First Name	Last Name	General comments regarding council's proposed SV	Comments on Criterion 1:	Comments on Criterion 2:	Comments on Criterion 3: Comments on Criterion 4:	Comments on Criterion 5:
			There has been very limited consultation with this community.  This community, as with most community, have suffered economically as a result of the catastrophic bushfires			
		I have lived on the Central Coast at Copacabana for 49 years and have been a ratepayer for 31 of those years.  The roads, foot paths, general services are wholly inadequate and there has been no explanation whatsoever as to how this Council used or lost 500 million.	and Covid.  The request to increase rates ignores the proposal of the council to harmonise rates between Wyong and			
		The administrator that has been appointed has written to the Gosford ratepayers advising that we are the stakeholders and that we voted for this Council.	Gosford Council. There have been no benefits whatsoever arising from the merger of the two councils.			
		We as ratepayers have very little input into what a council does or does not do and further, the administrator, who is appointed by the State government, gave this Council a clean bill of health less than three years ago and somehow this Council has lost \$500 million.	The administrator has indicated that prior to any rate increase, Gosford ratepayers must pay the same as while ratepayers meaning that Gosford ratepayers must pay more to equal that amount that has been paid by		The proposal for the increase is not reasonable especially in circumstances where the administrator	
		No one has demonstrated where the money went nor have a demonstrated how this problem will be fixed in the future. We have simply been asked to pay more money.  Before any further money is obtained from the ratepayers, an investigation must be undertaken to determine whether \$500 million went and who will be responsible and accountable in the future for the	Wyong. After this harmonisation process has occurred, then the administrator is seeking to increase rates by a further 10%-15%.		is proposing to harmonise rates between Gosford and Wyong councils and then increase rates by a further 10%-15%.	
		utilisation of ratepayer funds.  This is the second that Gosford Council has simply "lost" a substantial amount of money and no one has been held to account.		Other than the administrator indicating that as the stakeholders we are responsible for our Council, the administrator has not once demonstrated how the	In some cases some Gosford Council ratepayers will be looking at a total increase in the vicinity of	
1 Anonymous	Anonymous	The government owes a fiduciary duty to the ratepayers and the administrator is not complying with this duty. Simply raising money is not fixing the problem.  I am angry that Central Coast Council are trying to increase the rates on my property. I live in an area of Central Coast Council named Mooney were only basic work is done. Apart from weekly rubbish	staffing levels, increase in pay levels for Council staff yet there has not been any increase in services.	5500 million dollars was lost and how it is proposed that this will not occur again.	35%-45% to their current rates	
2 Anonymous	Anonymous	semoval, curb side bulk pickups, and the maintenance of two small children's playgrounds, there is little care				
		I am a resident and rategaver of the Central Coast and to say I am appealed at the disastrous mis-management and subsequent finacial failure of the Council, is a cross understatement. I strongly reject any of				
		the special rate rise proposals they are chasing, apart from the 2% pegged rate rise. The incompetence and extremely poor management of this Council is beyond belief. I have worked for another large Council				
		down in Sydney for many years and they have managed to provide adequate services and supprate intrastructure and still remain in the black francially without slugging their rategyers special rates antiations. However, even the Council I work for has major systemic faults in their organizations and business model that feault in excessive spending and excessive. These faults include: Excessive levels of upper & middle management personnel, managers who view Councils as a quasi private sector corporation instead of a local government agency, expensive company cars substidied by Council, overly				
		ambitious and high cost infrastructure projects, unaffordable beautification projects, insufficient monies allocated to maintaining and upgrading essential infrastructure and providing essential services,				
		insufficient monies allocated to hiring base level workers to carry out the grass roots physical works, overly controlled and restrictive procurement policies which prevent the engagement of lower priced consultants, contractors and suppliers, poor supervision and follow up by managers allowing low levels of output from their staff. I could go on and on as I see this dysfunctional culture every day, and			The existing rates are already high and are verging on being unaffordable to the majority of	
		everybody's rates continue to climb higher and higher to unaffordable levels. Central Coast Council appear to have all the above faults on a major scale, hence the embarrassing position they now find themselves in. And once again, they want the victims of their poor management (or lack of management) to ball them out with more rates money, which as I said I unholebearted to relevate and will not pay. I	The Council needs to learn to live within it's means and not over extend to the point where they are constantly	do not support any SV rate rise, only the 2% pegged rate rise. The Council needs to find alternative funding including recovery of termination funds mpaid	ratepayers. I only earn a basic salary and I can't afford another rate rise, particularly a large one. The level of services provided by the Council do not represent good value for the rates paid by we I would hope that ipart gives those documents very close scrutiny and takes a hard	The Council needs to take a good hard look at itself and it's culture, pull their whole operation apart and re- structure it to operate efficiently and within it's means financially. It's time they became accountable instead
3 Larry	COHEN	sincerely hope that joart enforces the people's will in this case and the task of re-building the Council remains with the Council. Thank you. Larry Cohen.  We understand that our council is seeking a 15% increase in parts to any of their incommendation. We understand that our council is seeking an 15% increase in parts to any of their incommendation. We strongly onnote the manner in which this is, being proposed. If rate powers are remained to assist all rate.	hunting revenue to fend off insolvency.	out to the offending managers.	ratepayers. line on the Council by rejecting their SV proposals.	of acting like executives in a private sector corporation.
		payers should pay the same amount. It should not be a % increase dependent on property value.			We strongly argue that it is not reasonable to expect some rate payers to be paying more than	
4 Anonymous	Anonymous	This special variation is both unfair & unnecessary for the following reasons- 1. If awarded this will become the base for future increases.			others. The figure payable by rate payers should be the same for each home or businesss.	
		Council should be kept to hold rates that IPART actually legislated some years ago to a max increase of 8 %.     Why should all rate payers bear the cost of this poor &				
		Disgusting effort by this council.  4. If ran my house budget like council has to the detriment of having to lose my home through mortgage failure, will council fund my situation as they want their rate payers/homeowners to do?				
		<ol><li>Council are about to build a new Library in Gosford at the cost of \$8.5 million, this should not happen with the debt this council is in.</li></ol>				
		<ol> <li>Council should be selling off as many assets as possible to repay this debt. This is what every person in Australia &amp; maybe the world would need to do to if in a similar situation.</li> <li>This is un Australian.</li> </ol>				
5 James	Raiston	8. This council are also about to spend \$1,000,000 on a safety cage! fencing on the ST Hubert's Island road bridge which locals don't want or need. So here is another million dollars saved if hatted. How many more projects can be hatted?				
		Dear Mr Hart I note you letter of 13 Jan and the insert in the recent rates notice.				
		I am writing to you on behalf of myself and my husband who are 65 and 66 respectively and have a property of				
		This property is our retirement plan and when we bought it, we were very surprised to see that the rates for a rural block which is 60% bush were \$3784 pa, which is way above the average figure of \$2909 for a Wyong farming property that you quoted in your letter of 13 Jan. This figure is already very difficult to pay for retirees.				
		I understand the difficulty you find yourselves however passing this on to people like myself who are already paying ridiculously high rates is not appropriate.				
		A 10% rise would put the rates up to \$4161.96 which is far more than you quote in your communications and a 15% rise up by \$557.54 to \$4351.14. These figures equate to \$7.27 and \$10.91 per week which				
		are again more than even the business rates you quoted. This is inappropriate when this property is essentially a residential property with some land.				
		I checked the rateable value after I first moved in and it apparently is correct, though far more than any other properties near where I live so I don't understand that either.				
		I totally oppose this method of raising funds to resolve the issues council has found itself in by its own mismanagement.				
		I look forward to hearing your thoughts.				
	L	Amanda Houghton				
6 Amanda	Houghton	I disagree with the rate rise for the Wyong Shire. We already had a rate rise and Gosford Shire did not. Now that CC Council has amalgamated, the rate rise will impact the Wyong Shire residents again.				
		I do also firmly believe that a proposal would have been completely unnecessary if Council funds had been used for their intended purpose, rather than illegally squandered.  The letter I received states low dams (with all this rain??), Boods (so dams are full?), bushfires (which received HUGE donations), coastal erosion (should have been dealt with years ago). Covid-19 and THE				
7 Anonymous	Anonymous	REALITY OF OUR FINANCIAL SITUATION Why should I be paying for Council's mistakes??!	The Administrator has stated that raising rates is the only option available after already identifying cuts such as			
			the sale of assets. However residents are yet to see the full detail of these cuts. A full public meeting needs to be held so everything can be explained in detail that's not in the Administrator's reports. There has also been		It is unreasonable because of the reasons stated above:  Not investigated properly	
			no explanation as to why no-one from the council has been investigated or referred for potential criminal activity or corruption despite illegally accessing and spending unrestricted funds, or why the former CEO was given a		Not explained property  No public meeting or government inquiry held.	
8 Anonymous	Anonymous	This permanent rate rise should not be approved until the largest debt ever incurred by a council is thoroughly investigated and explained, including the role of the NSW Audit Office.  The idea that rising the rates to the community of central coast will not make this council any better financially or provide better services, is not an idea I can agree with and all you are doing is fuelling the fire	or corruption despite illegality accessing and spending unrestricted funds, or why the former CEO was given a \$380,000 payout, adding to the bill for taxpayers.  A	A letter was sent to residents explaining a 10-15% rise for the average ratepayer but it wasn't made clear that it was permanent.	What has been cut apart from staff and assets and are there further cuts that can be made.	
		The lose that this gaine leaves to the community of central costs will not make this council any beater liminically or provide deliar services, is not an lose it can agree with and an you are doing is trelling the life that the same people that got us in this situation.  I am aware that some staff have been terminated and made redundant, but this again adds more costs to the rate payers.				
9 Fortunate	Verduci	You have a difficult decision to make, but sometimes one needs to look further into what has brought us to this dilemma. This request to increase raises well above what all the community can afford is not only going to force people to reconsider in how they can pay in these troubling times. Please do not allow this increase.				
			Central Coast Council was amalgamated by the NSW state government with no choice from the the residents. Only a few years in its been discovered that the council have extreme revenue pressures. The cause of which			
			clearly relates back to the formation of the amalgamated council and the lack of governance put in place by - the State government.			
			clearly relates back to the formation of the amalgamated council and the lack of governance put in place by -			
			clearly relates back to the formation of the amalgamated council and the lack of governance put in place by - the State government.  The amalgamated council has been forced by recent events at Wamberal to incur great costs to remediate an			
		It is not at all appropriate for a council lacking proper governance framework caused by the NSW state governments rushed amalgamation to be slugging COVID stressed residents an additional tax.	clearly relate back to the formation of the amalgameted council and the lack of governance put in place by I the State government. The amalgameted council has been forced by recent events at Warnberra to incur great costs to remediate an evision of the beach (info boses). The state government are directly responsible for policy relating to beach reaction and fooding.  The clear revenue path for council is to the state government to fund the shortfall and the medium term—	have discovered the intent for council to slua residents with this tax inadvertently whilst seeking information on a council MTB project.	As per my comments in criterion 1 - 8 is the NSW state government who in every way is the cause of the situation that the council finds itself. Therefore it is totally unreasonable for pateoxways to bear the	There are no cost containment strategies realized in past years - that is the whole basis of this request for additional stude - namely hat funds were not successfully managed nor appropriated correctly.
		It is not at all appropriate for a council lacking proper governance framework caused by the NSW state governments rushed amalgamation to be slugging COVID stressed residents an additional tax.  The council should be making the funding request directly to the NSW state government and the NSW state government should be taking responsibility for the shootdy state of affairs they have created.	clearly relates back to the formation of the amalgameted council and the lack of governance put in place by the State government.  The amalgameted council has been birced by recent events at Warnhers to incur great costs to remediate an execution of the beach first houses). The state government are directly responsible to policy relating to beach excision and flooding.  The clear revenue path for council is to the state government to fund the shortfall and the medium term particularly since the state government by its own actions created this situation.	have discovered the intent for council to slug residents with this tax inadvertently whilst seeking information on a council MTB project. read online news dally and have a landline. It is highly likely that the majority of residents are not aware of the plan to also a 15% tax on them.	the situation that the council finds itself. Therefore it is totally unreasonable for ratepayers to bear the burden of cost.	additional funds - namely that funds were not successfully managed nor appropriated correctly.
10 Anonymous	Anonymous	It is not at all appropriate for a council facking proper governance framework caused by the NSW state governments rushed amalgamation to be stugging COVID stressed residents an additional tax.  The council should be making the funding request directly to the NSW state government and the NSW state government should be taking responsibility for the shooldy state of affairs they have created.  The council has also made an absolutely appalling job of informing residents of no less than a 15% impending rate rise. Clearly the strategy is to sneak this through with little scrutiny.	clearly relates back to the formation of the amalgameted council and the lack of governance put in place by the State government.  The amalgameted council has been bixed by recent events at Warnberra to incur great costs to remediate an erection of the beach rind houses). The state government are directly responsible to policy relating to beach excitor and faculting.  The clear revenue path for council is to the state government to fund the shortfall and the medium term-particularly since the state government by its own actions created this situation.	have discovered the intent for council to slug residents with this tax inadvertirely whilst seeking information on a council MTB project. read online news daily and have a landline. It is highly likely that the majority of residents are not aware of the plan to slug a 15% tax on them.	the situation that the council finds itself. Therefore it is totally unreasonable for ratepayers to bear the	
10 Anonymous	Anonymous	It is not at all appropriate for a council tacking proper governance transevork caused by the NSW state governments rushed amalgamation to be slugging COVID stressed residents an additional tax.  The council should be making the funding request directly to the NSW state government and the NSW state government should be taking responsibility for the shoody state of affairs they have created.  The council should be making the funding request directly to the NSW state government and the NSW state government should be taking responsibility for the shoody state of affairs they have created.  The council should be making the funding request directly to the NSW state government should be taking responsibility for the shoody state of affairs they have created.  The Associated has also maked an absolutely appointing job of thorning residents on less than a 15% impending rater rise. Clearly the strategy is to sneak this through with little exclusive.  The Associated has also maked as appointed a special variation on the basis that even after returning staff head count and CAPEX to pre-amalgamation levels there will stifl be a significant operating defect and a rate increase is the over youthorn to have a find a supplementation of the state of	clearly relates back to the formation of the amalgameted council and the lack of governance put in place by the State government.  The amalgameted council has been birced by recent events at Warnhers to incur great costs to remediate an execution of the beach first houses). The state government are directly responsible to policy relating to beach excision and flooding.  The clear revenue path for council is to the state government to fund the shortfall and the medium term particularly since the state government by its own actions created this situation.		the situation that the council finds itself. Therefore it is totally unreasonable for ratepayers to bear the burden of cost.  The cost should be borne by the NSW state government as part of the ratepayers existing taxes.	additional funds - namely that funds were not successfully managed nor appropriated correctly.  Without the elementary governance framework being put in place for such a council to function any
10 Anonymous	Anonymous	It is not at all appropriate for a council facking proper governance framework caused by the NSW state government rushed amargamation to be slugging COVID stressed residents an additional tax.  The council should be making the funding request directly to the NSW state government and the NSW state government should be taking responsibility for the shoody state of affairs they have created. The council has also made an absolutely appalling job of informing residents of no less than a 15% impending rater inc. Clearly the strategy is to sneak this through with little soution.  The Administrator has requested a special variation on the basis that even after returning staff head count and CAPEX to pre-amargamation levels there will still be a significant operating deficit and a rate increases in the city solution to this. I disagree.  The Administrator has requested a special variation on the basis that even after returning staff head count and CAPEX to pre-amargamation levels there will still be a significant operating deficit and a rate increase in the city solution to this. I disagree.	clearly relates back to the formation of the amalgameted council and the lack of governance put in place by the State government.  The amalgameted council has been birced by recent events at Warnhers to incur great costs to remediate an execution of the beach first houses). The state government are directly responsible to policy relating to beach excision and flooding.  The clear revenue path for council is to the state government to fund the shortfall and the medium term particularly since the state government by its own actions created this situation.		the situation that the council finds itself. Therefore it is totally unreasonable for ratepayers to bear the burden of cost.  The cost should be borne by the NSW state government as part of the ratepayers existing taxes.	additional funds - namely that funds were not successfully managed nor appropriated correctly.  Without the elementary governance framework being put in place for such a council to function any
10 Anonymous	Anonymous	It is not at all appropriate for a council lacking proper governance framework caused by the NSW state governments rushed amalgamation to be slugging COVID affectsed residents an additional tax.  The council should be making the funding request directly to the NSW state government and the NSW state government about be taking responsibility for the shody state of affairs they have created. The council should be making the funding responsibility for the shody state of affairs they have created. The council should be making the state of the state o	clearly relates back to the formation of the amalgameted council and the lack of governance put in place by the State government.  The amalgameted council has been birced by recent events at Warnhers to incur great costs to remediate an execution of the beach first houses). The state government are directly responsible to policy relating to beach excision and flooding.  The clear revenue path for council is to the state government to fund the shortfall and the medium term particularly since the state government by its own actions created this situation.		the situation that the council finds itself. Therefore it is totally unreasonable for ratepayers to bear the burden of cost.  The cost should be borne by the NSW state government as part of the ratepayers existing taxes.	additional funds - namely that funds were not successfully managed nor appropriated correctly.  Without the elementary governance framework being put in place for such a council to function any
10 Anonymous	Anonymous	It is not at all appropriate for a council lacking proper governance framework caused by the NSW state governments rushed amalgamation to be slugging COVID effects of residents an additional tax.  The council should be making the funding request directly to the NSW state government and the NSW state of affairs they have created. The council has also made an absolutely appealing job of informing residents on no less than a 15% impending rate rise. Clearly the strategy is to neak this through with title southing.  The Administrator has requested an appeal and uniform on the basis that even after returning staff head count and CAPEX to pre-analgamation levels there will all be a significant operating deficit and a rate increase is the only solution to this. I disagree.  The purpose of the analgamation was to increase operating efficiency. Not only has the Administrator not been able to identify any such efficiencies, his interim Report indicates that a significant level of institutions has only a such efficiencies. In the interim Report indicates that a significant level of institutions have been presented.  The Administrator has recovered as a restart of the analgamation. No other reason for the need for a special variation has been presented.  The Administrator has or been able to level thy the reason for the day in the interim. Plant the count of pulmbing inspector recently. He stated that the maximum travel time levels that a number of other council departments were significantly effected.  The reason for the inefficiency joint critical to the geography of the amalgamation of the analgamation. He expressed the Three reason for the inefficiency joint critical actions of the council adoptivents were significantly effected.	clearly relates back to the formation of the amalgameted council and the lack of governance put in place by the State government.  The amalgameted council has been birced by recent events at Warnhers to incur great costs to remediate an execution of the beach first houses). The state government are directly responsible to policy relating to beach excision and flooding.  The clear revenue path for council is to the state government to fund the shortfall and the medium term particularly since the state government by its own actions created this situation.		the situation that the council finds itself. Therefore it is totally unreasonable for ratepayers to bear the burden of cost.  The cost should be borne by the NSW state government as part of the ratepayers existing taxes.	additional funds - namely that funds were not successfully managed nor appropriated correctly.  Without the elementary governance framework being put in place for such a council to function any
10 Ancrymous	Anonymous	It is not at all appropriate for a council lacking proper governance framework caused by the NSW state governments rushed amalgamation to be slugging COVID attreased residents an additional tax.  The council should be making the funding request directly to the NSW state government and the NSW state government should be taking responsibility for the shoddy state of affairs they have created. The council has also made an absolutely appealing job of informing residents of no less than a 15% impending rate rise. Clearly the strategy is to sneak this through with little socrulary.  The Administrator has requested a special variation on the basis that even after returning staff head court and CAPEX to pre-amalgamation levels there will still be a significant operating delict and a rate increase is the city solution to this. I disagree.  The purpose of the amalgamation, to increase operating efficiency. Not only has the Administrator not been able to identifying any such efficiencies, his inferim Report indicates that a significant level of inefficiency has occurred as a restul of the amalgamation. No other reason for the need for a special variation has been presented.  The Administrator has not been able to leftly the reason for this dop in the filtown; I can help. It had a caused conversation with an ournal plumbing inspector recently. He stated that the maximum travel time to his next appointment was 30 minutes prior to amalgamation and is now up to two hours depending on time of day. This has significantly reduced his work efficiency port amalgamation. He oppressed the verse that a number of other council dependent was extracted council, which is simply impractical.  Before approving the special variation, PART would need to be satisfied that there is no practical alternative to it. I submit that de-amalgamation would reverse the inefficiencies which have led to the need for the special variation.	clearly relates back to the formation of the amalgameted council and the lack of governance put in place by the State government.  The amalgameted council has been forced by recent events at Warnhers to incur great costs to remediate an execution of the back in dhouses). The state government are directly responsible for policy relating to beach reaction and facilities.  The clear revenue path for council is to the state government to fund the shortfall and the medium term-particularly vince the state government by its own actions created this situation.  It revenue path is NOT to stug its COVID stressed residents an additional tax.		the situation that the council finds itself. Therefore it is totally unreasonable for ratepayers to bear the burden of cost.  The cost should be borne by the NSW state government as part of the ratepayers existing taxes.	additional funds - namely that funds were not successfully managed nor appropriated correctly.  Without the elementary governance framework being put in place for such a council to function any additional funding is titledy to be spent in just the same unscruppidous way.  As detailed shows, I submit that council's P&R documents do not disclose the true cause of the decrease
10 Anonymous	Anonymous	It is not at all appropriate for a council lacking proper governance framework caused by the NSW state government numbed amarigamation to be slugging COVID sitressed residents an additional tax.  The council should be making the funding request directly to the NSW state government and the NSW state government should be taking responsibility for the shoody state of affairs they have created.  The council has also made an absolutely appealing job of informing residents of no less than a 15% inepending rater isse. Clearly the strategy is to sneak this through with little excurity.  The Approach than requested a special variation on the basis that even after returning staff head count and CAPEX to pre-amarigamation levels there will still be a significant operating deficit and a rate measure that the propose of the amarigamation was to increase operating efficiency. Not only has the Administrator not been able to identify any such efficiencies, his freim Report indicates that a significant level of inefficiency has council as a result of the amarigamation. Not offer season for the increase of the special variation is been presented.  The Approach that is council as result of the amarigamation. Not offer season for the increase of the special variation of all calls. The Assignment was 30 minutes prior to amarigamation and in row up to be not used expending on their ord all. This has against content was 30 minutes prior to amarigamation and in row up to be not used expending on their ord all. This has against prior adjustment of the product of a series of the inefficiency just and any and the product of a series of the inefficiency is directly related to the page apply of the amarigamation council, which is simply impractical.	clearly relates back to the formation of the amalgameted council and the lack of governance put in place by the State government.  The amalgameted council has been birced by recent events at Warnhers to incur great costs to remediate an execution of the beach first houses). The state government are directly responsible to policy relating to beach excision and flooding.  The clear revenue path for council is to the state government to fund the shortfall and the medium term particularly since the state government by its own actions created this situation.		the situation that the council finds itself. Therefore it is totally unreasonable for ratepayers to bear the burden of cost.  The cost should be borne by the NSW state government as part of the ratepayers existing taxes.	additional funds - namely hat funds were not successfully managed nor appropriated correctly.  Without the elementary governance framework being put in place for such a council to function any additional funding is likely to be spent in just the same unscrupulous way.
10 Anonymous	Anonymous	It is not at all appropriate for a council facking proper governance framework caused by the NSW state government rushed amalgamation to be slugging COVID stressed residents an additional tax.  The council should be making the funding request directly to the NSW state government and the NSW state government should be taking responsibility for the shoody state of affiairs they have created.  The council has also made an absolutely appalling job of informing residents of no less than a 15% impending rater rise. Clearly the strategy is to sneak this through with little scrutiny.  The Administrator has requested a special variation on the basis that even after returning staff head count and CAPEX to pre-amalgamation levels there will still be a significant operating deficit and a rate noneses in the only socialism to this. Lidinages.  Intelligency has council as a result of the amalgamation. No not has the Administrator not been able to identify any such efficiencies, his laterin Report indicates that a significant level of intelligency has council as a result of the amalgamation. No her results not be result in the new present of the scruting of the amalgamation has been presented.  The Administrator has not been able to identify the reason for their done, in a factor of the scruting of the amalgamation. No not septembly on their of all a causal conversation with a council plumbing inspector recently. He stated that the maximum travel time to his next appointment was 50 minutes for the outside the state and is own to be to horse depending on their olds. This has significantly inspection.  Before approximally appeal solvation, PART would need to salistified that there is produced in the administrator's literin Report) and be given the opportunity to express their view on the matter.  If the very least, the time players should be presented with these tools (which were not disclosed in the Administrator's literin Report) and be given the opportunity to express their were on the matter.	clearly relate back to the formation of the amalgameted council and the tack of governance put in place by in the State government.  By State government are the state of the		the situation that the council finds itself. Therefore it is totally unreasonable for ratepayers to bear the burden of cost.  The cost should be borne by the NSW state government as part of the ratepayers existing taxes.	additional funds - namely that funds were not successfully managed nor appropriated correctly.  Without the elementary governance framework being put in place for such a council to function any additional funding is titlely to be spent in just the same unscruppidous way.  As detailed shows, I submit that council's P&R documents do not disclose the true cause of the decrease
		t is not at all appropriate for a council lacking proper governance framework caused by the NSW state governments rushed amalgamation to be slugging CCV/ID aftereased residents an additional tax.  The council should be making the funding request directly to the NSW state government and the NSW state government should be taking responsibility for the shoody state of affairs they have created. The council has also made an absolutely appalling job of informing residents of no less than a 15% impending rater ise. Clearly the strategy is to sneak this through with title scrutiny.  The Administrator has requested a special variation on the basis that even after returning staff head count and CAPEX to pre-amalgamation levels there will still be a significant operating deficit and a rate increases in the crity solution to this. I disagree.  In the Administrator has requested a special variation on the basis that even after returning staff head count and CAPEX to pre-amalgamation levels there will still be a significant operating deficit and a rate increases in the crity solution to this. I disagree.  In the Administrator has not been able to identify the reason for the device making and the amalgamation in the making and the second of the state of the count of second count of the amalgamation and in orw by to the towns depending on them that been presented.  The Administrator has not been able to identify the reason for the significant operation and in orw by to the towns depending on them of day. This has significantly reduced his work efficiency post amalgamation. He expressed the view that a number of other count dependented so the making and in orw by to the towns depending on their of day. This has significantly reduced his work efficiency post amalgamation. He expressed the view that a number of other count dependented on the analgamation would reverse the inefficiencide which have led to the need for the special variation.  PAST work less if the stable of the special variation and in the state of the precial var	clearly relate back to the formation of the amalgameted council and the tack of governance put in place by in the State government.  By State government are the state of the		the situation that the council finds itself. Therefore it is totally unreasonable for ratepayers to bear the burden of cost.  The cost should be borne by the NSW state government as part of the ratepayers existing taxes.	additional funds - namely that funds were not successfully managed nor appropriated correctly.  Without the elementary governance framework being put in place for such a council to function any additional funding is titlely to be spent in just the same unscruppidous way.  As detailed shows, I submit that council's P&R documents do not disclose the true cause of the decrease
		It is not at all appropriate for a council lacking proper governance framework caused by the NSW state governments rushed amalgamation to be slugging COVID affersed residents an additional tax.  The council should be making the funding request directly to the NSW state government and the NSW state of affairs they have created. The council should be making the funding requested the state of affairs they have created. The council sha also make an absolutely appealing job of informing residents on no less than a 15% impending rate rise. Clearly the strategy is to nease this through with title southing.  The Administrator has requested an appeal uniform on the hassit that even after returning staff head count and CAPEX to pre-analgamation levels there will stall bit a significant operating deficit and a rate increases is the only southor to this. I disagree.  The purpose of the analgamation was to increase operating efficiency. Not only has the Administrator not been able to identify any such efficiencies, his interim Report indicates that a significant level of inefficiency has occurred as a restall of the analgamation. No other reason for the need for a special variation has been presented.  The Administrator has released to the interim the state of the state of the interim the state of the	clearly relate back to the formation of the amalgameted council and the tack of governance put in place by in the State government.  By State government are the state of the		the situation that the council finds itself. Therefore it is totally unreasonable for ratepayers to bear the burden of cost.  The cost should be borne by the NSW state government as part of the ratepayers existing taxes.	additional funds - namely that funds were not successfully managed nor appropriated correctly.  Without the elementary governance framework being put in place for such a council to function any additional funding is titledy to be spent in just the same unscruppidous way.  As detailed shows, I submit that council's P&R documents do not disclose the true cause of the decrease
		It is not at all appropriate for a council lacking proper governance framework caused by the NSW state government snushed amalgamation to be slugging COVID stressed residents an additional tax.  The council should be making the funding request directly to the NSW state government and the NSW state government should be taking responsibility for the shootdy state of affairs they have created. The council has also made an absolutely appealing job of informing residents of no less than a 15% impending rater rise. Clearly the strategy is to sneak this through with little excurity.  The Autoristation has requested a special variation on the basis that even after returning staff head count and CAFEX to pre-amalgamation levels there will stifl be a significant operating deficit and a rate increase is the two rysolution to this. I adopted the state of the stat	clearly relate back to the formation of the amalgameted council and the tack of governance put in place by in the State government.  By State government are the state of the		the situation that the council finds itself. Therefore it is totally unreasonable for ratepayers to bear the burden of cost.  The cost should be borne by the NSW state government as part of the ratepayers existing taxes.	additional funds - namely that funds were not successfully managed nor appropriated correctly.  Without the elementary governance framework being put in place for such a council to function any additional funding is titledy to be spent in just the same unscruppidous way.  As detailed shows, I submit that council's P&R documents do not disclose the true cause of the decrease
		It is not at all appropriate for a council lacking proper governance framework caused by the NSW state governments rushed amalgamation to be slugging COVID sitressed residents an additional tax.  The council should be making the funding request directly to the NSW state government and the NSW state government should be taking responsibility for the shoody state of affairs they have created. The council has also made an absolutely appealing job of informing residents of no less than a 15% inepending rate rise. Clearly the strategy is to sneak this through with little excuring.  The Administrator has requested a special variation on the basis that even after returning staff head count and CAPEX to pre-amalgamation levels there will still be a significant operating deficit and a rate. The purpose of the amalgamation was to increase operating efficiency. Not only has the Administrator not been able to identify any such efficiencies, his faterin Report indicates that a significant level of inefficiency has council as senset of the amalgamation. No the resum for the resid of a special variation, has been presented.  The Administrator has not been able to identify the reason for this drop in efficiency. I can help. I had a casual conversation with a council plumbing inspector recently. He stated that the maximum areas line to his read appointment was 30 minutes price to amalgamation and a row up to be to hose depending on their old. The hase instanced the appeal and a result of the propagation of the product of a special variation. In the propagation of the product and a result of the product of a special variation. In a position of the product of th	clearly relate back to the formation of the amalgameted council and the tack of governance put in place by in the State government.  By State government are the state of the		the situation that the council finds itself. Therefore it is totally unreasonable for ratepayers to bear the burden of cost.  The cost should be borne by the NSW state government as part of the ratepayers existing taxes.	additional funds - namely that funds were not successfully managed nor appropriated correctly.  Without the elementary governance framework being put in place for such a council to function any additional funding is titlely to be spent in just the same unscruppidous way.  As detailed shows, I submit that council's P&R documents do not disclose the true cause of the decrease
		It is not at all appropriate for a council lacking proper governance framework caused by the NSW state governments rushed amalgamation to be slugging COVID affectsed residents an additional tax.  The council should be making the funding request directly to the NSW state government and the NSW state government amount of the properties of the should be taking responsibility for the shody state of affairs they have created. The council should be making the funding request directly appalling job of informing residents on no less than a 15% impending rate rise. Clearly the strategy is to sneak this through with little scrutify.  The Administrator has requested a special variation on the beast that even after returning staff head count and CAPEX to pre-amalgamation levels there will still be a significant operating deficit and a rate increases is the only solution to this. I disagree.  The purpose of the amalgamation was to increase operating efficiency. Not only has the Administrator not been able to identify any such efficiencies, his interim Report indicates that a significant level of inefficiency has occurred as a restart of the amalgamation. No other reason for the red for a special variation has been presented.  The council department was 30 minutes price to amalgamation and as rows up to two house depending on time of day. This has significantly reduced his work efficiency post amalgamation. He expressed the view that a number of other council departments were significantly affected.  All the very least, the rate payers should be presented with these face (which were not disclosed in the Administrator's before Report and be given the opportunity to express the inefficiencies which have led to the needs for the special variation.  All the very least, the rate payers should be presented with these face (which were not declosed in the Administrator's before Report and be given the opportunity to express the view on the matter.  It is a formation of the payers should be presented with these text (which were not d	clearly relate back to the formation of the amalgameted council and the tack of governance put in place by in the State government.  By State government are the state of the		the situation that the council finds itself. Therefore it is totally unreasonable for ratepayers to bear the burden of cost.  The cost should be borne by the NSW state government as part of the ratepayers existing taxes.	additional funds - namely that funds were not successfully managed nor appropriated correctly.  Without the elementary governance framework being put in place for such a council to function any additional funding is titledy to be spent in just the same unscruppidous way.  As detailed shows, I submit that council's P&R documents do not disclose the true cause of the decrease
		It is not all alpringriate for a council lacking proper governance framework caused by the NSW state government should be taking responsibility for the shoody states of affairs they have created.  The council should be making the funding request directly to the NSW state government and the NSW state government should be taking responsibility for the shoody state of affairs they have created.  The council has also made an absolutely appelling job of informing residents of no less than a 15% impending rater rise. Clearly the strategy is to sneak this through with little exclusivy.  The purpose of the annalysmation has required a special variation on the basis that even after returning staff head count and CAPEX to pre-amalgamation levels there will stift be a significant operating deficit and a rate increase is the too's postulate to the state of the state of the shadows and t	clearly relate back to the formation of the amalgameted council and the tack of governance put in place by in the State government.  By State government are the state of the		the situation that the council finds itself. Therefore it is totally unreasonable for ratepayers to bear the burden of cost.  The cost should be borne by the NSW state government as part of the ratepayers existing taxes.	additional funds - namely that funds were not successfully managed nor appropriated correctly.  Without the elementary governance framework being put in place for such a council to function any additional funding is titledy to be spent in just the same unscruppidous way.  As detailed shows, I submit that council's P&R documents do not disclose the true cause of the decrease
		It is not at all appropriate for a council lacking proper governance framework caused by the NSW state governments nurshed amalgamation to be slugging COVID sitressed residents an additional tax.  The council should be making the funding request directly to the NSW state government and the NSW state government should be taking responsibility for the shoody state of affairs they have created.  The council has also made an absolutely appealing job of informing residents of no less than a 15% impending rate rise. Clearly the strategy is to sneak this through with little excurity.  The Aprinted-first has requested a special variation on the basis that even after returning staff head count and CAPEX to pre-amalgamation levels there will still be a significant operating deficit and a rate returning staff head count and CAPEX to pre-amalgamation levels there will still be a significant operating deficit and a rate returning staff head count and CAPEX to pre-amalgamation levels there will still be a significant level of interest in the return of the state of the	clearly relate back to the formation of the amalgameted council and the tack of governance put in place by in the State government.  By State government are the state of the		the situation that the council finds itself. Therefore it is totally unreasonable for ratepayers to bear the burden of cost.  The cost should be borne by the NSW state government as part of the ratepayers existing taxes.	additional funds - namely that funds were not successfully managed nor appropriated correctly.  Without the elementary governance framework being put in place for such a council to function any additional funding is titledy to be spent in just the same unscruppidous way.  As detailed shows, I submit that council's P&R documents do not disclose the true cause of the decrease
		It is not at all appropriate for a council facking proper governance framework caused by the NSW state governments rushed amalgamation to be slugging COVID sitrested residents an additional fax.  The council should be making the funding request directly to the NSW state government and the NSW state government should be taking responsibility for the shoody state of affairs they have created. The council has also made an absolutely appealing job of informing residents of no less than a 15% imperming rater (inc. Clearly) the strategy is to sneak this through with little excuring.  The Administrator has requested a special variation on the basis that even after returning staff head count and CAPEX to pre-amalgamation levels there will still be a significant operating deficit and a rate returning propose of the amalgamation was to increase operating efficiency. Not only has the Administrator not been able to identify any such efficiencies, his Interim Report indicates that a significant level of interfluency has occurred as a restart of the amalgamation. No other reason for the indicates, has not been analgamation of the amalgamation. No other reason for the indicates; has not been asked to identify the reason for the department of the properties of the amalgamation was to increase operating efficiency. I can help. I had a causal conversation with a council pluminip inspector recently. He stated that the maximum saved line to his not adaptorized was 30 minutes prior to amalgamation. No expressed the department of the intelligency plus accounted as a restart of the amalgamation. No the state of the intelligency is directly reliated to the goography of the amalgamation council, which is simply impractical.  Here we have a staff of the properturally to express their view on the matter. All these problems seem to have occurred since merging with Conford Council. Why should the rate payers from the Wyong shire have to proper shirt view on the matter.  If we received interest the propertural to the property of the council	clearly relate back to the formation of the amalgameted council and the tack of governance put in place by in the State government.  By State government are the state of the		the situation that the council finds itself. Therefore it is totally unreasonable for ratepayers to bear the burden of cost.  The cost should be borne by the NSW state government as part of the ratepayers existing taxes.	additional funds - namely that funds were not successfully managed nor appropriated correctly.  Without the elementary governance framework being put in place for such a council to function any additional funding is titlely to be spent in just the same unscruptions way.  As detailed shows, I submit that council's PAR documents do not disclose the true cause of the decrease
		t is not at all appropriate for a council lacking proper governance framework caused by the NSW state governments rushed amalgamation to be slugging CCVID aftereased residents an additional fax.  The council should be making the funding request directly to the NSW state government and the NSW state government should be taking responsibility for the shoody state of affiring they have created. The council has also made an absolutely appalling job of informing residents of no less than a 15% impending rater rise. Clearly the strategy is to sneak this through with little scruting.  The Administrator has requested a special variation on the basis that even after returning staff head count and CAPEX to pre-amalgamation levels there will still be a significant operating deficit and a rate noneses in the city solution to this. I disagree.  Intelligency has counted as a restart of the amaignamation. No long has the Administrator not been able to identify any such efficiencies, his briterin Report indicates that a significant level of intelligency has counted as a restart of the amaignamation. No her restant for the restor of the restant present of a special variation in the language of the amaignamation of the restant for the rest of a special variation in the language of the amaignamation of the restant for the restant present of the special variation.  The Administrator has not been able to identify the reason for their dispinition, and in or well to be to not depending on their dispinition with a number of counted government was 30 minutes price to amalgamation and in or well to be horse depending on their of start. The size of the special variation.  The Administrator has not been able to identify the reason for the depending on their of start in the size of the special variation.  The Administrator is been reason and the size of the size of the special variation of the special variation.  The Administrator has been presented with the size of the size of the special variation.  All the very least, if the special var	clearly relate back to the formation of the amalgameted council and the tack of governance put in place by in the State government.  By State government are the state of the		the situation that the council finds itself. Therefore it is totally unreasonable for ratepayers to bear the burden of cost.  The cost should be borne by the NSW state government as part of the ratepayers existing taxes.	additional funds - namely that funds were not successfully managed nor appropriated correctly.  Without the elementary governance framework being put in place for such a council to function any additional funding is titlely to be spent in just the same unscruptions way.  As detailed shows, I submit that council's PAR documents do not disclose the true cause of the decrease
