SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

Shire of Denmark – Ward & Representation Review 2020

	Submitters Name	Comments Verbatim	Officer Comments
1		Strongly oppose Option 3 that proposes to remove all ward boundaries i.e. 'no ward structure'. 1. Poses a very real threat of our community loosing its voice. 2. Could result in there being no Councillors from our local area with local knowledge or understanding of local issues. 3. Makes it difficult for residents to contact and communicate with Councillors especially local face--to--face contact and creates confusion as to which Councillor is the best point of contact. 4. Shifts rural representation towards town/powerhouse of Denmark Shire. 5. It is not fair to expect Councillors to represent the entire Shire and have sufficient understanding over all issues. Strongly oppose any future proposal to reduce the number of councillors in the Kent/Nornalup Ward. Out of the options provided by the Denmark Shire we prefer/support Option 4 that proposes to retain current wards and representation. We propose a further option: Make Kent River a new ward boundary, including the Kent River/Kentdale community so there is a true Kent/Nornalup Ward representative of the Kent/Nornalup community. Peaceful Bay is underrepresented because of a high ratio of non-electorate ratepayers. *This is exacerbated by too much focus on factor number 5 and not enough focus on factors 1 through to 4 when considering changes to wards and representation. We request more focus on factors 1 to 4 during the next Review of Wards and Representation particularly in relation to Peaceful Bay. *We request the Denmark Shire to work proactively with the Peaceful Bay Progress Association to address this issue.	**Preference for Option 4** – Retain the current Wards & Representation with nine Elected Members and three Wards **Submitter strongly opposes Option 3** – Implement a 'no Ward' structure with nine Elected Members.
2		I am writing as an elector in the Kent/Nornalup ward and would like recorded my wishes on the current Ward Review. I am a leasehold resident of Peaceful Bay and enrolled on the Denmark Shires roll. Many Peaceful Bay leaseholders are Ratepayers but not Electors and as such the locality numbers are not realistically represented. I strongly feel Shire should retain both Councillor position for the Kent/Nornalup Ward and strongly oppose a No Ward structure (Option 3) in the discussion paper.	**Preference for Option 4** – Retain the current Wards & Representation with nine Elected Members and three Wards **Submitter strongly opposes Option 3** – Implement a 'no Ward' structure with nine Elected Members.
3		Of the options presented by the Shire of Denmark (SOD) for consideration, as a leasehold owner at Peaceful Bay I support Options 1, 2 and 4. In all these cases Peaceful Bay and Nornalup are fairly represented by retaining the existing two elected councilors for the ward. Whilst I understand that councillors are elected to represent all ratepayers within the shire of Denmark. It is clear that elected representatives that live and associate with local ratepayers within that ward are typically more attune to issues that are affecting the community. The Peaceful Bay and Nornalup community are well represented by our two Councillors and this has resulted in a fair and professional relationship with the SOD. As a member of the community I would like to see this continue. Of the three Options 1,2 & 4 - I favour Option 2 which includes a newly created ward of Ocean Beach that may improve the representation of ratepayers within that area and provide a similar close working relationship between councillors and ratepayers. Option 3 - No Ward boundaries I strongly oppose this or any other similar structure as a possible proposal for the SOD. This structure risks a bias of elected councillors from one particular locality and despite councillors best intentions it is unlikely to result in fair and reasonable representation across the entirety of the SOD. It risks undoing all the hard work that councillors have put in trying to ensure members of their local communities have their voices heard, which can be particularly hard in regional areas that have lower population density than the direct townsite for example One last additional comment to be made is with regards to one of the KPI's assessed #5 - Ratio of councillors to Electors. I can understand the need for this assessment and typically it would provide the SOD a reasonable idea of the spread of councillors across the community. I would like to make the comment that Denmark has a high representation of Holiday Homes in the area, in particular the community of Peaceful Bay. Many holiday home owners may not actually be registered to vote in local council elections because they are registered in their principal place of residence and are unaware they can also register for the Denmark Shire Council Elections. This may mean the ratio of	**Preference for Option 2** – Create 4 Wards and split the Townsite Boundary area into two Wards **Submitter strongly opposes Option 3** – Implement a 'no Ward' structure with nine Elected Members.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

