

## WARD & REPRESENTATION REVIEW 2022

### Summary of Submissions

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>Proposal 1</b>	<b>Proposal 2 (Option 1)</b>	<b>Proposal 2 (Option 2)</b>	<b>Proposal 3 (Option 1)</b>	<b>Proposal 3 (Option 2)</b>	<b>Other Suggestions</b>
1	Yes					
2	Yes					
3					Yes	
4	Yes					
5	Yes					
6	Yes					
7	Yes					
8	Yes					
9					Yes	
10					Yes	
11	Yes					
12	Yes					
13	Yes					
14	Yes					
15	Yes					
16						Split into 2 separate shires each with 2 wards – 8 councillors each
17	Yes					
18	Yes					
19	Yes					
20	Yes					
21	Yes					
22					Yes	
23	Yes					
24	Yes					
25	Yes					
26	Yes					
27	Yes					
28	Yes					

29		<b>Yes</b>				
30			<b>Yes</b>			
31			<b>Yes</b>			
32		<b>Yes</b>				
33	<b>Yes</b>					
34	<b>Yes</b>					
35	<b>Yes</b>					
36	<b>Yes</b>					
37	<b>Yes</b>					
38	<b>Yes</b>					
39	<b>Yes</b>					
40	<b>Yes</b>					
41					<b>Yes</b>	
42	<b>Yes</b>					
43	<b>Yes</b>					
44	<b>Yes</b>					

### **Additional Comments**

- No. 1** - I believe the whole shire should be one ward
- No. 2** - Give Elected members portfolios, so that passionate elected members can advocate for the betterment of the entire LGA. For example, a Councilor that is passionate about the environment can better represent all the constituents that also are passionate about environmental issues. Not just the ones that happen to live in the same area. This also allows voters to have more say, what happens if the three people running in one ward don't align with my values but there are individuals running in the area over that better align with my thoughts and beliefs? This eliminates this issue.
- No. 3** - The fairest for all residents. Several Councillors are never available anyway, and at least one is completely unknown in the foothills. Cut down the number of Councillors and ensure they earn what they are now paid.
- No. 4** - i think it is time to move away from the constant perception of an up the hill, down the hill City and the only way we can do that is to have no wards. In turn we should be seeking to align Councillor appointments with portfolios and seek specific skillsets from within the community. i have always found it difficult to understand why i can only vote for 3 councillors but all 12 could make a decision that affected me. Remove the ward boundaries and try to unite the City not divide.
- No. 5** - Please record that I have a preference to have the minimum number of councillors permitted (5), including the Mayor.
- No. 6** - I would suggest no wards otherwise the high population small areas will have a disproportionate say in the overall mix.
- No. 7** - Please record that I have a preference to have the MINIMUM number of councillors permitted (5), including the Mayor.
- No. 8** - All Councillors vote on all decisions so it shouldn't matter where they live. Decisions should be made for the benefit of the whole community.
- No. 9** - nil
- No. 10** - Need local councillors for local suburbs not one that lives up the hill to decide for other suburbs that aren't their own
- No. 11** - To Whom It May Concern. Please record that I have a preference to have the MINIMUM number of councillors permitted (5), including the Mayor and the NO WARDS option.
- No. 12** - To Whom It May Concern. Please record that I have a preference to have the MINIMUM number of councillors permitted (5), including the Mayor and the NO WARDS option.
- No. 13** - To Whom It May Concern. Please record that I have a preference to have the MINIMUM number of councillors permitted (5), including the Mayor and the NO WARDS option.
- No. 14** - Please record that I have a preference to have the minimum number of councillors permitted (5), including the Mayor and the NO WARDS option.
- No. 15** - I am in favour of no wards and minimum counsellors, the reason being I fail to see the value of any of it. The meetings I've been to in the past and there are many, most of the time if not all the time the counsellors adopt the offices recommendation. Even if it's against the wishes of the people they are supposed to represent. I think also the mayor should be elected by the people, this could go some way to breathe new life into the city something drastically needs

- No. 16** - Needs of the two areas are different in that the property ages, sizes and flora/fauna content are very different. Hills people are interested in preserving history and village for tourism. Foothills are about convenience in living and getting to work.
- No. 17** - Please record that I have a preference for the minimum number of councillors permitted (5), including the Mayor, and the 'no wards' option.
- No. 18** – See comments attached (Appendix 1).
- No. 19** - I believe this review is well overdue as I have felt that for some time Local Government has been top heavy with councillors. I have attended a number of council meetings and have come away unimpressed with the performance of those who are there to represent us. I could count on one hand those that were switched-on and attentive to the proceedings while the others were fiddling with mobile phones. Others, by the comments they made, were there because of blatant self-interests.

When council elections are due we have pamphlets and fliers circulating stating how active and supportive of the area they would be. Unfortunately, once elected their statements and promises do not bear the fruit they espouse. It is also very obvious by the comments made by one long standing councillor, that they are only in it for the remuneration.

Therefore, in my opinion the area could be adequately serviced by a maximum number of five councillors with no wards.

**No. 20** - To Whom It May Concern

As I have no idea who our local councillors are and have never seen (apart from some unknown representatives hidden behind computer screens at Council meetings) nor heard, nor been contacted by our local councillors, I have a preference to have the minimum number of councillors permitted (5), including the Mayor and the NO WARDS option please.

**No. 21** – We therefore want to express a preference for the MINIMUM number of Councillors permitted (that is five, including the Mayor) and NO WARDS.

See attached submission for further comments (Appendix 2)

**No. 22** - I have concerns about the workload for Councillors with 25% less representation than currently exists. As Stated in the report many members attend committees on multiple nights per week as well as community events. The significant increase in reading and deliberation of items will make their positions more onerous. I believe we will see an increase in delegated authority to staff to make more and more decisions on behalf of the City. This will mean effectively less representation of the community. Representation should continue with Communities of similar content - The existing boundaries could be tweaked to keep population numbers similar such as using Lyndhurst Road instead of Mundaring Road for North Ward. All wards need to reflect population for at least a 6-8 year period. - Not just current when we are fully aware of further infill subdivision and future urban subdivisions. The commercial imperative of business is not always effectively considered by the City as there is no relationship of the importance when local government voting is considered. A decision to split the City into two ward should be resisted at all cost. A polarised city would not be a good governance result.

**No. 23** - To Whom It May Concern.

Please record that I express a preference for the City of Kalamunda to have the minimum number of councillors permitted (5), including the Mayor and the NO WARDS option.

The current number of councillors are an unnecessary cost on the rate-payer and do not reflect value for money.

Cutting the number will increase competition and attract better, more qualified candidates.

**No. 24** - To Whom It May Concern.

Please record that I express a preference for the City of Kalamunda to have the minimum number of councillors permitted (5), including the Mayor and the NO WARDS option.

The current number of councillors are an unnecessary cost on the rate-payer and do not reflect value for money.

Cutting the number will increase competition and attract better, more qualified candidates.

