

The minute that [REDACTED] learnt that IPART only allowed a 15% rate increase for three years, rather than sit down with the senior staff and plan the finances to take into account what he thought was a shortfall, he immediately announced that it was not going to be enough and that he was going to apply for an extension to 10 years. And that sums the thinking of this new formed council, that is, if there is a shortfall just get the ratepayers to make it up by increasing the rates.

No thought is given in running the council more productively and no savings are planned. It is the sixth worst council for productivity and the time to approve developments has slipped by 7% even though it has 128 more personnel since amalgamation.

The council is currently running as if it has no debt. It's evident by seeing council workers doing gardening work on weekends which would obviously be at penalty rates or plastering graffiti work on Terrigal footpaths to improve the residents' mental health. It is also planning to improve footpaths on Terrigal with a budget which is relying on future grants.

Further to this, Mr [REDACTED] has informed us that he has saved \$1.4M by not running a separate referendum for the number of councilors. However, he has not mentioned that in the process the Council has lost \$300000 as it had signed a contract with the AEC which it now cancelled.

A pointless referendum, a vanity project of [REDACTED] and carried on by [REDACTED], originally scheduled for this year and which has been postponed now to the next election.

Also, the council employed consultants to formulate the submission for an increase in water rates by 34% and the employment cost \$170000.

Why was not the money used to hire consultants to see how savings could be made by council?

Why were consultants used in the first place considering that there are plenty of council personnel and some would be intelligent enough to formulate the submission. There are many there who are on \$200000 plus salary. Surely they do not think that it is beneath their status to formulate a submission?

Regarding the submission itself, I notice that they state that they consulted with a sample of the community. This is just a fabrication of facts for a number of reasons.

Firstly, I'm in a Facebook group consisting of close to 9000 members. This might be a small number relative to the CC community but there is still a chance that one of our members would have been contacted by the consultants. This has not happened. It did not happen last time either when [REDACTED] claimed that people agreed via phone survey.

Secondly, the idea that people surveyed would agree with the increases of rates is laughable. This was confirmed at a recent Council meeting where the [REDACTED] from council stated that people would not agree to a rate rise if asked but would see the reason for the rate rise.

Thirdly, the consultants, in their submission did not mention how many people had been surveyed. It could have been just one. I suspect that there were none.

In the Public Inquiry that was recently run, the present [REDACTED] was interviewed. I was rather surprised when [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] could have solved the shortfall that was created when IPART reduced the water rates if [REDACTED] had been employed then. And yet [REDACTED] is not prepared to do something about the current shortfall that [REDACTED] is complaining about.

It is all very well for [REDACTED] to ask for a rate increase extension but he has no idea how the other half lives. His current salary is \$300K, my pension is \$22K. I'm not crying poor but I am watching my cents. There are quite a few of us in the same situation. Mr. [REDACTED] expects us to pay a 15% increase a year while our pensions would be lucky to increase by 0.1% and now he also expects us to pay 34% for a water rate increase.

Added to this, new legislation has been passed recently where the rates will increase automatically based on the population increase. Thus a 1% increase in population will automatically add 1% to the pegged rate of 2%. And this will happen without any input from IPART.

Currently it looks like we are paying money into a bottomless hole, supporting an organization where the senior management are not accountable, not productive and not dependent on results for their salaries.

I urge you to reject the submissions for extension of rate increase to 10 years and the 34% increase in water rates