		It is not at all appropriate for a council facking proper governance framework caused by the NSW state governments rushed amalgamation to be slugging COVID sitrested residents an additional fax.  The council should be making the funding request directly to the NSW state government and the NSW state government should be taking responsibility for the shoody state of affairs they have created. The council has also made an absolutely appealing job of informing residents of no less than a 15% imperming rater (inc. Clearly) the strategy is to sneak this through with little excuring.  The Administrator has requested a special variation on the basis that even after returning staff head count and CAPEX to pre-amalgamation levels there will still be a significant operating deficit and a rate returning propose of the amalgamation was to increase operating efficiency. Not only has the Administrator not been able to identify any such efficiencies, his Interim Report indicates that a significant level of interfluency has occurred as a restart of the amalgamation. No other reason for the indicates, has not been analgamation of the amalgamation. No other reason for the indicates; has not been asked to identify the reason for the department of the properties of the amalgamation was to increase operating efficiency. I can help. I had a causal conversation with a council pluminip inspector recently. He stated that the maximum saved line to his not adaptorized was 30 minutes prior to amalgamation. No expressed the department of the intelligency plus accounted as a restart of the amalgamation. No the state of the intelligency is directly reliated to the goography of the amalgamation council, which is simply impractical.  Here we have a staff of the properturally to express their view on the matter. All these problems seem to have occurred since merging with Conford Council. Why should the rate payers from the Wyong shire have to proper shirt view on the matter.  If we received interest the propertural to the property of the council	clearly relate back to the formation of the amalgameted council and the tack of governance put in place by in the State government.  By State government are the state of the		the situation that the council finds itself. Therefore it is totally unreasonable for ratepayers to bear the burden of cost.  The cost should be borne by the NSW state government as part of the ratepayers existing taxes.	additional funds - namely that funds were not successfully managed nor appropriated correctly.  Without the elementary governance framework being put in place for such a council to function any additional funding is titlely to be spent in just the same unscruptions way.  As detailed shows, I submit that council's PAR documents do not disclose the true cause of the decrease
		It is not at all appropriate for a council lacking proper governance framework caused by the NSW state governments nushed amalgamation to be slugging COVID affrested residents an additional tax.  The council should be making the funding request directly to the NSW state government and the NSW state government should be taking responsibility for the shoody state of affirins they have created.  The council has also made an absolutely appealing job of informing residents of no less than a 15% impending rater rise. Clearly the strategy is to smeak this through with little excurity.  The Administrator has requested a spread variation on the basis that even after returning staff head count and CAPEX to pre-amalgamation levels there will still be a significant operating dieficit and a rate increase in the not producted in the 1st diagrams.  The purpose of the amalgamation was to increase operating efficiency. Not only has the Administrator not been able to identify any such efficiencies, his interim Report inclines that a significant level of interictions have accounted as a result of the amalgamation was to increase in the not of the result of the need for a special variation. In this base presented.  The Administrator has not been and les to identify the reason for the discinery. Lean help. In that a causal conversation with a council optimizing inspector recently. He stated that the maximum travel time view that a number of other council departments were significantly decided.  The reason for this inefficiency is directly related to the geography of the amalgamatic output of the state of the special variation. A Park vary levels the production of the production are stated to the response of the special variation. A Park vary levels the production are stated to the present of the department of the special variation.  All the very level, the real payers should be presented with these facts (which were not disdozed in the Administrator's Interim Report) and be given the opportunity to express their view on the matter.	clearly relate back to the formation of the amalgameted council and the tack of governance put in place by in the State government.  By State government are the state of the		the situation that the council finds itself. Therefore it is totally unreasonable for ratepayers to bear the burden of cost.  The cost should be borne by the NSW state government as part of the ratepayers existing taxes.	additional funds - namely that funds were not successfully managed nor appropriated correctly.  Without the elementary governance framework being put in place for such a council to function any additional funding is titlely to be spent in just the same unscruptions way.  As detailed shows, I submit that council's PAR documents do not disclose the true cause of the decrease
		It is not at all appropriate for a council lacking proper governance it amework caused by the NSW state government should be making the funding request directly to the NSW state government and the NSW state government should be taking responsibility for the shoody state of affairs they have created.  The council has also made an absolutely appalling job of informing residents of noise than a 15% impending rater rise. Clearly the strategy is to smeak this through with little excurting.  The Administrator has requested a special variation on the basis that even after returning staff head count and CAPEX to pre-amalgamation levels there will still be a significant operating deficit and a rate notewark in the roy studies the first includes.  The purpose of the amalgamation was to increase operating efficiency. Not only has the Administrator not been able to identify any such efficiencies, has freim? Report inclinates that a significant level of intellicity of the amalgamation was to increase in the two for the amalgamation. We only result on the property of the amalgamation in the amalgamation in the managamation. No other reason for the increase in the two carried as a small of the amalgamation of the result of the re	clearly relate back to the formation of the amalgameted council and the tack of governance put in place by in the State government.  By State government are the state of the		the situation that the council finds itself. Therefore it is totally unreasonable for ratepayers to bear the burden of cost.  The cost should be borne by the NSW state government as part of the ratepayers existing taxes.	additional funds - namely that funds were not successfully managed nor appropriated correctly.  Without the elementary governance framework being put in place for such a council to function any additional funding is titlely to be spent in just the same unscruptions way.  As detailed shows, I submit that council's PAR documents do not disclose the true cause of the decrease
		It is not at all appropriate for a council lacking proper governance framework caused by the NSW state governments nushed amalgamation to be slugging COVID affrested residents an additional tax.  The council should be making the funding request directly to the NSW state government and the NSW state government should be taking responsibility for the shoody state of affirins they have created.  The council has also made an absolutely appealing job of informing residents of no less than a 15% impending rater rise. Clearly the strategy is to smeak this through with little excurity.  The Administrator has requested a spread variation on the basis that even after returning staff head count and CAPEX to pre-amalgamation levels there will still be a significant operating dieficit and a rate increase in the not producted in the 1st diagrams.  The purpose of the amalgamation was to increase operating efficiency. Not only has the Administrator not been able to identify any such efficiencies, his interim Report inclines that a significant level of interictions have accounted as a result of the amalgamation was to increase in the not of the result of the need for a special variation. In this base presented.  The Administrator has not been and les to identify the reason for the discinery. Lean help. In that a causal conversation with a council optimizing inspector recently. He stated that the maximum travel time view that a number of other council departments were significantly decided.  The reason for this inefficiency is directly related to the geography of the amalgamatic output of the state of the special variation. A Park vary levels the production of the production are stated to the response of the special variation. A Park vary levels the production are stated to the present of the department of the special variation.  All the very level, the real payers should be presented with these facts (which were not disdozed in the Administrator's Interim Report) and be given the opportunity to express their view on the matter.	clearly relate back to the formation of the amalgameted council and the tack of governance put in place by in the State government.  By State government are the state of the	read orline news daily and have a landline. It is highly likely that the majority of residents are not aware of the plan to slug a 15% tax on them.	the situation that the council finds itself. Therefore it is totally unreasonable for integrayers to bear the busiden of cost.  The cost should be borne by the MSW state government as part of the natepayers existing taxes.  In which is a second of the state of the natepayers and the natepayers are stating taxes.  In which is the cost about the borne by the MSW state government as part of the natepayers existing taxes.  In which is the nate of any exhibition of IPSR documents.  The effect of such a large rate rise is NOT reasonable particularly after the effects of the pandemic	additional funds and a -namely hat funds were not successfully managed not appropriated correctly.  Without the elementary governance framework being put in place for such a council to function any additional funding is thely to be spend in just the same unscriptations way.  As debated above, I submit that council's PAR documents do not disclose the true cause of the decrease in productivity which has led to the need for the special variation and presents no plan for repairing that decrease.  The council has clearly resisted NO cost containment measures in past years, in fact they do not seem to
		t is not at all appropriate for a council facking proper governance framework caused by the NSW state governments rushed amalgamation to be slugging COVID attreased residents an additional fax.  The council should be making the funding request directly to the NSW state government and the NSW state government should be taking responsibility for the shoody state of affiring they have created. The council has also made an absolutely appalling job of informing residents of no less than a 15% imperating rate rise. Clearly the strategy is to sneak this through with little excursive.  The Administrator has requested a special variation on the basis that even after returning staff head count and CAPEX to pre-amalgamation levels there will still be a significant operating deficit and a rate noneses in the only socialist to this. Lidinagree.  In administrator has not been able to identify the reason for the drop in residence of a special variation, his been presented.  The Administrator has not been able to identify the reason for the drop in residency. I can help. I had a causal conversation with a council plumbing inspector recently. He stated that the maximum street line to his next appointment was 50 minutes for to amalgamation. No use depending on their old str. The Administrator has not been able to identify the reason for this drop in reficiency. I can help. I had a causal conversation with a council plumbing inspector recently. He stated that the maximum street line to his next appointment was 50 minutes for the amalgamation. No leads a final transport and the state of other council dependenters were significantly affected.  All the very least 1 supports a possible of the special variation. A street is pecial variation. In the process of the special variation, and a street of other council dependenters were significantly affected councils incompletence? We have been fold that when the merger took place to practical afferentiate to its and the process their view on the matter.  Jam from the old Wylong Shire, which	clearly relate back to the formation of the analgameted connect and the tack of governance put in place by the State government.  State government has been forced by roomed week at Winthersol to incregate cacts to remediate an excession of the beach recipion of the beach growth of the growth of the beach	read online news daily and have a landline. It is highly likely that the majority of residents are not aware of the plan to slug a 15% tax on them.  The community is only aware that we are now being asked to pay for the shortcomings of people employed at council who should have known better and	The effect of such a large rate rise is NOT reasonable particularly after the effects of the pandemic on employment and remuneration. This is an outlageous imposition of the Central Coast population.	additional funds and a namely that funds were not successfully managed no appropriated correctly.  Without the elementary governance framework being put in place for such a council to function any additional funding its titled to be spend in just the same uncorrupctions way.  As detailed shows, I submit that council's PASF documents do not disclose the true cause of the discresses in productivity which has led to the need for the special variation and presents no plan for repairing that decrease.  The council has clearly realised NO cost containment measures in past years, in fact they do not seen to call even understand the term and have open more yethood due diligence. If the rate increase is approved this wall be an imposition on the residents for only great to come in order to play such an entrease is approved this wall be an imposition on the residents of parts to come in order to play such an entrease is approved this wall be an imposition of the residents of parts to come in order to presy such an entrone, unapproved the
	Anonymous	It is not at all appropriate for a council lacking proper governance it amework caused by the NSW state government should be taking responsibility for the shoody state of affairs they have created.  The council should be making the funding request directly to the NSW state government and the NSW state government should be taking responsibility for the shoody state of affairs they have created.  The council has also made an absolutely appalling job of informing residents of no less than a 15% impending rate rise. Clearly the strategy is to smake this through with little excurity.  The Administrator has requested a special variation, on the basis that even after returning staff head count and CAPEX to pre-amalgamation levels there will still be a significant level of the count of a propose of the amalgamation was to increase operating efficiency. Not only has the Administrator not been able to identify any such efficiencies, his interim Report inclines that a significant level of the propose of the amalgamation was to increase operating efficiency. Not only has the Administrator not been able to identify any such efficiency and the such as a significant level of the propose of the amalgamation was to increase in the too of the resource of a section of the managamation. In the increase in the too of the such as a significant level of the section of the such as a significant level of the section of the such as a significant level of the section of the such as a significant level of the section of other count disposition state as a significant level of the section of other count disposition state as a significant level of the section of the section of other count dispositions are section of the section of other count dispositions are section of the section of other count dispositions are section of the section	clearly relate back to the formation of the analysameted council and the tack of governance put in place by the State government with an back from the young related to the great council and the state of the section of the back fund houses). The state government are directly responsible for policy relating to beach excision and fooding.  The clear revenue path for council is to the state government are directly responsible for policy relating to beach excision and fooding.  The clear revenue path for council is to the state government to fund the shortfall and the medium term-particularly since the tales government by the own addition created this situation.  The revenue path is NOT to stag its COVID attressed residents an additional tax.  In the control of the state government by the own additional tax.  As detailed above, I submit that council is PBIR documents do not dispose the true cause of the need for the opposition variation, or the alternative solution to the operating deficit, which is de-amalgamenton.  There is no community desire for any increase in rates on the Central Coast. The residents and rategopyers have been badly deceived and let down by minimanagement at council with no clear explanation as to how he have been badly deceived and let down by minimanagement at council with no clear explanation as to how he	read online news daily and have a landline. It is highly likely that the majority of residents are not aware of the plan to slug a 15% tax on them.  The community is only aware that we are now being asked to pay for the shortcomings of people employed at council who should have known better and	The effect of such a large rate rise is NOT reasonable particularly after the effects of the pandemic on employment and remuneration. This is an obligacion imposition of the Effect of such a large rate rise is NOT reasonable particularly after the effects of the pandemic on employment and remuneration. This is an obligacion imposition on the Center Coast population.  The effect of such a large rate rise is NOT reasonable particularly after the effects of the pandemic on employment and remuneration. This is an obligacion imposition on the Center Coast population.  The affect of such a large rate rise is NOT reasonable particularly after the effects of the pandemic on employment and remuneration. This is an obligacion imposition on the Center Coast population.  This appears to be a rabber stamping process. The increase will be approved, coast population in the coast population of the coast population in the coast population of the coast population in the	additional funds and a -namely that funds were not successfully managed not appropriated correctly.  Without the elementary governance framework being put in place for such a council to function any additional funding is thely to be speed in just the same suscerapidous way.  As detailed above, I submit that council's P&R documents do not disclose the true cause of the decrease is productify which has led to the need for the special variation and presents no plan for repairing that decrease.  The council has clearly realised NO cost containment measures in past years, in fact they do not seem to cost over understand the term and have spent morey without dediligence. If the rate increase is approved this cost of seem understand the term and have spent morey without dediligence. If the rate increase is approved this cost
12 Anonymous	Anonymous	t is not at all appropriate for a council facking proper governance framework caused by the NSW state governments rushed amalgamation to be slugging COVID attreased residents an additional fax.  The council should be making the funding request directly to the NSW state government and the NSW state government should be taking responsibility for the shoody state of affiring they have created. The council has also made an absolutely appalling job of informing residents of no less than a 15% imperating rate rise. Clearly the strategy is to sneak this through with little excursive.  The Administrator has requested a special variation on the basis that even after returning staff head count and CAPEX to pre-amalgamation levels there will still be a significant operating deficit and a rate noneses in the only socialist to this. Lidinagree.  In administrator has not been able to identify the reason for the drop in residence of a special variation, his been presented.  The Administrator has not been able to identify the reason for the drop in residency. I can help. I had a causal conversation with a council plumbing inspector recently. He stated that the maximum street line to his next appointment was 50 minutes for to amalgamation. No use depending on their old str. The Administrator has not been able to identify the reason for this drop in reficiency. I can help. I had a causal conversation with a council plumbing inspector recently. He stated that the maximum street line to his next appointment was 50 minutes for the amalgamation. No leads a final transport and the state of other council dependenters were significantly affected.  All the very least 1 supports a possible of the special variation. A street is pecial variation. In the process of the special variation, and a street of other council dependenters were significantly affected councils incompletence? We have been fold that when the merger took place to practical afferentiate to its and the process their view on the matter.  Jam from the old Wylong Shire, which	clearly relate back to the formation of the analgameted council and the tack of governance put in place by the State government with an absorb froot by romed week at Warberdal to long great councils to remediate an excession of the back fund houses). The state government are directly responsible for policy relating to beach excession and footing.  The clear revenue path for council is to the state government are directly responsible for policy relating to beach excession and footing.  The clear revenue path for council is to the state government to fund the shortfall and the medium term-particularly since the tales government by the own actions created this situation.  The revenue path is NOT to stag its COVID stressed residents an additional tax.  If the control of the state government by the control of the state government and the s	read online news daily and have a landline. It is highly likely that the majority of residents are not aware of the plan to slug a 15% tax on them.  The community is only aware that we are now being asked to pay for the shock-omings of people employed at council who should have known hatter and sched differently. An increase in matter is an inequilable means of dailaring the facts mended to address the maintenangement of mover by occasion. The role movemen matter is an inequilable means of dailaring the facts mended to address the maintenangement of mover by occasion. The role movemen matter is an inequilable means of dailaring the facts mended to address the maintenangement of mover by occasion. The role movemen matter is an inequilable means of dailaring the facts mended to address the maintenangement of mover by occasion. The role movement is simply even that was been called or processed another to see the part of the people are the other than despite the first they already pay more and people as the other based neighbor than the processed and the people are the other than despite the first than the people are the other than despite the first than the people are than the people are the other than despite the first than the people are the other than despite the first than the people are than the people are the other than despite the first than the people are the people are than the people are the people are than the people are the people are than the people are than the people are the people ar	The effect of such a large rate rise is NOT reasonable particularly after the effects of the pandemic on employment and remuneration. This is an obligacion imposition of the Effect of such a large rate rise is NOT reasonable particularly after the effects of the pandemic on employment and remuneration. This is an obligacion imposition on the Center Coast population.  The effect of such a large rate rise is NOT reasonable particularly after the effects of the pandemic on employment and remuneration. This is an obligacion imposition on the Center Coast population.  The affect of such a large rate rise is NOT reasonable particularly after the effects of the pandemic on employment and remuneration. This is an obligacion imposition on the Center Coast population.  This appears to be a rabber stamping process. The increase will be approved, coast population in the coast population of the coast population in the coast population of the coast population in the	additional funds framely that funds were not successfully managed nor appropriated correctly.  Without the elementary governance framework being put in place for such a council to function any additional funding is thely to be spent in just the same enscriptions way.  As detailed above, I submit that council's P&R documents do not disclose the true cause of the decrease in productivity which has led to the need for the special variation and presents no plan for repairing that decrease.  The council has clearly realised NO cost containment measures in past years, in fact they do not seem to soll even understand the term and have spent money without due diligence. If the rate increase is approved this will be an imposition on the residents for years to come in order to repay such an enormous, unapproved facility. We will designated and compropried at the mercy of such incompresses. When face no such that we have the council or the support of the support
12 Anonymous	Anonymous	t is not at all appropriate for a council facking proper governance framework caused by the NSW state governments rushed amalgamation to be slugging COVID attreased residents an additional fax.  The council should be making the funding request directly to the NSW state government and the NSW state government should be taking responsibility for the shoody state of affiring they have created. The council has also made an absolutely appalling job of informing residents of no less than a 15% imperating rate rise. Clearly the strategy is to sneak this through with little excursive.  The Administrator has requested a special variation on the basis that even after returning staff head count and CAPEX to pre-amalgamation levels there will still be a significant operating deficit and a rate noneses in the only socialist to this. Lidinagree.  In administrator has not been able to identify the reason for the drop in residence of a special variation, his been presented.  The Administrator has not been able to identify the reason for the drop in residency. I can help. I had a causal conversation with a council plumbing inspector recently. He stated that the maximum street line to his next appointment was 50 minutes for to amalgamation. No use depending on their old str. The Administrator has not been able to identify the reason for this drop in reficiency. I can help. I had a causal conversation with a council plumbing inspector recently. He stated that the maximum street line to his next appointment was 50 minutes for the amalgamation. No leads a final transport and the state of other council dependenters were significantly affected.  All the very least 1 supports a possible of the special variation. A street is pecial variation. In the process of the special variation, and a street of other council dependenters were significantly affected councils incompletence? We have been fold that when the merger took place to practical afferentiate to its and the process their view on the matter.  Jam from the old Wylong Shire, which	clearly relate back to the formation of the amalgameted connect and the tack of governance put in place by the State government with an back for the relation of the connection of the State government are directly responsible for policy relating to beach recipion of the beach faint houses). The state government are directly responsible for policy relating to beach recipion of the beach and houses). The state government are directly responsible for policy relating to beach recipion and storage.  The clear revenue path for council is to the state government to fund the shortfall and the medium term-particularly since the talks government by the own additions created this situation.  The revenue path is NOT to stag its COVID attressed residents an additional tax.  As detailed shows, I submit that council's PBIR documents do not dispose the true cause of the need for the practical variation, or the alternative solution to the operating deficit, which is de-amalgamenton.  There is no community desire for any increase in rates on the Central Coast. The residents and rategoryers in howe been bady deceived and led down by minimagement at council with no clear experience and rategoryers are been community desire for any increase in rates on the Central Coast. The residents and rategoryers are house them to be community desire for any increase in rates on the Central Coast. The residents and rategoryers are been been particularly deceived and led down by minimagement at council with no clear experience and so how this is	The community is only aware that we are not being asked to pay for the shoot-omings of people employed at council who should have known before and called differently. An increase makes in a mine was that are the many of council revenue in amendment of more by council. The role more accessed differently. An increase makes is an inequilable means of dollaring the fault model to additionable makes and more accessed and the council and the counci	The effect of such a large rate rise is NOT reasonable particularly after the effects of the pandemic on employment and remuneration. This is an obligacion imposition of the Effect of such a large rate rise is NOT reasonable particularly after the effects of the pandemic on employment and remuneration. This is an obligacion imposition on the Center Coast population.  The effect of such a large rate rise is NOT reasonable particularly after the effects of the pandemic on employment and remuneration. This is an obligacion imposition on the Center Coast population.  The affect of such a large rate rise is NOT reasonable particularly after the effects of the pandemic on employment and remuneration. This is an obligacion imposition on the Center Coast population.  This appears to be a rabber stamping process. The increase will be approved, coast population in the coast population of the coast population in the coast population of the coast population in the	additional funds and a -namely hat funds were not successfully managed not appropriated correctly.  Without the elementary operance features to keing part in just the same unscriptions way.  additional funding is likely to be spent in just the same unscriptions way.  As detailed above, I submit that council's PAR documents do not disclose the true cause of the decrease is productivity which has led to the need for the special variation and presents no plan for repairing that decrease.  The council has clearly realised NO cost containment measures in past years, in fact they do not seem to all even understand the term and have spent morey without due diligence. If the rate increase is approved the delict West and understand the term and have spent morey without due diligence. The rate increase is approved the delict. We are utility diguided and completely at the more of south incompleters. We what no also your plan and you we find and you were not be the record yout all going to compense or services to pay for the shortcomized or others are inclined and indication in their operations, this was one of the reasons for the ameligination. This situation has getter work one of the terms and not offered and redeficient and indication in their operations, this was one of the reasons for the ameligination.
12 Anonymous	Anonymous	It is not at all appropriate for a council tacking proper governance framework caused by the NSW state governments nushed amalgamation to be slugging COVID sitrested residents an additional tax.  The council should be making the funding request directly to the NSW state government and the NSW state government should be taking responsibility for the shody state of affiairs they have created. The council has also made an absolutely appalling job of informing residents of no less than a 15% imperming rate rise. Clearly the strategy is to sneak this through with little excuring.  The Administrator has requested a special variation on the basis that even after returning staff head count and CAPEX to pre-amalgamation levels there will still be a significant operating deficit and a rate. The propose of the amalgamation was to increase operating efficiency. Not only has the Administrator not been able to identify any such efficiencies, his Interim Report indicates that a significant level of intelligency has occured as a result of the amalgamation. No other reason for the inclinancy, a count of purpose of the amalgamation in the amalgamation was to increase operating efficiency. It can help. In that a casual conversation with a council primitipe inspector receivity. He stated that the maximum saved line to his next appointed was 30 minutes price to amalgamation and a row up to be to hose deposition on the old start. The Administrator has not been able to identify the reason for this inefficiency is directly reliated to the goography of the amalgamation council, which is simply impracticual.  Here we have a second to the inefficiency is directly reliated to the goography of the amalgamation council with a simply impracticual.  All the very least, the rate payers should be presented with these facts (which were not disclosed in the Administrator's Interim Report) and be given the opportunity to express their view on the matter. The response to the present view of the interimental payers from the Wyong shire have to prope	clearly relate back to the formation of the amalgameted connect and the tack of governance put in place by the State government with an back for the relation of the connection of the State government are directly responsible for policy relating to beach recipion of the beach faint houses). The state government are directly responsible for policy relating to beach recipion of the beach and houses). The state government are directly responsible for policy relating to beach recipion and storage.  The clear revenue path for council is to the state government to fund the shortfall and the medium term-particularly since the talks government by the own additions created this situation.  The revenue path is NOT to stag its COVID attressed residents an additional tax.  As detailed shows, I submit that council's PBIR documents do not dispose the true cause of the need for the practical variation, or the alternative solution to the operating deficit, which is de-amalgamenton.  There is no community desire for any increase in rates on the Central Coast. The residents and rategoryers in howe been bady deceived and led down by minimagement at council with no clear experience and rategoryers are been community desire for any increase in rates on the Central Coast. The residents and rategoryers are house them to be community desire for any increase in rates on the Central Coast. The residents and rategoryers are been been particularly deceived and led down by minimagement at council with no clear experience and so how this is	read online news daily and have a landline. It is highly likely that the majority of residents are not aware of the plan to slug a 15% tax on them.  The community is only aware that we are now being asked to pay for the shock-omings of people employed at council who should have known hatter and sched differently. An increase in matter is an inequilable means of dailaring the facts mended to address the maintenangement of mover by occasion. The role movemen matter is an inequilable means of dailaring the facts mended to address the maintenangement of mover by occasion. The role movemen matter is an inequilable means of dailaring the facts mended to address the maintenangement of mover by occasion. The role movemen matter is an inequilable means of dailaring the facts mended to address the maintenangement of mover by occasion. The role movement is simply even that was been called or processed another to see the part of the people are the other than despite the first they already pay more and people as the other based neighbor than the processed and the people are the other than despite the first than the people are the other than despite the first than the people are than the people are the other than despite the first than the people are the other than despite the first than the people are than the people are the other than despite the first than the people are the people are than the people are the people are than the people are the people are than the people are than the people are the people ar	The effect of such a large rate rise is NOT reasonable particularly wither the effects of the pandamic on employment and remuneration. This is not removed the modern of the reference of the pandamic on employment and remuneration. This is an outrageous imposition on the Central Count population and should not be excessed, November 1 to the response of the reference of the pandamic on employment and remuneration. This is an outrageous imposition on the Central Count population and should not be excessed. No excessed the pandamic on employment and remuneration. This is an outrageous imposition on the Central Count population and should not be excessed, No one has explained to use which is the subject of the individuals concerned are and how this situation is to the pandamic in was allowed, what the consequences for the individuals concerned are and how this situation is to the worlded in the future.	additional funds from the demental y governance finaments being put in place for such a council to function any additional funding is thely to be spent in just the same suscerapidous way.  As detailed above, I salemit that council's P&R documents do not disclose the true cause of the decrease in productivity which has led to the need for the special variation and presents no pilan for repairing that decrease.  The council has clearly realised NO cost containment measures in past years, in fact they do not seem to sold even understand the term and have spent morey without due diligence. If the rate increase is approved this will be an imposition on the residents for years to come in order to replay such an enormous, transproved facility. We have the council or the productivity decreases an imposition on the residents for years to come in order to replay such an enormous, transproved facility will be an imposition on the residents for years to come in order to replay such an enormous, reapproved the decit. We are utility dispussed and completely at the mercy of south comprehensive who have to perform the south controlled to the support of them. They have taked to suppose of others.  They have facility to suppose the more of the hardy Mary council positions of their.  They have facility to suppose the control of the supposition of the residence of the supposition of the suppositio
12 Anonymous	Anonymous	t is not at all appropriate for a council lacking proper governance transeork caused by the NSW state government should be taking responsibility for the shoody state of affairs they have created.  The council should be making the funding request directly to the NSW state government and the NSW state government should be taking responsibility for the shoody state of affairs they have created.  The council has also made an absolutely appalling job of informing residents of no less than a 15% impending rater rise. Clearly the strategy is to smask this through with little excurity.  The Administrator has requested a specific uniform on the basis that even after returning staff head count and CAPEX to pre-amalgamation levels there will still be a significant operating deficit and a rate noncesse in the no production to this. I clearly the stated state of the state of the state of the should be analysamation was to increase operating efficiency. Not only has the Administrator not been able to identify any such efficiencies, his interim Report inclines that a significant level of interictions have counted as a result of the amalgamation who for reson for the indicates that a significant level of interictions have counted as a result of the amalgamation. How presents the tree for a special variation, the state of other councid departments were significant level of the state of other councid departments were significant level. The reson for this inefficiency is directly related to the geography of the amalgamatic count, which is simply impractical.  Although the state of the propert is directly related to the geography of the amalgamatic count, which is simply impractical.  Although the state of the properts in the propert which was not broke. All these problems seem to have occurred since merging with Coastro Council. Why should the rate payers from the Wyong shire have to pay for Coastro documents incompetency? We think the property is the council of the council of the property is the council of the property is the co	clearly relate back to the formation of the amalgameted connect and the tack of governance put in place by the State government with an back for the relation of the connection of the State government are directly responsible for policy relating to beach recipion of the beach faint houses). The state government are directly responsible for policy relating to beach recipion of the beach and houses). The state government are directly responsible for policy relating to beach recipion and storage.  The clear revenue path for council is to the state government to fund the shortfall and the medium term-particularly since the talks government by the own additions created this situation.  The revenue path is NOT to stag its COVID attressed residents an additional tax.  As detailed shows, I submit that council's PBIR documents do not dispose the true cause of the need for the practical variation, or the alternative solution to the operating deficit, which is de-amalgamenton.  There is no community desire for any increase in rates on the Central Coast. The residents and rategoryers in howe been bady deceived and led down by minimagement at council with no clear experience and rategoryers are been community desire for any increase in rates on the Central Coast. The residents and rategoryers are house them to be community desire for any increase in rates on the Central Coast. The residents and rategoryers are been been particularly deceived and led down by minimagement at council with no clear experience and so how this is	The community is only aware that we are not being asked to pay for the shoot-omings of people employed at council who should have known before and called differently. An increase makes in a mine was that are the many of council revenue in amendment of more by council. The role more accessed differently. An increase makes is an inequilable means of dollaring the fault model to additionable makes and more accessed and the council and the counci	The effect of such a large rate rise is NOT reasonable particularly after the effects of the pandemic or employment and remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition of or each remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition of the Certain Coast population or employment and remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition of the Certain Coast population is be avoided in the future.  The effect of such a large rate rise is NOT reasonable particularly after the effects of the pandemic or employment and remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition on the Certain Coast population is a large rate rise in the consequences for the individuals concerned are and how this situation is to be a noticed to dispine savings to by its medit the meta coat and in the future.  The effect of such a large rate rise is NOT reasonable particularly after the effects of the pandemic or employment and remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition on the Certain Coast population is a second to dispine the consequences for the individuals concerned are and how this situation is to be a noticed to dispine savings to by its medit the meta coat and its perpetrations of this mees will move on to their read job without consequences. Where is the justice?	additional funds and a namely that funds were not successfully managed not appropriated correctly.  Without the elementary governous femicens the sign as in pass to reach a council to function any additional funding is likely to be spent in just the same uncorruptions way.  As detailed above, I submit that council's PAR documents do not disclose the true cause of the decrease is productivity which has led to the need for the special variation and presents no plan for repairing that decrease.  The council has clearly realised NO cost confairment measures in past years, in fact they do not seem to all even understand the term and have spent money without due diligence. If the rate increase is approved the dedictive and understand the term and have spent money without due diligence. The far rate recease is approved the dedictive are understand the term and have spent money without due diligence. If the rate increase is approved the dedictive are understand the term and have spent money without due diligence. The far rate increase is approved the dedictive are understand the term and have spent money without due diligence. The rate increase is approved the dedictive are understand the term and have spent money without due diligence. The rate increase is approved the dedictive are understand the term and have spent money without due diligence. The rate increase is approved the dedictive and prove the provent of the spent of the s
12 Anonymous	Anonymous	It is not at all appropriate for a council lacking proper governance framework caused by the NSW state government should be traking responsibility for the shoody state of affairs they have created.  The council should be making the funding request directly to the NSW state government and the NSW state government should be taking responsibility for the shoody state of affairs they have created.  The council has also made an absolutely appelling job of informing residents of no less than a 15% integering rise rise. Clearly the stategy is to smeak this through with little excurity.  The Aprincipation has requested a special variation on the basis that even after returning staff head count and CAPEX to pre-amalgamation levels there will still be a significant operating defect and a rate returning staff head count and CAPEX to pre-amalgamation levels there will still be a significant level of interest the returning staff head count and CAPEX to pre-amalgamation levels there will still be a significant level of interest the state of th	clearly relate back to the formation of the amalgameted connect and the tack of governance put in place by the State government with an back for the relation of the connection of the State government are directly responsible for policy relating to beach recipion of the beach faint houses). The state government are directly responsible for policy relating to beach recipion of the beach and houses). The state government are directly responsible for policy relating to beach recipion and storage.  The clear revenue path for council is to the state government to fund the shortfall and the medium term-particularly since the talks government by the own additions created this situation.  The revenue path is NOT to stag its COVID attressed residents an additional tax.  As detailed shows, I submit that council's PBIR documents do not dispose the true cause of the need for the practical variation, or the alternative solution to the operating deficit, which is de-amalgamenton.  There is no community desire for any increase in rates on the Central Coast. The residents and rategoryers in howe been bady deceived and led down by minimagement at council with no clear experience and rategoryers are been community desire for any increase in rates on the Central Coast. The residents and rategoryers are house them to be community desire for any increase in rates on the Central Coast. The residents and rategoryers are been been particularly deceived and led down by minimagement at council with no clear experience and so how this is	The community is only aware that we are not being asked to pay for the shoot-omings of people employed at council who should have known before and called differently. An increase makes in a mine was that are the many of council revenue in amendment of more by council. The role more accessed differently. An increase makes is an inequilable means of dollaring the fault model to additionable makes and more accessed and the council and the counci	The effect of such a large rate rise is NOT reasonable particularly after the effects of the pandemic or employment and remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition of or each remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition of the Certain Coast population or employment and remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition of the Certain Coast population is be avoided in the future.  The effect of such a large rate rise is NOT reasonable particularly after the effects of the pandemic or employment and remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition on the Certain Coast population is to be a noticed to the coast population. The same of the pandemic or employment and remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition of the Certain Coast population is to be a noticed to dispin into samings to by to ment the entire coat and is to be a noticed to dispin into samings to by to ment the entire coat and is to be a noticed to dispin into samings to by to ment the entire coat and is to be a noticed to dispin into samings to by to ment the entire coat and in the future.  This appears to be a noticed stanging process. The increase will be approved, cook and in the future.  The effect of such a large rate rise is NOT reasonable particularly after the effects of the pandemic or employment and remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition of the Certain Coast population is to be a noticed retaining process. The increase will be approved, cook and the coast population of the coast population.  The effect of such a large rate rise is NOT reasonable particularly after the effects of the pandemic or employees to be a noticed retaining process. The increase will be approved and the coast paper to be a noticed retaining process. The increase will be approved to the pandemic or employees and the coast paper to be a noticed retaining process. The increase will be approved to the pandemic or employees the pandemic	additional funds and a namely that funds were not successfully managed not appropriated correctly.  Without the elementary governous femicens the sign as in pass to reach a council to function any additional funding is likely to be spent in just the same uncorruptions way.  As detailed above, I submit that council's PAR documents do not disclose the true cause of the decrease is productivity which has led to the need for the special variation and presents no plan for repairing that decrease.  The council has clearly realised NO cost confairment measures in past years, in fact they do not seem to all even understand the term and have spent money without due diligence. If the rate increase is approved the dedictive and understand the term and have spent money without due diligence. The far rate recease is approved the dedictive are understand the term and have spent money without due diligence. If the rate increase is approved the dedictive are understand the term and have spent money without due diligence. The far rate increase is approved the dedictive are understand the term and have spent money without due diligence. The rate increase is approved the dedictive are understand the term and have spent money without due diligence. The rate increase is approved the dedictive are understand the term and have spent money without due diligence. The rate increase is approved the dedictive and prove the provent of the spent of the s
