From: [redacted]
To: Local Government Representation Review Secretariat
Subject: Submission to the 2026 NT Local Government Representation Review
Date: Thursday, 1 October 2026 4:14:24 PM

Dear Review Committee,

I am a City of Palmerston resident and ratepayer. I oppose any change to the municipal boundary that would transfer Greater Holtze, including Holtze and Kowandi, from Litchfield Council to the City of Palmerston.

I understand that City of Palmerston's published draft submission raises Greater Holtze for consideration without advocating for a particular boundary outcome. I wish to make clear my opposition to any subsequent proposal to incorporate this area into Palmerston.

Existing residents should be the priority

As a current ratepayer, I do not believe Council's existing service delivery consistently meets the needs and expectations of its residents. My concern is that expanding the municipality would place further pressure on Council's staff, resources and infrastructure before existing service shortcomings have been addressed.

Council should first demonstrate that it can provide reliable, responsive and satisfactory services to the community it already represents. Increasing the number of ratepayers does not, by itself, mean existing residents will receive better services.

Additional rates come with additional costs

While expansion may generate more rates revenue, it would also bring additional responsibilities and expenditure. New residential areas require ongoing road and drainage maintenance, waste services, parks maintenance, animal management, regulatory services and administrative support.

Before any boundary change is considered, there should be a publicly available, independently assessed financial analysis showing the full costs, expected revenue and long-term implications. Existing Palmerston ratepayers should not face increased rates, reduced services or deferred maintenance to support the expansion.

Particular attention should be given to infrastructure transferred to Council, including its condition, maintenance requirements and eventual replacement costs. Developer contributions and initial infrastructure funding do not necessarily cover these ongoing obligations.

Using Palmerston facilities does not justify changing boundaries

Residents of neighbouring areas may use Palmerston's shops, employment centres, recreational facilities and other services. However, people routinely travel across council boundaries for these purposes.

Accessing facilities in Palmerston is not sufficient reason to transfer an established area from another council. Where shared services create genuine costs or pressures, councils and the Northern Territory Government should consider cooperation, service agreements and appropriate funding arrangements.

Growth should not come at the expense of current ratepayers

The review should assess whether expansion would produce a clear, measurable benefit for existing residents, as well as residents of Greater Holtze. A larger municipality should not be treated as an improvement simply because it has more land, population or rates revenue.

Any proposal should also consider Council's workforce capacity, the effect on customer response times and whether existing infrastructure can support additional demand.

Meaningful consultation is essential

Any proposed transfer should be subject to specific consultation with both Palmerston and affected Litchfield residents. The community should receive clear information about the proposed boundaries, financial implications, service arrangements and alternatives before a decision is made.

I ask the Committee to recommend that Greater Holtze remain within Litchfield Council. City of Palmerston's priority should be improving services and maintaining infrastructure for its current ratepayers before taking on additional territory and responsibilities.

Yours sincerely,

Vanessa Wallis
[redacted]
City of Palmerston resident and ratepayer
[redacted]