

RESPONSES FROM PROPERTY OWNERS REGARDING COUNCIL'S PROPOSED SPECIAL VARIATION TO RATES

Submission No.		Preferred Option	Comments
1		1	We support Option 1 and oppose Options 2 and 3. Further, it was financially profligate and imprudent of the Council to waste ratepayers' money on opposing amalgamation with other Councils, which is really the only viable financial solution to funding community facilities. To be fair, the Council should be putting up amalgamation as Option 4 and general cost cutting as Option 5.
2		1	We have read the Hunters Hill Council News pamphlet in which ratepayers are asked to give opinions about Rates. We strongly support Option1, namely to peg rates at the 2.7% statutory increase. In our very strong opinion the Hunters Hill rates are already far too high due to the escalating land values. For the many residents of Hunters Hill Municipality the high rates are of great concern. Of course we understand and respect the need to maintain facilities in the Municipality. A review of current costs of all aspects of Council activities should precede any special rise in rates.
3		3	As a resident at Pittwater Rd, I support OPTION 3
4		1	Thank you for the excellent information pack & the opportunity to provide feedback. Our preference would be for Council to hold rates at the statutory increase (i.e. Option 1).
5		1	Please note that I am not in favour of it and I will not support it. The reason being is that we are on fixed incomes and we have had huge increases in energy costs and we have no one to go to just up our income!! I strongly suggest that you manage your affairs the same way we all have to.
6		More information needed	<p>Good afternoon I would like to make a suggestion in relation to the proposed rate changes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Whilst all these initiatives are wonderful for option 2/3, we would like a schedule of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> when such works are to take place more specifically what works will take place more detail of the costs of each project; and time of completion. A budget showing how much of the levy raised and how much is utilised; I would go as far as quarantining such funds raised through option 2/3 for the specific projects outlined and an audit to provide the community comfort of the use of funds; A clearer understanding of the current usage of rates because it's a little worrying that in Option 3 we need an additional amount to effectively cover current depreciation requirements. We would also like to ensure that during this time we are not asked for another special levy etc. because it's starting to look a little worrisome.
7		3	We are in receipt of your brochure re the options for Council rating and having reviewed each and evaluated the impact on the maintenance and improvement of the Hunters Hill municipality we support Option 3
8		3	We support Option 3 to improve the facilities in Hunters Hill as outlined in your Rates paper. I believe the rate increase is modest and it is important that we maintain the heritage, beauty and amenity of our beautiful area.
9		1	<p>In regard to the information on council rates I go for option one.</p> <p>As I feel rates are already too high have lived here 42 years am still waiting to see something decent come from council. If council spends rates with more thought I'm sure we'll be better off , being self funded I don't receive any deductions and resent council wasting my money</p>

RESPONSES FROM PROPERTY OWNERS REGARDING COUNCIL'S PROPOSED SPECIAL VARIATION TO RATES

Submission No.		Preferred Option	Comments
10		3	<p>Hunter's Hill Council is considering applying to IPART for a proposed Community Facilities Special Variation (SV). We support an application, and specifically the Option 3 (Rate Peg + Community Facilities SV + Operational SV).</p> <p>We live in a strata property which results in the minimum rating, and the proposed option 3 increase of just under 10% would result in an increase in our rates of \$114.20pa, which is very modest given the very wide range of valuable services provided by our council. Hunters Hill Council is in our view well managed, with excellent engagement with the community and a prudent approach to expenditure.</p> <p>The range of projects identified to benefit from the increase include several that we regard as important for the well-being of our community... for example playground, toilet and path upgrades; preschool upgrades and maintenance; 10 Cowell St (heritage) relocation.</p> <p>We volunteer for bushcare and other street side maintenance works, valued at several hundred dollars per year. The organisational and facilities support by council is essential to the effectiveness of my volunteer work and that of many other members of our community. This small increase in rates will assist council to maintain & improve public facilities to gain maximum utilisation and value for our community. In summary, we support an application for the Option 3 rate increase by Hunters Hill Council.</p>
11		1	<p>I am opposed to a rate increase higher than the peg. You have articulated that you cannot afford to fund things in the council area yet you thought it prudent to spend over \$300,000 fighting the mergers. You state that the council does not have many businesses like other larger councils to share the rate load. If the council is unable to fund and maintain its assets then maybe you should have thought about this and merged when you had the chance rather than raise rates because you don't have a large enough catchment and or poor economic management.</p> <p>Once again, I am opposed to the rate rise higher than the peg. Our rates are high enough already.</p>
12		1	<p>I am both dismayed and annoyed that an incompetent Council moves to further increase the burden on its rate payers. We are already subject to an Environmental Levy, a Roads Infrastructure Special Rate and an Other Infrastructure Special Rate. The arguments put forward by past elected Councillors to justify these aforementioned levies were that with their acceptance the Council would be able to continue to provide an adequate service to its rate payers - what a joke! Is it possible that the requirement for additional levies was driven by the Council spending enormous amounts of rate payers money in Court action driven by a few privileged, rich, white men residing on the peninsula, who were annoyed at the concept of council amalgamation?</p> <p>We reside in one of the smallest, if not the smallest municipality, in the State. Blind Freddy would realize that the long term situation is simply not viable. If the moneys splashed up against the wall in Court cases was initially redirected to put sustained pressure on Government to amalgamate with a progressive Council such as Lane Cove, we would be in a much better position.</p> <p>It is certainly ironic that Council is now looking to other funding options including, investigating shared services with neighbouring Councils! As for the lists of projects to be delivered' - I suspect they are pie in the sky'. I live in an area overlooking the entrance to the Tarban Creek pathway. Over recent years there has been a large increase in families, with pets, children and grandchildren using the facility. Over the year there have been 2 separate children's play areas in the area of parkland east of the Pilkingtons Bridge. Without any explanation they were removed by Council. Now the local children</p>

RESPONSES FROM PROPERTY OWNERS REGARDING COUNCIL'S PROPOSED SPECIAL VARIATION TO RATES

Submission No.		Preferred Option	Comments
			<p>have access to only 2 swings. Contrast this with the state of the art, securely fenced child's play area in Alexandra Street close to the Council Chambers. Do the children unfortunate enough not to reside on the Peninsular not deserve similar facilities? You should hang your heads in shame.</p> <p>Most are worthy of attention but 2 stand out as a somewhat laughable waste of rate payers money. 10 Cowell Street relocation. The building has absolutely no cause to be preserved. Put a bulldozer through it! If people wish to preserve and gaze upon old buildings with character and historical significance then redirect them to Vienna Cottage and spend Council money restoring it to its former glory! Upgrade to the Woolwich Baths. To my eye most of the residents of the Peninsular have private swimming pools. Those of us on the outer have the use of the Ryde Pool. How many locals actually use the pool and swim in polluted waters? Give us some numbers. As for the other projects to be delivered', these are all projects that Council are essentially responsible for and should be ranked by priority and implemented over time. The point is that any competent and fiscally responsible Council, either in the past or current, should have budgeted for these projects. Instead in the recent fight against amalgamation, the rate payers were not fully informed of the dire straight of the Councils fiscal position and these rate payer funds which should have been utilized for the provision of essential services were plundered for Court and Lawyer fees.</p> <p>The survey was simplistic, very poorly constructed, and seemingly designed to evoke responses favourable to Council. Such a poorly constructed survey would not have reached first base if proposed in any centre of higher education. May I also enquire as to the cost to rent payers of this pointless exercise? How much did it cost??</p> <p>My final submission - Option 1 is the only option that can be supported.</p>
13		2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Council is basically saying the Rate Peg Increase is not sufficient to cover expenditure required. 2. One would assume the base rate increase will cover waste and recycling collections, repairing footpaths and the like. 3. Council is expecting us to believe and trust that additional funding is required for other community facility upgrades. 4. What choice is there really? However, Council must be accountable for its spending. 5. The Operational SV is permanent and according to the front of brochure received. No-one in his/her right mind would allow Council this option. However, it says 4 years on Page 5. Which is it? 4 years would be acceptable over permanent. 6. If Council is to be believed that they need additional funds above the standard rate increase, as currently has been in place from the last rate rise in 2007/08, the OPTION 2 is my preferred option.Also, it would be appreciated if the survey personnel are asked not to phone at 7pm and that my mobile phone number is kept private.
14		1	<p>I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed special rate variation - either option 2 or option 3. To ask for a minimum 7% increase in a low inflation environment and threaten a reduction in existing services does not inspire confidence in the council's ability to manage a business or community services.</p> <p>Your brochure does not provide a compelling argument of why the Council has found itself in the current financial parlous state; despite having a statutory 2.7% annual increase which, in the current low inflation environment, should be sufficient to handle increases in wages and other costs.</p>

