

No.	First Name	Last Name	Reference	Special Variation Criteria - Your comments on Criterion 1:	Your comments on Criterion 2:	Your comments on Criterion 3:	Your comments on Criterion 4:	Your comments on Criterion 5:	Any additional comments	Attachments	
1	Eryn	Kelly	W22/169						Do not agree with Administrator Rik Hart's request to maintain the rate increase. This Council needs an overhaul and us members of the community need a say. The 3 minutes during an open forum is not enough. At this point in time it is our only means of getting our concerns heard. The Administration is NOT working and so many in our community cannot afford the rate increase. As I live in the old Gosford Shire, my rates went up 40% with the harmonisation and rate increase. All of this needs to be considered by IPART, along with the current mismanagement of past councils and current Administration.	No	
2	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W22/170	We need better services. I come from Wyong and we had no rate rise. I am happy to maintain the rates we have now or even pay a little more. Our rates are cheaper than other local areas anyway.	I am aware, since amalgamation Gosford has paid less rates than wyong but all the money has gone to Gosford as their assets were so bad. Council needs Gosford to pay what wyong has for years and we won't have this problem.	Even with the increase we are less rates than most council's in our area by some way.	I have seen what they have put up for the changes and I am happy.	I have seen their savings to date. I just want good services that are reasonable price. Without this increase there will be little services.	The rates should be equal to places like Lake Macquarie that is our neighbor and gets more money to spend on services. I spent more on my Foster than rates and most people spend more on smokes and beer. Give them what they need to give us a great place to live.	No	
3	STEPHEN	NORRIS	W22/172	Ratepayers should not pay for Council's mismanagement. Residents have paid a fair share and Council has mismanaged it. Council should be tasked with developing an operational plan that will enable it to generate sufficient revenue from sources other than residents. We should not pay extra because they mismanaged the funds we provided. The State Government should increase funding to local government and ensure the third tier of government can operate effectively as its their responsibility under the Act.	The community is aware that Council mismanaged the funds it provided through rates over many years to the point it became insolvent. Council has provided no evidence to demonstrate why residents should effectively pay double because of Council's mismanagement. Residents are not a bank that you can keep going back to and taking more and more funds off after you waste the funds they have provided you. A bank has more power than residents - it has a decision in whether it provides you funds. Council goes to IPART who considers the feedback from residents but residents have no decision making power in whether they provide the funds to council.	Effectively doubling rates over 10 years at a level above inflation is not reasonable or affordable for ratepayers. Council should be tasked with developing an operational plan that will enable it to generate sufficient revenue from sources other than residents. Residents are happy to pay their fair share, and have been doing so for decades. Council has mismanaged these funds and now residents are being financially punished. Again, residents have no way of taking action to demonstrate their disapproval of this approach as Council is currently run by a State Government appointed administrator and not elected representatives.	Displaying a document is not justification for a rates increase.	The Administrator claimed the raising of rates by 15 per cent over three years would address the financial issues that got Council into the position it found itself in. Now they are claiming they need to increase them a more than 100% over seven years to address the original financial issues. The Administrator has clearly failed to deliver 'productivity improvements and effective' cost containment strategies' and the request for exorbitant rates increases clearly demonstrate that they have failed a financial manager and should not be trusted with any additional ratepayer funds.		No	
4	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W22/174	Does the community need an airport? I think not. Perhaps ask if community what the rate payers need?	Transparency at all costs.	Most of the population on the central coast would be affected by these increases as cost of living has out shone the CPI		Well they should be transparent and delivered to each rate payer explaining the costs with a longer cooling off time so as to receive ratepayers feedback before submission with the results been made available to IPART with the submission.		No	
5	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W22/175						The staff do the work yet the hierarchy get the big dollars and free cars (which includes Rego, Green Slip, Roadside service and insurance. The majority of these overpaid morons also charge Council for private use petrol. EVERYONE should find their own way to and from work and a car pool established. These measures would save money to either pay off their debt or be used for the services that were non existent even before the debt was finally recognised. What were the Auditors paid for?	No	
6	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W22/176	This Council got into enormous debt without any explanation as to how this occurred. Their only solution is to raise rates and sell off assets. What about looking inwards at staff levels and workload wages and conditions. I cannot count how many times I have come across council workers doing very little outdoors and in the offices.	The community has not been satisfactorily informed of the need other than the Council got into massive debt but with no explanation of how this happened. Their accounting procedures also have much to be desired.	The impact on ratepayers who have had no significant increase in their remuneration and on pensioners at a time of increasing inflation will definitely not be reasonable.	I have never had any of the communications the Council claims to have sent to ratepayers. I have not seen the IP&R documents. The Council has closed the Gosford Chambers.	The Council is irresponsible. ██████████ and even resorts to ██████████ I am totally unimpressed with their performance.	ipart needs to reject this application until the ratepayers are completely satisfied that further rate rises are absolutely warranted.	No	
7	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W22/177	Our request to Council is that they maintain, upgrade, make safe existing infrastructure as required and ensure that the area is well maintained by way of mowing, weeding and trimming. We dont need new rubbish bins, we need the potholes filled, roads swept etc.	Council has allowed public viewing and comment throughout the Christmas/School Holiday period when most locals are away enjoying a break. I wasn't hand picked for a survey like some residents and sporting organisations who were ██████████ into supporting the SVR or potentially lose sporting fields, amenities etc.	This SVR and the proposed Water rate increase will have immediate impact upon my family and our budget. Ongoing increases will hurt and why, due to the mismanagement of the organisation	Council adopted the proposal to seek the SVR - please, it was the administrator and not the Council. We haven't had voice on Council for some time. The administrator said he had spoken to a handful of people when at the meetings but this doesn't represent the entire communities views.	Council understanding of productivity improvements is nil. Slashing the workforce and the works to be completed is not a productivity improvement. And as for costs, they could start by looking at the income of the CEO and Directors.	I was supportive of the original increase in rates but not this SVR increase. Impacts to my family by way of increased rates, services not being provided only leads me to believe that this Councils only way of thinking of improving things is raise rates. The organisation is too heavy, outdated by management and needs to move into the 21st century.	No	
8	Bryan	Smith	W22/178	I disagree with the increase/extension of already applied rate rises increasingly disgusted. They need to stop wasting money. Should be in jail for their abuse of ratepayers funds. We're more like ratepayers to them. It's disgusting. No to increase extension of increase rates	I disagree with the increase/extension of already applied rate rises increasingly disgusted. They need to stop wasting money. Should be in jail for their abuse of ratepayers funds. We're more like ratepayers to them. It's disgusting. No to increase extension of increase rates	I disagree with the increase/extension of already applied rate rises increasingly disgusted. They need to stop wasting money. Should be in jail for their abuse of ratepayers funds. We're more like ratepayers to them. It's disgusting. No to increase extension of increase rates	I disagree with the increase/extension of already applied rate rises increasingly disgusted. They need to stop wasting money. Should be in jail for their abuse of ratepayers funds. We're more like ratepayers to them. It's disgusting. No to increase extension of increase rates	I disagree with the increase/extension of already applied rate rises increasingly disgusted. They need to stop wasting money. Should be in jail for their abuse of ratepayers funds. We're more like ratepayers to them. It's disgusting. No to increase extension of increase rates	I disagree with the increase/extension of already applied rate rises increasingly disgusted. They need to stop wasting money. Should be in jail for their abuse of ratepayers funds. We're more like ratepayers to them. It's disgusting. No to increase extension of increase rates	No	
