

# LG Submission Form 2021-2022 - notifications

Submission date: **4 February 2021, 2:31PM**  
Receipt number: **3829**  
Related form version: **3**

## IPART Special Variation Submission Form

Industry	Local Government
Review	(LG) Special Variations & Minimum Rates 2021-2022
Document Reference	
Council	Cootamundra-Gundagai Regional Council, Application Notification Letter

Please leave your comments in the comment box below.

I feel that there was insufficient community consultation to capture the true feelings of the community. The reasons for this are:-

1. The survey distributed to ratepayers was done over the Christmas break when a large majority of ratepayers were absent following harvest and through school holidays.
2. The questions in the survey were bias as they gave only three choices these being - accept SRV, go into admin where SRV will be imposed anyway or reduce staff and services. These did not include better efficiencies, better management.
3. The entire SRV was focused around amalgamations and the cost to council. I fee that the de-merger issue has prevented council from implementing efficiencies.
4. Some ratepayers have already endured a 100% rate increase due to harmonisation. Now an additional 53.5% is being asked.

5. Additional community consultation was provided outside IGA. The various issues were only captured and not how many people had these issues. I spoke to staff who never wrote anything down until I asked them too. It came across as a "tick a box" process.
6. Information provided to the community in the survey did not have the entire information. It stated that CGRC was below the average in its rates category. It did not highlight the towns in the category to give true comparison. It did highlight that the information was online but not link provide. I searched and could not find. Some towns may have large industry groups or higher earning ratepayers.
7. CGRC is predominantly an age populate and a SRV will put additional financial burden on the elderly.
8. Council communicated that Deloitte report implied that a 62.5% increase was needed. Now Council has suggested that only a 53.5% increase is needed. This is confusing to the community and almost appears deceitful.
9. SRV should be the last stand once everything else has been exhausted. Efficiencies should be the first stand. Seven managers in a council is just top heavy. The reason for amalgamations is to address this.
10. Council's survey implying that 25% of staff will be lost or 30% service was just a [REDACTED] tactic to make ratepayers choose a SRV. This was unfair and came across that the outdoor staff was at risk.
11. Ratepayers who have multiple properties and pay multiple rates only had the opportunity to voice there opinion once. If these properties were held by separate ratepayers more views would have been collected highlighting the need to have a far less SRV or none at all.
12. Council has stated that they will reduce staff through natural process over time. Essential services are still needed so staff still need to fill those positions. This should be by MERIT and not putting existing staff in positions. If job losses are to occur

they should be for efficiencies that benefits ratepayers.

If you have attachments you would like to include with your feedback, please 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

[REDACTED]

IPART's Submission Policy

**I have read & accept IPART's Submission Policy**