RESPONSES FROM PROPERTY OWNERS REGARDING COUNCIL'S PROPOSED SPECIAL VARIATION TO RATES

Submission No.		Preferred Option	Comments
			<p>If cost shifting is indeed the main reason for this shortfall in your budget it appears time to re-explore the merger of Hunters Hill council with surrounding like minded councils to reduce the administrative budgets of smaller council areas.</p> <p>Another concern is that the Option 2 and 3, would appear to be incremental increases for the term of their adoption and that the council would effectively double dip with further increases in these levies in later years on top of the original increase.</p>
15		3	<p>Thank you for your informational brochure. We are supportive of a levy to ensure that the current service levels are maintained and that important local projects are delivered.</p> <p>We have a couple of questions, comments and suggestions:</p> <p>How has the list of projects been compiled? The descriptions appear very loose and therefore subject to cost overruns and scope creep.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Which projects have been considered but rejected? • How will the list of projects be reviewed and maintained in future? • I believe that the local community should be closely involved in the selection of all such projects • Scope should be clearly explained and carefully controlled to maximise the number of projects that can be delivered within such a tight budget • User pays should be considered as a source of part / full funding for each project • User pays should be considered as a source of funding for ongoing maintenance • If the SV is approved then Council should undertake to provide monthly updates on all projects - progress, budget, risk, timeframe, issues arising, and new projects under consideration
16		1	<p>Thank you for reaching out to the community with regard to the Council rates and the three options outlined. I would wish you to pursue option 1 and restrict the increase and I have outlined my reasons below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The neglect the council has shown towards the development of Gladesville town centre, which is in stark contrast to the Woolwich and Hunters Hill centres. 2. The resistance to change and lack of imagination - funds could be found and the Council mobilized when threatened with amalgamation and yet on other matters a slow bureaucratic and dull approach is seen by the council. 3. The list of items that the additional funding would be spent on again lacks ambition, vision or value.
17		3	<p>We opt for OPTION 3, giving the maximum increase in rates to the HHC.2. Looking at "What Projects Will Be Delivered" in our chosen, Option 3:- we focus on; 2.1 There is no mention of outdoor gym/fitness centre at Boronia Park Oval. About 4 years ago, residents were surveyed and the above was scheduled for 3 years' time frame. Nothing has been done. A similar gym project was delivered at King George's Park, Rozelle, completed in 3 days. Outdoor gym facilities are important for all residents, but particularly for the senior residents, of which HHC has a high proportion of the Council population. In August 2018, Mr. Roberts announced \$1 million funding injection to HHC for Boronia Park.</p> <p>10 Cowell Street Relocation - This dump should be binned into a skip and trucked to the tip. Interestingly, no budget is provided for this folly. How much is this costing the ratepayers? Refer to my previous letter to the HHC entitled Gladesville Shopping Village Development, dated 14 March 2018</p>

RESPONSES FROM PROPERTY OWNERS REGARDING COUNCIL’S PROPOSED SPECIAL VARIATION TO RATES

Submission No.		Preferred Option	Comments
			<p>at page 2. Annexed by attachment hereto. Compare this Cowell St. dump, with the stunning old classic residence that HHC has permitted to be demolished this week, next to the Fire Station on Pittwater Road, opposite the Gladesville Library. Is HHC approving the demolition of the other classic old homes, along the west of the Fire Station, in due course? In my view, the proposed relocation is a wanton waste of public money.</p> <p>Woolwich Baths Upgrades - I have never seen anybody, or any adjacent Woolwich Convent girls, swim in this riverside pool. The water is usually stinking dirty. Runoff pollution has been the death of "up- the- river pools" in Sydney. Why is HHC trying to breathe life into this cold, rotting corpse.</p> <p>How Can HHC Obtain Work for HHC Work Force, in lieu of moving a dilapidated dump and renovating a disused, rotting, smelling pool?</p> <p>Here are some thoughts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Fix HHC third world footpaths, starting with Joubert Street and Avenue Road• Arrange safe pedestrian crossing on Ryde Road. Also on Gladesville Road at SJC entrance for SJS students accessing Tarban Creek Rowing sheds. Also on Mary Street at Martin Street, for use of SJC students to access the SJC sports ovals and tennis courts.• Clean up leaves, branches, sticks from footpaths and gutters on a regular weekly or twice weekly basis – especially on Ryde Road, outside at Villa Maria Primary School.• HHC needs gutter and path Mobile Cleaners as used in Paris, whereby the operator or his assistant, alights from the vehicle and users a vacuum attachment and a water attachment to clean gutters between parked vehicles and the side-walks• Lucas Street should be one-way traffic east. Matthew Street should be one- way traffic west. There is no room for 2- way traffic in Lucas and in Matthew Streets. Sydney’s chaotic traffic, precipitated by the LNP unilateral, urban ,HHC destruction, strangles these streets.• Maintain and implement tree planting in HHC, starting in the fruit bat area beside Tarban Creek• Construct a pathway at the bottom of Joubert Street from the gutter to join the path going under the road bridge—presently this is rubble bricks at all heights and angles.• Provide adequate street lighting, almost everywhere e.g. Church Street is a walk in the dark. Residents need to carry a torch for their own safety in HHC.• Install pedal bike lanes on Ryde Road for bikers' safety; Reduce the speed limit to 50 kph to prevent injury and death . Get RMS and Minister Roberts on the job.• Eliminate speeding vehicles on Ryde Road. Get NSW State Government and the Police or the Macquarie Bank private traffic enforcer, just as they do, almost constantly, on the east bound Drummoyne Bridge lanes, on to this speeding. Speeding is a dangerous crime. Or install speed and noise cameras in Ryde Road, which is the principal road in Hunters Hill world de novo; Property (schools, etc.) should receive a notional rate from HHC. <p>Parking Meters - Income - The HHC reluctance to use parking meters should be compared to Manly at \$7 per hour from 7am to 7pm every day, every where. Balmoral is \$9 per hour, 7 days a week everywhere. Meters provide income to HHC.</p>

RESPONSES FROM PROPERTY OWNERS REGARDING COUNCIL'S PROPOSED SPECIAL VARIATION TO RATES

Submission No.		Preferred Option	Comments
18		2	<p>After reviewing the documentation (that has been letterboxed twice to my house) my vote is for Option 2.</p> <p>Council should look into cost savings that can be made to cover operational costs and work within the statutory increase.</p>
19		3	I'm happy with Option 3
20		1	<p>Regarding Hunters Hill Council Rates (letter received this week) we have decided that we would prefer Option 1.</p> <p>We would also be happy to join the IRIS telephone survey if required. NB. My wife and I are over 80y. So increased rates, including SV, would have a financial effect on us. We look forward to the final 2018 decision regarding changes to the Council rates.</p>
21		1	<p>I just received in my mail box notice information regarding Council proposal regarding increasing new way to get more money from rate payers. We are pensioners and struggling with all annual expenses starting with health, house, car insurance electricity and gas increases, extra expenses for Doctors, now you not happy what get from IPART annual increases you want more. Hunters Hill is the most expensive council in the Country. I'm struggling with current expenses and can't afford to pay any increases. Just looking at some of Council's proposals, [REDACTED].</p> <p>Woolwich baths upgrade what people are taking dogs to have bath there. Weil Park just got new amenities build so what you want them pull down and rebuild them. Bedlam Bay what you going to do with.</p> <p>To summarize your proposal is one big rubbish which is not worth this paper which is written on. I'm against any increases and Council has to find money for some of proposed upgrades and stop asking for more money enough is enough leave with it.</p>
22		1	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Council's proposed submission to the Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal (IPART) for a rate increase above the rate base limit. Hunter's Hill Council is the smallest council by area within NSW. It is also the smallest metropolitan council by population (13,999 - 2016 census). Despite, higher average Council rates in NSW, its rate base is too small and therefore inadequate to improve facilities and services within its area of operation. For this reason, the State Government sought to amalgamate Hunter's Hill with adjoining Councils to improve financial viability by economies of scale.</p> <p>Hunter's Hill Council strongly opposed this rationalisation by the State and argued that a proposed shared services model with neighbouring councils would maintain its financial viability and remove the need for any amalgamation. Now that the amalgamation proposal is dead, and based on Council's previous arguments on future financial viability, what action has Council taken to implement its shared services model with adjoining Councils? In your consultation document for rate increases it simply states that it "is currently investigating shared services".</p> <p>Further, there is nothing apparent on Council's website regarding any developments in this area and I would suspect that nothing is being actively pursued. As a consequence of its size and without a shared services model with other Councils, I would argue that Hunter's Hill Council does not have a sustainable financial strategy in place and this must be addressed before locking in any long term rate increases.</p> <p>Further, locking in any 10 year rate increases would reduce incentives for Council to adopt shared services with its adjoining Councils. I therefore oppose any rate increase by Council at this time.</p>

