

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Local Government Mailbox](#)
Subject: Randwick councils application for two general rate increases.
Date: Friday, 21 March 2014 5:46:43 PM

To whom it may concern,

In our local paper, tucked away on page 17 in a small article, we were advised for the first time of Randwick council's application for increases to our general rates.

Not once, while lobbying for the environmental levy to continue, did they mentioned this to the ratepayers.

Failure to advise ratepayers of their intentions to increase general rates, not once but twice, has left ratepayers feeling cheated, as with this knowledge the voting would not have favoured the extension of the environmental levy.

The first time ratepayers were aware of this was on the 19/3/14, and that the deadline to object to IPART was the 24/3/14, a very small window for the busy lifestyle ratepayers have.

Isn't in the guidelines that ratepayers are to be advised well in advance?

PS: Councillors of Randwick Council have been boasting in the local paper of how Financially sustainable Randwick Council is and has been, which I tend to agree especially considering they have \$44 million dollars in investment accounts earning over \$3 million dollars in interest in the 2013 year alone.

Or are they just saying this to protect their jobs in the event of amalgamation.

Either way they are still relying on IPART to approve an extension of the environmental

levy plus two general rate increases.

Give ratepayer a break!

Thanks

Ralph

Maroubra

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Local Government Mailbox](#)
Subject: Objection to Randwick councils Environmental levy ext
Date: Wednesday, 26 February 2014 12:02:09 PM
Attachments: [Letter to IPART.docx](#)
[Interactive Mapping - Projects.msg](#)
[Table - D](#)
http://www.randwick.nsw.gov.au/library/scripts/objectifyMedia.aspx?file=pdf_102_73.pdf&siteID=1&str_title=20100217_BuildingFundProgramYears1to3.pdf

Alison Milne,
Director, Local Government.

Dear Alison,

I would like to start off with the following statement:-

"There was no valid financial reason why Randwick should amalgamate, as we have proven to be financially sustainable."

This was quoted by Randwick Greens Councillor Murray Matson, in our local paper on the 14/1/14, which adds proof to what I am writing to you, that Randwick Council can pay for the itself without punishing ratepayers anymore.

Each of my subtitle's in the attached letter, exposes the savings that have been made through programs, past approved special levies and investments, which would able to fund the environmental levy.

Also I must bring to your attention, that I have tried to express these points to Randwick council, through my local councillor, [REDACTED], who after two weeks back in Oct 2013, of discussions, either by phone, email, text's, culminating to face to face meeting, as he was very interested with the points I brought up, that he advised me that he would take my questions to the next council meeting, as he also said to me, that Randwick Council was financially sustainable.

To this date I have not heard from him again, eventhough I have left numerous messages to contact me, even if he can't help me.

I wrote to the Mayor, who is big on community consultation, advising of my situation, and recieved a email, from a third party telling me that I should try and contact him, eventhough my complaint was for that very reason.

I can only assume that, [REDACTED] has been told not to correspond with me anymore as my questions were probably to in depth for council's liking.

I have attached my letter outlining points of concerns, and apologise for the size of the email, but you must understand that I had to read 102 pagers of Randwick councils financials, which is where I derived my points from.

Thanks
Ralph Murdaca
[REDACTED]

PS; please advise if there are any problem with this email.

26/2/14

IPART

Dear Alison

As discussed on numerous conversations with [REDACTED], (in regards to Randwick Council's request to extend the Environmental Levy for another 5 years), I'm Writing to you with the strong belief that Randwick council is (as quoted to me by a current councillor), financially sound and able to fund the Levy on its own.

As quoted by the Mayor, Mr Nash, to the ratepayers, at every opportunity, "Randwick council is and has been debt free, due to good financial Management".

The fact that the "the building for our community levy", generated \$34 million dollars and that the "Environmental Levy" has generated in the Last five years approx \$16 million dollars has nothing to do with council be debt free. If that's the case then why are they asking ratepayers to provide another \$20 million dollars, especially now when the cost of living is Killing ratepayers, on projects like the coastal walkway (approx \$6 million) which should never be a priority as there are many streets and Footpaths, that people have always used in the past.

Hopefully, I can express the points in writing, that needs to be brought to your attention, as I am sure Randwick Council won't provide an application that will jeopardize the loss of the approval to a \$20 million dollar levy.