9	Glen	Manning	W22/179	Due to the mismanagement of the council, I feel there is a higher need to discover the whereabouts of the lost/misappropriated money before putting up rates. By allowing a special increase, it will only give the impression that it's OK to lose \$600,000,000.00.	There is no need for a rate rise above the minimum amount as upon finding the lost/misappropriated money, the council will be in the black again. A full financial forensic examination of all councilors and administration is required.	It is totally unreasonable. Many rate payers are pensioners or self funded retirees, with a fixed income and no means by which to increase income. This additional burden, due to council mismanagement, should be borne by the council not the ratepayers. Other means of cutting costs must be determined. Wage reductions, staff reductions. AND NO MORE USE OF CONSULTANTS. If we do not have the necessary competency to do the job, terminate them, and get more competent persons.	There should be no additional submission.	The only improvement required is a reduction in council spending and a very strict curtailment of any increases in pay or benefits. Stop the use of consultants, if we do not have competent personnel on the council, terminate them and get some competent people.	The reason the CCC wants to increase rates is because they lost/lose or mismanaged council funds to a huge and unreasonable amount. Punishing the ratepayers for this mismanagement without strict and enforceable punishment of the council and it's administration is sending the wrong message. What it's saying is that it's OK to mismanage/lose or misappropriated council funds. WHICH IS THE WRONG MESSAGE.	No	
10	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W22/180						The consolidation and most recent special variation has seen my residential land rates increase by 45.5%, from \$1,515.94 for the period 1 July 2020 to 30 June 2021 to \$2,205.38. and i over the last 12 months I have seen services decrease, in particular maintenance of public parks, reserves and local roads on the Woy Woy peninsula in the poorest condition they have ever been severely potholed and many requiring replacement. The waterfront reserve in Blackwall has been getting maintained by locals that live there , many of whom are in their 70's and 80's. Central Coast Council has become a dictatorship since the Administrator and Council management team in my view, with ratepayers being treated with disdain. I also note recent property valuations completed by the Valuer Generals Office has seen local properties LUCV values rise , in my case I have seen a rise of 55% which in the not to distant future will see me paying an extraordinary rise in base rates should the current rate calculation method continue to be used. I strongly oppose Central Coast Councils application to extend the period of the rate temporary rate increase, just as it did the initial rise of 15% on top of the equalisation that was imposed on those in the old Gosford Council area. Greg Thompson Owner: 10 Plane St Blackwall 2256	No	
11	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W22/181	The council has not clearly articulated the need beyond what was originally allowed for in three years. They have not changed the culture of the establishment, are not transparent in their spending culture, have less public meetings and less availability to liaise with council. The ratepayers have not seen any improvement since they have been granted the last rise for three years, other than hiring of more staff. The community is desiring parkland, roadways maintained and roads repaired. Very little of this is occurring and our areas are looking shabby. Why should the rate payers be asked for a future rise when the current one given has not produced anything positive for the community.	We have not been given any notification of proposed \$ value to our rates for the seven years. Council has a history of covering up and maintains secretary on rate rises to avoid back lash from the community.	Rate payers will not have expected wage rises to cover costs of proposed rise for seven years and this will impact seriously on financial viability of households, and rents for tenants. Also with other rising inflation cost and fuel cost families will struggle to meet commitments.	Council has not provided transparent communication to ratepayers.	The council has focussed on two methods for repairing the problems encountered with funding Sell assets Raise rates The council should focus on real cultural change within administration, prove that this has occurred. Be transparent in its actions. Have a greater number of council meetings to show that they are performing their duties with due care for the community and the responsibility to the rate payers that the council must now incur. The council has not improved its reputation under the current administrator and this needs to be addressed as well as the path forward.		No	
12	Elie	Allen	W22/182	I'm sorry but I do not understand the need to raise it higher when infact it's just happened and the misappropriated funds of \$60million has still not been explained or found, they sold off land at bargain rates and infact the land they sold was also resold at a profit of many millions in a space of 3 months. They waste money yet they do not look after what they are supposed to do instead they concentrate on giving free lessons on canoeing / food festivals and redoing walkways that is not	I'm aware but I disapprove.		I cannot and have not seen them			No	
13	Kay	Hunt	W22/183	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	No	
14	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W22/184	I am not aware of transparent community consultation taking place. ██████████ held meetings with individual ratepayers, 300 odd, and there are many more ratepayers that haven't heard anything from Council. His idea of community consultation is in the form of a letter which advises if they don't get the rate rise services will be cut. He can't cut services any further, the Central Coast is an island. ██████████ has been since this debacle happened. The letter is holding ratepayers to	As stated above, community consultation only took place on a small scale. My entire street was not contacted at all. His idea of community consultation takes place in the confines of his head. Mine and many others assessment of Council, it is still stop heavy and continues to advertise new vacancies for positions that were made redundant.	The documents in question were a dogs breakfast, very hard to read, we haven't received all documentation. The community is not aware of the information as it has been withheld, need to know only and the community doesn't need to know.		Productivity improvements: there aren't any, staff are fed up being lumped with more work. Outdoor staff are getting abused daily and they advise staff to ring the occurrence hotline. Their mantra is "So more with less".	How does this make sense with the situation of Council. The fish head has gold teeth.	No	
15	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W22/185	Whilst communication has occurred we are still unclear on the actual numbers why we need this increase. Council should be looking for other methods to manage finances without creating further burden on the taxpayer who is certainly suffering a loss of services as a result of financial mismanagement.					We are being blackmailed by the current administration and told if we don't have this rise (and yes it is a rise) we will further lose services. The previous productivity improvements involved allowing everyone to take redundancy (a very expensive move) and now contractors and new staff need to be hired to fill the void. Hiring new staff costs lots of money and so do contractors.	It is disappointing that the Central Coast has not been provided with detailed plans and being told pay up (rate rise) or else. It's bad enough we have families and small businesses struggling from the continuing aftermath of covid, cost of living and inflation at a high and now we are being expected to fork out another increase when we didn't cause this issue. Accountability is still not falling on the current and previous council and its management.	No
16	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W22/186	Specifically addressing this item, the different revenue requirement hasn't been determined. Council has claimed publicly they have restricted services, and sold off significant assets, to fund the publicly known debt (cash reserves that needed to be repaid, near \$200 million). The rate hike already granted by IPART for 3 years, provides some extra revenue to the present day rates. The current administrator has been quoted as stating: The plan to repay loans includes writing off \$40M... selling assets of about \$60M and paying off the rest – about \$110M – over a 10-year period." That arithmetic hasn't changed. \$110M from rates over 10 years is \$11M per year. But a 15% rate hike raises \$20M a year. So, what is the other \$15M a year for?	I would strongly disagree - the council has far from demonstrated they have a need for additional funds. In fact, the public hasn't seen any distinct financial documents that clearly show a requirement for funding, i.e. an appropriate and accurate financial forecast showing the next 10 years, what the funding situation looks like - ideally such a document should be externally audited for accuracy.	The rate payers will not have expected wage rises to cover costs of proposed rise for seven years and this will impact seriously on financial viability of households, and rents for tenants. Also with other rising inflation cost and fuel cost families will struggle to meet commitments.	The other item to raise here is the two councils were somewhat financially viable prior to merge. Merge the two, restrict staff, and you should still have a functioning council after merge (give or take a few million in costs in merging the two). That was some years ago. Why are we still asking ratepayers for more money?	I don't have any faith in council to deliver anything. Let alone a properly costed and forecasted budget - and it's that reason alone that I would not support a rate increase.	I would appreciate IPART remaining with the original decision - 3 years and then the rates revert. This was understood to be sufficient to satisfy the original issues identified by Dick Person, and we accepted that.	No	
17	Alan	Woodbine	W22/187	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	No	
18	Geoff	Cook	W22/188	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	No	
19	Noel	RICHARDS	W22/189	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	No	
