

L.J. & T.I. BLAKEMAN,



JULY 29, 2015.

MR PETER BOXALL,
CHAIRMAN, IPART,
PO BOX K35,
HAYMARKET, NSW 1240



COPY THE HON PAUL TOOLE,
MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVT.,
GPO BOX 5341,
SYDNEY, NSW 2001

Dear Sirs,
PALLANATTA CITY COUNCIL (PCC)
"BECOMINGLY FIT FOR THE FUTURE"
~~~~~

Attached, please find our  
submission "FIT FOR THE FUTURE / COUNCIL  
MERGERS" in respect of the above.

It is an unabridged copy  
of our submission made to PCC on  
May 08, 2015 without prior knowledge  
of the PCC position on Council Mergers.

#### SUMMARY

Our response to the four (4)  
SCENARIOS presented by PCC in the  
Telephone survey of residents is  
summarised as follows:-

SCENARIO 1

Supported without equivocation

SCENARIO 2

Rejected absolutely.

SCENARIO 3

Supported with qualification

SCENARIO 4

Rejected absolutely

Further, we submit three (3) additional SCENARIOS:-

ALTERNATIVE SCENARIO 2ALTERNATIVE SCENARIO 4ADDITIONAL SCENARIO 5OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENTS ON PLC SURVEY

The process adopted by the PLC for this most important matter leaves much / everything to be desired

It was a lightweight, superficial technique more suited to a market research campaign for a new confectionary bar, an instant coffee variation or a fast food line.

The procedure was pathetic and lamentable and conducted by personnel not familiar with the ACC LGA and its surroundings. There was no scope for dialogue & discussion and was clearly structured and braced to produce the result now promoted by ACC in a "spin" sheet included with the 2015/2016 Rate Notice.

The decision to use a lightweight telephone survey in lieu of requesting formal submissions is, in our opinion, completely unprofessional. It creates the perception that ACC did not really desire solid and substantive feed back and that perhaps the overarching decision, in principle, to accept the "ALTERNATIVE SUBMISSION" had already been taken.

The grand scheme, ACC "ALTERNATIVE SUBMISSION" / "SCENARIO 4 A STRONG ECONOMIC REGION" which formed part of the telephone survey and submitted with ACC letter, dated Monday 22<sup>nd</sup> June 2015 to the minutes and to the Chairman, has all the characteristics of the megalomania practised by the Central European Powers in the late 19<sup>th</sup> - early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. It constitutes an ambit claim for territory without thought or

consideration for the needs and desires of the PCC population not of the residents of the adjoining LGAs.

The social and economic costs and consequences of such a loose proposal have been treated superficially and inadequately. The end result, if adopted, will inevitably be a spectacular failure.

There is absolutely no logical or rational case for PCC LGA to expand east of the Main Northern Railway Line.

We repeat absolutely the PCC "ALTERNATIVE SUBMISSION" which is their thrust of "BECOMING FIT FOR THE FUTURE."

#### SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON TELEPHONE SURVEY

The results of the Telephone Survey are distorted and flawed

1. Of the 1040 persons initially recruited 55% OR 572 were unaware of the merger proposal.

These should have been automatically disqualified.

2. 601 persons or 58% of those recruited participated in the survey.

This means that,

$29 < n < 330$  persons

(601 - 572)

(58% x 601)

who had no knowledge of the merger proposal most probably showed the outcome as demonstrated on P84 of ACC Appendices

Of the four (4) SCENARIOS, "SCENARIO 2 - NEW COUNCIL" as suggested by the NSW Government ranked fourth. The scope of SCENARIO 2 was clearly defined and as such was/is a "COMPLETE KNOWN" but 40% of respondents ranked it less acceptable than "SCENARIO 4 - A STRONG ECONOMIC REGION."

