

Have your say	Postcode
<p>Good morning</p> <p>Far fewer councils please.</p> <p>I've been in Hobart for 7 years and I'm dismayed how anti progressive this state continues to be.</p> <p>HCC says nothing publicly on the terrible \$1bn football stadium (that's where it will end up) that will flood the CBD with cars, noise, parking (?) and destroy the amenity of waterfront. Take a look at San Francisco's down town baseball stadium - a ghost town area on non game days, a wind tunnel around it, no shops can trade profitably on non game days. Special corporate interests run the Tasmanian government.</p>	<p>7000 (Glebe, TAS)</p>
<p>I am strongly supportive of the amalgamation/merging of local government councils. The current 29 councils situation is out-of-date and neither functionally or economically sustainable. The proposals provided here seem sensible and reasonable.</p> <p>There will be resistance to any such moves and as indicated, a voluntary approach may not be possible. The likely early resistance will abate over time. The worry by some of loss of representation is unlikely to be a reality. Indeed, larger councils are much more likely to have stronger impact in forums etc than the fragmented smaller ones at the moment.</p> <p>In particular, it is critical that the model for the greater Hobart area be developed - there can be no real solution to the increasing traffic problems unless and until a more macro approach can be instigated - this is far more likely to occur with more than just the current Hobart council and the need to work across jurisdictions is critical.</p> <p>While there will be much machinations in what this review is trying to achieve, the proposed moves to a more modern and dynamic set of council structures will be critical to the future viability of these bodies across Tasmania.</p>	<p>7004 (Battery Point, TAS)</p>

Have your say	Postcode
Western Shore scenario 3 please. As few councils as possible please.	7005 (Lower Sandy Bay, TAS)
<p>Based on the available information, I would see Western Shore 2 as the most viable scenario, however I believe the best Scenario for Hobart was not considered which would be Western Shore Scenario 2 + Clarence City Council as one Council.</p> <p>My reasoning on this is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clarence, Hobart, Glenorchy and Kingbrough represent the Urban core which make up Hobart. Residents identify as living in Hobart and deserve equal input, responsibility and access to resources for the city as a whole. Bridgewater would also fall into this catchment - Huon Council represents a more rural council with different focuses, and would be more sustainable with the population hubs of Margate, Cygnet and Kettering contributing to the overall Council resources . - Similarly the South-East of Sorell, Tasman and Glenorchy-Spring Bay represent a rural council with very different drivers to Clarence as an urban council. As someone raised in Tasman Council region I would say that the local residents would be ignored by Clarence Council and be completely unrepresentative. - Again, New Norfolk and Brighton are more rural/regional population hubs that are better associated with a central Tasmanian council. <p>What is not well articulated in this submission is how people will be represented in council. The current popularly elected councillors does not allow true representation of lower populated areas and potentially disadvantages certain areas. Switching a ward system similar to New Zealand as oppose to an undivided council system that currently exists would guarantee a level of representation to the existing areas and ensure that the interests of all people are represented.</p> <p>Ultimately whilst I support reform and fewer councils, any reform has to be done in consultation and respect of the people and people cannot be railroaded to suit either the interests of state politicians or the interests of Councillors.</p>	<p>7008 (Lenah Valley, TAS)</p>

Online portal submissions - deidentified

Have your say	Postcode
<p>The Huon City Council has often proven itself incompetent at managing its region properly due to, in my opinion, the ignorance and inferior reasoning powers of its inhabitants because of their isolation and poor upbringing.</p> <p>I therefore support moves to have that region administered by the Kingborough council.</p>	<p>7010 (Rosetta, TAS)</p>
<p>The stage two interim summary looks like you're on track to point out many goals most ratepayers want.</p> <p>I have to admit I didn't read 10% of the report, but the reform that advises 'Remove councillors' responsibility for determining development applications entirely. All developments would be determined by council planning officers or referred to an independent panel for determination' appears on the surface to be the best option. Does it need some clarity on the suitability/ qualification of council planning officers? At the moment having councillors who have no idea about planning laws seems to be a detriment. We get nowhere if this is still the case if we set up council planners to fail by not ensuring they are the best people to make recommendations.</p> <p>I guess this bleeds into reform #2 if we make a board or committee responsible for these decisions. Hopefully such a committee is well set up to manage a large workload.</p> <p>Personally at this point I'm in favour of your idea to make significant mandated changes to existing council boundaries to create a smaller number of larger, more capable councils.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	<p>7011 (Austins Ferry, TAS)</p>
<p>I live on the Eastern Shore and I have read the Eastern Shore Community Catchment Information Pack. Based on the scenarios provided, Scenario 1 is my preferred option followed by Scenario 3 as it appears the communities have more in common. I think it is an exciting time that can provide benefits across communities.</p>	<p>7018 (Montagu Bay, TAS)</p>

Have your say	Postcode
<p data-bbox="203 244 1377 272">Subject: Submission for Council Amalgamation - Eastern Shore Community Catchment (Scenario 3)</p> <p data-bbox="203 316 607 344">Dear Board of Local Government,</p> <p data-bbox="203 387 1704 523">I am writing to submit a proposal for the amalgamation of the Clarence, Sorell, and Tasman Local Government Areas (LGAs) to form a single council for the Eastern Shore Community Catchment, based on Scenario 3 outlined in the provided information pack. This submission is supported by thorough analysis and evidence that demonstrate the benefits and feasibility of this structural reform option.</p> <p data-bbox="203 566 495 595">Rationale and Evidence:</p> <p data-bbox="203 638 1693 810">Under Scenario 3, the proposed amalgamation recognizes the shared geography and interconnections between communities in the Eastern Shore region. The consolidation of these LGAs into one council area acknowledges the economic and employment links within the catchment and the emergence of important commercial and service centers, such as Sorell and Rosny. Additionally, the scenario considers the need to maintain local accessibility to services, representation, and employment, especially for the rural Tasman Peninsula.</p> <p data-bbox="203 853 1704 989">The consolidated council would have the necessary resources and capabilities to address emerging community needs, such as strategic planning, housing and infrastructure demands, and climate change mitigation. By pooling together the expertise and resources of the three LGAs, the council can ensure the sustainability and cost-effectiveness of local government services for rural communities like Tasman.</p> <p data-bbox="203 1032 1671 1168">The scenario supports enhanced scope capabilities in key areas such as regulatory services, environment and public health, building and plumbing, and strategic planning. It would enable better access to quality advice for customers, consistent regulation and compliance across the region, and facilitate the implementation of strategic initiatives like the Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy.</p> <p data-bbox="203 1211 1688 1347">To ensure access to services, the proposed network model suggests maintaining existing council offices across the Community Catchment as administrative and service delivery hubs. This arrangement would allow 94% of residents to be within a 30-minute drive of these hubs in Rosny, Sorell, and Nubeena. Moreover, this proximity not only supports access but also ensures economic and rates base diversity.</p>	<p data-bbox="1731 1358 1944 1386">7018 (Rosny, TAS)</p>

Have your say	Postcode
<p>Retaining local jobs and services is a key benefit of this scenario. The consolidation would enable the council to attract and retain specialist staff, provide job security and career pathways, and invest in productivity-enhancing equipment and standardization of back-office systems. While a single council facilitates sharing of resources and teams, maintaining regional depots and a larger regulatory services team would ensure business continuity, attract specialized staff, and meet local needs effectively.</p> <p>Preserving and enhancing local voice is a crucial consideration in this scenario. The challenge lies in ensuring that a single regional council preserves and enhances local representation across the diverse communities within the catchment. However, the consolidated council would have the capacity to invest in systematic approaches to community engagement, introduce community advisory panels, and conduct regional council meetings in different parts of the area. These measures would ensure that all communities are heard, represented, and have direct influence in the decision-making process.</p> <p>Financial Sustainability:</p> <p>The proposed amalgamation would have significant financial sustainability. The estimated rate revenue for the new council area in 2021 dollars would be \$64.3 million. With a diverse rate base drawn from residential, commercial, and industrial land, the council would have access to a substantial revenue source. While transition challenges exist, such as the variation in residential rates across the catchment, a larger council would be well-positioned to provide more cost-effective services to residents, particularly those in the Tasman Peninsula.</p> <p>Operational Sustainability:</p> <p>The consolidation of the three LGAs into a larger Eastern Shore Council would yield considerable economies of scope and scale. It would enhance the sustainability, coherence, and effectiveness of critical strategic, infrastructure, and land-use planning. However, careful consideration is required to address the implications for the South East Catchment, given the inclusion of Sorell and Tasman LGAs in this scenario.</p> <p>Implications for Neighboring Community Catchments:</p> <p>The proposed amalgamation of the Eastern Shore Community Catchment may have implications for neighboring community catchments and their respective councils. Boundaries along the coastlines provide a clear rationale, while implications arise from including urban Sorell, which could separate it from the wider South-East Catchment. Further investigation is needed to</p>	

Have your say	Postcode
<p>establish the orientation and identity of areas like Brighton and the implications for neighboring catchments, such as the Central and Midlands Catchment or the Western Shore Catchment.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>Based on the analysis and evidence presented, Scenario 3 of council amalgamation for the Eastern Shore Community Catchment is a viable and beneficial option. It ensures better resource allocation, improved service delivery, and enhanced representation for the diverse communities within the catchment. The consolidation would foster economic growth, provide job opportunities, and support the sustainability and cost-effectiveness of local government.</p> <p>We urge careful consideration of this proposal and its potential for positive outcomes in the region. We are confident that the amalgamation of the Clarence, Sorell, and Tasman LGAs will lead to a more efficient, effective, and responsive local government that can meet the evolving needs of the community.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this matter.</p>	

Have your say	Postcode
<p>hi there at the future of local government submissions receipt area! although local representation is important, it is simply too inefficient to have 29 councils for just over a half a million people local areas do need a process whereby local views can be taken into account, but the total number of councils should be dramatically reduced and because of a kind of cultural paralysis in Tasmanians, whereby little is ever achieved in this area, these changes must be forced it should all happen at once, the re-drawing of boundaries, and with significance then with simultaneous new elections for all positions, which would be declared vacant, starting anew (this should not lead to total chaos, as all current processes would continue, until changed by incoming councils, and state government processes and oversight would continue, and there would need to be a transition period for council staff, with allowances made for their employment and conditions) overall, the nine councils currently proposed is still too many the southern area only needs one council, not three, for example; Hobart, Clarence and Glenorchy can and should be combined, and also adjoining areas added other council areas could be: north and north-east coast north-west coast east coast central (all midlands areas) west coast that would mean a total of 6 councils, with the inclusion of a southern council, with all areas still represented each council would represent different numbers of people but there would be clear geographical associations, and it makes sense, intuitively also, please remove all planning matters from council altogether; the decisions made by locals on council are too open to lobbying and can be too partisan and not evidence-based, and it would be much more reasonable to have one single planning body for Tasmania, that processes applications, and one appeals body applications would still be lodged but there would be no options for lobbying, all decisions could be made on merits, and planning laws and regulations, and not on who you know/lobbying/politics it always seems very strange to watch a council meeting where one councillor - with no particular training in the area - describes their visit to a house to inspect regarding a possible skylight installation at one point in a meeting, and later on discusses the relative merits of a proposed 2,500 house lot subdivision, and the placement of the urban growth boundary.</p>	7021 (Lauderdale, TAS)

Have your say	Postcode
<p>FIVE COUNCILS MODEL</p> <p>Where should new council boundary lines be drawn?" Simply consolidate LGAs to five state / federal seat model. On the whole, works crews may continue to operate from existing depots, within redrawn boundaries.</p> <p>Together with much-needed reforms to "remove councillors' responsibility for determining development applications"; the efficiency dividends from reduced bureaucracy (e.g. \$200k plus salary-packaged General Managers etc) and reduced governance (number of councillors) is commonsense and pragmatic.</p> <p>Local government elections, based on a population-density ward system within LGAs, may then be fixed with state elections too.</p>	<p>7026 (Campania, TAS)</p>
<p>Keep the status quo. Will be no benefit to the community in terms of services in making the council areas larger. Being in a rural area we need closer services and people who are involved in the community. With one of the scenarios the counsellors would be cut from 40 to 7. How is this going to benefit our community when people being voted in would be from the larger demographic area with a larger voting presence. It will also impact our rates as the government have not allocated any funds towards the amalgamations. Who will be paying for the rebranding, IT support to join the different councils etc? Us. Southern Midlands Council is doing a great job for our community, please leave it as is.</p>	<p>7030 (Elderslie, TAS)</p>

Online portal submissions - deidentified

Have your say	Postcode
<p>Hello, The Kingborough community is very much and independent community away from the Hobart city area despite the fact that many of us work in that region. Kingborough is a very different space to that of Hobart. We have a large mix of rural and urban. We don't have a large city area. We are very aware that if aliged with Hobart then all the money will be spent north of Mount Nelson. Many organisations operate the southern area such as kingborough and the huon valley as seperate entities. If you wish to amalgamate Kingbrough then please align us with the Huon Valley. Taking the rural areas and putting them with the huon would not be economically viable. so please take two municipalities that are very similar and make them one . Two areas that are outside of the city area and that is the way that we like it. Kingborough Huon - Vote one! Let Hobart do their own thing.</p>	<p>7052 (Blackmans Bay, TAS)</p>
<p>I remain concerned about a particular aspect of any "amalgamation" of Tas Council's. It's my view, with the experience of working both with and for Local Govt., in Tas over a period of over 40 years, the key to maintaining a workable Local Govt., sector is to ensure the areas of responsibility are closely aligned to "areas of community interest". As an example, I believe the current Huon and Kingborough communities are a strong and traditional "area of interest" with the exception possibly of Taroon which is more aligned with Hobart City.</p>	<p>7052 (Blackmans Bay, TAS)</p>