RESPONSES FROM PROPERTY OWNERS REGARDING COUNCIL'S PROPOSED SPECIAL VARIATION TO RATES

Submission No.		Preferred Option	Comments
			Council should, without delay, demonstrate to its rate payers that it is taking all necessary steps to adopt shared services with other adjoining Councils.
23		2 or 3	<p>We would be happy for the council to go with option 2 or 3 if it will provide with the projects to be delivered. Not sure why everyone was against the amalgamation of councils if we cannot maintain and provide residence with the infrastructure that is required with the current council rates that are paid but it is important to maintain and improve facilities and council works.</p> <p>We notice that the council has in place a roads infrastructure special rate. If so why is Foss Street in such a mess? Pulled up and dug up over 9 months ago for electrical work and to date no one has returned to repair the street. Very noisy, track marks, gravel spills and washed away in the last big rain. We need it fixed but nothing happens. I have been to council but the front desk say it is not your issue as OZ GRID did the work and the damage. You are asking us, as residence, to pay more in our rates but will not look at our street and get it re surfaced.</p> <p>I have also requested over many years (20 plus) that Foss St. from Ferry St. should be one way to Ellesmere St. This has always been rejected and we would ask that it is re-looked at. Parking on both sides of Ellesmere St. between Foss and Alexander is crazy and there will be a major accident soon if it is not changed. I hope the comments are taken in a positive nature and I would be happy to receive a response.</p>
24		1	<p>I write in response to your latest documentation regarding the application to IPART for a rate increase. I was assured in August 2017, by Councillor [REDACTED] that my bridge driveway would be replaced when Sherwin Street was resealed. I was told it was very high on the Council list of road works to be undertaken. At the same time a Council truck turned up to throw down bitumen on some very dangerous footpath issues. I was assured this was only temporary and the footpath issues would be addressed properly very soon. I repeat, this was in August 2017.</p> <p>And now you want me to pay more money?</p>
25		3	<p>We strongly support Option 3, that is the rate peg increase, plus the community facilities special variation, plus the Operational special variation as set out in the document delivered recently by the council to residents.</p> <p>Rate pegging and cost shifting onto councils has been imposed by Governments of both political persuasions over many years. Cost shifting is now at 15% of council's income, which is a disgrace. Both actions have seriously diminished the capacity of all councils including Hunters Hill to raise sufficient monies to cater for the legitimate needs of their residents.</p> <p>The Hunters Hill community has through surveys and submissions made it very clear that it highly values the area's heritage and environment, its built form, its community and facilities. It wants its buildings and assets, including roads and footpaths to be safe and well maintained. An examination of council's finances indicates that to achieve these expectations requires the implementation of Option 3.</p> <p>It is our view that in coming to a decision as to which Option to take forward for an I PART determination, both the submissions received re the rate SV and earlier submissions made by residents as to what they value of the area and want to keep and improve, be considered.</p>

RESPONSES FROM PROPERTY OWNERS REGARDING COUNCIL'S PROPOSED SPECIAL VARIATION TO RATES

Submission No.		Preferred Option	Comments
26		2	<p>I agree with option 2.</p> <p>I don't agree with Option 3 and its proposal of permanent Operational SV.</p>
27		Further information required before making a decision	<p>I am in receipt of Council's leaflet titled Important Information About Your Hunter's Hill Council Rates • and wish to make the following submission:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have no basic objection to a rise in Council rates if justifiable. • I'm somewhat concerned around lack of detail in the Council's summary of its need to raise rates. • The entire submission assumes, without any supporting documentation, that Council currently prudently expends its revenue. How do the rate payers know that's factual? <p>Option 1 suggests that with a 2.7% increase (\$234,000), and I quote, No new facility projects will be delivered and maintenance standards on buildings, parks & reserves will reduce". There's no supporting documentation.</p> <p>Option 2 suggests that with an incremental rates increase of \$350,000, fourteen projects will be delivered. Notwithstanding these projects seem very significant and, at first blush, the \$350,000 seems inadequate, there's no supporting documentation.</p> <p>Option 3 suggests that with a further \$259,700, the same fourteen projects will be delivered and, and I quote, Enables Council to maintain current service levels.</p> <p>While I assume Council has conducted the necessary project designs/ evaluations/ financial analyses supporting the various statements made above, I would like to see and be given the opportunity to interrogate same.</p> <p>In addition, and as part of Council's justification, I suggest ratepayers be given the opportunity to review the numbers behind Council's published income and expenditure statement.</p>
28		1	<p>I would like to register that I would not like the rates increased so Option 1 is my preference. I also assume that a full review of all the costs associated with council e.g. the salaries of the staff have been done before asking rate payers to pay more. I am retired and on a fixed income and cannot afford additional costs</p>
29		1	<p>We have reviewed your booklet "Improving Hunter's Hill: Proposed Special Rate Variation". Firstly, we note the title is entirely misleading, one suspects purposefully. It should also be noted that Hunters does not so far as we are aware have an apostrophe - perhaps another example of the lack of attention to detail in the governance of our municipality.</p> <p>Your brochure is not about improving Hunters Hill nor about a Rate Variation - it is primarily about how to fund mismanagement and egregious and unwarranted legal expenses. Given Council has failed every year to meet the Operating Performance ratio bench mark that measures "how well council contained operating expenditure within operating revenue" it seems on its face that even with the benefit of recently expired prior Rate Variations Council still cannot deliver operational efficiency.</p> <p>You propose that by increasing our rates for at least 10 years by at least 9.74% per annum you will deliver a range of projects which will otherwise not be delivered.</p> <p>Why would we pay more for new projects when the existing management systems cannot deliver the necessary services efficiently. Simple examples: Councillor expenses including travel grew by 15% year</p>

RESPONSES FROM PROPERTY OWNERS REGARDING COUNCIL'S PROPOSED SPECIAL VARIATION TO RATES

Submission No.		Preferred Option	Comments
			<p>on year while expenditure on our pot holed roads grew 0.5% year on year. In dollars Councillor expenses grew \$26,000 while roads grew by \$6,000</p> <p>Total Employee costs grew by 2.40%. Employee numbers fell from 57 to 52. Employee costs per employee grew 12% from \$91,543 to \$102,750 per employee.</p> <p>Had our Council not spent \$1,871,000 on legal fees over the last 2 financial years the Rate Variation would not be required. Perhaps some reduction in this item alone would deliver much of \$709,500 Rate Variations Council proposes to charge us.</p> <p>The Council Financial report for 2018 lists at Special Schedule 7 the report on infrastructure. Only 15.2% of assets require renewal or urgent renewal. On the Council's gross replacement cost estimate that would mean approximately a total of \$18 million. Perhaps some of the \$20.5 million in cash assets the Council retains could be used for these capital works. \$20.5 million of money already contributed by and for the benefit of ratepayers. Additionally perhaps some of the non-core Council assets (Public halls, other buildings valued at a combined \$18 million) could be sold and the maintenance cost / risk passed on to other more financially capable owners/managers.</p> <p>Lastly, as regrettably we have come to expect, the notes on the Council website are misleading or plain wrong (we hope): "Council will review all of the feedback received from ratepayers, review the impacts both for and against a potential special rate implementation and make a formal decision in November 2018."</p> <p>We hope this is a mistake given the Council also says it seeks community consultation until 7 December albeit the earlier quote says a formal decision will be made in November!</p> <p>We look forward to Council considering this matter more fully and NOT seeking Rate Variations but managing the significant revenue already contributed by all residents for our mutual benefit.</p>
30		1	<p>We would like to express our concern re proposal to raise rates beyond the standard 2%.</p> <p>Our rates are already extremely high at \$4,000 pa and an above inflation increase would be extremely hard to budget for in these low interest times as a Self funding family.</p>
31		3	<p>This is to advise that I support the Community Services Variation Option 3 proposed by the Council, that is, Rate peg +Community facilities SV + Operational SV.</p>
32		1	<p>I am writing to put on the record my objection to the proposed increase to Hunter's Hill Council Rates.</p> <p>Many of the projects outlined at Options 2 and 3 should be included as part of standard Council actions and are actions which are expected to be taken by all Local Governments areas. This makes me question whether operating costs are too high or whether there is a misallocation of funds if there is no forward planning for such projects or ability to control existing budgets.</p> <p>There is no detail provided at all around what the projects entail, the estimated costs and why they are in fact required.</p> <p>Finally, the fact that there continues to be no CCTV at Buffalo Creek Reserve following the murder of Nicole Cartwright in October is highly disappointing. Such CCTV at a major playground should have been in place for years and would have assisted police in solving this ongoing murder investigation in the heart of our community.</p>
33			<p>At about 7:20 this evening I was rung by a woman, [REDACTED], conducting a survey on behalf of Hunters Hill Council something about changes to rates.</p>