12 Anonymous	Anonymous	It is not all appropriate for a council facility groper governance framework caused by the NSW state government should be taking responsibility for the shouldy state of affairs they have created.  The council has also made an absolutely appalling job of informing residents of no less than a 15% impending rate rise. Clearly the strategy is to sneak this through with little excursive. The council has also made an absolutely appalling job of informing residents of no less than a 15% impending rate rise. Clearly the strategy is to sneak this through with little excursive.  The purpose of the analigamation has been stated as peculiar within a council as a state of the analigamation on the hasis that even after returning staff head count and CAPEx to pre-analigamation levels there will still be a significant level of medicinary has opposed on the analigamation was to increase operating efficiency. Not only has the Administrator not been able to identify any such efficiencies, his triemine Report inclinates that a significant level of medicinary phase councils as size of the analigamation was to increase operating efficiency. Not only has the Administrator not been able to identify any such efficiencies, his therim Report and analysis of the state of that the meantum taxes where the council as a size of the analigamation was to increase in the only analysis of the state of that the meantum taxes where the properties were significant level of the state of the time analigamation and in row up to two house depending on time of day. This has significantly reduced his work efficiency post amalgamation. He expresses the view to the investment of the second of the special swelling of the state of the second of the special swelling of the state of the second of the special swelling of the state of the second of the special swelling of the	clearly relate back to the formation of the amalgameted connect and the tack of governance put in place by the State government with an back for the relation of the connection of the State government are directly responsible for policy relating to beach recipion of the beach faint houses). The state government are directly responsible for policy relating to beach recipion of the beach and houses). The state government are directly responsible for policy relating to beach recipion and storage.  The clear revenue path for council is to the state government to fund the shortfall and the medium term-particularly since the talks government by the own additions created this situation.  The revenue path is NOT to stag its COVID attressed residents an additional tax.  As detailed shows, I submit that council's PBIR documents do not dispose the true cause of the need for the practical variation, or the alternative solution to the operating deficit, which is de-amalgamenton.  There is no community desire for any increase in rates on the Central Coast. The residents and rategoryers in howe been bady deceived and led down by minimagement at council with no clear experience and rategoryers are been community desire for any increase in rates on the Central Coast. The residents and rategoryers are house them to be community desire for any increase in rates on the Central Coast. The residents and rategoryers are been been particularly deceived and led down by minimagement at council with no clear experience and so how this is	The community is only aware that we are not being asked to pay for the shoot-omings of people employed at council who should have known before and called differently. An increase makes in a mine was that are the many of council revenue in amendment of more by council. The role more accessed differently. An increase makes is an inequilable means of dollaring the fault model to additionable makes and more accessed and the council and the counci	The effect of such a large rate rise is NOT reasonable particularly after the effects of the pandemic or employment and remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition of or each remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition of the Certain Coast population or employment and remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition of the Certain Coast population is be avoided in the future.  The effect of such a large rate rise is NOT reasonable particularly after the effects of the pandemic or employment and remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition on the Certain Coast population is to be a noticed to the coast population. The same of the pandemic or employment and remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition of the Certain Coast population is to be a noticed to dispin into samings to by to ment the entire coat and is to be a noticed to dispin into samings to by to ment the entire coat and is to be a noticed to dispin into samings to by to ment the entire coat and is to be a noticed to dispin into samings to by to ment the entire coat and in the future.  This appears to be a noticed stanging process. The increase will be approved, cook and in the future.  The effect of such a large rate rise is NOT reasonable particularly after the effects of the pandemic or employment and remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition of the Certain Coast population is to be a noticed retaining process. The increase will be approved, cook and the coast population of the coast population.  The effect of such a large rate rise is NOT reasonable particularly after the effects of the pandemic or employees to be a noticed retaining process. The increase will be approved and the coast paper to be a noticed retaining process. The increase will be approved to the pandemic or employees and the coast paper to be a noticed retaining process. The increase will be approved to the pandemic or employees the pandemic	additional funds and a namely that funds were not successfully managed not appropriated correctly.  Without the elementary governous femicens the sign as in pass to reach a council to function any additional funding is likely to be spent in just the same uncorruptions way.  As detailed above, I submit that council's PAR documents do not disclose the true cause of the decrease is productivity which has led to the need for the special variation and presents no plan for repairing that decrease.  The council has clearly realised NO cost confairment measures in past years, in fact they do not seem to all even understand the term and have spent money without due diligence. If the rate increase is approved the dedictive and understand the term and have spent money without due diligence. The far rate recease is approved the dedictive are understand the term and have spent money without due diligence. If the rate increase is approved the dedictive are understand the term and have spent money without due diligence. The far rate increase is approved the dedictive are understand the term and have spent money without due diligence. The rate increase is approved the dedictive are understand the term and have spent money without due diligence. The rate increase is approved the dedictive are understand the term and have spent money without due diligence. The rate increase is approved the dedictive and prove the provent of the spent of the s
12 Anonymous	Anonymous	It is not at all appropriate for a council lacking proper governance Bamework caused by the NSW state governments nathed amalgamation to be slugging COVID stressed residents an additional tax.  The council should be making the funding request directly to the NSW state government and the NSW state government should be taking responsibility for the shody state of affairs they have created. The council has also made an absolution yeapsting job of forming residents of no less than a 15% impending rate rise. Clearly the strategy is to smeak this through with titlls exoruty.  The Administrator has requested a special variation in the basis that even after returning staff head count and CAPEX to pre-amalgamation levels the stronghy with titlls exoruty.  The papers of the amalgamation was to increase operating efficiency. Not only has the Administrator not been able to identify any such efficiency has been defined and a rate increases in the more immediation was to increase operating efficiency. Not only has the Administrator not been able to identify any such efficiency has been defined and a rate increases in the more administration was to increase operating efficiency. Not only has the Administrator on been able to identify any such efficiency has been administration of the amalgamation was to increase operating efficiency. Not only has the Administrator on the previous property of the amalgamation and is now up to his human depending on time of day. This has significantly reduced his work efficiency post amalgamation. The expressed the view that a number of the records were givinized.  The reason for this intelligency is directly related to the maintain state of the record of the record of the region of the record of the recor	clearly relate back to the formation of the amalgameted connect and the tack of governance put in place by the State government with an back for the relation of the connection of the State government are directly responsible for policy relating to beach recipion of the beach faint houses). The state government are directly responsible for policy relating to beach recipion of the beach and houses). The state government are directly responsible for policy relating to beach recipion and storage.  The clear revenue path for council is to the state government to fund the shortfall and the medium term-particularly since the talks government by the own additions created this situation.  The revenue path is NOT to stag its COVID attressed residents an additional tax.  As detailed shows, I submit that council's PBIR documents do not dispose the true cause of the need for the practical variation, or the alternative solution to the operating deficit, which is de-amalgamenton.  There is no community desire for any increase in rates on the Central Coast. The residents and rategoryers in howe been bady deceived and led down by minimagement at council with no clear experience and rategoryers are been community desire for any increase in rates on the Central Coast. The residents and rategoryers are house them to be community desire for any increase in rates on the Central Coast. The residents and rategoryers are been been particularly deceived and led down by minimagement at council with no clear experience and so how this is	The community is only aware that we are not being asked to pay for the shoot-omings of people employed at council who should have known before and called differently. An increase makes in a mine was that are the many of council revenue in amendment of more by council. The role more accessed differently. An increase makes is an inequilable means of dollaring the fault model to additionable makes and more accessed and the council and the counci	The effect of such a large rate rise is NOT reasonable particularly after the effects of the pandemic or employment and remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition of or each remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition of the Certain Coast population or employment and remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition of the Certain Coast population is be avoided in the future.  The effect of such a large rate rise is NOT reasonable particularly after the effects of the pandemic or employment and remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition on the Certain Coast population is to be a noticed to the coast population. The same of the pandemic or employment and remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition of the Certain Coast population is to be a noticed to dispin into samings to by to ment the entire coat and is to be a noticed to dispin into samings to by to ment the entire coat and is to be a noticed to dispin into samings to by to ment the entire coat and is to be a noticed to dispin into samings to by to ment the entire coat and in the future.  This appears to be a noticed stanging process. The increase will be approved, cook and in the future.  The effect of such a large rate rise is NOT reasonable particularly after the effects of the pandemic or employment and remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition of the Certain Coast population is to be a noticed retaining process. The increase will be approved, cook and the coast population of the coast population.  The effect of such a large rate rise is NOT reasonable particularly after the effects of the pandemic or employees to be a noticed retaining process. The increase will be approved and the coast paper to be a noticed retaining process. The increase will be approved to the pandemic or employees and the coast paper to be a noticed retaining process. The increase will be approved to the pandemic or employees the pandemic	additional funds and a namely that funds were not successfully managed not appropriated correctly.  Without the elementary governous femicens the sign as in pass to reach a council to function any additional funding is likely to be spent in just the same uncorruptions way.  As detailed above, I submit that council's PAR documents do not disclose the true cause of the decrease is productivity which has led to the need for the special variation and presents no plan for repairing that decrease.  The council has clearly realised NO cost confairment measures in past years, in fact they do not seem to all even understand the term and have spent money without due diligence. If the rate increase is approved the dedictive and understand the term and have spent money without due diligence. The far rate recease is approved the dedictive are understand the term and have spent money without due diligence. If the rate increase is approved the dedictive are understand the term and have spent money without due diligence. The far rate increase is approved the dedictive are understand the term and have spent money without due diligence. The rate increase is approved the dedictive are understand the term and have spent money without due diligence. The rate increase is approved the dedictive are understand the term and have spent money without due diligence. The rate increase is approved the dedictive and prove the provent of the spent of the s
12 Anonymous	Anonymous	It is not at all appropriate for a council lacking proper governance framework caused by the NSW state governments nathed amalgamation to be slagging COVID stressed residents an additional tax.  The council should be making the funding request directly to the NSW state government about be taking responsibility for the shody state of affairs they have created. The council has also made an aborticulely appalling job of informing residents of no less than a 15% impending rate rise. Clearly the strategy is to streak this through with little sociality.  The Affairstatur has requested a special variation on the bases that even after refurning staff head count and CAPEL to give-amalgamation levels there will still be a significant elevel of the council proposed of the amalgamation was to increase operating deficit and a rise.  The purpose of the amalgamation was to increase operating deficiency, but only tax the refurning staff head count and CAPEL to give amalgamation hereis there will still be a significant elevel of the council proposed of the amalgamation was to increase operating deficit and a rise.  The purpose of the amalgamation was to increase operating deficit and a rise.  The purpose of the amalgamation was to increase operating deficit and a rise.  The Affairstatur has not been able to level the research for the residence, which the strategy of the stress of the residence	clearly relate back to the formation of the amalgameted connect and the tack of governance put in place by the State government with an back for the relation of the connection of the State government are directly responsible for policy relating to beach recipion of the beach faint houses). The state government are directly responsible for policy relating to beach recipion of the beach and houses). The state government are directly responsible for policy relating to beach recipion and storage.  The clear revenue path for council is to the state government to fund the shortfall and the medium term-particularly since the talks government by the own additions created this situation.  The revenue path is NOT to stag its COVID attressed residents an additional tax.  As detailed shows, I submit that council's PBIR documents do not dispose the true cause of the need for the practical variation, or the alternative solution to the operating deficit, which is de-amalgamenton.  There is no community desire for any increase in rates on the Central Coast. The residents and rategoryers in howe been bady deceived and led down by minimagement at council with no clear experience and rategoryers are been community desire for any increase in rates on the Central Coast. The residents and rategoryers are house them to be community desire for any increase in rates on the Central Coast. The residents and rategoryers are been been particularly deceived and led down by minimagement at council with no clear experience and so how this is	The community is only aware that we are not being asked to pay for the shoot-omings of people employed at council who should have known before and called differently. An increase makes in a mine was that are the many of council revenue in american and incident green short of council revenue in american and incidence and in	The effect of such a large rate rise is NOT reasonable particularly after the effects of the pandemic or employment and remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition of or each remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition of the Certain Coast population or employment and remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition of the Certain Coast population is be avoided in the future.  The effect of such a large rate rise is NOT reasonable particularly after the effects of the pandemic or employment and remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition on the Certain Coast population is to be a noticed to the coast population. The same of the pandemic or employment and remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition of the Certain Coast population is to be a noticed to dispin into samings to by to ment the entire coat and is to be a noticed to dispin into samings to by to ment the entire coat and is to be a noticed to dispin into samings to by to ment the entire coat and is to be a noticed to dispin into samings to by to ment the entire coat and in the future.  This appears to be a noticed stanging process. The increase will be approved, cook and in the future.  The effect of such a large rate rise is NOT reasonable particularly after the effects of the pandemic or employment and remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition of the Certain Coast population is to be a noticed retaining process. The increase will be approved, cook and the coast population of the coast population.  The effect of such a large rate rise is NOT reasonable particularly after the effects of the pandemic or employees to be a noticed retaining process. The increase will be approved and the coast paper to be a noticed retaining process. The increase will be approved to the pandemic or employees and the coast paper to be a noticed retaining process. The increase will be approved to the pandemic or employees the pandemic	additional funds and a namely that funds were not successfully managed not appropriated correctly.  Without the elementary governous femicens the sign as in pass to reach a council to function any additional funding is likely to be spent in just the same uncorruptions way.  As detailed above, I submit that council's PAR documents do not disclose the true cause of the decrease is productivity which has led to the need for the special variation and presents no plan for repairing that decrease.  The council has clearly realised NO cost confairment measures in past years, in fact they do not seem to all even understand the term and have spent money without due diligence. If the rate increase is approved the dedictive and understand the term and have spent money without due diligence. The far rate recease is approved the dedictive are understand the term and have spent money without due diligence. If the rate increase is approved the dedictive are understand the term and have spent money without due diligence. The far rate increase is approved the dedictive are understand the term and have spent money without due diligence. The rate increase is approved the dedictive are understand the term and have spent money without due diligence. The rate increase is approved the dedictive are understand the term and have spent money without due diligence. The rate increase is approved the dedictive and prove the provent of the spent of the s
12 Anonymous	Anonymous	It is not at all appropriate for a council lacking proper governance is harmonic caused by the NSW state governments nathed amalgamation to be slugging COVID stressed residents an additional tax.  The council shauds be making the funding request directly to the NSW state government and the NSW state government about be taking responsibility for the shoday state of affairs they have created. The council has also made an absolutely appalling job of informing residents of no less than a 15% impending rate rise. Clearly the strategy is to sneak this through with title soutiny.  The Administrator has requested a special viriation on the basis that even with returning staff head count and CAPEEx to pre-amalgamation levels there will still be a significant departing deficil and a rate remarks of the resident of the resident of the still still a significant still resident of the still stil	clearly relate back to the formation of the amalgameted connect and the tack of governance put in place by the State government with an back for the relation of the connection of the State government are directly responsible for policy relating to beach recipion of the beach faint houses). The state government are directly responsible for policy relating to beach recipion of the beach and houses). The state government are directly responsible for policy relating to beach recipion and storage.  The clear revenue path for council is to the state government to fund the shortfall and the medium term-particularly since the talks government by the own additions created this situation.  The revenue path is NOT to stag its COVID attressed residents an additional tax.  As detailed shows, I submit that council's PBIR documents do not dispose the true cause of the need for the practical variation, or the alternative solution to the operating deficit, which is de-amalgamenton.  There is no community desire for any increase in rates on the Central Coast. The residents and rategoryers in howe been bady deceived and led down by minimagement at council with no clear experience and rategoryers are been community desire for any increase in rates on the Central Coast. The residents and rategoryers are house them to be community desire for any increase in rates on the Central Coast. The residents and rategoryers are been been particularly deceived and led down by minimagement at council with no clear experience and so how this is	The community is only aware that we are not being asked to pay for the shoot-omings of people employed at council who should have known before and called differently. An increase makes in a mine was that are the many of council revenue in american and incident green short of council revenue in american and incidence and in	The effect of such a large rate rise is NOT reasonable particularly after the effects of the pandemic or employment and remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition of or each remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition of the Certain Coast population or employment and remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition of the Certain Coast population is be avoided in the future.  The effect of such a large rate rise is NOT reasonable particularly after the effects of the pandemic or employment and remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition on the Certain Coast population is to be a noticed to the coast population. The same of the pandemic or employment and remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition of the Certain Coast population is to be a noticed to dispin into samings to by to ment the entire coat and is to be a noticed to dispin into samings to by to ment the entire coat and is to be a noticed to dispin into samings to by to ment the entire coat and is to be a noticed to dispin into samings to by to ment the entire coat and in the future.  This appears to be a noticed stanging process. The increase will be approved, cook and in the future.  The effect of such a large rate rise is NOT reasonable particularly after the effects of the pandemic or employment and remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition of the Certain Coast population is to be a noticed retaining process. The increase will be approved, cook and the coast population of the coast population.  The effect of such a large rate rise is NOT reasonable particularly after the effects of the pandemic or employees to be a noticed retaining process. The increase will be approved and the coast paper to be a noticed retaining process. The increase will be approved to the pandemic or employees and the coast paper to be a noticed retaining process. The increase will be approved to the pandemic or employees the pandemic	additional funds and a -namely hat funds were not successfully managed not appropriated correctly.  Without the elementary operance features to keing part in just the same unscriptions way.  additional funding is likely to be spent in just the same unscriptions way.  As detailed above, I submit that council's PAR documents do not disclose the true cause of the decrease is productivity which has led to the need for the special variation and presents no plan for repairing that decrease.  The council has clearly realised NO cost containment measures in past years, in fact they do not seem to all even understand the term and have spent morey without due diligence. If the rate increase is approved the delict West and understand the term and have spent morey without due diligence. The rate increase is approved the delict. We are utility diguided and completely at the more of south incompleters. We what no also your plan and you we find and you were not be the record yout all going to compense or services to pay for the shortcomized or others are inclined and indication in their operations, this was one of the reasons for the ameligination. This situation has getter work one of the terms and not offered and redeficient and indication in their operations, this was one of the reasons for the ameligination.
12 Anonymous	Anonymous	It is not at all appropriate for a council lacking proper governance framework caused by the NSW state governments nathed amalgamation to be stagging COVID stressed residents an additional tax.  The council should be making the funding request directly to the NSW state government about be taking responsibility for the shooly state of affairs they have created. The council has also made an absolutely appalling job of informing residents of no less than a 15% impending rate rise. Clearly the strategy is to sneak this through with little sociality.  The Administration has requested a special variation on the basis that even after returning staff head court and CAPEX to give amalgamation levels there will still be a significant question decreased to the council plants to the council as a sense of the amalgamation. No other reason for the need for a special variation has been presented.  The Administration has not been able to begin the reason for the need for a special variation has been presented.  The Administration has not been able to begin the reason for the one feed for a special variation has been presented.  The Administration has not been able to begin the reason for the price jill and cause council, which is simply impractical.  Identification has not been able to begin the reason for the price jill and cause council, which is simply impractical.  Identification has not been able to begin the desired to the prograph of the emisgramed council, which is simply impractical.  Identification has not been able to begin the second of the mental part of the program of the	clearly relate back to the formation of the amalgameted connect and the tack of governance put in place by the State government with an back for the relation of the connection of the State government are directly responsible for policy relating to beach recipion of the beach faint houses). The state government are directly responsible for policy relating to beach recipion of the beach and houses). The state government are directly responsible for policy relating to beach recipion and storage.  The clear revenue path for council is to the state government to fund the shortfall and the medium term-particularly since the talks government by the own additions created this situation.  The revenue path is NOT to stag its COVID attressed residents an additional tax.  As detailed shows, I submit that council's PBIR documents do not dispose the true cause of the need for the practical variation, or the alternative solution to the operating deficit, which is de-amalgamenton.  There is no community desire for any increase in rates on the Central Coast. The residents and rategoryers in howe been bady deceived and led down by minimagement at council with no clear experience and rategoryers are been community desire for any increase in rates on the Central Coast. The residents and rategoryers are house them to be community desire for any increase in rates on the Central Coast. The residents and rategoryers are been been particularly deceived and led down by minimagement at council with no clear experience and so how this is	The community is only aware that we are not being asked to pay for the shoot-omings of people employed at council who should have known before and called differently. An increase makes in a mine was that are the many of council revenue in american and incident green short of council revenue in american and incidence and in	The effect of such a large rate rise is NOT reasonable particularly after the effects of the pandemic or employment and remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition of or each remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition of the Certain Coast population or employment and remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition of the Certain Coast population is be avoided in the future.  The effect of such a large rate rise is NOT reasonable particularly after the effects of the pandemic or employment and remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition on the Certain Coast population is to be a noticed to the coast population. The same of the pandemic or employment and remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition of the Certain Coast population is to be a noticed to dispin into samings to by to ment the entire coat and is to be a noticed to dispin into samings to by to ment the entire coat and is to be a noticed to dispin into samings to by to ment the entire coat and is to be a noticed to dispin into samings to by to ment the entire coat and in the future.  This appears to be a noticed stanging process. The increase will be approved, cook and in the future.  The effect of such a large rate rise is NOT reasonable particularly after the effects of the pandemic or employment and remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition of the Certain Coast population is to be a noticed retaining process. The increase will be approved, cook and the coast population of the coast population.  The effect of such a large rate rise is NOT reasonable particularly after the effects of the pandemic or employees to be a noticed retaining process. The increase will be approved and the coast paper to be a noticed retaining process. The increase will be approved to the pandemic or employees and the coast paper to be a noticed retaining process. The increase will be approved to the pandemic or employees the pandemic	additional funds and a -namely hat funds were not successfully managed not appropriated correctly.  Without the elementary operance features to keing part in just the same unscriptions way.  additional funding is likely to be spent in just the same unscriptions way.  As detailed above, I submit that council's PAR documents do not disclose the true cause of the decrease is productivity which has led to the need for the special variation and presents no plan for repairing that decrease.  The council has clearly realised NO cost containment measures in past years, in fact they do not seem to all even understand the term and have spent morey without due diligence. If the rate increase is approved the delict West and understand the term and have spent morey without due diligence. The rate increase is approved the delict. We are utility diguided and completely at the more of south incompleters. We what no also your plan and you we find and you were not be the record yout all going to compense or services to pay for the shortcomized or others are inclined and indication in their operations, this was one of the reasons for the ameligination. This situation has getter work one of the terms and not offered and redeficient and indication in their operations, this was one of the reasons for the ameligination.
12 Anonymous	Anonymous	It is not all appropriate for a council beforing proper governance framework caused by the NSW state government suched amalgamation to be slagging COVID stressed residents an additional tax.  The council should be making the funding request directly to the NSW state government and the NSW state government	clearly relate back to the formation of the amalgameted connect and the tack of governance put in place by the State government with an back for the relation of the connection of the State government are directly responsible for policy relating to beach recipion of the beach faint houses). The state government are directly responsible for policy relating to beach recipion of the beach and houses). The state government are directly responsible for policy relating to beach recipion and storage.  The clear revenue path for council is to the state government to fund the shortfall and the medium term-particularly since the talks government by the own additions created this situation.  The revenue path is NOT to stag its COVID attressed residents an additional tax.  As detailed shows, I submit that council's PBIR documents do not dispose the true cause of the need for the practical variation, or the alternative solution to the operating deficit, which is de-amalgamenton.  There is no community desire for any increase in rates on the Central Coast. The residents and rategoryers in howe been bady deceived and led down by minimagement at council with no clear experience and rategoryers are been community desire for any increase in rates on the Central Coast. The residents and rategoryers are house them to be community desire for any increase in rates on the Central Coast. The residents and rategoryers are been been particularly deceived and led down by minimagement at council with no clear experience and so how this is	The community is only aware that we are not being asked to pay for the shoot-omings of people employed at council who should have known before and called differently. An increase makes in a mine was that are the many of council revenue in american and incident green short of council revenue in american and incidence and in	The effect of such a large rate rise is NOT reasonable particularly after the effects of the pandemic or employment and remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition of or each remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition of the Certain Coast population or employment and remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition of the Certain Coast population is be avoided in the future.  The effect of such a large rate rise is NOT reasonable particularly after the effects of the pandemic or employment and remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition on the Certain Coast population is to be a noticed to the coast population. The same of the pandemic or employment and remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition of the Certain Coast population is to be a noticed to dispin into samings to by to ment the entire coat and is to be a noticed to dispin into samings to by to ment the entire coat and is to be a noticed to dispin into samings to by to ment the entire coat and is to be a noticed to dispin into samings to by to ment the entire coat and in the future.  This appears to be a noticed stanging process. The increase will be approved, cook and in the future.  The effect of such a large rate rise is NOT reasonable particularly after the effects of the pandemic or employment and remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition of the Certain Coast population is to be a noticed retaining process. The increase will be approved, cook and the coast population of the coast population.  The effect of such a large rate rise is NOT reasonable particularly after the effects of the pandemic or employees to be a noticed retaining process. The increase will be approved and the coast paper to be a noticed retaining process. The increase will be approved to the pandemic or employees and the coast paper to be a noticed retaining process. The increase will be approved to the pandemic or employees the pandemic	additional funds and a -namely hat funds were not successfully managed not appropriated correctly.  Without the elementary operance features to keing part in just the same unscriptions way.  additional funding is likely to be spent in just the same unscriptions way.  As detailed above, I submit that council's PAR documents do not disclose the true cause of the decrease is productivity which has led to the need for the special variation and presents no plan for repairing that decrease.  The council has clearly realised NO cost containment measures in past years, in fact they do not seem to all even understand the term and have spent morey without due diligence. If the rate increase is approved the delict West and understand the term and have spent morey without due diligence. The rate increase is approved the delict. We are utility diguided and completely at the more of south incompleters. We what no also your plan and you we find and you were not be the record yout all going to compense or services to pay for the shortcomized or others are inclined and indication in their operations, this was one of the reasons for the ameligination. This situation has getter work one of the terms and not offered and redeficient and indication in their operations, this was one of the reasons for the ameligination.
12 Anonymous	Anonymous	It is not at all appropriate for a council lacking proper governance framework caused by the NSW state governments rushed annalgamation to be slagging COVID stressed residents an additional tax.  The council should be making the funding request directly to the NSW state government and the NSW state government and the bearing responsibility for the shouldy state of affairs they have created. The council has also made an absolutely appealing job of informing residents of no less than a 15% inspending rate rise. Clearly the strategy is to weak this through with title southly.  The Administrator bear expected a special variation on the basis that even after returning staff head count and CAPEX to pre-amagingamation levels there will still be a sjufficient operating defect and a rate of the council has been as the special variation. No control of the council of the special variation has been presented.  The Administrator has no been also be indeed to level by the reason for the review of intellicency has occurred as a result of the amaginametro. No control research of the council departments were also presented in the council departments were also presented in the council department were stated to the presented of the council departments were also presented with the second to the council departments were also presented with the second to the support of the council departments were also be a satisfied that there is no practical alternative to it. I south that de-amaginametron would reverse the irreflicencies with have level to be a satisfied that there is no practical alternative to it. I south that de-amaginametron would reverse the irreflicencies with have level to be a satisfied that the way that the proper is the council south of the demandagement of the council departments were algorithms with the simple proper and the council department of the council departments were algorithms with the simple proper and the council department of the council department were allowed to be a second of the council department of t	clearly relate back to the formation of the amalgameted connect and the tack of governance put in place by the State government with an back for the relation of the connection of the State government are directly responsible for policy relating to beach recipion of the beach faint houses). The state government are directly responsible for policy relating to beach recipion of the beach and houses). The state government are directly responsible for policy relating to beach recipion and storage.  The clear revenue path for council is to the state government to fund the shortfall and the medium term-particularly since the talks government by the own additions created this situation.  The revenue path is NOT to stag its COVID attressed residents an additional tax.  As detailed shows, I submit that council's PBIR documents do not dispose the true cause of the need for the practical variation, or the alternative solution to the operating deficit, which is de-amalgamenton.  There is no community desire for any increase in rates on the Central Coast. The residents and rategoryers in howe been bady deceived and led down by minimagement at council with no clear experience and rategoryers are been community desire for any increase in rates on the Central Coast. The residents and rategoryers are house them to be community desire for any increase in rates on the Central Coast. The residents and rategoryers are been been particularly deceived and led down by minimagement at council with no clear experience and so how this is	The community is only aware that we are not being asked to pay for the shoot-omings of people employed at council who should have known before and called differently. An increase makes in a mine was that are the many of council revenue in american and incident green short of council revenue in american and incidence and in	The effect of such a large rate rise is NOT reasonable particularly after the effects of the pandemic or employment and remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition of or each remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition of the Certain Coast population or employment and remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition of the Certain Coast population is be avoided in the future.  The effect of such a large rate rise is NOT reasonable particularly after the effects of the pandemic or employment and remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition on the Certain Coast population is to be a noticed to the coast population. The same of the pandemic or employment and remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition of the Certain Coast population is to be a noticed to dispin into samings to by to ment the entire coat and is to be a noticed to dispin into samings to by to ment the entire coat and is to be a noticed to dispin into samings to by to ment the entire coat and is to be a noticed to dispin into samings to by to ment the entire coat and in the future.  This appears to be a noticed stanging process. The increase will be approved, cook and in the future.  The effect of such a large rate rise is NOT reasonable particularly after the effects of the pandemic or employment and remuneration. This is an outlagoous imposition of the Certain Coast population is to be a noticed retaining process. The increase will be approved, cook and the coast population of the coast population.  The effect of such a large rate rise is NOT reasonable particularly after the effects of the pandemic or employees to be a noticed retaining process. The increase will be approved and the coast paper to be a noticed retaining process. The increase will be approved to the pandemic or employees and the coast paper to be a noticed retaining process. The increase will be approved to the pandemic or employees the pandemic	additional funds and a namely that funds were not successfully managed no appropriated correctly.  Without the elementary operance femines who kein part in piece for such a council to function any additional funding is likely to be spent in just the same unscriptions way.  As detailed above, I submit that council is PAR documents do not disclose the true cause of the decrease is productivity which has led to the need for the special variation and presents no plan for repairing that decrease.  The council has clearly realised NO cost containment measures in past years, in fact they do not seem to all even understand the term and have spent morey without due diligence. If the rate increase is approved that delictly were understand the term and have spent morey without due diligence. The rate increase is approved that delictly are understand the term and have spent morey without due diligence. The rate increase is approved that delictly are understand the term and have spent morey without due diligence. The rate increase is approved that delictly are understand the term and have spent morey without due diligence. The rate increase is approved that delictly are understand the term and have spent morey without due diligence. The rate increase is approved that delictly are understand the term and have spent more without due diligence. The rate increase is approved that delictly are understand the term and have been designed and the council for the province of the second council for the expension of the second council for the emiliant and applied the council for the management. That is simple to management. That is simple to management.

First Nam							
	me Last Name	General comments regarding council's proposed SV	Comments on Criterion 1:	Comments on Criterion 2:	Comments on Criterion 3:	Comments on Criterion 4:	Comments on Criterion 5:
		Dear (part,					
		I strongly oppose the increase to our Central Coast Council rates as these current Councillors have proven their ineptitude, and I pass a complete no-confidence vote in their ability to rectify again with my money this dire unprecedented situation we all find ourselves in.					
		This is just not a one-off mismanagement of funds, but a mismanagement of people that are cared for by this council.					
		The amalgamation was not managed properly to begin with. I do not see this as my fault, so why should I have to pay extra?					
		I do see this as unjust, and unfair.					
		My rates will be proportioned with Wyong to begin with as Wyong increased over time and ours did not, my rates will increase close to 45%. Not 10 or 15%.					
		I do not consent to a rate rise for Central Coast residents whether that be to pay for the "mismanagement" of Council funds or the mismanagement of State Government in their oversight of Local government.					I see no improvement plans, I see debt payments. I see nothing that would interest me or my family.
		There are far reaching considerations of what this will mean to the social costs; the ripple effect will be quite huge.  The majority of residents on the Central Coast are already doing it tough.			I do not consent to a rate rise for Central Coast residents whether that be to pay for the "mismanagement" of Council funds or the mismanagement of State Government in their oversight of	ar and a second	I understand during the amalgamation that I did see a CEO who was living it up in a villa on a golf course.
		We do not consent and we do not approve of any Council rate rises or any other publicly owned amenity rises.			Local government.  There are far reaching considerations of what this will mean to the social costs; the ripple effect will		We will have no money to enjoy external activities. I feel upset, frustrated and let down by a council or body that is meant to be looking after our money and the community.
		I believe strongly in not rewarding these current Councillors.		My rates will be proportioned with Wyong to begin with as Wyong increased over time and ours did not, my rates will increase close to 45%. Not just the 10 o	or be quite huge.	I have seen posted letters, but non stated rates will be proportioned with Wyong.	I would be happy with 3%, every 2 years for for a total of 9%, a gradual increase.
		Thank you for your consideration of this important matter that lies now in your jurisdiction to assist in rectifying this matter for all parties involved.	I do not consent to a rate rise for Central Coast residents whether that be to pay for the "mismanagement" of Council funds or the mismanagement of State Government in their oversight of Local government.	I see this as unfair and unjust, and is purely a management issue, not a customer issue.	My alone rates will be proportioned with Wyong to begin with. Wyong increased over time and ours did not, my rates will increase close to 45%. Not just 10 or 15%.		A massive increase, is unjust and unfair.
16 Domion	House	Thanks,	There are far reaching considerations of what this will mean to the social costs; the ripple effect will be quite	If this was a business, I would find a another business to provide that service.			Principle include, of displacement.
16 Damian	naynes	lunderstand that IPART is considering a special rate rise for Central Coast Council (CCC) on the back of the Administrator's report that our accumulated debt is \$565 million.	nuge.	II this was a dusiness, I would find a another dusiness to provide that service.	I see this as unfair and unjust, and is purely a management issue, not a customer issue.	Not a whopping big grab for cash.	
		Before PART considers this rate rise in May this year, it or another state government body (ICAC?) needs to probe into the financial state of the previous councils prior and post-merger in 2016. I understand that in 2016 the merged council had only \$5 million in unrestricted funds, yet this fact was unknown to the Council due to a catastrophic error (of judgemen?) and instead the Council smanagement staff disped					
		into unrestricted funds creating this huge debt, adding to the previous Councils' debt of \$317million. That debt alone should have raised a red flag to the new Council about its budgeting and spending going					
		forward, especially on a campaign of major capital works.					
		Adding insult to injury, the Councillors failed to inform themselves of the true financial state of the Council's finances and the former CEO and CFO continued to spend without probing the financial state of the merged Council. In addition to that it was revealed that Grant Thomton hired by the Council in July 2020 found that Council did not actively monitor and manage it cash flow.					
		According to the former CEO, the consulting firm DMB finally found what everybody else had missed for years that the Council was using restricted funds for operational purposes which is unlawful and nobody					
		recognised they were restricted funds.					
		Furthermore, the NSW Auditor General's reports for past three financial years did not identify the unauthorised use of restricted fund reserves.					
		It is unacceptable that the public ratepayers of the CCC should pay for the mistakes and bungling's of Council staff, councillors and the NSW Auditors General department.					
		We need an investigation into the financial state of affairs pre and post-merger of Wyong and Gosford Councils and the identification of wrongdoing by all parties involved and the actions of the state government in imposing this merger on the former councils without apparent due diligence. Then we need the intervention of the state government to contribute to some of the restitution of the missing funds so					
17 Surava	Coorey	that the ratepayers of CCC are not left carrying most of the burden by way of an ongoing, permanent 15% rate rise.					
18 Louise	Butlin	Council really need a closer/better directors: Regular Saturday Road teams @7am filling in potholes on along Palm Valley Rd. Council worker arrives on a Saturday morning to investigate possible tree lopping on front boundary-unnecessary. Just recent waste of funds					
- CALOUISE	seedl	In iron, ocurparly unrecessary, Just recent waste or turnos  How does the administrator of Central Coast council expect retirees on the old age pension to pay for his special rate rise of 13% + 2% rate peg. Actual fact it will be about 45%. He wants us to pay for council			Retired old age pensioner who will not be able to afford a 45% increase I rates. The administrator has lied to the rate payers. It's about \$10.00 a week extra that I will have to find plus all my other		
		stuff ups. There is a lot of retirees here on the old age pension and they didn't get a CPU rise in October, 2020. He says it's about \$5.00 a week extra but in fact it will be double that. My only income is my old			has lied to the rate payers. It's about \$10.00 a week extra that I will have to find plus all my other living expenses and Bill's. Everything has gone up except my pension. When I retired I was living comfortably now I'm living on the poverty line and will have to lose my house that I'm still paying off	ar a	
10 65-	Mark'	age pension and I will not be able to afford another \$500.00 a year extra for this council. I hope loart doesn't allow them to get away with this ludicrous attempted rate rise as us pensioners will be left homeless as we can't afford this rate histe. Especially when council caused this mess and illegally used funds that they were not allowed to. So I ask you. Why should the rate payers pay it back. Central Coast Council has the devot and of this			this rate rise is given to these money hungry thieves. They spent all that money illegally and want us	 B	
19 John	worumer	lied about all of this.  I attempted to have a path biult some 6 years ago for Disabled people at The Entrance, I was continually told after there was no funding. After we submitted a plan and almost a 1000 signatures on a peleition.  I attempted to have a path biult some 6 years ago for Disabled people at The Entrance, I was continually told after there was no funding. After we submitted a plan and almost a 1000 signatures on a peleition.  I attempted to have a path biult some 6 years ago for Disabled people at The Entrance, I was continually told after there was no funding. After we submitted a plan and almost a 1000 signatures on a peleition.			to pay it back. Well I can't without living on the street.		
		Mr Eaton, Council & council workers said "No Funding available". They joined Councils & next thing paths were being biult from Budgewol to to Woy Woy. I asked the State member were the money come from . He was under the impression the Council were flush with cash. My Submission is that we do grant them a Rate increase and No Wyong Council ratepayer bear the a rate rise increase. While we are all					
20 Chris	Saul	cheering for the appionted fellow from Sydney to solve the councils problems any person could divide the problem by amountly of rate payers and come up with a figure and self of assets and sack workers. I absolutely with all the the residences of my area in The Entrance i have spoken to do not see why we should bear the cost of incompentency.					
			An inquiry into how council's debt was incurred would provide much needed information about prospective			I have no faith in the government appointed administrator nor the personnel he has since appointed. A Gosford council meeting live streamed in February showed his	The level of CCC debt has increased exponentially in the last five years. It appears the requested rate rise
21 Anonymou	ous Anonymous	I believe the 15% increase requested by the administrator is misleading as the actual rate rise could be as high as 42%.	alternative income paths and debt recovery. Without an inquiry it seems ratepayers are being held responsible for the debt.	I believe the information rate payers have been provided in regard to a 15% rate rise is misleading.	The purpose of the rate rise is for CCC to recover some of the \$565 million that was squandered leaving it in debt.	arrogance and disdain for the rate payers who protested prior to the meeting and his conduct unbecoming if someone working in that capacity.	is a bandaid solution at best and one that will cause considerable stress to rate payers, especially those on a pension and others who have lost employment due to COVID.