20	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W22/190	Council do not communicate anything except their own propaganda in pamphlets that have figures in them that don't add up. No replies to my letters see attached file. My rates have increased 45% from last year. Why are the rate payers expected to clean up someone else's mess? I have written to the administrator twice highlighting discrepancies in their own brochure. Sales that have occurred and money/wages that have already been saved add up to more than the debt the council was in. All the administrator could send me was a form letter which didn't answer my questions. Why should rates be raised before we know the outcome of the inquiry as to whose fault it is that the council ended up in this mess?	My rates have increased 45% from last year. Why are the rate payers expected to clean up someone else's mess? I have written to the administrator twice highlighting discrepancies in their own brochure. Sales that have occurred and money/wages that have already been saved add up to more than the debt the council was in. All the administrator could send me was a form letter which didn't answer my questions. Why should rates be raised before we know the outcome of the inquiry as to whose fault it is that the council ended up in this mess?				Nothing has been shown to rate payers.	Yes	

No.	First Name	Last Name	Reference	Special Variation Criteria - Your comments on Criterion 1:	Your comments on Criterion 2:	Your comments on Criterion 3:	Your comments on Criterion 4:	Your comments on Criterion 5:	Any additional comments	Attachments
192	David	Barker	W22411	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	No
193	Vicki	Carmady	W22410	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	No
194	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W22412						I disagree on the rate review as this will adversely impact my family. We do not have kerb and guttering outside my home. I have to mow the road as the road is coming away and I keep the reserve adjoining my house mowed and beautiful. Council doesn't do any of this and still wants more.	No
195	David	Allprandi	W22413	Please stop this council from gouging the ratepayers!	Please DO NOT approve this SRV. This incompetent council surveys to suit their own agenda and twist results to suit their own purposes	Please refuse this SRV. Council spend like no tomorrow on everything except providing basic services	Council gave residents insufficient time to view the exhibited documents in the hope they could sneak this SRV through! Please REJECT this SRV!!!	What a joke !!! Council intend to employ more staff when 95% of the time I see existing staff they are riding around in 2 year old trucks doing NO WORK. Please REJECT this SRV		No
196	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W22414	None of the above are relevant to this submission. Misappropriation of funds, previously, lack of downsizing when amalgams, both employees through attrition, and council depots and and... increase of employee wages, benefits increases and most not required.	Evidence gathered from a slanted and inappropriate survey, not giving any options to disagree, or any comment. This should be reviewed for integrity. You will find none.	No rise is reasonable. Have no confidence in any management, or caretakers. They have continued the abhorrent misuse of funds, developing a dinosaur regional library with office buildings on top, instead of following through with a money making educational centre which would have changed the Gosford landscape in a most positive and 21st century way. This would have connected with tide and providing a pathway all the way down to waterfront. This project had been all but approved, it was architecturally designed, thousands of hours spent by both council and private citizens, only to be stopped at the last post.	Not relevant, need to look much deeper.	That would a fictional novel. We need the facts. The new c/o Mr Farmer has done zero to change anything that he was brought on board to do, unlike apparent other councils that he has turned around. Something sticks in this administration.	Investigate the already full information and evidence available. Please do not allow another or continued rate rise, it just gets spent on long lunches and higher wages, more employees, more unrequited benefits.	No
197	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W22415	Excessive rate increases have already been passed onto residents - with services well below that which existed previously. A further special rate increase should not be agreed to.	A great majority of ratepayers do not agree with the council rhetoric about the need for further increases. Management need to take decisive action to reduce costs and improve productivity and not rely on ratepayer increases	There is nothing reasonable about recent rate increases, nor the current application of another rate hike.			I strongly oppose any further increase in Council rates.	No
198	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W22417						I oppose paying a rate hike.	No
199	Cheryle	Carmichael	W22416	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	No
200	Glenn	Fischer	W22418						If ratepayers are forced to bail-out mal-administration by the Council on this occasion, what will stop it happening again? If the financial position of the Council is so dire, why does the Council not start by lowering the obscene remuneration earned by the Council's General Manager and other executives? Especially when that's where the fault lies.	No
201	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W22419						All I have to say is why should ratepayers continue to pay for Councils incompetence and mismanagement of OUR money. No changes have been made in how OUR money is spent. Upper management is still grossly overpaid and still pretty much... Before utilising a rate hike on ratepayers at the most possible time thanks to Covid, completely restructuring and cleaning out the deadwood from council should happen first. For example... Council advertising a brand new position for a staff morale officer is just one example of wasting money.	No
202	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W22420	The ratepayers and voters were given no say whatever in the amalgamation of councils. The consequences of the amalgamation is the mess that State Government under Michael Baird created. It should be up to State Government to correct their mistakes, not ratepayers/voters	Would not have been necessary if councils had not been amalgamated	As a pensioner, this will impose more financial burden that is the creation of Michael Baird State government. You broke it, you fix it. Give the Coast its democracy back and that is in place of a democratically elected council			End the and return democracy to the people of the Central Coast	No
203	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W22421	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	No
204	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W22422						How can they lose half a billion dollars? Who is accountable? Where did it go? Nobody can afford rates. Camper vans camping - why do pay rates and they camp free and they use facilities? Dog poo on streets. Trees dead and dropping limbs. No service Need independent inquiry	No
205	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W22423						As Pearl Beach ratepayers, full time residents and self founded retirees we were shocked at the current increase in our rates brought on by incompetence, unaccountability and goodness knows what else by the CCC. The increase suggestion made by CCC, to remain in place for a further 10 years, affects so many residents who are not holiday makers or owners of investment properties that rent out to AIRB&B and the like. Meaning that for a lot of us this increase will be impossible to sustain and very likely mean that selling up is the only viable option for us, which is already happening. Is this what the government wants - for us to move out and leave our beautiful village for wealthy Sydney property investors to enjoy the spoils? We see nothing being done by CCC for our village. The roads and sidewalks are a disgrace and very dangerous for traffic and walkers, potholes everywhere and nowhere to walk but in the road. Proper road development wanted more than ever with the huge increase of visitors. It's impossible to imagine that any further increase in rates can fix the issues while such a level of inability as in a council with no accountability for misappropriation of public money. For the reasons stated above we strongly object to the increase for a ten year period.	No
206	Mary	Daly	W22424	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	No
207	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W22425	Addressed in my attachment.	Addressed in my attachment.	Addressed in my attachment.	Addressed in my attachment.	Addressed in my attachment.	Confidential Reading through the Kevin Brooks submission, watching him at Council meetings and been interviewed on Central Coast ABC breakfast radio I need to express I could not agree more with his submission and hence I attached the same for my submission. I don't agree the community consultation with the Administrator has been conducted fair and reasonable instead he has used spin and propaganda in the meetings to convince the four hundred or so people he met with. The Administrator basically offered only two options Rate rise or service cut! Not to mention better productivity and pay out by senior staff, better staff training in general etc. Both the Administrator and the CEO have denied me a meeting on a serious matter involving the planning department. It appears they pick and choose who is interviewed. Council is hiding about one hundred new Toyota vehicles whilst existing vehicles not been used. Printing the phone number from the RUBBISH TIP as a contact regarding the rate rise. Comic graffiti images spoiling beautiful pathways when can't maintain nature strips and roundabouts. Paying the previous GM \$380,000.00 instead of just 13 weeks severance pay because it was too hard to arrange a performance review interview. Allowing a walkway in sensitive habitat at Terrigal with our money and still saying Council needs more funding. Leaving a concrete cancer building and allowing free parking. Replacing perfectly good yellow and black street signs with new white and blue ones. Upgrading Wiloughby Road Terrigal with resurfacing hot mix, wonder who lives along there? While many streets especially on the north and south end of the coast look like moon craters. An electric truck which sat unused at Erina depot, now rotting away unused at Buttenbury waste facility north of Wyong. Refurbishing an already refurbished office and board room simply because as TEMPORARY CEO you want the corner one with the better water view.	No
