

LG Submission Form 2021-2022 - Applications

Submission date: **6 March 2021, 8:24PM**
Receipt number: **336**
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.	<p>I wish to make the following submission in regards to the proposed Special Rate Variation of 6% apparently to run the Corowa Aquatic Centre.</p> <p>Firstly, Corowa is a relatively small town, so why on earth did we need to build 3 swimming pools? Corowa has not had a community swimming pool for the past 4 summers.</p> <p>Secondly, there was no application for the third pool, a splash pool, in the original Development Application, as this has apparently been hidden from the general public's viewing. We don't know how much money is needed to run the 50 m pool, the 25 m indoor heated pool or the splash pool, individually, as we have only recently been told the combined running costs.</p> <p>Before Council kicked out the long term caravan sites from the Council owned but leased out caravan park, it was returning a benefit to Council in the form of a</p>

lease. The people who leased the park also ran the previous pool at no cost to Council and a benefit to the local community.

Which brings me to my next point, that the predicted deficit for the combined running costs of the Aquatic Centre amounts to roughly the same amount as the amount spent on tourism promotion which was \$688,333 for a return of just \$7,542 income. This \$688,333 is rate payers' money, as tourists do not contribute to rates or levies. Why then are we subsidising tourism when nobody is subsidising our farming operations, even though if this Special Variation is granted it is farmers who will be paying the most? Why is this fair when we can receive no benefit?

This Council needs to be a responsible Council and start representing it's community and not tourists and out of town developers cashing in on our Council's total incompetence and mismanagement. If every time they stuff up they can run to IPART and get a handout from the rate payers, what sort of message does that send? Farmers did it really tough during drought years. Council received drought funding and built recreational facilities while farmers' rates rose. They even secretly passed a \$30 million solar farm on the edge of town beside our airport and industrial land which denied the planned truck bypass route included in the Strategic Land Use Plan, which was prepared with rate payers' money. Farmers are forced to spend their own money to fix Council roads just to get produce to markets. Enough is enough and someone needs to tell them as they are not listening to the community. I feel sure that if this proposed Rate Variation is denied they will find the money elsewhere. It is all about priorities. They should have built an Aquatic Centre of a scale suitable to the population where the user pay system could have been

implemented. In the past, Council have always taken the extra money from rural road funding. Perhaps it is time to get it from events and tourism funding.

Your comments on Criterion 1:

Your comments on Criterion 2:

Your comments on Criterion 3:

Your comments on Criterion 4:

Your comments on Criterion 5:

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