

[REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, 19 February 2019 12:21 PM

To: Local Government Mailbox <localgovernment@ipart.nsw.gov.au>

Subject: Special Rate Increase Port Stephens Council

I would like to strongly voice my disapproval of the intention of the PSSC to have a special rate increase of 6.5% per year compounding for the next 7 years that council claims it is required for additional funds for a range of infrastructure projects including town centre and neighbourhood revitalisation, new and improved infrastructure such as roads, paths and cycleways. It also includes additional asset maintenance, enhance community facilities and services to meet community expectations as outlined in their Community Strategic Plan.

Port Stephens Council by their own admission derives substantial income from various business interests with 16 million alone coming from the sand mine lease at Williamtown as well as income from Newcastle Airport, 5 tourist holiday resorts and levies from tour operators, some of the highest land rates in NSW etc. This income stream is I believe far more than most other equivalent sized council areas within N.S.W could hope to receive.

I know of several projects that the council has done recently that have been completed but have ended up with a sub-standard outcome. I have been in project management throughout Australia, the Pacific Islands and the Indian Ocean Territories and the way that Port Stephens Council conducts its self and the management

of projects and project budgets is substandard and should be investigated. The need for additional funding should not be required if project works were planned and carried out in a professional manner and actually finish with the best outcome possible while minimising the need to pay contractors variations and extras.

Taylor's Beach Jetty for instance had the tender called for a "design and construct" of a jetty with walkway jetty deck with gangway and floating pontoon. There is no doubt that this has been constructed but at a very poor standard of workmanship. This whole project while looking okay to the layman is sub standard and is not a value for money outcome by any stretch of the imagination. The Polyvinyl pile liners are supposed to be placed over the pile with approximately 800mm into the seabed and extend to the top of the pile, I cannot comment on the amount of penetration into the seabed that these have but they do not extend to the top of the pile which is in plain sight so I wonder what is where you cannot see.

The abutment path where it meets the timber portion of the jetty are at differing angles to each other, very unprofessional and low standard. The girders supporting the decking are placed at 1200mm centres which is far too wide and should be at 600mm centres.

Lemon Tree Passage waterfront upgrade is another project that cost rate payers dearly and have ended up with a sub standard outcome.

Karuah Boat Ramp upgrade, this project is about to start into it's 4th rehash as the preceding three attempts at providing a simple safe asset have ended up as dangerous and almost unusable at a huge financial cost to rate payers, this is another example of wasted funding.

Corlette Beach Erosion, this is a project that should not have any funds from rate payers used as the EIS that was conducted prior to the construction of The Anchorage Mariner seawall highlighted what would happen following the seawall construction, and that was the erosion of the Eastern end of Corlette Beach and Sandy Point with the Western end of the beach collecting sand against the seawall. As a condition of the DA approval for The Anchorage it was stated that the owners of The Anchorage would be responsible for the relocating of the sands from the Western end against the seawall back to the Eastern end of Corlette Beach and Sandy Point. This sand transfer has never been done in 26 years since the seawall construction yet PSSC has employed consultants to study the beach and make recommendation for its rectification, I believe at a cost to rate payers of approximately \$80k. This is just another case of miss spent moneys that could have been used elsewhere as it was not needed they had all the information they needed in the original EIS.

I have been told about a project at Swan Bay to install some culverts on Swan Bay waterfront road that had work crews sent to the work site only to waste a week with all plant, equipment, council staff and contract traffic