Have your say	Postcode
<p>The Taroona Community Association (TCA) is writing to comment on the Local Government Review Board Stage 2 Final Report and Southern Shore Community Information Catchment Information Pack.</p> <p>The TCA's comments are specifically in relation to Taroona, the long-term benefits of the servicing of this suburb and the management of the suburb's valued attributes.</p> <p>In reviewing the scenarios presented in the information package we support either scenario 1 or 3 (but only if there is support from the councils involved), both of which propose to move Taroona to the capital city LGA of Hobart.</p> <p>Scenarios 1 and 3 state that there will be significant challenges from a sustainability perspective if Taroona and Kingston's population are separated from Kingborough. We presume this is financial sustainability as there is insufficient detail presented to justify this broad statement.</p> <p>From Taroona's perspective we must consider the long-term benefits that realignment of LGA boundaries will have not just the short-term impacts.</p> <p>The benefits are:</p> <p>Geography and location on the Derwent Estuary Topographically, Taroona is separated from Kingston by Bonnet Hill whereas the Channel Highway joins up with Sandy Bay Road winding its way into Hobart on the same contour, hugging the Derwent Estuary coastline. Taroona also possesses an urban density of housing that differs from the semi-rural density of Bonnet Hill which separates it functionally and visually from Kingston.</p> <p>Environmental benefits Because of where Taroona is geographically located, it is our view that there would be improved management of the landscape and visual amenity, biodiversity, and infrastructure if we are moved into the LGA of Hobart. Contemporary natural resource management practices manage landscapes based on catchments so the LGA boundary could be aligned with the Bonnet Hill ridgeline. There could be improved management of the visual amenity of skylines with connections from Mt Nelson through to Albion Heights. There could be improved protection of natural values extending from the reserves of Truganini & Bicentennial Park through to Bonnet Hill and the potential for improved management and resourcing of the vegetated gullies which form characteristic fingers of green connecting to the Derwent.</p>	<p>7053 (Taroona, TAS)</p>

Online portal submissions - deidentified

Have your say	Postcode
<p>Fire management</p> <p>Urban area fire management has different needs to rural fire management. Hobart City Council has a well-resourced and informed urban and bushland fire management program that could better service the urban needs of Tarooma.</p> <p>To conclude, this submission represents the majority view of the TCA committee. Tarooma residents have not been surveyed but committee members are aware that it has been a long-held view of many residents that our suburb could be better placed in the Hobart Local Government Area as most residents work and shop in Hobart.</p>	

Have your say	Postcode
<p>I would like to see the existing Councils overhauled internally before any amalgamations. Any of these scenarios could work if the will to make it work for all the people was there but its not and we are then left with a choice between the least desirable because there is no trust in the process.</p> <p>Sure amalgamate the councils and then strip all their resources through the creation of TAS Water, TAS Waste, TAS Roads and TAS Planning. What then are the Councils responsible for ? Why would people still be required to pay rates in that scenario, so Council can continue with all the Social and Environmental Protection roles they have been busy writing themselves into for the last decade ?</p> <p>Manipulation of Council boundaries to enhance external funding opportunities for a Greater Hobart City seems to be high on the agenda. So why not just cut off the urban areas of Kingborough and let them join the Greater Hobart Council and enjoy all that Smart City funding. However amalgamating the existing Huon and Kingborough Councils will lead to further extraction of resources from the rural areas to help build the Kingston Activity Centre within the STRLUS framework.</p>	7054 (Leslie Vale, TAS)

Online portal submissions - deidentified

Have your say	Postcode
<p>I would like to suggest that the City of Hobart amalgamates with Kingborough Council and Huon Valley Council. Kingborough Council does not practice good governance. Any amalgamation of Kingborough and the Huon Valley would be to the detriment of the Huon Valley community.</p> <p>The City of Hobart incorporates principles such as these into all of its decision-making: transparency, genuine community engagement, treating communities equitably, accountability. Kingborough repeatedly avoids community engagement, frequently ignores endorsed strategies and policies, allocates funding without the strategic justification, neglects areas outside of Kingston (with regard to strategic planning as well as investment), has no concept of treating all communities fairly.</p> <p>Please remove Kingborough's control.</p>	7054 (Margate, TAS)
<p>None of these scenarios suits me. The better scenario would be to merge Huon and Kingborough and excise Taroona north of the Bonnet Hill summit, a much more geographically distinct boundary than currently exists north of Grange Avenue. Having lived in both areas the unKingboroughness of Taroona always jarred.</p>	7054 (Margate, TAS)
<p>I think strategy 2 is the way to go it makes sence to combine and share machinery as long as they're maintained properely, employing more on ground staff Councils are top heavy as it is and not employing outside manual workers at moment in Huon area . Maybe we'll see more repairs to roads where needed , We are over cancelled with small councils and combining may allow more to be done in communities.</p>	7109 (Grove, TAS)

Have your say	Postcode
<p>I am supportive of the following scenario: Scenario 2 – Establishing one Council area. This scenario combines the existing Huon Valley and Kingborough Council areas.</p> <p>This enables a new council to focus on areas that have similar concerns regarding growth and infrastructure. The challenges are embedded in balancing the demands for improvements to the existing services and resources allocated to semi/rural & rural localities whilst also catering to the needs of the more densely populated areas.</p> <p>Duplication of council services are currently a major concern with the overriding administrative cost burden versus the provision of actual services to improve localities. The quality of decision making is also of concern as there are a significant proportion of elected officials who have little, if no, understanding of finance, economics, functions of ROI etc.</p> <p>By decreasing the number of councils, the administrative cost burden is able to be reduced and budget income reallocated to priority areas. In noting this, it is also important to identify formulas that will facilitate equity in the allocation of funding to semi-rural and rural areas as the cost of service provision to these areas is often higher due to geographical spread vs rate income.</p>	<p>7109 (Grove, TAS)</p>
<p>I support Scenario 1.</p>	<p>7109 (Huonville, TAS)</p>

Have your say	Postcode
<p>Scenario 1: presents a compelling option for the structural reform of local government in Tasmania. Based on historical experiences, amalgamation often fails to deliver the anticipated benefits. Therefore, Scenario 1 offers a more prudent approach to ensure that local councils can better serve Tasmanian communities while preserving the essential aspects of local governance.</p> <p>The goal of the reform process is to design a local government system that allows all councils to develop and maintain the capability necessary to meet community needs, deliver services locally, protect local jobs, and ensure strong representation for all Tasmanians. Scenario 1 aligns with this objective by emphasizing the importance of preserving local services and jobs, as well as maintaining a strong voice for communities in decision-making processes.</p> <p>The three scenarios outlined in the information pack are intended to prompt discussion and consideration of different pathways to achieve a more capable and sustainable system of local government. While Scenario 1 is not the only option, it provides a viable alternative that addresses the pitfalls of amalgamation and acknowledges the unique needs and aspirations of each community.</p> <p>The development of Scenario 1, like the other scenarios, is based on the Board's structural reform principles and four essential criteria: Place and Representation, Future Needs and Priorities, Financial Sustainability, and Operational Capability. By utilizing these criteria and analysing relevant data sets, the Board, in collaboration with the University of Tasmania, has ensured an evidence-based and comprehensive approach to scenario development.</p> <p>Scenario 1 recognises the significance of place and representation. This approach ensures that communities have a direct say in local affairs and fosters a sense of ownership and connection to the decision-making process. By avoiding large-scale amalgamation, Scenario 1 avoids diluting local representation and keeps decision-making closer to the people it directly impacts.</p> <p>Additionally, Scenario 1 acknowledges the importance of financial sustainability and operational capability. By avoiding extensive service sharing and partnership arrangements, this scenario offers a more feasible and self-sufficient model. It reduces the risks associated with larger council areas that may struggle to maintain the necessary scale and financial stability to deliver long-term capability.</p> <p>In conclusion, Scenario 1 offers a more cautious and community centred approach to local government reform in Tasmania. By addressing the historical shortcomings of amalgamation and emphasising the preservation of local services, jobs, and</p>	<p>7109 (Huonville, TAS)</p>

Have your say	Postcode
<p>community representation, this scenario ensures a more capable and sustainable system of local government. The engagement process welcomes alternative suggestions, fostering an inclusive and collaborative environment where the unique needs and aspirations of communities can be considered.</p> <p>While reviewing, I also believe that LGA should lose there planning authority status.</p> <p>Conflict of Interest: Councils often face conflicts of interest when it comes to planning decisions. Elected officials may have personal or political motivations that can influence their decision-making, potentially leading to biased outcomes. By removing planning authority from councils, we can eliminate this conflict of interest and ensure that planning decisions are made solely based on objective criteria and the best interests of the community.</p> <p>Lack of Expertise: Councils are not always equipped with the necessary expertise in urban planning, architecture, environmental science, and related fields. Planning decisions require specialized knowledge to assess the impact on infrastructure, environment, and community development. By transferring planning authority to dedicated planning professionals or independent bodies, we can ensure that decisions are made by individuals with the required expertise, leading to more informed and effective planning outcomes.</p> <p>Inefficiency and Delays: Councils' involvement in planning decisions can often lead to bureaucratic red tape, lengthy approval processes, and unnecessary delays in development projects. This can hinder economic growth, stifle innovation, and discourage investment in local communities. By removing planning authority from councils and streamlining the decision-making process through specialized bodies or professionals, we can promote efficiency, expedite approvals, and foster a more conducive environment for sustainable development.</p> <p>Accountability and Transparency: Transferring planning authority away from councils can enhance accountability and transparency in decision-making. Councils may face pressures from vested interests or political influences, potentially compromising the integrity of planning decisions. By entrusting planning authority to independent bodies or professionals, we can ensure greater transparency, minimize the potential for favouritism, and hold decision-makers accountable for their actions.</p> <p>Regional and Consistent Planning: Planning decisions often have implications beyond individual council boundaries. They can affect neighbouring communities, regional infrastructure, and overall urban development. By centralizing planning authority at a regional or higher level, we can promote more cohesive and coordinated planning strategies that consider broader</p>	

Have your say	Postcode
<p>regional goals and harmonize development across different areas. This approach avoids fragmented decision-making and fosters a more integrated and sustainable approach to planning.</p> <p>By considering these arguments, one can make a case for taking away planning authority from councils. Doing so would address conflicts of interest, improve decision-making expertise, enhance efficiency, promote accountability, and enable more regional and consistent planning approaches.</p>	

Online portal submissions - deidentified

Have your say	Postcode
<p>I am strongly supportive of "Scenario 2 – Establishing one Council area. This scenario combines the existing Huon Valley and Kingborough Council areas" (with or without Tarooma) as I believe this is the most financially viable way forward for Huon Valley Council/residents and this should bring many strengths of Kingborough Council into the Huon Valley.</p> <p>However, consideration must be given as to how best ensure that the interests of rural members of the community are not swamped by those of Greater Kingston. While the suggested "community advisory panels" are one mechanism to achieve this, the need to consult such panels AND take into account their input must be enshrined in legislation or operational "charters". Care must be taken with such panels to ensure that they genuinely represent the interests of local areas. We should also be considering electoral reform to ensure that local areas within a merged larger council/entity are represented on council itself - councillors will therefore be directly answerable to their constituents.</p>	<p>7109 (Judbury, TAS)</p>
<p>Thank you, I very much agree with reducing the size of councils in Tasmania! I have worked as a staff member of a large council in Tasmania and disgusted on the lack of processes and professionalism there. I was very disappointed to see how little regard Council had for their role in the community and how they put personal opinions and politics before well-being of the community. Reducing the amount will ensure better use of resources and accountability, but even better is the need for code of conduct. Also something else to look at is lack of diversity and representation.</p>	<p>7109 (Judbury, TAS)</p>
<p>I believe the Huon Council should be amalgamated with the Kingborough Council because of the synergies of the two areas and the potential of the larger ratepayer base to prioritise and fund larger projects of importance across the two regions.</p>	<p>7109 (Lonnvale, TAS)</p>

Have your say	Postcode
<p>Southern Shore Catchment: Scenario 2 supported.</p> <p>Huon Valley and Kingborough Council amalgamated with the retention of Kingston Urban. It is understood Kingborough Council may wish for a Bruny Island exclusion with an independent Council to be granted. This also is supported.</p> <p>Overview of support:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tasmania has a unique chance to modernise Local Government and its relationship with the State Government that should not be lost. 2. Under this review it is paramount Local and State Governments re-evaluate their core functions and responsibilities. This includes areas of duplication in health services, aged care, child-care, and road safety and maintenance. For example, Health care (medical services) is not a responsibility of local government. It is a clearly defined responsibility between State and Federal governments. Funding and administration should not be provided at a Council and ratepayer level. The Huon Valley would have a significant proportion of its population not subject to the Medicare Levy, yet as ratepayers they are charged for general health services. 3. In addition to the above, transitional costs must be negotiated with generous funding support by the state government. As part of this review, the State Government should consider a more equitable rating base. Rates are for services provided and, as such, might be better raised as a flat fee statewide rather than based on estimates by the Valuer-General. This also creates long term financial sustainability. 4. Core functions by Local Government can be enhanced by amalgamating some administrative functions within the State Department of Local Government. Typically, these would include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Financial services. b. Human Resource Management (eg streamlined staff selections and documentation through external tender arrangements), and Performance Management procedural guidelines incorporating KPIs. c. Staff Development and Training (Induction; OH&S, Harassment, Discrimination, Equal Employment, and Access and Equity policies and procedural guidelines etc). d. Information Technology and Systems development to support the above. A paperless office should be one aim. We still receive our Rates Notice in paper form. An experience we had in 2015 had one Council only recognising formal letters as retained correspondence. Emails and telephone calls were not recognised. 5. Centres of Excellence should operate across regional councils (eg, Southern and Northern with Eastern and NW to be further considered). Engineering and Legal Services would fit within such Centres providing greater professionalism, project management, consistency, and a capacity to better manage staff professionalism and availability. 6. Kingston Urban must be retained as a necessary population base to the broader Channel and Huon Valley districts. Such urban centres are evidenced across Australia in regional Local Councils eg Dubbo, Wangaratta, Gippsland etc as forming part 	<p>7109 (Lucaston, TAS)</p>

Have your say	Postcode
<p>of the wider geographic area. Recreational activities (boating, 4WD, camping, cycling, sport) are usually local and come at a cost to local government and must be financially supported by all local ratepayers.</p> <p>Discounted Arguments against Local Government reform:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Loss of representation - Councillors, like any profession, might be good or bad with various strengths and weaknesses. A large or small council will not change this fact. Councillors will be only as good as they prove to be, and as accepted as segments of the voting public choose to believe.2. Amalgamation has failed interstate - This claim is hearsay only. Another difference is the relative size of a Council's population. Even with Tasmania's proposed amalgamations, Tasmania will not have similarly large-scale Councils. Critics are not comparing like with like.3. We will lose our identity or township - Expenditure needs to shift with population shifts. There are pockets of urban development, and the ABS Census data show large shifts over time across townships including aging. If 50% of the population resides north of Geeveston, for example, then expenditure and infrastructure need to reflect that quantum. Quite simply, it's a nonsense.	

