

LG Submission Form 2021-2022 - Applications

Submission date: **3 March 2021, 8:34AM**
Receipt number: **219**
Related form version: **2**

IPART Special Variation Submission Form - Applications

| | |
|---|--|
| Industry | Local Government |
| Review | (LG) Special Variations & Minimum Rates 2021-2022 |
| Document Reference | |
| Council | Central Coast 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 highlight what I believe are inaccuracies relating to the proposed rate rise for Central Coast rate payers.</p> <p>In a letter dated 13 Jan 2021 to "Dear Ratepayer", Acting CEO Rik Hart clearly documented a "Residential Average" for Gosford rate payers of \$1,015 for the current year (see attached scanned image). The administrator has repeatedly pushed for a "15%" rise, and it is my understanding council's submission to IPART is using that number. In the relevant column the dollar value equating to 15% rise is \$1,267.</p> <p>15% of \$1,015 is \$152.25. So an increase of 15% should come to \$1,167.25. Rik clearly states in explanation that the figures are "based on a harmonised rating system and the application of Special Rate Variation (SRV) to increase Council's total rate income above the rate peg. The proposal</p> |

includes a permanent one-off of 15% (inclusive of 2% rate peg and 13% SRV).” So it would appear the numbers are all-inclusive, ie they’re not leaving anything out or trying to hide anything.

Where did the extra \$100 come from? ($\$1267 - \$1167.25 = \99.75) According to my calculations, $\$1,015 + 24.8\%$ (TWENTY FOUR POINT EIGHT PERCENT) is JUST UNDER the figure of \$1,267

It gets even more confusing when one uses the rate calculator on the CCC website. Working backwards a little bit, I found that entering land valuation of \$431,000 give the current rates figure they say is current residential average (\$1,015). However that calculator tells me that someone on land of that value will pay \$1,478 under the 15% rate increase. Huh??? Sorry, but I can do basic maths ... the difference is \$463 which equates to an increase of 45.6%!!!

At the same time, it is my understanding that Council is required to communicate clearly and effectively with the rate payers. That letter of the 13th is the ONLY one I have received. The only other thing of relevance received in the mail was a brochure / leaflet type thing (not dated) from Dick Persson. In that document he CLEARLY states that “With a 15% increase the average residential increase will be \$3.20 a week”. Hmmmm, again, the website calculator clearly says the increase (for "average" Gosford property) will be \$463. Maybe I have to do the maths for those guys again ... 463 divided by 52 is 8.90384615 ... lets round that down (to give them a little benefit) and call it \$8.90. Or are we using some other version of weeks ... maybe a week on Mars is longer (I don't know) ...but it would take 144 weeks at \$3.20 to get the increase of \$463. No, hang on a minute, I just figured something out ... Dick's \$3.20 is "about right" if the rate rise really was 15%. $3.2 \times 52 =$

166.4. Refer back to my first figure of \$152.25 and let's just assume someone somewhere is taking a commission of \$14.15 on each of these "average" rates, taking it from what is really 15% (\$152.25) up to this new figure of \$166.40???? Sorry but I can only see here either errors and mistakes made at various times by multiple people ... or plain lies and deception.

I understand that "Council" seems to have had a little bit of difficulty with numbers over the past years, but history seems to be repeating itself?

I do hope Council has provided amended correct figures to IPART when requesting the SRV. You certainly shouldn't be using wrong, misleading and deceptive figures?

Quite frankly, I'm confused. Council has left me **TOTALLY UNCLEAR** as to what to expect.

Your comments on Criterion 1:

no comment

Your comments on Criterion 2:

See my general comments for inaccuracies and errors in councils numbers

Your comments on Criterion 3:

Many many people on the CC are elderly on pensions for whom this would be extremely difficult. Being in health care, I have no doubt some of these people might be forced into choosing between paying rates and either eating or getting healthcare services.

The ratepayers were in **NO** way responsible for the poor management and decisions that resulted in the debt, the repayment of which is (supposedly) the reason for the SRV, and as such, it is **NOT** reasonable to slug us these **HUGE** increases!

Your comments on Criterion 4:

no comment

Your comments on Criterion 5:

They have NO "productivity improvements and cost containment strategies in past years". There MIGHT be SOME such efforts in the last few months, but they DO NOT meet the specifically worded criteria. In fact, until picked up lately, they actively and continually made the situation WORSE "in past years".

If you have attachments you would like to include with your feedback, please attach them below.

[IMG_20210302_0001.pdf](#)

Your Details

Are you an individual or organisation?

Individual

If you would like your submission or your name to remain confidential please indicate below.

Publish - my submission and name can be published (not contact details or email address) on the IPART website

First Name

Darren

Last Name

Rickett

Organisation Name

Position

Email

[REDACTED]

IPART's Submission Policy

I have read & accept IPART's Submission Policy