Shire of Denmark – Ward & Representation Review 2020

	Submitters Name	Comments Verbatim	Officer Comments
		councillors to actual rate payers is actually lower than what has been stated in the ward review - particularly the Community of Peaceful Bay. Therefore while KPI #5 is a consideration for the SOD, it should not be the primary means of measurement when determining the best structure for the ward review. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this review.	
4		I believe that it is in the interest of all communities that the current Ward system is retained. This allows for valuable local input for the special needs of those communities. While it may be democratic to have a ratio of councilors to electors, this could result in decisions and focus being mainly on the town of Denmark, at the expense of the outer wards. As we enter the recovery phase of Covid-19, there could be many demographic changes that we cannot envisage. Therefore, I suggest that Council appeals to the Minister to have this review delayed for another 12 months.	**Preference for Option 4** – Retain the current Wards & Representation with nine Elected Members and three Wards
5		I prefer Option 3, No Wards. It gives Denmark voters the opportunity to speak to any Councilor on any subject. It provides for Councilor's with approximately 600 voters. This a relatively small give the size of State and Federal electorates.	**Preference for Option 3** – Implement a 'no Ward' structure with nine Elected Members.
6		We believe that the ward set up provides good representation for communities in our shire.	Although no preference is given, the Officer interprets this comment to mean that the Submitter wishes to retain the current Wards & Representation with nine Elected Members and three Wards
7		Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Shire of Denmark's document titled "Review of Wards and Representation Discussion Paper". Regarding the options proposed in the document, my comments are as follows: • Option 1 - (Table 3). The "town" ward has over 50% of the councillors and philosophically I am against this situation. • Option2 – (Table 4). Of the various options my preference is for the inclusion of the "new Ocean Beach ward". It appears to provide a reasonable spread of councillors throughout the shire. • Option 3 – (Table 5). I oppose the "no ward" proposal. With this option it is possible that any current ward area could end up without representation. • Option 4 – In my opinion retaining the current ward boundaries & representation (as Table 1) is acceptable but provides a less positive solution than does option 2. In all options the document appears to retain the current representation of nine councillors and I support this position.	**Preference for Option 2** – Create four Wards and split the Townsite Boundary area into two Wards **Submitter strongly opposes Option 3** – Implement a 'no Ward' structure with nine Elected Members.
8		Thank you for the opportunity to provide my feedback on the ward boundary and representation review. My order of preference for the proposed options: First preference: Option 4 - retain the current wards and representation with 9 elected members and 3 wards. 2nd preference: Option 2 - create 4 wards (introducing new Ocean Beach Ward) 3rd preference: Option 1 - increase councillors in town from 3 to 5 and reduce Scotsdale/Shadforth from 4 to 2. 4th preference: Option 3 - implement a 'no ward' structure with 9 elected members I believe it is essential for Peaceful Bay to have 2 representatives in council (ie within Kent/Nornalup) otherwise Peaceful Bay runs the risk of being totally overlooked in many decisions. Thank you for your time in undertaking this community consultation.	**Preference for Option 4** – Retain the current Wards & Representation with nine Elected Members and three Wards **Submitter strongly opposes Option 3** – Implement a 'no Ward' structure with nine Elected Members.
9		As the owners of a holiday house at peaceful bay, we support the current ward boundaries. We feel we would have no representation if these were changed.	**Preference for Option 4** – Retain the current Wards & Representation with nine Elected Members and three Wards
10		The would like to enter the following submission on the above review.	**Preference for Option 4** – Retain the current Wards & Representation with nine Elected Members and three Wards