Online portal submissions - deidentified

Have your say	Postcode
<p>I believe there is an urgent need to reform. Councils have a huge workload and inadequate funding due to cost transfers and politically driven grant allocations. The skill shortage is also a statewide problem which could be addressed through state supported training and cadetship programs in particular for engineers, town planners, environmental health officers, and building surveyors.</p> <p>Southern Shore Scenario 2 has some merit. As the info pack says, it "maximises scale capability potential for the Catchment, and having rural areas connected to significant regional commercial centres would enhance the financial sustainability of the new council."</p> <p>My preference is for it to be without Taroona which could link with Hobart and for existing council service, administration and works hubs to be maintained in Huonville and Kingston.</p> <p>It is critical that systems are put in place to ensure the whole region receives an adequate and consistent agreed minimum service standard, including around infrastructure. It is more equitable and transparent to do this via deliberate and direct subsidisation to areas of need.</p> <p>It is critical that the State Government fund the cost of transition and provide support to ensure equity and fairness. As further stated in the info pack "The Board has received a range of submissions suggesting that there is a need for, and a potential benefit from, local government receiving stronger and more targeted support from State Government. The kinds of support suggested includes regulatory guidelines, decision support tools, staff exchanges, shared facilities, staff training and funding. The Board has identified a number of specific opportunities for establishing new or enhanced partnerships with State Government that could be pursued in conjunction with structural reforms to councils. These partnerships could enhance the quality, range and accessibility of services provided by councils to the community, and also reduce the cost of providing those services. " and</p> <p>"By enabling the community's access to government services at a range of locations, including at home through online and phone services, stronger State Government partnerships could support two of the core guiding principles discussed in the Stage 2 Interim Report:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Retain jobs and service presence locally,2. Preserve and enhance local voice"	7109 (Lucaston, TAS)

Have your say	Postcode
<p>I also support the info pack statement that "Integrating local government enquiries into a shared contact centre capability would provide access to efficient and effective operating practices, best in class technology and support, along with economies of scale. Councils may often experience surges in demand such around rates notice periods and emergencies, and so leveraging a more scalable capability can assist at these times." and</p> <p>"Improved connectivity would enable Digital hubs to be established in regional areas, with well supported digital access and a range of council and community facilities, such as service shopfronts, conferencing facilities and meeting rooms. By focussing State Government and council investment in this way, such premises could be available for council 'regional' meetings, community engagement sessions and regional online attendance to improve community representation. To build capability to support these things locally, there is also scope for the State Government's emerging Digital Workforce Capability program to be leveraged for local council staff – the program will focus on three areas: digital skills and workforce planning, digital careers development and digital talent pipelines.</p> <p>Over time, the digital services portal will provide foundational tools that could potentially assist councils to enhance the range of services that can be offered online. Examples of these tools include e-forms, a central customer relationship management platform and a systems integration capability. " and</p> <p>"Community Engagement plans to ensure people impacted by a decision are genuinely consulted about those impacts citizens who are given the opportunity to participate in deliberative engagement processes feel stronger connections to their communities, and their representatives. "</p> <p>The info pack outlines a well-considered method to ensure good community engagement "community advisory panels regularly consulted by council to ensure constituents, especially from rural communities, enjoy enhanced formal representation and direct influence in the decision-making process including community budget priorities. (see Supporting Paper on Supporting Strong and Empowered Local Communities). Operations hubs could also be used for a program of scheduled regional council meetings in different areas of the municipality. "</p> <p>Under Scenario 2 (minus Taroona) we could still investigate Shared Services Models</p> <p>As stated in the info pack "with potential boundary consolidation scenarios, consideration needs to be given to the Board's principles for structural change, in particular, that shared services:</p>	

Have your say	Postcode
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • can support councils in focusing on current and future community needs; • are compatible with retention of local jobs and services; and • receive appropriate resourcing for transition" and <p>"Drivers for shared services vary depending on local circumstances. However, common drivers of shared services, identified through the Board's engagement and research, are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meet skill shortages and provide a means for attracting locally based resources in regional areas. • Increase organisational capacity to meet service standards and, potentially, capacity to provide higher level and/or additional services. • Achieve efficiencies in service delivery through economies of scale, helping to improve financial sustainability, and reduced duplication of effort and resources. • Improve risk management due to sharing of risks and improved ability to comply with legislation due to increased capacity and resources" <p>"The success factors for shared services in local government are articulated in the UTAS paper Options for sharing services in Tasmanian Local Government as being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identified, realistic, and measurable benefits. • Transparent, accountable governance arrangements and formalised agreement. • Role clarity. • Support from council staff. • Equitable distribution of resources, cost, and risk. • Systems and infrastructure compatible with service or resource sharing. 	

Have your say	Postcode
<p>Alongside the success factors sit barriers which UTAS identifies as being mainly as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Inappropriate rationale for adoption.• Lack of data or inadequacy of monitoring, reporting, and evaluation.• Resistance on the part of councillors or council staff.• Perceived loss of control or autonomy. "	

Online portal submissions - deidentified

Have your say	Postcode
<p>Scenario 2 sounds like the best option by far! It allows so much more opportunity for growth. Let's get our roads sealed, our infrastructure stable and our people to the services they need. United we can achieve more.</p>	<p>7109 (Lucaston, TAS)</p>
<p>I prefer scenario 1. Two council areas with the current Huon Council area retained. The current Huon Valley council are doing a superb job in invigorating the culture of the Huon Valley for the first time since I moved here 20 years ago. I want that to continue and I don't believe an amalgamated council can successfully represent the needs of our community which are vastly different from kingborough.</p>	<p>7109 (Lucaston, TAS)</p>
<p>My main concern — what will this do to approved building projects and projects in the approval pipeline? It takes so long to get development and building approval in the Huon Valley, and many other councils — I would *hate* for a poorly conceived and executed consolidation to end in lost approvals, reset clocks, etc — causing years of wasted time and wasted funds to those seeking to build. However the consolidation goes forward, please ensure that building projects are not negatively affected.</p>	<p>7109 (Lucaston, TAS)</p>
<p>i believe the councils should be kept separate - specifically - Kingborough and Huon Valley and whoever determined to excise Taroona from Kingborough, did so without consultation and that needs to be reversed.</p> <p>warm regards and thanks for the opportunity to have my say</p>	<p>7109 (Lymington, TAS)</p>
<p>I fully support keeping the 2 council areas separate. HVC is sitting in a better financial position and have done very well maintaining all of their infrastructure and roads and parks and creating lovely spaces over the years. Kingborough Council has made a total mess of their finances and also of their township street scape. Keep separate for sure.</p>	<p>7109 (Ranelagh, TAS)</p>

Online portal submissions - deidentified

Have your say	Postcode
<p>I write concerning the proposed amalgamation of Huon Valley (HVC) and Kingborough Councils. I am generally in favour of a merger to reduce the total number of local government areas in Tasmania. My specific concern is that Kingborough is carrying \$24m in debt on its balance sheet (30 June 2022). By contrast HVC has practically none. If an amalgamation were to occur, I would want current Kingborough rate payers to shoulder the burden of their debt, not current HVC rate payers. If an amalgamation were to occur, one potential solution is a debt repayment levy (or other rate increase) on current Kingborough properties. Alternatively a sale of some Kingborough Council assets or some other balance sheet restructuring might be required before an amalgamation.</p>	<p>7109 (Ranelagh, TAS)</p>
<p>Scenario 2 would be our preferred option. The current council arrangement sees very few basic services in the Southport area, currently enjoyed by rate payers of the Kingborough Council such as waste services, sealed roads, curb and guttering, public parks with waste removal, transport services, medical services. No tourist infrastructure is currently available that is not privately funded.</p>	<p>7109 (Southport, TAS)</p>

Have your say	Postcode
<p>Regarding Southern Shore Catchment.</p> <p>We feel that it is not truly viable for any business(and a Council is one) to be able to function effectively if there is an ongoing need for applications for grants and extra funds. All businesses have to be able to conduct themselves in a manner that ensures costs stay within the bounds of income. Presently our Huon Valley Council is unable to do that.</p> <p>Increasing the rateable catchment may mean a furtherance of the needs of the more rural areas in aspects such as roading, community facilities and health services. The risk of melding with a high proportion of suburban rate payers, is the division of demand for those services based on proportion of funds raised. In other words the demand for kerbing for residential areas gets precedence over the repair of potholes, washouts and unsafe gravel roads in rural areas.</p> <p>Given the dynamic nature of the rural areas of both Kingborough and Huon Valley Councils as evidenced by the increased approval for housing developments and the dearth of housing in Greater Hobart, the population of the Southern Shore is set to increase markedly. Most of these new residents will be in suburban residences which will attract a greater income for Council.</p> <p>The City of Kingston and the Town of Margate are fast becoming satellite suburbs of Greater Hobart with many residents commuting there for work.</p> <p>In conclusion- We prefer an amalgamation of Huon Valley Council with that portion of Kingborough south of the North West Bay River, thence north westwards to the existing boundary. This would then include those areas presently rural or semi rural in nature but include those areas that increase the rateable catchment without jeopardising the interests of those residents.</p> <p>In regard to Councillors involvement with Building Approvals.</p> <p>We are strongly in favour of removing the involvement of Councillors in the decision making process for Building and Design Approvals.</p> <p>Councillors are lay members of the community who are elected by their peers to develop policy across all aspects of the Council's jurisdiction. Most are not trained for nor have any background in the technical aspects of planning or building. There are laws, bylaws and directives that verbalise exactly whether a proposed development can or cannot proceed.</p> <p>Trained and Approved professionals are the only ones who have the ability to interpret these guidelines in a fair and sanctioned fashion.</p>	7112 (Cygnets, TAS)

Have your say	Postcode
<p>The Huon Valley is a distinct rural region. It's population is made up of a large proportion of people living in a rural setting & using the local towns (each with their own distinctive character) for their services. This is a vastly different situation when set against the urban nature of Kingborough municipality. The needs & aspirations of people living in a rural setting to those in an urban environment vary greatly. I am convinced that if the Huon Valley became part of a wider region including Kingborough, we in the Huon would be at a disadvantaged in many ways that would see us relegated to poor cousins.</p> <p>I am strongly in favour of the Huon Valley Region staying as a rural entity governed from Huonville.</p>	<p>7112 (Cygnet, TAS)</p>
<p>I do not exist this group to represent my views, or the views of my peers. However, i do wish to declare that the consolidating of council districts is destructive to the needs of the local communities. Already the Huon Valley Council fails to help its local inhabitants, and stands in the way of true community resilience. Any further consolidation or centralization of governing power will only exacerbate these problems by delocalizing the council government.</p>	<p>7112 (Cygnet, TAS)</p>
<p>I accept Tasmania has too many local councils but I always believed and still do, that amalgamating Cygnet Council with Huon Valley Council was detrimental to Cygnet residents in every respect. I would like to add my voice to scenario 2 combining the Huon Valley and Kingborough Council areas, minus Tarooma. I hope that Huon Valley Council will no longer be required and residents of this area are no longer subjected to bad financial management of ratepayer funds, and Council employees who consider themselves above the interests of the community.</p>	<p>7112 (Cygnet, TAS)</p>

Online portal submissions - deidentified

Have your say	Postcode
<p>Hi</p> <p>I want to see a solution that results in lower rates by reducing duplication in various roles across so many councils. I want to see important decisions made by people who DO NOT have a financial or other personal interest in various developments. I want to see nepotism actively driven out of whomever finally gets these new roles. I want o to see forward looking progressive representatives who can finally help drag this state into the future. I also count the days until I see the Huon council disbanded and replaced by people of intelligence rather than by people who know someone.</p>	7112 (Cygnet, TAS)
<p>Hi ,</p> <p>I vote or prefer option 1 .</p> <p>I reside in Garden island creek and so not want to combine 2 councils as prefer to keep Huon valley council separate to kingborough council areas . I feel it's not in the best interest of the Huon areas to amalgamate as Kingbourough council has sold most of its large land holdings to developers and created high density living areas . They know nothing of this area which is more rural and I would like to keep it that way and be unique and keep its beauty. It is in the best interest of this area to keep its own local council .</p> <p>Thank you</p>	7112 (Garden Island Creek, TAS)
<p>I would not agree to a merging of kingborough and huon councils.</p>	7112 (Nicholls Rivulet, TAS)
<p>I do not agree with the Huon Valley Council merging with Kingborough. This is not in the interests of HV ratepayers and we should remain as a stand alone Council. A merger will just result in higher rates and less services.</p>	7112 (Nicholls Rivulet, TAS)
<p>Please leave the Huon Valley Council as it is. There is no value to a merger with Kingborough. Then our areas will just be backwaters that will not be considered. I am very concerned about this. Evidence in other states shows that we will not get reduced rates at all. All our Huon rates will go up to Kingston and we won't get what we need down here. Leave the Council as it is please.</p>	7112 (Nicholls Rivulet, TAS)

Online portal submissions - deidentified

Have your say	Postcode
<p>Hi. I find the argument in favor of the Huon Valley council amalgamating with the Kingborough council unconvincing and would like to object to this occurring.</p>	7116 (Geeveston, TAS)
<p>I think that option 3 would be the best choice for the future of the Huon valley.</p>	7116 (Port Huon, TAS)
<p>I support Scenario 3.</p>	7116 (Surges Bay, TAS)
<p>The Southern Midlands Council is a small organisation representing a relatively small number of people across a broad rural area. It is in a good financial position and currently shares services across a number of neighbouring councils. I am concerned that any forced amalgamation – and I stress amalgamation will not be voluntary – will not be beneficial to the residents and ratepayers of SMC. In fact, it is fair to say that it will be detrimental—we will lose our identity, our voice and our representation if we are swallowed up into a larger local government area. Moreover, the support that the community receives from SMC currently would be greatly reduced or even removed altogether as the crucial connection between the councillors and their communities is severed. Don't make us amalgamate; it is not broken now, so don't try to 'fix' it. I support SMC, which has expressed its wish to retain the status quo.</p>	7120 (Oatlands, TAS)
<p>I believe that the present council structure should remain as there is no gains or cost savings by amalgamation As we are a small population joining with another council will mean less say in how things are done and services will be depleted Our council is presently financially viable and providing services for all persons that are needed Medical services are the only problem we have and amalgamation will not improve that problem as New Norfolk has the same problem.</p>	7140 (Ouse, TAS)

