

Author name: I. DOUGLAS

Date of submission: Thursday, 9 February 2023

Please provide any other comments on the council's application that you would like to make here.

I love and am proud to be a member of this community. I also like doing what I call "community service" ie actually improving things myself such as maintaining footpaths, parks and vacant lands in my vicinity. I do this for nothing but I see massive plusses for me (health and mental and physical) in demonstrating such pride. I focus on quality work - an issue foreign to council - sadly. Through an innovative QUALITY BASED approach council would get far more "bang for buck" to put it crudely. I have tried to join the Team several times but never even an interview. Fair enough - but I had and have a lot to contribute - even if I was unpaid I have many ideas for improving Council - but sadly opportunities keep being lost. And as for public safety and security measures such as fire risk - little or nothing is heard - all I can say is I am aware (13 years in bushfire service) but nothing from Council.

Question 1 (Criterion 1) - Has the council clearly established the need for, and purpose of a different revenue path for the council's General fund?

We have been swamped with "information" yet the fact remains the Council is failing on virtually all fronts - whether it be roads, water, maintenance generally, development and building approvals. Even the simplest and most basic maintenance items such as local roads have been a failure and locals have to adapt (on a daily basis) to further deterioration in these transport assets. There has been little or no evidence of any emphasis on quality of work completed - for example the "same old" problems recur daily. Admittedly the weather does not help but maintenance has been patchy and of very poor quality. We see plenty of trucks and plant driving around but little of any substance gets done and not on a sustainable basis. They simply threaten that if rate rises are not granted, then services will be further curtailed - nothing about examining the quality of work (rise in quality should obviate 'return calls' for the same problems to be fixed yet again).

Question 2 (Criterion 1) - Has the council canvassed alternatives to the rate rise?

No substantive alternatives are on offer except further cuts to services. There is no innovation in their simplistic approach. We need a quality philosophy and the entire team from roads to development needs to be re-invigorated with quality as a key and core goal - thus lessening the need for repeat attention to problems.

Question 1 (Criterion 2) - Did the council communicate the full cumulative increase of the proposed special variation in percentage terms? And the total increase in dollar terms for the average ratepayer by rating category?

Yes but the mass and detail and relevance/authenticity of such claims are difficult to test and there has been little or no public evidence of audit and INDEPENDENT review.

Question 2 (Criterion 2) - Has the council's community engagement strategy demonstrated an appropriate variety of engagement methods to ensure community awareness?

They have not been realistic and open to countenance local concerns. Our issues are so basic it is beyond comprehension that it has multiplied in "the obscurity of overwhelming complexity" beyond the interests or concerns of locals. There has been no focus on quality or alternative approaches to solving problems and ensuring maintenance and improvements have any degree of long term quality.

Question 3 (Criterion 2) - Please comment on the action taken by council in response to feedback from the community on the proposed special variation.

There is no limit to the volume of output concerning the rate rise claim generally. One must consider the costs of same - to the detriment of focus on simple but fundamentally vital issues particularly in quality - dependability and reliability. How can citizens hope to comprehend the sheer volume of paper output classed as "information" - again tying up Council staff in basically a marketing exercise way beyond the comprehension of many. WHERE is the audit on quality INDEPENDENTLY done for Council and dissemination to the community?

Question 1 (Criterion 3) - Please comment on the reasonableness of the impact on affected ratepayers of the proposed special variation.

A rise of 47% (way up from 26% as flagged last year!?) simply stuns residents - many of whom are seniors and the less well-off - this is not Mosman - we have a right to simplicity and quality of service. It is clearly a "massive wave" approach to be so simply ludicrous it must somehow be "right" given its impact - something like a severe storm as is becoming more common place - the hidden outcome being one of the populace becoming bamboozled.

Question 2 (Criterion 3) - Please comment on the council's consideration of the community's capacity and willingness to pay.

Very little or almost no social research has been done into this most important aspect. As Pensioners ourselves we are stunned by the lack of difference to "ordinary" working rates - I know I had to specially withdraw superannuation to pay rates this term. Yet I religiously pay on time or before time due.

Question 3 (Criterion 3) - In its application the council outlined how it intended to address hardship caused by the proposed

special variation. Please comment on the council's plan.

There is little or no ultimate saving for those in distress. As one having a daughter in such circumstances - yes there are payment plans and so on but the emphasis is on still meeting the rating demands.