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

Shire of Denmark – Ward & Representation Review 2020

	Submitters Name	Comments Verbatim	Officer Comments
		(a) The strongly supports retention of the Ward System as outlined in Option 1, Option 2 and Option 4. The rationale is that Peaceful Bay is fairly represented in these Options and the communities of Nornalup and Peaceful Bay are keen to keep the Kent/Nornalup Ward relevant. We have two Councillors representing our Ward and have developed a good working relationship to address the issues that affect our communities. The area comprises short term holiday accommodation, tourism and associated business interests, rural lifestyle blocks and farming enterprises each with their own unique requirements and concerns, which are well understood by our current Council representatives. (b)The strongly opposes the "No Ward" structure - Option 3. The prime risk being that we are in danger of losing our voice in the decision making process on issues which concern our community and rural representation for the Kent/Nornalup area would diminish, or at worst, disappear altogether. We would also lose the accessibility to a Councillor who is familiar with issues specific to our area.	**Submitter strongly opposes Option 3** – Implement a 'no Ward' structure with nine Elected Members.
11		I strongly oppose the proposed Option 3 of 'no ward' structure as this could result in Peaceful Bay having NO representation on Council and this would NOT benefit leaseholders and landholders in Peaceful Bay and surrounding districts.	**Submitter strongly opposes Option 3** – Implement a 'no Ward' structure with nine Elected Members. Although no preference is given, the Officer interprets this comment to mean that the Submitter wishes to retain the current Wards & Representation with nine Elected Members and three Wards
12		I strongly object to OPTION 3 of NO WARD structure in the Ward Review. This would mean that the Kent/Nornalup Ward and other districts throughout the Denmark Shire would have no representation on the Shire. This would also include lease holders and land holders of the coastal settlement of Peaceful Bay. Districts need local representatives on Council. I am amazed that this option would even be considered.	**Submitter strongly opposes Option 3** – Implement a 'no Ward' structure with nine Elected Members. Although no preference is given, the Officer interprets this comment to mean that the Submitter wishes to retain the current Wards & Representation with nine Elected Members and three Wards
13		I strongly oppose the proposed Option 3 of 'no ward' structure as this could result in large parts of the Shire having NO representation on Council and this would NOT benefit leaseholders and landholders in these districts, for example Nornalup, Peaceful Bay and Bow Bridge.	**Submitter strongly opposes Option 3** – Implement a 'no Ward' structure with nine Elected Members. Although no preference is given, the Officer interprets this comment to mean that the Submitter wishes to retain the current Wards & Representation with nine Elected Members and three Wards
14		I oppose the proposed Option 3 of "no ward" structure as this could result in Peaceful Bay having no representation on Council and this would not benefit leaseholders and landholders in Peaceful Bay and surrounding districts.	**Submitter strongly opposes Option 3** – Implement a 'no Ward' structure with nine Elected Members. Although no preference is given, the Officer interprets this comment to mean that the Submitter wishes to retain the current Wards & Representation with nine elected Members and three Wards
15		As a ratepayer and resident of Peaceful Bay I would like to make known my strong opposition to option 3, as stated in your discussion paper. Peaceful Bay needs representation by dedicated councillors, who understand the unique issues of our community. In the past Peaceful Bay has been represented by councillors not from this area who proved to be less than fully committed to acting on behalf of the ratepayers and leaseholders at Peaceful Bay. I feel we have been well represented by the current councillors, cannot see any benefit to Peaceful Bay by adopting option 3, and would feel extremely let down by the council if it was to be introduced and implemented.	**Submitter strongly opposes Option 3** – Implement a 'no Ward' structure with nine Elected Members. Although no preference is given, the Officer interprets this comment to mean that the Submitter wishes to retain the current Wards & Representation with nine Elected Members and three Wards
16		My wife and I are leaseholders and ratepayers of . Having read the Denmark Shire 2020 Ward Review document we wish to strongly object to any consideration being given to the inclusion of Option 3, offered in the report, in any further discussions relating to revision of ward	**Submitter strongly opposes Option 3** – Implement a 'no Ward' structure with nine Elected Members.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

