

## Response to Randwick & Waverley council Business Case Randwick and Waverley Council merger.

From Robert Belleli on behalf also of the Belleli family [REDACTED]  
as a residedent of Randwick city council area.

### A. Comments regarding submission wording. Executive summary.

1. Councils opening admission “Communities and councils would prefer to remain as stand alone”. It left out **majority of residents local business chamber of commerce and precincts.**
2. All the above in point 1 wanted council to only put a standalone proposal only. Only 8 councillors at Randwick against a huge population as well as 6 councillors that wanted to put in a submission to stand alone. One a big change like this it should have gone to a referendum.
3. Having a bigger council does not guarantee a stronger financial position and delivery of transport and infrastructure of services.

For example before 2004 council had a infrastructure backlog of \$115 million. Then introduce new councillors with some experience councillors and greatly reduce infrastructure backlog provide excellent service infrastructure and stability on council. It is my and majority of others if you change Randwick council the risk of losing all the local control we have will be lost forever. And that's to much a price to pay.

4. We need to keep investing in our local democracy and voice and not create a possible big uncontrollable self-ruling ignoring arrogant organisation only accountable to itself.
5. I and majority of people in our area disagree with councils submission that council stand alone cannot deliver all the criteria for fit for future. Council has proven in the past for development forecast and other criteria it has always since 2005 surpassed any requirements and bench marks from state government I can't see why we can't continue there is no proof that we cant.

6. It talks about paying debt we have no debt does it envisage as a merge council we are going to take on debt. If so another reason for not merging.

B. Comments regarding submission wording “Executive Summary”.

1. Page 9 paragraph 3. The compelling requirement to service significant residential areas with a variety of differing characteristic and needs including social economic will challenge the future growth and management “ This is the same argument regarding the proposal for Randwick and Waverly.  
The two areas have different needs and focuses.
2. It talks about Waverly and Randwick council the survey samples are not large enough for the scale of the proposal. The residents disagree and feedback I have received we are large enough. It also has been challenged by experts in the community. On a change like this only a referendum of yes or no would be more transparent to the community.
3. Also in the survey results many residents phoned me and complained they could not just put yes and no they could not complete the form unless they choose an amalgamation option. I find as their local representative and a resident myself that is not acceptable as it distorts the true wishes and figures of the people who wish to participate in the survey.
4. Also in the information council gave out it made some statements “that rates will not rise” “no waste charges increase” “maintain operations and services” “Debt free”  
how could it possibly guarantee it, most believe it cant.
5. It admits to residents in its community engagement “fewer councillors for local representation, initial short term disruptions, loss of Randwick identity’.  
It left out possible loss of local democracy, a different make up of council could direct infrastructure to different areas and suburbs

creating winners and losers. Imposing benefits to some area and detriment affects to other areas.

6. Another point council could become a tyrant organisation and us against them approach as resident business and community groups become disgruntle with council. As a result of political or make up change in council which could risk council being dysfunctional and off track on economics, infrastructure and bad decisions made with a merger proposal. Also areas and suburbs could end up animosity between each other, which would not be socially and economical healthy.
7. Also our valuable precincts could be dismantling an important voice ideas and feedback to the council.

#### C. Scale of the merged council.

1. Majority of all believe we are big enough it would be unwise to make us bigger. It is worked to control well the size we are if bigger many things will go out of control. Both political (backlashes causing instability) and manageable.
2. Job rate and Local Businesses will lose out, in times like this we can't afford to lose our council workers both in Waverley and Randwick. Council workers shop in the local area and provides the local economy a lot. Loss of jobs for council workers will result on many not being able to find work again. This means the government and tax payer will have to fit the bill for most the rest of the life. That will end up costing more than any supposed forecast savings which could dissipate with unexpected cost or bad financial decisions. If bad decision or fortunes comes to one small council at least it doesn't bring down another larger council. The risk is reduced keeping Waverley and Randwick separate.

#### 5. Strategic Capacity of a new council.

More robust review base, the only way many of the community is increase parking meters or increases in levies and big increase rates or less staff to provide less service delivery or less expenditure on infrastructure or borrowings (debt) and if that is the case in

modelling there will a big community backlash that will not go away already there is planned fights for this.

Modelling is just that it's not the reality, and how often modelling can be different to what happens due to factors beyond control. Also feedback from residents throughout its survey has been bias to a merger option. I and many others have little confidence in the modelling.

The strategic Capacity of the new council is easier to achieve in a less complicated Randwick council stand alone. It has proved already it can achieve benchmarks it's given even surpass them.

Council has people working from all over Sydney even our General manager lives out of the local area this has not stopped both trying to get the best people for the job both locally or further. This is an example how with this council, makes reasons that we already doing.

Page 47 table 2 Table 3

As you can see Randwick council is in a better position than Waverly. Why we would risk continue on our own reform and control for little benefits to our ratepayers.

As I have seen with decentralising we end up paying more for less. Any benefits that are in this proposal can be easier achieved if we stand alone.

As we see in Western Australia and Queensland they are spending millions demerging. I hope we can learn from their previous mistakes and don't meddle with a council that has taken a lot of work and effect to be as good as it is.

Thank you for reading my submission.

I plan to no run for council again, but as a concerned resident and seeing how council runs I and the community fears and concerned are justifies.

The only thing I do agree no global city but don't throw the baby out with the bath water by amalgamating Waverly and Randwick . the people have spoken to stand alone. At least should be done is referendum. As going against the people would not be wise. Already there is tension building with the two councils where administration will be and we haven't even begun.

Thanks again

Cr Robert Belleli

Randwick council.