SCENARIO 4 was a "COMPLETE UNKNOWN", not defined nor was it supported by any detail whatsoever. It embraces all of the last ranked SCENARIO 2 and much much more.

SCENARIO 4 ranked as first preference with twice the number of respondents compared with

SCENARIO 2 — 30% to 15%.

Combined first and second preferences for "UNKNOWN" SCENARIO 4 totaled 50% of respondents with corresponding support for "KNOWN" SCENARIO 2 at 35%!

Such results do not reflect favourably on the PC/METACOR methodology nor on the validity of the survey.

Yours faithfully,



Yours L.J.D.T.I. BLAKEHAN.

ATTACH SUBMISSION: "FIT FOR THE FUTURE."

13-0  
3, 2015  
L. J. & T. I. BLAKEMAN,

MAY 08, 2015

CI. SCOTT LLOYD,  
LORD MAYOR OF PARRAMATTA,  
PARRAMATTA CITY COUNCIL,  
PO BOX 32,  
PARRAMATTA, NSW 2124

JULY 29, 2015  
MR PETER BOXALL,  
CHAIRMAN  
IPART  
PO BOX K35  
HAYMARKET NSW  
1240

Dear Sir,

FIT FOR THE FUTURE / COUNCIL MERGERS

- I would refer to the following
- your undated "DEAR RESIDENT" circular letter, post marked April 28, 2015 and received May 01, 2015 with leaflet under the above heading,
  - telephone survey 16.30<sup>h</sup> May 05, 2015 conducted by opinion canvasser MICROMA of the Central Coast

#### SUMMARY

My response to the four (4) presented SCENARIOS is summarised as follows:-

#### SCENARIO 1

Supported without equivocation

SCENARIO 2

Rejected absolutely.

SCENARIO 3

Supported with qualification.

SCENARIO 4

Rejected absolutely.

Further, I submit three  
(3) additional SCENARIOS:-

ALTERNATIVE SCENARIO 2ALTERNATIVE SCENARIO 4ADDITIONAL SCENARIO 5

---

SUBMISSION

As a responsible long term owner and resident of PCO I now make the following submission.

SCENARIO 1

SUPPORTED, without equivocation.

SCENARIO 2

REJECTED absolutely.

I do not support any merger with Holroyd and Auburn Councils

The culture, character, philosophy and demography of Holroyd and Auburn LGAs bears little in common with the PC and would NOT strengthen nor enhance PC in any way.

PC may not be the most efficient and user friendly LGA in NSW, but its performance will not improve by adding the lower performing, diverse and inefficient adjoining LGAs with their long standing issues and problems.

The comparatively weak Holroyd and Auburn LGAs will NOT be strengthened by merging with and impacting on the relatively recently performing PC. The combined result will be reduced services, less responsive LOCAL government with a bigger bureaucracy, lower efficiency and higher costs.

#### ALTERNATIVE SCENARIO 2

Cede WOODVILLE WARD, formerly Granville Ward and, prior to

February 10, 1950, the Municipality of Granville to a merged Holroyd - Auburn Council

Incorporate the western third of Hyde LGA and the North Parramatta Area of the Hills LGA with PCC

### SCENARIO 3

SUPPORTED on clear understanding that "minor geographic boundary changes" and "removal of current anomalies" are, in fact what is really meant and embraced by SCENARIO 3.

### SCENARIO 4

I assume that this is the "new larger council area to reflect the future role of the Parramatta region in Greater Sydney."

In your leaflet it is surprisingly presented without reference to proposed boundaries. There are no tangible facts or details to assess like accompanying non specific, vague generalities and motherhood statements.

It is not apparent whether the State Government is supportive or a silent motivator for this PCC initiated proposal.

It does however bring into question the integrity and transparency of the trial process.

REJECTED absolutely.

#### ALTERNATIVE SCENARIO 4

Incorporate the compatible and complementary northern area of Auburn Council with PCC.

Boundaries as follows:-

|            |          |                                     |
|------------|----------|-------------------------------------|
| NORTH      | BOUNDARY | — PARRAMATTA RIVER                  |
| SOUTH EAST | "        | — HOME BUSH BAY DRIVE               |