**Nos. 25 & 26** – See attached comments (Appendix 3)

**No. 27** – To Whom It May Concern,

Please record that I have a preference to have the minimum number of councillors permitted (5), including the Mayor and the NO WARDS option.

**No. 28** - To Whom It May Concern,

Please record that I have a preference to have the minimum number of councillors permitted (5), including the Mayor and the NO WARDS option.

**No. 29** - Similar needs for residents between the Foothills suburbs.

**No. 30** – Nil

**No. 31** – Nil

**No. 32** – Nil

**No. 33** - To Whom It May Concern

Please record that we have a preference to have the minimum number of councillors permitted (5), including the Mayor and the NO WARDS option.

**No. 34** - I was going to complete your questionnaire but felt it was bias as to how you wanted the community to respond to the questions and decided to write instead.

I am against keeping the ward system as it stands as I believe there are too many Councillors. I feel that there really is no need to have the excessive amount of Councillors which are tied into a ward. I believe we should eradicate the ward system and Councillors fight to be elected by all ratepayers within the city. Make Councillors represent everyone and not be thinking of how do I please my ward so I can get re-elected and only requiring a small amount of votes or at times have no one opposed and get an easy vote in.

No to wards and reduce the amount of Councillors.

**No. 35** – See attachment for additional comments (Appendix 4).

**No. 36** – To Whom It May Concern.

Please put on record that I would prefer for the City of Kalamunda to have the minimum number of councillors permitted (5), including the Mayor and the NO WARDS option. The current number of councillors are an unnecessary cost on the rate-payer and do not reflect value for money. Cutting the number will increase competition and attract better, more qualified candidates.

The current council set up have presided over many controversial decisions that has led to the degradation of what once was a place proud of its natural habitat. The sitting councillors have shown little regard for residents wanting to keep our greenspace and pandered to high density developers.

They have ignored science and study after study that tells us to manage our resources better.

**No. 37** - To Whom It May Concern.

Please record that I express a preference for the City of Kalamunda to have the minimum number of councillors permitted (5), including the Mayor and the NO WARDS option.

The current number of councillors are an unnecessary cost on the rate-payer and do not reflect value for money. Cutting the number will increase competition and attract better, more qualified candidates.

**No. 38** - The survey form is extremely limited in the feedback it permits to be entered so I feel it must be noted separately by email that my feedback is this.

The city of Kalamunda should move toward a no ward structure with the maximum of 5 Councillors being required. There appears to be absolutely no benefit whatsoever to any resident of the shire to require more than 5 councillors. So 5 it should be

**No. 39** - Nil**No. 40** - Nil**No. 41** - If a two ward system is chosen, the two wards should both have an equal number of Hills constituents and an equal number of Foothills constituents in each and therefore an equal number of Councillors. This would eliminate the conflict of "uppers verses downers.**No. 42** - With regard to the above mentioned subject, we would like it recorded that the minimum number of councillors , (5) be permitted to sit on the Kalamunda Shire Council Board, including the Mayor and the NO WARDS option.**No. 43** - In regards to the abovementioned subject I thank you for the opportunity to have my view recorded which is to have the **minimum** number of councillors permitted (5), including the Mayor and the NO WARDS option.**No. 44** - After consideration of the published documents I feel the Town of Kalamunda would function adequately with 5 council representatives elected from the Town Districts under a no ward system. The current much larger council does not generate active debate and seldom expresses the views of the people they represent. With a much smaller council residents can be more targeted in their deputations and members more confident of their influence.

## Appendix 1

Submission to the City of Kalamunda relating to  
Ward Boundaries and Councillor Numbers  
16<sup>th</sup> January 2023

**To Whom It May Concern**

I am a rate-payer living in the city of Kalamunda.

In responding to the City of Kalamunda's request for Public submissions from electors and ratepayers, I submit my comments as follows:

**NO WARDS**

I strongly support abolishing all Wards in the City of Kalamunda.

The reasons for my position are:

1. Both the City's *Governance and Policy Framework* (Section 8.1) and the *Local Government Act 1995* (Section 2.10, p.16), state that "...a councillor represents the interests of electors, ratepayers and residents of the district."  
As all councillors vote on issues affecting every ward, the separation into wards serves no effective purpose and implies a barrier to those seeking assistance from a Councillor outside one's ward.
2. Electors would perceive a wider range of Councillors to select from in presenting their issues.
3. There is a general sense among City residents that a number of our City Councillors do not take an interest in or represent the community concerns of their wards.  
As a resident of Piesse Brook and an elector in the South East Ward, with over 50 concerned residents, I observed the disinterest of our Ward councillors in representing amenity concerns relating to a development, either in private or at Council meetings.
4. In its *Discussion Paper*, the city has indicated a cost-saving in running Council elections. This is a contributing factor in favour of abolishing the obsolete Ward system

## **NUMBER OF COUNCILLORS**

I strongly support a reduction in the number of Councillors to a **maximum of 5 competent councillors plus a Mayor/President** elected by the community (a total of 6 elected members).

The benefit of reduced numbers would be:

1. Time/opportunity at Council meetings for more Councillor voices to be heard, the opportunity/requirement for each Councillor to state the reason for his or her position with regard to an issue. With the current number of Councillors this often does not occur. Council meetings are lengthy events. Some representatives make long, rambling statements, others are silent. A small number remain on message, state reasons for their positions and are respected by the community.
2. It is recognised by this constituent that Councillors have a significant workload. However, the current larger numbers do not appear to have generated either sound or inclusive decision-making on a number of community issues.
3. Annual cost savings in reduced numbers.

Thank you,  
Yours faithfully,



**Appendix 2**

**TO: CITY OF KALAMUNDA**

**BY**

---

**SUBMISSION RE: Local government structural reform process: Ward and Representation review**

**Date of document: 17 January 2023**

On 21 September 2022, the Minister for Local Government Hon. John Carey issued a media statement proposing a set of local government reforms. Under the voluntary pathway to enact these reforms, local councils were required to conduct a **full** Ward and Representation Review (WRR). We allege the WRR process currently underway in the City of Kalamunda fails to comply with the Minister's directives for a fit and proper review in a number of important respects in that it

- contravenes the Local Government Act 1995
- places the government reform process in jeopardy
- undermines public confidence in elected officials.

It has implications not only for the conduct of local government but crucially raises the question of whether the Local Government Advisory Board may knowingly permit a flawed review process to stand.

#### **WHAT IS A SUITABLE REVIEW?**

The voluntary reform pathway chosen by the City of Kalamunda requires a **full** Ward and Representation Review, as described in the Minister's media statement (21 September 2022). Further enquiries with the Minister's Office confirmed that if a "suitable review" was not completed within the timeframe permitted, then the Board may recommend that the Reform Election Pathway be enacted.

The Local Government Act does not define what constitutes a "suitable" review, although it does specify technical factors to be considered in relation to establishing or varying ward boundaries.

In the absence of a legal definition, the common meaning of the word "suitable" is *"the quality of being right or appropriate for a particular person, purpose, or situation"*.