Question 1 (Criterion 4) - Have the relevant IP&R documents in the council's application been exhibited, approved and adopted by the council before it applied to IPART for the proposed special variation?

yes but whether comprehensible by the populace is beyond surety. I am highly qualified with several degrees and higher degrees and professional memberships and assessing the mountain of "information" is bedazzling for me so I cannot imagine others more general having any benefit from trying to understand it

Question 1 (Criterion 5) - In its application the council is required to explain and quantify the productivity improvements and cost containment strategies the council has realised in past years and plans to realise over the proposed special variation period. Please comment on the council's response here.

this is very poor or non-existent. - I am not aware of or from any quality reviews undertaken let alone implemented. I applied to be on the Audit Committee as an independent part-time member - despite being highly qualified was not even considered. I despair at finding anything information on the LCC website re audit and quality improvement.

Author name: j. young

Date of submission: Thursday, 2 March 2023

Please provide any other comments on the council's application that you would like to make here.

The community engagement meant nothing to council they had an agenda they wanted to push and what we said didn't mean a thing. They got a vote on the 2 options and 90% don't want the increase, council have badly mismanaged our money for a lot of years and asking for more wont fix this, they need to be audited and an investigation into their fund management. they simply aren't capable of managing the council anymore.

Question 1 (Criterion 1) - Has the council clearly established the need for, and purpose of a different revenue path for the council's General fund?

Not particularly

Question 2 (Criterion 1) - Has the council canvassed alternatives to the rate rise?

No, 1 option is continue same substandard services or increase 47 percent

Question 1 (Criterion 2) - Did the council communicate the full cumulative increase of the proposed special variation in percentage terms? And the total increase in dollar terms for the average ratepayer by rating category?

only for the average no personal increase amount sent.

Question 2 (Criterion 2) - Has the council's community engagement strategy demonstrated an appropriate variety of engagement methods to ensure community awareness?

No, a survey of people for and against which resulted in a majority no but still looking to increase.

Question 3 (Criterion 2) - Please comment on the action taken by council in response to feedback from the community on the proposed special variation.

No interest in the communities opinion, just interested in increasing the rates, with inflation this is unaffordable for a lot of people.

Question 1 (Criterion 3) - Please comment on the reasonableness of the impact on affected ratepayers of the proposed special variation.

There is no reasonableness to this, its a huge increase. Council just released a statement regarding them effectively about to gain 14million from a 1.5million investment so why do we need an increase.

Question 2 (Criterion 3) - Please comment on the council's consideration of the community's capacity and willingness to pay.

No consideration, and im sure with the increase they will just have increased debts.

Question 3 (Criterion 3) - In its application the council outlined how it intended to address hardship caused by the proposed special variation. Please comment on the council's plan.

did not see one, although there was a huge increase in pensioner discounts of \$300 which is both fair but insulting to the rate payers who are asked to pay full expense

Question 1 (Criterion 4) - Have the relevant IP&R documents in the council's application been exhibited, approved and adopted by the council before it applied to IPART for the proposed special variation?

they posted once on social media

Question 1 (Criterion 5) - In its application the council is required to explain and quantify the productivity improvements and cost containment strategies the council has realised in past years and plans to realise over the proposed special variation period. Please comment on the council's response here.

the response is for the maintenance of roads and services.

Author name: P. Haley

Date of submission: Thursday, 16 February 2023

Please provide any other comments on the council's application that you would like to make here.

I am very much of the opinion that the management of Lithgow Council by way of their executive team and councillors has failed sufficiently to warrant the appointment of a Administrator and I humbly request that your review of the Council SRV application future management that will enable development of a satisfactory financial situation where shock special levy increase are not required to maintain services.

Question 1 (Criterion 1) - Has the council clearly established the need for, and purpose of a different revenue path for the council's General fund?

Srv council advise 34.3% increase plus 3.7% rate peg 23/24 only in percentage terms mentioned 85% of residents advise Srv 42% advising of the option to increase rates and maintain service with 58% or the majority advising of their preferences to move a nominal 3.7% rate peg 23/24 this could run into 47%.

Question 2 (Criterion 1) - Has the council canvassed alternatives to the rate rise?

Not aware of any alteration to this. No Council communication at this stage.

Question 1 (Criterion 2) - Did the council communicate the full cumulative increase of the proposed special variation in percentage terms? And the total increase in dollar terms for the average ratepayer by rating category?

