

From: [IPART Mailbox](#)
To: [Local Government Mailbox](#)
Subject: FW: objection to SRV by Hawkesbury City Council
Date: Monday, March 12, 2018 8:38:06 AM

From: Robyn Laurenson [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, 10 March 2018 12:37 PM
To: IPART Mailbox
Subject: objection to SRV by Hawkesbury City Council

Dear Sir /Madam.

Please do not allow this Council to force us from our home! We have just had an increase to our rates of over 105% without any warning. To add another increase will see us have to sell our home of 22 years.

My husband is 72 and I am 55, both of us are on the pension. We have worked all our lives till 2 years ago when Bill retired from part time work and I went on New start allowances whilst I await approval for a disability pension due to ill health.

I understand that our homes have increased in value BUT this does not mean money in our pockets to put food on the table.

Why has this been allowed to happen?

How is a Council that is such financial straits allowed to give 85% of the LGA a discount on their rates whilst giving 15% of the LGA a massive increase of up to 200% . The only explanation I can come up with is to mislead the resident of the true situation of the Councils position and their desire to be re-elected.

It is my understanding that Councils must distribute the rates burden fairly across all residents of the LGA. Hawkesbury City Council have not done so and I beg of you to investigate this disparity of the rates.

Council have stated in the IPART submission that they protected some suburbs so they only get an increase of \$90, while other suburbs will get increases more than \$6500.

This is the opposite of the intention in the Local Government Act, which intends rates to be evenly distributed to pay for services

The council has not been honest with the ratepayers and have been telling the community the rates structure they put in place is fair.

When our Local Progress Association tried to correct this misinformation with a newsletter to our fellow residents we were attacked in a Council Meeting. The [REDACTED] mislead the chamber by stating that the letter was unsigned and no contact details were supplied. The Name of our President and the email address of the Association were included on the newsletter for anyone to contact the Association with any concerns

Council also polled people and asked what new services we want, and implied we will get new services, but have NOT applied for new services or infrastructure in the IPART Submission. The submission is about retiring an \$80M debt accrued over decades by a failing council.

Council has been running operating losses for seven years, have not managed their fiduciary responsibilities, and have neglected our assets to the point where the state government requires immediate action.

Council spending is out of control, preferring to spend our money on frivolous things, pandering to minority groups, and neglecting the needs of long term ratepayers in rural areas. We do NOT need

flags to support and celebrate Gay Marriage or Sister Cities for Councillors to visit
It seems the council have changed the rates structure specifically to gain support of the urban areas,
and force the rural areas to pay for it.
People in the rural residential areas are dealing with hardship imposed by Council, with people
paying between \$4000 and \$9000 before an SRV.
It is unfair, and Council are out of control
Sincere regards
Robyn and Bill Laurenson

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]



Virus-free. www.avast.com