Within the context of the Act, a suitable review would therefore be one that reflects the intent of the Act as described in section 1.3(2) (see Appendix B), the good governance principle arising from section 3.1 (see Appendix B) and the Local Government Advisory Board guiding principles (see Appendix C) which reflect the provisions of Schedule 2.2 of the Act. It would also be in accord with the Government's guide *"How to conduct a review of wards and representation for local governments with and without a ward system"* (October 2017).

In the current context of a comprehensive and costly local government reform agenda, a "suitable review" must go beyond the technical factors cited above to encompass procedural fairness and full disclosure of relevant facts in an objective, relevant and timely manner. A review would be suitable only if it were to assist the community to contribute their ideas and participate meaningfully in decisions relating to both council size and ward structures, if any.

Neither of these outcomes is enabled by the Council's initiated current consultation process.

#### **LOCAL GOVERNMENT REVIEW PANEL FINAL REPORT**

The final report of the Local Government Review Panel 2020 outlined recommendations to guide the subsequent reform agenda. The panel considered community engagement ("inclusive local democracy") as the bedrock of good government, with the local government being there for, and to respond to, the community. The panel enunciated the following principles:

- Councils actively engage with their local communities.
- Councils are responsive to the needs, interests and aspirations of individuals and groups within its community.

- Community engagement processes have clearly defined objectives and scope.
- Participants in community engagement have access to **objective, relevant and timely information** to inform their participation. (added emphasis from the authors)
- Participants in community engagement are representative of the persons and groups affected by the matter that is the subject of the community engagement.
- Participants in community engagement are entitled to reasonable support to enable meaningful and informed engagement.
- Participants in community engagement are informed of the ways in which the community engagement process will influence council decision-making.

To form opinions based on reason, the community needs information we can rely on. Whatever the reason, the Council endorsed process has been based on a continuous stream of **misinformation** that directly militates against the Minister's stated objectives and the intent and spirit of the reform agenda. It wholly undermines the basis of the term "suitable review". In our view a new system poisoned at the source cannot be allowed to stand into the future.

### **FAILURES OF CITY OF KALAMUNDA REVIEW PROCESS**

In the media statement of 21 September 2022, the Minister described the intent of the reform agenda as follows:

*"Our reform agenda is clear – we are strengthening the transparency, accountability and efficiency of local governments, and this set of electoral reforms will enable stronger local democracy and community engagement."*

Standards for decision-making and community engagement require that information and options be presented in a balanced, complete and neutral (objective) manner. The Council's current review process fails on all three counts. Alternatives are not clearly defined. The right information is not presented, and the costs and benefits are not fully explored. For example, **all** mention of the current cost of councillor remuneration (around \$30,000 per year each) is entirely absent from the Council's documentation package.

Indeed, the City's discussion paper shows blatant bias towards alternatives that perpetuate the status quo. In local government, where sins of commission (doing something) tend to be punished much more severely than sins of omission (doing nothing), the status quo holds a particularly strong attraction. But in failing to seize the occasion when change is expected, the City is failing electors and undermining the objectives of the Government's reform agenda.

Without balanced, complete and unbiased information, we have no democracy. Making these rights real requires remedial action now before the projected benefits of reform are lost. Enacting the Reform Election Pathway is an obvious step to ensure the review process is professional and legal, and that community protections are real and effective.

#### Misleading information

On 25 November 2022, the Council uploaded documents relating to the reform process on their website, inviting public comment by Friday, 20 January 2023, at 5pm.

The introduction stated that the Council was reviewing its wards and representative structure at the behest of the State Government in order:

*“To ensure that there is not an imbalance in the number of electors per councillor between the wards and that the number of councillors for the City and each ward meets the legislative requirements and is appropriate for providing proper governance and community representation across the district.”*

This wording misconstrues the Government’s purpose by inferring the retention of the ward structure is a “given” and that the community is simply being given the opportunity to comment upon the distribution of councillors across existing wards.

Seven attachments, including a discussion paper, accompanied the Council’s proposal. However, 5 of the attachments were identical, each directing the reader back to the 40-page discussion paper. Whether or not a deliberate ploy, the sheer bulk of 7 attachments could be expected to have a chilling effect on community members, making the background reading appear more daunting than it should have been. The attention of electors, seemingly buried under paperwork, might have lapsed as a result.

#### Out of the equation

And these readers were the lucky ones. They at least had found their way to the discussion on the Council’s webpage. The ‘Have your say’ section of the website appears to have been the **only** avenue adopted by the Council to notify residents of their right to participate in the consultation process at all. The only exception appears to have been a mention of the WRR in the Mayor’s online newspaper column published on 2 December 2022.

Unless residents made a habit of checking the City’s website or, were among the few who attended actual council meetings, they would generally remain unaware of this opportunity to make a submission.

As the Council has possession of the full contact details of property owners, we contend that the failure to use all available means to contact residents directly constituted an improper restriction on the people’s right to participate in the reform process. Further, only computer literate people had easy access to the relevant information. In effect, many people’s right to participate in the (ratepayer-funded) consultation process was negated.

#### Discussion paper

A discussion paper is a central element of the process of consultation by the Council with stakeholders. It is intended to highlight the key considerations that must be taken into account in future Council deliberations.

In order to determine an appropriate policy response, a discussion paper is therefore expected to be factual, evidence-based and nonsuggestive. The Council’s current discussion paper fails on all three counts, as shown below. In particular, we contend the information package was designed to deliver a predetermined result (“business as usual”), albeit with a minor reduction in councillor numbers as required by the Minister. In fact, page 9 of the discussion paper states this bias plainly:

*“The City, in discussion with Council, has based the proposals outlined in this paper on having the allowable maximum of 8 councillors.”*

and

*“Whilst the Council can have a minimum of 5 councillors it is viewed that any outcome other than 8 councillors is considered not practicable from a community engagement and workload perspective.”*

*Bias*

Local government in Western Australia has either a ward system, or no wards, for the representation of electors. The title of the Council’s own discussion paper, Ward and Representation Review, contains a reference to the ward system.

However, the public submission form permits residents to express an opinion about representation (the future size of the Council) **only** if they first agree to continue with the ward system. The rationale for the no ward option is manifestly inadequate.

Rather than eliciting alternative community views, the discussion paper presents only the single option of the status quo as in the best interests of the community.

While page 9 contains a disclaimer: “The City is not promoting any single option”, the very next paragraph gives the lie to this statement: “The City, in discussion with Council, has based the proposals outlined in this paper on having the allowable maximum of 8 councillors. This was considered based on the size of the City, the population and current workloads of councillors.”

In case electors remained in doubt, the discussion paper goes on to say:

*“Whilst the Council can have a minimum of 5 councillors it is viewed that any outcome other than 8 councillors is considered not practicable from a community engagement and workload perspective. Notwithstanding this view, the City through the public consultation phase is interested to hear the community’s view on councillor representation and how many councillors would be appropriate under the new requirements.”*

At 2 relevant public council meetings, Councillors reiterated their desired outcome of the maximum 8 councillors (see Appendix D).

