

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Tuesday, 2 November 2021 8:22 AM

**To:** IPART <[ipart@ipart.nsw.gov.au](mailto:ipart@ipart.nsw.gov.au)>

**Cc:** [REDACTED]

**Subject:** Strenuous objection to Central Coast Council's proposal to keep rates at the new rate for a further seven years

Good morning,

I am writing to object to the Central Coast's proposal to keep rates at the new increased rates for a further 7 years beyond 2022. Why is this burden for rate payers to carry?

When the initial increase was first proposed we were told it would be a 2% increase however when you look at the figures it is far more than that.

My rates for my property at [REDACTED], Blackwall where I live and have lived for many years used to be \$511.00 per instalment in 2021 and with the increase they are now \$688.00 per instalment

This equates to a rise of \$177.00 per quarter which far exceeds 2%. I have been told this is because there are more affluent people in my area and here I was thinking rates were equated with land value. We are a one income family and \$177.00 a quarter increase just makes our life harder.

The former [REDACTED] of the council who caused financial devastation were able to walk away with all their payouts in tact – is this the new normal that we now reward such bad behaviour? Council told us it was because there was no clear case of [REDACTED] it was just poor financial skills – seriously!

An [REDACTED] was brought in who is paid very well for his troubles I'm sure and his idea is to apply more financial pressure to the Central Coast people who did nothing more than trust that the people elected to Council were competent at their job and oversight was in place.

For many years now the council has been told by the local residents that the infrastructure to support all the new people moving to the area was not in place and needed to be looked at. No notice was taken and here we are. The local joke for years has been that if you want a rest go work for the council.

Over the years the services council were responsible for declined until they were non-existent. The projects they have under taken have been hit and miss and yet we are told to be grateful for what they do for us.

Surely a more sensible way to recoup more money would be to get levies from all the new developments on the area where they are putting up 8 units where only one house used to be on very small parcels of land? We are way over developed and way under serviced and it is unsustainable in the long term.

I realise I have just wasted my time writing this however it needed to be said. At 62 I understand that when we are told our opinion matters what is really meant is that the institutions involved will go ahead and do what they like anyway and I'm sure this time will be no different

Regards

\_\_\_\_\_

[illegible]

As a result, the model is able to capture the complex relationships between the variables and provide a more accurate prediction of the outcome. The model is trained on a dataset of 1000 samples, and the results show that the model is able to predict the outcome with a high degree of accuracy. The model is able to capture the complex relationships between the variables and provide a more accurate prediction of the outcome. The model is trained on a dataset of 1000 samples, and the results show that the model is able to predict the outcome with a high degree of accuracy.

\_\_\_\_\_