Have your say	Postcode
<p>I have read the information pack regarding Southern Shore Community provided and submit the following observations Overall, I believe Tasmanians are over governed. Given our small state population the expenditure on these levels of government are is excessive. I believe we must look at all possible measures to reduce costs to residents. Services are duplicated by councils and require rationalisation. Scenario 2 listed in the information pack seems a well thought out solution and I would favours this approach. If amalgamation of Kingborough and Huon Councils with the formation of one council is not possible, there should be a sharing of services between the two councils. I believe transfer of Taroona to Hobart LGA is logical given proximity and similarities. Urban Kingston should remain in Southern LGA.</p>	<p>7150 (Longley, TAS)</p>
<p>Hello,</p> <p>Local councils were created to represent and provide services for local communities.</p> <p>Amalgamation makes councils less 'local' and hence less responsive and sensitive to local issues. Instead of amalgamation why not encourage councils to work together with their services? This could be either by amalgamating service divisions (much like what happened with Tas Water, but on a smaller scale) or by one council providing services to its neighbours, and vice versa.</p> <p>Also I am very concerned about the removal or development decisions from councils. Development directly affects the community and so it should be the community that decides on developments. There are often very specific local issues that will not be apparent to staff situated in offices possibly 100km or more away from any given proposed development. Development decisions are best done by elected local representatives who are familiar with local requirements and sensitivities. This can still be in the framework of statewide guidelines, but the ultimate decisions need to be made by people answerable to the community.</p>	<p>7170 (Roches Beach, TAS)</p>

Have your say	Postcode
<p>Hello,</p> <p>Tasmania, as the review has already pointed out, has too many local councils to properly support their localities and deliver the minimum services required.</p> <p>My point of view, as a former local council employee, is that the number of councils needs a significant reduction, even beyond the suggestion made by the review panel.</p> <p>My suggestion is that there be three large councils generally located Northwest, Northeast & South.</p> <p>All the work depots would be retained, other than those that are located within a few kilometres of each other, these workforces and assets would be merged.</p> <p>Each of the new councils would have two, or three major offices to enable localised delivery of services and points of contact for residents. With a head office for each located in Burnie, Launceston, and Hobart, respectively.</p> <p>There would be a reduction in the upper management of each of the current councils, with some being re-deployed to the new entities. This would bring significant savings.</p> <p>The consolidation of asset management, information management, employment services, would see significant savings.</p> <p>The State Government has recently announced that it would not force any council amalgamations. This is an error and must be reversed.</p> <p>There is no way that the current councils will ever voluntarily merge.</p>	<p>7173 (Primrose Sands, TAS)</p>

Online portal submissions - deidentified

Have your say	Postcode
<p>After voting no to the previous amalgamation attempt with Tasman and Sorell I believe that the option in Scenario 1 has addressed my concerns. Merging Tasman with Glamorgan spring bay and the rural parts of Sorell keeps our council rural and coastal, and an upgrade to wielangta rd makes sense. I think in this scenario we will be able to still have good access to our local representatives, maintain our Peninsula Identity and leave potential for a future east coast identity to emerge.</p>	<p>7184 (Nubeena, TAS)</p>

Have your say	Postcode
<p>Hello</p> <p>As a resident of Tasman and a local councillor in the area, I am extremely pleased to see progression of the local government review. Whilst the vocal minority in my council have focused on the negatives of forced amalgamations and boundary adjustments, they have absolutely missed the opportunity to re-evaluate the priorities of the area and investigate better solutions and outcomes for residents and ratepayers. Local government should not be immune from review. Nor should local government refuse to participate in a review as has the Tasman Council.</p> <p>Shared services do not work for small regional/rural councils. In the last 5 years, Tasman has consistently reduced its use and participation in shared services, to the point it is completely irrelevant both as a service and as a budget line item.</p> <p>Tasman council is struggling to attract skilled workers (i.e planners/managers) and as such we are forced to use consultancy companies at extremely high per hour rates to deliver on essential services.</p> <p>If boundary adjustments are implemented, I strongly request that you keep our area as a rural and regional area and not integrate us with suburban/city areas. Tasman would lose its voice if we were to be absorbed by large city/suburban councils. In the Tasman municipality, we do not have sewage and or water services (not even potable water). We rely on septic systems and rainwater. We do not have adequate public transport. The majority of our roads are unsealed. If we are to be absorbed into other regional council areas, we must be provided the financial resources to support such a community.</p> <p>Regional and rural councils lack the density of a solid rate base, unlike suburban councils. Therefore we will require additional government funding to remain viable and provide the essential council services our community expects,</p> <p>Streamlining services at a state level will work but councils will not participate in this on their own accord. They will need to be directed by State government to do so. The duplication of services across the state must end and areas such as planning, accounts/finances/environmental health, building inspections etc.. need to be a state wide service and not run by 29 individual councils.</p>	<p>7185 (Premaydena, TAS)</p>

Have your say	Postcode
<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed Local Government Reform.</p> <p>There is no doubt that with 29 Local Government centers, the two levels of State Govt (House of Assembly and Legislative Council) and the two levels of Federal Government (House of Reps and the Senate) we are over governed.</p> <p>I note with interest that the North East and South East Community Information packs, have fuzzy boundaries, reflecting considerable uncertainty, as with a number of the other proposals elsewhere in the state.</p> <p>The history of past Council amalgamations for the East Coast has left a trail of lies and deception particularly in respect to the amalgamation of the oldest rural municipality in Australia, Glamorgan, and, at the time the "broke" Spring Bay Council.</p> <p>Glamorgan residents were promised that the "new" council would retain a Council shopfront in Swansea, and that services and facilities would be shared across the municipality, resulting in an improvement.</p> <p>All of these promises have been broken, with infrastructure and facilities in the northern part of the "new " municipality falling into disrepair or disappearing altogether, while million dollar developments and infrastructure spends, flourish in the south.</p> <p>I have no faith in this amalgamation process, as whichever way it goes, it would appear that Swansea Bicheno and Coles Bay, will end up at the end of the line again. The lines are being drawn to pick the eyes out of what used to be a vibrant, financially sound municipality and communities.</p> <p>My personal desire is that the original "Glamorgan" municipality remains "in tact". The fact that it is the oldest rural Municipality in the country should not be overlooked and could be utilized as a draw card.</p> <p>Logic would tell you that the East Coast, from Cape Portland to Spring Bay is a region now reliant on Tourism. The major employment Industry and Land Management Agency being Forestry is no more. Viticulture and other intensive agriculture is spreading along the coast from top to bottom.</p> <p>A Local Govt area with a "common focus" may bring some stability and consistency and sharing of the decision making processes for the whole region.</p> <p>From the outside looking in, Break O Day Council do have a focus on providing infrastructure and facilities which benefit both locals and tourists alike. The chaos which has plagued the GSBC over the past 7 years, including 10 GMs or acting GM's, a Mayor found Guilty of breaching the Local Government Act, Performance Improvement Directives issued to GSBC by the Local Govt Minister, it is little doubt that the residents of this municipality are jaded with Local Government.</p> <p>If the lines on maps are to be re-drawn, then a greater East Coast Municipality from Cape Portland in the north to the Little Swanport River in the south, encompassing Break O Day and the original Glamorgan Municipality would not be any worse than what we have currently provided "Ward" representation is included in the structure.</p>	<p>7190 (Swansea, TAS)</p>

Online portal submissions - deidentified

Have your say	Postcode
<p>Apologies to the Councilors who have been working hard to turn the chaos of GSBC around, your efforts are appreciated, however new focus, direction and long term planning is what's needed to re-invigorate the central East Coast region.</p> <p>Re-instate Swansea as a central HUB for the East Coast. A combined Service Tas Office , Local Govt shopfront, Tourist Information Centre including Heritage. The Community owned buildings to house this concept are still here despite Councils best efforts to sell them off.</p> <p>Expand the recreation opportunities with walking and cycling facilities and infrastructure, not just for Mountain bikes but pathways for electric commuter cycles all the way down the coast. Not on the highway clogging traffic and causing safety issues.</p> <p>We can look forward to a positive future.</p>	

Online portal submissions - deidentified

Have your say	Postcode
<p>I love this review. Campbell Town will best be served by being with other communities who share geography and demographics. The Northern Midlands council has been terrible for Campbell Town, and the dynamism of the Southern Midlands Council will be a welcome change under the proposed boundaries. I also love the future focus of this document: Campbell Town cannot sustain a major highway through its main street without major traffic and pedestrian infrastructure and/or by pass of the town, and needs innovative ways to capitalise on either opportunity.</p>	<p>7210 (Campbell Town, TAS)</p>
<p>I think that the Break O’Day Council should be left as it is, and we can do the same with all of the other councils too. But, if there’s only one or two councils left in the North East area of Tasmania, Flinders Island should become part of the Dorset Council and maybe do a new route from Bridport to Flinders Island via. a ferry, and maybe the same can apply to Smithton and King Island with the Circular Head Council on the North West Council if it’s being merged with other councils. But, I would prefer that all 29 councils should be left as they are, but with some border changes to represent the places that they are in their council regions like Mathinna is part of the Break O’Day Council, so the entire Mathinna area should stay within the Break O’Day Council.</p>	<p>7216 (St Helens, TAS)</p>

Have your say	Postcode
<p>I support amalgamation of Councils to share the rate base over urban and regional areas, to coordinate services, and to develop overarching land development strategies for an urban area and its satellite towns. At present there is a push for example to develop Hadspen, Legana, and Evandale when new development should be focussed on densification of Launceston.</p> <p>In Tamar valley I most strongly support the Scenario 3. I agree with the southern boundary but I would also be open to the area north of Brady's lookout and Windermere, and including Lilydale, being combined into a new Dorset-Lower Tamar Council area to better represent these more regional areas.</p> <p>Regardless of the boundaries I believe it is important to maintain local representation and would like to see ward-based councillors representing Urban Launceston, Midlands, and Lower Tamar wards. I would also like to see discretionary planning decisions made by only the Councillors representing the affected wards rather than the full council. To support this the Council should convene a panel of independent planners and architects to provide fearless advice to the Councillors in making their decision. The number of Councillors should be large to support the ward-based decision making with savings in service delivery rather than by reduction in total Councillors across the state.</p>	7248 (Mowbray, TAS)

Have your say	Postcode
<p>The amalgamation of the former St Leonards and Lilydale municipalities should be taken as a blueprint of what NOT TO DO if you are going to amalgamate local government areas. One of the 3 reasons the Government of the day gave for amalgamating St Leonards was the treatment of St Leonards (S L) rural ratepayers, but by doing away with the ward system any chance of rural representation went out the window! Rural ratepayers are now given no consideration whatever! SL had embarked on a program of progressively sealing rural roads and when it was put into administration (under Mr F J C White) that program was continued and expanded but when his tenure ended and it was returned to elected council it came under such extreme pressure from LCC (under Mayor Don Wing) that the SL Council ceased all capital works so they could keep their rates below LCC which they thought would ensure their survival. It was a policy which ultimately led to their downfall!</p> <p>When the "Roads To Recovery" (RTR) program was first initiated it all had to be spent on rural roads. LCC was given the largest grant in Tasmania because it was the city with the longest length of unsealed road in the state, but following representations from several towns in western NSW those stipulations were relaxed. While rural municipalities across northern Tas have been using RTR grants to expand their sealed road networks LCC has used it nearly all in the urban area. A year or two ago they were going to use \$2million of RTR funds to change the city light bulbs (according to an article I read in "New Scientist" the ones they were going to use are bad for human health) and , as far as I know the only sealing that they have used RTR funds for was to seal the road to the home of the daughter of the deputy mayor lived and the deputy mayor was living with her there! As a former premier said to me when we discussed this " I don't know how people can do that and look at themselves in the mirror"</p> <p>In my lifetime I have lived (for quite a long time) with the Clarence Commission, St Leonards under both council and administrator, Launceston under both administrator and council and I can say very positively that the administration of Clarence under the Commission was the best(by a long way) and the administrators next. LCC rates very poorly</p> <p>What can be learnt? Big government is not necessarily better. If it has to be bigger a ward system is essential. It is also critical to get large urban areas divorced from rural areas. Bigger councils mean bigger bureaucracies, which tend to put more effort into maintaining and expanding themselves than looking after the interests of ratepayers. If you have an inexperienced council the tail can very much wag the dog!</p>	<p>7249 (Youngtown, TAS)</p>

Online portal submissions - deidentified

Have your say	Postcode
<p>Good afternoon, These amalgamations will decrease the trust, services and planned infrastructure already built in the community by the existing Councils. Meander Valley and George Town Council are a class above re the planned and current infrastructure in the Tamar River area. For example; Any localized graffiti is removed within a day, Launceston increases every day. This form of vandalism effects tourism and lowers peoples enthusiasm to have a presentable and workable community.</p>	7250 (Blackstone Heights, TAS)
<p>Amalgamations are a necessity to improve the professionalism of council and ensure better service models. Start with riverine catchments as a model given most roads and suburbs follow these ridge lines. For the Tamar, include Launceston CC, West Tamar and George Town Councils as the base and add in Prospect Vale & Blackstone Heights plus the Perth & Evandale commutertowns. Keep Longford, Cressy and Hadspen in Meander Valley as a rural council.</p>	7250 (Blackstone Heights, TAS)
<p>I agree with the amalgamation of small obsolete councils to create a much improved and more efficient Launceston Council. I support Scenario 1 - Tamar Valley Catchment.</p>	7250 (Launceston, TAS)
<p>Hi All the proposals are poorly thought thru. The Tasmanian State Government and Local Government need to be more mature for this process to be effective. The Tasmanian State House of assembly and the LGA's need to be reviewed as a holistic approach. Not ad hoc.</p>	7250 (Launceston, TAS)
<p>This whole exercise is about money or a so called cost reduction. There has been no thought put into how this will actually benefit the residence of the state. Surely the people can see the government is completely incompetent. Ridiculous idea</p>	7250 (Riverside, TAS)

Online portal submissions - deidentified

Have your say	Postcode
<p>Do not limit the reform to tread too lightly. There is a risk that we will need to further reduce the number of councils again in future if we do not.</p> <p>The councils which reflect the communities that we live in is a good start. The ridiculous current situation in Launceston with multiple councils in a small city needs to be addressed.</p> <p>I see no reason at all that a single entity would not more efficiently provide non-client facing services such as IT Finance HR Etc</p> <p>This would free up money to either reduce rates or provide additional services without increasing rates</p>	<p>7250 (Riverside, TAS)</p>
<p>Although I am extremely in favour of amalgamating councils, there will be many (most likely older) people that will defend the existence of their local council, even if more benefit would be gained by amalgamation. People need to be assured that merging councils won't impact their local community. However, I think that most young people, including myself, are disengaged enough from local politics that they won't care, or will support any reforms to local government.</p> <p>I hope that Tasmanians will understand that if they want councils to be more effective, they will have to be amalgamated. If anything, this is giving more power to local communities, and removing influence from Hobart (this argument would probably sell quite well in the North of the state) by letting local governments have actual responsibility for their ratepayers.</p>	<p>7250 (Trevallyn, TAS)</p>

