

Unfortunately I missed the Randwick City Council (RCC) Community Consultation process regarding a Special Rate Variation of 19.85% over three years.

I am a RCC ratepayer and I object to the rate increase. My rates are \$ [REDACTED] almost 60% more than the figure quoted. As a 60 year old self-funded retiree, retiring early due to illness, this increase is onerous. I expect that I am not the only one in this position.

I expect most of the increased funding will only improve community amenity to benefit residential building developers and state govt projects. Local residents will pay the toll of increased traffic volumes on our roads and aging infrastructure in our streets, such as sewage and drainage. Yes, there is a university and hospital campus in the area, but the residents only get the busy traffic volumes that come with these institutions. They do not necessarily promote community wellness and facility for local residents and ratepayers.

Some of the individual projects do not match expected responsibilities of local government. Eg the Women's Refuge. Isn't this a State govt responsibility? with some funding provided at the Federal level. Also why do both RCC and Bayside Councils wish to set up Refuges. Surely local councils can work together to share such resources.

I also question the accuracy of the statistics you quote. For instance a sample taken at a shopping centre is NOT a random sample as claimed in the Community Consultation Result Summary (attached). I am not even sure who the target population is supposed to be. I would expect either rate payers, and/or local residents, not just someone who happened to be in a local shopping centre. The statistics quoted are flawed - quoting a Confidence Interval requires random sampling.

Can other sources of revenue be considered? EG RCC does not charge for parking, perhaps this can be reconsidered? Cars add to our traffic and pollution, why do they get special treatment? Ratepayers are being charged enough!