

Author name: P. Gill

Date of submission: Monday, 3 June 2024

Your submission for this review:

This submission is prepared on a Personal basis as a resident and ratepayer. Rate pegging has, in the past become problematic for Councils, leading to a tranche of SRV applications, many in the order of multiple times the rate of annual inflation, in a catch-up type scenario. Unfortunately for many the surge was well above the expectation of Inflation. Whilst understanding the rationale for establishment of the Reference Group, in my view it raises the following points: 1) It does not provide for input from Ratepayers themselves. 2) There may be representative bias in having 8 local government representatives in that what Council does not want more funds. 3) From 2) above the definition of local government representative is not further defined. Presumption would be that these would be Councilors. 4) From 3) above the grouping could be skewed by these all being the Mayor. My suggestion is that composition be more reflective of a random sample across the various regions, perhaps drawn at random. 5) Noting that representation from IPART is the Secretariat, how will the Independence of IPART be maintained. 6) I hold the view that applications and reviews should be decided on their respective merits without pre-defined formatting that this proposal appears to intimate. 7) The terms of reference do not provide much detail, other than being a Draft Proposal to establish a body. It is my view that more detailed information is necessary to make a more critical assessment. 8) In my opinion any such methodology may require adjustment with the passage of time to better reflect changes forced on Councils by events including Government Cost shifting, size of the Grant funding pool fluctuating (and the dependence of Councils on this), the Economy, Natural Disasters/Pandemics , Government legislation and the general economic climate. Yours Sincerely Peter Gill