


Author name: Anonymous

Date of submission: Thursday, 28 February 2019

Submission: Please see attached document.

 I own a property and live in Randwick Council area.

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing this submission because I am against the extension to the special rate levy, based on the following reasons:

1. The council rate is based on the land value, which has been increasing substantially over the last 3 years and is still continuing to grow in 2019 according to the land value notice, at a much higher rate than wage growth and CPI of the same period (2016: \$140,610, 2017: \$154,585, 2018: \$171,140, 2019: \$180,170 – comes from my 2 bedroom unit). Therefore my council rate also increases every year at a much higher rate more than CPI.
 - a) Have your department considered the economic impact to living cost for all residents.
 - b) If they spent wisely, the extra fund just from council rate along would have covered any substantial environment initiatives.
2. I am an environment conscious person and to look after the environment I do not have extra out of pocket expenses. Now I don't see the council doing extra solar panels at every council properties or parks so where is the justification for special levy?
 - a) Have your department looked at the projects they claimed they have achieved using extra fund, they are related to normal activities, like footpaths and parks. Many of them are not specifically target carbon reduction.
 - b) Three years ago the Randwick council said they would use the fund to design and build dedicated cycling paths separated from the traffic so daily cycling commuters like me can avoid the main artery and safely travel to CBD. They still have not built that yet and in the recent update, the council said the decision to design and construct of the bike paths are subjected to funding by the RMS. So what I hear is, when they want to charge extra, they will use the 'environment banner', but the actual spending is not according to what it says.
 - c) Your department should not approve the special levy before consulting with the Auditor General to see if they extra levy over the previous years are indeed spent on what it is supposed to be. If not you are just as **irresponsible** as the council.
3. The council rate for a similarly sized property in the neighbouring Bayside council is about 15% cheaper than Randwick. This difference is substantial enough to cast doubt on Randwick spending.
4. The special levy should be based on a voluntary opt-in basis rather than compulsory. Just like solar panels: yes it is good to the environment, but it is expensive and not everyone can afford it and therefore, the government is not and should not force people to install. The same applies to the levy.
5. The 'survey' conducted by the council is not comprehensive or independently verified. I doubt its objectivity.