

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, 13 March 2017 4:50 PM
To: Local Government Mailbox
Subject: Submission re: Inverell Shire Council's SRV Application

Dear Sir or Madam,

I wish to object to Inverell Shire Council's (ISC) application for a SRV as I believe it is totally unnecessary for the following reasons:

ISC could save millions of dollars by employing all outdoor staff on a contract basis and working all machinery 7 days a week on a rotating roster. This would mean a lot less machinery would be required and the staff would be on the job longer, so more work would be done in a day, a huge saving in rates. The staff don't have to work any more hours over a 2-week period to achieve their required hours. A Time & Motion Study would be very beneficial as much time is wasted due to poor planning of works.

ISC was going to spend millions of dollars upgrading the CBD and the public was told that no rate rise was needed to fund this, but they are now not proceeding with this and now they state they can't even maintain basic services without a SRV.

ISC has \$51.83 million in cash and investments, some of which is restricted or committed to ongoing projects. However, there seems to be a large discrepancy between what ISC's accountant, the auditor and what ISC states is available for immediate use.

In ISC's SRV Newsletter of Dec. 2016 they state that their total general rate income is \$10,257,163. A 14.25% SRV on that amount would not raise \$13.66 million over 3 years as they have stated. To achieve this, general rate income would have to be around \$32 million. They also claim that the Inverell Residential average rate is \$935.94 and the Farmland average rate is \$2,586.49 which seem grossly underquoted, so as to make the cumulative impact over 3 years of \$4 per week for Residential and \$11.04 for Farmland rates, seem quite small. There seems to be many erroneous statements made by Council to support their claim for a SRV.

ISC rates are already quite high and as the Inverell area is in the lower end of the State's socio-economic range, residents can ill afford any rate rise. Farmers already pay too much for very little service.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]