RESPONSES FROM PROPERTY OWNERS REGARDING COUNCIL'S PROPOSED SPECIAL VARIATION TO RATES

Submission No.		Preferred Option	Comments
			<p>Given the number of unsolicited calls we receive, I was not pleased about the timing of the call - just as I had served my family's dinner, and told the woman so, however, I wanted to take part in the survey. I asked why she was ringing in private time of an evening, instead of during business hours 9-5.</p> <p>She did not apologise for interrupting our privacy, saying this is when people will be home. So she deliberately rings in the evening.</p> <p>Yes, I was short with her, but I agreed to do the survey so long as it genuinely only took 6 minutes, as she said. She offered to call back "later" - but not during daytime hours. With that she said: "I don't think I want to do the survey if you're screaming at me". I was critical of her timing, but not screaming.</p> <p>I feel I have been denied the opportunity to have my opinion registered and would still like to do so.</p> <p>Why doesn't council send out the survey by letterbox drop, as it does for other council literature? Or initially try to contact households during business hours.</p>
34		2	I would vote for option 2 of the special levy and encourage council to reduce some of the upgrades to projects in order to maintain current service levels.
35		2 or 3	I wish to advise that I support Council's application for a Community Facilities Special Variation.
36.		1	My rates have nearly doubled in the ten years I have lived in the HHC municipality – [REDACTED]
37.		1	<p>I support Option 1, the peg, because I think Council is yet to demonstrate progress on extending the ROC concept, working closely with neighbouring Councils, or taking any observable actions to deliver better operating efficiency.</p> <p>We can increase rates later, once we see how true Council's claims of being able to improve efficiency are - claims made when fighting amalgamation.</p>
38		Rejects all three options.	<p>I wish to object to any rate increase and reject all three options identified in a recent circular distributed to residents. I note that the deadline for comment stated on the circular is 10 December which differs from information on the Council website.</p> <p>Sections of the Hunters Hill community argued very strongly against the State government merger proposals with the cost of this vigorous campaign met by all ratepayers. One of the claims in the campaign was that Hunters Hill Council was currently financially viable.</p> <p>However, information in the recent circular to residents suggests that this argued financial viability was false and that Council is unable to deliver the new facility projects and ensure maintenance standards without additional levies on ratepayers. This should have been explained properly during the amalgamation debate.</p> <p>Further, the list of new projects and initiatives included to support the application for the rate variation options is contentious. It is unclear how these new projects, which may or may not have merit, have been prioritized through proper community engagement and master planning processes. It is unclear how revenue from leased buildings on the list is directed towards their maintenance. The list even includes works on a privately owned property.</p>

RESPONSES FROM PROPERTY OWNERS REGARDING COUNCIL'S PROPOSED SPECIAL VARIATION TO RATES

Submission No.		Preferred Option	Comments
			<p>Councils are required under the <i>Local Government Act 1993</i> to apply principles of integrated planning and reporting yet most of these new projects do not appear in Council's supporting strategic documents.</p> <p>It is particularly disturbing that Council demonstrates no responsibility in its role as a natural areas manager in the list of valuable assets targeted for attention with a rate increase.</p> <p>Perhaps greater attention by Councillors to responsible strategic planning would facilitate Hunters Hill Council "living within its means". If this is not realistic in terms of the standards that the community expects from their local Council then perhaps there is need for honest community engagement and discussion about transitioning HHC to a viable merged Council.</p> <p>I also understand that Council is discussing a future "Hunters Hill Day" tonight at Council. I would urge caution regards this. There is still some community angst that Hunters Hill did not merge in some way during the recent round of Council amalgamations. It will take time to restore full community confidence in the purpose and viability of HHC as a small local government entity if that is genuinely Councillors' intention.</p>
39		1	<p>Reason for selecting option one.</p> <p>For the last 22 years we have paid for lawn mowing of council nature strip. Topsoil, weed 'n' feed, watering & considerable time spent manually weeding of the same strip.</p> <p>Cleaning the gutters of litter left behind after garbage trucks have been.</p> <p>Suffering stress of dirty negligent demolitions e.g. dangerous fallout of Asbestos complaints to council were ignored !!!</p> <p>Enduring years of "rat-running" vehicles at morning & afternoon peak hours...This (& previous councils) have done nothing to address this problem.</p> <p>On our walks to either Boronia Park shops or village, picking up rubbish from footpaths, nature strips & gutters, particularly Figtree Park.</p> <p>What cheek!!!! Your council should be paying us!!!!!!!</p>
40		3	<p>I have read in detail the Councils Rate Variation proposal and documentation and I wish to advise that I strongly support Option 3 as it enables Council to provide services and projects greatly needed in our community.</p> <p>I'm also very concern by the continual cost shifting and rate pegging policies of the NSW Government.</p>
41		3	<p>I have received and read the brochure labelled "Important Information about your Hunters Hill Council Rates"and also read the information on the Council's Website.</p> <p>I understand that Council is considering applying to the Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal for a Community facilities Special Variation for a rate increase above the rate peg limit.</p> <p>Having considered all the documentation and bearing in mind the considerable costs in managing and maintaining a Council, and bearing in mind the need to improve facilities I endorse Option 3 which I understand will deliver projects as listed and also enable Council to maintain current service levels.</p>

RESPONSES FROM PROPERTY OWNERS REGARDING COUNCIL'S PROPOSED SPECIAL VARIATION TO RATES

Submission No.		Preferred Option	Comments
42		3	We support Option 3
43		1	<p>Is council really asking for more rates?</p> <p>I have read the brochure - but you have not answered the fundamental question - what has changed to require such an unprecedented increase in rates, there is nothing new in the document that a well managed council would not have known last year or the year before that during the state government audit process.</p> <p>Council promised a superior solution to amalgamation and presented to the state government documentation that proved it was capable and in a sound financial position to deliver. Then we had a windfall of (a reported) \$9million from the sale of public assets which boosted our bank balance and reduced the amount of assets we needs to maintain into the future.</p> <p>I do not accept there is a need to raise rates at all - surely a well managed Council one that proved it was fit for the future should be able to out perform the rest and deliver the same services for less than the maximum allowed 2.7% rate increase</p> <p>Council needs to live within its means and manage its budget, its far easier to ask for more money than to provide what you offered - superior solutions.</p>
44		1	<p>I cannot in good conscience support the proposed increases in the SRV of either 9.74% or 6.74% instead of the 2.7% for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I can't comprehend or support why the ratepayers of HHC should be left with the cost of relocating 10 Cowell St after it has been sold to the property developer of GSV. I can't understand why HHC hasn't requested or sought the developer cover the costs of relocation especially when they will (eventually) reap the benefits of the property development when it finally goes ahead and is completed - whereas members of the community will be left dealing with the both the impact of the proposed overdevelopments in around the GSV as well as the loss of the amenity of the Heritage item from being in situ. 2. Given the proposed rate rises in the SRV it was not clear what the costs of all the individual items/projects actually are so it's hard to comprehend in detail what the SRV covers and whether this will indeed cover the costs of the proposed projects or will fall short of the estimated costs. 3. Insurance was mentioned in the SRV, it's not clear whether HC is currently underinsured or if this is in relation to additional insurance? 4. The very significant Operational Special Variation (3% component) is described as being permanent yet also as being for 4 years only – this is not clear in the proposal. I am not in support of a very significant operational special variation when it's not clear what this covers let alone the potential that this maybe a permanent cost increase that is in perpetuity. <p>If further details can be provided especially in relation to the potential costs of each of the proposed projects that would provide greater level of detail for the community to assess whether the SRV is justifiable.</p>
45		2	No Comments provided