| SOUTH      | "        | — M4 MOTORWAY                       |
| EAST       | "        | — HOME BUSH BAY<br>& POWELL'S CREEK |
| WEST       | "        | — DUCK RIVER,                       |

Incorporation of Silverwater, Newington, Homebush Bay and the developing business district of Olympic Park would be synergistic with the current development of the PCC CBD.

It would produce the "BIG PICTURE" PCC at the demographic centre of the Sydney Metropolitan Area.

### COMBINED ALTERNATIVE 2 SCENARIO AND ALTERNATIVE 4 SCENARIO

This would result in an enhanced PCC with clearly defined boundaries and would anchor PCC as the economic centre of Western Sydney with foci: PCC CBD in the west and the Olympic Park CBD in the east.

A strengthened and expanded PCC without the distractions, problems, demands and inefficiencies of Holroyd and Auburn would ensure the long term sustainability of PCC in the Central Western Region of Greater Sydney.

### ADDITIONAL SCENARIO 5:

If the State Government is concerned about the long term economic viability and sustainability of Holroyd and Auburn LGAs then consider merging these two

compatible entities with Woodville Ward (ex PCC) and the adjoining Bankstown LGA and/or Fairfield LGA to the south.

With or without merging Holroyd - Woodville Ward & Auburn with their southern neighbours) SCENARIO 5 would provide "CLEAR OWNERSHIP" of the vital Parramatta Road corridor from Woodville Road to Centenary Drive

Further, with the high density, high rise developments now under consideration in Pendle Hill, Wentworthville and Merrylands the cash flow position of Holroyd should be assured IF proper governance is in place.

#### PREFERRED SCENARIO - SHORT TERM.

If in fact PCC can demonstrate that the status quo can be sustained then I support unequivocally SCENARIO 1 combined with SCENARIO 3.

PREFERRED SCENARIO - LONG TERM.

For a long term solution which I favour over a short term solution, I submit my ~~PROPOSED~~ ALTERNATIVE 2 SCENARIO combined with my ALTERNATIVE 4 SCENARIO

REJECTED SCENARIOS

~~PROPOSED~~ SCENARIO 2 and ~~PROPOSED~~ SCENARIO 4, either singly or in combination, is REJECTED absolutely.

THE ECONOMIC & SOCIAL CASE FOR MERGING COUNCILS

The case for merging councils has NOT been made nor enunciated.

Such a proposal was initiated and subsequently abandoned by the Socialist CARR-EGAN Government as an adjunct to Urban Consolidation in the 1950's to facilitate control over a lesser number of recalcitrant independent LGAs vis-a-vis the planning process.

With recent legislation, real planning controls for significant development rest with the State Government anyway!

## FINANCIAL INDUCEMENT TO MERGE

If the State Treasuries can indeed support expenditure of \$1.0 billion as an inducement to merge then it would be socially more responsible to use the funds as a down payment on much needed new water storage dams to support the burgeoning population of Sydney and the East Coast of NSW.

Expenditure on much needed fundamental infrastructure is the preferred alternative to dissipating finite wealth pursuing SOCIAL ENGINEERING PHILOSOPHY of more centralized control of LOCAL government.

Historically, central control of public administration does NOT produce better outcomes, greater efficiencies and lower costs as demonstrated by the performance of the European Union (EU) and the CAR-ELAN-REFSHAUGE driven mergers of the electrical supply authorities in NSW.

I would ask you please to acknowledge receipt in writing, and confirm that this submission has been placed on the public record and will be included in the PCC submission to the INDEPENDENT LOCAL GOVERNMENT REVIEW PANEL in June 2015.

Thanking you in advance,  
I remain

Yours faithfully,

A large black rectangular box redacting the signature of the sender.

Yours faithfully,  
L. J. & T. I. BLAKEMAN.