Only in percentage terms and no real dollar term one councillor came up two cups of coffee a day.

Question 2 (Criterion 2) - Has the council's community engagement strategy demonstrated an appropriate variety of engagement methods to ensure community awareness?

No strategy or any other methods to ensure community awareness, Councillors are expected to represent the view of the community why did council accepted no1 42% listing and the community voted for no2 58% listing

Question 3 (Criterion 2) - Please comment on the action taken by council in response to feedback from the community on the proposed special variation.

I wish to record my displeasure at the council decision and request your thorough and earnest review of the applicator be lodged with your tribunal under Section 508 (2) of the NSW Local Government Act for a special Rate variation (SRV) in 23/24.

Question 1 (Criterion 3) - Please comment on the reasonableness of the impact on affected ratepayers of the proposed special variation.

The Financial, social welfare sensitivity of our Local Government area given the closure and unknown future of power generation, reduction in the major industry of coal extraction the difficulties our youth population and on employment opportunities . The financial pressure already felt by home owners, recent interest rates along with pensioners within the community and stress of large levy increase.

Question 2 (Criterion 3) - Please comment on the council's consideration of the community's capacity and willingness to pay.

The financial burden felt by home owners and businesses owners the community will not be able to cope with a rise to what the council proposal.

Question 3 (Criterion 3) - In its application the council outlined how it intended to address hardship caused by the proposed special variation. Please comment on the council's plan.

Srv A improve financial sustainability B Maintaining existing services C Reducing infrastructure backlog for assets maintenance and renewal.

Question 1 (Criterion 4) - Have the relevant IP&R documents in the council's application been exhibited, approved and adopted by the council before it applied to IPART for the proposed special variation?

Not aware unless you are on social media (hard for pensioners) newspaper supplied one day a week.

Question 1 (Criterion 5) - In its application the council is required to explain and quantify the productivity improvements and cost containment strategies the council has realised in past years and plans to realise over the proposed special variation period. Please comment on the council's response here.

Concern the council is like kindergarten unable to conduct monthly meetings in a proper manner Councillors should attend development induction program ongoing professional development and consultation with the community The voting system should be changed to first-past the post get rid of the ward system some councillors are in the council on two votes.

Author name: Name suppressed

Date of submission: Thursday, 2 March 2023

Please provide any other comments on the council's application that you would like to make here.

The supposed poor financial state that the Lithgow council and hence community now find themselves in, if true, has been caused by neglect in financial management and oversight by the current elected council. Nowhere during the SRV consultation process has any councillor apologised for their neglect of duties in regularly examining the state of council's finances before this mess occurred. Instead, the community have been regularly led to believe that all was running smoothly.

Question 1 (Criterion 1) - Has the council clearly established the need for, and purpose of a different revenue path for the council's General fund?

Need - whilst council's current Long Term Financial Plan (LTFP) suggests a shortfall in funds, the LTFP they prepared in 20/21, only 2 years ago, indicated improving finances - a 5.0% shortfall in 22/23 reducing to 2.9% in 26/27. Indeed Council's ARV application for 22/23 (made in June 22) showed the same improving state of their finances. Council haven't made it clear why their finances have taken a sudden turn for the worse. Council also applied for a SRV in 19/20 which was to improve the long-term viability of their funding - this was approved, and again council hasn't made it clear why these extra funds weren't sufficient or successful as they had indicated. If approved the 23/24 SRV will result in a massive growth of council's equity (over \$20M) - is this what an SRV is for? Council is basing their SRV on one very small study. If the need were so great it should be obvious without a study. The OLG needs to undertake their own review of Lithgow Council's finances.

Question 2 (Criterion 1) - Has the council canvassed alternatives to the rate rise?

Resourcing alternatives - council also proposed reducing the services and infrastructure maintenance - this was supported by 74% of the local community rather than the rate increase. Since putting in their submission council have received 2 additional government grants for road maintenance and improvement of \$1.7M and \$2.3M respectively. Road maintenance was the key issue council raised in their SRV application and communications with the community. By Council's own admission in their LTFP, they have a strong balance sheet with \$18.8M in cash and investments Council didn't but could have suggested drawing down on these funds as an alternative. Council has estimated that the local population will increase by 5000 people over the next 20 years, yet they have not included the increased rates coming from this higher population in their modelling.