RESPONSES FROM PROPERTY OWNERS REGARDING COUNCIL'S PROPOSED SPECIAL VARIATION TO RATES

Submission No.		Preferred Option	Comments
46		3	<p>Both my wife [REDACTED] and myself – [REDACTED] are residents of h7unters hill and have been for many years.</p> <p>We have read the document recently delivered to residents – strongly support Option 3.</p> <p>We have discussed the matter with a number of other residents and they are in total agreement with us.</p>
47		1	<p>I'm not in support of the proposed SRV (Option 2 and 3).</p> <p>I would like to see a comparison of our rates to the rates in neighbouring councils since you are saying that the majority of HH residents are paying less than what they would be paying for similar properties in neighbouring areas. This needs to be substantiated. Unfortunately, I couldn't find the necessary information on Ryde Council's website.</p> <p>In your brochure regarding the SRV, you also didn't mention that the land values for 2018/19 rates are based on values as at July 16 and from 1.7.20 rates will be based on the higher values as at July 17, i.e. there will be a further rate increase due to the higher land value (in my case, this means rates for 19/20 based on the higher land value would have gone up by more than 20 % incl. the 2.7 % statutory increase). While this increase will not have an impact in 19/20, it will in the following years when the proposed SRVs would still apply.</p> <p>I'm particularly opposed to the SRV on the fact that both SRVs exceed the statutory increase, i.e. they are not just small increases on top of the statutory increase.</p> <p>If anything, in my view a new SRV should only be considered when one of the existing SRVs and Special Levy have expired.</p> <p>Also, when the merger with other councils was discussed, HH Council opposed it and said that it can survive on its own, i.e. by working with other councils. Now, you are asking for yet another SRV with the argument that HH Council doesn't have as many commercial rate payers as other councils and therefore has less funds available. Shouldn't that have been a factor to consider when determining whether or not to merge with other council areas?</p> <p>I support Council working with other councils in shared services as you suggest with the aim of saving costs to avoid any further SRV until at least one of the current SRVs has expired.</p> <p>Let me close by saying that although I'm opposed to the proposed SRV, I appreciate the hard work of all councillors and staff.</p>
48		1	<p>I write re Hunters Hill Council's proposal to apply to the Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal for the implementation of two additional Special Variations over and above the rate peg limit.</p> <p>I cannot see how Council can pursue and justify two more levies amounting to 7.04% in the current economic climate. The imposition of these new levies will bring the total annual rate increase to 9.74%, plus the cost of levies already charged by Council, namely; Environmental Levy, Road Infrastructure Special Rate and Other Infrastructure Special Rate.</p> <p>The proposed rate increases are well above the current inflation rate, and residents should not have additional rate costs put on them at a time when;</p>

RESPONSES FROM PROPERTY OWNERS REGARDING COUNCIL'S PROPOSED SPECIAL VARIATION TO RATES

Submission No.		Preferred Option	Comments
			<p>1. Current official interest rate is 1.5%.</p> <p>2. Wage rates are steady with little or no increases in recent years.</p> <p>3. Residents relying on income from term deposits and allocated pensions have been impacted by low interest rates (under 3%) and a declining share market.</p> <p>4. Property prices have fallen by around 9% over the last year. Is this going to result in lower land values on which rates are calculated?</p> <p>Further, the information documentation put out on these proposed new levies shows approximate weekly and annual increases which appear to be only relatively small amounts. There is no mention as to what they will amount to in future years due to the effect of compounding on amounts and interest.</p> <p>I would also ask if council has considered looking at ways of reducing expenditure to live within our means just as we residents have to do. We the residents in the present economic climate are not able to call on anybody or organisation to obtain a 7.04% per annum increase in income.</p> <p>With the State Government currently promoting the surplus funds they have, like last week giving \$2.3m to the Lithgow Zig Zag Railway, maybe council should if not already done apply for grants from them for operational maintenance and essential works.</p> <p>On a point of clarification. The information document indicates the proposed Operational levy is to be permanent. Why then on page six under the heading of SV Affect On Businesses does Option 3 show 4 years?</p>
49		1	<p>I vehemently object to the rates increases that council has put forward and in particular options 2 and 3, which are overindulgent and unnecessary.</p> <p>Hunters Hill Council (HHC) have consistently failed to provide even the fundamental services with the already exorbitant rates that it charges, and in comparison to Ryde Council (Ryde), HHC falls way behind. For example, Ryde provides five council clean ups per year whereas HHC only provides two.</p> <p>We don't need more community centres or the relocation and upgrading of dilapidated relic houses. HHC has consistently for almost a decade delayed the development of the Gladesville village precinct, denying the community the social and economic benefits of a modern village area.</p> <p>Perhaps HHC should better manage its finances and get on with its job instead of finding wishy washy projects to fund.</p> <p>Such a rate rise suggests that HHC has consistently been fiscally imprudent in its management of ratepayer fees and any increase will undoubtedly be met with community and ratepayer criticism.</p>
50		More information needed	Regarding the Hunters Hill Council Rates submission. Can you please provide more details of the difference between submission 2 and submission 3?
51		Rejects all three options	<p>NO ... to all 3 Options ! Not all HH residents are extremely wealthy!</p> <p>Just as Hunter Hill Council is feeling the pinch ...it's exactly the same story for many of your self-funded retiree / pensioner ratepayers (especially those west of Burns Bay Road)! We are also feeling the pressure of higher living costs in every part of our lives! Maybe council needs to look at cutting wastage... just like many of us are now also having to do!! Rather than spending the ratepayer money on trying to sell us on a 'BETTER FUTURE'BUT <u>ONLY</u> IF WE PAY COUNCIL MORE MONEY!</p>

RESPONSES FROM PROPERTY OWNERS REGARDING COUNCIL'S PROPOSED SPECIAL VARIATION TO RATES

Submission No.		Preferred Option	Comments
			<p>Why not actually offer ratepayers some real and practical cost saving options instead of with virtual threats of 'rack and ruin' !</p> <p>Misleading faux 'Community Consultation' !</p> <p>I do wonder why Council is wasting ratepayer money on <u>token</u> 'Community Consultation' when many believe regardless of any community criticism or negative feedback , that Council will go ahead anyway and apply to IPART for an new SV levy approval (Feb 2019) ...all on top of the new rate rise!</p> <p>Council Cries Poor... while it wastes ratepayer money !</p> <p>Why has Council <u>wasted</u> considerable ratepayer money on those excessive 8 x page, Glossy, Colour 'Options' BROCHURES + PHONE SURVEY calls . This spend makes no sense when the council's whole campaign message is ...we need more of your money!! I find it real worrying that the NEW General Manager, Mayor and Councillors can't see that such a blatant waste of ratepayer money sends out the wrong message and just makes the residents ponder what <u>other money</u> is being possibly being wasted by council in other lower profile spends?</p> <p>Is this the aftermath of an excessive Anti-Amalgamation Campaign!</p> <p>If Council is so short of money .then I wonder if this new fund seeking campaign is a major consequences of another extravagant council campaign spend (on steroids!)...the Anti-Amalgamation Campaign?</p> <p>Actually I also seem to remember that the Anti-Amalgamation campaign material made claims that council/ ratepayers were going to be better off financially (win or lose) as our council was being responsible with cost cutting and consequently there was to be a 'Joint Council Organisation' formed so as to cut many costs for nearby councils. I wonder what has happened to that cost saving plan ?</p> <p>#10 Cowell Street unfairly now a ratepayer burden !</p> <p>I see #10 Cowell Street is now listed in the campaign as a community burden! That is a cheap trick by council !. After all the heritage listing process for #10 was all stuffed up by the then council The Gladesville residents and this iconic old house deserve better than the building making your <u>Hit List</u>!! If the deal had been done properly in the first place then the developer should of course be paying any costs related to preserving/ moving this iconic Gladesville building...not the ratepayers! By the way has all the income from the sale of all that public land gone now?</p> <p>Why not start a campaign for more State Govt funding?</p> <p>Surely if the State Govt has unfairly passed costs onto council then a better campaign idea for council (especially just before an election) maybe a council driven campaign lobbying the State Government for more financial support for local infrastructure (especially with all the State sanctioned overdevelopment in Gladesville!) . That spend would be supported by many ratepayers...especially if meant some rate (+ SV) rise relief!</p>
52		1	<p>Is council really asking for more rates?</p> <p>I have read the brochure - but you have not answered the fundamental question - what has changed to require such an unprecedented increase in rates, there is nothing new in the document that a well managed council would not have known last year or the year before that during the state government audit process.</p>

