

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Local Government Mailbox](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Appeal against Randwick Councils Application for Variation of Rates
Date: Sunday, March 04, 2018 8:23:08 PM

This is an Application against Randwick Councils variation of Rates application, which has been decided by Council, on incorrect Council decision making & misuse of Statistics. The decision to raise Rates was based on the results of minute population response of 6000 replies. The arguments against the Rate rise are:-

1) The Survey is an **inadequate sample**. The survey response was approximately 6000 replies from an Electorate of approximately **140,000 people**. Council advise that 57% of people who responded to a telephone survey voted for option 3 (or the highest increase) and 49% similarly from a written survey. This is a confusing static & one can at least decipher that if 57% voted for the highest increase, (this equates to about 3,420 were in favour of the increase). This means that approximately 2580 were not in favour of this increase. Both figures are a **totally inadequate sample** on which to decide to introduce a 19.9% cost impost on rate payers. This means that approximately 95% of the electorate have had **NO INPUT**.

2) The statistics are corrupted and are obviously biased to the councils expectation. Does Council honestly expect anyone to believe that the majority of people voted for a significant rate increase!! One only needs to use the Legal TEST ie "what would a reasonable person do in a similar situation" ie would they vote for an increase?? NO.

3) Current pay rises or Social Service pay increases, do not allow such a Rate increase to be sustainable or affordable.

4) The IPART Fact sheet on which Councils are instructed, how to justify rises, says in "Box 1 Guidelines assessment Criteria for applications"-

"Item 3

- clearly show the impact of any rate rises upon the community
- include the councils consideration of the community's capacity & willingness to pay rates,
- establish that the proposed rate increase are affordable having regard to the community's capacity to pay.

How can a pensioner on approximately \$ 300 a week afford a rate rise of almost 20%?? Point

5) which follows, shows the above item 3 requirements, have not been met.

5) It is well known that Utility costs are soaring. The governments target of either 42% or 50% (Labor and Liberal) renewable energy reduction, is already causing cost hardship on most

people. All Utility costs are increasing such as water, telephone, Electricity and Rates are already increased regularly. Let alone Fuel and Medical costs are becoming a daily impost. Private Medical insurance cost are almost prohibitive and pray that you don't need a dentist. Registration, car Insurance, House hold and Contents insurance, are all increasing and the Government ACKNOWLEDGES that DISPOSABLE income is insufficient to meet daily costs for many people.

This and comments in points 1 to 4, above means that the points in Item 3 above have not been satisfied by council!!

6) This Council has already added special rate increases twice over recent years which I believe were only supposed to be for a limited period, but which are still being charged. One was a special Environmental Levy.

6) if Council chooses to use a 6000 sample I can say I have carried out a straw pole amongst my friends all of who are local voters and of 20 people, not one said they voted for an increase. All have asked for the option of No increase.

7) The items the Council is asking to be funded are not real Local Council responsibilities. The things they want to fund are often state or Federal Government liabilities, such as counter terrorism Risk Management initiatives a cultural centre or the desire to renovate a museum at La Perouse is not a council responsibility.

8) Council wants to borrow \$27 million to assist in funding this. Council already has sufficient funds invested an amount of about \$64 million of which accounts can be accessed. So why do they want to borrow?

9) One of councils intensions is use these funds to try & beautify the suburbs by moving power lines underground. How do they reconcile this logic, when the "Light rail" which is being currently built, is being provided with over head cables? The Council actually has contributed, I think it was \$25 million towards the Light Rail (I suppose we voted for this expenditure as well. Why would the council contribute this much). So isn't this, in direct contrast to the funding of infrastructure, which is daily installing overhead power cables/lines etc?

there are so many issues I can raise but I think this is sufficient on which to assist "IPART" to make a decision rejecting Councils proposed Rate Increase.

Thank You for your due consideration of this submission.

Andrew Papandreas

Dip Lab Relations and Labor Law, Dip Safety Science, Dip Insurance

Justice of the Peace
4th March 2018