

Author name: Anonymous

Date of submission: Friday, 2 March 2018

Submission: My husband and I live in [REDACTED], (Randwick City Council). We are on a very minimal income, cash is tight, so we cannot afford a rate hike. Initially I thought that the rate hike would be about 5%, to pay for much needed infrastructure, and we voted for option 2 (see below).

But then I discovered that the rate hike being applied for by the Council is closer to 20% spread over the next three years! This we CANNOT afford - our income is going down in real times, not up by 20% - that means we would have to skimp on other things so as to afford the rates bill.

I also discovered that only about 10% of residents responded to the survey, conducted over the Christmas period, asking which of 3 scenarios residents preferred:

- (1) no increase, meaning no extra infrastructure will be built;
- (2) a modest increase, meaning that some extra infrastructure will be built; or
- (3) the "preferred" increase (preferred by Council that is) to fund things such as a women's shelter, a community centre, undergrounding of power lines, etc, and including the cost of the Federal-government-imposed anti-Terrorism Measures!!

How the Federal government can justify forcing local councils to pay for anti-terrorism infrastructure is a complete mystery, especially when the Federal Government has \$billions to spend on "stopping the boats", keeping genuine refugees in VERY expensive-to-run Pacific gulag camps, funding large Federal agencies etc. It is utterly ridiculous to force ratepayers to pay for this.

Of the 10% of residents who responded, the Council stated that over half of them supported Option 3, therefore justifying their application to raise the rates as per option (3)!! This is so unfair, so unrepresentative, that we have changed our minds, and now want to vote for "NO INCREASE" in rates.

We are therefore urging IPART to please REJECT Randwick City Council's application.

Thank you.

[REDACTED]