Online portal submissions - deidentified

Have your say	Postcode
<p>Tamar Valley scenario 3 is best in my opinion . At present outlying country areas are treated as poor cousins with nothing coming back to us for our rates . We pay a separate amount for rubbish collection , a fire levy for fire service , and there ends the service we receive for our rates . Our roads get to a dangerous state before being patched . Last year it took a phone call to police to get action on the roads. We appear to have no right to appear at council meetings and some meetings have been closed meetings with no feedback allowed to ratepayers (info about this was passed on to me from a sitting councillor). There is minimal preventative maintenance done (grading of roadside verges, mowing ,pothole repair etc) while rate money is spent building mountain bike tracks and new footpaths to no where in the ton itself. in my view amalgamation is a step forward , All we have to do is bypass the self interest of sitting councillors , mayors and managers.</p>	<p>7252 (Lulworth, TAS)</p>
<p>The Furneauxnl cannot speak for the</p>	<p>7255 (Killiecrankie, TAS)</p>

Have your say	Postcode
<p>20/07/2023</p> <p>RE: NE Community Catchment – Submission opposing merge of Flinders Council</p> <p>The proposal of merging Flinders Council on Flinders Island (plus 52 islands of Bass Strait), with other Councils is raising significant concerns among many residents who built this remote, enthusiastic, consolidated community while appreciating the quiet lifestyle, hard work, and natural beauty.</p> <p>The Council has been running efficiently, with a great understanding of local issues, problems, and priorities. The roads are maintained to the best of the Council's ability, all public assets controlled as well as possible and the local airport – run by the Council is efficient, practical, and safe.</p> <p>So, it was of great concern that the original poll of 500 Tasmanians run by the Board was taking into consideration some opinions requesting/recommending a change from a fraction of the Tasmanian population aged 16-44, which unfortunately shows discrimination of valued opinions (do not fix what works) expressed by experienced, matured workforce aged 24-84+ that Flinders Island consists of.</p> <p>The Board's reasons and explanations behind the proposed merger are many and not always correct, however, the benefits detailed are few in between and can be achieved by Flinders Council without a merger/boundary change. For example - behind the original proposal to merge, the Board did specify Bridport as a freight and transit link to Flinders Island. It is simply one of many gateways– such as Port Welshpool, Launceston, and Devonport, so should we amend the Council's boundaries to merge with Victoria?</p> <p>The Board states that change is needed to improve the overall capability of our local government sector while delivering services locally, keeping jobs in local communities, and ensuring that all Tasmanians have a strong voice in decisions being made on their behalf. This has been happening on Flinders for many years already. Not long ago Tasmanians went through a change from 46 to 29 councils, so do we really have to continue decimating the importance of local governments?</p> <p>The Board’s proposed hybrid approach states that the boundary changes are needed to deliver larger, more capable councils which theoretically should be supported by mandated shared service arrangements. This approach is unfortunately not always correct for remote, flexible island communities, especially if it is mandated...How do you propose to manage it?</p> <p>The boundaries of Flinders Council are already large, and incorporating additional councils would spread all resources and services thinner rather than strengthen them. Any proposal of a larger council would become economically non-sustainable, the agricultural, tourist, and business communities could disintegrate and services by non-local contractors would become much more expensive, increasing burden on the population and impact negatively, not positively on how people live, work, and access services on Flinders Island - and all other islands managed by the Council.</p> <p>The boundaries of Flinders create a community, in which people are known to each other, where there is little or no crime, where family values are supported and the land and resources are managed to the best of their/and Council’s ability.</p> <p>Amendments to these boundaries will disintegrate what we value and treasure. There are many other options for improving</p>	<p>7255 (Whitemark, TAS)</p>

Online portal submissions - deidentified

Have your say	Postcode
<p>productivity and finances (such as APAC/other Australian companies taking over responsibility for Flinders Airport, currently managed by the Council).</p> <p>I am certain that these words may reflect the sentiment of many smaller communities, so please, do not herd us, as the charm, beauty, independence, and respect that Tasmania is famous for may be lost in transition...</p>	

Online portal submissions - deidentified

Have your say	Postcode
<p>To whom it may concern.</p> <p>I absolutely 100% OBJECT to the proposed amalgamation of Tasmania’s local councils.</p> <p>The Dorset council is fortunate to have all local councillors and Mayor who are totally dedicated to our community and some are also local business owners.</p> <p>We have seen a demise of industry with the loss of two major sawmills and the Simplot vegetable processing plant which saw a large loss of employment.</p> <p>Our local Dorset council has engaged with local groups and industry and brought our local economy and employment to a level we can be proud of and despite this they are still striving ahead for the benefit of our local municipality.</p> <p>I am a local businessman and employ people in the Transport industry with trucks and buses, a mechanical business and along with two siblings have 9 commercial rental properties in Scottsdale. I am thankful to have the local council that we have had during the difficult times with a local focus and I am very doubtful that an amalgamated council with a broader area to cover would not have yielded such positive results for our local economy.</p> <p>Given the previous demise in industry in our district and the way that the Dorset Council has worked to get our local economy back up to standard , an amalgamation of local councils would be absolutely foolish and detrimental and take away the local focus that we need.</p> <p>You need to realise that one cap does not fit all and the Dorset municipality has a different set of needs to other districts.</p>	<p>7260 (Springfield, TAS)</p>
<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>We support Dorset Council 100% on there decision on amalgamations,</p>	<p>7262 (Tomahawk, TAS)</p>

Have your say	Postcode
<p>I prefer scenario 2, Breakoday, Dorset and Flinders without Georgetown. This would mean that all areas are similar, Georgetown is too close to Launceston, more like a city. i do not want and cannot afford rates to skyrocket like Launceston. One council would hopefully be easier to hold to account, small councils are tending to become like a “family group” that just do what they want, been there too long and do not really listen to any opposing views. For where I live, grading of the roads is important, Dorset side seem to look after it better than Breakoday, which mainly keep the road in good condition only up to the the bike tracks. All these zones have a similar lack of health facilities so could fight for better together. I travel often between both Dorset and Breakoday for shopping. Tourism, retirement, farming and preferred quieter lifestyle are other similarities, along with a need for environmental protections exclusive to our zones.</p>	<p>7264 (Ansons Bay, TAS)</p>
<p>At the moment we as a human race are destroying the planet with things like plastic at a rate that has never been seen before . Future generations will just put up with the rubbish , the pollution , the deforestation of Tasmania and the plastic invasion into their bodies as they do not know what life was like before, Tasmania does not need to log the native forests , it does need to manage its landfill and it needs to manage its population rise , if in doubt just read the local UK newspapers to find out how life will become ,</p>	<p>7264 (Pioneer, TAS)</p>

Online portal submissions - deidentified

Have your say	Postcode
<p>The option 3 to rationalise councils in the Tamar Valley is the best one. Some people will say that they won't have representation. Some people won't combine because rates are higher in Launceston and they fear a rate increase. But the reality is that rationalisation is very important to enable one council to be economically viable. The local small councils are too poor and lack the ability to ensure safe roads and the provision of services which are taken on by larger and more efficient councils.</p> <p>I know there will be a lot of squarking from mayors, councillors and CEOs. They are merely protecting their own patch and jobs. From 5 mayors and 45 councillors and 5 CEOs to 1 mayor and 8 councillors (?) to 1 CEO is much more efficient. Once the new administration has established itself it can examine rationalising workforces but lawns will still need to be cut and other functions will need to be attended to. This rationalisation will save at least 2 million dollars in the first year. Imagine the footpaths, bike tracks and rural road sealing this saving would have over a 10 year period. That's only from having fewer councillors and CEOs. We'll soon have 35 House of Assembly members and 15 Legislative Councillors so we'll be well represented especially with 5 House of Representatives and 12 Senators. Be brave, be strong and reform our archaic system of governance.</p>	<p>7270 (Sidmouth, TAS)</p>
<p>Community Services departments would benefit with an LGA reform. Eg. I've been a Youth Development Officer for the past 8 years in local government, and we naturally work together between Councils. It would be beneficial to have a statewide YDO position with local YDO positions working together for the betterment of the state as a whole. The youth community don't see LGA boundaries as they live, work, recreate, socialise etc. Young people may live in one boundary, play sport in another, go to uni in yet another and then socialise across multiple boundaries, both face to face and online. The Community Services Department roles need to reflect the nature of how community operates and not in a local government silo.</p>	<p>7277 (Legana, TAS)</p>

Have your say	Postcode
<p>My concern that the Perth, Evandale, Longford and Devon Hills are will be swallowed up into City of Launceston is based on a number of factors.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The rate increase associated with being a part of City of Launceston2. The distribution of funds which will be directed to city based projects, upgrades and projects over those for regional areas3. The loss of identity and focus on maintaining and restoring the historical significance of our regional and more rural centres4. A city council encapsulating into its catchment rural and agricultural zones properties, whose needs will be second to those of the major commercial centre due the the population distribution, and ultimately the voting distribution5. Changes in rubbish collection (Northern Midland residents have a fortnightly rubbish collection, whereas Launceston has a weekly), with the weekly rubbish collection encouraging people to produce more waste. (Note: Any decision to leave rubbish picks the same could result in regional areas claiming their rates are being used to provide twice as many services to those in the city compared to those in the regional areas - petty I know - but you know that will happen) <p>My preference is for the Northern Midlands proposal to amalgamate with Meander Valley Council. Both councils have within them similar heritage towns (Westbury, Deloraine, Evandale, Longford), with similar populations and heritage values, services, community festival and events, natural disaster needs, infrastructure, road systems and community values.</p> <p>I think is logical for City of Launceston to expand to include Prospect, Prospect Vale, Riverside etc, as residents of these centres all consider themselves residents of Launceston. However, the residents of Perth, Longford, Devon Hills, Evandale and surrounds do not. We reside in our towns and centres, and are proud of our unique townships, community values and connection. A City Council needs to be just that - a council for the city and its immediate surrounding suburbs. Do that well and we all prosper</p>	<p>7300 (Devon Hills, TAS)</p>

Online portal submissions - deidentified

Have your say	Postcode
We do not agree to changing the boundaries or mergers within the Northern Midlands. We vote for our community to remain as is!	7300 (Perth, TAS)
We strongly agree with our council to remain as is and do not agree with the threat of boundary changes etc! We vote NO	7301 (Liffey, TAS)
I have farms in two regional council areas. I have no issue merging Meander Valley with Northern Midlands but I definately do not support merging any part of either Council area with Launceston. I have worked at all three Councils, and Launceston is the most dysfunctional with corrupt planning processes.	7301 (Liffey, TAS)
I am happy with the Northern Midlands Council. They are doing a good job. I would like no further amalgamations.	7301 (Longford, TAS)

Have your say	Postcode
<p>As a former employee of the 7th largest council in Australia I can see the desperate need for reform in Tasmanian Councils. Regardless of whether or not the councils go through another amalgamation, the current local government model in Tasmania needs urgent reform.</p> <p>Development Applications: The assessment and approval or otherwise of development applications should be delegated to well trained and educated planning officers, with Councillors only having a say on those applications that are controversial and/or have a large number of objections/submissions based on sound planning concerns.</p> <p>Council Reform: In addition I think the distribution of councillors should be changed. I live in the Longford township, within the Northern Midlands Council(NMC) area and I can clearly see that some regions within the NMC are poorly represented, where other areas are over represented.</p> <p>For examplly within NMC, the majority of Councillors reside in Longford, however most of the NMC area is in fact rural and these areas have little to no representation with many of the Councillors having no understanding of the concerns and requirements of small rural communities and/or large rural holdings.</p> <p>Each Council area should be divided into Divisions and each Division should then be represented on the council by a Councillor who must have their primary residence within that Division. This way each section of the community recieves fair representation by a Councillor who understands the concerns, requirements and oportunities within that Division.</p>	7301 (Longford, TAS)

Have your say	Postcode
<p>THE FUTURE OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN TASMANIA REVIEW. SUBMISSION ON THE STAGE 2 REPORT INTO LOCAL GOVERNMENT TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD, MAY, 2023.</p> <p>Introduction This submission is lodged for the Board’s consideration, following my detailed submission to Stage 2, and my attendance at the Board’s community consultation meeting at Longford. It closely follows segments of the Stage 2 Report, and offers comments from the viewpoint of one located within the Northern Midlands Council area, but not confined to that region. The status quo is not an optimal or sustainable model for the sector as a whole, given growing demands, complexity, and sustainability challenges. Agree. The status quo of 29 Councils serving a total Tasmanian population of around 550,000 compares dramatically with coverage by the Brisbane City Council of around 1.3 million residents. It is apparent from the literature that the proliferation of local Councils in Tasmania was generated as much by problems of access and communication in its early history, as by any assessed need for Council services. In the 21st century, the presence of safe roadways, internet and telephonic communications, and modern vehicles both domestic and industrial, by themselves justify a wholesale re-think of the means of all forms of service delivery across the State. Some form of consolidation is necessary to deliver greater economies of scale and scope, at least for some services. The quantum of Councils’ costs engaging consultants is by itself strong justification for consolidation and sharing particularly of costly specialist services. In the last financial year, the Northern Midlands Council spent almost double that of the Launceston City Council on consultants’ fees, begging the question of just how much of such expenditure could be saved by sharing consultancies with neighbouring Councils. Relief from the reliably rising costs of Council rates can be guaranteed to garner support from ratepayers for change. It is acknowledged that some services will require ongoing local delivery, but the option of satellite offices and machinery depots attached to larger and more financially viable Councils should be very seriously considered.</p> <p>The scale and extent of the consolidation needed to deliver significantly better services will, unfortunately, not occur on a purely voluntary basis within the current framework. Reform must be designed collaboratively but, once settled,</p>	7301 (Longford, TAS)