Shire of Denmark – Ward & Representation Review 2020

	Submitters Name	Comments Verbatim	Officer Comments
		boundaries. The possibility of having no council member with extended knowledge of Peaceful Bay and/or history of developments and heritage of it would represent a distinct disadvantage to all leaseholders and property owners there. Any consideration of elimination of all ward boundaries, particularly in a predominately rural regional Shire runs the undesirable risk of removing from Shire council decision making processes, sound and informed understanding of significant localised issues from all parts of the Shire. This is of particular importance where past histories, including the bases of past decision making need to be taken into account. Informed opinions of small business proprietors in other than main populated areas need to be available to Shire decision makers. We trust this submission by us will be considered in the decision making process for the outcome of the 2020 Ward Review	Although no preference is given, the Officer interprets this comment to mean that the Submitter wishes to retain the current Wards & Representation with nine Elected Members and three Wards
17		As rate payers and residents of Peaceful Bay we would like to enter the following submission on the above review. We strongly support the retention of the ward system as outlined in either Options # 1, 2 and 4. WE, ON THE OTHER HAND STRONGLY OPPOSE OPTION #3 AS THIS WILL COMPLETELY LEAVE THE KENT / NORNALUP AREA WITHOUT ANY DEDECATED REPRENTATIVES ON COUNCIL This ward not only encompasses the Peaceful Bay village but also includes a significant number of rural properties as well as the settlement of Nornalup. To propose the no ward system for the whole Shire will NOT be a fair and equitable representation for the smaller population areas within the Shire of Denmark.	**Submitter strongly opposes Option 3** – Implement a 'no Ward' structure with nine Elected Members. **Supports Options 1, 2 & 4**
18		I strongly oppose the proposed Option 3 of 'no ward' structure as this could result in Peaceful Bay having NO representation on Council and this would NOT benefit leaseholders and landholders in Peaceful Bay and surrounding districts.	**Submitter strongly opposes Option 3** – Implement a 'no Ward' structure with nine Elected Members. Although no preference is given, the Officer interprets this comment to mean that the Submitter wishes to retain the current Wards & Representation with nine Elected Members and three Wards
19		We strongly oppose the proposed Option 3 of 'no ward' structure as this could result in Peaceful Bay having NO representation on Council. This would NOT benefit leaseholders and landowners in Peaceful Bay and surrounding districts.	**Submitter strongly opposes Option 3** – Implement a 'no Ward' structure with nine Elected Members. Although no preference is given, the Officer interprets this comment to mean that the Submitter wishes to retain the current Wards & Representation with nine Elected Members and three Wards
20		As a rate payer and leaseholder in Peaceful Bay I would like to object to the removal of wards within the shire of Denmark as I feel we would be unfairly represented with in the town ship of Denmark.	**Submitter strongly opposes Option 3** – Implement a 'no Ward' structure with nine Elected Members. Although no preference is given, the Officer interprets this comment to mean that the Submitter wishes to retain the current Wards & Representation with nine Elected Members and three Wards
21		we strongly oppose the proposed option 3 of 'No Ward' structure as this could result in Peaceful Bay having no representation on council and this would not benefit leaseholders and landholders in Peaceful Bay and surrounding districts	**Submitter strongly opposes Option 3** – Implement a 'no Ward' structure with nine Elected Members. Although no preference is given, the Officer interprets this comment to mean that the Submitter wishes to retain the current Wards & Representation with nine Elected Members and three Wards
22		I do not support option 3 of the Ward Review.	**Submitter strongly opposes Option 3** – Implement a 'no Ward' structure with nine Elected Members.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