1/ Cash Assets & Investments

The total Cash and Investments as at 2013 was \$62.187 million dollars which has increased compared with \$53.817 million and \$47.546 million At the close of the financial years 2012 and 2011 respectively.

I'm sure this is due to the granting of the Special Levy, "Building for our Community", plus the "Environmental Levy".

These cash assets are then broken up as follows:

- Externally restricted cash & investments = \$26.094 million
- Internally restricted cash & investments = \$33.012 million
- Unrestricted cash & investments = \$ 3.081 million

Internally restricted cash & investments have been restricted in their use by,

Resolution or Policy of Council to Reflect forward plans, Identified Programs of works.

So you can say that the Environmental Levy falls into this category.

This category of cash has increased from 2011 (\$23.167 million), 2012 (\$28.755 million), to 2013 (\$33.012 million), on average an increase

Of approx \$5 million per year extra, saved into this category and the environmental levy was generating \$3.500 million per year, (as per 2013 Profit & Loss statements of Randwick Council).

My point is that this is a reserve account, for forward plans and so should be and could be used to fund future environmental projects rather than asking For extension of the levy.

2/Cash Flow

Why is part of Randwick Council's cash outflows which shows that they are able to spend \$81.689 million dollars to purchase investment securities

In one year, but don't have \$3.5 million per year to fund the environmental levy projects.

3/Interest Received

As per their Profit & Loss, in the year 2013 interest received equalled \$3.5 million dollars.

Why can't this money be used to fund the environmental levy.

4/ Productivity Improvements (See attached Table A)

I was provided with the attached (**Table A**), which shows me how much money council was saving, with some of the savings as a result of the Environmental Levy, programs.

The total of these savings amounted to \$4.585 million dollars per year.

Why can't the funds saved be allocated to fund the environmental levy?

At a recent face to face meeting, ratepayers asked this question, and were told by council, that this would cause the projects to take longer

To, complete.

So this is how council listens to the ratepayers.

Why is it so important to spend \$6 million on a coastal walkway, putting ratepayers under more financial pressure for a project which if it

Doesn't go ahead, would not be the end of the world, as people will walk as they have done for years on other footpaths.

Again we have no proof that this is what ratepayer's wanted as a priority.

I think ratepayer's priority lies with them being able to pay their rates first and on time or council will charge you interest.

5/ Budget Variations (Revenue)

Five years ago when Randwick Council approached the local government for the extension of the Environmental Levy, they needed

To provide forecasted figure's on revenue for the following five year's plus the forecasted costs of the projects that the levy was to fund,

To justify councils request to extend this levy, otherwise there would be a shortfall in revenue.

My problem is that in the last four years, after speaking to [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] I found out

That no one from this department had monitored the actual financial performance of the council to be aware of major variations.

I'm sorry but [REDACTED] is to analyse the "actual" performance of the business operations of the Council, in relation to the forecasted information used by council to support and win their application of the levy.

In the year 2013 alone (**As per attached table B**), Randwick Council's actual revenue received was approx \$7.5 million dollars above Their Budgeted, figures.

Now we are not talking about \$100,000 dollars, but a surplus of revenue of \$7.5 million dollars, for one year only, which I'm sure Has been channelled into council's, investment accounts.

I brought this to [REDACTED] attention, and I'm sorry this should be her job, not mine to expose this large variance, and I believe it should Be a criteria that these actual's should be presented for scrutiny on a yearly basis, not just be excepted by government and then not Followed up.

6/Costs of Environmental Works

I have noticed how council is very accommodating when providing table's showing the projected capital works and their projected Costs to support the request of the environmental levy.

In all the correspondence this table is readably available in a basic format that everyone can understand.

This table is also provided to the local government as a supporting document used to have the levy approved.

After speaking to [REDACTED] neither herself or ratepayers, have ever seen the same type of table format, showing

The completed projects, with a column showing the actual costs, of each project.

This would show if the forecasted costs of these projects have been over-estimated compared to the actual cost, which would lead to Surplus of the levy.

If we can't see this information, then ratepayers and local government, would never know.

[REDACTED] has tried to have this very simple request emailed to her from council, which is supposed to be easily available for

Everyone to view, and so far has received a brochure showing 3 lining of completed projects but no actual costs figures.

Again she requested this information, and this time was sent a link from council's website, (in relation to projects under

The building for community program), but the principle reporting would be the same.