208	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W22426	This is not now nor ever will be to constantly increase rates. This is not good financial management. CCC have proven they cannot effectively manage the accounts. A huge change needs to take place to adequately fund the required services in an acceptable and efficient way. Making residents pay is not that solution. They will continue to make the same errors and mess time after time. The problem is mismanagement not that the rates are not adequate.	It seems council don't either know how to honestly communicate or continually on the defensive. They need to be honest, clear and deliver information in a timely way. The community has no faith in their ability or desire to do this.	Everyone expects rate rises but they need to be reasonable and in line with other councils. Equally councils need to prove they effectively manage the funds raised and this is clearly not been the case to date.	They need to be understandable for the community and accessible for everyone everywhere so on line and at council is appropriate	I doubt that council can achieve this with any accuracy or honesty but yes this is what needs to happen	I don't know what else to say. Councils mismanagement of funds is monumental and did not happen over a short period, it was clearly hidden for so long, simply hurting the community with unreasonable high rate prices and not changing financial policy and managers has to be part of the answer.	No
209	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W22427	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	No
210	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W22428						I submit in the attachment the submission by Kevin Brooks. As I endorse Kevin's comments and analysis. I work in Community Services on the Central Coast and wish to bring to the attention the impacts of the previous rate rise had upon the community, especially our senior citizens. A vast number of the senior citizens that are clients of the organisation that I work for have been local residents most if not all of their lives. These ratepayers had purchased their properties decades ago when property values on the Central Coast were considered affordable. In recent years as the Sydney region has expanded, these land values have increased when the income of the ratepayers has not. It is depressing to see the appalling conditions that some of these long term residents of the Central Coast live in and are who are reluctant to move away from their home, along with family and friends. The further rate rise that this authoritarian council administration is seeking will only increase the hardship on the vulnerable residents of the Central Coast. Along with increase in everyday living expenses, fuel, food, insurance etc., what more due these vulnerable people have to endure, along with the Covid restrictions that have taken a further physically and mentally strain in their lives. In relation to insurance, many senior citizens have not renewed their home insurance. I invite all members of IPart to spend a day with me and to experience the situation that I and many other Community Providers attend daily.	Yes
211	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W22429	Central Coast Council has not actively examined all options to fund its services including debt reduction. It continues to act as if the merger between Gosford and Wyong councils did not occur and runs them as 2 separate areas using 2 separate systems. As an example it has the Gosford Council Chambers or consolidated its activities by function as opposed to location. It continues to operate functions that are already efficiently provided by the private sector such as child care and build a new regional operations centre in the guise of a regional library, where most of the population in the area are not Gosford centric. Meeting rooms for the community are already well supplied in existing facilities that are not fully used such as the Entrance Community Centre or are available through existing community bodies such as sporting clubs. There are also commercial services that it could raise higher fees on such as the Warnervale airport or be sold if not economic to repay debt. Council documents show staffing levels are expected to rise for the rate increase but with an amalgamation staff savings especially in corporate areas should fall. No average salary information is available to ensure that executive salaries are no excessive. Use of Sydney salaries is not appropriate as average salaries on the Coast are lower and many persons who live on the Coast will accept a lower salary to avoid commuting.	The community is aware of what the Council want and do not support it. The need for the increase shows a biased view using spin doctors and does not provide a well argued logical case that is supported by strong economic analysis. None of the documents provided by council allows for those that do not support the increase to outline their case to the community.	The current rate levels are above those in many city areas. The Coast is a low socio-economic area with a higher than state average level of retirees and those on lower incomes. Rate rises will lead to property owners turning away from permanent lettings and move to air BNB. This will result in many elderly and low income family and singles having no accommodation options. The community have not been given the option of determining what services they would like ceased to avoid a rate increase as the method of consultation has not been objective and unbiased	no comment	The council has not outlined this in a satisfactory manner. They need to outline clearly what they have achieved or planned. They have not shown an ability to deliver and take hard decisions. Justification on community "wants" is pointless. Everybody wants something, but when they have to pay for it then they realise it was something they could do without.	As person with a economics/accounting qualifications, decades working for Treasury and having lead numerous financial reform/amalgamation programs in the Government and private sectors I find the documents presented by Council to support a rate increase totally unsatisfactory. What is lacking from Council is a drive to deliver financial, service delivery and management reforms. Giving them more rate increase gives them no reason to improve and reform. There are avenues for them to achieve this without a rate increase they just lack the will and leadership to do it.	No
212	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W22431						We pay a huge amount and get very little in return! Roads are full of holes, weeds and overgrown grass everywhere and it seems like half the central coast doesn't even have curb and guttering. The council have been so incredibly wasteful with our money, they do very little work during the week then all come out to do gardening, road works etc on the weekends when they get paid penalty rates. I have lost all confidence in this council and they obviously haven't learned how to save money so why should we give them more to waste!	No

No.	First Name	Last Name	Reference	Special Variation Criteria - Your comments on Criterion 1:	Your comments on Criterion 2:	Your comments on Criterion 3:	Your comments on Criterion 4:	Your comments on Criterion 5:	Any additional comments	Attach ments
213	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W22430	<p>There are many ways to manage money. Central Coast Council seems to mismanage it and then hold their hands out to the rate payers with a big threat of cutting services. The ratepayers did not lose the funds, so why should they be the ones to bail the Council out, especially as many of the same executives are in place as before.</p>	<p>I have had NOTHING communicated to me at all. NOT ONE WORD. The Council is looking to be more like the [redacted] and no responsibility taken for actions. I know nothing of the increases.</p>	<p>Purpose of the variation??? To fill the huge hole created by this Council themselves. No one has enough funds these days to pay more for services that are decreasing at the time. The phones are never answered when I do have an issue and the only communication is the rate notice.</p>	<p>Exhibited where? And communicated how? To whom? When? This authoritarian Administrator seems to view ratepayers as an inconvenience to be ignored. As long as they pay the increase he wants to fund his lifestyle. Where is our representation???</p>	<p>Selling stuff does not constitute productivity improvements. That is called selling the farm. It is only a short time ago we were told that Council was 500 million in debt. We now have enormous loans to service. Maybe a pay decrease equal to the rate increase would be a good containment strategy (and for the same period as the increase in rates being requested). We do not need any more cost of living increases as we are struggling to survive as it is.</p>	<p>I have paid rates forever. I am getting less service. Now I am being asked to pay more. That is not management support. Save money by [redacted] all the senior management, for a start.</p>	No
214	Kevin	Brooks	W22432	<p>Central Coast Council has failed to meet this criterion as explained in section 2 of my uploaded submission.</p>	<p>Central Coast Council has failed to meet this criterion as explained in section 3 of my uploaded submission.</p>	<p>Central Coast Council has failed to meet this criterion as explained in section 4 of my uploaded submission.</p>	<p>Central Coast Council has failed to meet this criterion as explained in section 5 of my uploaded submission.</p>	<p>Central Coast Council has failed to meet this criterion as explained in section 6 of my uploaded submission.</p>	<p>Central Coast Council (CCC) admits in its own submission that this is a "repeat application." It is essentially the same application CCC submitted last year and was partially rejected by IPART. CCC is therefore in effect appealing against I1 is therefore effectively an appeal against that decision.</p> <p>Many people in our community who took the time to make submissions last year have told me they won't be doing so again this year because they don't have the time to respond year after year to a Council that won't take no for an answer. Nor do they see the point when it seems obvious IPART's processes are rigged against us.</p> <p>This is not a level playing field.</p> <p>In the past two years CCC has spent millions of dollars (ironically ratepayers' money) in staff costs, consultancies and other costs putting together its submissions. Community members have to use our own resources in our own time.</p> <p>CCC receives "assistance" from IPART officials on its application - and opportunities for behind the scenes lobbying and relationship building. We are given no such access.</p> <p>CCC can submit repeat applications year after year. We have no right of appeal.</p> <p>No wonder many in our community have simply become cynical about this process.</p>	Yes