		I'm writing concerning the proposed Central Coast Council variation. As a retired individual I'm alarmed at the unreasonable 10 or 15% rate increase requested by the administer due to total incompetence by the terminated CEC, CPG & auditions of our council. My increase will be a 10 more then the stated devarage as my base rate is \$333,000 not including water 5 exewerage. My rise will be 3 times the stated					
		average & therefore a big impost with interest rates at virtually zero on my super.  I do think council has options including borrowing at very low rates & seriously cutting back on expenditure & new works, plus the stated sale of assets. After the shock losses Gosford council suffered with					
		investments in the GFC it would seem not much has been learnt re financial control. Therefore they need to know that they cannot keep costing the ratepayers every time they stuff up. They'll just be back at PART asking again in a few years,					
22 Anonymou	ous Anonymous		Council could borrow at extremely low interest, halt new work & sell assets	Well, my average increase would be more than three times the stated average.	As above	Ok	Not sure what the cost containment strategies were as they obviously weren't costed or contained & it seems monies illegally accessed.
		I Wish to comment on the lack of honesty & transparency regarding the proposed increase in Council rates for the Central Coast region.  The administrator has repeatedly stated that an increase in rates is required, and they are asking for a 15% increase. From the figures provided by Rick Hart in a letter addressed to all rate payers, the average		in a superior and a s			
		Increase for the Gosford region will be around 25%, much higher than the stated 15%.  The language used in the explanation for the desired rate rise is also confusing with a 10% one-off increase for seven years' and 'a 15% one-off permanent increase' - what does this mean. Are rates rising					
		once in 2021-22 or will there be a series of rate rises for the next seven years or beyond? This introduces uncertainty for retirees and those approaching retirement.		The information priced by the Council administrator has not hear honged or transported with the numbers associated in a latter to rate.	d in a time of neolicible wange arouth and in an groot with many retireds on a surror.	I cannot comment on the timeline for these events as I only have news reports to go	From reporting, there has been little consideration of aspects such as reducing the fleet of Council cars, or
23 Elizabeth	Telford	late once that the administrator is still pushing forward with a desaination plant. Why not got a pause on this project and other large projects and focus on repaying the restricted reserves. During this time period, reconsider the financial position and consult with residents with greater transparency and honesty.  Given that Central Coast Council is in the position of debt is due to unlawful specifing. Rate payers should not be responsible for their illegal activities. Their proposal to the rate payer including the survey did	The recent online survey to gauge ratepayer feedback was very limited in alternatives.	The information priced by the Council administrator has not been honest or transparent with the numbers provided in a letter to rate payers being contradicted by discussions on local radio by Council representatives.	d In a time of negligible wages growth and in an area with many retirees, an average rate increase of 25% (based on Council letter) does not seem to be reasonable.	<ul> <li>on. Due to the destruction of local news reporting, I do not accept the accuracy and validity of such reports.</li> </ul>	From reporting, there has been little consideration of aspects such as reducing the fleet of Council cars, or potentially putting large projects 'on hold'.
24 Anonymou	ous Anonymous	Given that Central Coast Council is in its position of debt is due to unlawful spending. Rate payers should not be responsible for their illegal activities. Their proposal to the rate payer including the survey did not include the standard rate rise. The rate comparisons did not include any councils from Greater Sydney of witch we are a part of.					
		Gentlemen, Central Coast Council is in dire financial strails owing to gross mismanagement of its finances. In my opinion, this has occurred because of the forced amalgamation of the Gosford and Wyong councils by an					
		incompetent state government. Residents did not ask for this amalgamation nor were they asked if they approved. It was forced upon us (and others). Consequently we were left with an incompetent council and a government administrator foisted upon us. This administrator wants to increase our rates by 15%! The residents did not cause this situation and should not have be expected to pay for it. If the money has		L	The Central Coast has a very large senior population (pensioners) who cannot afford such a		
25 Mark	Gattenhof	to come from somewhere, then it should be coming from the state government who caused this problem in the first place.		The administrator has advised of the reasons for the rate rise. The residents don't agree!  IPART's criterion for assessing SRVs: "Council's need to show IPART there is community awareness of their plans."	proposed rate rise.		
				Central Coast Council has now admitted live on ABC radio this was not the case as you can hear in this clip:			
		As you know, IPART's first criterion for assessing SRVs is "Council"s need to show IPART there is community awareness of their plans."		https://www.abc.net.au/radio/centralcoast/programs/breakfast/rate-rise-revelations/13171706			The Ciuncil submission provides nothing concrete on productivity improvements. It is just full of waffle and vague promises of jam tomorrow.
		Central Coast Council has now admitted live on ABC radio this was not the case as you can hear in this clip:		There is a longer version of the same interview on ABC's website.			The Executive Leadership Team responsible for past mismanagement are nearly all still there. How can
		https://www.abc.net.au/radio/centralcoast/programs/breakfast/rate-rise-revelations/13171706	L	Central Coast Council has now publicly admitted the real rate increase in Gosfordshire will be 42%, not either of the 10% or 15% stated during the public			they be trusted with 42% more of our money when they have so spectacularly mismanaged our money in
							the past?
			The Council's application shows no strategic thinking and does not explore all available avenues.  It merely sluns the ratenavers (42% in Gosfordshire) cuts services across the hoard 15% and sells assets. A	consultation.			the past?  The Administrator's 30 day report points to a pose in the trough culture when it states staff numbers.
		There is a longer version of the same interview on ABC's website.	The Councir's application shows no strategic trinking and does not explore all available avenues.  It merely slugs the ratepayers (42% in Gosfordshire), cuts services across the board 15%, and sells assets. A child of ten with a spreadsheet could have come up with it.	consultation.  Somewhat bizarrely (more clearly in the longer clip), the Council spokesperson appears to be blaming IPART for the misinformation by claiming IPART did			the past?  The Administrator's 30 day report points to a nose in the trough culture when it states staff numbers increased 12% but staff costs over 40% since amalgamation.
		There is a larger version of the same interview on ABC's website.  Central Coast Council has now publicly admitted the real rate increase in Gosfordshire will be 42%, not either of the 10% or 15% stated during the public consultation.	It merely slugs the ratepayers (42% in Gosfordshire), cuts services across the board 15%, and sells assets. A child of ten with a spreadsheet could have come up with it.  There is no strategic thinking about the difference between core services, community priorities, and	consultation.  Semented bitamenly (more dearly in the longer dip), the Council spokesperson appears to be blenning PART for the misinformation by deliming PART did not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the final percentage increase when communicating with raties/spers during the comutation.			The Administrator's 30 day report points to a nose in the trough culture when it states staff numbers increased 12% but staff costs over 40% since amalgamation.  These fat cat salaries have not been reduced. The administrator claims he has reduced Executive numbers
		There is a longer version of the same interview on ABC's website.	It merely slugs the ralepayers (42% in Gosfordshire), cuts services across the board 15%, and sells assets. A child of let with a spreadsher could have come up with it. There is no strategic behind about the difference between core services, community priorities, and discretionary services. On discretionary services, to immovibe cleas about community or voluntary providers sking over or working in partnership to retuce Council costs. And no abeing to identify discretionary services.	consulation.  Somewhat bizarraly (more clearly in the longer clip), the Council spokesperson appears to be blanning PART for the misinformation by claiming PART did not allow the Council is include the impact of harmonisation on the first percentage increase when communicating with interpuyers during the consultation.  This doesn't seem to make series given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation – an increase of 57 a week in Coloriothies and decrease of 53 a week in Wipomphire. If they had been unable to include harmonisation in the first markets have once the	e 7		The Administrator's 30 day report points to a nose in the trough culture when it states staff numbers increased 12% but staff costs over 40% since amalgamation.
		There is a longer version of the same interview on ABC's website.  Central Coast Council has now publicly admitted the real rate increase in Gosfordshire will be 42%, not either of the 10% or 15% stated during the public consultation.  Somewhat bizarrely (more clearly in the longer (cit), the Coast Spokespeans appears to be bizaring PRAT for the misinformation by claiming PRAT did not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the final percentage increase when communicating with interpyers during the consultation.  This doesn't seem to make seems given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation — an increase of \$7 a week in Gosfordshire and decrease of \$3.	It merely slugs the ratepayers (42% in Gosfordshire), cuts services across the board 15%, and sells assets. A child of ten with a spreadsheet could have come up with it. There is no strategic behinding about the difference between core services, community priorities, and discretionary services. On discretionary services, to increasitive ideas about community or voluntary providers stating over or working in partnership to reluce. Counted costs. And no alternpt to identify discretionary services that are not a priority and do not need to be provided at all.	consultation.  Somewhat bizarrely (more clearly in the longer clip), the Council spokesperson appears to be biaming PART for the misinformation by claiming PART did not allow the Council is include the impact of harmonisation on the first perceitage increases when communicating with interpuyers during the consultation.  This obsent seem to make sense given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation—an increase of 37 a week in Coefforthier and decrease of 33 a week in Myongshire. If they had been unable to include harmonisation in the first numbers how come the were able to claim a \$3 a week reduction in Wyongshire?	ey		The Administrator's 30 day report points to a nose in the trough culture when it states staff numbers increased 12% but staff costs over 40% since amagiamation.  These fit cat salaries have not been reduced. The administrator claims he has reduced Executive numbers but that is smoke and mirrors based on positions afteredly avacant (and never needed) and positions re
		There is a longer version of the same interview on ABC's website.  Ceritral Coast Council has now publicly admitted the real rate increase in Gosfordshire will be 42%, not either of the 10% or 15% stated during the public consustation.  Somewhat bizarrety (more clearly in the longer clip), the Council spokesperson appears to be blanning FPART for the misinformation by claiming FPART did not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the final percentage increase when commerciating with ratespayers during the consustation.  This decent seem to make seen give that the typic include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation — an increase of \$1 a week in Gosfordshire and decrease of \$3 a week in Wyongshire. If they had been unable to include harmonisation in the final numbers how come they were able to claim a \$3 a week reduction in Wyongshire?	It merely slugs the ralepayers (42% in Gosfordshire), cuts services across the board 15%, and selfs assets. A child of len with a spreadsheet could have come up with it. There is no strategic thinking about the difference between core services, community priorities, and discretionary services. On discretionary services, to innovative ideas about community or voluntary providers about community or voluntary providers about a community or voluntary providers about a community or voluntary providers about a real replication and a fort increte to be provided at all.  And nothing about culture change to improve efficiency, productivity, or performance culture.	consulation.  Somewhat bizarraly (more clearly in the longer clip), the Council spokesperson appears to be blanning PART for the misinformation by claiming PART did not allow the Council is include the impact of harmonisation on the first percentage increase when communicating with interpuyers during the consultation.  This doesn't seem to make series given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation – an increase of 57 a week in Coloriothies and decrease of 53 a week in Wipomphire. If they had been unable to include harmonisation in the first markets have once the	ey		The Administrator's 30 day report points to a noise in the trough cutture when it states staff numbers increased 12% but staff costs over 40% since amalgamation.  These flat cat satirise have not been reduced. The administrator claims he has reduced Executive numbers but that is smoke and mirrors based on positions already vacant (and never needed) and positions re classified as no longer sensor staff or Executive - but retaining their existing stateries.  Claims this . and the case.
		There is a longer version of the same interview on ABC's website.  Central Coast Council has now publicly admitted the real rate increase in Gosfordshire will be 42%, not either of the 10% or 15% stated during the public consustation.  Somewhat bizarrely (more clearly in the longer clip), the Council spokesperson appears to be blanning FPART for the misinformation by claiming FPART did not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the final percentage increase when communicating with ratespierse during the consultation, and the consultation on the final percentage increase when communicating with ratespierse during the consultation and increase of \$1 a veek in Confordshire and decrease of \$3 a veek in Wyongshire. If they had been unable to include harmonisation in the final numbers how come they were able to claim a \$3 a week reduction in Wyongshire?  As if happens, they got the weekly amount wrong too – the weekly increase in Gosford will actually be \$8.13 and the weekly decrease in Wyong \$2.18 (as they now admit in the radio interview).	Investigation the relicious to acceptance (Calcin Coolindative), cuts services across the board 15%, and sells assets. A childred yallogs the military acceptance could have come up with it.  There is no strategic hinting about the difference between core services, community priorities, and discretionary services. On discretionary services, commonity elected community or voluntary providers about community in priorities; and discretionary services. On the control of the community or voluntary providers that grow or volunting in partieratiop to reduce Council colos. And on absent to the electron discretionary services that deep not a priority and do not deep to be provided at an extra sprintly and do not deep to be provided at an extra sprintly and do not deep to be provided as and.  And nothing about cutture change to improve efficiency, productivity, or performance culture.  The Council's solution is crude, blunt, and unfair on ratepayers.	consultation.  Somewhat bizzaerly (more clearly in the longer clip), the Council spokesperson appears to be biaming PART for the misinformation by claiming PART did not allow the Council is include the impact of harmonisation on the rest percentage increases when communicating with interpayers during the consultation.  This doesn't seen to make sense given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation - an increase of 37 a week in Coloristic and order the consultation - an increase of 37 a week in Coloristic and order to a come the were able to claim a \$3 a week includion in Wyongsthire. If they had been unable to include harmonisation in the final numbers how come the were able to claim a \$3 a week includion in Wyongsthire?  As it happens, they got the weekly amount wrong too – the weekly increase in Gosford will actually be \$8.13 and the weekly decrease in Wyong \$2.18 (as the more worth in the read interview).  Bis crystal clear from this notio interview that the community was not made aware of Council's actual rate rise plans during the public consultation, and that	ry ry		The Administrator's 30 day report points to a nose in the trough culture when it states staff numbers increased 12% but staff costs over 40% since amagamation.  These fit cat salaries have not been reduced. The administrator claims he has reduced Executive numbers but that is smaller and mirrors based on positions already vacant (and never needed) and positions re
		There is a longer version of the same interview on ABC's website.  Central Coast Council has now publicly admitted the real rate increase in Gosfordshire will be 42%, not either of the 10% or 15% stated during the public consustation.  Somewhat bizarrely (more clearly in the longer clip), the Council spokesperson appears to be blanning PART for the misinformation by claiming PART did not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the final percentage increase when communicating with ratespyers during the consustation.  This doesn't seem to make sense given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation — an increase of \$7 a week in Gosfordshire and decrease of \$3 a week in Wignighte. If they had been unable to include harmonisation in the final markers how come they were able to claim a \$5 a week reduction in Wignighte?  As it happears, they got the weekly amount wrong too—the weekly increase in Gosford will adually be \$8.13 and the weekly decrease in Wyong \$2.18 (as they now admit in the radio interview).	It merely slugs the ralepayers (42% in Gosfordshire), cuts services across the board 15%, and selfs assets. A child of len with a spreadsheet could have come up with it. There is no strategic thinking about the difference between core services, community priorities, and discretionary services. On discretionary services, to innovative ideas about community or voluntary providers about community or voluntary providers about a community or voluntary providers about a community or voluntary providers about a real replication and a fort increte to be provided at all.  And nothing about culture change to improve efficiency, productivity, or performance culture.	Consulation. Scene and bitarrely (more dearly in the longer dip), the Council spokesperson appears to be bitening PART for the instinctionation by datening PART and not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the final percentage increase when communicating with ratepayers during the consultation.  This doesn't seem to make series given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation – an increas of 27 a week in Coefforthier and decrease of 25 a week in Wiporigation. If they had been unable to include harmonisation in the first innerhears how come the week all to claim a 55 a week in Wiporigation?  All happens, they give the weekly amounts wrong to — the weekly increase in Coefford will actually be 58.13 and the weekly decrease in Wyong \$2.18 (as the now admin in the radio interview). It is a repatic active from this radio interview of the community was not made excess of Council's adult rate rise plane during the public consultation, and that therefore a genularly independent regulator could not objectively conclude they have met its first criterion.	ry The Central Voadt is one of the most deprived communities in NSW. A 42% jost harmonisation rate rise in Costordatire will be devastating.		The Administrator's 30 day report points to a noise in the Brough culture when it states staff numbers increased Th's but staff costs over 40% since amalgamation.  These fit call staff costs over 40% since amalgamation.  These fit call staff costs have not been reclosed. The administrator claims he has reduced Executive numbers but that is smoke and mirror based on positions afready vacant (and rever needed) and positions re disastified an on longer sensor staff or Executive but retaining her feer siding salarises.  Given this is and the ces.  Lecture 1.
		There is a longer version of the same interview on ABC's website.  Central Coast Council has now publicly admitted the real rate increase in Gosfordshire will be 42%, not either of the 10% or 15% staked during the public consultation.  Somewhalt bizarrely (more clearly in the longer clip), the Council spokesperson appears to be blaming PART for the misinformation by claiming PART did not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the field percentage increase when communicating with intelepsive floring the consultation.  This doesn't seem to make sense given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation — an increase of \$7 a week in Gosfordshire and decrease of \$3 a week in doubt the communitation of the interview of the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation in Vijorgabire?  As it happens, they got the weekly amount wrong too — the weekly increase in Gosford will actually be \$8.13 and the weekly decrease in Wyong \$2.18 (as they now admit in the radio interview).  It is crystal deer from this radio interview that the community was not made aware of Council's actual rate fies plants outing the public consultation, and the reference agenturely independent regulator could	It merely slugs the ralepayers (42% in Gosfordshire), cuts services across the board 15%, and sells assets. A child of tex with a spreadsheet could have come up with 1. There is no strategies behind packed the difference between core services, community priorities, and discretionary services. On discretionary services, no innovative ideas about community or voluntary providers stating over or working in partnership to retuce Council costs. And no alternipt to identify discretionary services that are not a priority and do not need to be provided rail.  And nothing about cuture change to improve efficiency, productivity, or performance culture. The Council's solution is crude, blunt, and unfair on ratepayers.  Nor will it work. The previous Executive Leadership Team are nearly all still there. How can they possibly be	consultation.  Somewhat bizzaerly (more clearly in the longer clip), the Council spokesperson appears to be biaming PART for the misinformation by claiming PART did not allow the Council is include the impact of harmonisation on the rest percentage increases when communicating with interpayers during the consultation.  This doesn't seen to make sense given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation - an increase of 37 a week in Coloristic and order the consultation - an increase of 37 a week in Coloristic and order to a come the were able to claim a \$3 a week includion in Wyongsthire. If they had been unable to include harmonisation in the final numbers how come the were able to claim a \$3 a week includion in Wyongsthire?  As it happens, they got the weekly amount wrong too – the weekly increase in Gosford will actually be \$8.13 and the weekly decrease in Wyong \$2.18 (as the more worth in the read interview).  Bis crystal clear from this notio interview that the community was not made aware of Council's actual rate rise plans during the public consultation, and that	ry The Ceirtral Voadt is one of the most deprived communities in NSW. A 42% post harmonisation rate rise in Gosfordshire will be devastating.  Quite apart from individual handship, businesses already rawaged by Covid will be devastated by		The Administrator's 30 day report points to a noise in the trough culture when it states staff numbers increased 17% but staff costs over 40% since amalgramation.  These fact states he twen ot been reclaimed. The administrator claims he has reduced Executive numbers but that is moke and mirror stated on positions already vacant fund rever needed; and positions reclassified as no longer "sensor staff or Executive" but retaining their existing staff staff.  [Journ Bits - and the near
		There is a longer version of the same interview on ABC's website.  Cerital Coast Council has now publicly admitted the real rate increase in Gosfordshire will be 42%, not either of the 10% or 15% stated during the public consultation.  Somewhat bizarrely (more clearly in the longer dip), the Coast dispotengenon appears to be Blaiming PART for the misinformation by claiming PART did not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the final percentage increase when communicating with interpayers during the consultation.  This doesn't seem to make sense given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation —an increase of \$7 a week in Gosfordshire and decrease of \$3 a week in Wyongshire. If they had been unable to include harmonisation in the final numbers how come they were able to old min \$5 a week reduction in Wyongshire?  As it happens, they got the weekly amount wrong to — the weekly increase in Gosford will actually be \$8.13 and the weekly decrease in Wyong \$2.18 (as they now admit in the radio interview). It is crystal defear from this radio interview that the community was not made aware of Council's actual rate rise plans during the public consultation, and that therefore a genuinely independent regulator could not objectively conclude they have met be first criterion.	It merely slugs the ralepayers (42% in Gosfordshire), cuts services across the board 15%, and sells assets. A child of tex with a spreadsheet could have come up with 1. There is no strategies behind packed the difference between core services, community priorities, and discretionary services. On discretionary services, no innovative ideas about community or voluntary providers stating over or working in partnership to retuce Council costs. And no alternipt to identify discretionary services that are not a priority and do not need to be provided rail.  And nothing about cuture change to improve efficiency, productivity, or performance culture. The Council's solution is crude, blunt, and unfair on ratepayers.  Nor will it work. The previous Executive Leadership Team are nearly all still there. How can they possibly be	consulation.  Somewhat bizarrely (more clearly in the longer clip), the Council spokesperson appears to be blanning PART for the misinformation by claiming PART of a distrible to consult the include the impact of harmonisation on the first percentage increase when communicating with interpuyers during the consultation.  This doesn't seem to make series given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation - an increas of 57 a week in Coloridative and decrease of 53 a week in Wyongshine. If they had been unable to include harmonisation in the first numbers how come the were able to claims a 53 a week in Wyongshine. If they had been unable to include harmonisation in the first numbers how come the wave allow to claim a 53 a week in education in Wyongshine.  As it happens, they got the weekly amount wrong too – the weekly increase in Gosford will actually be 58.13 and the weekly decrease in Wyong 52.18 (as the rows admit in the radio interview).  It is crystal clear from this radio interview that the community was not made aware of Council's actual radie rise plans during the public consultation, and that therefore a genuinely independent regulator could not objectively conclude they have met its first critierion.	y The Central Voadt is one of the most deprived communities in NSW. A 42% post harmonisation rate rise in Gosfordshire will be devastating.  Quite apart from individual haddship, businesses already rawaged by Covid will be devastated by the double whammy of higher rates and reduced customer spending power.	I haven't seen them anywhere? So why is IPART even allowing this farce to continue	The Administrator's 30 day report points to a noise in the trough culture when it states staff numbers increased 17% but staff costs over 40% since amalgamation.  These fact at states have not been reclosed. The administrator claims he has reduced Executive numbers but that is smoke and mirror issued on positions already vacant, fand near reseted) and positions reduced asserted as no longer "sentor staff" or Executive - but retaining their existing staffets.  Glazes this - and the near
28 Kevin	Brooks	There is a longer version of the same interview on ABC's website.  Central Coast Council has now publicly admitted the real rate increase in Gosfordshire will be 42%, not either of the 10% or 15% stated during the public consultation.  Somewhat bizarrely (more clearly in the longer dip), the Coast depotement appears to be bizarriely part of the misinformation by claiming PART did not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the final percentage increase when communicating with interpure stating the consultation.  This doesn't seem to make seeme given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation —an increase of \$7 a week in Gosfordshire and decrease of \$31 week in Myongshire. If they had been unable to include harmonisation in the final numbers how come they were able to dains a \$3 a week induction in Myongshire?  As it happens, they got the weekly amount wrong to — the weekly increase in Gosford will actually be \$8.13 and the weekly decrease in Myong \$2.18 (as they now admit in the radio interview). It is crystal clear from this radio interview that the community was not made aware of Council's actual rate rise plans during the public consultation, and that therefore a germinely independent regulator could not objectively conclude they have met its first criterion.  If an therefore asking you to please put our community out of its missery and immediately reject this application which has caused so much grief and is literally tearing us apart.  A rate increase is only a band aid effect. Placing good money into bad is not good business sense.	It merely slugs the ralepayers (42% in Gosfordshire), cuts services across the board 15%, and sells assets. A child of tex with a spreadsheet could have come up with 1. There is no strategies behind packed the difference between core services, community priorities, and discretionary services. On discretionary services, no innovative ideas about community or voluntary providers stating over or working in partnership to retuce Council costs. And no alternipt to identify discretionary services that are not a priority and do not need to be provided rail.  And nothing about cuture change to improve efficiency, productivity, or performance culture. The Council's solution is crude, blunt, and unfair on ratepayers.  Nor will it work. The previous Executive Leadership Team are nearly all still there. How can they possibly be	consulation.  Somewhat bizarrely (more clearly in the longer clip), the Council spokesperson appears to be blanning PART for the misinformation by claiming PART of a distrible to consult the include the impact of harmonisation on the first percentage increase when communicating with interpuyers during the consultation.  This doesn't seem to make series given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation - an increas of 57 a week in Coloridative and decrease of 53 a week in Wyongshine. If they had been unable to include harmonisation in the first numbers how come the were able to claims a 53 a week in Wyongshine. If they had been unable to include harmonisation in the first numbers how come the wave allow to claim a 53 a week in education in Wyongshine.  As it happens, they got the weekly amount wrong too – the weekly increase in Gosford will actually be 58.13 and the weekly decrease in Wyong 52.18 (as the rows admit in the radio interview).  It is crystal clear from this radio interview that the community was not made aware of Council's actual radie rise plans during the public consultation, and that therefore a genuinely independent regulator could not objectively conclude they have met its first critierion.	ry The Ceirtral Voadt is one of the most deprived communities in NSW. A 42% post harmonisation rate rise in Gosfordshire will be devastating.  Quite apart from individual handship, businesses already rawaged by Covid will be devastated by	I haven't seen them anywhere? So why is IPART even allowing this farce to continue if it is genuinely independent and objective?	The Administrator's 30 day report points to a noise in the trough culture when it states staff numbers increased 17% but staff costs over 40% since amalgamation.  These fact as taken to have not been ended. The administrator claims he has reduced Executive numbers but that is smoke and mirror search specifican already vacant; fand near needed) and positions reduced assetted as no longer "sensor staff" or Executive - but retaining their existing salintes.  Gazen this - and the near
28 Kevin	Brooks	There is a longer version of the same interview on ABC's website.  Central Coast Council has now publicly admitted the real rate increase in Coafordshire will be 42%, not either of the 10% or 15% stated during the public consultation.  Somewhat bizarrely (more clearly) in the longer clip), the Council application with the processing increase when communicating with rate-payers on the battery of the maintenance of the processing increase when communicating with rate-payers during the consultation.—an increase of \$7 a week in Coafordshire and decrease of \$3 a a week in Coafordshire and decrease of \$3 a a week in Coafordshire and decrease of \$3 a week in	It merely slugs the ralepayers (42% in Gosfordshire), cuts services across the board 15%, and sells assets. A child of tex with a spreadsheet could have come up with 1. There is no strategies behind packed the difference between core services, community priorities, and discretionary services. On discretionary services, no innovative ideas about community or voluntary providers stating over or working in partnership to retuce Council costs. And no alternipt to identify discretionary services that are not a priority and do not need to be provided rail.  And nothing about cuture change to improve efficiency, productivity, or performance culture. The Council's solution is crude, blunt, and unfair on ratepayers.  Nor will it work. The previous Executive Leadership Team are nearly all still there. How can they possibly be	consulation.  Somewhat bizarrely (more clearly in the longer clip), the Council spokesperson appears to be blanning PART for the misinformation by claiming PART of a distrible to consult the include the impact of harmonisation on the first percentage increase when communicating with interpuyers during the consultation.  This doesn't seem to make series given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation - an increas of 57 a week in Coloridative and decrease of 53 a week in Wyongshine. If they had been unable to include harmonisation in the first numbers how come the were able to claims a 53 a week in Wyongshine. If they had been unable to include harmonisation in the first numbers how come the wave allow to claim a 53 a week in education in Wyongshine.  As it happens, they got the weekly amount wrong too – the weekly increase in Gosford will actually be 58.13 and the weekly decrease in Wyong 52.18 (as the rows admit in the radio interview).  It is crystal clear from this radio interview that the community was not made aware of Council's actual radie rise plans during the public consultation, and that therefore a genuinely independent regulator could not objectively conclude they have met its first critierion.	y The Central Voadt is one of the most deprived communities in NSW. A 42% post harmonisation rate rise in Gosfordshire will be devastating.  Quite apart from individual haddship, businesses already rawaged by Covid will be devastated by the double whammy of higher rates and reduced customer spending power.		The Administrator's 30 day report points to a noise in the though culture when it states staff numbers increased 17% but staff costs over 40% since amalgimation.  These fact at staffs he have not been reclosed. The administrator claims he has reduced Executive numbers but that is smoke and mirrors based on positions already scantif, and never needed) and positions reduced that the smoke and mirrors based on positions already scantif and never needed) and positions reduced that the smoke and mirrors are classified as no longer "sentor staff" or Executive - but retaining their existing staffses.  Glazes this - and the near a contractive indexing the rest of tax.  And many of them are put up at rategagers expense at five size Magerias Stores (Resort because it is breast) them to committe to work every day like the rest of us.  Used this noise in the trough culture changes, until there is performance culture and accountability, until there are concrete errors not (pat affaire) promises) to improve farmacial contract, efficiency, productively there are concrete errors not (pat affaire) promises) to improve farmacial contract, efficiency, productively
26 Kevin	Brooks	There is a longer version of the same interview on ABC's website.  Central Coast Council has now publicly admitted the real rate increase in Gosfordshire will be 42%, not either of the 10% or 15% stated during the public consultation.  Somewhalt bizarrely (more clearly in the longer clip), the Council spokesperson appears to be blaming PART for the misinformation by claiming PART did not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the field precing including with precisions that one of the precing include the impact of the properties of the precing properties where the council to make sense given that they did include the impact of the impact of the properties of the prop	It merely slugs the ralepayers (42% in Gosfordshire), cuts services across the board 15%, and sells assets. A child of tex with a spreadsheet could have come up with 1. There is no strategies behind packed the difference between core services, community priorities, and discretionary services. On discretionary services, no innovative ideas about community or voluntary providers stating over or working in partnership to retuce Council costs. And no alternipt to identify discretionary services that are not a priority and do not need to be provided rail.  And nothing about cuture change to improve efficiency, productivity, or performance culture. The Council's solution is crude, blunt, and unfair on ratepayers.  Nor will it work. The previous Executive Leadership Team are nearly all still there. How can they possibly be	consulation.  Somewhat bizarrely (more clearly in the longer clip), the Council spokesperson appears to be blanning PART for the misinformation by claiming PART of a distrible to consult the include the impact of harmonisation on the first percentage increase when communicating with interpuyers during the consultation.  This doesn't seem to make series given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation - an increas of 57 a week in Coloridative and decrease of 53 a week in Wyongshine. If they had been unable to include harmonisation in the first numbers how come the were able to claims a 53 a week in Wyongshine. If they had been unable to include harmonisation in the first numbers how come the wave allow to claim a 53 a week in education in Wyongshine.  As it happens, they got the weekly amount wrong too – the weekly increase in Gosford will actually be 58.13 and the weekly decrease in Wyong 52.18 (as the rows admit in the radio interview).  It is crystal clear from this radio interview that the community was not made aware of Council's actual radie rise plans during the public consultation, and that therefore a genuinely independent regulator could not objectively conclude they have met its first critierion.	y The Central Voadt is one of the most deprived communities in NSW. A 42% post harmonisation rate rise in Gosfordshire will be devastating.  Quite apart from individual haddship, businesses already rawaged by Covid will be devastated by the double whammy of higher rates and reduced customer spending power.		The Administrator's 30 day report points to a noise in the trough culture when it states staff numbers increased 17% but staff costs over 40% since amalgamation.  These fact as taken to have not been ended. The administrator claims he has reduced Executive numbers but that is smoke and mirror search specifican already vacant; fand near needed) and positions reduced assetted as no longer "sensor staff" or Executive - but retaining their existing salintes.  Gazen this - and the near
26 Kevin	Brooks  Brooks	There is a larger version of the same interview on ABC's website.  Certifal Coast Council has now publicly admitted the rest rate increase in Gosfordshire will be 42%, not either of the 10% or 15% stated during the public consultation.  Somewhat bizarrely (more clearly in the longer clip), the Council spokesperson appears to be bizaring PART for the misinformation by claiming PART did not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the field precentage increases when communicating with releases withing the accusation.  This doesn't seem to make sense given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation — an increase of \$7 a week in Gosfordshire and decrease of \$3 a week in the Council to include the impact of harmonisation in the final numbers how come they were able to claim a \$3 as week reduction in Wynagshire?  As it happens, they got the weekly amount wrong too — the weekly crease in Coastor and the weekly decrease in Wynags \$2.8 (as the year) was admit in the radio interview).  It is crystal clear from this radio interview that the community was not made aware of Council's actual rate rise plans during the public consultation, and that therefore a genuinely independent regulator could not objectively conclude they have med its first oriterion.  I am therefore asking you to please put our community was not made aware of Council's actual rate rise plans during the public consultation, and that therefore a genuinely independent regulator could not objectively conclude they have med its first oriterion.  An late increase is only a band sid effect. Placing good money into bad is not good business serse.  As late increase is only a band aid effect. Placing good money into bad is not good business serse.  As late increase is only a band aid effect. Placing good money into bad is not good business serse.	It merely slugs the ralepayers (42% in Gosfordshire), cuts services across the board 15%, and sells assets. A child of tex with a spreadsheet could have come up with 1. There is no strategies behind packed the difference between core services, community priorities, and discretionary services. On discretionary services, no innovative ideas about community or voluntary providers stating over or working in partnership to retuce Council costs. And no alternipt to identify discretionary services that are not a priority and do not need to be provided rail.  And nothing about cuture change to improve efficiency, productivity, or performance culture. The Council's solution is crude, blunt, and unfair on ratepayers.  Nor will it work. The previous Executive Leadership Team are nearly all still there. How can they possibly be	consulation.  Somewhat bizarrely (more clearly in the longer clip), the Council spokesperson appears to be blanning PART for the misinformation by claiming PART of a distrible to consult the include the impact of harmonisation on the first percentage increase when communicating with interpuyers during the consultation.  This doesn't seem to make series given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation - an increas of 57 a week in Coloridative and decrease of 53 a week in Wyongshine. If they had been unable to include harmonisation in the first numbers how come the were able to claims a 53 a week in Wyongshine. If they had been unable to include harmonisation in the first numbers how come the wave allow to claim a 53 a week in education in Wyongshine.  As it happens, they got the weekly amount wrong too – the weekly increase in Gosford will actually be 58.13 and the weekly decrease in Wyong 52.18 (as the rows admit in the radio interview).  It is crystal clear from this radio interview that the community was not made aware of Council's actual radie rise plans during the public consultation, and that therefore a genuinely independent regulator could not objectively conclude they have met its first critierion.	The Certiful Voad is one of the most deprived communities in NSW.  A 42% post harmonisation rate rise in Gosfordshire will be devastating.  Quite apart from individual hardship, businesses already ravaged by Covid will be devastated by the double wharmof higher rates and reduced customer spering power.  Certral Coast Council's economic modelling is as incompetent as everything else they do.		The Administrator's 30 day report points to a noise in the though culture when it states staff numbers increased 17% but staff costs over 40% since amalgimation.  These fact at staffs he have not been reclosed. The administrator claims he has reduced Executive numbers but that is smoke and mirrors based on positions already scantif, and never needed) and positions reduced that the smoke and mirrors based on positions already scantif and never needed) and positions reduced that the smoke and mirrors are classified as no longer "sentor staff" or Executive - but retaining their existing staffses.  Glazes this - and the near a contractive indexing the rest of tax.  And many of them are put up at rategagers expense at five size Magerias Stores (Resort because it is breast) them to committe to work every day like the rest of us.  Used this noise in the trough culture changes, until there is performance culture and accountability, until there are concrete errors not (pat affaire) promises) to improve farmacial contract, efficiency, productively there are concrete errors not (pat affaire) promises) to improve farmacial contract, efficiency, productively
26 Kevin	Brooks  Brooks  Anonymous	There is a longer version of the same interview on ABC's website.  Central Coast Council has now publicly admitted the real rate increase in Gosfordshire will be 42%, not either of the 10% or 15% stated during the public consultation.  Somewhalt bizarrely (more clearly in the longer clip), the Council spokesperson appears to be blaming PART for the misinformation by claiming PART did not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the field precing including with precisions that one of the precing include the impact of the properties of the precing properties where the council to make sense given that they did include the impact of the impact of the properties of the prop	It merely slugs the ralepayers (42% in Gosfordshire), cuts services across the board 15%, and sells assets. A child of ten with a spreadheet outd have come by with 1 have been seen that the control of	consulation.  Somewhat bizarrely (more desty in the longer dip), the Council apolesperson appears to be biaming PART for the misinformation by daining PART did not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the first percentage increase when communicating with reliepsyers during the consultation.  This doesn't seem to make series given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation - an increas of 37 a week in Coefforthier and decrease of 3.5 a week in Wylongshire. If they had been unable to include harmonisation in the first numbers how come the were able to claims a 53 a week reduction in Wylongshire.  At Itagories, they give the weekly uncount wrong too - the weekly increase in Gosford will adually be 58.13 and the weekly decrease in Wylong \$2.18 (as the row admit in the radio interview).  It is crystal clear from this radio interview that the community was not made aware of Council's actual rate rise plans during the public consultation, and that therefore a garunty-independent regulation could not objectively conclude they have med 18 first criterion.  Iam Decrease asking you to piesse put our community out of its missery and immediately reject this application which has caused so much grief and is literally takening to appart.	The Central Voadt is one of the most deprived communities in NSW.  A 42% post harmonisation rate fie in Gosfordative will be devastating.  Quite apart from individual hardship, businesses already ravaged by Covid will be devastated by the double whatmapy of higher rates and reduced outstoner spending gover.  Central Coast Council's economic modelling is as incompetent as everything else they do.  set appeared comments.  The property of the coast cannot afford this given the impact of COVID related job loss.  Inner people on the coast cannot afford this given the impact of COVID related job loss.  In my recent correspondence with council they advised that there where provisions for hardship by		The Administrator's 30 day report points to a noise in the though culture when it states staff numbers increased 17% but staff costs over 40% since amalgimation.  These fact at staffs he have not been reclosed. The administrator claims he has reduced Executive numbers but that is smoke and mirrors based on positions already scantif, and never needed) and positions reduced that the smoke and mirrors based on positions already scantif and never needed) and positions reduced that the smoke and mirrors are classified as no longer "sentor staff" or Executive - but retaining their existing staffses.  Glazes this - and the near a contractive indexing the rest of tax.  And many of them are put up at rategagers expense at five size Magerias Stores (Resort because it is breast) them to committe to work every day like the rest of us.  Used this noise in the trough culture changes, until there is performance culture and accountability, until there are concrete errors not (pat affaire) promises) to improve farmacial contract, efficiency, productively there are concrete errors not (pat affaire) promises) to improve farmacial contract, efficiency, productively