Shire of Denmark – Ward & Representation Review 2020

	Submitters Name	Comments Verbatim	Officer Comments
		In my opinion, option 3 does not even qualify as an option. Imagine having 200 elected Federal Politicians in Canberra, all elected from the Canberra population, representing all Australians.!!!!! If a person living in Tuckanarra, Western Australia wanted advice on legal issues regarding some aspect of remodelling his miners hut, imagine how valid this advice would be if it was tendered by one of the elected Canberrans. “Where is Tuckanarra” The same rationale applies to my location of Peaceful Bay. I want someone who is aware of all the local situations peculiar to Peaceful Bay, to represent me on Denmark Shire Council.	Although no preference is given, the Officer interprets this comment to mean that the Submitter wishes to retain the current Wards & Representation with nine Elected Members and three Wards
23		I wish to voice my strong opposition to option 3 as outlined in the ward review document. I would not want to loose the strong and effective representation the Kent/Nornalup ward has enjoyed, being represented by councillors Phillips and Seeney.	**Submitter strongly opposes Option 3** – Implement a ‘no Ward’ structure with nine Elected Members. Although no preference is given, the Officer interprets this comment to mean that the Submitter wishes to retain the current Wards & Representation with nine Elected Members and three Wards
24		I’d like to register my support of Option 2 in the Denmark Shire Council Ward Review. I believe representation in Local Government is essential for a healthy vibrant community. Our diverse demographics requires the need to have a ward system which allows local people to interact with their ward councillor with issues directly related to their area. Local people have better ideas and knowledge about their local problems -as does the ward councillor.	**Preference for Option 2** – Create 4 Wards and split the Townsite Boundary area into two Wards
25		I just wanted to have my two bob’s worth regarding the Ward Review. Whilst I am currently of the , I am putting in this submission as a private individual and a candidate in the . The will be making a submission shortly. I was able to see the current system in operation last September and October whilst campaigning for . I walked and drove all over the Ward which ranged from CBD addresses to semi-rural properties up in the hilly areas (which barely warranted the “ ” description). When State and Federal electoral commissions draw up lower house constituency boundaries, they place great emphasis on the principle of ‘contiguity’. Essentially this means that each electorate has things in common – the electorate hangs together with common issues and interests. It is hard to see the operation of this principle in the Shire of Denmark’s ward boundaries. The key determinant seems to be equalising population numbers and councillor-resident ratios. Hence, Kent-Nornalup ranges from sparsely populated areas in the west to more dense population as the eastern boundary pushes well into Scotsdale-Shadforth. Therefore, there are few distinctive features in one ward that are not in another. As you may have surmised, I think residents and/or ratepayers would be better served by a ward-less Shire where all Councillors are there to represent all residents and/or ratepayers and to make decisions in the interest of the Shire as a whole.	**Preference for Option 3** – Implement a ‘no Ward’ structure with nine Elected Members.
26		I am a resident of Kentdale and firmly believe in the retention of the ward system for our shire, it is the only way to ensure fair representation and ensure the needs of people who live outside the Denmark township are met I believe if the ward system was to be abolished, many of the issues we face in the western end of the shire would not make it to the decision making table.	**Opposes Option 3 – (**Implement a ‘no Ward’ structure with nine Elected Members). Submitter does not however provide a preference out of options 1, 2 & 4.
27		I support Option 3: ending the historical ward system in favour of a “no ward” local government for Denmark. The age of parochialism is long over.	**Preference for Option 3** – Implement a ‘no Ward’ structure with nine Elected Members.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

Shire of Denmark – Ward & Representation Review 2020

	Submitters Name	Comments Verbatim	Officer Comments
		If in due course this proves to be too great a burden for nine councillors, additional councillors can be elected if required; or delegations to senior staff modified. However, I believe that no-one should stand for council who is not prepared to put in the work, so I would hope that one of the results of adopting Option 3 is that we get progressively better candidates standing for election. To that end I also believe that councillors should be better remunerated than they are / have been – though the choice is ultimately theirs.	
28		We wish to register support for the continuation of the ward structure in local Council Elections. We feel that Peaceful Bay is a unique area of the Shire , and as such, needs local representation to maintain and protect that feature.	Although no preference is given, the Officer interprets this comment to mean that the Submitter wishes to retain the current Wards & Representation with nine Elected Members and three Wards
29		Of the options outlined in the Discussion Paper [DP] my preference is for Option 4. I have not arrived at this opinion because of the proverbial 'if it ain't broke, don't fix it' advice … rather it's because the other three options are in some way or other less attractive. Even so, the advice would be appropriate … for in my view the current Councillors and Staff are doing a good job. However, the Discussion Paper does not display the current three-ward arrangement clearly enough … and since this could lead to confusion between Localities and Wards I have modified the diagram in DP p12 to better illustrate the Ward boundaries. Residents of Ocean Beach (Locality) may, for example, be tempted to identify the Scotsdale/Shadforth Ward with the Localities of Shadforth and/or Scotsdale whereas the Ward actually contains properties listed in the Hay, Denmark and Mt Lindesay Localities … the Ward completely encircles the Town Ward as shown below. Dominated by the Mt Lindesay National Park and State Forest in the north, it is otherwise the rural-urban fringe or outskirts of the township as it was pre-2016. The temptation to divide the new (post 2016) boundaries into two separate Wards should, in my view be avoided because it raises the question "if Ocean Beach Ward why not Shadforth and/or Scotsdale or Hay Wards at some later date?" I believe this Kent/Nornalup Scotsdale/Shadforth Town is enough to rule out Option 2 completely … for such fragmentation could only work against a sense of community rather than enhancing it. Option 3 would, I think, be potentially even more disruptive to community harmony for there would always be a perception of unbalanced representation. Self-interested power groups with little concern for the welfare of the entire community would be easier to form than at present. The same concern applies to Option 1for although it is objective, in that it relies on mirroring the post-2016 town boundary, five elected representatives from this area (DP Figure 2) could easily lose sight of those further afield. Moreover, the boundaries must change as the town grows and this means that Ward structure would have to be adjusted … possibly leading to electoral instability. All in all, I think that the current arrangement is serving us well. We don't need to make changes.	**Preference for Option 4** – Retain the current Wards & Representation with nine Elected Members and three Wards
30		The Kent / Nornalup Ward is the largest in area in the shire yet currently has an equal number of constituents per councillor percentage wise as the smallest ward, namely the town ward. This therefore appears to be inequitable and requires the councillors of the Kent /Nornalup ward to cover a high number of electors compared to the Scotsdale/Shadforth Ward, over a larger area. The email sent to electors stated: "Ward boundaries and the number of offices of Councillor for each ward will be reviewed against the following factors: • Community interest • Physical and topographic features • Demographic trends • Economic factors • Ratio of Councillors to electors" Addressing these points –	**Preference for Option 2** – Create 4 Wards and split the Townsite Boundary area into two Wards