Have your say	Postcode
<p>implementation must be mandated by the State Government.</p> <p>Multiple previous attempts at either Council consolidation, or major resource-sharing, have failed largely due to the ferocity of objections from those whose self-interest transcends the evident community benefits of so doing, and the unwillingness of successive Tasmanian Governments to proceed despite strong evidence of the need for reform.</p> <p>Regardless of the contents of the Board’s final Report and recommendations, elected Members who regard Council membership as some sort of fiefdom, and paid officers who fear their employment may disappear, can be relied upon to mount strident opposition to any change to the status quo. The tone of the Board’s second Report suggests that, finally, the Tasmanian Government may be willing to face the inevitable but localised campaign by those with entrenched interests in maintaining current arrangements. I dare to hope that both the Board and the Government will, this time, have the fortitude to carry meaningful change into reality.</p> <p>Mandating Change: Involve significant mandated changes to existing council boundaries to create a smaller number of larger, more capable councils. Provide flexibility to apply for different approaches to designing new councils that serve urban and rural communities, respectively.</p> <p>This argument has long been a no-brainer in terms of the efficient delivery of services to a population as small but as scattered as in Tasmania. Observation of the duplication of expensive machinery at adjoining Council depots merely underlines the crying need for mandated resource sharing, which some Councils regard (wrongly) as diluting their ability to deliver services.</p> <p>The implied notion of major redesign of Council areas to reflect their respective responsibilities to urban and rural community needs is warmly welcomed.</p> <p>Recommended changes should preserve and enhance local voice.</p> <p>Speaking chiefly from the standpoint of a resident of the Northern Midlands, any notion of an effective “local voice” to this Council has long been an empty hope, since the combination of a tyrannical General Manager, and a compliant and largely intimidated Council, have meant that the whole suite of means of denying effective community voice have long been employed.</p> <p>The transparent ploy of engaging consultants to produce a specified outcome as justification for Council’s actions; operation of local Committees as window-dressing for community consultation, but lacking power to directly influence Council decisions; the sometime provision of ‘community input’ to proposed Council projects, while fixed on desired outcomes, which may or may not wholly ignore any such input; justification for projects unwanted by the community since funding is provided by outside agencies (like the State or Federal Governments);</p> <p>and the centralisation of project expenditure and infrastructure upgrades in major population centres, at the expense of</p>	

Have your say	Postcode
<p>outlying communities still within the municipality.</p> <p>At the Board’s community consultation meeting in Longford, I warmly endorsed some form of return to a “Ward” system in municipalities like Northern Midlands, but not restricted to that municipality, to ensure direct Council representation of minor population centres like Ross, Campbell Town, Tunbridge, Conara and Cressy, whose needs have been and continue to be very largely ignored by the current Council. Members entirely come from the Longford-Perth area, and their actions have consistently shown that their priorities lie with their local constituents.</p> <p>The Board is particularly interested in the community’s ideas about how local government should be structured to best serve the community catchments we have identified. Proposed “community catchments”: Tamar Valley Consultation Group Launceston, West Tamar, George Town, Northern Midlands, Meander Valley.</p> <p>These comments refer particularly to the situation in the Northern Midlands and adjoining Council areas. The catchments of the Northern Midlands and Meander Valley Councils seem a seamless fit, and form an example of the absurdity of resourcing three adjacent Councils (Launceston, Northern Midlands, Meander Valley) to perform tasks which are so closely aligned. It would appear that the catchment of Tamar Valley Consultation Group, West Tamar and George Town makes a similarly cogent argument for radical change, chiefly since all are required to manage scattered rural, small urban and riverine environments, within manageable distances.</p> <p>The Board’s view that “the mandating of some service sharing but only for a relatively narrow range of services or functions” is noted, but the range of services and functions capable of being rationalised will vary from existing Council to existing Council, since some have taken a more intelligent and capable view of such provision than their neighbours. The Board should not resile from recommending beyond any “relatively narrow” revision of the most efficient and efficacious means of service delivery, even if that may involve very considerable initial disruption.</p> <p>Selling the need for change</p> <p>As noted above, it can be anticipated that entrenched interests, and perhaps even the Local Government Association, may mount a public campaign to discredit and disallow changes which may be recommended by the Board’s final Report. Given a weak Minister and a populist State Government, the Board’s recommendations must be promoted in the most positive ways, stressing that significant financial savings resulting from careful reforms hold promise of easing the burden on ratepayers of ever-increasing Council rates. Such consideration is particularly relevant at this time of worrying increases in cost-of-living pressures, which may well continue beyond the release of the Board’s final Report and recommendations</p> <p>The Board should consider the ‘Love Your Local’ campaign enacted prior to the 2018 Tasmanian election. The Australian Labor Party campaigned on the social damage inflicted by poker machines located in pubs and clubs on the State’s most vulnerable, proposing to withdraw them to casinos only. Sensing multi-million dollar losses, the gambling monopoly mounted a shamefully deceptive and factually incorrect ‘Love Your Local’ campaign, which was largely credited with the defeat of the</p>	

Have your say	Postcode
<p>ALP in the election, and the creation of a limp model for gambling reform which was subsequently endorsed by a State Government overly dependent on gambling royalties.</p> <p>That campaign succeeded by ignorance and deception, and by its consistent negativity toward any change to the status quo. Any campaign opposing major changes in Local Government would follow very similar paths. The Board should be prepared, with funding from the Tasmanian Government, to address the likely arguments against change in the most consistently positive ways, emphasising how improvements to the delivery of Council services ultimately translate to financial benefits for ratepayers everywhere – the “hip pocket” strategy.</p> <p>Conclusion\ The Board’s comprehensive review of the current state of Local Government in Tasmania is welcomed and applauded, as its Report of Stage 2 unequivocally reveals its view that the status quo of 29 Councils serving a total population of around 550,000 is not sustainable, and demands major change.</p> <p>As stated above, responses from elected Members and senior paid Council staff to past attempts at voluntary Council amalgamation and/or resource sharing, guarantee that any proposals for change will be met with loud objections from those with entrenched interests in the maintenance of current arrangements.</p> <p>In the case of the Northern Midlands Council, there is a body of evidence supporting either the imposition of an Administrator to address the demonstrated long-term mismanagement and incompetence of the Council, or the Board may consider recommending its abolition in favour of consolidation with the Launceston City Council, offering services via satellite offices in Longford. My belief is that – properly and carefully managed - any such move would have broad community support within the municipality.</p> <p>I wish the Board strength and resolution when framing its final Report to Government, knowing that it must contain as well as definitive recommendations for change, reassurances to the responsible Minister that the communities affected by recommended changes can be relied upon to support them.</p>	

Have your say	Postcode
<p>To the Board,</p> <p>As you know I went to several of your community forums. I have also been to several of the Pmat forums being held. Pmat has a few more numbers and have some interesting motions coming out from them.</p> <p>What has become clear to me that there is some community support for amalgamations around the bigger city councils ie Devonport, Burnie and Launceston here in the North.</p> <p>The regional Councils that are in relative strong positions are strongly against amalgamation. The reason for that is several fold.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. that farming Land must not be built on is very strong message.2. that village culture and community must not be changed.3. given they are rural means they don't want to be a city. If these councils are financially ok then why change them? If one is broken then fix it with a good administrator. <p>City and surrounding councils are more often broken, debt burdens ie Latrobe 11 plus million 3 more then Burnie. Devonport 40 plus million now where to grow accept up which should be considered as a better alternative then housing on good farming land.</p> <p>So maybe there is a measured way forward by amalgamating city councils with bordering mid level city councils and go vertical with development sensitive to the communities subordinate to the larger city. ie Allow Devonport to go 20 plus stories in city centre or east Devonport as well. Latrobe and Ulverstone could go 10 to 15 stories. Burnie 20 plus and Wynyard somerset 10 to 15</p> <p>Cost of living pressures on rural residents who should not have to support city growth through their rates must be addressed.</p> <p>The board could reduce council numbers down to 15 in this way and better support the rural engine of this state as well by proportionate spending inline with output of each council area. GDP</p> <p>I still think one council with wards to ensure a streamlined approach would work best.</p> <p>But after 7 meetings this is the feed back and my observations here in the north.</p>	<p>7304 (Deloraine, TAS)</p>

Have your say	Postcode
Good Luck.	

Online portal submissions - deidentified

Have your say	Postcode
<p>1. This method of engagement requires considerable skills in the use of digital technology - to access the models, to sign up and to make this submission. Given the digital divides operating in Tasmania across geography and age groups, a significant number of voices may not be heard.</p> <p>There is commentary in some packs indicating that the new councils will be heavily reliant on grant funding. However, there is limited discussion of the impact of this financial constraint on current council operations, or potential impacts upon operations of future councils.</p>	7304 (Deloraine, TAS)
<p>Including large areas of rural areas in with major city's would be disastrous for those community's.</p> <p>Central and Midlands: Scenario 1 - would be a better out come for Meander Valley areas involved than being included within a Launceston council area.</p>	7304 (Mayberry, TAS)

Have your say	Postcode
<p>As a Kentish resident I am deeply opposed to council amalgamations, and in particular amalgamations with more urbanised regions such as Devonport and Ulverstone.</p> <p>As a long-time resident of Kentish (16 years) who also works in this community, I have come to appreciate that this community is both unique in the region and also fragile. The characteristics that make it this way are the same that attracted my family, and many others, to Kentish is the first place.</p> <p>The demographics the UTAS study present completely fail to acknowledge both the unique and fragile nature of this community. Kentish is very much a community with one foot in the past and one foot in the future, with large agricultural interests combining with natural resource collection and tourism. Fundamentally, all of these aspects are directly connected to the rural nature of this community, and it is this nature that draws migrants to the area and keeps people here. We did not move here, and do not live here, because we want to live in a city. This community is adapting to the future as a rural community, one that is growing, but not into an urban centre. This development is the near-universal desire of residents.</p> <p>Thus, our community focus is at direct odds with that of Devonport and Ulverstone, both of which focus on urban renewal and development to draw money and growth into their economies. Rate payer-based projects such as the Living City have only a tangential impact on our community at best. To be honest, I've been yet to see any benefit to Kentish, whatsoever. What good does this sort of expenditure do for our community? I know there have been promises of wealth and prosperity, but they have yet to come to fruition within the boundaries of Kentish.</p> <p>What we do need is the sort of development that will both protect our natural values and promote our existing industries. Our community has tread a tightrope between development and natural value for as long as I've lived here, as exemplified by the failed cable car endeavour. This was a grassroots-developed project that met with strong grassroots opposition. In other word, it was both proposed and opposed within a community by people with largely shared values that differed in fundamental ways. What united both sides of the debate was a love and appreciation for Kentish's natural beauty. How can urbanised centres be expected to maintain this value, to respect our land and our natural resources?</p> <p>Put bluntly, the priorities and values of the councils which we would be subsumed by are completely at odds with our own.</p> <p>This brings me to the next point, which is that we have a viable representative government in Kentish that reflects the desires of our community. Amalgamation will result in a watering down of Kentish voters' voices as they find themselves, and their interests, deeply subverted by the heavily urbanised, more populated centres it is proposed that we join with. This is</p>	<p>7306 (Sheffield, TAS)</p>

Have your say	Postcode
<p>inherently undemocratic. Both our people and our council are strongly opposed to amalgamation, and in forcing this upon us you are removing our most fundamental and proximate layer of government. And, in replacement, you would be giving as an extremely small minority voice in a large entity that doesn't seem to give a damn for us.</p> <p>Next, there is the matter of extravagant spending by the Devonport Council. The idea that the residents of Kentish, who do not generally seek massive development projects such as the Living City, would be roped in to this sort of development AND expected to pay for them is ludicrous. By amalgamating, you are forcing us to pay for the improvement of other communities to the detriment of our own, and removing our political ability to do anything about it.</p> <p>And there are the completely different ethos of the councils regarding local laws. Devonport's development strategies are completely at odds with our rural community. The constant provision of bigger and better shopping, allowing wholesale and illegal land degradation such as the clearing of the tea tree forest beside the homemaker centre to go undisturbed and the seeming haphazard way in which zoning and large-scale development is handled does not inspire confidence in Kentish voters. The ubiquity of parking metres in Devonport is something I'd hate to see here, as is their drive to spread commercial develop into new areas without considering how to shore up floundering local centres such as the Rourke St Mall and Four Ways. Our tips are free as well, something that is very important to a community with numerous small landholders like Kentish. Devonport seems completely happy to allow areas of it's community to slip into neglect, something that is completely anathema to the Kentish community, which strives to ensure the prosperity of all of it's parts.</p> <p>And then there is the well-publicised statements by the Devonport Council regarding the forced absorption of Kentish and other smaller councils, stating that this was a matter of fact, without even consulting our local council. That sort of school-yard bullying is exactly what Kentish has to look forward to if larger councils are allowed to swallow us.</p> <p>Also, by being forced to join with these centres, we will be forced to pay for things like Splash, which is not widely used by our community and is frankly too far to be of much benefit to us. In other words, we'll be paying for someone else's pools and parks, and I'm sure that we will not gain any benefit from this.</p> <p>And lastly there is the rhubarb of rates. The UTAS report rather blindly states that our rates are higher than other communities, but does not acknowledge the wildly diverse nature of our community, in which averaging of rates is not representative of the rates paid by the ordinary Kentish ratepayer. The rates we pay are far less than those levied against similar properties in neighbouring communities. The intimation that our rates would drop is simply horseshit. There's no more polite way to describe it.</p>	

Have your say	Postcode
<p>As a resident of Kentish I will be strongly opposed to amalgamations that include urban centres.</p> <p>Likewise, while we currently have a good arrangement with Latrobe Council, much of the ethos between the councils is different, and amalgamation with them presents a situation where our ratepayer voices will be swallowed by a larger population with diametrically opposed development interests.</p> <p>Obviously, this is an extremely divisive issue that has already been roundly rejected by voters. I can appreciate that some people in the community see public governance as a matter of budgets and resources, but from my perspective, that is only of secondary concern. Local governments are meant to be our point of first contact with government, our most immediate governmental system and the one in which our individual voices have the most strength. For me, local government represents the community, our community. Therefore, no matter what the money crunchers and economists say, our government needs to remain our government, and that means it needs to remain in the hands of the people who live in our community. That does not include Ulverstone, Devonport or Latrobe. It reflects our community, which reflects ourselves and our way of life, a way of life we have fought to protect, and will continue to to fight to protect.</p> <p>And last but not least, with both of our major political parties floundering badly, the economy staggering and many people in rural communities feeling the bite of multiple economics crises, how can this be a good time to be having this discussion? How is amalgamation going to help the young people I work with, some of whom cannot afford three meals a day, some of whom cannot afford a roof over their head. Sucking more money out of our community to build more white elephants for Devonport will not be helping them at all. Quite the opposite. Higher rates = higher rent = less food.</p> <p>Perhaps those are the problems UTAS ought to be spending it's time worrying about. If it's looking to fix something that is broken, there's plenty of better places to spend/waste their resources.</p>	

