Author name: Name suppressed

Date of submission: Monday, 28 February 2022

Your submission for this review:

Please see attached file

Your comments on Criterion 1:

Regarding need/desire for service levels/projects and limited council resourcing alternatives. The survey that the council instigated and foisted onto a handpicked sample group and where they were only given two choices:- rate hikes or service cuts, REJECTED THE HIKE CHOICE. And this was by a very large margin.

Your comments on Criterion 2:

Sport groups that use council facilities were warned that if the increase is not approved then council may be forced to close some of these facilities. This borders on

Your comments on Criterion 3:

15% is a very substantial increase compounded over the 7 years that the council is seeking. Wages have been stagnant over a decade but the cost of living has risen in that time. A trip to the supermarket reflects that. Once the fuel dockets meant something and necessitated a spend of \$30. These days a weekly spend of \$120 is not out of place and its only for basic food. Imposing a 15% rise means prioritizing ones spending for the extra money that has to go on rates.

Your comments on Criterion 4:

Your comments on Criterion 5:

There has been no productivity improvements. No effort appears to have been made to streamline the workforce. A recent example of the repair of one road pothole where eight (8) workers turned up with their trucks and a roller. It shows that the middle management has not sat down and worked out a work schedule and the number of personnel required for each job. Services have already been cut and the Administrator is foreshadowing further cuts should the proposed increase be not approved. The new CEO has settled and is fitting in well with the councils lack of productivity. Its been 10 months and he still does not appear to have gone through the council hierarchy and determined whether they are productive. Two LTEs left just before last Christmas but no reason was given. The most productive part about the Administrator and the CEO has been the enthusiasm with which they embraced a future proposed rate increase. They even hiree consultants to prepare the submission. It appears that the current personnel is incapable or incompetent to prepare a submission.

The money currently being collected, \$110M from rates over 10 yrs is \$11M per year, !5% rate hike rises \$26M per year. The Administrator has not been able to explain where the other \$15M is being utilized.

The following I have copied from a post on FB and am providing it just in case the poster does not submit an objecton of rate rise to IPART.

In summary there has been no noticeable productivity. We have potholes galore on the local roads, mowing is still being done on weekends which, I'm sure, is at a higher rate, there is a lot of projects forecast and all have top priority, an unrealistic expectation.

The staff reductions occurred in areas where it should not have been. As an example those dealing with DA have been reduced to one. This is one area where the Council makes money.

The former Administrator, Mr Presson, stated in a letter to you that in his experience, increases in rates are soon forgotten by ratepayers. It could be the case if it was a one off but this is not in this situation. We have already experienced a massive 42% harmonization increase which will be followed by another two years at 15% and it's all compounded. Quite a few of the ratepayers, including myself, have had to prioritize our spending and, in some cases, go without.

It is insane of the current Administrator to think that the ratepayers can be slugged for a further 7 years at 15%. Unfortunately, he and the LTE, at salaries above \$300000 a year, do not experience the hardships that a fair portion of ratepayers are experiencing due to these large increases.

I totally oppose the continuation of a 15% increase for a further 7 years and I appeal to IPART to stand firm by their initial decision and reject Council's application for this increase.