215	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W22433	<p>Our rates went up more than 42% in the last year with the combination of "harmonisation" and the SV that had been granted to Central Coast Council for the 3 year period.</p> <p>With this huge increase to the ratepayer, the Council should have sufficient funds to pay for essential & other services to which we are entitled from our rates, especially given the escalation in housing growth. However the Administrator has [redacted] on a number of occasions to halt or reduce a number of these services, even with the influx of additional rates that they have received over the last 12 months. If the Council were run as a fully functioning business organisation then it would have a plan, instigated and managed by a competent CEO and supporting managers that it would keep it solvent, even if not making a profit.</p> <p>This council & CEO are taking the easy path by coercion of its ratepayers. We are not a "slush" fund, ready for the taking whenever the Council has overspent, or as in our case, illegally spent funds.</p> <p>If the Council is not encouraged by Ipart to find alternative revenue streams other than their ratepayers' pockets, then Central Coast Council is unlikely to change into a fully functioning responsible entity, functioning for the benefit of its ratepayers.</p>	<p>Many in the community are aware of the rate rise but object to the fact that they have to pay for the Council's [redacted] or misuse of funds in the last few years. Those who are aware use social media and online news sources to find this information as we have only one hardcopy newspaper which is available at some supermarkets. However there will be many others who are not social media savvy - I would suggest that many of these people are unaware because there has been very little correspondence from the Council about this issue.</p>	<p>No, the impact on us IS NOT REASONABLE!!</p>	<p>We are already paying more than 42% for our rates since July last year and it is likely to go up when the next Valuer General's report is released. Any increase in value to us is only realised if we sold, but this is our home, we have been here for 40 years and do not want to be forced to move!</p>	<p>Moreover the "ratepayer base" would already have increased substantially for the Council, given the large numbers of new residents who have moved to the Central Coast during the pandemic. There should already be more funds for the Council, no thanks to any effort on the Council's behalf.</p>	<p>I was going to attempt to write this submission based fully on all the Criteria outlined, but have found it too difficult to express my thoughts, so will just finish with my honest opinion.</p> <p>Overall, this whole process, finding out the Central Coast Council was so deeply in debt, despite the fact that it had been audited TWICE, having to write another submission in regards to the impact of the unreasonable, unjustifiable increase, has been distressing and frustrating for us and many in the Central Coast community. We have already gone through this process and Ipart had given its decision for the SV to be restricted to 3 years.</p> <p>At the same time, NO-ONE in State or Local Government has attempted to get to the bottom of Central Coast Council's huge debt and it appears that there is no justice for the ratepayers who do not deserve to be treated thus, through no fault of their own. There has been no due diligence carried out by anyone in authority which would at least give us the assurance that this will not happen again!</p> <p>The Central Coast Council, and its various Administrators, appear to have little regard for the ratepayers. Nothing has changed from the reasons included in our original submission - with harmonisation coming into effect at the same time, our rates increased over 42%. For us, in fact, there are now more imperative reasons to keep the SV to the original 3 year period. Being pensioners, there is no "new" money coming in... the funds we had 12 months ago buy much less than they did then. Inflation in terms of what we buy at the supermarket means having to shop even more frugally and it appears that this will only get worse with the impact of both the floods and the crisis in Russia/Ukraine.</p> <p>It will be a huge burden if we do have to keep paying those additional, unreasonable, unfair rates for further SEVEN YEARS!! Please listen to the community.</p>	No
216	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W22434	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	No
217	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W22435	<p>I made comments on this criterion in my submission last year, I don't see why I should have to go to the trouble of writing it all out again because IPART allows Councils to reapply year after year if they don't get what they want first time round. Yet we get no right of appeal. How fair is that? You'll have to dig out my last year's submission for more detailed comments.</p>	<p>I made comments on this criterion in my submission last year, I don't see why I should have to go to the trouble of writing it all out again because IPART allows Councils to reapply year after year if they don't get what everything they want first time round. Yet we get no right of appeal. How fair is that? You'll have to dig out my last year's submission for more detailed comments.</p>	<p>I made comments on this criterion in my submission last year, I don't see why I should have to go to the trouble of writing it all out again because IPART allows Councils to reapply year after year if they don't get what everything they want first time round. Yet we get no right of appeal. How fair is that? You'll have to dig out my last year's submission for more detailed comments.</p>	<p>I made comments on this criterion in my submission last year, I don't see why I should have to go to the trouble of writing it all out again because IPART allows Councils to reapply year after year if they don't get what everything they want first time round. Yet we get no right of appeal. How fair is that? You'll have to dig out my last year's submission for more detailed comments.</p>	<p>I made comments on this criterion in my submission last year, I don't see why I should have to go to the trouble of writing it all out again because IPART allows Councils to reapply year after year if they don't get what everything they want first time round. Yet we get no right of appeal. How fair is that? You'll have to dig out my last year's submission for more detailed comments.</p>	<p>I am totally opposed to this SV application.</p> <p>My general rates have already gone up by far more than inflation over the past 8 years but Council services keep getting worse and worse. You should come up here and see the pot holes, overgrown verges and the way these uneducated bureaucrats treat us as customers. Whatever happened to the principle of 'no taxation without representation'? It is obvious to anyone that this Council doesn't need more of our money. What it needs is better management, efficiency and productivity. The new CEO and administrator have done nothing fundamental to change things and see slugging the ratepayer and cutting services as easier options than tackling root cause problems in their own bureaucracy. If you keep bailing them out (with our money) they will never have any incentive to change.</p>	No
218	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W22437	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	No
219	Matthew	Cross	W22438	<p>I have been shocked by the level of contempt for the ratepayers of the Central Coast that the current and previous administrator's have. It is staggering.</p> <p>I have recently made suggestions to the current administrator for alternative revenue streams which he summarily dismissed as a potential distraction to council doing what they are supposed to. I am furious that [redacted] is in a position to even request an SRV given the last administrator told us that IPART would make a decision and the Council would be obliged to conform to that decision. But here we go again [redacted] didn't like the decision so he's asking the same question. Please explain to him that when IPART makes a decision, the next job for the council is to get on with serving the community, not focus their efforts on asking IPART the same question that's already been answered.</p>	<p>I've previously spoken with two different staff members at CCC and both explained to me that I wouldn't understand the rate calculation because it's very complicated. To [redacted] There was a recent survey conducted that basically asked ratepayers if they wanted more, less, or the same, for a number of services. With the thirly voted [redacted] of cuts to services if rates weren't increased. There's been no activity for community consulting about looking for additional revenue streams. There's been plenty of rhetoric about the benefits the community has enjoyed by the money that was - not [redacted] - used for whatever the council used it for. Which I can't see at all. I don't want rates to stay where they are any longer than IPART approved. I simply cannot afford it and am already having to choose between paying the additional rate costs and buying basic necessities. The community became aware of the full impact of the rate increase when a ratepayer contacted the ARB Central Coast radio station, pointing out that the actual rise by Gosford residents was 42%, because IPART [redacted] harmonisation. When it was pointed out on radio [redacted] came on and said "Unfortunately Kevin (the caller) is completely correct." And went on to say "We are not trying to be non-transparent in the matter." I [redacted] they weren't. There was a survey in which over 7,000 people responded. 70% said they didn't want a rate rise. So what did the [redacted] do? He did a hand-picked phone survey of 400 residents to see if he could get a better result.</p>	<p>The impact on the affected ratepayers is totally unreasonable, and the fact that CCC is repeating their submission to IPART for an SRV is evidence that the [redacted] has no interest in the wellbeing of the community.</p> <p>I wish he would admit that he has no ideas to improve the financial situation other than gouging ratepayers, and do the honourable thing and [redacted]</p>	<p>They probably weren't. The CCC has a track record of not providing information when originally scheduled, only to have it rushed through at the last minute. The Administrator invited ratepayers to an online meeting during which (there was four of us on the call I was on) and I have the screenshots from he said the council was looking for community members to be advocates.</p>	<p>Please... Cost containment strategies? Isn't the whole reason we're in this mess is because of the demonstrated incompetence of CCC to contain costs? Give them the rate peg, tell them they're very lucky to have three years of [redacted] and now they need to get to work and find a way to service the community. And for God's sake, if they think it can't be done without another seven years of inflated rates, resign and let someone else do it.</p>	<p>[redacted] that is running a campaign of contempt for ratepayers of the Central Coast and needs to be sent from IPART with [redacted] because his only solution to the mismanagement of ratepayer funds is to ask for more ratepayer funds to be better managed. We've seen first-hand how good [redacted] is at stopping your time, the CCC's staff time, and the ratepayers money by asking IPART for permission to gouge the ratepayers for longer. You've made your decision. You're the impure. Tell him what it all's going to do, is keep asking the same question that's already been answered. [redacted] And an example of how [redacted] have a book at how he depicts CCC, IPART, and ratepayers in the attached.</p>	Yes