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

Shire of Denmark – Ward & Representation Review 2020

	Submitters Name	Comments Verbatim	Officer Comments
		• Community interest - While not addressed in the document circulated, the community interest of the Kent/Nornalup ward is primarily farming except for the two small towns of Nornalup and Peaceful Bay, who are primarily retired people or absentee owners. The Scotsdale/Shadforth ward would appear to be primarily farming with many small holdings with those opting for either off farm income or more intense farming. Town ward includes both commercial interests, educational institutions, and other employment opportunities, as well as retirees and absentee owners. • Physical and topographic features – Again, although not obviously addressed in the document, the Kent/Nornalup ward has the largest diversity of topographic features ranging from inlets, coastal swamps to dense forests, and the attractions they encompass, with numerous roads to service the farms and attractions within the ward. The town of Peaceful Bay has the challenges of coastal erosion, a lack of potable water and sand hills, while Nornalup has the Frankland river defining its boundary, yet with population on the other side of that river being serviced from the Denmark shire although resident in the Manjimup shire. • Demographic trends – Again insufficient information is given on this topic, but we can only surmise by the number of blocks being released, that the current town ward is growing while the other wards are remaining relatively static. • Economic factors- insufficient information to really comment except for the obvious difference in commercial interests in the town of Denmark as opposed to the rest of the shire. While there are some commercial businesses scattered throughout the shire, these are mostly tourist related and presumable reasonably evenly spread the breadth of the shire, especially closer to the coast and Southcoast Hwy. • Ratio of Councillors to electors – This appears to be the only real category that has been taken into consideration in most of the options given in the document supplied. These options all leave the Kent/Nornalup ward (except for option 3) at a +6% ratio of councillors to electors. Therefore, taking the above factors into consideration, we would submit that Option 2 of the document, but with a realignment of the ward boundaries, to be the preferred option. Option 3 of the document, a no ward system, is the least preferred. This option has been tried elsewhere and abandoned for the very reasons outlined in the Disadvantages listed. There was also a disproportionate number of councillors elected from some areas of the shire as opposed to others. And while it is not essential for a councillor to live in the area he or she represents, it is generally the case that they do and this is preferable for accessibility to electors and for knowledge of the electorate. In Option 2, the proposed Ocean Beach ward would have a somewhat similar demographic to the town ward, without the intense commercial area of the town centre. We would have thought it would have been preferable to include the Inlet Dr area within the Ocean Beach ward as this area is divided from the main town by the reserves etc between Ocean Beach Rd and the inlet. This would also go some way to balancing the elector numbers between Town and Ocean Beach, where currently there is a 750-elector difference. The Kent/Nornalup boundary should be moved further west to reduce the area of that ward and thus removing some of the small lot subdivisions of Panorama Rd, which are more in keeping with the demographic of the Scotsdale/Shadforth Ward than the Kent/Nornalup ward. This would therefore reduce the Ratio thus allowing the councillors of the Kent/Nornalup ward to better service their electors. We acknowledge that councillors, once elected are in council to serve the whole shire, but the reality is that if an elector needs to speak to a councillor on a matter of shire business, then they will approach their local councillor for their ward. They are also more across the affairs of the local ward than they can possibly be of the whole shire, no matter how conscientious they are, and are therefore better served to have a more balanced number of electors to service. The Kent/Nornalup ward also places more demands on its councillors, not just because of the size of the ward, but also because of the two extra towns it encompasses, with the extra requirements that those towns require compared to the Scotsdale/Shadforth ward which has no towns. Therefore, we urge the councillors to opt for Option 2 but with ward realignments as outlined.	
31		My preferred Option is that provided by the Shire as Option 3, a “no Ward” structure.	**Preference for Option 3** – Implement a ‘no Ward’ structure with nine Elected Members.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