Online portal submissions - deidentified

Have your say	Postcode
<p>I would be happy to amalgamate with Latrobe but not with Devonport . Latrobe and Kentish have much in common , being semi rural towns . Devonport is deep in debt and would not be receptive to the needs of our community .</p>	<p>7306 (West Kentish, TAS)</p>
<p>I disagree with an amalgamation of the councils. Kentish COuncil should be kept separate and the needs of the people in this area are different from the needs of the more developed Devonport. A local council can effectively solve local problems. Rural councils deal with different problems than city councils. I love the fact that i can contact my local council and get the answers I need quickly. We have recently hd the council out to fix the dirt road that had washed into our dam. They did a wonderful job and personally that's where i want my rates to go...to local people. Local councils understand their people. We had an amalgamation of the Sunshine Coast of the local councils to one large one and it was ABSOLUTELY the demise of the area. Coastal problems are not the same as the rural areas and over development and blanket rules across large areas caused serious problems. The Noosa council area held a referendum and voted to be removed from the Sunshine COast Council. Now there council area is a world biosphere protected from the development rules that apply to the other council areas that were amalgamated. Read up on that complete shambles and you will not want to amalgamate. Local council should be kept local. Large councils do not work.</p>	<p>7306 (West Kentish, TAS)</p>
<p>As a citizen of Latrobe, where this town currently shares some facilities with its neighbouring Kentish Council, I would like to see these shared facilities increased. It is my preference that Latrobe amalgamate with just one neighbouring council, at least for the foreseeable future.</p>	<p>7307 (Latrobe, TAS)</p>

Online portal submissions - deidentified

Have your say	Postcode
<p>Having moved from Queensland 11 years ago and experienced council amalgamations, (some of which have since de-amalgamated) I would prefer that Latrobe Council continue with its current relationship with the Kentish Council.</p> <p>If it becomes necessary that there needs to be amalgamation, I would prefer Latrobe amalgamate with Kentish.</p> <p>Definitely not with Devonport as I do not think we should be funding their 'Living City' and the thought of parking meters in Gilbert Street scares me.</p>	7307 (Latrobe, TAS)
I feel scenario 1 would benefit us the most	7307 (Latrobe, TAS)
I feel scenario 1 would benefit us the most.	7307 (Latrobe, TAS)
<p>I live in Latrobe and disagree of an amalgamation that includes Burnie and Waratah Wynyard. They are much better suited to the West Coast, Circular Head, King Island proposal. From a population and financial perspective it also makes more sense. Ideally we would prefer a Latrobe Kentish amalgamation. When you stretch services over such expansive areas the service levels drop and the ability to agree on town focussed rather than regionally focussed decisions is impacted.</p>	7307 (Latrobe, TAS)
<p>I have read the stage 2 summary report and it all makes sense.</p> <p>My only concern as a resident is the possibility of so many councils combining and the mechanics of this.</p> <p>Local consultation during the process will be essential.</p>	7307 (Latrobe, TAS)
My partner and I would like to see Scenario 4 - Establishing 2 councils. With Latrobe and Kentish amalgamating.	7307 (Port Sorell, TAS)

Online portal submissions - deidentified

Have your say	Postcode
<p>I'm so angry that ANY council will be forced to amalgamate with Devonport Council, they are inept, lazy and absolutely do NOT listen to their rate payers. I was a rate payer with Devonport for many years and moved to Port Sorell to escape them. Yes, they are THAT bad. I know no-one that would willingly be part of that amalgamation. All it will mean it much higher rates , far less services, and a council body that have too much power. Latrobe council are wonderful, fair and hard working, an amalgamation with Kentish would be a good plan as they already share resources. Please don't inflict this pain on us. I wholeheartedly support scenario 4 of the Latrobe and Kentish council.</p>	<p>7307 (Port Sorell, TAS)</p>

Have your say	Postcode
<p>Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) needs very major reform within Tasmania. There is no scalable EIA which would provide a level of EIA based on the level of development involved. An EIA is only required when the EPA becomes involved as the regulator for a development is what Devonport City Council (DCC) informs me. Consequently, living within the DCC region I am told by this entity there is ZERO environmental assessment required/associated with a 13 dwelling development adjoining my property. This is a complete and utter disgrace leaving me to contend with the whim of a developer to any and all environmental impacts. I am to be confronted with a totally unmanaged moderate to large scale development that has no management of timeframes, no environmental assessment/mitigation whatsoever, no meaningful planning about the project made available to me. Consequently, very major structural and legislative reform is needed within Tasmania to deal with environmental impacts. There is a very strong need for a scalable form of EIA dependent upon the level of development that is proposed to be involved.</p> <p>A copy of my attempts to get a minimal EIA related to a development at 108 River Road, Ambleside is below this Submission. This is to provide ONE example of how flawed and totally unreasonable EIA and basic residential consideration is managed by DCC under the existing legislative framework.</p> <p>APPEAL AGAINST DEVELOPMENT AT 108 RIVER ROAD, AMBLESIDE</p> <p>I am the property owner of 3 Ambleside Place, Ambleside that adjoins the proposed development at 108 River Road, Ambleside.</p> <p>I put in a Submission to DCC related to this development that requested an EIA to be prepared. Council has not addressed this issue to me and merely sent me an E Mail inviting me to attend a Planning Authority Committee Meeting on 8th May 2023. No Agenda for the meeting was provided with this EMail however I was asked to review the DCC website for the meeting Agenda. My review of the DCC website identified no Agenda for this Committee meeting. I attended this Committee meeting at the prescribed time and observed any issues relevant to EIA for this development were not mentioned in any sense. The members of this Committee passed this development with no mention of EIA.</p> <p>My issues related to this development are broad and specific. Broad in the sense that I wanted to review what environmental issues were identified as attached to the site and specific in the sense that I do not want to be impacted by noise, stormwater invading my property, or any other environmental issue. I had mentioned in my Submission that I wanted the opportunity to review a prepared EIA for the site so that I could properly assess ALL environmental impacts of concern. This obviously did not eventuate.</p>	7310 (Ambleside, TAS)

Have your say	Postcode
<p>I asked the question at the end of this Committee meeting about what happened to my Representation for this project. A woman from this Committee went out of the room and came back with the Agenda for this meeting. Reviewing this Agenda it became apparent that NO EIA was requested by Council for this development. Consequently, my issues related to noise, stormwater runoff from the site, and all other potential environmental impacts from this development are not assessed/discussed/mitigated in any sense. Environmental issues very much remain UNKNOWN for this development. Comments made in the Agenda related to my representation are copied below: -</p> <p>"The legislative trigger requiring an EIA is the Environmental Impact and Pollution Act (1994) (EMPCA) and is only referred to in LUPAA where the EPA is the relevant regulator for major project assessments. For this reason an EIA was not requested. The matters regarding noise and stormwater during construction are addressed in standard conditions and notes contained within the Planning Permit. As residential development the future inhabitants will be required to manage noise as any other existing residential development in the area."</p> <p>The end outcome is there is ZERO environmental impact assessment associated with this development and therefore ZERO mitigation methods outlined to address environmental concerns. This is APPALLING.</p> <p>The comment made in the Agenda about "The noise and stormwater during construction are addressed in standard conditions and notes contained within the Planning Permit" make ZERO attempt to inform me what these standard conditions and notes are in the Planning Permit. The "RECOMMENDATION" within the Agenda makes mention of stormwater issues that are to be approved by Council 'AT A LATER DATE'. Other than a mention of stormwater issues to be addressed in accordance with the 'EPA Soil and Water Management at Building and Construction Sites', this is the extent of EIA for this 13 dwelling development.</p> <p>My purpose asking for an EIA was to assess how the development site would be managed from an environmental perspective. For me to be provided an EIA document so I properly assess ALL environmental mitigation measures. This has been rejected/dismissed by Council so any chance for me to assess specific environmental impacts with this development is not available via the route Council has adopted for this development.</p> <p>My back fence adjoins this development and I DO NOT WANT TOTALLY UNMANAGED NOISE INVADING MY PROPERTY. There is no time scale for the development, no list of ALL proposed equipment used with their associated noise ratings, no time periods identified for the use of equipment that creates highly invasive noise pollution. No mitigation whatsoever related to</p>	

Have your say	Postcode
<p>noise minimisation. NONE. I want this redressed with good, clear understanding of ALL equipment used, their noise ratings, the time periods for when they will be used, the time periods for when they are not to be used.</p> <p>The method adopted by Council to environmental assessment and associated mitigation associated with this 13 dwelling development is viewed as APPALLING. As it stands, I as an adjoining landowner am the only entity that seeks to assess and thereby minimise environmental impact. My appeal against this APPALLING approach adopted by COUNCIL is to request the developer to prepare the following as a bare minimum: -</p> <p>* Itemise all the equipment to be used in this development with their noise ratings, the time periods for when they will be used, the time periods for when they are not to be used. My request is for no invasive noise outside the hours of 9.00am to 5.00pm Monday to Friday. I want the opportunity to properly review this prepared request prior to, and well before, any development approval. This includes any and all "conditions and notes contained within the Planning Permit".</p> <p>I have tried to be constructive dealing with Council on this matter. It is highly disappointing nothing related to my Representation against this development was looked upon in any meaningful sense by Council.</p>	

Have your say	Postcode
<p>Support for Shared council IT Services</p> <p>As a professional who has been working in the IT industry for 20 years in several roles with government and the private sector I would like to make a submission in support of a council shared IT service model as outlined in the shared services discussion paper.</p> <p>In the long term combining back office IT systems for Finance, Rating, Payroll, Purchasing, and Records management will have a cost saving effect and or provide more access to modules within these systems.</p> <p>In the short term a combined IT service desk could reasonably quickly be established helping to assist in building confidence with council staff of the benefits of sharing a shared IT services model.</p> <p>The “new” IT shared services wouldn't necessarily need a central office to operate in, most IT staff are more than happy to function remotely. Working as part of a team that would be spread in different parts of the council area or even state.</p> <p>Working towards a shared service model within larger councils or between councils is definitely the right direction, 29 councils duplicating the same functions in Finance, IT, HR, GIS and Records isn't viable for the future.</p>	<p>7310 (Devonport, TAS)</p>

Online portal submissions - deidentified

Have your say	Postcode						
<p>Just a way to keep representation for areas Elect a Councilor with about 6000 electors SO Devonport would elect 4 Councilors</p> <table><tr><td>Ulverstone would elect</td><td>3 Councilors</td></tr><tr><td>Latrobe would</td><td>2 Councilors</td></tr><tr><td>Kentish would</td><td>1 councilor</td></tr></table> <p>If you added Burnie 3 Councilors</p> <p>Over the years some Devonport Councilors lived in Surrounding electoral areas</p>	Ulverstone would elect	3 Councilors	Latrobe would	2 Councilors	Kentish would	1 councilor	<p>7310 (Don, TAS)</p>
Ulverstone would elect	3 Councilors						
Latrobe would	2 Councilors						
Kentish would	1 councilor						

Have your say	Postcode
<p>I am a resident of Kentish Municipality. I have owned property in the area since 1986, for 37 years. The reasons I chose to purchase and make my home here are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I love the mountains, valleys, forests and wilderness in my backyard. • I serve on the Weindorfer Memorial Committee, which showcases at an annual event supported by Council the strong historic link between Wilmot and Cradle Mountain and Mount Roland in Sheffield. • I have brought up my family as keen bushwalkers, loving the environment • The Kentish Council was small enough for me to know many of the Councillors personally • I attend the Community meetings arranged by the Kentish Council twice a year in my area, and I feel that the Councillors listen to the concerns of the community members. • I have worked closely with the officer responsible for Community Development in the committees that I serve. That officer always gave her best effort to her job of assisting local community groups to develop and present their projects. • The local rates are reasonable compared to some other municipalities. • I volunteer in several local organisations because I can see the effect of the work that I do. • I like to know and communicate easily with my community • Kentish and Latrobe municipalities have a Resource Sharing arrangement where large equipment is shared, also certain roles in the Councils are shared, which saves money. <p>I recognise that amalgamation of some councils is necessary. I object strongly into being forced to join with a municipality that I escaped from, whose attitudes and policies I didn't agree with.</p> <p>My vote is for Scenario 4 That establishes two councils Council A to be an amalgamation of the existing Burnie, Central Coast and Devonport and Council B to be an amalgamated Latrobe, Kentish Council.</p> <p>Further notes: I don't think it is aa good idea in Scenario 2, to break up Wilmot and Sheffield from Cradle mountain (see the proposal to include the country south of Moina and Cethana into Central Coast) and Wilmot does not feature at all in that scenario</p> <p>I don't think Scenario 1 which cuts Ulverstone in half down the Leven River is a good idea. The main shops are in one municipality and the sporting complex is over the river, in another municipality.</p>	<p>7310 (Erriba, TAS)</p>

Have your say	Postcode
<p>RE: Cradle Coast area</p> <p>I think anything less than creating one council for this area would be a lost opportunity to reduce the number of councils in Tasmania to a sensible number. If councils on the mainland can cope with similar numbers in population and area I'm sure we can too. Having just one council will bring benefits in economy of scale and not having to coordinate between the councils.</p> <p>That said, I am very happy with my local council (Central Coast) and have worries that I'll end up in a council like Burnie with expensive rates and a lot of debt and not as good parks and facilities. However I do acknowledge that Tasmania has too many councils so amalgamation is justifiably inevitable.</p>	<p>7315 (West Ulverstone, TAS)</p>
<p>I accept that fewer councils are needed in Tasmania.</p> <p>The key problem is to address the inherent inequity between rural and large urban areas in terms of income, presence of government agencies and public servants, dispersed population and major infrastructure requirements.</p> <p>Community of interest is a major factor in people's minds and this needs to be considered when creating new entities. For example, the Community Catchments chosen by the Local Government Board in the consultation process did not address the inherent unfairness surrounding dispersed populations and access to government.</p> <p>To overcome the discontent associated with re-drawing boundaries, the current Legislative Council divisions might be considered to be the 15 Tasmanian councils. Although not everyone is happy with the peculiarities of some of the divisions, there is a certain level of acceptance that these are a workable way of representing people's interests. There would need to be some compensation for disadvantages such as geographical isolation and low rate base.</p>	<p>7315 (West Ulverstone, TAS)</p>