This link, (**Table C**) as attached, again only showed the projected costs not the actual costs for the completed works.

As this was a simple request, I provided [REDACTED] with (table D), which shows simple tables of proposed capital works.

I said to [REDACTED], please send council this table, (which has been provided by them, in a simple format), and ask them to just add an extra column

showing the actual costs of each of the projects, that way both ratepayer's and local government, can quickly and easily see if projected

Costs are not over estimated.

Considering that Randwick council's budgeted revenue for 2013 was under estimated by \$7.5 million dollars, what's to say that their

Capital works costing are reliable.

Randwick Council's reply for this request was as follows:-

"The director that I had been speaking to is on leave. The officer that I spoke to said that they could provide the information

When the director returns.

They said the best way to do this is to email council directly"

I wrote back to [REDACTED], and advised her that this information should be displayed and available as readably as the projected figures are.

How come only one person has access to this information?

If this information showed major discrepancies between forecast and actual figures, I was going to use it in my report to you, but

For some reason, Randwick Council is making it a task in itself.

Finally I have received a table (**Table C2**), which has been provides in the format requested, as this format does not exist for actual figures

On completed projects for rate payers viewing, as it is not in council's financial reports.

I know this table relates to the special levy of, "Building for our Community", but it raises questions in regards to the funds raised.

The Building for our community levy, was advertised to the rate payers as following,-

" It's a 3 year special levy of 2.71%, to raise \$34.8 million in funds to fund a 7 year program of capital works"

As per stated on council's website.

Now as you can see from the attached table, we are now in our fourth year of this programme, and so far council has only completed 13 projects, at a Total actual cost of \$5.189 million, but only \$3.275million has been used from this levy, with the balance coming out of other sources of funds, like

The environmental levy, etc.

So from the \$34 million they have collected in the previous three years they have used \$3,275 million of these funds, in three years which you can say could be funded

By the interest alone.

So there is a high probability that there is over \$30 million dollars of the funds from this levy, sitting in investments, earning interest , and paying for projects

In the next four years with just interest alone, with the end result at the end of the 7 year program, of having \$30 million dollars of excess funds from this levy.

If that is the case, first of all I don't know why they are drawing funds from other revenue's to fund the projects, and

Number two, if they can draw funds from the environmental levy to pay for "Build for our Community", projects, then why can't they do visa a versa,

And use the excess money in the Building for our community levy to fund the Environment Levy.

The whole idea of collecting this money in the first 3 years, rather than spreading it over 7 years, (the life of the program), is so council can raise

Three years of interest for themselves.

The Building for our Community Levy was approved and sold to the rate payers, that they were raising \$34 million dollars to complete capital projects to

That value, by the end of the seventh year, and not for the purpose of council have millions of dollars left over for the benefit of increasing their bank balance

Or investment portfolio.

I have also confirmation from council, that these 13 projects are all the capital works that have been completed in relation to the program, at a cost to

The building for our community levy of only \$3.275 million dollars.

But who monitors all this, for all ratepayers know, council could just used the interest raised from this levy to fund projects, and then end up with a windfall

At the end of the 7 years.

I say let them fund pay for the environment levy .

7/ Mail out survey

I feel that any survey that can potentially deliver council \$20 million dollars, which they so desperately need, should be conducted

I dependably, as I feel that there is a major conflict of interest, especially when the end result is not audited and only viewed by

The people, who are conducting the survey in the first place.

I'm sorry, but after all the bad publicity in relation to the Health Union, and the Mining Licenses, you can't help becoming cynical.

I have seen the results of the survey which council sent me, and I'm sure it will be presented to you in their application, but

After speaking to the editor of our local paper, who told me that in regards to ratepayers writing to the paper to express their

View either for or against the levy extension, it was pretty even, so again I'm not going to except figures from a survey that's

Carried out and overviewed by the same organisation who want and will benefit from this result.

The two page fact sheet, which was sent out with the survey, was nothing more than a tool used to scare ratepayers into

Voting for the levy extension.

One section of the fact sheet states:-

“that if the levy doesn't continue, then current projects, that are funded by the levy are at risk of being cut or reduced, and if some projects

Are to continue, then cuts need to be made in other operational programs.”

When has the environmental levy programs, taken precedent over traditional council operations, that they would blackmail ratepayers

Into the belief that it will be doom & gloom if the levy doesn't go through.

