## LG Submission Form 2021-2022 - Applications

Submission date: 28 February 2021, 10:11PM

Receipt number: 172

Related form version: 2

## **IPART Special Variation Submission Form - Applications**

Industry	Local Government
Review	(LG) Special Variations & Minimum Rates 2021-2022
Document Reference	

Council Federation Council, Special Variation Application

If you have any general feedback regarding your council's proposed SV, please leave your comments in the comment box below.

Federation Council asked for ratepayer submissions re it's SVA which is intended to fund the operation of an aquatic centre and said these submissions would accompany Councils application to IPART.

Submissions could either be via their website or by direct correspondence. There were 6 written submissions and 145 submissions via their website.

All 6 written submissions were against a SRV and Council now says that the 145 responses were part of a survey, and were not submissions, which is clearly, now a misrepresentation. I can only assume most, if not all the 145 responses, were against a SRV but I don't know because these submissions, one of which was mine, were never made public, unlike the written applications.

I find it incredible that a Council can obtain external funding to build an Aquatic Centre, start building it, and then apply for a rate increase to fund it's running costs. Surely running costs should have been foreseen and planned for well before construction started, and budgeted for accordingly. It's a bit rich to ask IPART to endorse a rate increase (for ever) to cover operating costs that should have part of the planning process to begin with. I suggest IPART rejects this SRV on the grounds it endorses inadequate governance by this Council. A survey conducted by Council last year, indicated more than half of all ratepayers rejected any rate increase to fund this potential white elephant. If this was private enterprise someone would have been sacked by now.

Your comments on Criterion 1:

If this has been identified as a community need/desire then those that desire it should fund it on a user pays basis. If that basis is not viable then the desire is unaffordable and should not have been built in the first place.

Your comments on Criterion 2:	Council has identified an average rise for residential rates in Federation (after construction started) but hasn't identified what the rise will be for rural rates.  Council has said that this SRV will be applied evenly to each property and not on the land value. Farms are typically made up of numerous individual rateable parcels of land that make up a farm. This will mean that rural ratepayers will pay this rate increase multiple times whereas residential ratepayers will pay only once. Rural ratepayers will also be the most likely group not to use this facility but will get to pay for it multiple times. That is not fair.
Your comments on Criterion 3:	This rate rise is not reasonable if the original project was not affordable in the first place.
Your comments on Criterion 4:	
Your comments on Criterion 5:	Council has made some assumptions as to the user income this facility might generate when calculating the rate increase it is applying for. When these figures are found to be hopelessly optimistic going forward and the centre does not generate anywhere near the anticipated income what then? Back to IPART with their hand out for more rate increases to fund this black hole. Please reject this application now and make this Council live within its means, just like its rate payers have to do.

If you have attachments you would like to include with your feedback, plese attach them below.

## Your Details

Are you an individual or organisation?	Individual
If you would like your submission or your name to remain confidential please indicate below.	Anonymous - my submission can be published but my name should remain anonymous
First Name	

Last Name	
Organisation Name	
Position	
Email	

IPART's Submission Policy

I have read & accept IPART's Submission Policy