Online portal submissions - deidentified

Have your say	Postcode
<p>I believe smaller Councils will lose their local identity under any amalgamation. On the mainland especially in Queensland a number of Councils have De-amalgamated because it did not work, Review should have focused more on issues that detrimentally affect Councils' ability to increase rates base (i.e. wind farms, mining, etc) State Government needs to have special assistance to smaller councils (Tasman, Flinders Is, King Is, West Coast). Amalgamating West Coast with say Wynyard would not help anyone, and place an unfair burden on Wynyard. Waratah Wynyard is a well run Council with good financial stats/ratios etc in most areas. We currently have an excellent resource sharing with Smithton., and there would be little to gain from amalgamating these. While you would think a bigger Council would be more cost effective this is very rarely the case, and Rates never go down. (look at Tas Water, and other states.) We do NOT want Waratah-Wynyard to amalgamate with any other council. especially Burnie.</p>	<p>7325 (Wynyard, TAS)</p>
<p>I do not support forced council amalgamations. Any amalgamations should be voluntary. Importantly, planning decisions should remain with local councils.</p> <p>However, there is an opportunity for council's to share services; this should be encouraged and facilitate by State authorities. One area that all councils in the north-west region all lack expertise is in developing environmental policies and strategies. Now is a unique opportunity for councils in the Cradle Coast region to share an Environmental Officer at the senior level equivalent to the Executive Engineer positions that councils now share. This would enable councils to develop appropriate policies and strategies for the many environmental issues that council need address, rather than hiring external consultants.</p>	<p>7325 (Wynyard, TAS)</p>

Have your say	Postcode
<p>Lets look at 1 tiny aspect of it - Councillor costs. CH + Wyn + West +King Island + Burnie came together - and you had 11 Councillors for the new Council - it has now become a full time job - so an appropriate salary would need to be paid. Even though you're massively reducing the number of councillors - the Councillor salary would double. But I do believe that the amalgamations will have the unfortunate side effect of politicising local government. An individual would need the backing of a major party to be able to campaign at a scale across such a huge area. the local gov reform represents great opportunity for the political parties. whereas I think they should keep their bibs out of it. to me at least its def a Stage 1 kind of thing with a view to reducing it further down the track. The idea with these things is that it gives greater power to reduce costs and offer more services... however if you look at any single example, it always means that the central point does very well out of it and outlying areas are afforded 'visiting' services.. which never last long. Anything from Telstra, Banks, Gov services - its always the same story so theres a lot of risk to us in that regard.</p>	<p>7330 (Smithton, TAS)</p>
<p>Please don't amalgamate Tasmanian Councils any more than they already are. I lived through the disastrous period of Council amalgamations in NSW, and after all the research and all the promises, the outer areas of the amalgamated Council areas invariably suffered a decline in services and response times. Loss of a local Council office in Queenstown would immediately create a crisis of unemployment, and in a town with an already limited job market, could very possibly end up killing the town entirely.</p> <p>All I ask is that you seriously look at the lessons NSW Council amalgamations have given us. The damages may not show in the balance books, but the loss of local representation and local services is glaringly obvious. Council services, like health services, aren't meant to be profit centres. They're meant to be services to benefit the community. Not the accountants.</p>	<p>7467 (Queenstown, TAS)</p>

Have your say	Postcode
<p>I am an employee of West Coast Council and a local resident/ratepayer.</p> <p>Integrating our council into a larger council will be detrimental to the West Coast.</p> <p>I oppose the proposed amalgamation for these reasons:</p> <p>The West Coast community is unique in its location, remoteness, culture and needs. We already face issues with accessing medical, social services, water services and more. As an ex-mainlander who have lived in many states, cities and small towns, I find the West Coast to be so completely different from anywhere else I have lived. The local population need to be able to access local, knowledgeable service. A visit to Burnie Council involves a 4+ hour round trip by car on some very challenging roads. For the significant number of non-driving West Coasters, that becomes a bus ride and takes most of the day.</p> <p>An amalgamation would also, I believe, result in many job losses. Particularly in the administration side of Council. Our admin staff make up about 80% of Queenstown residents and the remaining approximately 20% live in other West Coast towns. We already have a high unemployment rate. It would be irresponsible of the Minister to make that situation even more dire.</p> <p>On a personal level, last year I entered into a 15 year mortgage due to the ongoing rental crises. My partner is in ill health and cannot work full time. This makes me the breadwinner. I believe an amalgamation would result in the loss of my income and therefore place our home at risk. We risk loosing pretty much everything.</p> <p>So I appeal to the Minister to reject the proposed boundary changes. It will not benefit anyone.</p>	<p>7467 (Queenstown, TAS)</p>

Have your say	Postcode
<p>i think that amalgamating the west coast with any other council would be a huge mistake as the west coast has been cut back on all services especially, medical and any future education locally and employment .if you were to amalgamate it would be reasonable to include cradle mountain and Bronte park with the west coast perhaps going as far as strathgordan. as we are already a sufficient mining and hydro arena ,not excluding wind farms and fish farming . as the west coast is made up of WHA areas and reserves and such perhaps more funding to our council should be forth coming</p> <p>THE WEST COAST IS UNIQUE AND AN UPRAOR WILL BE HAD IF WE LOSE OUR IDENTITY from all parts of Tasmania please do not allow us to be lost in poor judgments and lack of knowledge on our amazing west coast and shutting us out of govt funding has been ongoing and is considered rude and poor behavior by our locals. negligence from many of our state and federal representatives have been an ongoing issue and now is not the time to turn your backs on us amalgamation with farming and city will,, not benefit any of us so why try and fix something if it isnt broken</p>	<p>7468 (Strahan, TAS)</p>
<p>I see no need to amalgamate the west coast council with ANY OTHER</p>	<p>I reside outside of Australia</p>
<p>To make an informed decision on, let's face it a merger, with latrobe council, has any thought gone into giving the people of Kentish some facts.</p> <p>Would we be obliged once our cemetery is full to travel to Latrobe for burial, would there be a guarantee that the offices in Sheffield will stay open, or will we eventually have to travel to Latrobe if needing services of council. For council elections would we be called Latrobe..... and how about the waste transfer station would there be a change to that with a merger. Please don't think calling it anything other than a merger makes it something else, the public of Kentish don't need that type of insult. There are many things the people of Kentish are wondering about this, and unless council can give us some straight answers, they will stay against the idea of a merger.</p> <p>Almost persuaded if given more details.</p>	

Have your say	Postcode
<p data-bbox="203 244 696 304">Submission to 'The Future of Local Government Review'</p> <ol data-bbox="203 459 1704 1377" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="203 459 1704 632">1. In 1988, Australia held a referendum on several questions. One of those questions was: A Proposed Law: To alter the Constitution to recognise local government. Do you approve this proposed alteration? The proposal was to add the following Section to the Australian Constitution: "119A. Each State shall provide for the establishment and continuance of a system of local government, with local government bodies elected in accordance with the laws of the State and empowered to administer, and to make by-laws for, their respective areas in accordance with the laws of the State."<li data-bbox="203 675 1704 775">2. The proposal was rejected by about 66.4% of the country. EVERY state and territory voted NO, with Tasmania (and over 72% of its population) voting the highest to reject, with HELL NO! Australians clearly wanted—and still want—LESS government NOT more or larger government.<li data-bbox="203 818 1704 919">3. Since then, almost every state/territory government has seen fit to ignore the results of the referendum, and enacted their own Local Government Act, or similar. These actions are currently being investigated at the highest level, with a view to challenging all such state/territory legislation on the grounds of illegality/unconstitutionality.<li data-bbox="203 962 1704 1099">4. I believe the ideal situation for governance in ALL states/territories is to have a plethora of 'Progress Associations' in each major town or locality, with unpaid members elected/unelected at regular community meetings to discuss local community issues. Those elected members (President, Vice-President, Secretary) are then delegated to meet with STATE government at regular intervals to discuss those local issues.<li data-bbox="203 1142 1704 1203">5. The 'power' would then literally be held by the people in each community, with their elected representatives conveying views/requirements/demands on the peoples' behalf... directly to the State.<li data-bbox="203 1246 1704 1377">6. The Huon Valley encapsulates TOTALLY DIFFERENT demographics, lifestyle, tourism and other industries, everyday pace, environment and climate to any other in the entire country, not just the Kingston area. Some populated parts of the Huon Valley are almost 3 hours drive from Kingston, and a large number of residents need to travel out of the area only a few times a YEAR! The Valley cannot and should not be compared, let alone combined, with Kingston—simply to make a larger local	

Have your say	Postcode
<p>Council! SMALLER Councils, not larger!</p> <p>7. My submission..... KEEP the Huon Valley Council totally SEPARATE from Kingborough Council. And... Councils, it will be alleged, are legally and constitutionally NOT governments, and have none of the power of such.</p>	

Online portal submissions - deidentified

Have your say	Postcode
<p>My wife and I strongly oppose any change to our local council. Northern Midlands Council has served us well and has a good sense of contact, understanding, and care for the community. We feel greatly annoyed that this could be taken away from us by government like the Taswater take over. NMC has managed things well for the many years we have lived in the municipality and we simply don't trust a bigger form of government taking over. Despite all the talk and promises of cost-cutting and improvement, I'm sure in a short time we would see costs increasing, and services declining as we get swallowed up in a bigger local government organisation. Our opinion is: leave us well alone!! We don't need to change.</p>	
<p>I am of the view that the Huon Valley would be well served by establishing one council area combining the existing Huon Valley Council area and Kingborough Council areas, minus Taroona.</p> <p>My reasons for this are:</p> <p>(a) historical inability of the Huon Valley Council to work collectively and effectively for the good of the entire Valley;</p> <p>(b) A merger should result in decrease in costs given a reduction in duplication of activities.</p> <p>Any such change would, of course, need to ensure that the interests of all areas are represented equally on the single council entity.</p>	
<p>I live in Glaziers Bay and support option 3. This option would enlarge the rate payer base of the council while retaining its rural interest. Combining with more built up ares in Kingston would not be a good idea as our needs are different.</p>	
<p>Option 1 - two separate councils is my choice</p>	
<p>Yes!! We have wanted this for years! We don't have the population to finance two councils. We are very small in relation to other councils on the mainland population wise thus higher rates, more money needed to run councils. Less administration costs is a huge step in the right direction! Join with Kingborough council no matter what the final result looks like but join with the most population, most shops.</p> <p>Yes</p>	

Have your say	Postcode
<p>As a rural ratepayer in the Launceston municipality, and formerly with St Leonard's Council, I must say that amalgamating rural based municipalities with large urban councils is a disaster. When Launceston took over St Leonard's, there was a rural roads sealing program in place that was totally removed post amalgamation. The year prior to amalgamation LCC did not have funds to progress the Brisbane st mall. The following year, thanks to St leonards positive cash position the mall was progressed.. As a local progress association we had to work extremely hard to finally get a major rural road, Prossers Rd, widely recognised as one of the most heavily trafficked unsealed roads sealed. It took 20 years of banging on doors to finally achieve this, and it was not until it was transferred to the State that this occurred. LCC particularly at senior management level appears to have no interest in rural communities. Getting a representative elected to urban councils is near impossible. Please give us some half decent roads so we can get to town so we can enjoy some of the supposedly wonderful culture and arts that this URBAN council is hell bent on spending our rates, taxes and grants on</p>	
<p>if it's not broke, why fix it ??</p>	
<p>Currently Southern Midlands Council is managing our district well. Leave things the same.</p>	
<p>The scenarios offered are plausible but assume too much in terms of growth. In 1995 Noosa council became the first in Australia to put a population cap in place to guide future decision making. In 2023 it is high time Tasmania caught up. Governments have decided we need more tourists. We do not. Governments have decided population growth is required. It is not. We endure growth and the traffic congestion it causes. We endure growth and the changes it causes to development. We endure growth and the problems it causes the health system. I could go on. A population cap would put a different lens on the scenarios provided. Much of the bureaucratic and political problems of our time would be changed if a cap could be put on population growth. Steady state economic modelling would then direct resources. Cap the population first, then look at local government boundaries.</p>	

Online portal submissions - deidentified

Have your say	Postcode
<p>There was a vote with the Tasman council rate payers a couple of years ago about merging with the Sorrel council and the result was heavily against the merger and I am still of the same opinion</p>	
<p>I currently live in Kingston and am happy with the way Kingborough Council operates. I grew up in Glenorchy and have lived at various times in Hobart and Kingborough. The significant thing is that I have always been a Hobart person. Hobart is my city. Went to school in Hobart, Worked in Hobart, shop in Hobart, arts and entertainment and culture in Hobart.</p> <p>So a natural affinity with Hobart. Kingston is a really nice place to live, good local services and amenities and only 15 miss to Hobart. No affinity at all to Huonville and very little south of Kingston/Blackman's Bay. No affinity with Brighton or NewNorfolk</p> <p>Another point which doesn't seem to be recognised in your docs is Kingston is not part of the "Channel" - it fronts on to the Derwent - not the Channel.</p> <p>The more natural affinity is what has long been referred to as "Huon and Channel". Less LGAs would be a good thing (one of my first jobs was in Bureau of Stats analysing the accounts of 49 LGAs) so better now but not quite there. My conclusion is that the optimal result would be reflected by: Southern Shore Scenario 3 Western Shore Scenario 2</p>	
<p>Merge Huon with Kingborough Council.</p>	

Have your say	Postcode
<p>This proposal is completely driven by people with no understanding of impacts that have formed the past or present in our communities.</p> <p>Over the last 25 years we have seen the decline in industry and job losses. This has affected so many families and many have moved on to other areas or interstate. This is no surprise because state and federal governments are only interested in growing the metropolitan areas, leaving rural areas to fight for funding and survival. This has happened in Dorset for years and we have now only just started to see it turn around all due to a council. There was a time when council just watched everything shutdown with out a fight. We now have seen growth in our area due to some great ideas. Leave us to manage our area and let us continue to make progress without any further disruption.</p>	
<p>I am writing to have my say against councils amalgamating. If the West Coast Council amalgamates with a bigger council their will be job loses, services will be cut rates will rise homelessness will increase and we will be in a worse position than one that can't be undone. We will inherit debt from the bigger councils and that isn't fair. Leave the smaller councils alone and amalgamate the bigger councils if need be, but honestly I feel that is even a bad move. The west coast will be lost as we won't have a say on the issues that arise. The west coast needs a voice and my voice is leave us be Gail Shea Ratepayer and home owner</p>	
<p>There will need to be legal pressure to make the smaller local councils amalgamate as counsellors do not wish to give up their "power and status" that being a councillor has in their local community. Clearly there are duplication of services and machinery. While small may be beautiful such is not generally administrative r functional. Maybe then some financial savings could be worked out to let the people know where the benefits are in amalgamation. Also examples of improved and widened services. Thus give the voters power in their hands to apply pressure on their local councils. Power to the people not to the member of councils.</p>	