As stated above, the submission form does not permit an opinion on representation, **except** in the context of an elector first agreeing to continue with a ward structure.

Even if an elector expresses a view on the number of councillors by some other means, the discussion paper states that **only views supported by Council** will be submitted to the Board and Minister for approval.

*“Council will consider all submissions received and will then decide on ward boundaries and elected member representation levels. Any Council supported changes to the current structure will then be submitted to the Local Government Advisory Board (LGAB) and Minister for approval.”*

Given that the Council has already made it clear that it has a preferred position – that is, 8 councillors, plus a Mayor and the continuation of a 4 ward system, this proviso makes a mockery of the reform process in particular and local democracy in general. That the vast power imbalance between electors and the City is real is shown by previous experience. For example, in 2020 only 2 submissions were received in support of an advertised concept plan compared with 145 against. Councillors simply substituted a “ring in” concept plan and, without further reference to the

community, submitted it to the WAPC for approval. The City’s understanding of “suitable review” and “community consultation” is therefore farcical.

All the more reason for the Board to enable legitimate scrutiny and debate of the proposed reforms by declaring the default option for Kalamunda forthwith.

*Failure to disclose financial impacts*

The City openly announced its intention of retaining the maximum number of councillors while failing to disclose the financial implications of their plan. For example, the paper omits all reference to the costs associated with each councillor position. Moreover, demographic trends show that the City it is not expected to reach the “trigger point” for a permitted increase in Council size for at least 20 years. This represents a potential saving of approximately \$1.8 million over the next 20 years if the City opted for the minimum number of councillors (5) instead of the maximum (8).

By failing to disclose relevant information, the City has attempted to steer community thinking, making it harder for electors to choose wisely. The financial impacts of reform may be considered even more significant given that the Council’s budget management has recently been the subject of adverse comment by the Auditor General. This comment is recorded in points 17 and 18 of the minutes of the City’s Special Council Meeting held on 27 June 2022. The minutes reveal that the Auditor General has highlighted a deteriorating trend with respect to the City’s Operating Surplus Ratio, which has declined over the past 3 years. Clearly therefore, the financial aspects of councillor representation are a key consideration.

Consideration of the financial impact of changes to the ward system is also obligatory for the Board. The Guiding Principles of the Board (see Appendix C) form the basis for the consideration of any changes to local government boundaries, which in this instance must include consideration of the Minister’s publicly announced reform agenda and the alternative of the Minister’s Reform Election Pathway. Factors that affect the viability of local government, including financial viability, must also form part of any WRR review.

By failing to include the required cost–benefit analysis of the various reform options, the Council has exposed the community to a lack of evidentiary basis for change and the Board to the flow-on effects of non-compliance.

As it is the community who shoulder the financial responsibility for local government services, the absence of full financial disclosure in the discussion paper is particularly galling.

*A ward system, or no wards*

On 28 July 2018, *The West Australian* newspaper reported Minister Templeman as saying there was a pressing need for the State Government to intervene earlier when councils “go off the rails”. The Reform Election Pathway proposed by his Ministerial successor was seen as a much-needed fresh start for troubled local government authorities. The public record shows the City of Kalamunda falls into that “troubled” category in need of a fresh start. It has gone “off the rails” in many of its responsibilities, including environmental sustainability, climate change, community engagement and budget management. But it has failed to grasp this review as an opportunity for genuine engagement, much less to seek feedback on whether a ward system should be retained, or ward boundaries be abolished, based on an objective analysis of both options.

On page 22, the discussion paper pre-empts public consideration of changes to the ward system by stating:

*“There is no need to make any changes to the current ward boundaries.”*

and

*“All of the following proposals and options have been prepared on the basis of eight (8) councillors.”*

Comprehensive omissions in the discussion paper also relate to Proposal 1 “Have no wards”. For example, the rationale for Proposal 1 implies that one of the disadvantages to a no ward system may be that:

*“... a member of the community may feel that their interests are not being represented, particularly if they are from an area with a small population, and if most of the councillors are from more populated areas. The residents of certain areas of the City may have specific concerns that are not relevant to residents of other areas and may feel that their issues are not understood or seen as being important.”*

This statement implies that councillors with a personal connection to a specific ward, either by living or working in the ward, are necessarily more effective than a colleague who lives in an adjacent ward. This has no basis in fact. Nor is residency in a specific ward a legal requirement, a pertinent fact that is omitted from the rationale for Proposal 1. While physical proximity may have played a major role in communications in horse-and-buggy days, modern technology breaks down any distance barrier.

Nor does the discussion paper point out the potential advantage of no wards in terms of providing voters with a larger pool of candidates. Given generally low levels of community participation in the affairs of local government, increasing potential voter choice is entirely consistent with the government’s goal of greater community participation and the one-vote, one-value principle.

The Department of Local Government advised the authors on 6 December 2022 that there are 30 local governments in the metropolitan area, 6 without wards. Yet on page 23 of the discussion paper, the Council states:

*“As at the 2015 Local Government Elections five of the 30 local governments within the metropolitan region had no wards – Town of Bassendean and Cities of Gosnells, Kwinana, Perth and the Shire of Peppermint Grove.”*

Apart from using data that was 7 years old, in the interests of completeness the paper could have just as easily said that 85 local governments out of 137 across the state have opted for No Wards.

The Council’s selective comment is a psychological trap that undermines free and critical thinking. It implies that the vast majority of local government authorities had duly weighed up the pros and cons and concluded that No Wards was undesirable. In reality, their structure simply reflected historical precedent. Far better perhaps for the discussion paper to have quoted Frank Zappa: “Without deviation from the norm, progress is not possible.”

A ward system, or no wards? The discussion paper fails utterly to present either case beyond the presumption of the status quo, underscoring the cynical nature of the City’s entire review process.

*Public submission form*

Appendix 8 of the discussion paper is the public submission form. The introduction to the form fails to reflect all the facts and is slanted towards a desired outcome (the status quo).

Examples include:

*“Consequently, the City of Kalamunda (City) ... can now only have a maximum of 8 councillors plus a Mayor elected by the electors.”*

and

*“The review is being carried out in accordance with clause 6 of Schedule 2.2 of the Local Government Act 1995 and will assess the appropriateness of:*

- *The current ward boundaries.*
- *The number of councillors representing each ward.”*

The above statement refers only to changing the boundaries of existing wards and conceals the crucial option of doing away with wards altogether.

In summary, when the outcome doesn't fit the Council's narrative, the Council abandons the facts, not the narrative. Virtually every piece of information the community get through these documents has been massaged, curated and manipulated before it reaches us. The Council cannot be counted on to reflect all the facts, which must be recognised as an unacceptable state of affairs in a democracy.

