

[REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, 11 March 2019 7:36 AM

**To:** Local Government Mailbox <localgovernment@ipart.nsw.gov.au>

**Subject:** Randwick Council Environmental Levy Submission

Hi - I tried to submit via website but it gave an error.

Please find below my submission, given on an anonymous basis.

Regards,

[REDACTED]  
  
Submission:

As a ratepayer in Randwick I submit that the environmental levy should cease. It is nothing other than an excuse to charge ratepayers more money, dressed up in an appealing way ("helping the environment"). Environmental projects should come from the normal rates budget - council can easily reduce superfluous activities in this and other areas of spending to accomodate a lower revenue base.

The process was also misleading:

1. Misrepresentation of cost: Council very prominently used a figure of 25 cents a day as the cost of the levy. Aside from making it sound small by quoting it daily this is based on the average rate, but of course many ratepayers will pay much more than that as rates are based on land value which will vary greatly from apartments to houses. Instead some sort of range of annual costs should have been used (e.g. "for 90% of rate-payers the levy will cost between [\$50] and [\$300] per year").

2. Biased campaign: The material put forward by council was one-sided, in support of the levy. So there was a very well-funded case in support of the levy and no case made for the other side. All results of the consultation need to be viewed in this light - as the result of a biased process.

3. Misrepresentation of consultation results: The results of the consultation do not represent strong support for the levy. Council cites the telephone survey as the only method that was "Random and Unbiased". But it is inherently flawed as it surveys all residents, not just ratepayers. So it amounts to asking: "Would you like SOMEONE ELSE to pay for parks etc. that you can enjoy?". Unsurprisingly more than 50% said yes. In the ratepayer survey the support was only 54% and in submissions 40%.

IPART should require overwhelming support from ratepayers before allowing extraordinary rates/levies. This has not been achieved here so the application should be denied. Please support ratepayers as council will not - turkeys don't vote for Xmas!