Question 1 (Criterion 2) - Did the council communicate the full cumulative increase of the proposed special variation in percentage terms? And the total increase in dollar terms for the average ratepayer by rating category?

No - council only provided the typical rate increase (27.7%) on a very low land value property. Using council's own rate calculator, my rates will increase by 67% or over \$1000 per annum. My property is a typical rural residential subdivision with land values similar to other subdivisions recently developed in Lithgow. There will be hundreds of other properties in a similar position. Council have advised that the 27.7% residential rate limit won't apply to individual properties hence why many are going above this percentage.

Question 2 (Criterion 2) - Has the council's community engagement strategy demonstrated an appropriate variety of engagement methods to ensure community awareness?

Question 3 (Criterion 2) - Please comment on the action taken by council in response to feedback from the community on the proposed special variation.

Council surveyed the community as to their desire to increase rates or have services reduced. 74% of the community supported a reduction in services and were against the rise in rates. (via council's written and website questionnaire) 58% of the community supported a reduction in services and were against the rise in rates. (via telephone survey) Council have ignored that feedback.

Question 1 (Criterion 3) - Please comment on the reasonableness of the impact on affected ratepayers of the proposed special variation.

Council have not made transparent the extent of the rate increase, and if known, a greater proportion (higher than the current 74%) of the community may well have not supported the increase.

Question 2 (Criterion 3) - Please comment on the council's consideration of the community's capacity and willingness to pay.

Question 3 (Criterion 3) - In its application the council outlined how it intended to address hardship caused by the proposed special variation. Please comment on the council's plan.

As the rate increase is far greater than that advised by council, they have not provided any indication how they will support anyone other than a \$50 per annum subsidy to pensioners.

Question 1 (Criterion 4) - Have the relevant IP&R documents in the council's application been exhibited, approved and adopted by the council before it applied to IPART for the proposed special variation?

It should be noted that whilst council has made their submission available to the community including their website, they have

hidden from the community the opportunity to make submissions to IPART. One can only suspect that this has been done deliberately.

Question 1 (Criterion 5) - In its application the council is required to explain and quantify the productivity improvements and cost containment strategies the council has realised in past years and plans to realise over the proposed special variation period. Please comment on the council's response here.

Council hasn't made it clear to ratepayers as to what they are doing in this regard.

Author name: Name suppressed

Date of submission: Friday, 10 February 2023

Please provide any other comments on the council's application that you would like to make here.

Question 1 (Criterion 1) - Has the council clearly established the need for, and purpose of a different revenue path for the council's General fund?

The council has been awarded a lot of funds from federal government since the black summer fires some for repairs after fires and then more after the floods

Question 2 (Criterion 1) - Has the council canvassed alternatives to the rate rise?

Council asked rate payers to do a survey if we want a rate rise or reduced services the community mostly voted for reduced services then council decided to go ahead to ask for a 47.9 percent rise in rates

Question 1 (Criterion 2) - Did the council communicate the full cumulative increase of the proposed special variation in percentage terms? And the total increase in dollar terms for the average ratepayer by rating category?

We have been told 47.9 percent im unaware of the total cost in dollars

Question 2 (Criterion 2) - Has the council's community engagement strategy demonstrated an appropriate variety of engagement methods to ensure community awareness?

Council community engagement was a postal survey and a Facebook survey

Question 3 (Criterion 2) - Please comment on the action taken by council in response to feedback from the community on the proposed special variation.

Council ignored the community who mostly voted for a reduction in services

Question 1 (Criterion 3) - Please comment on the reasonableness of the impact on affected ratepayers of the proposed special variation.

This rate rise will have a massive impact on the community as a lot of aged residents who only have a fixed income of aged pensioner also a lot of disabled residents like myself who moved here for cheaper housing and dont have the capacity to pay more even families with two working parents are struggling with interest rate hikes this will be just another stress on top I fear if this rate hike comes in people will be skipping meals to pay rates

Question 2 (Criterion 3) - Please comment on the council's consideration of the community's capacity and willingness to pay. There has been no consideration at all our council seem to know better than the community when council has been asked questions barely a response

Question 3 (Criterion 3) - In its application the council outlined how it intended to address hardship caused by the proposed special variation. Please comment on the council's plan.

I heard of no plan as it is I pay 95 dollars a fortnight for rates on a house worth a third of my last house in Sydney that only cost me 60 dollars a fortnight in rates

Question 1 (Criterion 4) - Have the relevant IP&R documents in the council's application been exhibited, approved and adopted by the council before it applied to IPART for the proposed special variation?

