

### **Comments - Earlier intervention, effective regulation and stronger penalties**

This proposal seems reasonable except the State already has a whole department called the Local Government Department to do this job.

However, in recent years the Department has become a tool for additional red tape, ineffective red tape and is in place it seems to stifle bad publicity for the industry that would make an incumbent Minister look bad..

I can see this position being a duplication of the DLGSC and part of what was the role of the CCC, along with an army of bureaucrats.

If the government is going to create a position of Inspector, then it needs to cull the bureaucrats at the DLGSC, define what the functions of the DLGSC will be, heavily reduce red tape that keeps the bureaucrats employed, and streamline the DLGSC - or perhaps scar the Department.

Yours faithfully



Comments - Earlier  
intervention\_ effecti

### **Comments - Reducing red tape, increasing consistency and simplicity**

There is nothing in the preamble of this proposal that will reduce red tape - reducing red tape can be achieved by reducing the bureaucracy in the DLGSC, which is just a body nowadays that creates red tape. It serves no useful purpose.

Standardise meeting procedure - there is no purpose or red tape reduction in this. Its just window dressing.

Flexibility to encourage resource sharing - it already exists; its just that resource sharing is a fine concept but a practical impossibility in most instances

Standardised residential crossovers - how on earth can this reduce red tape?? That is a very poorly thought out idea especially as throughout the State circumstances, landscapes, road designs, budgets vary greatly. Each local government knows its best solution without some shiny seat bureaucrat determining what is best.

Streamlining local laws - this is somewhat of a nightmare for LG's but these are Lws and so the process is lengthy. It could be streamlined as long as communities are not disadvantaged.

Yours faithfully



Comments -  
Reducing red tape\_

### **Comment - Greater transparency and accountability**

This proposal just discarded the proposed reduction in red tape, by creating a whole new bunch of red tape matter.

Recording of Council Meetings - is already very widespread and can be increased without a whole lot of additional red tape regulations. The keeping of meeting recordings is already regulated.

Guidance for confidential items will create more and more red tape. You can't create guidelines or regulations for the hundreds of confidential items that a council may deal with. Its a massive overreach.

I agree with the online records of registers which most LG's keep anyway. Its not difficult to put that record online.

I don't know of any industry or any government agency, or any member of Parliament that has their performance criteria made public... In fact MP's are virtually not subject to performance criteria and are only judged at each election by the media mainly and also by the public. There are many unscrupulous council members and councillors, who could vilify a CEO and destroy his/her career unfairly or vindictively by publicising what they think of a CEO. Yes, the CEO can make comment but it's too late - they are already exposed. This proposal should NOT proceed.

Consistent recording of all votes - very widespread and could easily be mandated - agreed.

Yours faithfully



Comment - Greater  
transparency and ac

### **Comments - Stronger local democracy and community engagement**

Direct election of mayor or president - Agreed but this should be applied to all local governments. I have seen in smaller LG's a President continually elected by a controlling group of councillors though the person continues to be incompetent and in some instance corrupt. I can name 2 LG's straight away where this has occurred to the detriment of the community. The LG's may be smaller but they are still managing millions of dollars and to local people it is important.

Preferential voting - I have witnessed this system and also the first past the post. Both have merits and both have disadvantages.

Consistent number of elected members - yes I agree with this proposal.

No wards for smaller LG's - yes i agree, dispose of the wards except for larger LG's.

Community engagement charter - community engagement is a complete farce. In large centres community engagement is dominated by pressure groups, usually government funded community organisations and quangos because these are the people who have the time to participate - and their little quango gets LG funds and well as State/Federal funds. And they can push their political agenda. In smaller communities the public elect members to the council to express their views on what they want.

Annual meetings of electors - generally a waste of time unless there has been some very controversial activities with the LG that year. I have attended such meetings in a large centres and the attendance and be as little as zero to 2 non employees/members.

Yours faithfully



Comments -  
Stronger local demo

### **Comment - Clearer roles and responsibilities**

Principles - there are some dangerous and discriminatory apparent proposals, depending on what eventually evolves. A unique status for aboriginal West Australians?? What is this supposed to mean that aboriginal people will be treated differently than everyone else. This reeks of discrimination. The principle should be that everyone in West Australia has a unique status.

Communication agreements - another lot of red tape.

Elected members using their titles - this is already in place.

Caretaker period - some LG's have policies in place for this and all should, without it needing to be regulated.

CEO Recruitment - this is complete overreach by the government. I have been told that LG's are bodies independent of the government with publicly elected councils. So the government should NOT be interfering in the appointment of the CEO's - its just more unnecessary interference without responsibility.

The role of CEO's - Yes there should be defined roles of CEO & the elected. There is far, far too much interference in the administration role by elected officials, especially in smaller LG's. I have been a victim of aggressive demands to interfere in the CEO role including staff recruitment and there is no protection for a CEO in these circumstances.

Role of WALGA - YES, it's about time that WALGA was removed from its controlling functions within local government. It has become the DLGSC in local government. There is no room for the DLGSC and WALGA.

yours faithfully



Comment - Clearer  
roles and responsib

### **Comment - Improved financial management and reporting Local Government Reform**

Model financial statements - yes I agree with a standardised format

Rates & revenue policy - I believe most LG's already do this

Reforms for financial ratios - the current ratios are farcical and I believe were introduced without much forethought. They are irrelevant and need review.

Credit Card Statements - I have been surprised that in some LG's such statements are not provided to the Council and become part of financial reporting.

Your faithfully



Comment -  
Improved financial n