Shire of Denmark – Ward & Representation Review 2020

	Submitters Name	Comments Verbatim	Officer Comments
		My reasons are basically embodied in the paper provided by the Shire, a more simpler and cheaper method to administer, and other comments by the Shire, in particular : Most issues required by Councillors to vote on are holistic, an exception being on a particular road upgrade; changing Ward boundaries will be controversial and we can do without that; once we move to a "no Ward" system, the issue goes away. Yes, it would be more expensive for potential Councillors to post their respective manifestoes out to all Electors, however, many potential Councillors do not post anything out, but rely on their standing in the community and use social media avenues. My second option would be to retain the status quo.	
32		I am stating how vital I think it is to retain our ward for Peaceful Bay, Kent, Nornalup known as the Kent Nornalup ward and particularly to have two representatives from this area as shire councillors, and if not two, AT LEAST ONE.	Although no preference is given, the Officer interprets this comment to mean that the Submitter wishes to retain the current Wards & Representation with nine Elected Members and three Wards
33		(a) I strongly support retention of the Ward System as outlined in Option 1, Option 2 and Option 4. The rationale is that Peaceful Bay is fairly represented in these Options and the communities of Nornalup and Peaceful Bay are keen to keep the Kent/Nornalup Ward relevant. We have two Councillors representing our Ward and have developed a good working relationship to address the issues that affect our communities. The area comprises short term holiday accommodation, tourism and associated business interests, rural lifestyle blocks and farming enterprises each with their own unique requirements and concerns, which are well understood by our current Council representatives. (b) I strongly oppose the "No Ward" structure - Option 3. The prime risk being that we are in danger of losing our voice in the decision making process on issues which concern our community and rural representation for the Kent/Nornalup area would diminish, or at worst, disappear altogether. We would also lose the accessibility to a Councillor who is familiar with issues specific to our area.	**Opposes Option 3 –** (Implement a 'no Ward' structure with nine Elected Members). Submitter does not however provide a preference out of options 1, 2 & 4.
34		Thank you for allowing the to formulate a response to the Shire's Ward Review. The Committee met to discuss this issue as previously advised and we canvassed our membership as to their views on the various ward options. The Committee, by a large majority, favoured the no ward option. A majority of those members who responded to our survey favoured the no ward option but it was by no means unanimous. 60% voted for no wards and the remainder preferred Options 1,2 or 4. Some of the arguments for Option 3 were : 1. In a small community, simplicity is best. 2. The existing ward boundaries are artificial and are primarily drawn to balance populations in the three wards. They don't represent any real differences in lifestyle or culture. 3. It's better if all Councillors are there to represent all residents and/or ratepayers and to make decisions in the interest of the Shire as a whole. 4. If people are concerned about a lack of local representation in a no-ward scenario, then people from across the Shire should be encouraged to stand for council. Therefore, the official position of the is that we support a Ward Review leading to the abolition of the current ward structure and its replacement by a whole of Shire electoral district.	**Preference for Option 3** – Implement a 'no Ward' structure with nine Elected Members.