We are far from alone in expressing our dissatisfaction with the process, as evidenced by 2 recent Letters to the Editor in the local *Echo* newspaper (see Appendix E). The newspaper titled the letter by J Jeavons, of Wattle Grove, published on 2 December 2022, as “Ward woes”. This letter said in part:

*“In my view, adopting the Minister's reform election pathway would provide residents in the City with the ‘circuit breaker’ we so desperately need ...*

*It is clear from reading relevant council minutes that the current councillors want the maximum number of councillors permitted and want to continue with some form of ward structure.*

*In my view, the wording of the ‘discussion paper’ is clearly slanted to increase the chance that the community will endorse these councillor views ...*

*In my view, such a high-handed disregard for the community's right to participate in fair and objective consultation processes only serves to underscore the desperate need for local government reform as recognised by the Minister.”*

The letter by M Ryan of Wattle Grove, published on 3 November 2022, was titled “Partial say not good enough”. After saying the Council's discussion paper could cause confusion and bamboozle the community, the letter concluded:

*“The people should be given a say on all aspects of the full representation and ward review and not just have a partial say on wards only.”*

In another instance, the first statement of preference on the public submission form permits a choice of No Wards but does not prompt the elector to comment on the level of representation they think should be linked with a No Ward structure.



The second statement of preference permits the elector to express a preference for the number of councillors but only within the constraint of accepting the continuance of a ward system.

It is technically open for a community member to respond ‘one’ to the question about the desired number of wards, which could then be interpreted as them having selected the “No Wards” option. However, equating “one” ward with “No Wards” is trickery. If the elector had answered the first statement of preference as “No Wards”, the second statement of preference would be irrelevant. The use of such deceptive methodology is surely to be condemned.

*Predetermined view*

A comprehensive guide for local governments on how to conduct a review of wards and representation was published in October 2017. The full title of the guide was “*How to conduct a review of wards and representation for local governments with and without a ward system*”.

A basic principle of the guide was that councils should not try to “sell” a particular option. The City of Kalamunda continues to act in contravention of this principle.

Election reform was the subject at an ordinary council meeting of the City of Kalamunda on 25 October 2022 and again one month later on 22 November 2022.

Minutes of each meeting (see Appendix D) clearly show the Council stating and “selling” its preferred option, regardless of the wishes of residents. As no alternatives additional to the current ward system can or will be considered, the consultation process perpetuated by the Council is an administrative fraud and should not be supported.

**HOW DOES KALAMUNDA COMPARE?**

The Board is in a far better position than the authors to compare the merits of each Council’s review process as well as ensure their compliance with the Act. But the unevenness of the process is evident even from public documents. For example, the quality of the public documentation issued by the City of Albany stands in stark contrast to the misinformation supplied by the City of Kalamunda (see Figure 1). While Albany’s discussion paper fulfils both the letter and the spirit of the intended reforms, Kalamunda’s effort can only be described as incompetent at best or deliberately misleading at worst.

<b>Factor</b>	<b>City of Albany</b>	<b>City of Kalamunda</b>
Objectivity	✓	✗
Comprehensiveness	✓	✗
Influence of community feedback	✓	✗
Cost–benefit analysis of councillor numbers	✓	✗
Options explained	✓	✗
Clear feedback submission form	✓	✗

**Figure 1 Comparison of quality of public discussion papers**

*a) Objectivity*

The City of Albany’s discussion paper is objective and impartial, with no apparent position on the preferred number of councillors. The discussion paper by the City of Kalamunda is heavily biased. The Council has openly adopted the maximum number of councillors (8) as their preferred position and has explicitly ruled out alternative views.

*b) Comprehensiveness*

Albany makes it clear that both the future size of the Council and the ward system are to be reviewed. Kalamunda explicitly rules out the No Ward option, referring only to a review of existing ward boundaries, and omits any choice on Council size if one opts for a No Ward preference.

*c) Influence of community feedback*

Albany undertakes to reflect community feedback in their final position to be forwarded to the Board and Minister as follows:

*“The City will make a determination on a preferred option following consideration of all submissions received.”*

Kalamunda gives no such undertaking. In fact, the opposite. Kalamunda is quite open about the fact that only one model will be forwarded to the Board – and that is the Council’s preferred model as proposed in the discussion paper.

*“Any Council-supported changes to the current structure will then be submitted to the Local Government Advisory Board and Minister for approval.”*

Kalamunda treats the discussion paper as a cynical public relations exercise, which is an insult to the administration of local government and the people it supposedly represents.

*d) Cost–benefit analysis of Councillor numbers*

Albany includes and addresses the financial impacts of various options as shown below in the extract from the City of Albany discussion paper.

<b>Councillors</b>	<b>Electors</b>	<b>Cr: Elector ratio</b>	<b>Estimated savings</b>
12 (current)	28,093	1:2341	N/A
10	28,093	1:2809	–\$71,940
8	28,093	1:3511	–\$143,880
6	28,093	1:4682	–\$215,820
4	28,093	1:7023	–\$287,760

***Table 3. Financial Implications – Reduction in Elected Representation (based on Councillor Payments approved in the 2022–23 Budget).***

. Kalamunda does not include any cost-benefit analysis of Council size in the discussion paper. Nor does it refer even to the annual cost to ratepayers per councillor.

*e) Options explained*

Albany presents a balanced discussion of the options, including drawing electors' attention to the fact that councillors do not need to live in the ward they represent. Kalamunda omits significant facts, rules out options that should logically remain on the table, and generally presents a very biased discussion of the issues. Their weak explanation of the no ward option purports that councillors need to live in the ward they represent if they are to be effective. This is factually incorrect.

*f) Submission forms*

Albany outlines all options available to the community clearly (see Appendix F). Kalamunda allows the community to comment upon the future size of the Council **only** if they first agree to retain wards (see Appendix G).

The overall lack of transparency is an indictment of the City of Kalamunda, which is going through the motions of a WRR solely to maintain a veneer of propriety while driving its own status quo agenda.

We hope that the Board will act to restore the integrity of the process that is to shape the future of local government in Western Australia if the Council fails to do so.

## **CONCLUSION**

Fake news' may feel like a new problem to society, but it has a long pedigree at the City of Kalamunda. This is not the first time that residents have been tricked into tokenistic engagement designed to ratify a predetermined outcome.

In our view, by failing to initiate a suitable review, Councillors have forfeited the right to automatic continuation in the role beyond 2023 via the voluntary pathway. Enacting the Reform Election Pathway provides a way forward that is both fair to the community and supportive of the Government's reform agenda.

We therefore want to express a preference for the MINIMUM number of Councillors permitted (that is five, including the Mayor) and NO WARDS.

Yours sincerely

**Appendix 3**

City of Kalamunda

Re Ward and Representation Review

To All Whom It Concerns

As property owners of above, we wish it recorded that we have a definite preference to have the minimum number of councillors permitted (5), including the Mayor, as well as the No Wards option.

A brief history to quantify our reasonings.

In 1987 we moved from the country, purchasing a house in Bottega Place Lesmurdie.

In 1995/96 we purchased this property in Wattle Grove.

At no stage in all these years, has an elected Councillor or Ward Representative ever made personal contact explaining their intentions, responsibilities or plans for their given ward.

