

Author name: Anonymous

Date of submission: Thursday, 5 August 2021

Your submission for this review:

Question 1: Should our methodology be re-based after the census every five years to reflect actual growth? Response: No, in support of ensuring that the process remains straightforward and based on IPARTs analysis that the difference between estimates and actual census data would be minimal, we do not believe that an adjustment would be necessary unless there was a material difference. Question 2: In the absence of a true-up, should we impose a materiality threshold to trigger whether an adjustment is needed on a case-by-case basis to reflect actual growth? Response: We do not support a true-up in any circumstances where it would result in a reduction in a councils income. The population factor should instead remain at zero until the position is corrected. We do support a threshold to be established where actual population growth exceeds the estimated growth by a material percentage. In general terms we believe a material difference would be 5% or higher. Question 3: Do you have any other comments on our draft methodology or other aspects of this draft report? Response: a. Although Council supports the draft methodology proposed by IPART it will not fully address the problems resulting from rate pegging. There are other cost drivers and revenue constraints that would not be accounted for by this change. These factors are independent of population growth and include costs driven by the expanding roles and responsibilities of local government, rising community expectations, rising project costs, cost shifting and the ongoing decline in Commonwealth Financial Assistance Grants in real terms. These factors impact on all councils, not just growth councils. b. Councils view is that the best solution to the problems of rate pegging and its negative impact on a councils long term financial sustainability is to unconditionally remove rate pegging.