Another part of this fact sheet, state's that the environmental levy saved ratepayers money on their energy & water bills, which this in

It's self is misleading as you ask anyone we haven't had a bill reduction in years.

I wrote to Randwick council and asked them why they didn't supply in their fact sheets, facts that were more educational to ratepayers
Like, how much money Randwick council has invested, and how much interest it earns a year, etc.

This is information that would make ratepayer's ask questions and educate themselves more in order to make a more knowledgeable
Decision.

But no, council makes you go and research this information.

The fact sheet, also talks about the minor increase to the levy, but doesn't paint the whole picture in advising ratepayers, that this levy

Is only one of many categories that make up rate notices, and that on top of the levy increase you need to add increases to all the

Other levies and charges on the rate notice, and in doing so, would then paint the picture that increases to the environmental

Levy would be added to the other rate increases, taking the yearly increase of rate's to a lot more than what council is saying.

8/ Face to Face Surveys

This is another survey, Randwick council will use to convince IPART to approve the levy extension, as the results again favour's them.

██████ you will see that Randwick council will not advise in any of it's notes that a cash amount of \$80, was paid to each of the
People that attended these meetings.

Please do not be conned, in regards to this survey, as again Randwick council conducted this survey, and only used a market

Research company (Taverner Rearch), who's only involvement was to source forty people to attend two face to face meetings

Which council \$80 each.

Again, what was the criteria to be eligible?

Why would you pay a market research co, plus 40 people \$80 each, when council doesn't have money?

Isn't this buying votes, and again a conflict of interest?

I asked the question to the mayor, directly, but received an answer from a third party, why with the amount of people attending

Your eco fairs, (which we pay for), would you not conduct face to face meetings, as I'm sure people who attend these fairs

Are very passionate about the environment and would not need cash incentives.

9/Carbon Tax Savings

When the carbon tax first came out, councils were screaming how they would have to increase general rates to cover this

Tax, as it would cost them millions of dollars.

Now that this tax will be abolished, will our general rates reduce by the same margin it increased when the tax first came out, or

Will nothing happen and council keep collecting this money for a tax that won't exist.

If our rates don't reduce, then council can use these savings to pay for the levy.

10/ Councillor's Admissions.

In a meeting with Councillor [REDACTED], I was told, in his own words, (Randwick council is financially sustainable) and this Was also supported by Councillor Murray Matson, who in a recent article (attachment E) stated that Randwick Council Is "Financially sustainable", but it seems this is only true when their jobs are on the line, whenever the topic of council Amalgamations arises, as for all other times, Randwick council may not be able to deliver other services if the levy is Not approved.
Are ratepayers and the local government having the wool pulled over their eyes?

PRODUCTIVITY IMPROVEMENTS

This sheet provides you with information about Council's efficiency and productivity savings.

How is Council being efficient and effective?

Randwick City Council adopts a strategic approach to achieving efficiency and productivity savings and is committed to continuing further efficiencies and productivity savings into the future. The identification and implementation of productivity improvements is an integral part of Council's Long Term Financial Planning. The table below provides a summary of recent productivity initiatives that have been delivered in relation to:

- recurrent savings or increased revenue
- efficiency improvements
- improved customer service.

