

From: Riordan, Michael [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, 20 March 2014 3:30 PM
To: Canterbury City Council
Cc: Tony Camenzuli
Subject: RE: E-news Update from Canterbury City Council

Canterbury Council's request for an additional rate increase is not new, it was proposed by the same GM as today and implemented in 2000 for a 'temporary' 15 years and even that was on the back of one prior that had expired!

There are heaps of reasons why Council should not be granted an increase beyond the capped 2.9%.

For instance, I also support healthy living but in times where ratepayers will most likely be sluggish with a 7.5% increase where inflating is only 3% how can you justify such programs as 300 pushbike giveaways?

Live within your means, the ratepayers have to!

Thanks,
Mike

From: Riordan, Michael [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, 3 March 2014 1:28 PM
To: Tony Camenzuli
Subject: Special Rate Variation - Canterbury

[REDACTED]

I'm a resident of Canterbury Municipal Council.

I understand Council has applied for a Special Rate Variation of 4.6% on top of the 2.9% limit.

Council have advertised the additional amount is urgent but temporary, duration of 3 years.

I have many concerns and raised such with Council with a mix of replies, however my suspicions are especially raised with the description of this being 'temporary'.

The same Council, led by the same General Manager proposed the same strategy in approximately 2000. I attended a community meeting organised by the Council in Earlwood as part of the then road-show. They then stated the 'temporary' measure was for 15 years which takes us to the implementation of the next levy (if approved by IPART).

They said in 2000 that there had previously been an additional levy but it was due to expire.

So when does a temporary levy become permanent? Over two decades of 'temporary increases' undermines this.

They finally sent a reply to my concerns blaming everything from web site problems, admitting incorrect wording in survey questions, the lack of notice advertising evening community meetings plus a range of other items where their replies would strain under the test of scrutiny.

I'll give you one example, when questioning the need to retile a town centre (not repair) they said it was in response to preferred community wants.

In discussion with Council staff they tell me they are unable to complete many road safety projects as there is no money in the budget especially when a town centre sucks up \$1m. Are Council so concerned with the feelings of the shoppers or just beautifying shopfronts for shop keepers at rate-payers expense?

I would love all our town centres be beautified but unless there is an urgent safety consideration then they should be deferred until they are affordable.

They should not be classified as urgent infrastructure and an impost imposed upon the residents for additional funding from ratepayers. Good economics dictates whether it be government or domestic, beautification is when you have additional funds, not when times are tight.

This application has been done before, veiled in Community Consultation. I hope IPART see Council's track record, approve only the 2.9% and tell them to get their house in order. This ongoing slug to the ratepayers is unfair and unnecessary.

The ratepayers in my street are dirty at this proposal and believe Council may not represent our feelings accurately. I hope you enable IPART to hear our voices.

Thanks

Mike

Michael Riordan