RESPONSES FROM PROPERTY OWNERS REGARDING COUNCIL'S PROPOSED SPECIAL VARIATION TO RATES

Submission No.		Preferred Option	Comments
			<p>Council promised a superior solution to amalgamation and presented to the state government documentation that proved it was capable and in a sound financial position to deliver. Then we had a windfall of (a reported) \$9million from the sale of public assets which boosted our bank balance and reduced the amount of assets we needs to maintain into the future.</p> <p>I do not accept there is a need to raise rates at all - surely a well managed Council one that proved it was fit for the future should be able to out perform the rest and deliver the same services for less than the maximum allowed 2.7% rate increase</p> <p>Council needs to live within its means and manage its budget, its far easier to ask for more money than to provide what you offered - superior solutions.</p>
53		1	<p>HHC should make good on its claims made when campaigning against amalgamation, of delivering operating synergies and improved economic performance - before asking us to pay more in Council rates.</p> <p>Otherwise we may just be throwing good money after bad, extending the demise of the micro-council, at cost to rate-payers - both financial and performance/amenity.</p>
54		2	<p>I feel that option number two is the best one for Council to adopt.</p>
55		3	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> As a matter of principle I believe Councils should be well funded, from rates income, so they are to fulfil their functions; therefore I support Option 3. I query the way the three options have been configured when it would be more logical for Option 2 to be for a permanent increase in rates at least sufficient to maintain current service levels. I also query the inadequate time the community has been given to consider these proposals: My flyer arrived in my letterbox on Wednesday 5th, the same day a notice was published in TWT, giving only 5 days to respond (I note that the version of the flyer on Council's website gives the closing date for submissions as Friday 7th Dec!). I also note that Council's Extraordinary meeting to consider is set for Wednesday 12th Dec, giving scant time to absorb submissions, such as this one of mine. I object to the lack of consultation in selecting items to be funded from the increased rate income. I suggest the item '10 Cowell St relocation' be deleted from the list of projects to be funded. Council sold 10 Cowell St, and it should be the responsibility of the current owner to either maintain the house on this land, or to relocate it, not Council's. I suggest that funding for the care of our bushland be added to the list of projects to be funded. I suggest also adding those items listed under the Action Plan of the Boronia Park Plan of Management (dated December 2015, where the priority of items is identified as High (1 year), Medium (2-3 years) or Low (3-5 years); i.e. all listed items to be completed by December 2020!

RESPONSES FROM PROPERTY OWNERS REGARDING COUNCIL'S PROPOSED SPECIAL VARIATION TO RATES

Submission No.		Preferred Option	Comments
			8. In particular, I suggest adding the recommendation to provide playground facilities at Boronia Park for older children (identified on p46 as being of Medium priority, (i.e. to be completed by December 2018!)
56		1	<p>Notwithstanding consistent advice from fellow local residents clearly 'conditioned' over time and view Council as an unfortunate 'arising'; somewhat at variance to consistent messaging communicated by Council and which undersigned 'schooled in' that 'self -praise is no recommendation'? Further, when visiting the wider area learn its ill-starred reputation extends far and wide upon disclosure to associates where resident and indicate submitting following will be wasting our time although once again subjected to Council seeking Rate increase above the norm at a time when all the signs are citizens will be called upon generally to 'tighten their belts' in the not too distant future so why not Council? Furthermore, in our over 18 years residence in Hunters Hill this is the FIRST approach from Council pertinent any form of 'engagement' seeking our views including during your 'Independence' crusade and would not be surprised if unintentional?</p> <p>Unquestionably Information Leaflet fails to provide a meaningful business case and but upholds evidenced experienced at all levels by the undersigned notwithstanding we have consistently and objectively sought to uphold/maintain all the attractions of residing in a 'leafy suburb' and Heritage and Conservation Area albeit latter increasingly viewed in but name alone - accept separate issue.</p> <p>Certainly, have concluded over 18 plus years of residence are unlike no other overseen by a small Council embedded with a proven failed capability and culture at all levels plus as information leaflet indicates ever deteriorating service levels and unsustainable financial situation (supporting example – ex Councillor [REDACTED] who now sees himself as an expert on Sydney Airport flight paths and cannot give up his past position title when past Chair of the Council's Tree Committee undersigned having been caught by a heavy falling branch and but millimetres from at the minimum serious injury not only did [REDACTED] attempt to put subject tree on Preservation List but on attendance communicated 'trees more important than humans' and subsequently upon seeking related FOI rejected by past GM. Fortunately, upon seeking background from another source discovered Council had been obligated to put in place a management plan going as far back as Town Clerk days which they clearly had not and therefore Council forced to engage a consultant whose recommendation was immediate removal). In support of above and whilst not exhaustive founded on the basis of information promulgated and forwarded under heading 'Important Information' suggest totally reasonable recipients scrutinize impact, contemplate and ask questions pertinent to survey and by no means exhaustive such as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Your 'Reported' comments in the local press communicated residents are the 'Masters' (your word) so where is that shown in proposal where it is maintained having achieved your 'Tribal Independence' residents now confronted with reality with increased payment options and if not supported in one form or the other or alternatively viewed as holding a 'gun to our head' as earlier commented by already 'shabby' service conditions and if not existing staff level not fully gainfully employed staff reductions should apply? [REDACTED]

RESPONSES FROM PROPERTY OWNERS REGARDING COUNCIL’S PROPOSED SPECIAL VARIATION TO RATES

Submission No.		Preferred Option	Comments
			<p>3. Both you and outgoing GM it was reported record loyalty of Council's public service employees leading up to 'Amalgamation' or not decision. Whilst it could be viewed comments were little more than 'political' judgement, where were potential employment opportunities likely to be found if a reduction in public service numbers if amalgamation had proceeded? Moreover, why would a public service employee leave in such a period of uncertainty if albeit unlikely employment opportunity exists and to do so effectively walking away for a generous pay out? Further, amalgamation did not occur and therefore suggest reasonable to assume retained employees contributed to the flawed 'consideration' document both in terms of strategy and substance – jobs-worth?</p> <p>4. Astounded when arriving over 18 years ago to not observe alliances or the like aimed at delivering efficacy and cost effectiveness between comparable adjacent councils in termed 'support services' areas. Apparently it takes for example the newly appointed Deputy Mayor and his skill set aka as with any comparable business Board capability to identify the inequality of Council's library contribution? Moreover, subsequently witness disagreement between Councillors where to some although 2019 almost upon us and all the challenges of today pertinent to regulation, governance have somewhat moved on from 150 years ago and even in the past decade some of your peers remain locked in the past – all about them and no doubt 'ego' not the 'bigger picture'.</p> <p>5. Surely it is fundamental to consider and define to include in the 'Two dream Options' Council has effected a review of Council's current organisational structure and operations and any savings which can be made and if not found why not including potential cost reductions stemming lack of service capability should not above the rate peg limit be agreed and hence reduction in financial support) clearly not considered by Council as an option – once again says it all?. As ever one way viewing and by doing so once again question does this not further uphold identified culture and capability shortcomings? Also, as shown during your 'Independence' crusade criticised State government actions as continues today yet Council once again demonstrates effectively operates in a similar manner having created the unsustainable situation and it is in sum 'Our way or the Highway'?</p> <p>6. Not included in your 'Dream Options' is investment in innovation, technology etc aimed at raising the bar pertaining to operational efficacy in terms of cultural behaviours and capability not essentially at best practice level but 'fit for purpose' solutions similar to that encountered in commercial business world? For some reason Council building improvements are listed and interpreted as confirming suggest how bad planning and financial allocation is as must have been known prior to 'Independence' but not highlighted until now separate to the issue Council as ever never looks inward relative to workforce improvement capability and service standards? For example, look no further than this survey as to the fragmented and all too obvious one-sided focussed approach by Council presumably collated to some extent from such as the much promoted 'precinct gatherings '? However, note perhaps conveniently no 'feedback' publicised as to their effectiveness, percentage of resident attending providing of meaningful inputs and general re-action in terms of value etc – same as always kept in the dark like a 'mushroom 'one way traffic? Further, Simply how can residents be assured if they contribute and assured responses meaningfully handled when 5 forms of response are listed, reply dates differ between leaflet and website. Furthermore, no titling record given for email reply and all too aware that within the plethora of emails received by Council co-ordination will not occur and who is to say results cannot be distorted as effectively must question integrity of process as evidenced – what difference is there in principle to recent farce in US Florida State election cascading from leadership/management shortcomings?</p>