26 Kevin 27 Anonymou	Brooks  Anonymous	There is a longer version of the same interview on ABC's website.  Certifal Coast Council has now publicly admitted the reaf rate increase in Gosfordshire will be 42%, not either of the 10% or 15% stated during the public consultation.  Somewhat bizarrely (more clearly in the longer clip), the Council spokesperson appears to be bizaring PART for the misinformation by claiming PART did not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the field percease; including the accusation.  This doesn't seem to make sense given that they did include the impact of harmonisation in the field numbers how come they were able to claim a \$3 as week reduction in Vijorgathire?  As it happens, they got the weekly amount wrong too – the weekly circase in Gosfordshire and decrease of \$3 as week reduction in Vijorgathire?  As it happens, they got the weekly amount wrong too – the weekly circase in Gosford will adulatly be \$8.13 and the weekly decrease in Vijorga \$2.18 (as they now admit in the radio interview).  It is crystal dear from this radio interview that the community was not made aware of Council's actual rate free plans during the public consultation, and that therefore a gerturnly independent regulator could not objectively conclude they have med its first criterion.  Lam therefore asking you to please put our community out of its misery and immediately reject this application which has caused so much grief and is literally learning us apart.  A rate increase is only a band aid effect. Placing good money into bad is not good business sense.  Is altered the council. That believes is a closted of Clip Cauncil now amalgamated known as Certific Caset Council has had only themselves to answer to. Alteged corruption has become the norm culture of this solice intelled council. That believes in a count of the protection. Such this wide council from the buddent up. Employee have been herefore to ment bads but on laming and friends keeping the you scratch in the council ment in the council. That believes in a count of t	Investigation the rategogens (ECS) in Conditribility), cuts services across the board 15%, and sells assets. A child of the with a opinad-bland could have come up of additional country. The country is a considerable of the country provides. On discretionary services, continually one of the country of the	Consulation.  Same shall bizarrely (more clearly in the longer slip). the Council spokesperson appears to be bizering PART for the misinformation by daliming PART don at allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the final percentage increase when communicating with relappears during the consultation.  This doesn't seem to make series given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation. In increase of 31 a week in Wylongshire. If they had been unable to include harmonisation in the final numbers have come to a week at the column a 53 a week in Wylongshire. If they had been unable to include harmonisation in the final numbers have come have been able to claim a 53 a week in Wylongshire. If they had been unable to include harmonisation in the final numbers have come have been able to claim a 53 a week in Wylongshire. If they had been unable to include harmonisation in the final numbers have considered the service of the claim a 53 a week in Wylongshire. If they had been unable to include harmonisation in the final numbers have considered they have been applicated to the claim a 53 a week in Wylongshire. If they have not seen a consideration and the weekly decrease in Wylong \$2.18 (as the row wall in the radio interview that the community was not made aware of Council's actual rate rise plans during the public consultation, and that therefore asking you to please put our community out of its missery and immediately reject this application which has caused so much grief and is literally leading as apart.  See general comments.	The Certiful Voad is one of the most deprived communities in NSW.  A 42% post harmonisation rate rise in Cosfordshire will be devastating.  Outhe spart from individual hardwisp, businesses already ravaged by Covid will be devastated by the double wharmony of higher rates and reduced customer spending power.  Certiful Cosst Council's economic modelling is as incompetent as everything else they do.  see general comments.		The Administrator's 30 day report points to a noise in the trough culture when it states staff numbers increased 17% but staff costs over 40% since amalgamation.  These for call staff costs over 40% since amalgamation.  These for call staff costs over 40% since amalgamation.  These for call staff costs over 40% since amalgamation claims he has reduced Executive numbers but that is smoke and mirror sussed on positions already vacant (and never needed) and positions are classified as no longer "enter out affor Cascutive but retaining evidence staff gas staffes.  Closen this - and the new
20 Kevin 27 Anonymou 28 Anonymou	Brooks  Anonymous  Anonymous	There is a longer version of the same interview on ABC's website.  Central Coast Council has now publicly admitted the real rate increase in Gosfordshire will be 42%, not either of the 10% or 15% stated during the public consultation.  Somewhat bizarrely (more clearly in the longer of (p), the Council spokesperson appears to be bizarriely part of the missiformation by claiming PART did not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the field precipation for the precipation receives when communicating with trategypes and wright the consultation.  This docent seem to make sense given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation. —an increase of \$7 a week in Gosfordshire and decrease of \$3 a week. It is consultation of the weekly amount wrong to —the weekly increase in Gosford will adularly be \$8.13 and the weekly decrease in Wyong \$2.18 (as they now admit in the radio interview).  It is crystal clear from this radio interview that the community was not made aware of Council's actual rate rise plans during the public consultation, and that therefore a genuinely independent regulator could not objectively conclude the hylawer eith first criterion.  If am therefore asking you to please put our community was not made aware of Council's actual rate rise plans during the public consultation, and that therefore a genuinely independent regulator could not objectively conclude the hylawer eith first criterion.  If an therefore asking you to please put our community out of its misery and immediately reject this application which has caused so much grief and is literally learning us apart.  A rate increase is only a based aid effect. Placing good money into bad is not good business series.  A rate increase is only a bad aid effect. Placing good money into bad is not good business series.  A rate increase is only a bad aid effect. Placing good money into bad is not good business series.  A rate increase is only a bad aid effect. Placing good money int	It merely slugs the ralepayers (42% in Gosfordshire), cuts services across the board 15%, and sells assets. A child of ten with a spreadheet outd have come by with 1 have been seen that the control of	consulation.  Somewhat bizarrely (more desty in the longer dip), the Council apolesperson appears to be biaming PART for the misinformation by daining PART did not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the first percentage increase when communicating with reliepsyers during the consultation.  This doesn't seem to make series given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation - an increas of 37 a week in Coefforthier and decrease of 3.5 a week in Wylongshire. If they had been unable to include harmonisation in the first numbers how come the were able to claims a 53 a week reduction in Wylongshire.  At Itagories, they give the weekly uncount wrong too - the weekly increase in Gosford will adually be 58.13 and the weekly decrease in Wylong \$2.18 (as the row admit in the radio interview).  It is crystal clear from this radio interview that the community was not made aware of Council's actual rate rise plans during the public consultation, and that therefore a garunty-independent regulation could not objectively conclude they have med 18 first criterion.  Iam Decrease asking you to piesse put our community out of its missery and immediately reject this application which has caused so much grief and is literally takening to appart.	The Central Voadt is one of the most deprived communities in NSW.  A 42% post harmonisation rate rise in Gosfordshire will be devastating.  Cubia part from individual hardwisp, businesses already ravaged by Covid will be devastated by the double wharmony of higher rates and reduced customer spending power.  Central Coast Council's economic modelling is as incompetent as everything else they do.  see general comments.  -many people on the coast cannot afford this given the impact of COVID related job lossin my recent correspondence with council they advised that there where provisions for hardship by to rever or extra originary provisions they been consideredCell funder relates on fixed iscomes are not considered and cannot afford its rate riskCell funder relates on fixed iscomes are not considered and cannot afford its rate riskCell funder relates on fixed iscomes are not considered and cannot afford this rate risk.		The Administrator's 30 day report points to a noise in the trough culture when it states staff numbers increased CTIs but staff costs over 47% since amalgemation.  These fact as stands have not been reclosed. The administrator claims he has reduced Executive numbers but that is make and mirror shased on positions already vacant (and never needed) and positions re disastified an no longer serior staff or Executive but retaining their existing salaries.  Given this - and the new
20 Kevin 27 Anonymou 28 Anonymou	Brooks Anonymous Anonymous	There is a longer version of the same interview on ABC's website.  Central Coast Council has now publicly admitted the real rate increase in Gosfordshire will be 42%, not either of the 10% or 15% stated during the public consultation.  Somewhalt bizarrely (more clearly in the longer clip), the Council spokesperson appears to be blaming PART for the misinformation by claiming PART did not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the field precentage increases when communicating with relayers within the precentage increases when communicating with relayers with the council to include the impact of barronisation on the weekly emounts quoted during the consultation. —an increase of \$3 a week in Gosfordshire and decrease of \$3 a week in Council to include the impact of barronisation on the weekly emounts quoted during the consultation. —an increase of \$3 a week in Gosfordshire and decrease of \$3 a week in Council to include the council to include the impact of barronisation of the council to include the c	It merely slugs the ralepayers (42% in Gosfordative), cuts services across the board 15%, and sells assets A child of the with a spread-therd cold hater downs up with 1. There is no stratego briting about the difference between core services, community priorities, and discretionary services. On discretionary services, to involve ideas about community or voluntary providers studing over or working in partnership to relocate Conzulc costs. And na alterny to identify discretionary services that are not a priority and do not need to be provided at all.  And rothing about culture change to improve efficiency, productivity, or performance culture.  The Council's solution is crude, blurt and unfair on ratepayers.  Nor will it and X. The previous Executive Leadership Team are nearly all still there. How can they possibly be trusted with 42% mone of my money when they have so spectacularly mismanaged my money in the past?  See general comments.	Consultation.  Semental bizarrally (more dearly in the longer dip), the Council spokesperson appears to be biaming PART for the misinformation by daining PART did not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the final percentage increase when communicating with ratepayers during the consultation.  This doesn't seem to make sense given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation - an increase of 37 a week in Coloridative and decrease of 35 a week in Wipornghieri. They had been unable to include harmonisation in the first numbers how come were able to claim a \$5 as week in Vipornghieri?  All happens, they go the weekly amounts wrong to - the weekly increase in Conford will actually be \$8.13 and the weekly decrease in Wipornghieri to a specific property of the	The Central Voadt is one of the most deprived communities in NSW.  A 42% post harmonisation rate rise in Cosfordabire will be devastating.  Guille apart from individual hardship, businesses already ravaged by Cond will be devastated by the double wharmony foligher rates an elevacide cultomer spending power.  Central Cosst Council's economic modelling is as incompetent as severything else they do.  Less appeared to the cost council and the property of the contract of the cost of the	If it is genutrely independent and objective?	The Administrator's 30 day report points to a noise in the trough culture when it states staff numbers increased IT% but staff costs over 40% stoce amalgemation.  These fits of staff she have not been recision. The administrator claims he has reduced Executive numbers but that is make and mirror sheed on positions already vacant (and never needed) and positions re desired and noise present staff or Secutive. But retaining file reineding salaries.  Given this a end the cost.  And many of them are put up at ratepayers expense at five star Magenta Shores Resort because it is breadth them to communite to work every day like the rest of us.  Likeli this none in the trough culture charges, will there be performance culture and accountability, until there are concrete reforms (not) part fuller by performance culture and accountability, until there are concrete reforms (not) part fuller by performance culture and accountability, until and castioner relations, they will never meet this criteria and ratepayers will continue to throw good money after bot.  The application doesnot transparently disclose the failings of the previous council and there is no real information related to cost containment. If the council receives more money without accountability they will
28 Kevin	Brooks  Brooks  Anonymous  Anonymous  Anonymous	There is a longer version of the same interview on ABC's website.  Central Coast Council has now publicly admitted the real rate increase in Gosfordshire will be 42%, not either of the 10% or 15% stated during the public consultation.  Somewhat bizarrely (more clearly in the longer clip), the Council spokesperson appears to be blanking PART for the misinformation by claiming PART did not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the feath percentage increase when communicating with relapsers with the process of \$3 a week in Gosfordshire and decrease of \$3 a week in Council in Wyongshire. If they had been unable to include harmonisation in the final numbers how come they were able to claim a \$3 as week reduction in Wyongshire.  As it happens, they got the weekly amount wrong too. — the weekly increase in Gosford will actually be \$3.1 and the weekly accesses in Wyong \$2.1 (8 at they row admit in the radio interview).  It is cyplat clear from this radio interview that the community was not made aware of Council's actual rate rise plans during the public consultation, and that therefore a genuinely independent regulator could objectively conclude they have mel its first crinicion.  In an therefore asking you to please put our community out of its misery and immediately reject this application which has caused so much grief and is iteratly tearing us apart.  At all increase is only a band aid effect. Placing good money into bad is not good business sense.  Is alleged through personal experience the Gosford Clip Council now analignamized towns as Certail Coast Council has had only themselves to answer for. Alleged corruption has become the norm culture of this roter in the process of the council of the place to see where the from payer bage exchanged hands. I am a persistorer already strugglin	It merely slugs the ralepayers (42% in Gosfordative), cuts services across the board 15%, and sells assets A child of the with a spread-therd cold hater downs up with 1. There is no stratego briting about the difference between core services, community priorities, and discretionary services. On discretionary services, to involve ideas about community or voluntary providers studing over or working in partnership to relocate Conzulc costs. And na alterny to identify discretionary services that are not a priority and do not need to be provided at all.  And rothing about culture change to improve efficiency, productivity, or performance culture.  The Council's solution is crude, blurt and unfair on ratepayers.  Nor will it and X. The previous Executive Leadership Team are nearly all still there. How can they possibly be trusted with 42% mone of my money when they have so spectacularly mismanaged my money in the past?  See general comments.	Consultation.  Semental bizarrally (more dearly in the longer dip), the Council spokesperson appears to be biaming PART for the misinformation by daining PART did not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the final percentage increase when communicating with ratepayers during the consultation.  This doesn't seem to make sense given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation - an increase of 37 a week in Coloridative and decrease of 35 a week in Wipornghieri. They had been unable to include harmonisation in the first numbers how come were able to claim a \$5 as week in Vipornghieri?  All happens, they go the weekly amounts wrong to - the weekly increase in Conford will actually be \$8.13 and the weekly decrease in Wipornghieri to a specific property of the	The Certifal Voadt is one of the most deprived communities in NSW.  A 42% post harmonisation rate rise in Gosfordshire will be devastating.  Author and from individual hardwisp, businesses already pranged by Cond will be devastated by the double wharmoy of higher rates and reduced customer spending power.  Certifal Coast Council's economic modelling is as incompetent as everything else they do.  See general comments.	If it is genutrely independent and objective?	The Administrator's 30 day report points to a noise in the trough culture when it states staff numbers increased IT% but staff costs over 40% stoce amalgemation.  These fits of staff she have not been recision. The administrator claims he has reduced Executive numbers but that is make and mirror sheed on positions already vacant (and never needed) and positions re desired and noise present staff or Secutive. But retaining file reineding salaries.  Given this a end the cost.  And many of them are put up at ratepayers expense at five star Magenta Shores Resort because it is breadth them to communite to work every day like the rest of us.  Likeli this none in the trough culture charges, will there be performance culture and accountability, until there are concrete reforms (not) part fuller by performance culture and accountability, until there are concrete reforms (not) part fuller by performance culture and accountability, until and castioner relations, they will never meet this criteria and ratepayers will continue to throw good money after bot.  The application doesnot transparently disclose the failings of the previous council and there is no real information related to cost containment. If the council receives more money without accountability they will
20 Kevin	Brooks  Brooks  Anonymous  Anonymous	There is a larger version of the same interview on ABC's website.  Central Coast Council has now publicly admitted the real rate increase in Gosfordshire will be 42%, not either of the 10% or 15% stated during the public consultation.  Somewhat bizarrely (more clearly in the longer clip), the Council spokesperson appears to be blanking PART for the misinformation by claiming PART did not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation in the fine flar percease; increase when communicating with releayers during the consultation.  This doesn't seem to make series given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation. — an increase of \$7 a week in Gosfordshire and decrease of \$3 a week in Wyingsthire?  As it happers, they give the weekly amount wrong too. — the weekly increase in Gosford and the state of	It merely slugs the ralepayers (42% in Gosfordative), cuts services across the board 15%, and sells assets A child of the with a spread-therd cold hater downs up with 1. There is no stratego briting about the difference between core services, community priorities, and discretionary services. On discretionary services, to involve ideas about community or voluntary providers studing over or working in partnership to relocate Conzulc costs. And na alterny to identify discretionary services that are not a priority and do not need to be provided at all.  And rothing about culture change to improve efficiency, productivity, or performance culture.  The Council's solution is crude, blurt and unfair on ratepayers.  Nor will it and X. The previous Executive Leadership Team are nearly all still there. How can they possibly be trusted with 42% mone of my money when they have so spectacularly mismanaged my money in the past?  See general comments.	Consultation.  Semental bizarrally (more dearly in the longer dip), the Council spokesperson appears to be biaming PART for the misinformation by daining PART did not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the final percentage increase when communicating with ratepayers during the consultation.  This doesn't seem to make sense given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation - an increase of 37 a week in Coloridative and decrease of 35 a week in Wipornghieri. They had been unable to include harmonisation in the first numbers how come were able to claim a \$5 as week in Vipornghieri?  All happens, they go the weekly amounts wrong to - the weekly increase in Conford will actually be \$8.13 and the weekly decrease in Wipornghieri to a specific property of the	The Central Vosati is one of the most deprived communities in NSW.  A 42% post harmonisation rate rise in Gosfordshire will be devastating.  Quite apart from individual hardship, businesses already ravaged by Covid will be devastated by the double wharmony of higher rates an effectived cautations spending power.  Central Coset Council's economic modelling is as incompetent as everything else they do.  set general comments.  set general comments.  set general commonities account attend this given the impact of COVID related jub loss.  In my coent correspondence with council they advised that there where provisions for hardship by in new or extra cortianary provisions have been considered.  Self funded retirection on fixed incomes are not considered and cannot afford this rate rise.  Health and entregency workness did not recione a CPV into this year and are also betting the princh or the proposed increase for currans with the just 15th and 25th CPV year on year. They also intend to harmonise the rates between the former Wyong and Gosford shires.  This means that work play an additions of \$15 per vector \$275 (\$20 p, lossed or the average applied to our existing rates of \$2,000 pain in addition to the ICS) proposed increases.	If it is genutrely independent and objective?	The Administrator's 30 day report points to a noise in the trough culture when it states staff numbers increased IT% but staff costs over 40% since amalginarian.  These fits of staffs have not been relocated. The administrator claims he has reduced Executive numbers but that is moke and mirrors based on positions already vacant and never needed; and positions are disastified an notinger stearor staff or Executive. but retaining the residing staffers.  Given this , and the new
28 Kevin 27 Accommos 28 Accommos	Brooks  Anonymous  Anonymous	There is a longer version of the same interview on ABC's website.  Central Coast Council has now publicly admitted the real rate increase in Coafordshire will be 42%, not either of the 10% or 15% stated during the public consultation.  Somewhat bizarrely (more clearly) in the longer clip), the Council spokesperson appears to be bizaming PART for the misinformation by claiming PART did not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the feet percentage increase when communicating with rate powers and unity the consultation.—an increase of \$7 a week in Coafordshire and decrease of \$3 a week in White Part of \$7 a week in Coafordshire and decrease of \$3 a week in White Part of \$7 a week in Coafordshire and decrease of \$3 a week in White Part of \$7 a week in Coafordshire and decrease of \$3 a week in White Part of \$7 a week in Coafordshire and decrease of \$3 a week in White Part of \$7 a week in Coafordshire and decrease of \$3 a week in Coafordshire and \$4 a week in Coafordshire and \$4 a week in Coafordshire and \$	It merely slugs the ralepayers (42% in Gosfordative), cuts services across the board 15%, and sells assets A child of the with a spread-therd cold hater downs up with 1. There is no stratego briting about the difference between core services, community priorities, and discretionary services. On discretionary services, to involve ideas about community or voluntary providers studing over or working in partnership to relocate Conzulc costs. And na alterny to identify discretionary services that are not a priority and do not need to be provided at all.  And rothing about culture change to improve efficiency, productivity, or performance culture.  The Council's solution is crude, blurt and unfair on ratepayers.  Nor will it and X. The previous Executive Leadership Team are nearly all still there. How can they possibly be trusted with 42% mone of my money when they have so spectacularly mismanaged my money in the past?  See general comments.	Consultation.  Semental bizarrally (more dearly in the longer dip), the Council spokesperson appears to be biaming PART for the misinformation by daining PART did not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the final percentage increase when communicating with ratepayers during the consultation.  This doesn't seem to make sense given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation - an increase of 37 a week in Coloridative and decrease of 35 a week in Wipornghieri. They had been unable to include harmonisation in the first numbers how come were able to claim a \$5 as week in Vipornghieri?  All happens, they go the weekly amounts wrong to - the weekly increase in Conford will actually be \$8.13 and the weekly decrease in Wipornghieri to a specific property of the	The Certifal Voadt is one of the most deprived communities in NSW.  A 42% post harmonisation rate rise in Gosfordshire will be devastating.  Author and from individual hardwisp, businesses already pranged by Cond will be devastated by the double wharmoy of higher rates and reduced customer spending power.  Certifal Coast Council's economic modelling is as incompetent as everything else they do.  See general comments.	If it is genutrely independent and objective?	The Administrator's 30 day report points to a noise in the trough culture when it states staff numbers increased This but staff costs over 40% since amalgements.  These fact as stands here not been enclosed. The administrator claims he has reduced Executive numbers but that is smoke and mirror based on positions afreedly vacant (and never needed) and positions reduced but that is smoke and mirror based on positions afreedly vacant (and never needed) and positions reduced as the control of the reduced positions afreedly according to the reduced positions and the new factor because it is bereath them to commate to bere when you give the tens of us.  Until this noise in the trough culture changes, until there are connected reforms (not just future promises) to improve financial control, efficiency, productively and coalconer reduced, they will never meet this criteria and radepages will continue to throw good money after bad.  The application does not transparently disclose the failings of the previous council and there is no real information related to cost containment. If the council receives more money without accountability they will sate keep spending.  Gooked Council has long history of accountability on council receives more money without accountability they will be forcided immanagement at whom they conceived his position general control continues on the sort property developer, applied funding additional to make and the recipiting plantific control control for property developers, applied funding additional control control to one property developers, applied funding additional to make and the recipiting plantific control control for the forcide in control force of the failure of the force of the reduced accountability than the force of the force of the control control control to one of the force of the control control to one of the force of the control of the control of the c
28 Kevin 27 Anonymou 28 Anonymou 29 Anonymou		There is a larger version of the same interview on ABC's website.  Central Coast Council has now publicly admitted the real rate increase in Gosfordshire will be 42%, not either of the 10% or 15% stated during the public consultation.  Somewhat bizarrely (more clearly in the larger clip), the Council spokesperson appears to be blaming PART for the misinformation by claiming PART did not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the larger persign increase when communicating with relapsessy entiring the consultation.  This docent seem to make sense given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts qualed during the consultation.————————————————————————————————————	It merely slugs the ralepayers (42% in Goolfordshire), cuts services across the board 15%, and sells assets A child of the with a spread-sheet cold hate comes by with a fire of the control of the comes of the control of the comes of the control o	Consultation.  Semental bizarrally (more dearly in the longer dip), the Council spokesperson appears to be biaming PART for the misinformation by daining PART did not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the final percentage increase when communicating with ratepayers during the consultation.  This doesn't seem to make sense given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation - an increase of 37 a week in Coloridative and decrease of 35 a week in Wipornghieri. They had been unable to include harmonisation in the first numbers how come were able to claim a \$5 as week in Vipornghieri?  All happens, they go the weekly amounts wrong to - the weekly increase in Conford will actually be \$8.13 and the weekly decrease in Wipornghieri to a specific property of the	The Central Voadt is one of the most deprived communities in NSW.  A 42% post harmonisation rate rise in Cosfordahire will be devastating.  Quite apart from individual hardarile, businesses already ravaged by Cond will be devastated by the double wharmony of higher rate an effected caustomer spending power.  Central Cosst Council's economic modelling is as incompetent as everything else they do.  Let a general comments.  The property of the cost council afford this given the impact of COVID related job loss, when my recent correspondence with council they advised that there where provisions for hardarile power. In the contract of the cost council and the contract of the cost of the	If it is genutrely independent and objective?	The Administrator's 30 day report points to a noise in the brough culture when it states staff numbers increased CTNs but staff costs over 47% since amaginaristic.  These fact as stands here not been reclosed. The administrator claims he has reduced Executive numbers but that is smoke and mirror shared on positions already vacant (and never needed) and positions re disastified are no longer reduced. The administrator inferior states of a positions are disastified are no longer serior staff or Executive but testingly define residing salaries.  Given this a end the creation of the state of the stat
		There is a larger version of the same interview on ABC's website.  Central Coast Council has now publicly admitted the real rate increase in Gosfordshire will be 42%, not either of the 10% or 15% stated during the public consultation.  Somewhat bizarrely (more clearly in the longer clip), the Council spokesperson appears to be blanning PART for the misinformation by claiming PART did not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation in the first percease; increase when communicating with relapsers and unity the consultation.  This doesn't seem to make serice given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation.  This doesn't seem to make serice given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation. In the properties of \$7 a week in Gosfordshire and decrease of \$3 a week in Syringshire?  As it happers, they give the weekly amounts was provided during the consultation.  It is crystal clear from this radio interview that the community was not made aware of Council's actual rate rise plans during the public consultation, and that therefore a genuinely independent regulator could not objectively conclude they have melt to first circleson.  It is crystal clear from this radio interview that the community was not made aware of Council's actual rate rise plans during the public consultation, and that therefore a genuinely independent regulator could not objectively conclude they have melt to first circleson.  In an therefore asking you to please put our community out of its misery and immediately reject this application which has caused so much giref and is literally tearing us apart.  At the increase is only a hand set effect. Placing good money into bed is not good huminess serice.  I saliege through private places the council of the council of the problem. Sack this whole council from the bottom up. Employees have been hired not on ment basis but on lamily and friends keeping they you scratch my	Intentify along the ratiopayers (CZC) in Confordative), cuts services across the board 15%, and sells assets. A month of the will a spread-there could have come up with it.  There is no strategic himining about the difference between core services, community priorities, and discretionary services. On discretionary services, to innovative ideas about community or voluntary providers about one of the community in priorities and services, and are not a priority and so not desert to be priorities at all and a priority and so not desert to be priorities at all and a priority and so not desert to be priorities at all and and representation of the community of the control of the community of the commu	Consultation.  Semental bizarrally (more dearly in the longer dip), the Council spokesperson appears to be biaming PART for the misinformation by daining PART did not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the final percentage increase when communicating with ratepayers during the consultation.  This doesn't seem to make sense given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation - an increase of 37 a week in Coloridative and decrease of 35 a week in Wipornghieri. They had been unable to include harmonisation in the first numbers how come were able to claim a \$5 as week in Vipornghieri?  All happens, they go the weekly amounts wrong to - the weekly increase in Conford will actually be \$8.13 and the weekly decrease in Wipornghieri to a specific property of the	The Central Voad is one of the most deprived communities in NSW.  A 42% post harmonisation rate rise in Gosfordshire will be devastating.  A 42% post harmonisation rate rise in Gosfordshire will be devastating.  Quite apart from individual hardship, businesses already ravaged by Covid will be devastated by the double wharmony of higher rates and reduced customer spending power.  Central Coset Council's connemic modelling is as incompetent as everything else they do.  Let a connemic an expension of the coset of the cost of the co	If it is genutrely independent and objective?	The Administrator's 30 day report points to a nose in the Brough culture when it states staff numbers increased This but staff costs over 40% since amaginarison.  These fits of staff costs over 40% since amaginarison.  These fits of staff costs have not been reduced. The administrator claims he has reduced Executive numbers but that is smoke and mirror based on positions afreely scant (and never needed) and positions reduced but their smoke and mirror based on positions afreely vacant (and never needed) and positions reduced as the second of the staff of the
29 Anonymou	ous Anonymous	There is a longer version of the same interview on ABC's website.  Central Coast Council has now publicly admitted the real rate increase in Coafordshire will be 42%, not either of the 10% or 15% stated during the public consultation.  Somewhalt bizarrely (more clearly) in the longer clip), the Council applications with the council in include the impact of harmonisation or the flag precipitar price sees when communicating with rate-payers during the consultation.—an increase of \$1 a week in Coafordshire and decrease of \$3 a week in Coafordshire and decrease of \$3 a week in White and the council in include the impact of the consultation.—an increase of \$1 a week in Coafordshire and decrease of \$3 a week in Coafordshire and decrease of	Intentify along the ratiopayers (CZC) in Confordative), cuts services across the board 15%, and sells assets. A month of the will a spread-there could have come up with it.  There is no strategic himining about the difference between core services, community priorities, and discretionary services. On discretionary services, to innovative ideas about community or voluntary providers about one of the community in priorities and services, and are not a priority and so not desert to be priorities at all and a priority and so not desert to be priorities at all and a priority and so not desert to be priorities at all and and representation of the community of the control of the community of the commu	Consultation.  Semental bizarrally (more dearly in the longer dip), the Council spokesperson appears to be biaming PART for the misinformation by daining PART did not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the final percentage increase when communicating with ratepayers during the consultation.  This doesn't seem to make sense given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation - an increase of 37 a week in Coloridative and decrease of 35 a week in Wipornghieri. They had been unable to include harmonisation in the first numbers how come were able to claim a \$5 as week in Vipornghieri?  All happens, they go the weekly amounts wrong to - the weekly increase in Conford will actually be \$8.13 and the weekly decrease in Wipornghieri to a specific property of the	The Central Voad is one of the most deprived communities in NSW.  A 42% post harmonisation rate rise in Gosfordshire will be devastating.  A 42% post harmonisation rate rise in Gosfordshire will be devastating.  Quite apart from individual hardship, businesses already ravaged by Covid will be devastated by the double wharmony of higher rates and reduced customer spending power.  Central Coset Council's connemic modelling is as incompetent as everything else they do.  Let a connemic an expension of the coset of the cost of the co	If it is genuinely independent and objective?	The Administrator's 30 day report points to a noise in the trough culture when it states staff numbers increased This but staff costs over 40% since amalgements.  These fact as stands here not been enclosed. The administrator claims he has reduced Executive numbers but that is smoke and mirror based on positions afreedly vacant (and never needed) and positions reduced but that is smoke and mirror based on positions afreedly vacant (and never needed) and positions reduced as the control of the reduced positions afreedly according to the reduced positions and the new factor because it is bereath them to commate to bere when you give the tens of us.  Until this noise in the trough culture changes, until there are connected reforms (not just future promises) to improve financial control, efficiency, productively and coalconer reduced, they will never meet this criteria and radepages will continue to throw good money after bad.  The application does not transparently disclose the failings of the previous council and there is no real information related to cost containment. If the council receives more money without accountability they will sate keep spending.  Gooked Council has long history of accountability on council receives more money without accountability they will be forcided immanagement at whom they conceived his position general control continues on the sort property developer, applied funding additional to make and the recipiting plantific control control for property developers, applied funding additional control control to one property developers, applied funding additional to make and the recipiting plantific control control for the forcide in control force of the failure of the force of the reduced accountability than the force of the force of the control control control to one of the force of the control control to one of the force of the control of the control of the c
29 Anonymou		There is a longer version of the same interview on ABC's website.  Central Coast Council has now publicly admitted the real rate increase in Gosfordshire will be 42%, not either of the 10% or 15% stated during the public consultation.  Somewhalt bizarrely (more clearly in the longer clip), the Council spokesperson appears to be blaming PART for the misinformation by claiming PART did not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the least percentage increase when communicating with release year workly the consultation.  This docent seem to make sense given that they did include the impact of the mission of the longer of the percentage included during the consultation. —an increase of \$1 a week in Gosfordshire and decrease of \$3.1 week. It Wyongton. It is not the sense of \$1 a week in Gosfordshire and decrease of \$3.1 week. It Wyongton. It is not the consultation of the sense of \$1 a week in Gosfordshire and decrease of \$3.1 week. It Wyongton. It is not include the weekly amount wrong too — the weekly increase in Gosford will adually be \$8.13 and the weekly decrease in Wyong \$2.16 (as they now admit in the radio interview).  It is crystal clear from this radio interview that the community was not made aware of Council's actual rate rise plans during the public consultation, and that therefore a genuinely independent regulator could not objectively conclude they have med in first criterion.  If an therefore asking you to please put our community out of its misery and immediately reject this application which has caused so much grief and is filterafly feating us apart.  A rate increase is only a band aid effect. Placing good money into bad is not good business sense.  I all adapted protopy becomed experience the Gosford Clip Council now amarigameted known as Certain Coast Council has been dry known and protopy the council and the council of the place of the industry of the place of the industry of the place of the place of the place of the industry of the place of the place of the place of the in	Intentify along the ratiopayers (CZC) in Confordative), cuts services across the board 15%, and sells assets. A month of the will a spread-there could have come up with it.  There is no strategic himining about the difference between core services, community priorities, and discretionary services. On discretionary services, to innovative ideas about community or voluntary providers about one of the community in priorities and services, and are not a priority and so not desert to be priorities at all and a priority and so not desert to be priorities at all and a priority and so not desert to be priorities at all and and representation of the community of the control of the community of the commu	Consultation.  Semental bizarrally (more dearly in the longer dip), the Council spokesperson appears to be biaming PART for the misinformation by daining PART did not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the final percentage increase when communicating with ratepayers during the consultation.  This doesn't seem to make sense given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation - an increase of 37 a week in Coloridative and decrease of 35 a week in Wipornghieri. They had been unable to include harmonisation in the first numbers how come were able to claim a \$5 as week in Vipornghieri?  All happens, they go the weekly amounts wrong to - the weekly increase in Conford will actually be \$8.13 and the weekly decrease in Wipornghieri to a specific property of the	The Central Voad is one of the most deprived communities in NSW.  A 42% post harmonisation rate rise in Gosfordshire will be devastating.  A 42% post harmonisation rate rise in Gosfordshire will be devastating.  Quite apart from individual hardship, businesses already ravaged by Covid will be devastated by the double wharmony of higher rates and reduced customer spending power.  Central Coset Council's connemic modelling is as incompetent as everything else they do.  Let a connemic an expension of the coset of the cost of the co	If it is genuinely independent and objective?	The Administrator's 30 day report points to a noise in the trough culture when it states staff numbers increased This but staff costs over 40% since amalgements.  These fact as stands here not been enclosed. The administrator claims he has reduced Executive numbers but that is smoke and mirror based on positions afreedly vacant (and never needed) and positions reduced but that is smoke and mirror based on positions afreedly vacant (and never needed) and positions reduced as the control of the reduced positions afreedly according to the reduced positions and the new factor because it is bereath them to commate to bere when you give the tens of us.  Until this noise in the trough culture changes, until there are connected reforms (not just future promises) to improve financial control, efficiency, productively and coalconer reduced, they will never meet this criteria and radepages will continue to throw good money after bad.  The application does not transparently disclose the failings of the previous council and there is no real information related to cost containment. If the council receives more money without accountability they will sate keep spending.  Gooked Council has long history of accountability on council receives more money without accountability they will be forcided immanagement at whom they conceived his position general control continues on the sort property developer, applied funding additional to make and the recipiting plantific control control for property developers, applied funding additional control control to one property developers, applied funding additional to make and the recipiting plantific control control for the forcide in control force of the failure of the force of the reduced accountability than the force of the force of the control control control to one of the force of the control control to one of the force of the control of the control of the c
29 Anonymou	ous Anonymous	There is a longer version of the same interview on ABC's website.  Central Coast Council has now publicly admitted the real rate increase in Gosfordshire will be 42%, not either of the 10% or 15% stated during the public consultation.  Somewhalt bizarrely (more clearly in the longer clip), the Council spokesperson appears to be blaming PART for the misinformation by claiming PART did not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the leaf percentage increases when communicating with rategy-use for unity the occustation.  This docent seem to make sense given that they did include the impact of the impact of the properties of the propert	Intentify along the ratiopayers (CZC) in Confordative), cuts services across the board 15%, and sells assets. A month of the will a spread-there could have come up with it.  There is no strategic himining about the difference between core services, community priorities, and discretionary services. On discretionary services, to innovative ideas about community or voluntary providers about one of the community in priorities and services, and are not a priority and so not desert to be priorities at all and a priority and so not desert to be priorities at all and a priority and so not desert to be priorities at all and and representation of the community of the control of the community of the commu	Consultation.  Semental bizarrally (more dearly in the longer dip), the Council spokesperson appears to be biaming PART for the misinformation by daining PART did not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the final percentage increase when communicating with ratepayers during the consultation.  This doesn't seem to make sense given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation - an increase of 37 a week in Coloridative and decrease of 35 a week in Wipornghieri. They had been unable to include harmonisation in the first numbers how come were able to claim a \$5 as week in Vipornghieri?  All happens, they go the weekly amounts wrong to - the weekly increase in Conford will actually be \$8.13 and the weekly decrease in Wipornghieri to a specific property of the	The Central Voad is one of the most deprived communities in NSW.  A 42% post harmonisation rate rise in Gosfordshire will be devastating.  A 42% post harmonisation rate rise in Gosfordshire will be devastating.  Quite apart from individual hardship, businesses already ravaged by Covid will be devastated by the double wharmony of higher rates and reduced customer spending power.  Central Coset Council's connemic modelling is as incompetent as everything else they do.  Let a connemic an expension of the coset of the cost of the co	If it is genuinely independent and objective?	The Administrator's 30 day report points to a nose in the Brough culture when it states staff numbers increased TPs but staff costs over 40% since amaginariation.  These first cat staffers have not been recision. The administrator claims he has reduced Elecutive numbers but that is smoke and mirror based on positions afrestly vacant (and never needed) and positions red classified as no longer shere of the Test staffer of the staffer of t