220	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W22439	<p>I feel that this is a quick fix and the root of mismanagement and accountability and lack of apology to the public give rise to concern that this will happen again. The public do not trust you can manage our funds.</p>	<p>I feel instead of hitting the residents here, alternative revenue eg. parking meters for holidaymakers and visitors should be considered first.</p>	<p>I feel instead of hitting the residents here, alternative revenue eg. parking meters for holidaymakers and visitors should be considered first.</p>	<p>I feel instead of hitting the residents here, alternative revenue eg. parking meters for holidaymakers and visitors should be considered first.</p>	<p>I feel instead of hitting the residents here, alternative revenue eg. parking meters for holidaymakers and visitors should be considered first.</p>	<p>I feel instead of hitting the residents here, alternative revenue eg. parking meters for holidaymakers and visitors should be considered first.</p>	No
221	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W22440	<p>No rate rise</p> <p>IPART must not incentivise poor performance.</p> <p>Where did all the money go?</p> <p>We can see this very clearly in the increase in employee costs between 2017 and 2020, as reported in the Administrator's 30-day report. Employee numbers rose 12.9% during this period. But what is truly shocking is that employee costs over the same period rose 33.1%</p> <p>Council Plans Another 13% Increase in Employee Costs if SV is Approved???? The Long-Term Financial Plan that went on exhibition in December 2021 proposes a \$23M (13%) increase in employee costs next year (2022/23) compared with this year (2021/22). It seems Council once again intends splashing the extra cash on the bureaucracy, not the community.</p>	<p>No rate rise</p> <p>The key question in this survey was a binary choice between rate hikes or service cuts. There was no other option such as reducing internal costs or improving productivity. The sample must have felt [redacted] had them in an armlock and was [redacted] to break their arm if they didn't hand over their pocket money. Yet despite these biased tactics, CCC still couldn't get a majority for its SV application.</p>	<p>Central Coast has higher levels of socio-economic disadvantage than NSW as a whole. CCC commissioned a socio-economic report by Informed Decisions (ID) in January 2022 which is included as attachment 12 to its SV submission. This report states on page 49:</p> <p>"The Central Coast Council area has a SEIFA index of 989, which when ranked among all local government areas of New South Wales, puts it at 86th most disadvantaged of 130 local government areas."</p> <p>Socio-economic disadvantage is unevenly spread across the Central Coast</p> <p>Central Coast Council probably now upper quartile in rates despite providing very poor services</p>	<p>CCC's argues in its submission that exhibiting the documents over the new year holidays doesn't matter because the community had plenty of time to object to the previous SV in 2021 and this application is merely a repeat of that one.</p> <p>"While the exhibition process occurred during December and January (22 December to 21 January), this SV is a repeat of last year's application. The community has had multiple opportunities to comment on this SV over the past 12 months, as part of last year's application and this year's repeat application."</p> <p>This is a ridiculous argument and demonstrates the lengths CCC will go to in using spin to justify its failings. There is a clear requirement in IPART's rules to update these documents and publicly exhibit them as part of the SV process. CCC has failed to do so in a manner that could be described as reasonable. The community was not given a reasonable opportunity to view and comment on these documents.</p> <p>CCC is not in reasonable compliance with IPART's requirement.</p> <p>None of the 190 projects in the Delivery Program relate to completion of the merger. Yet we were told the main reason for extending the Council's administration was to allow time for the current administrator Rk Hart and new CEO David Farmer to liberate cost savings through completion of the merger. So, why no projects in the Delivery Program to generate efficiencies from the merger?</p>	<p>CCC productivity still lower than five years ago.</p> <p>How can this Council be doing so much less with the same number of staff it had five years ago?</p> <p>The bottom line here is that CCC is providing fewer and worse services despite having about the same number of employees as five years ago. That means productivity (output per employee) has fallen.</p>	<p>We pay our rates and there is no maintenance done. Wyong Road is a disgrace. Weeds are so high and rubbish is littered everywhere. The main thoroughfare for the tourists. Our lake floods regularly as again the required preventative action is not undertaken. Our drains are blocked with leaves and debris. Councils CEO takes home a huge salary without delivering. Residents want action and no rate rise. Why are we being punished for Council's mismanagement.</p>	No
222	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W22441	<p>No rate rise</p>	<p>No rate rise</p>	<p>No rate rise</p>	<p>No rate rise</p>	<p>No rate rise</p>	<p>No rate rise</p>	Yes
223	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W22442	<p>I disagree with the rate rise and how it will impact me in these challenging times</p>	<p>No to the rate rise people have to much to deal with at the moment give us a break</p>	<p>No to any rate rise and the impact it will have on everyone trying to recover from these hard times stop it it not right give the community some rate relief and get back some support</p>	<p>There has been Covid-19 and now several natural disasters to deal with and a crisis without kids getting back to school nobody as the time to find and then look at these papers except for the council's themselves as they seem to have plenty of time for this nonsense</p>	<p>No way they should have access to any more funds look what they have done with the last lot le lost it millions of dollars gone somewhere???</p>	<p>No way you have robbed the people and now what them to pay to get you of the hook give back what you have stolen and there will be plenty of money there no to any rate rise it is the completely wrong time and thing to do people are struggling and this will negatively impact them and all businesses. NO!!!!</p>	No
224	Ronald	Gibbs	W22444	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	No
225	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W22443	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	No
226	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W22445	<p>CCC have not shown that they can manage the funds that these previously collected from our rates so how can we trust them to wisely use any increases that are granted to them. Having said that I do not agree to them being allowed to increase my council rates for the intent of clearing the debt that was incurred by their reckless management or indeed for the Special Variation to be granted or extended. I find it abhorrent that we the ratepayers are being penalised for something for which we had no responsibility or control.</p>	<p>CCC have not shown that they can manage the funds that these previously collected from our rates so how can we trust them to wisely use any increases that are granted to them. Having said that I do not agree to them being allowed to increase my council rates for the intent of clearing the debt that was incurred by their reckless management or indeed for the Special Variation to be granted or extended. I find it abhorrent that we the ratepayers are being penalised for something for which we had no responsibility or control.</p>	<p>CCC have not shown that they can manage the funds that these previously collected from our rates so how can we trust them to wisely use any increases that are granted to them. Having said that I do not agree to them being allowed to increase my council rates for the intent of clearing the debt that was incurred by their reckless management or indeed for the Special Variation to be granted or extended. I find it abhorrent that we the ratepayers are being penalised for something for which we had no responsibility or control.</p>	<p>CCC have not shown that they can manage the funds that these previously collected from our rates so how can we trust them to wisely use any increases that are granted to them. Having said that I do not agree to them being allowed to increase my council rates for the intent of clearing the debt that was incurred by their reckless management or indeed for the Special Variation to be granted or extended. I find it abhorrent that we the ratepayers are being penalised for something for which we had no responsibility or control.</p>	<p>CCC have not shown that they can manage the funds that these previously collected from our rates so how can we trust them to wisely use any increases that are granted to them. Having said that I do not agree to them being allowed to increase my council rates for the intent of clearing the debt that was incurred by their reckless management or indeed for the Special Variation to be granted or extended. I find it abhorrent that we the ratepayers are being penalised for something for which we had no responsibility or control.</p>	<p>Finally, I'd like to add, where the [redacted] is the Office of Local Government in all of this? Aren't they responsible for the operations of Local Government?</p>	No

