

My wife (Mrs Jennifer Greaves) are against the rate rise per following-

Cumulative effect is 17.64% over period. This is unaffordable for many rate payers. 33% shire residents aged 65 to 85. Many on fixed income, are continually squeezed. An indication of this is 9.81% (concerning figure) default on Council rates at present level can only increase, Socially disruptive and unfair.

Current economic growth is at best stagnant with lowest wages growth in decade and increasing cost of living already a burden for average home owner who is working. Impossible for retired /fixed income. Yet council once again seeks significant rise above CPI.

Council has established a habit of seeking special variation on top of ordinary allowable rate rise. This will be the second in consecutive terms. Always claim to be one off. Have seen approx. 150% increase in past 10 years.

While repair of the river is a noble aspiration even the Mayor concedes, it is a huge task requiring the involvement of all tiers of government. River repair only raised as an issue when it became apparent that variation was widely unpopular. Environmental blackmail to tie improved river to increase. Yet repair of river was only issue pressed in Council commissioned poll.

My discussions with people who participated in the telephone poll indicate "push polling". No option was given to reject the rate rise but fund river from existing programs. Hardly independent when council selects and remunerates firm.

Can't understand the methodology of telephone poll having a lesser number of responses than written and internet survey responses and yet being cited as a superior indicator of the feelings of the wider community (see comment on push polling). The percentages of negatives in all written responses if extrapolated over shire indicates community rejection.

Council has several assets and investments which rate rises indicate are not being managed wisely and to the benefit of rate payers.

Consultation to tick a box.