Initiatives delivering recurrent savings or increased revenue	Initiatives delivering efficiency improvements	Initiatives delivering improved customer focused services
<p>New IT systems have resulted in cost savings of up to <u>\$1 million</u> per annum.</p> <p>Southern Sydney Regional Organisation of Councils (SSROC) has a joint procurement venture resulting in annual savings for Randwick Council of approximately <u>\$1.2m</u>. (Estimated regional savings over 10 years of \$105 million).</p> <p>Savings achieved under the SSROC Large Site Electricity contract equates to 6.5 per cent or <u>\$100,000</u> per annum.</p> <p>A review of our fleet management processes has extended the car replacement schedule for passenger and light commercial vehicles to three years, delivering savings of over <u>\$200,000</u> annually.</p> <p>Diversification in the range of vehicles offered resulted in a decrease in average vehicle purchase price with savings of over <u>\$40,000</u> per annum.</p> <p>Implemented flexible leave arrangements such as cashing out annual leave and purchasing leave, reducing leave balances by 9,000 hours with a <u>\$375,000</u> reduction in leave liability.</p> <p>Improved management of sick and carer's leave absenteeism saw a productivity increase of over 350 work days in 12 months representing a saving of <u>\$131,000</u>.</p> <p>Installation of in-house document scanning software has saved <u>\$39,000</u> per annum in scanning Development Applications and considerable staff time.</p> <p>The domestic waste garbage and recycling collection program is saving <u>\$500,000</u> per annum.</p> <p>Annual water savings of 500 million litres saves <u>\$1 million</u> annually.</p> <p>Completion of remedial and restoration works for contaminated sites in 2019-2020 will result in a two per cent reduction in the domestic levy.</p> <p>Total Savings \$1,585,000</p>	<p>Use of remote access and control technology enables irrigation, water recycling and floodlights to be remotely controlled and monitored delivering greater efficiency in water and electricity use.</p> <p>Redesigning the recruitment strategy has increased candidate numbers by 49 per cent over three years and delivered a 66 per cent reduction in recruitment costs through better understanding, branding and online focus.</p> <p>Improved and more tightly managed leases have resulted in lessees of all community buildings assuming responsibility for maintenance, saving money for Council.</p> <p>Establishment of new environmental performance targets for new Council vehicles has realised a reduction in fuel consumption and CO₂ emissions from Council's fleet.</p> <p>Implemented an employee engagement program which increased employee productivity by 1.1 per cent over 12 months.</p> <p>The introduction of an E-tendering system has streamlined the issue and evaluation of tenders leading to a reduction in staff time allocated to assessing submissions.</p> <p>Strengthened relationships with Local Government Procurement and Procurement Australia has reduced the need to conduct tenders.</p> <p>Participation in the PMMS Procurement Roadmap Program coordinated by SSROC has led to an improved procurement process resulting in better planning and cost savings whilst ensuring probity and transparency.</p> <p>Introduction of Ezescan Indexing module has automated the process of registering various types of documents into Council's records management system. The time savings in registering some documents is around 90 per cent; for other documents requiring meta data input there are time savings of about 50 per cent to 70 per cent.</p>	<p>Provision of a range of online services including lodgement of Development Applications and BPoint for payment of rates (in 2011-2012 \$3.3 million of rates paid online).</p> <p>Range of innovative ways for the community to interact with Council including: Council's website with 255,000 unique visits in 2012 (18 per cent increase from 2011); myRandwick smartphone App; multi-lingual website; and yourSayRandwick.com.au for community consultation.</p> <p>Online Electronic Housing Code (EHC) was introduced in 2013 enabling property owners to check whether approvals for proposed residential work is required. The system also allows 'fast-track' complying development to be lodged and progress tracked online.</p> <p>Dashboard iPad Software delivers live information to better inform councillors and senior management.</p> <p>The review of the Comprehensive Development Control Plan (DCP) consolidated 29 existing DCPs and 9 policies into the one document, for easier and consistent guidance for applicants and the community.</p> <p>Background research statements on heritage items and conservation areas now on our website to assist home buyers/sellers or renovators.</p> <p>Online waste forms available to report a missed collection, illegal dumping, lost/stolen bin and graffiti; and request a bin upgrade, or a clean-up booking.</p> <p>Ability for ratepayers to update their personal details online.</p> <p>Online mapping services and interactive maps allows residents to access the latest updates on the Buildings for our Community Program, check wards and councillors and see their local waste collection timetable.</p> <p>A broader range of vehicles on offer, together with competitive employee contributions provides staff with choice of vehicle to best meet their individual needs and promotes Council as an Employer of Choice.</p>

Randwick City Council

Notes to the Financial Statements

for the financial year ended 30 June 2013

Note 16. Material Budget Variations

\$ '000

Council's Original Financial Budget for 12/13 was adopted by the Council on 25 June 2013.

While the Income Statement included in this General Purpose Financial Report must disclose the Original Budget adopted by Council, the Local Government Act requires Council to review its Financial Budget on a Quarterly Basis, so that it is able to manage the various variations between actuals versus budget that invariably occur throughout the year.

This Note sets out the details of MATERIAL VARIATIONS between Council's Original Budget and its Actual results for the year as per the Income Statement - even though such variations may have been adjusted for during each Quarterly Budget Review.

Note that for Variations* of Budget to Actual :

Material Variations represent those variances that amount to **10%** or more of the original budgeted figure.