No.	First Name	Last Name	Reference	Special Variation Criteria - Your comments on Criterion 1:	Your comments on Criterion 2:	Your comments on Criterion 3:	Your comments on Criterion 4:	Your comments on Criterion 5:	Any additional comments	Attachments	
				I believe that the extraordinary ongoing rate rises asked for are not supported and that there are viable alternative sources of revenue. I believe that Council funding deficit is caused in part by the NSW Govt failing to provide sufficient support and funding to the amalgamation of Gosford and Wyong Councils, hence NSW Govt should be providing supplementary funding and extra oversight to ensure the systems are in place to govern the local area and provide adequate services. It is hard to accept that the incompetence of the Councils in recent years, that has resulted in reserved funds being accessed and considerable debt, should be shouldered by the ratepayers, particularly considering that the lack of NSW Govt oversight has allowed debt levels to progress to the point that Council could not pay their staff without emergency funding being advanced. I believe that there are several alternate ways that Council could pay down current debt and fund operations without a large ongoing rate rise. Some excess Council land has been sold to pay down debt and undoubtedly there is more land that could be sold. Councils Water supply business doesn't appear to be run as a separate business with transparent costs and income - water supply costs and income are mixed with general council operating business. Council appears to be operating this business at a loss and is continually pushing for higher water rates. I believe that part or all of the Water supply business should be sold to Sydney or Hunter Water (or Gosford to Sydney water and Wyong to Hunter Water). This would result in enough cash to at least pay off all debt (and probably supplement many years operating costs) and the water business would be run efficiently by experienced competent operators and result in lower rates rates. Another avenue would be to assess the environmental credentials of all parcels of COSS land and any parcels with environmental value could be given or sold to NSW Govt as national park land and the remainder of COSS land sold. Council has no business being involved in raising environmental land, which is an unnecessary drain on council resources to acquire and maintain. Another avenue for funding would be to dispose part or all of the garbage collection and recycling business. I don't know enough about this to comment further but it would provide funds to pay down debt and provide funds for ongoing operations.							
227	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W221441		In my view, the council administrator and staff have failed to demonstrate the need for the proposed increase	The proposed increase is not reasonable against these criteria, particularly as there are viable alternatives for raising revenue.		Perhaps the Council documents do propose improvements, etc, but it is evident that the ratepayers have not been convinced.		No	
228	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W221446	I believe that the State Government should dissolve what is currently the Central Coast Council. As a resident I can only see the expense of the rate rise reducing my power to keep my property and live a normal life with ordinary expenses that any normal resident could foresee and plan for in their retirement years. The state government should step in and manage the repayments as the overseeing regulatory body who allowed the misappropriation of funds in the Original years of the Central Coast Council as mere ratepayers had no involvement in same, and should not be expected to pay for CCC and the State Government of the time.	We are not personally responsible for the debts incurred by others. This is a point of law which has continued to be overlooked.	It is not reasonable to expect ratepayers of various degrees of income to be able to pay such exorbitant increases as any other residents of any local government areas in NSW. Personally my income is fixed as an old age pensioner and if the increase are to remain, then I will no doubt not be able to retain my home on the Central Coast of NSW. Where do I have to go to be allowed to live in peace and safety without Big Brother imposing such gross hardships on me and in turn my family who are in a similar position.			Why is the State Government continuing allow Central Coast Council's administrator to have powers far beyond being fair and equitable to and for ratepayers. Residents who have not received normal services in their community, have not received what is normally expected with such high rates.	No	
229	Brian	Davies	W221448	Council already have an available resource to fund service levels. It has large cash reserves in accounts reserved for restricted uses. The administrator has been dipping into restricted funds to keep council running. Large bank loans were forced on council by the decision of the minister to sack elected councillors and to appoint an administrator. These reserves are effectively wasted sitting in accounts and could have been used by the former CEO and elected councillors to help council trade out of the so called financial crisis (and could still be used more effectively). The sudden debt was really just the stroke of a pen to say funds formerly classified as unrestricted suddenly being classed as restricted.	I have not received any direct communication from council with the explanations mentioned above.	The purpose of the variation is to repay unnecessary bank loans that were forced on ratepayers by decisions of the minister and her appointees so they can repay the funds mentioned in Criterion 1. The rises are not reasonable as they are to pay the costs of unjustified arbitrary decisions by the minister to cover debts incurred by council including the flawed decision to force Wyong and Gosford Councils to merge, a failed IT merger initiated by an appointed administrator, and many years of cost shifting of state government responsibilities to ratepayers.	The public exhibition was deeply flawed as the exhibition period ran from just days before Christmas to the 21st January. This is the time when most people are on leave and often away on holiday (as I was). This was ticking a box, not a genuine attempt to engage the community. The administrator is the sole authority for approving the documents so there is no democratic process.	Council puts forward statements claiming to represent these issues but the main message I got was 'either support our push for more rates and pain for the community or there will be more pain as we sack another 200 staff, out essential services and sell off more assets'. That seems to be the plan to cut costs.	Please see my attached document for more detailed explanations on the above points and other matters.	Yes	
230	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W221450			While the community has been made aware of the proposed extension of the rate increase, this awareness in no way is sanctioned or given tacit approval by ratepayers. An extension being forced on ratepayers, especially those from the old Wyong Council who have already suffered an 8 year variation to rates, which also continued when Amalgamation of councils occurred with Gosford, have now being asked for a further 3 years variation, with 15% a hefty financial burden to any ratepayer. And now seeking to further extend this through Council malfeasance is totally rejected by the ratepaying community. Additionally, with new subdivisions mushrooming in the Northern end of the coast, the Council is already in line for a massive influx of new ratepayers. Following on from business closures due to Covid, how much more can ratepayers be expected to pay?	Totally unreasonable, given as above, the final cessation if an 8 year variation suffered by Wyong Council ratepayers. Additionally, with Covid lockdowns, business closures and reduced incomes as a result, it would be preferable to see council out spending on treated and inefficient departments, and for workers to be seen increasing productivity. The slow pace of roadworks for example would not be tolerated in private business, and is an affront to hard working ratepayers, particularly low income workers and pensioners.		Again, just because Council can advertise strategies to achieve these does not guarantee the proposed outcome. This is not an application that should be approved, please at least consider holding over any decision in this approval for the term of the current variation, where the Council must show that the above strategies are in place and are achieving the desired results.	No extension of this rate variation should be approved until the end of the current variation period, in which time IPART should monitor whether Council has begun to achieve the cost containment strategies and proven productivity improvements are being achieved before any further extension of the current rate variation should be considered by IPART.	No
231	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W221449	Disagree with all rate hikes		Must be reasonable	Agree			No	
232	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W221451	I disagree with the rate hike and I am already struggling financially paying the rates and water now.	I disagree with the rate hike and I am already struggling financially paying the rates and water now.	I disagree with the rate hike and I am already struggling financially paying the rates and water now.	I disagree with the rate hike and I am already struggling financially paying the rates and water now.	I disagree with the rate hike and I am already struggling financially paying the rates and water now.	I disagree with the rate hike and I am already struggling financially paying the rates and water now.	No	
