

Author name: Anonymous

Date of submission: Wednesday, 8 March 2017

Submission: We object to BSC's special variation application. We believe the Council's community consultation exercise resulted in an overwhelming objection to the rate increases. We believe there is no urgent immediate need to hit the ratepayers for more money for these less than significant proposals. If Council really believe they are necessary, they should be prioritised for future funding from the considerable rate income that Council receives or from sale of Council's valuable assets. Any support that Council received for the variation was obtained in part [REDACTED]. Mr [REDACTED] was phoned by the Council's community survey consultant. After being subjected to many minutes of extremely fast reading from the survey "propaganda" (which he had already read), he was asked if he supported the 4 options. He advised he supported only the no variation proposal. He then was asked to rank the 4 proposals. Proposal #1 (no variation), he ranked 1. Asked to rank #2, he said he wouldn't rank as ranking would give it credibility - the consultant said "if you don't rank I will not retain your participation and delete your comments to date". The same comments were made concerning #3 and #4. Mr [REDACTED] refused to rank #2, 3 and 4 and the consultant rudely hung up the phone. It is clear to us that this survey was structured to con those being surveyed. Community surveys are structured to give the answer that owners want and professional surveyors hired by owners utilise that tactic. Therefore, BSC's whole community consultation exercise was a [REDACTED]. Mr [REDACTED] is available to give evidence about this phone call to a responsible officer. Reports that Council received 90% objection to the rate variation should be significantly increased due to the methodology of the survey consultant. Council's application should be rejected and Council should act responsibly for its ratepayers.