Yes I think so as Im disabled I didnt have the opportunity to go look

Question 1 (Criterion 5) - In its application the council is required to explain and quantify the productivity improvements and cost containment strategies the council has realised in past years and plans to realise over the proposed special variation period. Please comment on the council's response here.

Im unsure of response

Author name: Name suppressed

Date of submission: Saturday, 11 February 2023

Please provide any other comments on the council's application that you would like to make here.
I cannot afford this, and I get nothing out of my council's rates as it is.

Question 1 (Criterion 1) - Has the council clearly established the need for, and purpose of a different revenue path for the council's General fund?

No

Question 2 (Criterion 1) - Has the council canvassed alternatives to the rate rise?

No

Question 1 (Criterion 2) - Did the council communicate the full cumulative increase of the proposed special variation in percentage terms? And the total increase in dollar terms for the average ratepayer by rating category?

No

Question 2 (Criterion 2) - Has the council's community engagement strategy demonstrated an appropriate variety of engagement methods to ensure community awareness?

Question 3 (Criterion 2) - Please comment on the action taken by council in response to feedback from the community on the proposed special variation.

Question 1 (Criterion 3) - Please comment on the reasonableness of the impact on affected ratepayers of the proposed special variation.

I am a single person with a mortgage, and this increase to my rates will all but prevent me from continuing to own a home in my hometown. I simply cannot afford such a large increase.

Question 2 (Criterion 3) - Please comment on the council's consideration of the community's capacity and willingness to pay. They haven't considered our opinion. A majority of home owners do not want this.

Question 3 (Criterion 3) - In its application the council outlined how it intended to address hardship caused by the proposed special variation. Please comment on the council's plan.

No it hasn't.

Question 1 (Criterion 4) - Have the relevant IP&R documents in the council's application been exhibited, approved and adopted by the council before it applied to IPART for the proposed special variation?

Not sure.

Question 1 (Criterion 5) - In its application the council is required to explain and quantify the productivity improvements and cost containment strategies the council has realised in past years and plans to realise over the proposed special variation period. Please comment on the council's response here.

There needs to be an investigation into abuse of funds for prior councils

Author name: Name suppressed

Date of submission: Monday, 20 February 2023

Please provide any other comments on the council's application that you would like to make here.

Whilst cost of living pressures was the most commonly cited reason for supporting Option 2 (114 submissions) poor management/lack of trust in council was not far behind (94). Council has clearly demonstrated their inability to manage their budget during a time of rapidly escalating property values, running persistent operating deficits. It is the same leadership in place that has presided over the ever widening deficit and there is no reason to believe their stewardship will improve with a ratepayer funded bail out. Administration or merger with a more efficient LGA should be a pre-condition to any consideration of granting such a rate rise.

Question 1 (Criterion 1) - Has the council clearly established the need for, and purpose of a different revenue path for the council's General fund?

Question 2 (Criterion 1) - Has the council canvassed alternatives to the rate rise?

Lithgow Council recently carried out a survey of ratepayers to gauge community appetite for either a hefty rate increase to maintain services, (Option 1), or reducing service levels to a sustainable level. (Option 2). The survey was poorly designed in presenting the options as completely binary, with no hybrid option presented, with no details of potential savings that could be achieved by scaling back part of the various programs. It was a simple "give us the money or wait to see what we will cut and by how much". Council cannot therefore claim to have canvassed alternatives to the rise. Source Micromex report

Question 1 (Criterion 2) - Did the council communicate the full cumulative increase of the proposed special variation in percentage terms? And the total increase in dollar terms for the average ratepayer by rating category?

Question 2 (Criterion 2) - Has the council's community engagement strategy demonstrated an appropriate variety of engagement methods to ensure community awareness?

Question 3 (Criterion 2) - Please comment on the action taken by council in response to feedback from the community on the proposed special variation.

Council has completely ignored the feedback from the survey. Despite the limitations, of the 762 submissions lodged, only 189 supported maintaining council services. Just over 75% of submissions were in favour of Option 2, reducing service levels. Notwithstanding the community's overwhelming rejection of Option 1, Council has announced they are applying to IPART for approval of a Special Rate Variation. Reasons cited are that 80% of respondents to a telesurvey want better roads (they do, but they absolutely made clear they do not want a 40% plus hike in their rates) and that 49% of those asked were somewhat satisfied with council (so they couldn't even muster a majority on the weakest level of support! Source Micromex Report

Question 1 (Criterion 3) - Please comment on the reasonableness of the impact on affected ratepayers of the proposed special variation.

