Author name: Anonymous

Date of submission: Tuesday, 27 February 2018

Submission: The proposed increase of 19.85% over 3 years is massively more than the cost of living which is around 2% and therefore does not pass the "pub test".
The Council relied on a phone survey of 600 households? The result was 57% for the Councils preferred Option 3 Approach but as they were asked leading questions that were slanted towards this outcome it was obviously a deceiving result. Our Municipality is a very mixed demographic area with some very Rich households and many Foreign students plus others struggling to make ends meet. I can't but question who these 600 voter's were or whether they were even ratepayers as they were selected at random via the White Pages & at shopping centres.
Further, the written survey is also far from conclusive with only around 5,700 returned though 51% did say "NO" to option 3.
Hidden agendas, clever wording, misleading low annual rate examples, confusing graphs all pushing the Councils preferred target has left many unaware of the huge 19.85% actual rate cost to the Ratepayers. I find this totally dishonest, unfair and misleading and falsely supports Council's intention to achieve it's objective.
Considering there are around 50,000 ratepayers who have not spoken and with only 11% take up, these polls are totally insufficient responses and too inconclusive to allow such a outlandish decision to be made.
Don't forget that a $27 million loan will also come into play with Option 3 even though we have our own funds available. This debt will grow with higher interest rates and may never be repaid.
I have grave concerns that the Major projects will be delivered quickly anyway, as past experiences have shown, so why not "Pay as we go"?.