F = Favourable Budget Variation, U = Unfavourable Budget Variation

\$ '000	2013 Budget	2013 Actual	2013 Variance*		
REVENUES					
Rates & Annual Charges	89,928	90,181	253	0%	F
User Charges & Fees	12,207	14,164	1,957	16%	F
Council received fees for restoration work to public roads that were undertaken in previous financial years (\$704k). These were in excess of what was budgeted for. The high volume of patrons at DRAC resulted in higher fees from the centre (\$230k). Fees received from Work Zones and Paid Parking was high for the financial year due to a corresponding high level of activity in these areas.					
Interest & Investment Revenue	2,255	3,552	1,297	58%	F
Council's cash reserves were high throughout the financial year due to large capital projects being completed late in the year or carry over into the 2013-14 year (\$923k). Council's investments were also yielding higher returns that were not originally budgeted for. In addition, Council also had investments that it had realised and unrealised gains on throughout the year (\$406K).					
Other Revenues	7,170	8,171	1,001	14%	F
Council's Health Building and Regulatory services activities received more revenue, through infringement notices, than originally budgeted for (\$705K). Council's property portfolio also yielded higher than anticipated returns for the financial year (\$146).					
Operating Grants & Contributions	5,981	7,836	1,855	31%	F
Council receives various grants through the financial year for which it had not originally budgeted for. They include: Waste and Sustainability Improvement Payment (\$856K); Ecological Footprint Project (\$228K). Council also receives contributions that fund additional operating expenditure that was not originally budgeted for. This includes: Disaster Recovery Contributions (\$226k); Insurance Incentive Schemes (\$142K) and Paid Parental Schemes (\$85K).					
Capital Grants & Contributions	3,058	6,177	3,119	102%	F
The level of additional Section 94 contributions that was received throughout the year was not anticipated in the original budget (\$1,743K). Council received grants for jointly funded road capital construction projects (\$394K) and Stormwater harvesting projects (\$332K).					
Net Gains from Disposal of Assets	1,633	-	(1,633)	(100%)	U
Council does not budget for the Net Loss or Gain made from disposal of its assets. These gain or losses result from a movement in their written down value which is a non-cash item. Council only budgets for the cash proceeds received from the sale of the asset.					

BUILDINGS FOR OUR COMMUNITY PROGRAM

Completed Projects since June 2010

Projects

South Maroubra ✓
Clovelly Surf Life Saving Club ✓
Maroubra Surf Club ✓
Coogee Surf Club ✓
SOS Preschool ✓
KU Child Care Centre ✓
Peter Pan Kindergarten ✓
Moverley Children's Centre ✓
Rainbow Street Childcare Centre ✓
Duffy's Corner Occasional Childcare ✓
Maroubra Senior Citizens Centre ✓
Clovelly Beach Inspectors Office ✓
Pioneers Park Amenities ✓

ORIGINAL ESTIMATES		
Total Project	Building Levy	Grant Funding
583,000	583,000	-
350,000	350,000	-
350,000	350,000	-
350,000	350,000	-
58,000	58,000	-
146,000	146,000	-
146,000	146,000	-
175,000	175,000	-
146,000	146,000	-
146,000	146,000	-
146,000	146,000	-
146,000	146,000	-
58,000	58,000	-
978,000	753,000	225,000
TOTAL	3,632,000	225,000

ACTUALS					
Total Project Cost	Building Levy	Grant Funding	Infrastructure Reserve	Environment Levy	General Revenue
1,479,896	576,896	658,000	245,000		
379,907	340,000	-	39,907		-
457,527	350,000		100,000		7,527
540,173	360,698	50,000	45,198		84,276
69,959	69,762	198			
192,735	192,735				
224,199	224,199				
85,445	85,445				
48,725	48,725				
98,003	98,003				
334,662	145,875		188,787		-
30,433	30,433				
1,247,810	752,715	150,650	178,897	39,645	125,904
TOTAL	5,189,474	858,847	797,790	39,645	217,708

NOTE:

1. Any savings generated from the BFOC projects are maintained in the Building Levy reserve and only utilised on other approved projects within the BFOC program.

2. BFOC Projects not listed above are those that have not been completed and their original estimates have not been finalised.