Residential ratepayers have already incurred substantial rate hikes as a result of the Valuer General's triennial valuations. My own valuation increased by 66% last year.

Question 2 (Criterion 3) - Please comment on the council's consideration of the community's capacity and willingness to pay. The Micromex report noted that cost of living pressures was the most commonly cited reason for supporting Option 2 (114 submissions).

Question 3 (Criterion 3) - In its application the council outlined how it intended to address hardship caused by the proposed special variation. Please comment on the council's plan.

Question 1 (Criterion 4) - Have the relevant IP&R documents in the council's application been exhibited, approved and adopted by the council before it applied to IPART for the proposed special variation?

Question 1 (Criterion 5) - In its application the council is required to explain and quantify the productivity improvements and cost containment strategies the council has realised in past years and plans to realise over the proposed special variation period. Please comment on the council's response here.

Author name: Name suppressed

Date of submission: Monday, 20 February 2023

Please provide any other comments on the council's application that you would like to make here.

Over successive years, Lithgow Council has demonstrated their inability to manage their budget, to deliver on commitments made to rate payers and to deal fairly and equitably with the community. Until an administrator can be appointed, this Council does not deserve additional ratepayer funding.

Question 1 (Criterion 1) - Has the council clearly established the need for, and purpose of a different revenue path for the council's General fund?

No. We are rural landowners in Lithgow Council and our needs are largely ignored by Council. We pay the same rates as city dwellers but do not receive any of the services that you have mentioned water supply, sewerage services, domestic waste or stormwater management. We are very unhappy with the lack of progress Council is making in repairing roads in our area - even though federal funds were received for this. So, we are the wrong people to be asking about why Council should have access to a different revenue path - they do not properly administer what they already have to meet the needs of the Community.

Question 2 (Criterion 1) - Has the council canvassed alternatives to the rate rise?

No. They are unable to demonstrate productivity strategies or the ability to better manage the funds that they have.

Question 1 (Criterion 2) - Did the council communicate the full cumulative increase of the proposed special variation in percentage terms? And the total increase in dollar terms for the average ratepayer by rating category?

Yes.

Question 2 (Criterion 2) - Has the council's community engagement strategy demonstrated an appropriate variety of engagement methods to ensure community awareness?

Lithgow carried out a survey of ratepayers to gauge community appetite for either a hefty rate increase or reduced services. The survey was poorly designed in presenting the options as binary only, there was no hybrid option. Of the 762 submissions lodged, only 25% supported maintaining council services. Just over 75% of submissions were in favour of option 2, reducing services largely due to cost of living pressures.

Question 3 (Criterion 2) - Please comment on the action taken by council in response to feedback from the community on the proposed special variation.

Despite the communities' overwhelming rejection of Option 1 (increasing rates) the Council has announced that they intend to apply to IPART for the approval of a special rate variation, - their reasons cited as rate payers wanting better roads and 49% of respondents being somewhat satisfied. SO, it would appear that this survey is just window-dressing - it does. Not seem to matter what the community view is Lithgow Council had always intended to look for a Special Rate Variation.

Question 1 (Criterion 3) - Please comment on the reasonableness of the impact on affected ratepayers of the proposed special variation.

Lithgow council rate payers are amongst some of the poorest in the state of NSW with little ability to manage this type of increase. Rate rises are not being offset by salary increases - not existent for most people for years now.

Question 2 (Criterion 3) - Please comment on the council's consideration of the community's capacity and willingness to pay.

I don't think that this has been addressed at all by Council.

Question 3 (Criterion 3) - In its application the council outlined how it intended to address hardship caused by the proposed special variation. Please comment on the council's plan.

No plan.

Question 1 (Criterion 4) - Have the relevant IP&R documents in the council's application been exhibited, approved and adopted by the council before it applied to IPART for the proposed special variation?

Don't know.

Question 1 (Criterion 5) - In its application the council is required to explain and quantify the productivity improvements and cost containment strategies the council has realised in past years and plans to realise over the proposed special variation period. Please comment on the council's response here.

Have not seen one. Lithgow can't explain their deficit or plans to improve their cash management and project completion costs.