RESPONSES FROM PROPERTY OWNERS REGARDING COUNCIL'S PROPOSED SPECIAL VARIATION TO RATES

Submission No.		Preferred Option	Comments
			<p>7. So it is communicated 'Dream List' content to be effected over ten years. So where if we are to make meaningful decisions such as unquestionably should have been assembled/included in compilation process priorities (critical/desirable/environmental), timescale and projected costs or once again they simply do not exist or are simply little more than a 'finger in the wind' or not operate in an open and transparent manner? Are we to find that through self-interest – political and personal - survey result in reality will be determined by the cadre once again who make the most noise or lobby hardest drowning out the majority if they were to be afforded a fair opportunity due to not being in agreement?. Accordingly, whilst note approximate size of 'Dream List' revenue generation are the residents to be refused such information and not also potentially take into consideration that not too distant down the line Council without doubt be seeking a further rate increase above the rate peg limit living as evidenced repeatedly Council acts in their 'Bubble' i.e. undersigned has real justification for concluding most politicians are in it for themselves and will take any course to achieve their goals/aspirations until discovered. As for public service employees effectively unaccountable and will create enough 'noise' until validated as to whether their continuing employment merited.</p> <p>8. No data evidence provided for analysis beyond a sweeping statement regard comparable rates with other Councils and as much else invariably open to interpretation as with other funding options. Look no further than earlier comment upon undersigned arrival 18+ years ago astounded and in the past highlighted to Council as to the non-existence of alliances between adjacent Councils in terms of 'support services'. Council's financial predicament has not occurred overnight but ever ongoing and pertinent to funding options quote 'is currently investigating shared services with neighbouring councils' suggest a far from new concept in both public and commercial entities but once again but confirms the whole leadership, management, culture and capability deficiencies and we as residents are required to pay for in terms for services which for one exception valueless. By the information leaflets own content indicates detachment regarding lack of innovation/initiative to deliver the 'shared model' as found well established across the world for decades.</p> <p>So in conclusion are we effectively to be treated as 'lemmings' if without further reference to residents such issues as set out above Council proceeds without the likes of internal validation submit one of the two 'Dream List' Options to IPART? Certainly view from a business perspective any submission fundamentally based on 'information brochure' presented to IPART should be rejected by them however Council attempts to 'sell it' as simply viewed as all about Council survival in its current form? Additionally, where is there any indication of considering 'downsizing' notwithstanding Council's unsustainable financial position albeit undersigned aware of mandatory obligations to likes of higher formations? Moreover, if IPART agree then would be viewed as not dissimilar behaviour as found through Royal Commission on Banks as per ASIC and APRA who have been shown not to have a clean bill of Health. Finally, hope is new GM operates as the long overdue 'Change Agent' up to the considerable challenge and above all we wish her well. Hopefully this email is received directly by addressees as whilst a small Council notwithstanding past communications addressed for personal attention resultant behaviours and practices appear akin to that enacted years ago in the UK TV Series 'Yes Minister'?</p>
57		1	We are writing in response to Council's wish to apply to IPART for a Community Facilities Special Variation to increase rates above the rate peg limit.

RESPONSES FROM PROPERTY OWNERS REGARDING COUNCIL'S PROPOSED SPECIAL VARIATION TO RATES

Submission No.		Preferred Option	Comments
			<p>The information brochure regarding this proposal was only made available to ratepayers within the last week, with a deadline for submissions by Monday 10 December. A follow up Extraordinary Meeting is planned for this Wednesday 12/12 for consideration and, presumably, determination.</p> <p>Firstly, we believe this timing entirely fails to meet best practice for consulting with the community, particularly on an important matter such as the potential raising of rates by almost 10 per cent p.a.</p> <p>Secondly, the matters listed for the 10 year funding program have no specific detail on need, costings or apparent priority. They appear as a random collection of works with no overall plan for how they will be justified for selection. What will be the process for community participation in making the decisions on which project is the next one in urgent need of funding?</p> <p>One of the items in particular - the re-location of 10 Cowell Street heritage property - is very concerning. This is situated on land sold by Council for development. There is no social license from the community for the property to be re-located, and certainly no agreement that any re-location should be at ratepayers' expense rather than that of the private owners.</p> <p>Council has made financial decisions and choices in recent years that have inevitably left a shortfall in funding. An assumption was made that most ratepayers were in favour of these expenses being incurred, but this was never put to the test. Clearly there will now be restrictions on Council's funding capacities over the next decade but, as Council believes in its financial and resource management capability, this should be achievable. Or were we mislead that Council was indeed Fit for the Future when a merger was so strongly resisted?</p> <p>It is very disappointing that a proposal such as this should be so hastily presented at the end of the year and with so little time to respond. It is highly likely that a majority of ratepayers will not even be aware of the Special Rate Variation and its options. How will this enable a fair and equitable decision to be made?</p> <p>We wish to state our support for Option One (rate peg increase only) and to record our objections to the poor process involved. Council should delay any decision on this SRV until it is evident to ratepayers that there has been a proper and transparent community consultation conducted.</p>
58		2	<p>We'd prefer to vote for option 2, rate peg + Community Facilities SV.</p> <p>One issue we have with option 3 is that the front page of the booklet delivered to households lists the Operational SV as "permanent". We think any SV choice such as this should not be decided as "permanent", especially when the Community Facilities one is limited to 10 years.</p>
59		1	<p>I am writing to oppose the increase in rates and to object that this leaflet was only delivered to ratepayers last week with a ridiculously short deadline for submissions by today! This unnecessary hassle of the community at this busy time of year appears to a cynical ploy to stop ratepayers having their say and does not meet best practice for consultations.</p> <p>Where are the business cases for the range of vague proposals listed for the 10 year funding program? For example where is the business case or community demand for a toilet block in Figtree Park? My proposal to reinstate a toddler play park in this Park to cater for the many families with young children in the surrounding streets would meet an absolutely need in the community. So rather than wasting thousands of dollars on 'toilets' for a little local park where there is no sports field, no playground or no dog walking area, ratepayers would be much better served by money being spent on a playground.</p>

RESPONSES FROM PROPERTY OWNERS REGARDING COUNCIL'S PROPOSED SPECIAL VARIATION TO RATES

Submission No.		Preferred Option	Comments
			I support Option One (rate peg increase only) and record my strong objection to the poor process involved. Council should delay any decision on this until it is evident that a formal and transparent community consultation has been conducted.
60		1	<p>We have just returned home after 2 weeks to find the information notice re increase in rates. It seems that not much notice was given by HHC as the submissions close 10 December 2018. Perhaps it is intended to 'fall under the radar' just prior to Christmas.</p> <p>██████████. HHC say they will not create new facilities and reduce maintenance on others if a rate increase above the statutory increases not forthcoming. This increase was not mentioned in the fight against amalgamation.</p> <p>If HHC stopped wasting money on fighting and agreed to amalgamate there would be enough money to fund the projects listed under Option 3.</p> <p>Anyone only needs to look at the footpaths on Victoria and Pittwater roads to see the contempt HHC have for the ratepayers east of the overpass.</p>
61		2	<p>In reference to the proposed variation to rates and the 3 options. I am in favour of Option 2.</p> <p>Option 1 is too limiting and Option 3 is perhaps not feasible to many.</p> <p>I feel especially perplexed at the attitude of Council in not properly patrolling and enforcing the time limits in parking in the Woolwich Pier Hotel area in which I am situated. If regular and after hours parking officers were retained there would be a substantial and regular source of revenue.</p> <p>The reality is that regulars of the business avenues around this area know that after certain hours it is rarely patrolled if at all and so park with impunity.</p> <p>Typical spot which is highly dangerous is the no parking area on Woolwich Rad with the corner of Franki Avenue.</p> <p>This is almost continually abused after hours and creates a hazard for any one coming from Franki Avenue and turning left into Woolwich Road. One cannot see cars coming.</p> <p>Apart from depriving the residents of spots there are a number of safety concerns. These abuses are prolific after hours.</p> <p>Council should consider proper enforcement</p>
62		Not Specified	<p>I received the Council's SV rates publication today and provide the following comments:</p> <p>The cost increases proposed under Options 2 & 3 appear modest but it is disappointing to learn about the State Government's cost shifting and the Council's small size and reliance upon residential rates to fund maintenance of significant public assets demonstrates that the present funding model is inadequate and not sustainable.</p> <p>I note the Council is currently investigating shared services with neighbouring councils. This is an important step; in terms of the imperatives of cost sharing in the circumstances and adoption of more environmentally sustainable processes.</p>