At election time we see the Billboards, 'Vote for.....,' but no knock on the door or personal contact.

Of late (ie the last few years) Ward Representatives for our area (Wattle Grove South) have made decisions it seems, favouring the minority rather than the majority. Decisions also made by council, which have a devastating environmental impact, such as the Hale Road Logistics Park.

Reducing the number of councillors to the minimum of 5 and doing away with the ward system would also be of obvious financial benefit.

Please record our preference(s) one each as individuals, (X2) rather than one as a couple.

Yours Sincerely

Wednesday 18th January 2023

## Appendix 4

### No. 35 - Additional Comments

To: Whomsoever it may concern.

Further to the entirely reasonable request from the WA Minister responsible for Local Government Hon John Carey for all Local Governments to carry out a Review of Ward and Representation Review **taking the views of ratepayers fully into account** . -

**I consider that the City Officers and Council of Kalamunda have so far within the expected time scale - failed to openly and adequately consult the ratepayer electorate**, and should refer back to the Local Government Act Section 1..3(2) that spells out the intended result being better decision making; greater community participation in the affairs of local governments; greater accountability to their communities; and more efficient and effective local governments. Good governance principles arise from Section 3.1 of the Act.

In contrast –

- a. Completely inadequate effort has been made to ensure that all Kalamunda ratepayers are aware of this Review.
- b. The documentation offered is inadequately objective in content and presents an impression of the current Officers/ Council wishing without refence to community opinion, to preserve the status quo in terms of maintaining a Ward structure (*in which incidentally some current Councillors do not even reside within the wards they are supposed to represent*) and retaining the current excessive numbers of Councillors **required to ensure adequate community participation.**

**c)** Contrary to the 'Options offered for Wards and filling positions' I consider (as apparently does the Hon LG Minister) that the 'population size, land mass and nature of communities' does not warrant the current number of Councillors. 5 Councillors including the Mayor (elected by Council) and no Wards will be adequate, provided that each and every one of them in future fully and continuously engage personally with the community. -

*E.g. Having attended most Council meetings in person for several years I have noticed that several current Councillors have not made any contribution whatsoever personally to discussions and debate; and some others convey an impression of expressing their own personal views on topics arising for decision, sometimes without having previously sought the views of electors in their respective 'wards'.*

**APPENDIX A**

Letter to [REDACTED] from the Minister's Office dated 11 November 2022



---

**Hon John Carey MLA**  
**Minister for Housing; Lands; Homelessness; Local Government**

Our Ref: 78-09448

11 NOV 2022

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your email dated 26 October 2022 to the Hon John Carey MLA, Minister for Local Government, regarding local government electoral reforms. I am responding to you on the Minister's behalf.

Under Schedule 2.2 of the *Local Government Act 1995* (the Act), local governments carrying out a Ward and Representation Review (review) are to consider submissions made to them during the review consultation period.

The Local Government Advisory Board (the Board) is an independent statutory body established under the Act. It considers the outcome of such reviews (i.e., local government proposals) and ensures compliance with the Act. If the Board determines that the review is not compliant with the Act, it may inform the local government and request the proposal considers the factors and trends outlined in the legislation (i.e., demographic trends, economic factors and community of interests).

Once the Board submits a recommendation to the Minister, the Minister can only accept or reject the Board's recommendation; it cannot be changed.

It is intended that amendments to the Act will contain provisions for the Reform Election Pathway to apply if a local government decides to follow the Voluntary Pathway but does not complete a suitable review in the timeframe required.

The City of Kalamunda's resolution to undertake a review and publish a discussion paper will provide you with the opportunity to further make your views known through the making of a submission.

Yours sincerely

**EUGENE CARMODY**  
**CHIEF OF STAFF**

Level 7, Dumas House, 2 Havelock Street, WEST PERTH WA 6005  
Telephone: +61 8 6552 5300 Facsimile: +61 8 6552 5301 Email: minister.carey@dpc.wa.gov.au

**APPENDIX B**

The intent of the Local Government Act is described in Section 1.3(2) of the Act as follows:

This Act is intended to result in —

- (a) better decision-making by local governments; and
- (b) greater community participation in the decisions and affairs of local governments; and
- (c) greater accountability of local governments to their communities; and
- (d) more efficient and effective local government.

Good governance principles arise from Section 3.1 of the Act as follows:

General function

- (1) The general function of a local government is to provide for the good government of persons in its district.
- (2) The scope of the general function of a local government is to be construed in the context of its other functions under this Act or  
any other written law and any constraints imposed by this Act or  
any other written law on the performance of its functions.
- (3) A liberal approach is to be taken to the construction of the scope of the general function of a local government.

**APPENDIX C**

The Local Government Advisory Board's guiding principles form the basis for considering changes to local government boundaries and take into account the factors set out in the Act. The factors are:

1. Community of interests
2. Physical and topographic features
3. Demographic trends
4. Economic factors
5. History of the area
6. Transport and communication
7. Matters affecting the viability of local governments
8. The effective delivery of local government services.

Points 7 and 8 (viability and effective delivery) in particular have been shown to be lacking in the reform processes of the City of Kalamunda.

These principles affirm that the Board has a duty to protect the rights of residents and ratepayers from improper processes in the current changes to ward boundaries and representation.



## APPENDIX D

Election reform was the subject at an ordinary council meeting of the City of Kalamunda on 25 October 2022 and again one month later on 22 November 2022.

In each instance, the fact that the Council has improperly decided upon a predetermined outcome for the review is evident.

### Council meeting 25 October 2022

Agenda item 10.4.3 of the council meeting included an Officer Report titled “Local Government Reform – Election of Mayor, Council Size & Wards”.

The purpose of the Officer Report was explained one way, but the subsequent Officer Recommendation was described in a different way. The discrepancy was challenged via a deputation, but the correction went unheeded.

### Purpose of the Officer Report

*1. The purpose of this report is to seek Council's adoption of a preferred model for the forthcoming local government reforms relating to:*

- *the size of the Council*
- *the election of the mayor*
- *the structure of wards.*

### Adopted Officer Recommendation

*3. REQUEST the Chief Executive Officer to prepare a Ward Boundary Review discussion paper, including all possible appropriate options, for consideration by Council in November 2022 and for the purpose of issuing the discussion paper for an 8-week public advertising period.*

By specifying not “the structure of wards” as stated in the purpose but only a “Ward Boundary Review”, the Council deliberately narrowed the scope of potential reform to the current ward system. In other words, only the boundaries of the current wards would be considered not the existence or otherwise of the ward model itself.

There was a virtual absence of debate. The vote was carried unanimously 11 to 0.

In our view, the fact that the Council both ignored an opportunity to correct the wording and persisted in its interpretation in contravention of the Government’s reform policy shows it had already decided to pay “lip service” to the Minister’s requirement of a “full representation and ward review”.

Instead, the Council would “sell” the maximum allowable number of councillors (8 and a mayor) as its preferred position.