233	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W221452		Council has not provided a reasonable reason for the need of a rate increase except to repay a loan that was sourced to repay restricted funds used by past management.	Further rate increase will result in having to sell our house due to the financial burden.			I have not seen any improvement in management or council services since amalgamation of Wyong and Gosford councils. Recent statements of council improving their systems for ratepayers have been a total waste of money due to system rate billing that is not accurate and billing for previously paid bills.	No	
234	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W221453						CCC in particular the current Administrator viciously defends the application as a 'not an increase' when the Community is aware that the increase approved by IPART in May 2021 was for 3 years and at which time CCC has to show significant cost savings before they can apply for a further increase. How could CCC justify applying if no cost savings (other than a plethora of motherhood statements) evidence has been shown or any defensible projects have been established to justify any further increase. Oh yes and Mr. Administrator is so adamant that the Community will quickly forget any increase. CCC is currently awaiting final approval from IPART for a water increase which could be up to 34% (heaven forbid). How much more can the CC Community can bear in increased costs? I would expect IPART to defer a decision on the CCC's application for 3 years in line with IPART's quite recent approval in May 2021.	No	
235	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W221454						I whole heartedly disagree with any further rate increase for central coast council. We are pensioners and have lived here for 38 years. The increase will impact considerably on our economic finances, which we should not have to incur basically because the Councilors and staff are lately the new incumbents liability to manage our funds. There are still ridiculous accounts coming out and I've even seen adds for people to apply for arts grants when they can't even keep our roads in good order.	No	
236	Belinda	Mabbott	W221455	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	No	
237	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W221456	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	No	
238	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W221457			I oppose the rate increase! I am a single woman in 60's who purchased a property in 2020 with a large mortgage and under the proviso I can afford to make rates water and general upkeep of the property under my budget. That has now been blown out and I will be forced to sell if rates aren't reduced				No	
239	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W221458	Services are needed. I fail to understand how there has been no accountability for the people who "lost" the money in the first instance. Action needs to be taken not rate rises.	Our services are poor compared to other councils. More jobs at the top need to go and action taken to limit overtime etc. money recouped in other ways than rate rises.	Average middle class wage earner here with a family. Rates and water rates are high enough. Increase would add to financial burden.	This council should not approve anything that the previous council mismanaged	Show the rate payers what benefit and services would be better under the SV		No	
240	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W221460	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	No	
241	Cheryl	Elis	W221459	I oppose the rate hike as I cant see that council will improve our services in any way shape or form.		I oppose the rate hike as it will affect me financially and also a lot of people I know, who are struggling with the cost of living.				No	
242	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W221461	No	No	No	No	No	Central Coast Council will never change if IPART keeps giving them more of our money. The new Chief Executive [redacted] has changed nothing since being appointed 12 months ago. He earns over \$500,000 (more than the Premier) but seems to be on a [redacted] management culture that caused the problems in the first place while administrator Rick Hart just sees slugging ratepayers an easier option than fixing the internal problems. CEO [redacted] recently appeared on ABC Central Coast to answer topical issues but when he was asked about a local issue (removing the community art in Tasco) that had been getting a huge response from the community he claimed he had "no idea" about it even though his own Communications Department had issued a press release on it the previous day. He turned up [redacted] and it epitomises why the community thinks nothing has changed or will change while he is CEO and why we think the only option is to force them to sort out their problems themselves by cutting off the easy option of more and more rate increases to subsidise their complacency and incompetence. WE'VE HAD ENOUGH!	No	
243	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W221462	Better management of the funds from the last increase would save having to have another increase.	The community understand there isn't a need for a further rate increase, just better management of the funds the Council is already getting. And it would be nice if Council did communicate with ratepayers.	The rate rise on top of the previous rate rise is exorbitant and will put a strain on myself and others for something that was not our responsibility. Given the last two years most ratepayers are already suffering and don't have the funds to cover Council's mismanagement. Pensioners are on a limited budget and already suffering from the last rate rise and this one could mean no food on the table for something they aren't responsible for.	in total agreement with documents being approved by ratepayers before adopted by Council for submission to IPART.	Maybe hold off on new projects until such time as current expenses and jobs are completed and money accrued before starting new projects.		No	
244	Name suppressed	Name suppressed	W221463						I cannot afford a SV in rates. As a full time nurse on the CC a SV in my rates would impact me financially to the extent I would seriously need to consider selling and moving to a more affordable area to live. I have previously struggled to pay the old Wyong Council SV rate increase and do not believe it is fair nor justified to expect rate payers to pay for a council's mismanagement of their funds.	No	
245	Artigoni	Runge	W221464	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	No	
246	Avoca Beach Community Association			The limited time interval provided by IPART to make input to its assessment of a Central Coast Council application for an extended Special Variation in rates, and concurrent COVID restrictions on assembly, have not allowed comprehensive community engagement in preparation of this submission by the Avoca Beach Community Association (ABCA). This submission has been produced by the ABCA Committee, to reflect community views to the best of its ability. Central Coast Council's application for extension of the 15% special rates variation sits within a wider context of strong community dismay over: *A Council amalgamation in 2107 that was forced by the State Government and unwanted by the great majority of residents. *The amalgamation being much more complex and costly than indicated beforehand by the State Government. *Gross financial mismanagement within the newly amalgamated Council, producing in 2021 a debt crisis. *Residents in the southern half of the Central Coast learning after the amalgamation they would have imposed a 28% rates rise to equalize rate levels across the Central Coast. *Receiving in recent months new rates notices imposing a 42% general rates rise (including the IPART approved Special Variation). In response, Council has: entered into a \$150 million commercial loan to be repaid over 10 years, with strict performance conditions attached; cut services to the community; and slashed its staffing level. Against that backdrop, Council has presented to the community a binary choice for paying off the loan covering the debt: IPART approval of extension of the current 15% Special Variation for 10 years; or, additional major cuts immediately to Council services and staffing. The Avoca Beach Community Association (ABCA) does not have a formal, specific position on the special variation extension - as there is unlikely to be a high degree of consensus among Avocans. Many consider the State Government should bear significant responsibility for the debt situation and make a substantial financial contribution - but that is a matter outside the mandate of IPART in conducting this review.	ABCA considers Council has performed a solid effort in informing and giving consultation opportunity regarding the intended application to IPART.	As noted above, it is an inescapable fact that Council's \$150m commercial loan to cover debt incurred must be repaid. As noted, we look to IPART to establish the parameters for any needed Special Variation. A 42% recent rates rise for Avocans has come as a shock for the household budgets of many Avocans. (With this impact now likely to be exacerbated if IPART approves the simultaneous application by Council for increased water and sewer rates.) Pensioner and hardship special provisions offered by Council on rates payments are a worthy benefit for a minority of households, but for many others the impact is substantial.	Council seems to have followed required steps for exhibition, consultation and approval of this application to IPART.	Whilst Council appears to have laid out the binary choices between a hefty Special Variation or additional large services and staff cuts, ABCA considers that productivity gains in delivery of Council functions are one way of maintaining service levels and limiting revenue demands. We note with approval that the Administrator has instituted actions within Council and reporting to this effect. We consider Council must continue to pursue and expand productivity gains, reporting on performance to the community, embedding this in organizational culture, and select performance audits. These productivity gains and associated communication to the community are important in restoring the community's badly shaken faith in the newly amalgamated Central Coast Council.	In the event that the Public Inquiry into administration of Central Coast Council and community pressure lead to the State Government switching its position to making a future financial injection to Council, IPART should institute a review of its decision on level and duration of a Special Variation.	No	