RESPONSES FROM PROPERTY OWNERS REGARDING COUNCIL'S PROPOSED SPECIAL VARIATION TO RATES

Submission No.		Preferred Option	Comments
			Will the Council consider amalgamation with the neighbouring councils to further improve the delivery of services and budget to meet the demonstrated need for increased maintenance and infrastructure renewal works to protect and preserve this historic area?
63		1	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the HH council rates submission. I have lived in HH for 4 years and it is an absolutely beautiful suburb.</p> <p>Having reviewed the documentation I can appreciate that HH does not have all the massive development that other councils have, but the footprint is also a smaller area compared to other councils.</p> <p>However, councils like Ryde who have seen a huge level of development over the past 5 years has also requested a special rates increase a few years back, which is something I find extremely difficult to understand.</p> <p>Therefore, high development does not always equate to increase funds available for project work.</p> <p>The other difficulty I have with agreeing with option 2 or option 3 is that the documentation does not take into account the fees residence pay when they build or renovate a new home.</p> <p>The fee to build is 1% of the build cost. The homes in HH are generally of a very high quality and therefore 1% of 1 million property is \$10,000, as an example. These DA fees goes to the council to pay for public projects. This is approximately equivalent to 5 years of council rates on a 1.5million property (land value).</p> <p>Given that the land value will increase every few years, and the amount of money that I have paid to build in HH, my preference would be Option 1.</p> <p>Again, thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback.</p>
64		1	<p>I am emailing in response to the Council's application to apply to Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal (IPART) for Community Facilities Special Variation (SV) to increase above the rate peg limit.</p> <p>My support is for Option One (rate Peg Increase). I consider that there has been poor process involved and that the Council should delay on this until there has been transparent community consultation. I only received this notice 10 days ago in the letterbox and it has appeared at the busiest time of the year when we are preparing for a longer holiday period and when many who live in Hunters Hill and Woolwich are not around to give proper consideration to potentially raising the rates by almost 10 percent per annum.</p> <p>Option 2 and Option 3 give a random list of what projects will be delivered and many of these projects I question.</p> <p>* Figtree Park new toilet block - WHY? there is no children's playground, which would be more advantageous to our community than a toilet block in a park which has no other facilities. I often see people walking their dogs, children just enjoying the grass and trees or locals doing Tai Chi but they do not require a toilet block.</p>

RESPONSES FROM PROPERTY OWNERS REGARDING COUNCIL'S PROPOSED SPECIAL VARIATION TO RATES

Submission No.		Preferred Option	Comments
			<p>* Harry Shelley Memorial Park is used regularly by the locals there is no toilet block there so why do we need one in Figtree Park? This playground not that long ago had an upgrade, why would it need another one so soon?</p> <p>* Valentia Street Reserve is not so regularly used, it is mostly used by those who are waiting to do a pick up from the ferry - it is not a park that would be a chosen one - not like Weil Park where children do play regularly.</p> <p>The list of projects in my opinion are not able to be delivered with the approx. annual amount generated, even over a ten year period.</p> <p>* Possibly just the roof restoration, air conditioning and maintenance improvements to Hunters Hill Town Hall would take up much of the raised extra funds delivered in Option 2.</p> <p>* 10 Cowell Street relocation - to relocate and restore the cottage would take up almost a full annual amount of Option 2.</p> <p>* Woolwich Baths upgrade would be great for the locals but what is proposed? and will the Council maintain it once it is done? because currently it seems to have been forgotten!</p> <p>* the 2 pre-schools and Gladesville occasional care internal and external upgrades and maintenance alone would probably take up a years' extra funds. And exactly what does this statement mean ?</p> <p>* Enables Council to maintain current service levels at the end of Option 3.</p> <p>It is very disappointing that this brochure has been strung together not giving any details of proposed works, proposed costings for the work, proposed time frames or the selection plan for such works. How can we as rate payers make an informed decision when we have nothing but a random list of projects hastily put together at the end of the year?</p> <p>Unfortunately due to the inadequate details of the proposed works and estimate of cost for each my support is for Option 1.</p>
65		1	<p>Firstly it is not my intention to whinge unnecessarily and I am being practical and honest and I have attached some pics of the street and reserve drains referred to below causing flooding on our property when full of leaves etc (below) indicating the source of some of the problems we have encountered over the last few years. I have only received an automated reply and no remedial action has been taken place so I assume this matter is very low on Councils priority list this year due to Xmas (or next year too) so maybe I should kick up a stink somewhere else if Council ignores me?</p> <p>FYI the Reserve steps also are a nightmare with bamboo growing rampantly and debris and plane tree leaves everywhere even from years ago and one day someone will hurt themselves but no doubt Council has Public Liability Insurance to cover this but for the record however I see no mention of the Reserve receiving any maintenance and the decrepit boatshed below also is very dangerous regardless of the warning signs and should be removed immediately before someone gets hurt.</p> <p>Secondly we recently received your little brochure offering alternative SV Rates hikes with promises of justification and I have read your recommended info on <i>impact of cost shifting etc.</i></p>

RESPONSES FROM PROPERTY OWNERS REGARDING COUNCIL’S PROPOSED SPECIAL VARIATION TO RATES

Submission No.		Preferred Option	Comments
			<p>Maybe the cost of the opposed amalgamation with the Ryde Council has depleted your funds but your Council Officers and employees jobs now are safe for the time being if only at the expense of the rate payers generosity as result of this proposed "special variation" if only we could run our own businesses like this!</p> <p>Lastly we also incur our own gardeners costs which are in excess of \$60 - \$80 per hour nowadays and in our case also blocked drains and gutters from the nearby Ferdinand reserves un-serviced overgrown Plane and Jacaranda trees (another matter) but on principle I do not believe in charity for Government bodies or Councils so without prejudice I won't prolong my assumptions any further but I'm not impressed.</p> <p>PS: Apologies for prolonging this communication but it is most obvious all the local street gutters have not been swept for some time and there is a large build-up of leaves which of course creates the problems of drains and other blockages I have referred to when it rains and today 12-12-18 will be good barometer as it is now raining.</p> <p>Gone are the days when a mobile street sweeper used to come around regularly particularly in the leafy seasons and so we can only assume a lack of funds has put a temporary halt to this service and the rumours about Councils large expenditures protecting its anonymity from the merger are rife.</p> <p>I offer no opinions on the viability of the merger either way but I do have an opinion on Council's latest "cash grab" to bail itself out of poverty and ask for our essential services and precinct general maintenance be restored and maybe Council will find another way to procure the funds seemingly required to survive even from the State Government perhaps?</p>
		1	<p>I believe that the council should only increase rates by the statutory increase since this council doesn't know how to supply services of appropriate value and continually wastes money on self interest groups.</p> <p>The staff don't understand that they have jobs to provide services to the rate payers.</p> <p>It would also appear that residences outside the peninsular don't need to be provided the same quality of service.</p>
		1	<p>As a rate payer, owner of [REDACTED] Hunter's Hill I urge Council considers Option 1, Rate Peg Increase (Statutory Increase) only - to ensure rates remain affordable.</p>

RESPONSES FROM PROPERTY OWNERS REGARDING COUNCIL’S PROPOSED SPECIAL VARIATION TO RATES

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Other	Total Submissions
34	8 plus 2 that supported both 2 and 3	14 plus 2 that supported both 2 and 3	3 Needed More Information 2 Reject all Options 1 Could not participate in phone survey 1 - Comments but preferred option not specified	65