The Officer Report also made other references to this preferred position as follows:

*In all cases, it is proposed that the City comprise 8 Councillors and a Mayor as a balanced representation across existing (and potential new) wards (Point 20).*

*Given the size, both in population and in land mass as well as the diverse communities within the area, it is recommended Council opt for 8 councillors and a mayor. This brings the total to 9 which accords with the reform proposals (Point 21).*

Paragraph 23 and an accompanying table showed the options put ward. It is important to note that in each instance the maximum number of councillors was preferred in all scenarios (see Column 3).

**Options for wards and filling positions**

<b>Option</b>	<b>Wards</b>	<b>Number of positions</b>
1	No wards (this is the Reform Pathway option)	Election of all 8 council offices in 2023
<i>The following options are all voluntary pathways</i>		
2	4 wards – which is the existing structure	Election of all 8 council offices in 2023
3	4 wards – which is the existing structure	Retain 6 existing members and election for 2 council offices in 2023.
4	2 Wards Hills Ward – North Ward and South East Ward Foothills Ward comprising High Wycombe, Forrestfield and Maida Vale	Election of all 8 council offices
5	2 Wards Hills Ward – North Ward and South East Ward Foothills Ward comprising High Wycombe, Forrestfield and Maida Vale	Retain 6 existing members and election for 2 council offices in 2023.
6	2 Wards Hills Ward – North Ward with South East Ward and Maida Vale Foothills Ward – High Wycombe, Forrestfield and Wattle Grove	Election of all 8 council offices
7	2 Wards Hills Ward – North Ward with South East Ward and Maida Vale	Retain 6 existing members and election for 2 council offices in 2023.

	<i>Foothills Ward – High Wycombe, Forrestfield and Wattle Grove</i>	
8	<i>No wards</i>	<i>Retain 6 existing members and election for 2 council offices in 2023.</i>

In addition, points 25 to 32 and point 38 in the Officer Report all reference the City proceeding in the future with 8 councillors (plus Mayor). The reduction in Council numbers by 3 would result in a saving of around \$90,000 per year. The City would gain approximately \$1.8 million over the next 20 years if the City opted for the minimum number of councillors (5) instead of the maximum (8). However, in the reform documentation supplied, residents are not privy to a full accounting of the financial implications of the various options.

The discussion paper in which the Council outlines the process of review fails to contain a cost–benefit analysis of the options, depriving residents of the information they need to make a considered decision.

The local government guidelines for conducting a review list the cost of elected members as a factor to be taken into account. Other factors are:

- The advantages and disadvantages of no wards
- The advantages and disadvantages of reducing the number of councillors
- The implications of any change to the councillor/elector ratio
- The effectiveness and efficiency of Council meetings
- The advantages and disadvantages of a ward structure.

Each of these factors ought to have been presented in the discussion paper to be forwarded to the community but were not.

The absence of financial implications, given that ratepayer funds are involved, is of particular concern, especially as the City’s audited results for the year ending June 2021 highlighted a downward trend in the City’s operating surplus ratio over the past three years.

According to the minutes of a Special Council Meeting held on 27 June 2022, the downward trend was also identified as a concern by the Office of the Auditor General.

As it is the community who shoulder the financial responsibility for local government services, the absence of full financial disclosure in the discussion paper is particularly galling.

The complainants (and the community) look to the Board and the Minister to progress local government reform unmolested by the schemes of self-interested councillors.

#### Council meeting 22 November 2022

Misleading references only to ward review continued in the Officer Report related to Agenda item 10.4.4 at the meeting held on 22 November 2022.

In point 1, the Officer Report described the purpose of the agenda item as seeking Council endorsement to issue the City of Kalamunda (City) Ward Review Discussion Paper 2022 for community consultation.

Again, the emphasis was placed on the ward review aspect and not representation.

Ward review only was also shown in points 3, 4, 13, 14, 15, 18, 21, 24 and 25, culminating in the Officer Recommendation that was unanimously supported by councillors.

*That Council AGREE to issuing the City of Kalamunda Ward Review Discussion Paper 2022 shown as Attachment 1 for community consultation from 25 November 2022 until 20 January 2023.*

As information is a primary organisational asset that is needed now and into the future, good recordkeeping is vital. The failure of the Council to produce trustworthy records, from minutes to Officer Reports and discussion papers, is an outrage.

Local government reform has been promoted as a way to reverse the decline in trust in democracy. If a solution is to be found, the Board and Minister must ensure councils are genuinely open to change. If a local government claims to represent the people, they should take the people seriously.

APPENDIX E

Letter to the editor published in the Echo local newspaper on 2 December 2022

between what the community wants City of Kalamunda councillors to do and what they actually do.

In my view, adopting the Minister's reform election pathway would provide residents in the City with the 'circuit breaker' we so desperately need to reset council direction and to provide greater value for money for residents into the future.

It is a matter of public record that City of Kalamunda councillors have chosen to chart their own course and, at the council meeting held on November 22, 2022 councillors endorsed a so called 'discussion paper' for the community to read prior to submitting their views about the number of councillors and, whether or not the City should continue with ward structures.

It is clear from reading relevant council minutes that the current councillors want the maximum number of councillors permitted and want to continue with some form of ward structure.

In my view, the wording of the 'discussion paper' is clearly slanted to increase the chance that the community will endorse these councillor views.

Seemingly in anticipation however, that this may not ultimately prove to be the case, there is a throw-away line within the 40-page paper which states that only council supported changes will be forwarded for Ministerial approval.

This means that even if the majority of the community want to opt for five councillors (with a saving of roughly \$1.8 million ratepayer dollars over the next 20 years or so, as described on page 13 of *Echo News* and No wards, councillor views will prevail.

Therefore, rather

**Thought of the day**  
Spread love everywhere  
come to you without leaving

than the 'full consultation' required by the Minister, councillors are simply proposing a tokenistic engagement with residents over the busy Christmas/New Year to ratify their predetermined view.

In my view, such a high-handed disregard for the community's right to participate in fair and objective consultation processes only serves to underscore the desperate need for local government reform as recognised by the Minister.

**Ward woes**

Dear Echo News,  
I have a particular interest in the local government reform agenda of Minister Carey as I hold the view that there is a very evident disconnect

**Letter to the editor published in the Echo local newspaper on 3 November 2022**

**Partial say not good enough**

**Dear Echo News,**

As stated in last week's article, *Counsellors make pathway decision* (Echo News, October 28), the Minister for Local Government is attempting to reduce the perceived costly 'over-governance' characterising many local government authorities, including the City of Kalamunda.

The City must reduce the number of councillors it has from 12 to between five and nine, including the mayor.

Council has been given the opportunity to either follow the minister's default pathway, where there are no wards and all councillor positions are declared vacant at the 2023 council elections or whether to undertake a voluntary transition pathway in consultation with their communities.

The council has chosen to follow the voluntary transition pathway but ironically, the pathway chosen will not allow the community to determine how

participation in the affairs of local government.