29 Anonymou	ous Anonymous	There is a longer version of the same interview on ABC's website.  Central Coast Council has now publicly admitted the real rate increase in Gosfordshire will be 42%, not either of the 10% or 15% stated during the public consultation.  Somewhat bizarrely (more clearly in the longer clip), the Council spokesperson appears to be blaming PART for the misinformation by claiming PART did not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the leaf percentage increase when communicating with interpret wing the consultation.  This decent seem to make sense given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation. —an increase of \$3 a week in Gosfordshire and decrease of \$3 a week in Consort the property of the council to include the harmonisation of the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation. —an increase of \$7 a week in Gosfordshire and decrease of \$3 a week in Consort the property of the propert	Intentify along the ratiopayers (CZC) in Confordative), cuts services across the board 15%, and sells assets. A month of the will a spread-there could have come up with it.  There is no strategic himining about the difference between core services, community priorities, and discretionary services. On discretionary services, to innovative ideas about community or voluntary providers about one of the community in priorities and services, and are not a priority and so not desert to be priorities at all and a priority and so not desert to be priorities at all and a priority and so not desert to be priorities at all and and representation of the community of the control of the community of the commu	Consultation.  Semental bizarrally (more dearly in the longer dip), the Council spokesperson appears to be biaming PART for the misinformation by daining PART did not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the final percentage increase when communicating with ratepayers during the consultation.  This doesn't seem to make sense given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation - an increase of 37 a week in Coloridative and decrease of 35 a week in Wipornghieri. They had been unable to include harmonisation in the first numbers how come were able to claim a \$5 as week in Vipornghieri?  All happens, they go the weekly amounts wrong to - the weekly increase in Conford will actually be \$8.13 and the weekly decrease in Wipornghieri to a specific property of the	The Central Voad is one of the most deprived communities in NSW.  A 42% post harmonisation rate rise in Gosfordshire will be devastating.  A 42% post harmonisation rate rise in Gosfordshire will be devastating.  Quite apart from individual hardship, businesses already ravaged by Covid will be devastated by the double wharmony of higher rates and reduced customer spending power.  Central Coset Council's connemic modelling is as incompetent as everything else they do.  Let a connemic an expension of the coset of the cost of the co	If it is genuinely independent and objective?	The Administrator's 30 day report points to a nose in the Brough culture when it states staff numbers increased TPs but staff costs over 40% since amaginariation.  These first cat staffers have not been recision. The administrator claims he has reduced Elecutive numbers but that is smoke and mirror based on positions afrestly vacant (and never needed) and positions red classified as no longer shere of the Test staffer of the staffer of t
29 Anonymou	ous Anonymous	There is a longer version of the same interview on ABC's website.  Central Coast Council has now publicly admitted the reaf rate increase in Gosfordshire will be 42%, not either of the 10% or 15% stated during the public consultation.  Somewhat bizarrely (more clearly in the longer clip), the Council spokesperson appears to be blanning PART for the misinformation by claiming PART did not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the level processor of the processor of the processes when communicating with relapseyable until the consultation.  This docen't seem to make sense given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the veelety amounts quicked during the consultation. — an increase of \$1 a week in Gosfordshire and decrease of \$3.1 and the veelety increases in Veryorgabin. If they had been unable to bidde harmonisation in the final numbers how come they were able to claim a \$3 as week reduction in Wyongabin. If they had been unable to bidde harmonisation in the final numbers how come they were able to claim a \$3 as week reduction in Wyongabin. If they had been unable to bidde harmonisation in the final numbers how come they were able to claim a \$3 as week reduction in Wyongabin.  It is crystal clear from this radio interview that the community was not made aware of Council's actual rate rise plans during the public consultation, and that therefore a genuinely independent regulator could not objectively consultation by the sense of the public consultation, and that therefore a genuinely independent regulator could not objectively consultation to the public consultation, and that therefore a genuinely independent regulator could not objectively consultation. In the public consultation, and that therefore a genuinely independent regulator could not objectively consultation and the public consultation in the first farience.  If a selective asking you to please put our community out of its misery and immediately reject this application which has caused so much girel and is iterally t	Intentify along the ratiopayers (CZC) in Confordative), cuts services across the board 15%, and sells assets. A month of the will a spread-there could have come up with it.  There is no strategic himining about the difference between core services, community priorities, and discretionary services. On discretionary services, to innovative ideas about community or voluntary providers about one of the community in priorities and services, and are not a priority and so not desert to be priorities at all and a priority and so not desert to be priorities at all and a priority and so not desert to be priorities at all and and representation of the community of the control of the community of the commu	Consulation bizarrely (more clearly in the longer disp). the Council spokesperson appears to be blaming PART for the misinformation by dalming PART don at allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the final porceitage increase when communicating with indepues during the consultation.  This doesn't seem to make series given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation. — an increase of 37 a week in (Vigorgahire. If they had been unable to include tharmonisation in the final numbers had not a seem to miscons to the younghard. — they had been unable to include tharmonisation in the final numbers had not related to the claim a 53 a week in (Vigorgahire. If they had been unable to include tharmonisation in the final numbers had not allow they increase in Gosford will actually be \$8.13 and the weekly decrease in Wyong \$2.18 (as the row admin in the radio interview) and the community was not made aware of Council's actual rade rise plans during the public consultation, and that therefore asking you to please put our community out of its missery and immediately reject this application which has caused so much grief and is literally large as apast.  See general comments.  See general comments.  See general comments.	The Certiful Voadt is one of the most deprived communities in NSW.  A 42% post harmonisation rate rise in Gosfordshire will be devastating.  Quite apart from individual hardship, businesses already ravaged by Covid will be devastated by the double wharmony of higher rates and reduced customer spending power.  Certral Coast Council's economic modelling is as incompetent as everything else they do.  the spending of the coast control afford this given the impact of COVID related jub loss.  **many people on the coast cannot afford this given the impact of COVID related jub loss.  **many people on the coast cannot afford this given the impact of COVID related jub loss.  **many people on the coast cannot afford this part of the provisions for fundation to never or effor cordinary provisions have been considered.  **Self funded retires on fined incomes are not considered and cannot afford this rate freshes.  **health and emergency workers did not receive a CPT into this year and are also feeling the pinch.  In harmonise the rates between the former Wiyong and Coolford shries.  **This means that we will pay an additions if by length of the public of the everage applied to our easting rates of \$2,000 pays in addition to the 15% proposed increase.  \$1,000 pain crease for us will man we have to budget and it is certainty more than the few cape of coffees per week that the Councilions are promoting.  **This relates the thing of the promotion of the everage rates in the region. I am not convinced that they are being honest and transparent in their promotion of the ross.	If it is genuinely independent and objective?	The Administrator's 30 day report points to a noise in the trough culture when it states staff numbers increased IT% but staff costs over 40% store amalgemation.  These fact staffs have notice necessary. The administrator claims he has reduced Executive numbers but that is make and mirror sheed on positions already vacant (and never needed) and positions reduced becautive numbers but that is make and mirror sheed on positions already vacant (and never needed) and positions reduced the staff of
29 Anonymou	ous Anonymous	There is a longer version of the same interview on ABC's websile.  Central Coast Council has now publicly admitted the real rate increase in Gosfordshire will be 42%, not either of the 10% or 19% stated during the public consultation.  Somewhalt bizarrely (more clearly in the longer clip), the Council spokesperson appears to be bizaming PART for the misinformation by claiming PART did not allow the Council is include the impact of harmonisation on the least percentage increases when communicating with releayess with the consultation.  This docent seem to make sense given that they did include the impact of the missing of the production of the council to be consultation. — an increase of \$1 a week in Gosfordshire and decrease of \$3 a week. It is consultation of the weekly amount wrong to — the weekly increase in Gosford will adularly be \$8.13 and the weekly decrease in Wyong \$2.18 (as they now admit in the radio interview).  It is crystal clear from this radio interview that the community was not made aware of Council's actual rate rise plans during the public consultation, and that therefore a genuinely independent regulator could not objectively concide the type were life first criterion.  If an therefore asking you to please put our community was not made aware of Council's actual rate rise plans during the public consultation, and that therefore a genuinely independent regulator could not objectively concide the type were life first criterion.  If an therefore asking you to please put our community was not made aware of Council's actual rate rise plans during the public consultation, and that therefore a genuinely independent regulator could not objectively concide the type were life first criterion.  If an therefore asking you to please put our community as not made aware of Council has been conciled to the put of the council and the put of the council and the put of the council and the council an	Intentify along the ratiopayers (CZC) in Confordative), cuts services across the board 15%, and sells assets. A month of the will a spread-there could have come up with it.  There is no strategic himining about the difference between core services, community priorities, and discretionary services. On discretionary services, to innovative ideas about community or voluntary providers about one of the community in priorities and services, and are not a priority and so not desert to be priorities at all and a priority and so not desert to be priorities at all and a priority and so not desert to be priorities at all and and representation of the community of the control of the community of the commu	Consultation.  Semental bizarrally (more dearly in the longer dip), the Council spokesperson appears to be biaming PART for the misinformation by daining PART did not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the final percentage increase when communicating with ratepayers during the consultation.  This doesn't seem to make sense given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation - an increase of 37 a week in Coloridative and decrease of 35 a week in Wipornghieri. They had been unable to include harmonisation in the first numbers how come were able to claim a \$5 as week in Vipornghieri?  All happens, they go the weekly amounts wrong to - the weekly increase in Conford will actually be \$8.13 and the weekly decrease in Wipornghieri to a specific property of the	The Certiful Voadt is one of the most deprived communities in NSW.  A 42% post harmonisation rate rise in Gosfordshire will be devastating.  Quite apart from individual hardship, businesses already ravaged by Covid will be devastated by the double wharmony of higher rates and reduced customer spending power.  Certral Coast Council's economic modelling is as incompetent as everything else they do.  the spending of the coast control afford this given the impact of COVID related jub loss.  **many people on the coast cannot afford this given the impact of COVID related jub loss.  **many people on the coast cannot afford this given the impact of COVID related jub loss.  **many people on the coast cannot afford this part of the provisions for fundation to never or effor cordinary provisions have been considered.  **Self funded retires on fined incomes are not considered and cannot afford this rate freshes.  **health and emergency workers did not receive a CPT into this year and are also feeling the pinch.  In harmonise the rates between the former Wiyong and Coolford shries.  **This means that we will pay an additions if by length of the public of the everage applied to our easting rates of \$2,000 pays in addition to the 15% proposed increase.  \$1,000 pain crease for us will man we have to budget and it is certainty more than the few cape of coffees per week that the Councilions are promoting.  **This relates the thing of the promotion of the everage rates in the region. I am not convinced that they are being honest and transparent in their promotion of the ross.	If it is genuinely independent and objective?	The Administrator's 30 day report points to a noise in the trough culture when it states staff numbers increased CTNs but staff costs over 40% since amalgements.  These fit call staffs have not been reclosed. The administrator claims he has reduced Executive numbers but that is smoke and mirror shared on positions afready vacant (and never needed) and positions reduced but that is smoke and mirror shared on positions afready vacant (and never needed) and positions reduced to the staff of the control of the cont
29 Anonymou	Anonymous Anonymous	There is a longer version of the same interview on ABC's websile.  Central Coast Council has now publicly admitted the real rate increase in Gosfordshire will be 42%, not either of the 10% or 15% stated during the public consultation.  Somewhalt bizarrely (more clearly in the longer of p), the Council spokesperson appears to be blaming PART for the misinformation by claiming PART did not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the least percentage increases when communicating with releases well to climate as 15%. The desert seem to make sense given that they did include the impact of the mission of the large through the council to include the impact of the large through the council to council the power of the large through the council to council the power of the large through the council to council the power of the large through the council to council the power of the first criterion.  It is crystal clear from this radio interview that the community was not made aware of Council's actual rate rise plans during the public consultation, and that therefore a genuinely independent regulator could not objectively conciled the hylaw eme life first criterion.  If an otherefore asking you to please put our community out of its misery and immediately reject this application which has caused so much grief and is filterally feating us apart.  At late increase is only a band aid effect. Placing good money into bad is not good business sense.  I altalege through personnel experience the Council or Cycloparation or the council that has been the large through personnel experience the Council and the council that has drift presented to the present of the council that has been the large through personnel experience the Council city (Cycloparation or the council that has been the way for years and years that most employees are delicted in this high every personnel personn	It merely slugs the ralepayers (42% in Goolfordshire), cuts services across the board 15%, and sells assets. A child of the with a spread-there could have comes by with. There is no stratego hinking about the difference between core services, community priorities, and discretionary services. On discretionary services, to innovative ideas about community or voluntary providers lated governous explainting about the difference between core services, community providers shall governous explainting in partimetrial to relate Contract Costs. And native the identification providers that are not a priority and do not reset to be provided at all.  And nothing about cuts change to improve efficiency, productively, or performance culture. The Council's solution is crude, blunt, and unfair on ratepayers.  Now will it work. The previous Executive Leadership Team are nearly all still there. How can they possibly be trusted with 42% more of my money when they have so spectacularly mismantaged my money in the past?  See general comments  The consultation with the community has been poor and flaudulent- the survey did not give an option of choosing no rate race, and we where forced to elect a 16-15% rise to proceed.  It believe Council should be required to be fully transparent with all future spending and they should be made it assesses existing costs on infinishructure and facilities that only benefit a small percentage of the community.	Consulation bitarrely (more dearly in the longer dip). the Council spokesperson appears to be bitening PART for the misinformation by dalming PART did not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the final percentage increase when communicating with ratepayers during the consultation.  This doesn't seem to make series given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation —an increase of 27 a week in Colorishie and decrease 35 a week in Wiporaghier?  As It appears, they give the weekly amounts wrong to — the weekly increase in Conford will actually be \$8.13 and the weekly decrease in Wyongsters and a support of the colorishies and continued to conford will actually be \$8.13 and the weekly decrease in Wyong \$2.18 (as the now admin the radio interview). It is an interview of the community was not made wave of Council's actual rate rise plans during the public consultation, and that therefore a genuinely independent regulator could not objectively conclude they have met its first criterion.  If am therefore asking you to please put our community out of its missery and immediately reject this application which has caused so much giref and is literally to believe that the council is mis-representing the rate rise percentage. I suspect that it will be closer to a 45% rise for the individual and this has been attended on radio. Its not these parent.  See general comments  We have been made aware of the need for a rate rise, I still feel that ratepayers should not be made responsible for mistates, mismanagement, overspecting the law to the council is mistates, mismanagement, overspecting the law to the council is mistates, mismanagement, overspecting the law to the council is mistates, mismanagement, overspecting the law to the council is mistates, mismanagement, overspecting the law to the council is mistates, mismanagement, overspecting the law to the council is mistates, mismanagement, overspecting the law to the council is mistated to the law	The Central Voadt is one of the most deprived communities in NSW.  A 42% post harmonisation rate rise in Gosfordshire will be devastating.  Cubile part from individual hardship, businesses already ravaged by Covid will be devastated by the double wharmony higher rates an devaded customer spending power.  Central Coast Council's economic modelling is as incompetent as everything else they do.  see general comments.  -many people on the coast cannot afford this given the impact of COVID related job losssh my recent correspondence with council fleey advised that there where provisions for hardship by no new or eath or carriagy provisions the been consideredSelf funder retrieves on fixed iscomes are not considered and cannot afford this rate riskSelf funder retrieves on fixed iscomes are not considered and cannot afford this rate riskSelf funder retrieves on fixed iscomes are not considered and cannot afford the rate for the construction.  The proposed increase for our area will not be just 15% and 25% CPI year on year. They also intend to harmonise the rates between the former Vilverg and Coding of shree.  This meets that we will pay an additional 514 per veryel or 5746 pay, Clossed on the average applied Our council rate for early the Councillors and online retrievents on 35% increase in 2012. An additional 51.000 ps increase for us will mean we have to budget and it is certainly more than the few cups of cofficiency prevents that the Councillors are promoting.  There is also no information to support how they reached the average rates in the region. I am not convinced that they are being honest and transparent in that promotion of the coals.  Many ratepayers on the Central Coast will experience extra hardship if rates are increased. Most of	If it is genuinely independent and objective?	The Administrator's 30 day report points to a noise in the trough culture when it states staff numbers increased CTIs but staff costs over 40% since amalgements.  These fact states have not been reclosed. The administrator claims he has reduced Executive numbers but that is make and mirror sheed on positions already vacant (and never needed) and positions reduced but that is make and mirror sheed on positions already vacant (and never needed) and positions reduced but that is make and mirror sheed on positions already vacant (and never needed) and positions reduced that the control of
29 Anonymou	Anonymous Anonymous	There is a longer version of the same interview on ABC's website.  Central Coast Council has now publicly admitted the real rate increase in Gosfordshire will be 42%, not either of the 10% or 15% stated during the public consultation.  Somewhalt bizarrely (more clearly in the longer of p), the Council spokesperson appears to be blaming PART for the misinformation by claiming PART did not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the leaf percentage increases when communicating with rategy-use for which the council to include the impact of harmonisation on the leaf percentage increases when communicating with rategy-use value and other parts of the council to include the impact of harmonisation on the leaf percentage increases of \$3 a week in Gosfordshire and decrease of \$3 and the percentage	It merely slugs the ralepayers (42% in Goolfordshire), cuts services across the board 15%, and sells assets A child of the with a spread-sheet cold have comes by with a fire of the control of the with a spread-sheet cold have comes by with a fire of the control of the comes of	Consulation bitarrely (more dearly in the longer dip). the Council spokesperson appears to be bitening PART for the misinformation by dalming PART did not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the final percentage increase when communicating with ratepayers during the consultation.  This doesn't seem to make series given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation —an increase of 27 a week in Colorishie and decrease 35 a week in Wiporaghier?  As It appears, they give the weekly amounts wrong to — the weekly increase in Conford will actually be \$8.13 and the weekly decrease in Wyongsters and a support of the colorishies and continued to conford will actually be \$8.13 and the weekly decrease in Wyong \$2.18 (as the now admin the radio interview). It is an interview of the community was not made wave of Council's actual rate rise plans during the public consultation, and that therefore a genuinely independent regulator could not objectively conclude they have met its first criterion.  If am therefore asking you to please put our community out of its missery and immediately reject this application which has caused so much giref and is literally to believe that the council is mis-representing the rate rise percentage. I suspect that it will be closer to a 45% rise for the individual and this has been attended on radio. Its not these parent.  See general comments  We have been made aware of the need for a rate rise, I still feel that ratepayers should not be made responsible for mistates, mismanagement, overspecting the law to the council is mistates, mismanagement, overspecting the law to the council is mistates, mismanagement, overspecting the law to the council is mistates, mismanagement, overspecting the law to the council is mistates, mismanagement, overspecting the law to the council is mistates, mismanagement, overspecting the law to the council is mistates, mismanagement, overspecting the law to the council is mistated to the law	The Central Voadt is one of the most deprived communities in NSW.  A 42% post harmonisation rate rise in Gosfordshire will be devastating.  Cubile part from individual hardship, businesses already ravaged by Covid will be devastated by the double wharmony higher rates an devaded customer spending power.  Central Coast Council's economic modelling is as incompetent as everything else they do.  see general comments.  -many people on the coast cannot afford this given the impact of COVID related job losssh my recent correspondence with council fleey advised that there where provisions for hardship by no new or eat or carriage provisions for hardship by no new or eat or carriage youthors for the correct correspondence with council fleey advised that there where provisions for hardship by new or early continued to the council of the contract of the con	If it is genuinely independent and objective?	The Administrator's 30 day report points to a noise in the trough culture when it states staff numbers increased CTIs but staff costs over 40% since amalgements.  These fact states have not been reclosed. The administrator claims he has reduced Executive numbers but that is make and mirror sheed on positions already vacant (and never needed) and positions reduced but that is make and mirror sheed on positions already vacant (and never needed) and positions reduced but that is make and mirror sheed on positions already vacant (and never needed) and positions reduced that the control of
29 Anonymou	Anonymous Anonymous	There is a longer version of the same interview on ABC's website.  Central Coast Council has now publicly admitted the real rate increase in Gosfordshire will be 42%, not either of the 10% or 15% stated during the public consultation.  Somewhat bizarrely (more clearly in the longer clip), the Council spokesperson appears to be blaming PART for the misinformation by claiming PART did not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the large precision include the impact of butter of the 10% or 15% stated during the consultation.  This docent seem to make sense given that they did include the impact of the impact of the precision o	Intensity slugs the ralepayers (42% in Gooffordshire), cuts services across the board 15%, and sells assets. A mold of the with a spread-therd could have come as with a Three in an strategic brinking about the Efficiency between core services, community priorities, and discretionary services. On discretionary services, community priorities, and discretionary services. On discretionary services, community priorities, and discretionary services. On discretionary services, community or voluntary providers and services and a read a priority and 5 and services of the control of the services of all and a priority and 5 and services to the priorities of all and a priority and 5 and services the priorities of all and a priority and 5 and services the priorities of all and an order to be priorities of all and order to be priorities and all and the services. Now will it work. The previous Executive Leadership Team are nearly all still there. How can they possibly be trusted with 42% more of my money when they have so spectacularly mismansaged my money in the paar?  See general comments.  The consultation with the community has been poor and fraudulent- the survey did not give an option of choosing for rate inte, and we where forced to dect a 10-15% rise to proceed.  It believe Council should be required to be fully transparent with all future spending and they should be made it assess existing costs on infrastructure and facilities that only benefit a small percentage of the community.  Cut expenditure and run the Council like most good businesses.	Consulation bitarrely (more dearly in the longer dip). the Council spokesperson appears to be bitening PART for the misinformation by dalming PART did not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the final percentage increase when communicating with ratepayers during the consultation.  This doesn't seem to make series given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation —an increase of 27 a week in Colorishie and decrease 35 a week in Wiporaghier?  As It appears, they give the weekly amounts wrong to — the weekly increase in Conford will actually be \$8.13 and the weekly decrease in Wyongsters and a support of the colorishies and continued to conford will actually be \$8.13 and the weekly decrease in Wyong \$2.18 (as the now admin the radio interview). It is an interview of the community was not made wave of Council's actual rate rise plans during the public consultation, and that therefore a genuinely independent regulator could not objectively conclude they have met its first criterion.  If am therefore asking you to please put our community out of its missery and immediately reject this application which has caused so much giref and is literally to believe that the council is mis-representing the rate rise percentage. I suspect that it will be closer to a 45% rise for the individual and this has been attended on radio. Its not these parent.  See general comments  We have been made aware of the need for a rate rise, I still feel that ratepayers should not be made responsible for mistates, mismanagement, overspecting the law to the council is mistates, mismanagement, overspecting the law to the council is mistates, mismanagement, overspecting the law to the council is mistates, mismanagement, overspecting the law to the council is mistates, mismanagement, overspecting the law to the council is mistates, mismanagement, overspecting the law to the council is mistates, mismanagement, overspecting the law to the council is mistated to the law	The Central Vosati is one of the most deprived communities in NSW.  A 42% post harmonisation rate rise in Gosfordshire will be devastating.  Quite apart from individual hardship, businesses already ravaged by Covid will be devastated by the double wharmony of higher rates and reduced cautomes personing power.  Central Cosat Council's connection modelling is as incompetent as everything else they do.  sets general comments.  **The contraction of the connection of the property of the contraction of the c	If it is genuinely independent and objective?	The Administrator's 30 day report points to a noise in the trough culture when it states staff numbers increased This but staff costs over 40% since amalgements.  These flat cat staff new not been reclosed. The administrator claims he has reduced Executive numbers but that is smoke and mirror based on positions already vacant (and never needed) and positions re disastified as no interfer has not been staff or the control of the control o
29 Anonymou	Anonymous Anonymous	There is a longer version of the same interview on ABC's website.  Central Coast Council has now publicly admitted the real rate increase in Gosfordshire will be 42%, not either of the 10% or 15% stated during the public consultation.  Somewhat bizarrely (innor clearly in the longer clip), the Council appearance shows the communicating with rate-payers or during the consultation.  This docent seem to make sense given that they did include the impact of harmonisation or the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation.—an increase of \$7 a week in Gosfordshire and decrease of \$3 a week in White Indiana.  As it happeans, they got the weekly amount wrong to —the weekly increase in Gosford will adularly be \$8.13 and the weekly decrease in Wyong \$2.18 (as they now admit in the radio interview).  It is crystal clear from this radio interview that the community was not made aware of Council's actual rate rise plans during the public consultation, and that therefore a genuinely independent regulator could oxide/they conclude they have med in first citerion.  I am therefore asking you to please put our community was not made aware of Council's actual rate rise plans during the public consultation, and that therefore a genuinely independent regulator could oxide/they conclude they have med in first citerion.  I am therefore asking you to please put our community and of its misery and immediately reject this application which has caused so much grief and is literally learning us apart.  Asiate increase is only a hard and effect. Plusing good money into bad is not good insulates series.  Application of the council in the properties of the Gosford City Council me emigratured to the council to the council to the properties of the Gosford City Council me emigratured to the council to the properties of the Gosford City Council me emigratured to the council to the properties of the Gosford City Council me emigratured to the council to the properties of the control of the council to the properties of the Gosford City Council me	It merely slugs the ralepayers (42% in Gooffordatire), cuts services across the board 15%, and sells assets. A child of the with a spread-therd could have come up with 1 and the come of	Consulation bitarrely (more dearly in the longer dip). the Council spokesperson appears to be bitening PART for the misinformation by dalming PART did not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the final percentage increase when communicating with ratepayers during the consultation.  This doesn't seem to make series given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation —an increase of 27 a week in Colorishie and decrease 35 a week in Wiporaghier?  As It appears, they give the weekly amounts wrong to — the weekly increase in Conford will actually be \$8.13 and the weekly decrease in Wyongsters and a support of the colorishies and continued to conford will actually be \$8.13 and the weekly decrease in Wyong \$2.18 (as the now admin the radio interview). It is an interview of the community was not made wave of Council's actual rate rise plans during the public consultation, and that therefore a genuinely independent regulator could not objectively conclude they have met its first criterion.  If am therefore asking you to please put our community out of its missery and immediately reject this application which has caused so much giref and is literally to believe that the council is mis-representing the rate rise percentage. I suspect that it will be closer to a 45% rise for the individual and this has been attended on radio. Its not these parent.  See general comments  We have been made aware of the need for a rate rise, I still feel that ratepayers should not be made responsible for mistates, mismanagement, overspecting the law to the council is mistates, mismanagement, overspecting the law to the council is mistates, mismanagement, overspecting the law to the council is mistates, mismanagement, overspecting the law to the council is mistates, mismanagement, overspecting the law to the council is mistates, mismanagement, overspecting the law to the council is mistates, mismanagement, overspecting the law to the council is mistated to the law	The Certiful Voad is one of the most deprived communities in NSW.  A 42% post harmonisation rate rise in Gosfordshire will be devastating.  Quite apart from individual hardship, businesses already ravaged by Covid will be devastated by the double wharmony of higher rates and reduced customer spending power.  Certral Coast Council's economic modelling is as incompetent as everything else they do.  Leave a continue to the coast council should this given the impact of COVID related job loss.  **many people on the coast council should find given the impact of COVID related job loss.  **many people on the coast council should find given the impact of COVID related job loss.  **many people on the coast council should find given the impact of COVID related job loss.  **see general comments.  **end funded release on findal incomes are not considered and cannot affort this rate inches.  **health and emergency workers of find incomes are not considered and cannot affort this rate inches.  **health and emergency workers did not recieve a CPT rise this year and are also betting the profession of the coast	If it is genuinely independent and objective?	The Administrator's 30 day report points to a noise in the trough culture when it states staff numbers increased This but staff costs over 40% since amalgements.  These fact as stands here not been reclosed. The administrator claims he has reduced Executive numbers but that is smoke and mirror based on positions already vacant (and never needed) and positions reduced but that is smoke and mirror based on positions already vacant (and never needed) and positions reduced as the control of the produced of the control of the produced of the control of the reduced of the control of the reduced but that is moke and the new.  Loren bits and the new connected to the countries of the produced of the staff the new and countries of the staff the new and countries of the staff the new and countries of the new and countries of the new and countries of the new and countries the staff the new and countries to the new and countries to the new and countries to the new and the produced countries to the new and the new and the produced countries then not real information related to cost containment. If the council receives more money without accountability they will be the septiment of the new and the produced countries the new and the new and the new and the produced countries then produced the new and the n
29 Anonymou	Anonymous Anonymous	There is a longer version of the same interview on ASC's website.  Central Coast Coast Coast Dans now publicly admitted the real rite increase in Gosforderine will be 42%, not either of the 10% or 15% stated during the public consultation.  Somewhat bizarrely (more clearly in the foreget clip), the Coancil speckages on appears to be belanning PART for the minisformation by claiming PART of and allow the Coancil to include the impact of harmonication on the final percentage increase with communicating with indepressed using the consultation.  This docent seem to make sense given that they of a include the impact of harmonication on the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation — in increase of \$7 a week in Gosfordative and decrease of \$8.1 weekly increase in Coancil and the coancil an	Intensity slugs the ralepayers (42% in Gooffordshire), cuts services across the board 15%, and sells assets. A mold of the with a spread-therd could have come as with a Three in an strategic brinking about the Efficiency between core services, community priorities, and discretionary services. On discretionary services, community priorities, and discretionary services. On discretionary services, community priorities, and discretionary services. On discretionary services, community or voluntary providers and services and a read a priority and 5 and services of the control of the services of all and a priority and 5 and services to the priorities of all and a priority and 5 and services the priorities of all and a priority and 5 and services the priorities of all and an order to be priorities of all and order to be priorities and all and the services. Now will it work. The previous Executive Leadership Team are nearly all still there. How can they possibly be trusted with 42% more of my money when they have so spectacularly mismansaged my money in the paar?  See general comments.  The consultation with the community has been poor and fraudulent- the survey did not give an option of choosing for rate inte, and we where forced to dect a 10-15% rise to proceed.  It believe Council should be required to be fully transparent with all future spending and they should be made it assess existing costs on infrastructure and facilities that only benefit a small percentage of the community.  Cut expenditure and run the Council like most good businesses.	Consulation bitarrely (more dearly in the longer dip). the Council spokesperson appears to be bitening PART for the misinformation by dalming PART did not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the final percentage increase when communicating with ratepayers during the consultation.  This doesn't seem to make series given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation —an increase of 27 a week in Colorishie and decrease 35 a week in Wiporaghier?  As It appears, they give the weekly amounts wrong to — the weekly increase in Conford will actually be \$8.13 and the weekly decrease in Wyongsters and a support of the colorishies and continued to conford will actually be \$8.13 and the weekly decrease in Wyong \$2.18 (as the now admin the radio interview). It is an interview of the community was not made wave of Council's actual rate rise plans during the public consultation, and that therefore a genuinely independent regulator could not objectively conclude they have met its first criterion.  If am therefore asking you to please put our community out of its missery and immediately reject this application which has caused so much giref and is literally to believe that the council is mis-representing the rate rise percentage. I suspect that it will be closer to a 45% rise for the individual and this has been attended on radio. Its not these parent.  See general comments  We have been made aware of the need for a rate rise, I still feel that ratepayers should not be made responsible for mistates, mismanagement, overspecting the law to the council is mistates, mismanagement, overspecting the law to the council is mistates, mismanagement, overspecting the law to the council is mistates, mismanagement, overspecting the law to the council is mistates, mismanagement, overspecting the law to the council is mistates, mismanagement, overspecting the law to the council is mistates, mismanagement, overspecting the law to the council is mistated to the law	The Central Voadt is one of the most deprived communities in NSW.  A 275 post harmonisation rate rise in Gosfordshire will be devastating.  Cubia part from individual hardwish, businesses already ravaged by Covid will be devastated by the double wharmony higher rates and reduced customer spending power.  Central Coast Council's economic modelling is as incompetent as everything else they do.  **The contract correspondence with council they advised that there where provisions for hardwigh be reverted to the coast cannot afford this given the impact of COVID related job loss.  **In ny recent correspondence with council they advised that there where provisions for hardwigh be reverted to the coast cannot afford this standard provisions have been considered.  **The proposed increase for our area will not be just 15% and 2% CPV provision and the contraction of the coast of the coas	of it is genutrely independent and objective?	The Administrator's 30 day report points to a noise in the trough culture when it states staff numbers increased CTIs but staff costs over 47% since amalgamation.  These fact states have not been recision. The administrator claims he has reduced Executive numbers but that is smoke and mirror shared on positions already vacant (and never needed) and positions reduced but that is smoke and mirror shared on positions already vacant (and never needed) and positions reduced that is smoke and mirror shared on positions already vacant (and never needed) and positions reduced to an outper service staff or Security of the control of the
29 Anonymou	Anonymous Anonymous	There is a longer version of the same interview on ABC's website.  Central Coast Council has now publicly admitted the real rate increase in Gosfordshire will be 42%, not either of the 10% or 15% stated during the public consultation.  Somewhat bizarrely (innor clearly in the longer clip), the Council appearance shows the communicating with rate-payers or during the consultation.  This docent seem to make sense given that they did include the impact of harmonisation or the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation.—an increase of \$7 a week in Gosfordshire and decrease of \$3 a week in White Indiana.  As it happeans, they got the weekly amount wrong to —the weekly increase in Gosford will adularly be \$8.13 and the weekly decrease in Wyong \$2.18 (as they now admit in the radio interview).  It is crystal clear from this radio interview that the community was not made aware of Council's actual rate rise plans during the public consultation, and that therefore a genuinely independent regulator could oxide/they conclude they have med in first citerion.  I am therefore asking you to please put our community was not made aware of Council's actual rate rise plans during the public consultation, and that therefore a genuinely independent regulator could oxide/they conclude they have med in first citerion.  I am therefore asking you to please put our community and of its misery and immediately reject this application which has caused so much grief and is literally learning us apart.  Asiate increase is only a hard and effect. Plusing good money into bad is not good insulates series.  Application of the council in the properties of the Gosford City Council me emigratured to the council to the council to the properties of the Gosford City Council me emigratured to the council to the properties of the Gosford City Council me emigratured to the council to the properties of the Gosford City Council me emigratured to the council to the properties of the control of the council to the properties of the Gosford City Council me	It merely slugs the ralepayers (42% in Gooffordatire), cuts services across the board 15%, and sells assets. A child of the with a spread-therd could have come up with 1 and the come of	Somewhat bizarrely imore clearly in the longer slip). the Council spokesperson appears to be bizering PART for the misinformation by daliming PART and not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the final porcentage increase when communicating with indepues during the consultation.  This doesn't seem to make series given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation. In increase of 37 a week in (Vigorgahire. If they had been unable to include the impact of the included of the council and the	The Certiful Vosati is one of the most deprived communities in NSW.  A 42% post harmonisation rate rise in Gosfordshire will be devastating.  Quite apart from individual hardship, businesses already ravaged by Covid will be devastated by the double wharmony fingher rates an effectived coatoms reprending power.  Certiful Coset Council's economic modelling is as incompetent as everything else they do.  sets general comments.  set general comments.  set general commonities amount atthird this given the impact of COVID related job loss.  In my rocent correspondence with council they advised that there where provisions for hardship be no new or extra ordinary provisions have been considered.  Self funded retireson fined incomes are not considered and cannot afford this rate rise.  The proposed increase for cut area with to be just 15% and 25°C Plyear on year. They also intend to harmonise the rates between the former Wylong and Gosford shires.  This means that work play and additions to the 15% proposed increase.  1.000 pa increase for us will mean where to budget and it is certainly more than the everage applied to our existing rates of \$2.000 pal in addition to the 15% proposed increase.  1.000 pal notes for us will mean where to budget and it is certainly more than the everage of coffees per week that the Councilions are promoting.  This is no way a resonable rise in and a transparent in their promotion of the costs.  This is no way a resonable rise in rate and I suggest this goes to the Judges and evidence needs to be collected.  This is no way a resonable rise in rate and I suggest this goes to the Judges and evidence needs be to be collected.	If it is genutrely independent and objective?	The Administrator's 30 day report points to a nose in the Brough culture when it states staff numbers increased This but staff costs over 40% since amaginarists.  These filed staff staff costs over 40% since amaginarists.  These filed staff staff costs over 40% since amaginarists.  These filed staff staff increased and the staff
