

From: Paul Recher [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, 12 February 2020 3:20 PM
To: Local Government Mailbox <localgovernment@ipart.nsw.gov.au>
Subject: submission #1 Lismore council SRV

There is no wide spread support for this SRV. In fact, the initial response was so overwhelmingly against LCC moved the goalposts and suddenly there was a third option. Submissions to this 3rd option were 'hidden' over the Xmas break.

Councillors supporting this SRV always say roads are the #1 thing residents complain about and want fixed. This as well as the phone survey omitted the vital component to their query. Namely, "would you support a roads SRV if it cost you \$200? \$400 extra per annum? Then, like the results when asking about climate change, is a resounding No. People want to do something about road and climate change until they learn it'll hit them in the hip pocket.

LCC got a roads SRV of 6.4% in 1998. After 2 years, LCC subsumed this SRV into general revenue. If LCC had kept that SRV for roads we would not be here today with this SRV, in part, for roads. Though legislation now states the SRV must stay where it is allocated, there is nothing to prevent future councils from reducing the overall roads budget and still account for the SRV. Imaginal exercise. 2019/2020 roads budget is 10 million. An SRV is granted for one million so 2020/21 budget is 11 million for roads. But in 2021/22 council could cut roads budget by 6 million and still account for the one million SRV.

When presenting the SRV to the public for discussion, LCC said there were 3 options a) yes to SRV b) no to SRV and no added funds for roads c) no to SRV increase roads budget by cutting services. Concerning option c. If LCC took their responsibility seriously instead of finagling their way to get the SRV they want, they would have told the public exactly what services would be chopped. This would have enabled an improved understanding of the ramifications.

For too many people, including myself as an aged pensioner, rates are already an impost on my livelihood. This proposed increase is hurtful. My rates have, in spite of rate pegging, increased by >6% per annum excl water & sewerage since 1978. In 1978 they were \$235 and now about \$2750.

This council was repeatedly told the new art gallery would be in the red for 100's of 1000's per annum. \$800,000 exact figure. Their warning was based on cost to Grafton and Tweed councils 'new' art galleries. This council voted to give developers of the North Plateau a multi-million dollar break in developer fees. These are just two recent examples of a multitude of inept financial decisions by this and previous councils. Now as history repeatedly shows us the council wants us to finance their errors so they can keep on making bad money decisions.

Proof of their incompetence with handling money is contained in this very SRV. LCC wants \$\$\$\$ to stimulate the Lismore economy. What hubris! Little ole LCC is going to turn around the Lismore economy. How utterly risible! If these financial wizards could turn around

Lismore's economy they would not be a staff member or councillor for LCC. They'd be in corporate world earning millions. I mean seriously giving this council money to spend stimulating the local economy? Its a joke and a waste of money.

LCC did not meet the requirements of the legislation. They did not CONSIDER submissions. Browsing or even reading does not meet the definition of consider. There was no thought given to submissions as evidenced by both the total failure of any specific responses to any of the submissions plus the ad hoc nature of what was presented to council as submissions by staff was selectively deceptive and expedient.

LCC was recently granted a biodiversity SRV. IPART should refuse this SRV. IPART should suggest to LCC to put this SRV to a referendum @ next Sept. council elections.

Sincerely, Dr. Paul Recher

Do not do unto others as you would not do unto others.

Corollary to the Golden Rule