And, instead of explaining what the pros and cons of continuing with the current ward structure are, and then asking the community the simple question of whether they want wards or not and if so, how many, councillors have opted to inform the community with a complex 'discussion paper'.

Such a paper can cause confusion and bamboozle the community into believing that it is, therefore, a good idea to continue with the irrelevant and undemocratic ward system with its limited choice of candidates.

Each councillor is paid \$25,580 a year and the mayor \$96,853 (2020/21 figures).

We now have 12 councillors including the mayor and deputy mayor at a cost of \$393,915, which is going to be cut by the reforms to a maximum of nine councillors including the mayor.

However, it is possible to have five councillors, including the mayor, a considerable saving to the annual budget.

The whole reform agenda is to acquire

The people should be given a say on all aspects of the full representation and ward review and not just have a partial say on wards only.

*The Echo reserves the right to edit letters for length, legal reasons or clarity. The opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect those of the Echo. All letters must contain the author's full name, address and phone number for verification purposes.*

**ECHO News**

**ADDRESS:**  
Unit 4/9 The Avenue  
Midland WA 6056  
**Phone: 9374 6666**

Jocelyn Longley  
General Manager 9374 6605

**DISPLAY ADVERTISING**  
sales@echo-news.com  
Belinda Lyne 9374 6607  
Karon McCracken 9374 6610

**CLASSIFIEDS, TRADES & SERVICES ADVERTISING**  
classifieds@echo-news.com  
Jo Hitchcock 9374 6666

**EDITORIAL**  
editorial@echo-news.com  
Claire Ottaviano 9374 6603  
Morgan de Smidt 9374 6602  
Rebecca Peppiatt 9374 6601

**PRODUCTION**  
production@echo-news.com  
Jeanene Allen 9374 6613  
Liz Rowlands 9374 6613

**ACCOUNTS**

**APPENDIX F**

**City of Albany public submission form**



City of Albany - Review of Ward Boundaries and Representation 2022

**Public Submission Form**

The City currently has a Ward System, which means that in accordance with the Local Government Act 1995, a review of those ward boundaries and elected representation must be undertaken every eight years. The Minister for Local Government has advised the City of Albany that it has been identified as one local government which will be required to reduce its number of elected representatives to between 4 and 8 (from 12) as a result of local government reforms. Please refer to the Discussion Paper for further information on those reforms.

Our community now has the opportunity to provide submissions on the number of elected representatives, and whether a Ward System should be retained or all wards should be abolished. If you support the retention of a Ward System, you may also choose to suggest ward names. Public submissions must be received by 5.00pm 08 December 2022.

Your response will be included in the table of submissions as part of the final recommendation to Council.

For more information contact the Governance Team on 68203076 or email [councilliaison@albany.wa.gov.au](mailto:councilliaison@albany.wa.gov.au)

**Based on my knowledge and opinion I support:**

**Number of Councillors:**

- 4 Elected Representatives
- 8 Elected Representatives
- A number between 4 and 8, please enter amount: \_\_\_\_\_

**Representation designated by:**

- Wards (Option 1A or 1B in the Discussion Paper)
- No Wards (Option 2 in the Discussion Paper)

**Please select one of the following options, if you have chosen Ward Representation\*:**

- Option 1A** Two Wards\* (Delineated by Albany Highway and York Street, refer map 1A).
- Option 1B** Two Wards\* (Delineated by Albany Highway, Chesterpass Road and York Street, refer map 1B).
- Option 3** Other Ideas (E.g. a different ward system than suggested in Option 1A & B, ward names or any other suggestions you may have regarding representation)

*\*Proposed Ward Maps for Options 1A and 1B are attached to the discussion paper.*

**Comments:** Please include any comments supporting your ideas – continue on additional sheets if necessary.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**APPENDIX G**

**City of Kalamunda public submission form – page 1**



## Public Submission Form

**CLOSING DATE FOR SUBMISSIONS  
FRIDAY  
20 JANUARY  
2023**

**City of Kalamunda**

### 2022 Review of Ward Boundaries & Representation

The State Government, as part of a major review of the Local Government Act 1995, has recently announced significant changes with respect to councillor numbers and the method of election of the Mayor/President for some local governments.

The minimum/maximum number of councillors will now be determined by population and for local governments within the Band 1 or 2 classifications, will mean the Mayor/President must be elected by the electors of the district.

Councillor numbers permitted by population bands are:

- » Up to 5,000 – 5 councillors (including the President).
- » Between 5,000 and 75,000 – 5 to 9 councillors (including the Mayor/President)
- » Above 75,000 – 9 to 15 councillors (including the Mayor)

Consequently, the City of Kalamunda (City) which is classified as a band 2 local government and a current population of around 61,000, can now only have a maximum of 8 councillors plus a Mayor elected by the electors.

To ensure that there is not an imbalance in the number of electors per councillor between the wards and that

the number of councillors for the City and each ward meets the legislative requirements and is appropriate for providing proper governance and community representation across the district, the City is reviewing its wards and representative structure.

Currently the City is divided into four (4) electoral wards, each electing three (3) councillors. The Mayor is elected by the councillors.

Council last reviewed its wards and representation in November 2016.

The review is being carried out in accordance with clause 6 of Schedule 2.2 of the Local Government Act 1995 and will assess the appropriateness of:

- » The current ward boundaries.
- » The number of councillors representing each ward.

You can read the review at [engage.kalamunda.wa.gov.au](http://engage.kalamunda.wa.gov.au), at the City Administration and your local Library or call us on 9257 9999.

This form has been provided for your convenience. Written public submissions do not have to be made on this form.

[engage.kalamunda.wa.gov.au](http://engage.kalamunda.wa.gov.au)

Please return this survey to a City of Kalamunda Library or:  
2 Railway Road KALAMUNDA WA 6076 PO Box 42 KALAMUNDA WA 6076  
T 9257 9999 F 9259 2715 E [haya@kalamunda.wa.gov.au](mailto:haya@kalamunda.wa.gov.au)

**(Continued overleaf)**



**City of Kalamunda public submission form – page 2**

**I support the following proposal, as described in the discussion paper:**

- Proposal 1:** No Wards
- Proposal 2:** Option 1
- Proposal 2:** Option 2
- Proposal 3:** Option 1
- Proposal 3:** Option 2

Comments (for example: reasons for support, suggested ward names).

---



---



---



---

Please attach additional pages if required.

**I believe the City of Kalamunda should have a ward system as follows:**

Number of wards:

---

Number of Councillors (by law, must be between 5 and 8):

---

Comments (for example: reasons for support, suggested ward names).

---



---



---



---

Please attach additional pages if required.

**Your details**

*Note: Information will only be recorded for statistical purposes and unless you wish to be contacted further on this matter or other City matters, your personal details will remain confidential.*

Name

---

Email

Suburb

Gender

Male

Female

Prefer not to say

Age

16-25

26-35

36-45

46-55

56-65

65+

Please keep me informed about:

Any developments regarding this ward review

Information about services and activities in the City of Kalamunda

**END**