29 Anonymou	Anonymous Anonymous	There is a longer version of the same interview on ABCs website.  Central Coast Coast Coast Danco by picking shalled the rest the increase in Coastorderine will be 42%, not either of the 16% or 15% stated during the public consultation.  Somewhat bizarrely (more clearly in the longer deligi), the Coancil spekesperson appears to be betaming PPAET for the missiformation by claiming PAET did not allow the Coancil to include the impact of harmonication on the final percentage in crease with communicating with interpretation of the coancil process of	It merely slags the ralepayers (42% in Gooffordshire), cuts services across the board 15%, and sells assets. A ordid of the with a spread-therd could have come as with it. Three in or strategle himing about the difference between core services, community priorities, and discretionary services. On discretionary services, to invocative ideas about community or voluntary providers stateging over or verbin in partnership to reflect occurations. An or a stempt to identify discretionary services and are not a priority and do not direct to be prioritied at all and a priority and do not direct to be prioritied at all and a priority and do not direct to be prioritied at all and a priority and do not direct to be prioritied at all and a priority and do not care to the priorities at all the priorities and an advantage of the council is solution is crude, blunt, and unfair on ratepayers.  Now will it work. The previous Executive Leadership Team are nearly all still there. How can they possibly be trusted with 42% more of my money when they have so specialcularly mismanaged my money in the past?  See general comments.  See general comments.  The consultation with the community has been poor and fraudident- the survey did not give an option of choosing for rate rise, and we where forced to elect a 10-10% rise to proceed.  The consultation with the community has been poor and fraudident- the survey did not give an option of choosing for rate rise, and we where forced to elect a 10-10% rise to proceed.  Cut expenditure and run the Council like most good businesses.  No matter what you say this goes back to the AUDITORS IN THE GOVT ABOVE SHELLEY HANCOCK AND EITHER GOVT OR COUNCL. NOT CHECKING AUDITORS IN THE GOVT ABOVE SHELLEY HANCOCK AND EITHER GOVT OR COUNCLE NOT CHECKING AUDITORS IN THE GOVT ABOVE SHELLEY HANCOCK AND EITHER GOVT OR COUNCLE NOT CHECKING AUDITORS IN THE GOVT ABOVE SHELLEY HANCOCK AND EITHER GOVT OR COUNCLE NOT CHECKING AUDITORS IN THE GOVT ABOVE SHELLEY HANCOCK and provide the survey of the provide that the pr	Same shall bizarrely imore clearly in the longer disp). the Council spokesperson appears to be bitarring PART for the misinformation by dalmining PART and not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the final procreatage increase when communicating with radiapyees during the consultation.  This doesn't seem to make series given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted the consultation. This doesn't seem to make series given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted the namonisation in the final procreatage in crease when communicating with include the impact of the colors at 3s a week in Wylonghier. If they had been unable to include harmonisation in the final numbers have can be were able to claim a 5s a week in Wylonghier. If they had been unable to include harmonisation in the final numbers have come were the total or the second o	The Central Voadt is one of the most deprived communities in NSW.  A 275 post harmonisation rate rise in Gosfordshire will be devastating.  Cubia part from individual hardwish, businesses already ravaged by Covid will be devastated by the double wharmony higher rates and reduced customer spending power.  Central Coast Council's economic modelling is as incompetent as everything else they do.  **The contract correspondence with council they advised that there where provisions for hardwigh be reverted to the coast cannot afford this given the impact of COVID related job loss.  **In ny recent correspondence with council they advised that there where provisions for hardwigh be reverted to the coast cannot afford this standard provisions have been considered.  **The proposed increase for our area will not be just 15% and 2% CPV provision and the contraction of the coast of the coas	of it is genutrely independent and objective?	The Administrator's 30 day report points to a noise in the trough culture when it states staff numbers increased This but staff costs over 40% since amalgements.  These fits of staff costs over 40% since amalgements.  These fits of staff costs have not been reclosed. The administrator claims he has reduced Executive numbers but that is smoke and mirror based on positions afreely vacant (and never needed) and positions reduced but that is smoke and mirror based on positions afreely vacant (and never needed) and positions reduced the control of the control
29 Anonymou	Anonymous Anonymous	There is a longer version of the same interview on ABC's website.  Ceretal Coast Coast Coast Charles have no publicly admitted the rest arise increases in Godordenire will be 42%, not either of the 10% or 15% stated using the public consultation.  Somewhat trizering (more clearly in the longer ofly), the Coast Coast Space persons appears to be balancing PART for the ministration of the history persons and the coast Coast Space persons and the coast Coast Space persons appears to be balancing PART for the ministration of the history persons and the coast Space persons and the coast Sp	It merely slugs the ralepayers (42% in Goolfordshire), cuts services across the board 15%, and sells assets. A child of the with a spread-therd cold have comes by with. There is no strategle hinting about the difference between core services, community priorities, and discretionary services. On discretionary services, to involve ideas about community or voluntary providers fasting over or working in patternative to reduce Control costs. And native to identify discretionary services that are not a priority and do not reset to be provided at all.  And nothing about culture change to improve elicitors, producities, or performance culture. The Council's solution is crude, blunt, and unfair on ratepayers.  Now will know. The previous Executive Leadership Team are nearly all still there. How can they possibly be trusted with 42% more of my money when they have so spectacularly mismanaged my money in the past?  See general comments  The consolitation with the community has been poor and frauditient. The surery did not give an option of checking no rate rise, and we where forced to elect a 10-15% rise to proceed.  The consolitation with the community has been poor and frauditient. The surery did not give an option of checking no rate rise, and we where forced to elect a 10-15% rise to proceed.  The consolitation with the community has been poor and frauditient. The surery did not give an option of checking no rate rise, and we where forced to elect a 10-15% rise to proceed.  The consolitation with the community has been poor and frauditient. The surery did not give an option of checking no rate rise, and we where forced to elect a 10-15% rise to proceed.  Cut expenditure and run the Council like most good businesses.	Somewhat bizarrely imore clearly in the longer slip). the Council spokesperson appears to be bizering PART for the misinformation by daliming PART and not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the final porcentage increase when communicating with indepues during the consultation.  This doesn't seem to make series given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation. In increase of 37 a week in (Vigorgahire. If they had been unable to include the impact of the included of the council and the	The Central Voadt is one of the most deprived communities in NSW.  A 42% post harmonisation rate rise in Gosfordshire will be devastating.  Outle spart from individual hardwish, businesses already ravaged by Oxid will be devastated by the double wharmony higher rates and reduced customer spending power.  Central Coast Council's economic modelling is as incompetent as everything else they do.  eee general comments.	If it is genutrely independent and objective?	The Administrator's 30 day report points to a nose in the Brough culture when it states staff numbers increased This but staff costs over 40% since amaginarists.  These filed staff staff costs over 40% since amaginarists.  These filed staff staff costs over 40% since amaginarists.  These filed staff staff increased and the staff
29 Anonymou	Anonymous Anonymous	There is a longer version of the same interview on ABC's website.  Gentla Cosact Council has now publishy admitted the rest arisk increase in Goldordshire will be 42%, not either of the 10% or 15% stated during the public consultation.  Somewhat bizarrely (more clearly in the longer of (s)), the Council spokespeson appears to be bizarrely private for the minimum private of the construction on the final processing in the consultation on the final processing private in the consultation on the final processing in the consultation on the final processing in the consultation on the final processing in the consultation on the consultation of the consultation on the consultation on the consultation on the consultation of th	It merely slags the ralepayers (42% in Gooffordshire), cuts services across the board 15%, and sells assets. A ordid of the with a spread-therd could have come as with it. Three in or strategle himing about the difference between core services, community priorities, and discretionary services. On discretionary services, to invocative ideas about community or voluntary providers stateging over or verbin in partnership to reflect occurations. An or a stempt to identify discretionary services and are not a priority and do not direct to be prioritied at all and a priority and do not direct to be prioritied at all and a priority and do not direct to be prioritied at all and a priority and do not direct to be prioritied at all and a priority and do not care to the priorities at all the priorities and an advantage of the council is solution is crude, blunt, and unfair on ratepayers.  Now will it work. The previous Executive Leadership Team are nearly all still there. How can they possibly be trusted with 42% more of my money when they have so specialcularly mismanaged my money in the past?  See general comments.  See general comments.  The consultation with the community has been poor and fraudident- the survey did not give an option of choosing for rate rise, and we where forced to elect a 10-10% rise to proceed.  The consultation with the community has been poor and fraudident- the survey did not give an option of choosing for rate rise, and we where forced to elect a 10-10% rise to proceed.  Cut expenditure and run the Council like most good businesses.  No matter what you say this goes back to the AUDITORS IN THE GOVT ABOVE SHELLEY HANCOCK AND EITHER GOVT OR COUNCL. NOT CHECKING AUDITORS IN THE GOVT ABOVE SHELLEY HANCOCK AND EITHER GOVT OR COUNCLE NOT CHECKING AUDITORS IN THE GOVT ABOVE SHELLEY HANCOCK AND EITHER GOVT OR COUNCLE NOT CHECKING AUDITORS IN THE GOVT ABOVE SHELLEY HANCOCK AND EITHER GOVT OR COUNCLE NOT CHECKING AUDITORS IN THE GOVT ABOVE SHELLEY HANCOCK and provide the survey of the provide that the pr	Same shall bizarrely imore clearly in the longer disp). the Council spokesperson appears to be bitarring PART for the misinformation by dalmining PART and not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the final procreatage increase when communicating with radiapyees during the consultation.  This doesn't seem to make series given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted the consultation. This doesn't seem to make series given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted the namonisation in the final procreatage in crease when communicating with include the impact of the colors at 3s a week in Wylonghier. If they had been unable to include harmonisation in the final numbers have can be were able to claim a 5s a week in Wylonghier. If they had been unable to include harmonisation in the final numbers have come were the total or the second o	The Central Voadt is one of the most deprived communities in NSW.  A 42% post harmonisation rate rise in Gosfordshire will be devastating.  Outle spart from individual hardwish, businesses already ravaged by Oxid will be devastated by the double wharmony higher rates and reduced customer spending power.  Central Coast Council's economic modelling is as incompetent as everything else they do.  eee general comments.	If it is genutrely independent and objective?	The Administrator's 30 day report points to a noise in the trough culture when it states staff numbers increased This but staff costs over 40% since amalgements.  These fits of staff costs over 40% since amalgements.  These fits of staff costs have not been reclosed. The administrator claims he has reduced Executive numbers but that is smoke and mirror based on positions afreely vacant (and never needed) and positions reduced but that is smoke and mirror based on positions afreely vacant (and never needed) and positions reduced the control of the control
29 Anonymou	Anonymous Anonymous	There is a longer version of the same interview on ABC's website.  Certain Coast Count has now publishy admitted the rest rate increase in Godordorine will be 42%, not either of the 10% or 15% stated during the public consultation.  Somewhat bizzerely (more clearly in the longer of cly), the Council spokesperson appears to be bizzerely given to the final processing in torsee when communicating with indipolyres during the consultation or to the final processing in torsee when communicating with indipolyres during the consultation or an increase of 37 a week in Condicident and decrease of 37 and the weekly increase when the Council to include the impact of humanication on the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation or an increase of 37 a week in Condicident and decrease of 37 and the weekly increase in Condicident and a 52 and 52 and 52 and 52 and 53 and 53 and 54 and 54 and 54 and 55 and	It merely slags the ralepayers (42% in Gooffordshire), cuts services across the board 15%, and sells assets. A ordid of the with a spread-therd could have come as with it. Three in or strategle himing about the difference between core services, community priorities, and discretionary services. On discretionary services, to invocative ideas about community or voluntary providers stateging over or verbin in partnership to reflect occurations. An or a stempt to identify discretionary services and are not a priority and do not direct to be prioritied at all and a priority and do not direct to be prioritied at all and a priority and do not direct to be prioritied at all and a priority and do not direct to be prioritied at all and a priority and do not care to the priorities at all the priorities and an advantage of the council is solution is crude, blunt, and unfair on ratepayers.  Now will it work. The previous Executive Leadership Team are nearly all still there. How can they possibly be trusted with 42% more of my money when they have so specialcularly mismanaged my money in the past?  See general comments.  See general comments.  The consultation with the community has been poor and fraudident- the survey did not give an option of choosing for rate rise, and we where forced to elect a 10-10% rise to proceed.  The consultation with the community has been poor and fraudident- the survey did not give an option of choosing for rate rise, and we where forced to elect a 10-10% rise to proceed.  Cut expenditure and run the Council like most good businesses.  No matter what you say this goes back to the AUDITORS IN THE GOVT ABOVE SHELLEY HANCOCK AND EITHER GOVT OR COUNCL. NOT CHECKING AUDITORS IN THE GOVT ABOVE SHELLEY HANCOCK AND EITHER GOVT OR COUNCLE NOT CHECKING AUDITORS IN THE GOVT ABOVE SHELLEY HANCOCK AND EITHER GOVT OR COUNCLE NOT CHECKING AUDITORS IN THE GOVT ABOVE SHELLEY HANCOCK AND EITHER GOVT OR COUNCLE NOT CHECKING AUDITORS IN THE GOVT ABOVE SHELLEY HANCOCK and provide the survey of the provide that the pr	Same shall bizarrely imore clearly in the longer disp). the Council spokesperson appears to be bitarring PART for the misinformation by dalmining PART and not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the final procreatage increase when communicating with radiapyees during the consultation.  This doesn't seem to make series given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted the consultation. This doesn't seem to make series given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted the namonisation in the final procreatage in crease when communicating with include the impact of the colors at 3s a week in Wylonghier. If they had been unable to include harmonisation in the final numbers have can be were able to claim a 5s a week in Wylonghier. If they had been unable to include harmonisation in the final numbers have come were the total or the second o	The Central Voadt is one of the most deprived communities in NSW.  A 42% post harmonisation rate rise in Gosfordshire will be devastating.  Outle spart from individual hardwish, businesses already ravaged by Oxid will be devastated by the double wharmony higher rates and reduced customer spending power.  Central Coast Council's economic modelling is as incompetent as everything else they do.  eee general comments.	If it is genutrely independent and objective?	The Administrator's 30 day report points to a nose in the Brough culture when it states staff numbers increased This but staff costs over 40% since amaginariation.  These filed staff staff costs over 40% since amaginariation.  These filed staff staff costs over 40% since amaginariation claims he has reduced Elecutive numbers but that is smoke and mirror based on positions afreadly vacant (and never needed) and positions red classified as no longer view results as a filed to the classified as no longer view results as a filed to the classified as no longer view results as a filed to the classified as no longer view red to the classified view red view red view red to the classified view red
29 Anonymou	Anonymous Anonymous	There is a longer version of the same interview on ABC's website.  Central Coard Counch has now publicly admitted the real nin reverse in Coedordative will be 42%, not either of the 10% of 15% sabled during the public commutation.  Comment to Exempt more calculy in the long city, the Council or public will be 42%, not either of the 10% of 15% sabled during the public commutation.  The Council sear in the same stranger with the public commutation by during the Council or include the impact of the 10% of 15% sabled during the counciliation — in increases of \$1.7 series in Coedordative and describes in Vijoropather. If they had been vasible to include the immensation in the first increases in Vijoropather. If they had been vasible to include the immensation in the first increases in Vijoropather. If they had been vasible to include the immensation in the first increases in Vijoropather. If they had been vasible to include the immensation in the first increases in Vijoropather. If they had been vasible to include the immensation in the first increases in Vijoropather. If they had been vasible to include the increases in Vijoropather in the ordinary of the version of the version of the version of the vijoropather in the vijoropathe	It merely slags the ralepayers (42% in Gooffordshire), cuts services across the board 15%, and sells assets. A ordid of the with a spread-therd could have come as with it. Three in or strategle himing about the difference between core services, community priorities, and discretionary services. On discretionary services, to invocative ideas about community or voluntary providers stateging over or verbin in partnership to reflect occurations. An or a stempt to identify discretionary services and are not a priority and do not direct to be prioritied at all and a priority and do not direct to be prioritied at all and a priority and do not direct to be prioritied at all and a priority and do not direct to be prioritied at all and a priority and do not care to the priorities at all the priorities and an advantage of the council is solution is crude, blunt, and unfair on ratepayers.  Now will it work. The previous Executive Leadership Team are nearly all still there. How can they possibly be trusted with 42% more of my money when they have so specialcularly mismanaged my money in the past?  See general comments.  See general comments.  The consultation with the community has been poor and fraudident- the survey did not give an option of choosing for rate rise, and we where forced to elect a 10-10% rise to proceed.  The consultation with the community has been poor and fraudident- the survey did not give an option of choosing for rate rise, and we where forced to elect a 10-10% rise to proceed.  Cut expenditure and run the Council like most good businesses.  No matter what you say this goes back to the AUDITORS IN THE GOVT ABOVE SHELLEY HANCOCK AND EITHER GOVT OR COUNCL. NOT CHECKING AUDITORS IN THE GOVT ABOVE SHELLEY HANCOCK AND EITHER GOVT OR COUNCLE NOT CHECKING AUDITORS IN THE GOVT ABOVE SHELLEY HANCOCK AND EITHER GOVT OR COUNCLE NOT CHECKING AUDITORS IN THE GOVT ABOVE SHELLEY HANCOCK AND EITHER GOVT OR COUNCLE NOT CHECKING AUDITORS IN THE GOVT ABOVE SHELLEY HANCOCK and provide the survey of the provide that the pr	Same shall bizarrely imore clearly in the longer disp). the Council spokesperson appears to be bitarring PART for the misinformation by dalmining PART and not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the final procreatage increase when communicating with radiapyees during the consultation.  This doesn't seem to make series given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted the consultation. This doesn't seem to make series given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted the namonisation in the final procreatage in crease when communicating with include the impact of the colors at 3s a week in Wylonghier. If they had been unable to include harmonisation in the final numbers have can be were able to claim a 5s a week in Wylonghier. If they had been unable to include harmonisation in the final numbers have come were the total or the second o	The Central Voadt is one of the most deprived communities in NSW.  A 42% post harmonisation rate rise in Gosfordshire will be devastating.  Outle spart from individual hardwish, businesses already ravaged by Oxid will be devastated by the double wharmony higher rates and reduced customer spending power.  Central Coast Council's economic modelling is as incompetent as everything else they do.  eee general comments.	If it is genutrely independent and objective?	The Administrator's 30 day report points to a nose in the Brough culture when it states staff numbers increased This but staff costs over 40% since amaginariation.  These filed staff staff costs over 40% since amaginariation.  These filed staff staff costs over 40% since amaginariation claims he has reduced Elecutive numbers but that is smoke and mirror based on positions afreadly vacant (and never needed) and positions red classified as no longer view results as a filed to the classified as no longer view results as a filed to the classified as no longer view results as a filed to the classified as no longer view red to the classified view red view red view red to the classified view red
29 Anonymou	Anonymous Anonymous	There is a longer version of the same interview on ABC's website.  Central Count Count has now publicly skettled the real nie increase in Condendative will be 42%, not either of the 10% of 10% stated during the public consultation.  Street, the count of the count o	It merely slags the ralepayers (42% in Gooffordshire), cuts services across the board 15%, and sells assets. A ordid of the with a spread-therd could have come as with it. Three in or strategle himing about the difference between core services, community priorities, and discretionary services. On discretionary services, to invocative ideas about community or voluntary providers stating over or verbing in partnership to reflect occurations. An or a stempt to identify discretionary services and are not a priority and do not direct to be prioritied at all and a priority and do not direct to be prioritied at all and a priority and do not direct to be prioritied at all and a priority and do not direct the priorities at all and ordinary providers stating over overhide sold and a priority and do not direct to be prioritied at all and and the priorities and and are considered to be fally than a renearly all still there. How can they possibly be trusted with 42% more of my money when they have so specialcularly mismantaged my money in the past?  See general comments  See general comments  The consultation with the community has been poor and fraudident- the survey did not give an option of choosing for rate rise, and we where forced to elect a 10-10% rise to proceed.  The consultation with the community has been poor and fraudident- the survey did not give an option of choosing for rate rise, and we where forced to elect a 10-10% rise to proceed.  Cut expenditure and run the Council like most good businesses.  No matter what you say this goes back to the AUDITORS IN THE GOVT ABOVE SHELLEY HANCOCK AND EITHER GOVT OR COUNCL. NOT CHECKING AUDITORS IN THE GOVT ABOVE SHELLEY HANCOCK AND EITHER GOVT OR COUNCL. NOT CHECKING AUDITORS IN THE GOVT ABOVE SHELLEY HANCOCK AND EITHER GOVT OR COUNCLE NOT CHECKING AUDITORS IN THE GOVT ABOVE SHELLEY HANCOCK and proved its incompletence in financial management. The merger should have reduced costs and	Same shall bizarrely imore clearly in the longer disp). the Council spokesperson appears to be bitarring PART for the misinformation by dalmining PART and not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the final procreatage increase when communicating with radiapyees during the consultation.  This doesn't seem to make series given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted the consultation. This doesn't seem to make series given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted the namonisation in the final procreatage in crease when communicating with include the impact of the colors at 3s a week in Wylonghier. If they had been unable to include harmonisation in the final numbers have can be were able to claim a 5s a week in Wylonghier. If they had been unable to include harmonisation in the final numbers have come were the total or the second o	The Central Voadt is one of the most deprived communities in NSW.  A 42% post harmonisation rate rise in Gosfordshire will be devastating.  Outle spart from individual hardwish, businesses already ravaged by Oxid will be devastated by the double wharmony higher rates and reduced customer spending power.  Central Coast Council's economic modelling is as incompetent as everything else they do.  eee general comments.	If it is genutrely independent and objective?	The Administrator's 30 day report points to a nose in the Brough culture when it states staff numbers increased This but staff costs over 40% since amaginariation.  These filed staff staff costs over 40% since amaginariation.  These filed staff staff costs over 40% since amaginariation claims he has reduced Elecutive numbers but that is smoke and mirror based on positions afreadly vacant (and never needed) and positions red classified as no longer view results as a filed to the classified as no longer view results as a filed to the classified as no longer view results as a filed to the classified as no longer view red to the classified view red view red view red to the classified view red

First Name Last Name	General comments reaarding council's proposed SV	Comments on Criterion 1:	Comments on Criterion 2:	Comments on Criterion 3:	Comments on Criterion 4:	Comments on Criterion 5:
	I hope this is the right place to comment on the rate increase proposed by CCC. If eal strongly that residents should not have to pay over and above our current rates, to pay for the poor financial management of the Council. Punish the many for the sins of a few, is a biblical response and					
36 Anonymous Anonymous	not one from a modern society. The only options provided were varying degrees of rate increase. So where are the other options and what else can be done?  I would agree to a rate increase ONLY. If it is nine with other councils and PART were considering a broad increase to rates across the state.  If am a Council employee and is support the rate rise. Essential services and jobs will be lost to the region if it does not eventuals.					
37 Priorymous Priorymous	pairi a Counce emproyee and it support are rate rate. Essential services and puss will be not to the region in troces not eventuate			I would pay more in rates if it meant that we would have better services, clean public toilets, public parklands that are maintained and mowed, council that is forward thinking and using gort funding		
	Central Coast Council have illegally used restricted funds and paid ridiculous and unnecessary monies to consultants. We now have a massive debt. Rate payers should not be held responsible, nor should we		Council have not been forthcoming in advising of the amount of the proposed rate rise. The figure keeps being changed by them. Now they are withholding	when made available for significant community improvements but the central coast council does not uphold its duty to rate payers and has neglected to look after our beautiful area in the way in which		
38 Anonymous Anonymous 39 Jasmine Thomas	have to accept a rate rise until Council can prove they can manage public money. We do not want any more of our money wasted by incompetent, illegal, irresponsible spending.  Saying no to ridiculous rates		necessary services as a bribe to make rate payers agree to a rate increase but we don't know how much the increase will be.	we have entrusted them to do.		
40 Kelly Stevenson	Please review extreme rate rise, unfair for rate payers. Mismanagement needs to be investigated not fixed by rate rise.	Please review extreme rate rise, unfair for rate payers. Mismanagement needs to be investigated not fixed by rate rise.	Y Transparent communication of total rate rise must be provided. Please investigate.	I am frightened the rate rise will be beyond what my husband and I can afford. I am concerned my children will leave central coast to find affordable alternative.		
41 Amanda Richardson	The increase is well over the 2%. It is not easy to find information on what this increase will cover, in what exactly will this 42% increase gain the local people.  This Central Coast Council has proven little if financially incompelent and the community must not be penalised for that incompetence. Many of our Central Coast residents are elderly and retired and are unable about the budgeous interesses in council rates being proposed by the Administration who has quite devolved, better the "easy or in submitting to PAPTA 15% increases. The entire community is	The evidence of need of such an increase is not clear.	The rate rise is massive and although communicated some what we have not as far as my mail box has seen been sent individual costs of the changes			Inadequate in scope and initiative demonstrating a lack of innovative thinking and a cowardice in the fails
	to assort the oursigeous increases in Council rates denig proposed by the Administrator who has quite dovicusly caken the leasy way out in suchraining to PART a 10% increase. The entire community so duraged that no accountability has been demonstrated by the Council , no pursuit of the inept Auditors and no assistance from the NSW Government that ORDERED the amalgamation that neither local community sought or supported.	Alternative revenue streams and asset divestment need further detailed investigation and community	The Council has been deceptive in its presentation of the alleged need for this rate increase and consultation - if it can be called that - has been dictatorial	The impact of the proposed increase is totally unreasonable not only in quantum sought but the underpinning logic as to why it it is needed. The sheer incompetence of the Council, senior		insacequate in scope and initiative demonstrating a tack or innovative trinking and a cowardice in the tall to address a key feature supported by the community. That key feature is an immediate approach to the State Government to provide the financial resources necessary to remedy the current situation which wa
42 David Dixon	Further, little or no review has been undertaken in respect to the actions of the previous Administrator charged with implementing the merger of the previous Wyong Shire and Gosford City Councils.  Hi.	consultation . Approaches to the NSW Government MUST be advanced .	insofar as not all propositions were allowed to be considered.	executives and external auditors is breathtaking in its magnitude.	No comment	brought about by that Government's compulsory amalgamation of the two former local councils.
	At the Central Coast Council meeting on February 23, 2021 the Administrator said with rates harmonisation and the proposed increase, the rates in the old Gosford Council area will go up 42%. This is a disgrace. We cannot afford it we have just come out of COVID and a flat economy before that.					
	Please BLOCK any rates rises above 2.2%			There is no basis for the ratepayers to have to pay for incompetence, mismanagment, corruption	We have been lied to. The Administrator said it was either a 10% or 15% increase.	
43 Anonymous Anonymous	Please The central coast council has sent a letter to ratepayers stating that they have unlawfully accessed and used restricted funds. I completely reject any rate increase as a result of unlawful spending until a	Limit CCC to 2.2% sell assets.	We have been lied to the actual increase is 42% after so called harmonisation.	and fraud.	It's actually 42% after rates harmonisation. That is deception.	Not seen
44 Michael O'Farrell	complete investigation has been held and the responsible people are held accountable.	I require sewerage, garbage, water and road repairs from council. Rates have been paid on my block for 7	5			
45 Gregory Phillips	I will be unable to pay the prosposed increase its well above my pay. I will be forced to sell and move.	years, i live 2 km from the heart of Gosford and have no kerb and guttering, no footpath, no provision for stormwater and one of the worst maintained roads in the entire area	The government appointed administrator has lied regarding how much my rates will rise with a flyer stating much less than actual cost. Inaccurate information was also included in flyer regarding contacting council	Rates have been skyrocketing every year since purchase of this property	Access to council is restricted	The administrator has not explained where the list money has been spent. Beaurocrats responsible still hold office amid a tesuffle of tgeir positions
40 Korl Houseman	We the trait payers did not create this finacial mess.  This state government are the overseer and have the power to disband or suspend a council for improper conduct. It's their ignorance along with CCC's incompetance that cussed this mess. Rate payers have had enough.					
40 Kaii Piouseiliali	Dear Sir, It is now painfully apparent that the highly paid yet under skilled council bureaucrats at central coast council, have done a disastrous job of managing the budget for the Central Coast council.					
	My first question is how can so many of these incompetent individuals, just walk away with a golden handshake with no consequence or retribution or financial forensic police investigation?  Secondly, why is up to the ratepayers, many on low income, to now bail out the abyamal actions of a few highly paid yet uesless individuals, now sitting at home after receiving a golden handshake,					
	None of this is the rate payers fault, no rate payer should be expected to pay more than the agree2% increase.  Mr Pearson has just been on the radio saying there will be a 43% increase in rates for the southern end of the coast, this in anyone's language is beyond outrageous!					
	I believe if approved making if the biggest rate increase in Australias history .  SO what can the ratepayers do, my suggestion simply not pay the increase EN MASSE.  Will the council or after every ratepayer and take us ALL to court?					
	Now that the community petition has reached the 20000 signatures required for a parliamentary enquiry I am hoping some accountability will now be brought onto those who got us here in the first place.  Raising the rate by more than the CPI will lead to hardship for many residents, a lot of whom are solely dependant on the pension as their only source of income.					
47 Richard Leeman	I would request that you NOT ALLOW any increase sought by the administrator, None of this was our fault and as such we are not liable to cover the costs of incompetency perpetrated by others.					
		Service levels have been unsatisfactory over the last 3 years and are currently worsening despite the massiv council overspend. Limited council resourcing options to provide even basic, adequate service levels are a				It has already been announced by the Administer, Dick Persson, that the rate increase of 15% is inevitated.
	As a Central Coast resident and rate payer for over 30 years I strongly object to the proposed rate variation until a thorough investigation of Central Coast Councils gross mismanagement of funds has been undertaken and the people responsible held accountable.	direct result of financial mismanagement. Increased community need/desire for service levels/projects is not true factor in this case.	a proposed SV. We have relied on the media and word of mouth to find out what's going on.  There has been no proper consultation with rate payers.	It is unreasonable to increase rates and to effectively expect ratepayers to fund unlawful overspend without consequences to those who should be held accountable.		and will be ongoing, also that a rate increase was a condition of the latest \$100 million dollar loan he has arranged.
49 Jody Stringer	THE MANAGE	The Council has unlawfully accessed funds for development. It is not clear that each ratepayer has benefited from this unlawful activity of the Council - or have in fact benefited at all. How is establishing the occurrence	of .			
		unlawful access of funds a basis for imposing a lawful liability on ratepayers to pay for the crime? It is not, the individuals who have authorised the unlawful use should pay - Council must have insurance.				
	The Council proposes a significant rate rise resulting from its mismanagement - the use of controlled moneys or moneys which have a particular trust impressed upon it, for general purposes. If this occurred a the result of recklessness or intent, then the people involved should be punished, not the people of the Local Government Area. If it is simple incometence, then punushment may not be appropriate, but the					
50 Stephen Coleman	local ratepayers haven't experienced a real increase in income, and should not have to pay for the Council's inadequacy and illegality. Anything more than an inflationary increase is completely inappropriate. If the Council needs to save money, it should employe fewer people and cease eyesore developments and stick to the basic services.	Council does not simply "find itself" in the current situation. It has actively mismanaged its finances and the ratepayers should not have to pay an extra 15% in rates.	the Community is aware of the alleged need for the rate rise, but is angry about it and has not responden positively to it.	The impact on ratepayers will not be reasonable having regard to current rate levels , the ratepayer base but particularly as it is intended to assist the council to address its unlawful activity.	No comment.	The Council has explained the cost cutting strategies and the potential loss of current services. It is clear dusfunctional and there should be an Administrator appointed.
	The amalgamation of Gosford City Council and Wyong Council currently known as Central Coast Council is a disbolical disaster. As rate payers we question the motivation of the NSW Government and what part of the blame and damage should they shoulder and accept. It was sold to the rate payers as the answer to all of our wees and has turned out to be the worst managed organisation I have ever experienced					
	Where are the auditors reports and if there are any, why do they not accept responsibility for the abysmal process that they would have under taken to allow such a massive debt not to be transparent or revealed. If there is an audit company involved where is their professional liability insurance which should be liable for the current financial position not us as rate payers or as Dick Perssons suggests we are					
	somehow shareholders. That is the most indicutous comment or out burst I have heard and I do not believe this administrator to be any better or competent than the failed CEO and 15 councillors supposedly responsible for this mess. CCC is over staffed and this has been a product of amalgamation. As rate payers of the former GCC we are faced with an expected 42% increase to satisfy rate harmonisation this is					
51 Gilbert Lehrer	oriminal.  The people of the Central Coast don't deserve to be punished for the wrongdoing of a corrupt council, there needs to be a better way to recoup their poor management then to make us one of the highest rate					
52 Anonymous Anonymous 53 Anonymous Anonymous	The people of the Central Coast don't deserve to be punished for the wrongdoing of a corrupt council, there needs to be a better way to recoup their poor management then to make us one of the highest rate payers in NSW.  It's outrageous!					
			As you know, one of IPART's criteria for assessing Special Rate Variations (SRVs) is "Council's need to show IPART there is community awareness of their plans."			
			Central Coast Council has now admitted live on ABC radio this was not the case as you can hear in this clip:			
			https://www.a			
			bc.net.au/radio/centralcoast/programs/breakfast/rate-rise-revelations/13171706			
			There is a longer version of the same interview on ABC's website.			
			As you can hear in that clip, Central Coast Council now publicly admits the real rate increase in Gosfordshire will be 42%, not either of the 10% or 15% stated during the public consultation.			
			Somewhat bizarrely (more clearly in the longer clip), the Council spokesperson appears to be blaming IPART for this misinformation by claiming IPART did			
			not allow the Council to include the impact of harmonisation on the final percentage increase when communicating with ratepayers during the consultation.  This doesn't seem to make sense given that they did include the impact of harmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation —an increase			
			I has doesn't seem to make sense given triat trey old include the impact or narmonisation on the weekly amounts quoted during the consultation — an increase of \$7 a week in Gosfordshire and decrease of \$3 a week in Wyongshire. If they had been unable to include harmonisation in the final numbers how come they were able to claim a \$3 a week reduction in Wyongshire?	y y		
			As it happens, they got the weekly amount wrong too – the weekly increase in Gosford will actually be \$8.13 and the weekly decrease in Wyong \$2.18 (as the	y		
		The proposed rate increase is to pay debt the council has accumulated unbeknownst to the rate payers. Not	now admit in the radio interview).			
		for service or projects or genuine community need.  The Council has accessed Restriced Funds unlawfullyfillegally and need to pay these back that is why they a requested this rate increase that is not actually just a 15% increase but a 42% increase. The people	It is crystal clear from this radio interview that the community was not made aware of Council's actual rate rise plans during the public consultation, and that re therefore a genuinely independent regulator could not objectively conclude they have met its first criterion.	The actual increase of 42% will have a disastrous effect on the Central Coast community. As many of the Central Coast residents are pensioners, self funded retirees and low income families this will be a devastating blow to the people who are still struggling to recover after a hellish 12months of		
	I believe that the proposed rate increase of 15% was falsely declared to rate payers. The actual increase would be 42% to Gosford Shire residents.		s. I am therefore asking you to please put our community out of its misery and immediately reject this application which has caused so much grief and is literally see learning us apart			We have had no cost containment in the past. This is why we are now in debt for the use of restricted
54 Danielle Copeland	An extremely exorbitant amount for individuals to have to pay for Central Coast Council's incompetence. We have no reason to believe that this rate increase will fix the problem with the council as no measures have been taken to ensure this will not happen again.	in services and community projects		The mental health of our residents is at stake! The pressure of a huge increase on household incomes will send many of us over the edge	The Administrator was appointed by the Stare Government and appears to be working in consideration of their interests not those of Central Coast residents.	funds. The only plan the administrator has in place is to pay the debt not to service the residents or hold those responsible accountable for their actions.
55 Lisa Rhook	l object to the rate rise, CCC have wasted rate payers money			The Central Coast Community is a medium to lower class wage earners, the rate rise will badly impact home owners especially young home owners with families	I haven't seen them	All I've heard is they have to keep borrowing money, they need to sacked
	ljust can't afford this rise in rates. Tim a self funded reliree struggling since before covid to meet paying all my bills. I come from a family that were the second settlers at been devastated by the inconnectancy of our local Council. We are a major tourist area and virtually have had very little funds in our area to support our growth on the Central Coast. Our roads are a disprace	No new Library until our debt has been wiped. Assessing of current staff to make sure they are doing their jol what they are paid to do. Reducing running costs e.g. staff vehicles only to be used for work, thorough	bs	All rates are the same for everyone throughout the coast. Not someone paying e.g. \$2000 more than	I don't have any confidence in Council now or the State Government, how the hell dict this get so out of hand and no one accountable for it and expecting the ratepayers to	We must have backing and funds provided by the State Government to enable the Central Coast to
56 Anonymous Anonymous 57 Anonymous Anonymous	and the priorities of where are money is going needs to be questioned specifically at this time e.g. new Library. It just upsets me too much thinking about the future of both the Central Coast and for me.  Have a fair go council!	background checks on staff and targets they need to maintain and reach and no payouts if found incompeten		other areas do on the Central Coast.	dive into our own pockets when we have some of the highest rates in NSW already.	
58 Anonymous Anonymous	Central coast rate payers are not responsible for the debt so why are we being held responsible to bail the council out. On the back of everything last year this is going to send some families and businesses on struggle street but that's ok because are streets will me maintained beautifullynot!		This has not been communicated well, letter sent to rate payers only gave two options of 10% or 15%. No option to oppose the rate rise. No information on other rises scheduled i.e the harmonisation. Poor consultation with the public and transparency non existent	No consideration given, been told we gave no other options.		
59 Kristin Bamford	Petition against the council submission for rate rise and request for inquiry into financial mismanagement by elected council officials.  The Administrator for the Central Coast Council has been shouting from the roof tops that a 15% increase in everyone's rates is needed to cover a debt that was somehow accumulated by mismanagement and	1				
	Inappropriate use of funds; he keeps telling us how much this will be to us on an average weekly basis and not actually disclosing how much the lotal figure will be and that this increase is not being proportioned equally. What he is not saying and I only just found this out (by myself) is that the rate increase is a to more than 15% in fact some figures going accuration on the internet are as much as 46% something to do with harmonization between different rates changed in the dot young Council area or the Geoford Council area. If the prior Wyong base rate was higher than the Geoford base rate in the year.					
	been because they were spending more money on developing areas or were not managing their monies correctly (who knows - this is not being disclosed to us). Why should the people from the old Gosford Council area now be forced to pay up to 46% more; there should be NO harmonization of rates; if the Council want to harmonize then simply don't apply the 2% standard increase in rates to the Wyong area					
	until both areas are equal or better still let's go back to the old way and have two separate councils. The majority of rate payers and residents did not want a merger to start with.					
	I would also like to say that the administrator has not provided the community with sufficient information as to how this situation came about, does not appear to have taken into consideration that a lot of people (myself included) cannot afford a rate increase and has not made the community fully aware of his plans.					
	The fact that the community has signed a petition to have a judicial enquiry must surely mean that there are a lot of people out there that want answers to questions that have not so far been answered.					
60 Anonymous Anonymous	Please do not approve this SV to the rates and tell the council NO harminization as a 46% increase in rates is just not affordable.  I am writing as a long time Patonga resident in support of our progress association submission regarding the matter of rate increases					
61 Christine Stead	A gradual payment of increased fees is definately the best way for people such as myself who no longer work and must manage our resources carefully.					