Randwick City Council

Proposed Building Program \$'000

2010-11 to 2012-13 (Years 1 to 3)

Total >>>

FULL PROJECT COSTS \$ '000				
TOTAL PROJECTS	Building Fund	Grants	s94	Council Reserves
\$9,275	\$9,050	\$225	-	-

YR 1 2010-11 Financial Year Building Program Forecast

					FULL PROJECT COSTS \$ '000				
	Building	Category	Project	Suburb	TOTAL PROJECT	Building Levy	Grants	s94	Council Reserves
Year 1 2010-11	South Maroubra Surf Club	Surf Club	Complete the structural repairs to the deteriorating exposed reinforced concrete beams, columns, slabs and other structural elements.	Maroubra	\$583	\$583	-	-	-
Year 1 2010-11	Clovelly Surf Club	Surf Club	Complete the structural repairs to the deteriorating exposed reinforced concrete beams, columns, slabs and other elements.	Clovelly	\$350	\$350	-	-	-
Year 1 2010-11	Maroubra Surf Club	Surf Club	Complete the structural repairs to the deteriorating exposed reinforced concrete beams, columns, slabs and other structural elements.	Maroubra	\$350	\$350	-	-	-
					\$1,283	\$1,283	-	-	-

YR 2 2011-12 Financial Year Building Program Forecast

					FULL PROJECT COSTS \$ '000				
	Building	Category	Project	Suburb	TOTAL PROJECT	Building Levy	Grants	s94	Council Reserves
Year 2 2011-12	Indoor Multi Purpose Fitness Facility at Des Renford Aquatic Centre	DRAC	Upgrade the Des Renford Aquatic Centre and build a new indoor fitness studio, multi-purpose room and creche (approx 350m2) to provide more health and fitness related programs for swim squads, fitness groups and other users. These improved facilities will generate additional income to improve the Centre's financial sustainability and help it become self sufficient.	Maroubra	\$2,707	\$2,707	-	-	-
Year 2 2011-12	Coogee Surf Club	Surf Club	Undertake structural repairs to the deteriorating exposed reinforced concrete beams, columns, slabs and other structural elements.	Coogee	\$350	\$350	-	-	-
Year 2 2011-12	SOS Preschool/Randwick/South Sydney Day Care	Childcare	Construct and install new awning to improve sun safety.	Randwick	\$58	\$58	-	-	-
					\$3,115	\$3,115	-	-	-

YR 3 2012-13 Financial Year Building Program Forecast

					FULL PROJECT COSTS \$ '000				
	Building	Category	Project	Suburb	TOTAL PROJECT	Building Levy	Grants	s94	Council Reserves
Year 3 2012-13	Nagle Park Dressing Room/Amenities	Amenities	Upgrade change rooms, shower areas, ventilation, graffiti prevention systems and security lighting.	Maroubra	\$175	\$175	-	-	-
Year 3 2012-13	Chifley Sports Reserve Amenities	Amenities	Construct a new multi-use amenities block and community facilities - including change rooms, toilets, club house, kiosk and viewing area. Council has recently taken over management of this reserve and is improving the amenities to facilitate use of fields.	Chifley	\$1,012	\$1,012	-	-	-
Year 3 2012-13	Coral Sea Amenities / Changeroom	Amenities	Upgrade the male and female change rooms, shower areas, toilets, kiosk, storage and security lighting.	Maroubra	\$350	\$350	-	-	-
Year 3 2012-13	Pioneers Park Amenities Buildings	Amenities	Construct new amenity building with toilets, showers and change rooms on the top field. Upgrade the bottom field change rooms, shower areas, toilets, kiosk and security lighting.	Malabar	\$978	\$753	\$225	-	-
Year 3 2012-13	Heffron Park Central Eastern Clubhouse and Amenities Building	Amenities	Construct large amenities building serving park users with toilets and multiple sporting groups with showers/toilets, change rooms, viewing areas, meeting rooms, storage and a kiosk. Each amenity block serves approx one third of Heffron Park or 15 hectares and over 40 sporting groups use the park.	Maroubra	\$700	\$700	-	-	-

