

[REDACTED]

From: Andrew Mangano [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, 9 December 2021 5:21 AM
To: DLGSC Act Review
Subject: Feedback on LG Reform

Hello,

The fundamental issue of Council sizes and boundaries has not been addressed or even considered.

There should be a standard size for metro councils of around 30000 people or for simplicity the same as state electorate, areas of like character if possible, and with logical geographical boundaries such as rivers, railways, freeways and main roads as boundaries preferably.

Councils such as Stirling, Melville and Joondalup are too large, and the councillors cannot properly represent their constituents (some have 20000 ratepayers per councillor) , whereas Peppermint Grove is too small so governance costs per ratepayer are high.

In rural areas the populations would be need to be smaller, but also be areas of like character if possible, and with logical geographical boundaries such as rivers, railways, and main roads as boundaries preferably.

Please feel free to contact me to discuss further.

Regards

Andrew Mangano
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Andrew Mangano [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, 24 February 2022 3:28 PM
To: DLGSC Act Review
Subject: LG Reform Submssion

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hello,

In my belief this review was fundamentally flawed for the following reasons:

1. It did not address the imbalance of power of the LG CEO vs elected members.
2. It did not address the LG size, boundary issues and wards, and standardisation across Metro/Urban LG's and Rural LG's.
3. It will result in less people wanting to be elected members because of the risk of criminal offence and other obstructive behaviours by the CEO's.

As far as I am concerned this so-called reform is a bad joke.

Regards

Andrew Mangano