					FULL PROJECT COSTS \$ '000				
	Building	Category	Project	Suburb	TOTAL PROJECT	Building Levy	Grants	s94	Council Reserves
Year 3 2012-13	Heffron Park Central Western Clubhouse and Amenities Building	Amenities	Construct large amenities building serving park users with toilets and multiple sporting groups with showers/toilets, change rooms, viewing areas, meeting rooms, storage and a kiosk. Each amenity block serves approx one third of Heffron Park or 15 hectares and over 40 sporting groups use the park.	Maroubra	\$700	\$700	-	-	-
Year 3 2012-13	Clovelly Beach Inspectors Office	Office	Upgrade the office, kitchen, shower/toilets and access controls.	Clovelly	\$58	\$58	-	-	-
Year 3 2012-13	KU Childcare Centre	Childcare	Upgrade the toilets, veranda, storage areas and undertake internal/external painting.	Randwick	\$146	\$146	-	-	-
Year 3 2012-13	Peter Pan Kindergarten	Childcare	Upgrade the kitchen, toilets, veranda and carryout internal/external painting.	Phillip Bay	\$146	\$146	-	-	-
Year 3 2012-13	Moverly Children's Centre	Childcare	Upgrade the kitchen, toilets and staff area and undertake internal/external painting.	Coogee	\$175	\$175	-	-	-
Year 3 2012-13	Maroubra Senior Citizens Centre	Senior Citizens Centre	Upgrade the kitchen, toilets and auditorium and undertake internal/external painting.	Maroubra	\$146	\$146	-	-	-

					FULL PROJECT COSTS \$ '000				
	Building	Category	Project	Suburb	TOTAL PROJECT	Building Levy	Grants	s94	Council Reserves
Year 3 2012-13	Rainbow Street Childcare Centre	Childcare	Upgrade the toilets, nappy change area, kitchen and shade structure and undertake internal/external painting.	Randwick	\$146	\$146	-	-	-
Year 3 2012-13	Duffy's Corner Occasional Childcare	Childcare	Undertake minor upgrade to kitchen and toilets, internal and external painting and replace the playground fence.	Maroubra	\$146	\$146	-	-	-
					\$4,877	\$4,652	\$225	-	-

SOUTHEAST

Super path to strong councils

Laura Suckling

NO FORCED AMALGAMATIONS: MINISTER STICKS TO PLEDGE

AN EASTERN suburbs-inner city super council is one step closer to reality, with the final report giving weight to the global city council model.

The Independent Local Government Review Panel released its final report on Wednesday, which stressed the need for council amalgamations. The \$1.8 million report proposes two options for mergers in eastern/inner Sydney, and in both cases Botany Council is absorbed by Sydney Council.

The preferred proposal is to create a "global city" that would see the eastern suburbs' four councils – Wool-

lahra, Waverley, Randwick and Botany Bay – swallowed up by Sydney.

The second is to extend Sydney's borders at Newtown and Paddington, to include Centennial Park, and south into Botany Bay.

Botany Bay Mayor Ben Keneally said the council remained firm in its stance against amalgamation.

"Based on an initial review of the report, there's nothing new here. Residents have made their views clear and I remain opposed to any amalgamation," he said.

A Botany Bay Council postal poll found 96.2 per

cent of respondents wanted the council to remain independent.

Panel chair Professor Graham Sansom said amalgamations must be considered to create stronger and more effective local government.

"This state simply does not have the financial and human resources to support 152 well-functioning councils," he said.

Randwick Greens Councillor Murray Matson said there was no valid financial reason why Randwick should be amalgamated "as we have been proven to be financially sustainable".

Randwick Mayor Scott Nash said the council was taking the time to review the report.

An amalgamation of Waverley, Woollahra, Randwick, Botany Bay and Sydney councils would have a projected population of 669,400 by 2031.

The report stated that if mergers were not pursued and the existing setup of councils was retained, the state could create sub-regional "joint organisations" that could share services, undertake joint planning and also engage with state agencies.

The report stated that amalgamated councils should have the option of establishing community boards.

Local Government Minister Don Page and Premier Barry O'Farrell have reinforced the government's election promise of "no forced amalgamations".

The panel also acknowledged the resistance to the prospect of mergers.

"Submissions to the panel indicate intense opposition to mergers," the report said.

Do you support a global city council? Email news@southern.courier.com.au

HAVE YOUR SAY

■ See the report and make a submission at dlg.nsw.gov.au. Submissions close on Friday, March 7.

■ Local Government NSW (LGNSW) is calling on NSW Premier Barry O'Farrell MP, to extend the consultation period until the end of April. President Keith Rhoades, said the majority of NSW councils did not have their first meeting for 2014 until February, leaving little time to properly consider and respond to the March 7 deadline. "The Minister's had the Review Panel's report for nearly three months; we've had it for three minutes," Cr Rhoades said.