	Just reading we are about to be nobbed by The Central Coast Council, Old Gesterd Council residents' rates will rise by up by 42%. How can IPART allow this. All the time of the forced merger, at no time where we told we would have to harmonise (Subsidised eye, Wyong Council residents, their rates will fail.)  This is outrageous the Statis Covernment has not stepped in and stopped this. We are being penalised for gross mismanagement and the lack of corporate governance and accountability. Someone should be	Firstly half the number of council workers, wasn't that the lie from Government to reduce cost and more benefits to the community.		the impact on ex-Gosford Council residents is absurd, most of the streets in my suburb don't have		
62 Anonymous Anonymous	charged and jailed over this. Now we have fewer assets, fewer services, and more debt and worse of all, MORE council workers. How can you merge and end up with less, and more staff? Think about the sheer hardship this will bring on families, even at the 15% rate that we were feed to was over the top.	10-15% rise was communicated. Not upto 42%	The community may be aware of the mismanagement and fraud committed, how else can they run up sucj huge I, but the fact some residents rates will go down while others go up 42%	curb and guttering, to leave the raising of ex-money for the council to waste should be bared by all residents including the Wyong residents	The Council is a shambles they oversaw this mess, and don't mention the administrator	
	The fairest way to implement the "Harmonisation" of rates between Gosford and Wyong would be to reduce the Wyong rate to the Gosford level and then put up the rates to 10%/15% from that level. This bringing together of rates should have been done soon after the amalgamation of the two councils and not now, when they are looking to extra money. The rating of rates for Wyong (19%/15%) and Gosford the results of the reduced t					
62 Many 4-1	(42% approx.) is inequitable for a supposed joint council. Rate payers should not be forced to pay for the mistakes of the previous Council as those Council members were responsible for the every-day working of the Council and it's officers. To biame the former, supposed, incompetent C.E.O. shows that the Councilors were "asleep at the wheet" in allowing him to spend money incorrectly, leaving us in the					
63 Warwick Barwell	current predicament. I have no complaint with rectifying this problem with an equitable rate increase to every ratepayer.			A 42% increase is not reasonable.  Due to the pandemic the wages have either stagnated or have been reduced, however the cost of		
				living has increased. A further increase to Rates will put many residents in hardship and the Council's hardship policy does not have any new measures to specifically assist those hardest hit by		
	The Councils request for an increase is to the 'unlawful' use of restricted funds. The Administrator has made come that the community has benefited from the use of these funds, however there is a great deal that is not being investigated, nor is full transparency being given. We received a letter with an option of a 10% temporary increase or a permanent 15% increase however the numbers were not correct and it			the proposed increases. The Central Coast has more than 50,000 aged pensioners in receipt of a Centrelink benefit. Many of these are ratepayers who have high land values simply because they		
64 h/s	has now been confirmed that the rate increase will actually be 42%. This is unacceptable given how much we pay already and seeing no value in being returned. Parks and streets are not being maintained, road conditions are becoming dangerous with an increasing number of potables. With utilities increasing and wages stagnating or reduced due to the pandemic, a further increase of 42% will make it almost improved before the pandemic of the pandemic and the pandemi		The council has communicated need of a 15% increase, however the dollar terms for the average ratepayer is actually 42%. They have also recently confirmed that the percentage is actually higher, and the Administrator has admitted the took the view that it would be easier to say how much now weak the increase a unifor for the average ratepayer.	have lived for decades in areas which have now become desirable.  The increase will also impact renters as the landfords will have no choice but to pass on an increase in order to make and meet.	There is no council that were all appeared due to	The increase is nurely to now hard the Doublished funds used the
o-e juna Barry	impossible for some homeowners to afford. This will also have a flow on affect to Renters.  Since the ratepayers are the victims of mismanagement, lack of duty of care by the Auditor General's office, amalgamation and lack of overseeing by the Minister for the Central Coast the NSW government should take responsibility.		how much per week the increase would cost the average ratepayer.	in order to make ends meet.	The Clis no country, uney were all suspended due to mismanagement of funds.	The increase is purely to pay back the Restricted funds used, there will be no improvements.
	It's certainty not just to punish the victims instead of the perpetrators.					
65 Joan De Celis	The administrator has failed dismally in consultation with the ratepayers. I received none of his letters, or emails nor did I get a phone call, as recently claimed by him.					
	Following an amended survey mailed to residents where the majority chose the option of zero rate rise and no to 10-15%. The administrator obviously not happy with that result, has conducted a PHONE poll of					
	approx 400 residents out of the entire CCC area of approx 300,000, and come up with a press release that 42% agree with a rate rise. Following this, I have found 3 residents out of thousands in various groupe. It viewed had received a phone call. One was told she was too do to participate, another said no rise and was told services will be out, the other was tread every ruledly when answering no rate rise. What is the percentage of 400 out of 300,000. The only ratepayers agreeing to this rise would be those that can either claim it in tax, or pass it on to tourism herands.					
	We now see the administrator admitting, after being found out, the rise will be 40-45% with harmonisation. This entire exercise has been in contradiction to your "are people aware of what has been proposedis it affordable" "community awareness of their plans". We have stated what was asked, it is not affordable, and we have been given less than acceptable information to be aware of what is proposed. We have	rates to a business level.	19			
1 1 1	been given misleading figures and it would seem this phone poll is a downright uneftical attempt to fill your requirements. The council meeting last Monday, 23rd Feb. had a public forum, one speaker had an approved time of 3 mins, the subjects listed were rate increases and asset sales. The discussion we all wanted to hear,	These properties are investment property mainly and claim rates on tax, or pass on the costs to the rising interest in tourism accomodation.				
		It is not fair that these properties pay similar rates to residential normal size properties.				
	This person is the qualified lawyer who set up the successful petition, and is well known locally, the administrator prevented her from speaking saying you can talk to me after the meeting but not here.  "Community awareness of their plans" was silenced. The administrator is not acting at arms length from the minister for local government, he is not acting in our interest, but his employers. The political	Our areas are becoming inundated with larger McMansion style accommodation all resulting in valuations risin	9			
66 Evelyn Wicks	This person is the qualified slavey who set up the successful petition, and is well known locally, the administrator prevented her from speaking supring story can talk to me after the meeting but not here. Community asswerances of heir plans* was selenced. The administrator is not administ an story and imprinted for local operations. He produces the produces are subject to the produces of the produces are subject to t	Our areas are becoming inundated with larger McMansion style accomodation all resulting in valuations risin to extreme levels, this in turn will increase our rates, this is beyond smaller home owners control, and needs be considered in any approval for this increase.	to As explained in my feedback	My comment in criterion 1		
66 Evelyn Wicks	"Community awareness of their plans" was silenced. The administrator is not acting at arms length from the minister for local government, he is not acting in our interest, but his employers. The political conflict of interest is playing a role here. The number of signatures for the petition has now reached the required level for tabling in parliament. The sale of assets and increase in rates has now been requested	Our areas are becoming inundated with larger McMansion style accommodation all resulting in valuations risin to extreme levels, this in turn will increase our rates, this is beyond smaller home owners control, and needs	to As explained in my feedback	My comment in criterion 1		
66 Evelyn Wicks	Community awareness of their plans" was silenced. The administrator is not acting at arms inergib from the minister for local government, be in ording in our interest, but is employers. The political condition of interest plans are interest, but is employers. The political condition of interest plans are interested in the plans and interested in the plans and interested in the plans and interested in the plans are interested in the plans are interested. This that become an absolute increasity now as it seems a statement between the radiopsysterication and a questionable administration has now been requested in the plans are interested. The plans are interested in the plant are interested in the plans are interested in the plant are in the plant are interested in the plant are	Our areas are becoming inundated with larger McMansion style accommodation all resulting in valuations risin to extreme levels, this in turn will increase our rates, this is beyond smaller home owners control, and needs be considered in any approval for this increase.  I do not support the special variation and rate increase proposed for the central coast, neither do I believe we should have to pay the harmonisation between the 2 councils.	to As explained in my feedback	The impact on the rate payers is not reasonable an added debt of 42% is not reasonable for		
66 Evelyn Wicks 67 Anonymous Anonymous	Community awareness of their plans' was silenced. The administrator is not acting at arms inergib from the minister for local government, be in ordaring in our interest, but is employers. The political condition of the product of indexes the plant garden error in the market of parameters for the petition has now scared the required level to builty in gradient. The sale of assets and of increase in rate has now been requested to be put added until an englety in completed. This tab become an distribute excessify now as it seems a statement between the rategorier/residents and a questionable administration has now been requested for our daugorier than a personal variation and male increase proposed for the central coast, neither do I believe we should have to pay the harmonisation between the 2 councils. Taken and the product of the prod	Our areas are becoming inundated with larger McMansion style accommodation all resulting in valuations risin to extreme levels, this in turn will increase our rates, this is beyond smaller home owners control, and needs be considered in any approval for this increase.  I do not support the special variation and rate increase proposed for the central coast, neither do I believe we should have to pay the harmonisation between the 2 councils.	to As explained in my feedback  As explained in my feedback			
67 Anonymous Anonymous	Community awareness of their plans" was silenced. The administrator is not acting at arms inergib from the minister for local government, be in ording in our interest, but is employers. The political condition of interest plans are interest, but is employers. The political condition of interest plans are interested in the plans and interested in the plans and interested in the plans and interested in the plans are interested in the plans are interested. This that become an absolute increasity now as it seems a statement between the radiopsysterication and a questionable administration has now been requested in the plans are interested. The plans are interested in the plant are interested in the plans are interested in the plant are in the plant are interested in the plant are	Our areas are becoming inundated with larger McMansion style accommodation all resulting in valuations risin to extreme levels, this in turn will increase our rates, this is beyond smaller home owners control, and needs be considered in any approval for this increase.  I do not support the special variation and rate increase proposed for the central coast, neither do I believe we should have to pay the harmonisation between the 2 councils.	to As explained in my feedback	The impact on the rate payers is not reasonable an added debt of 42% is not reasonable for someone dises mistakes and the amalgamation was supposed to make rates cheaper. Its a		

	First Name Leat Name	Separal comments regarding council's progosed SV	Comments on Criterion 1:	Comments on Criterion 2:	Comments on Criterion 3:	Comments on Criterion 4:	Comments on Criterion 5:
	69 Sharon Robertson	such incompetence. I am against such a hefty increase.	Comments on Criterion 1:	Comments on Orderion 2:	Comments on Criterion 3:	Comments on Critation 4:	Comments on Criterion S:
The state of the s	Frank German	I think the increases are unfair and poorly thought out. The amalgamation started the problem, so I think the State government should accept some of the blame. Furthermore there were 3 Government audits which didn't pick anything up.	Council has not been honest with the rate payers regarding the size of the increase.	No real communication. The administrator has not been open with the ratepayers.	Central Coast has the highest level of pensioners in NSW. A big increase as proposed would put them in a dire situation, and could cause mental health issues.	It was only decided on by the administrator,	I don't think this has been honestly done. The figures given to the rate payers have all been smok mirrors, and very hard to understand.
Part		Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback regarding Central Coast Council's proposed SV.  Our raises are increased on a yearly basis. PART has set the increase of 25 for 2021-25 pet if the county fact, our raises will be higher than 2%. This is because we have recently received our land valuation and, as raises are based on this valuation and the value of our land has considerably increased our raises will reflect that increased rise.	3	- sp an constraint conspany and		and the second s	,
		Central Coast Council has asked for an additional 13% SV in addition to the 2% making our rates 15% higher than this time last year - with the addition of costs due to our recent land valuation. I'm not sure how	w				
Part		My husband and I are on an aged pension. The cost of living has increased. Our health care premiums have increased. It seems that most things have increased. Except for one thing - Our pension has decreased. This is due in part because we have been very firthly with the money we receive and attenue.					
Part		We live in a rural area of the Central Coast. We have no curbs and guttering. My husband maintains the verge and roadside areas of our property. Our roads are narrow and full of pot holes. We have no refliculated water, yet we pay water rates. We do not receive the same garbage services of our town neighbours. It is assumed that we will manage any green waste that we might have. This is neither equitable	le le				
Market   M		We are involved in our community. Part of this commitment is the maintenance of community property such as the local fire brigade and other community sites. Central Coast Council does not carry out any					
Series of the se		home and yard. Will the extra costs to Central Coast Council residents put a dampner on the number of people volunteering to maintain community resources?					
		I do not believe that Central Coast Council has shown that its application for this SV will have a reasonable impact on rate payers I appeal to you, not only for myself and my husband, but for all pensioners who are "doing it tough" to reject Central Coast Council's request for a 15% SV increase to our rates.					
	1 Anonymous Anonymous	Thank you.					
		Where are the guarantees we wont just end up in this situation again in a few years?					
		How do we get out of almost corrupt setup with over 20% of cost being overheads? Sounds like to me the gravy train just ran out of money					
Part							
The Content of the		If our roads were pristine and service was great it might make sense, but this place is a mess				The council can send in the all the documents under the sun, with all the special	
Manual			Council needs to cut costs and show this clearly and that they can work with the current money correctly				They need to clean house, start a fresh and show some history of good money management bef
	72 Benjamin Stewart		They should have cut costs long ago, and since they didn't I have no faith more money will help this situation	Community is well aware and by current survey results over 70% of people think a rate rise is not what this Council needs	How is a 40% rate rise reasonable. And it is 40% for Gosford residents when everything is evened	No one believes it, how all of sudden do they now know how to manage money?	Productivity! I wrote to them 3 years ago with a street petition signed by 20 families in the street
	3 Anonymous Anonymous	The corcept what raispayers need to cover this councils mismanagement is natiousous. Currently my street has so many portiones its like a waterpark for ducks when it hairs.  The people who mismanaged this budget should be held accountable. Not the hapless residents suffering substandard council services and amenities.	Council need to stop funding unneeded projects and start providing basic services.	We understand that this council and the staff mismanaged our money. A 40% rate rise is extortion given their incompetence.  The need & extent has been communicated but the circumstances that have bought us to this have not been fully disclosed. The problem is more than use	been an expensive fail!	Routine response fast tracked via government appointed administrator. Quote: * Tve	action on road flooding and disrepair and they never once replied or acknowledged our submis after multiple emails. Their productivity was and continues to be woeful. Worse after the merge Standard template response. Sell assets, reduce services, retrench staff, increase rates?
Part	4 Anonymous Anonymous	Lack of transparency. No confidence in current administrator. Lacks conviction & just focused on massive rate increase & harmonisation to salvage loses. Issue demands full judicial inquiry.  Ilam writing to you as a central coast property owner in repards to your draft for rate rise. I totally disagree to increase the rates by any meaning as the current council crisis of budget shortage is 100 %	Insufficient disclosure & transparency to support this criterion.				WHAT OTHER OPTIONS DO WE HAVE?? Sell Gosford to offshore interests??
	5 Anonymous Anonymous	administration fault and unprofessional management from Central Coast City Council, so I am expecting to keep the services quality as is and no increase in the rates meanwhile local government should pay	1				
State   Stat	Anonymous Anonymous	Disputing the Council Land & Water Rate increases					no information on this criteria is included in the Council's submission. This is an attempt to have
		of all middle management and senior executive staff. This is malfeasance, and the executives should be brought to court, and stopped from working in any other council ever again. This submission by CCC is	There is no need for a rate rise. The Council needs to learn how to live within its means, the council doesn't	There is no need for a rate rise. The Council needs to learn how to live within its means. Reduce head office headcount and reduce some non-critical	based on the rates revenue they receive. This is an attempt by council to coverup their errors and		pay for their malfeasance and not operating within local government laws/rules and knowingly to away with it. There has not been any commentary on regret for the errors, rather that the council and lich. There has not been any commentary to regret for the errors, rather that the council and lich. There has not been any packable in the properties of the properties of the council and lich. There has not been any packable in the properties of the properties
	7 Anonymous Anonymous	adoct covering up the interleasance, and is not received. The counter received interval in the received interval in the received interval in the received interval in the received interval interval in the received interval interv	is no evidence that clearly articulates why this different revenue path is necessary.	executives with only 2 executives, the council is too top heavy, this will save significant costs.	related to funding.	no comments	implemented successfully, that I can determine.
					should not be made to bail out council or the state government due to their financial mismanagement.		Ratepayers are not responsible for the financial situation Central Coast council finds itself in. The
Second   S			Ratepayers are not responsible for the financial situation Central Coast council finds itself in. They should not	The administrator has not been truthful about the rate of the increase in communications with ratepayers. They claimed it would be 15% when in fact it will	Many ratepayers will be forced to sell and driven into the rental market when there is very limited I be stock. This is likely to result in families being made homeless. No person should be made homeless	itself in. They should not be made to bail out council or the state government due to	not be made to bail out council or the state government due to their financial mismanagement. The proposed rate rise is not intended to contain costs but increase the revenue of council. Their
	78 Steve Norris	postepayers are not responsible for the financial situation Central Coast council finds itself in. They should not be made to bail out council or the state government due to their financial mismanagement.  Please make CCC accountable for their exemblant, with nothing to show for it \$565+ million expenditure! We the mum and dad homeowners should not be penalised with the proposed rate rise. Nothing short	be made to bail out council or the state government due to their financial mismanagement.	45%.	due when they are not responsible for the situation council finds itself in.		do this is as a result of their financial mismanagement not collecting insufficient rates from ratep
Manual Content	ROJUIS Clarke	of ludicouss! Please look into the survey that was purported to have been recently attended by CCC regarding the proposed rate rise to cover the cost of CCC \$565million expenditure bungle. We the mum and dad					
Part	31 Anonymous Anonymous	I am in pelition of Council rate rise					
Mathematical   Math		How am going to pay for an increase as my wages only went up by .35% CPI last year due to new government blaming covid. How can anyone afford a increase atm, increasing this will take money out of the	child \$2 and that \$2 is for lunch, instead they go and buy a cd and then blame you and want you to give them	administrator. Umm where is staying and who is paying for that? What was the average cpi increase of the area for wages? I dont think it would be more		my rates, my part is done, I then rely on them and nsw government to do theirs ie build roads etc. In this case the funds were mismanaged grossly, this is an issue for icac or	review and alot more cost savings. At this stage looks like nothing has changed at council still po
Series of the se	82 Jamie Dabbs	community that is desperate to get back to normal way of life.	more money. Come on really.  The CEO should be claiming on his Directors and Officers insurance for their incompetence.	1% due to covid.	any increase on any thing is unfair and cruel to society.  There are many senior citizens on the coast who cannot afford a rate rise. The Central Coast rates	nsw government to deal with and to pay for. Not the rate payer.	decisions been made and worse they want the rate payer to pay for their mistakes. Is not fair.
Service of the servic	84 Anonymous Anonymous	This should not be happening. An enquiry needs to happen so the reasons for mismanaged funds can be investigated and it doesn't happen again.	I preter the sale of some assetts over an unknown rate rise.  No rate increase	I he tull extent of the proposed rate rise has not been made clear to the public.  Rate payers have a right to know where the money went	are arready high in comparison to other similar regions.  No they are not reasonable we are paying way too much for no return.	Mave not seen it No	Haven't seen it No
Part	86 Richard Bartolo	Todget to Council raising rates above the 2% rate peg. Why should we have to pay for Councillors disastrous handling of funds they already received.			My council rates are currently \$382.90 per nusater		
Part					My water rates are on average \$200.00 per quarter Total \$582.90 per quarter		
Part					My aged pension income is \$1888.00 per quarter.		
Part		Central Coast Council applied to IPART requesting a 15% increase, when over 70% of residents selected no increase in the Council's survey.			insurances, house insurance, my income is immediately reduced to \$1305.10 because of my payments to Central Coast Council. It leaves me \$326.00 a week to pay all my other expenses and		
Marie Barrie Bar		Central Coast Council should be held accountable for the mismanagement of the monies they collected from the ratepayers. They cannot simply walkaway without being held responsible for what they have					
series of the second process of the second p		IPART should strike down any increase in rates to any ratepayer, beyond the 2.2% rate. We are NOT ATM's to be drawn on to cover Central Coast Councils outstanding bills.	I would like to know how council expects the ratepayers to accept the CCC outlandish expenditures (electric		given this mess was caused by councils incompetence NOT mine.	Getting Central Coast Council to approve its own application is a conflict of interest	V
No.	67 Anonymous Anonymous		It should be determined where the funds were spend.	We don't need a rate rise, we need a criminal investigation into Central Coast Councils mismanagement.		ISTITIT	res. I want to know where the \$500,000,000 went:
Series of the se	88 Linda Wills	The SV includes opplied for by the CO County is well advice what is reasonable, believe this includes will cause minimal readouting for many rate payers. The rate includes is due to extend minimal minimal manufacture of the council which should not be recouped from rate payers.	accommodation at Magenta Shores for the current management team.	I have been advised by the Council of the proposed rate increase which is unsustainable for many rate payers.	only to replace funds which were taken by management for unknown expenses.	Exhibited where? Eve neither seen nor been told about any such exhibit to be able to	
A						comment. We never get any local newspapers etc delivered. The only communication	
The state of the s				As above they have negligently and grossly misrepresented the true rise. I cannot find anything online on their website where I can find what my own pers	conal	refused to complete it because it was unfair given no choice but 10 or 15% in a	They've gone the complete OPPOSITE direction "in past years" no way at all they can claim any
Part	89 Anonymous Anonymous	Council has grossly misrepresented the true SV increase, claiming 15% but when figures were checked and proven for many people to be up to 42% they acknowledged the discrepancy. The request needs to be rejected outright and the arms of the provention of the proven	They have fraudulently mismanaged what we already paid and now want huge amounts more paid to ball ther out.			THREATENING fashion basically 'if you don't choose the higher one we will cut services'	things!! They've employed heaps more middle management unnecessarily and wasted huge sums money on unneeded things
Part		Here is my submission to EART.  I holium Control Count Council from bone dollhorothy deposition in what they are follows the residents and IDAST. I holium it hondows as found.					
Section   Continue of Contin							
Part							
Property							
Part		This is deliberate misinformation and only when challenged they admit it and confess to this misinformation.					
Proposition for the Company of the							
Section   Sect		already 328% higher than the CPI.					
Residence of the control of the cont		There is no justification for IPART to approve any increase in Central Coast Council rates until a full analysis of what when wrong, who approved what and potential forensic audit and criminal investigations are completed.					
Part	Anonymous Anonymous	You can make a submission here https://www.ipart.nsw.gov.aul/HomelIndustries/Local-Government/Council-Portal/Submission-Form					
Part							
Part							
Property of the property of							
See							
set of the control of							
See		PART should strike down any increase in rates to any ratepayer, beyond the 2.2% rate, which mind you is much higher than the CPI. The CPI in June 2020 in NSW was minus 1%. For the 12 months ended December 2020 the CPI was 0.0%. Take a fit the increase of 10.9% in telepage the cold CPI increase of 10.9% in the CPI in June 2020 in NSW was minus 1%. For the 12 months ended December 2020 the CPI in June 2020 in NSW was minus 1%.					
IN THE PASE OF THE							
In the content of t		There is no justification for IPART to approve any increase in Central Coast Council rates until a full analysis of what when wrong, who approved what and potential forensic audit and criminal investigations are completed.	ė				
In the content of t	91 Mark Bodak						
In the last first private flate dash from your default and the course of the private part of of the private		fired but only stood down and expect to be reinstated and will continue their appalling mismanagement of funds. The administrator prepared and distributed an unfair survey that did not provide an option to					
Service of the foliation of the control position of th		results from the first survey were still tallied with the overall result! A phone survey/interview about the rate rise was supposedly done. I do not know one single person who received that phone call. Supposedly	у				
S TO SET	92 Anonymous Anonymov∾	honest and true reflection of the enormous financial burden ratepayers will be faced with in a community that already is a low income area. I simply can not afford to pay a massive rate rise and have no idea					
Series Se	zaorymous	It is not acceptable to increase spending and then stug the rare payers an additional hike above the acceptable norm.  Central Coast council need to be accountable fir their spending.					
Respond to the proposition of the control tended proposition of the contro	93 Barry Cole 94 William Fortier	There needs to be an enquiry.	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Register of the Cental Coard through the Security of Length Security o			There should not be an increase to rates.				
The standard of the Central Countal measure (page and if in challenge of the Central Countal measure (page and if in challenge of the Central Countal measure (page and if in challenge of the Central Countal measure (page and if in challenge of the Central Countal measure (page and if in challenge of the Central Countal measure (page and if in challenge of the Central Countal measure (page and if in challenge of the Central Countal measure (page and if in challenge of the Central measure (page and if in challenge of the Central measure (page and if in challenge of the Central measure (page and if in the page and if in challenge of the Central measure (page and if in the page and if in challenge of the Central measure (page and if in the page and if in challenge of the Central measure (page and if in the page and if in challenge of the Central measure (page and if in the page and if in challenge of the Central measure (page and if in the page and if in the page and if in the page and if in challenge of the Central measure (page and if in the page and if in the pa			The Council should find other ways to fund the ongoing upkeep of the area as it was their oversight and mismananement of funds that has caused the dabt				The document could not explain in all honesty the productivity improvements and cost containme strategies as they first need to pay an enormous debt they have created before they can move for the maintenance of the CCC area.
Residency files Central Coard Language						]	the maintenance of the CCC area.  I for one am furious regarding the enormous Debt this team of, one would expect very intelligent,
The respect of the Cortact Concel should not to be inside the Desirable Concel Concel doubt not to be invested to the Cortact Concel control to the Linguistic State Concel St			unnecessary suburb signage to name a few.		increase, I don't they would be lucky to get 2% if any. Also the age pensioners could apply for a 10-	where entrusted to them to run CCC, and only to create a very large debt. Should it	experienced leaders of a company, (Council) have managed to accumulate during their time in ch
Section Description of the Page of Engineery in An Principle Countrel late of the Page of Engineery in Agriculty (Engineery	95 Anonymous Anonymous	bad management and overspending.	We need lake care, roads repaired, kerb and guttering.		14% increase in pension, oh that's right they didn't get an increase this year at all, so that would be	not be the residents who vote and approve The documents prior to applying for	
Finally they did a survey which only allowed you to select 10% or 15% rate increase. This was later fased after Community Outrage.  Second they go to PART requesting a 15% increase, when over 70% of residents selected no increase in the Council's survey.  This is deliberate mininformation and only when challenged they admit that rate papers in the old Gooder Local Area could be papering up to 42% after so called harmonisation.  This is deliberate mininformation and only when challenged they admit that area papers in the old Gooder Local Area could be papering up to 42% after so called harmonisation.  This is deliberate mininformation and only when challenged they admit that are papering that the council is also as to the complete and a section of the paper in the old control and the deliberate mininformation.  The Selfred Social is for the most goal made by of relivers and personance. You cannot increase the engages harms. Just implementing year Collection for PART to approve any increase in Community of the fact that the administrator secured loans being paid out from the goal of the complete when the goal of the complete when the goal of the complete when the goal of the complete in the collection of the paper when made up of relivers and personance. You cannot increase the engages harms. Just implementing year Collection (and the paper) and to the complete health for our local council to mining paper when made up of relivers and personance. You cannot increase the register when made up of relivers and personance. You cannot increase the register when made up of relivers and personance. You cannot increase the register when made up of relivers and personance. You cannot increase the register has been do the complete health for our local council to mining page of the page of	6 Anonymous Anonymous			We were told of a rate rise but were unaware of the extent of the rise told a 15% rise at maximum			Seems that the rate payers are being held accountable for the mismanagement of funds. Cost containment? Was there any???
Second Bey go to PART requesting a 15% increase, when own 70% of residents selected no increase in the Council's survey.  Then they admit that reteptyees in the dot Goeded Local Area could be paying up to 42% after so called harmonisation.  This is deliberate main/remain and only when challenged they admit it and corders to the in initromation.  The is deliberate main/remain and only when challenged they admit it and corders to the in initromation and only when challenged they admit it and corders to the in initromation.  The cord of the increase of 10.0% in inbiance, the read of th							
Then they admit that radepagers in the old Gosbrid Local Area could be paying up to 42% after so called harmonisation.  This is deliberate misinformation and only when challenged they admit it and confess to this misinformation.  PART should stilke doos any increase in rates to any ratepagers. Expend the 22% rise, which mind you is much higher than the CPI. The CPI in June 2000 in NSW was minus 1%. For the 12 months ended power of the 22% that PART seems to this in sight for Councils across NSW is already 328% higher than the CPI.  There is no justification for PART to approve any increase in Central Cosal is for the most part made up of refirees and pensiones. You cannot increase the omitted and criminal investigations are rates of the season of t							
This is deliberate misinformation and only when challenged they admit tand confess to this misinformation.  PART thould driftle down any increase in rates to any rategoage, beyond the 2.2% rate, which mind you is much higher than the CPL. The CP in June 2020 in NSW was minus 1%. For the 12 months ended Described Park Park Seeds to the Countries across NSW is a leave you will be a lea							
PART should strike down any increase in rates to any ratepayer, beyond the 2.2% rate, which mind you is much higher than the CPI. The CPI in June 2020 in NSW was minute 1%. For the 12 months ended Observed Part 10 months of the comment of the part 10 months of t							
December 2020 the CD Place Of Decemb		PRATT should strike down any increase in rates to any ratepayer, beyond the 2.2% rate, which mind you is much higher than the CPI. The CPI in June 2020 in NSW was minus 1%. For the 12 months ended					
There is no justification for PART to approve any increase in Central Coast Los the most part made up of retirees and passingenines. You cannot increase the additional favorable and potential fiverence audit and oriminal investigations are indeed. All implementing new COMPUTER processes cost millions (\$250 million) let alone payril data distinctions are indeed and potential fiverence and potential forence audit and oriminal investigations are indeed and potential fiverence audit and oriminal investigations are indeed and potential fiverence and potential fiverence audit and oriminal investigations are indeed and potential fiverence and potential		December 2020 the CPI was 0.9%. Take out the increase of 10.9% in tobacco, the real CPI increase for 12 months was 0.67%. So the 2.2% that IPART seems to think is right for Councils across NSW is					
The increases to rategopers where we are already one of first the large playing parein not asset on the increase instances on the increase instances the particular of the special variation is due to the complete hability for our local cancel of manage a budget. If they are provided additional funds without any checks and bilances put in place we are going to be in The same that the increase instances there were the provided additional funds without any checks and bilances put in place we are going to be in The same that they are provided additional funds without any checks and bilances put in place we are going to be in The same that they are provided additional funds without any checks and bilances put in place we are going to be in The same that they are provided additional funds without any checks and bilances put in place we are going to be in The same that they are provided additional funds without any checks and bilances put in place we are going to be in The same that they are provided additional funds without any checks and bilances put in place we are going to be in The same that they are provided additional funds without any checks and bilances put in place we are going to be in The same that they are provided additional funds without any checks and bilances put in place we are going to be consistent to communities without this increase sentence to community consistent to the communities without this increase sentence to community consistent to the communities without this increase sentence to community consistent to the communities without the increase into the communities with the communities without the increase into the communities without the communities without the increase into the communities without the increase into the communities without the		There is no justification for PART to approve any increase in Central Coast Council rates until a full analysis of what when wrong, who approved what and potential forensic audit and criminal investigations are		m II	The Central Coast is for the most part made up of retirees and pensioners. You cannot increase the		
The special variation is due to the complete hability for our local council to manage a budget. If they are provided additional funds without any checks and balances put in place we are going to be in The sense of	07 01-1-1-1	complexes.	арр.	INO OTHER STATE IN NSW IS BEING ASKED YO PAY A 15% INCREASE, LET ALONE OVER 50%!!	The increase to ratepayers when we are already one of if not the highest paying area in NSW is		All lies no doubt
place for years to come no matter how much extra funds they are oliven.	97 Christine Macfadyen						1
98 Anomerous Anomerous going to continue at a larger scale.	97 Christine Macfadyen	The special variation is due to the complete inshills for our local council to manage a husball. If they was avaided additional fixed without any absolute and in the complete inshills for our local council to manage a husball.			with much less.	has been no intention to communicate with public, as far as he is concerned it is a	
power, an an approximation in transport of the properties and proposed a properties and properties are in transport of the properties and properties are in transport of the properties are in the properties	97 Christine Macfadyen	place for years to come no matter how much extra funds they are given.	I fail to see how this is possible when we do not get out council maintained areas (ie walkways, community centres etc) mowed for months/years at a time. We have no response to water main breakages on a Friday	Council are still yet to <u>catable</u> to the community how they assed away \$500 million dollars. [certainly don't see any imminements in the community	with much less. Impact to rate payers is going to be catastrophic as most are bordering on being unable to pay current rates. No thought has been out to the community only to the fact that council has souandered	has been no intention to communicate with public, as far as he is concerned it is a done deal and the only way forward.  All he keeps saying is that we are stakeholders and we selected the people in-	There has been no strategies other than spend what they don't have How anyone can say't didn't

First Name Last Name	General comments reparding council's proposed SV absolutely disgraceful and greedy application for SV to IPART by CCC, due to their completely inept, and criminal mishandling of their financial budget over the last several years. It needs to be looked at by	Comments on Criterion 1:	Comments on Criterion 2:	Comments on Criterion 3:	Comments on Criterion 4:	Comments on Criterion 5:
99 Anonymous Anonymous	ICAC and people should go to jail. The proposed SV paolication will only harm rate payers.			+		
	rise proposes of septicient will only make the payers. The 15% proposed is a permanent increase - the council at this time hasn't been actively doing the job of maintaining the roads, paths, and parks. The previous council prior to amalgamation did this perfectly.					
	For the extra 15% - the ratepayers get absolutely nothing. The pensioners and other disadvantaged residents will be far worse off impacting the region in other ways					
	The elderly will also suffer - less cashflow will result in them having to forego medicines and basic essentials.					
	A temporary increase would be a reasonable option, of a lower value, more reasonable to the capabilities of the residents.	This is a fail - they haven't clearly identified to the ratepayers why a permanent rate increase is necessary. A			The council is under administration. It can hardly be considered exhibited, and	
	I strongly disagree with a permanent increase. I mostly disagree with a increase.	temporary one would in effect assist council's finances, but then, il's still unclear where all the funds went and whether the state government holds responsibility for some of that (which would impact on the increase.		The impact on ratepayers is not reasonable at all the total increase some of the community will	approved in an effective manner when that decision was with just one person.  We don't have a team of councillors debating the requirement for the increase, this	
	Please consider that the permanent increase proposed would only result in all ratepayers paying more for less for the long term. Council have failed to justify the permanent increase benefits to the satisfaction	because if the state government was mostly responsible - then they should be footing most of the bill, resulting	The need has only been based on the minimal details released by council, the average ratepayer is also debatable - I don't pay anywhere near the \$1100	face is in excess of 45% for some areas if the 15% was approved. Worst still, being a permanent	immediately puts us all at a disadvantage and almost held at the whim of the	The period is claimed to be permanent, how can they acceptably identify that when they themselves are
100 Anonymous Anonymous	of ratepayers.	in less revenue from ratepayers being required).	'average' noted, I'm at around twice that value.	increase request, it's unlikely those who are impacted will financially be able to survive.  I don't believe a 15%, indefinite rate rise can be called "reasonable", especially for the less well off i	administrator.	lucky to pay staff?
				our community, such as pensioners and low incomer earners. The community should not have to foot the bill for the negligent actions of a CEO, who is still positively spinning all the "wonderful"		On this criterion Central Coast Council fails miserably. Post amalgamation, more than 200 Fulltime Staff
	I would like to object to the proposed rate rise on the basis that there is a very real risk that Central Coast Council will continue to mismanage their finances, and no SV should be granted until complete and			things he did for Central Coast Council on his Linkedin profile.		were employed, when the expectation from the community was that Amalgamation would yield efficiencies and a reduction in head count. The financial mis-management needs to stop, and the answer to the
101 Anonymous Anonymous	total reform is applied across Central Coast Council.  I am against the proposed rate increase above the regulated rate peg.					councils problems is not more money.
	The Gosford Council amalgamation with Wyong was meant to bring economies of scale. Instead it's been a debacle. The people responsible for this should be held accountable, and the ratepayers should not					
	have to shoulder the burden for this.  Our rate hike will be far in excess of the proposed increase and the Council is being devious in not properly explaining this and also presenting a flawed survey to residents.					
	My household is already stretched to the maximum. I am a single dad raising a primary school age daughter. I haven't had a pay rise in years, things are continually costing more and more. Now because of mismanagement of funds within the council, I have been told that I have no choice but to pay for their mistakes out of my pocket, to make up for the incompetent employees who who get paid much more than	Dosent council already make enough from the rate payers? Stop the bluffing from council workers. Constantly				
103 Shaun Aggett	your average person does. I am a trade qualified motor mechanic. How is that fair?	I see 10 people standing around a work site doing nothing. I bet that costs us like \$500 per hour.  There is a strong push from the Central Coast and wider communities to stop this rate rise from going ahead.		The impact of the suggested rate rise will not be reasonable. I will not be able to afford this rate rise		
104 Brooke Graham	I disagree with the rate rise being implemented from Central Coast Council. It should not be the rate payers responsibility to pay extra money to cover up and fix the mistakes made by councillors. I will not be able to afford to pay the rate rise.	There are many other avenues that can be taken to repay some of the ridiculous debt cause by the councillors. This is not the rate pavers responsibility to fix	Council has not been honest in the amount the rates will rise. Central Coast and the wider community so not trust the council.	and myself and children will suffer because of it. Our current rates are high and many will not be able to pay am increased amount.	Documents have been released although details and excuses keep changing. The council have lost their integrity	It all details are being released and some keep changing.
	I would like our council investigated I have lost confidents in the current council we have been appointed an administrator who doesn't seen to be making the appropriate changes to the current council for the future His answer is to make the community pay for the wrong doings of the current council This Administrator is misleading the community please we need help as most members including myself wi	Our administrator is asking for a 15% rate rise but it actually is 46% rate rise council did a phone poll asking	Back in early January our administrator asked for a 15% rate rise but he has now come out and said that the rate rise will be more like 46% rate rise which	h	*	
105 Anonymous Anonymous	not be able to afford the 46% rate rise	council mismanaged	alot of people in our community will not be able to afford			
	Why was the debt not found sconer if financials were being audited? Why is there no transparency of how they got into so much debt and no transperancy for the plan to pay it back. If they get the rise this year will it be going back down again in the future? We had a significant rate rise about 7 years ago and they have still managed to spend all that and more. What's in place to ensure this doesn't happen again and			We have a lot of retirees here on the Coast. I own 2 properties here personally the rate rise will		
106 Anonymous Anonymous	that proper managers are put in place. I understand the debt needs to be regaind and that leaves limited options except a rate increase however why should we all suffler for incompletencies. We are paying more rates than people in Systrey with land values worth at least 2 cybus than here. It just doesn't make seems that this could be left happen I am not sure if this is where I should give a comment about the Central Coast Councilor literation for raise our rates to pay for the mistakes of the council but here goes. My wife and I are self funded refrees who	The service levels haven't been up to scratch for some time	Understood. Just knowing doesn't make it right	affect me but it's affordable. I don't think it will be for a lot of others. It's not at all in line with pay increases for people or pension increases etc	Noted	That would be a good thing. If there is no plan to change then nothing will change except they will have more money to waste. Will the TOTAL increase go direct to paying off the debt?
	I am not sure if this is where I should give a comment about the Central Coast Councils intention to raise our rates to pay for the mistakes of the council but here goes. My wife and I are self funded retirees who worked hard all our lives saving our money for this time of retirement. We ensured we lived within our means and budgeted to be where we are now. It appears that council did not do this over many years and					
	we are now having to pay for It. We don't use any community facilities but are happy for our rates to support our community but not happy for them to support the mistakes of people who are paid a lot of money to manage our rates. We are not confident that our rates will be managed correctly into the future if there has not been a proper inquiry into this current mismanagement. Once this is carried out and people are					
	made accountable for their mistakes, if it is found that did make any, then rate payers of the central coast might be willing to accept a small rate increase, but at this moment we have received no					
	correspondence explaining how council got into this situation and how in the future it intends to avoid it. Finally to expect the public of the central coast, who are on a very light budget particularly during these very stressful times to ball out an organisation that in private business would probably be in the counts that the international probability or process and very not afford a rate for the central probability or process and very not afford a rate for the central probability or process and very not afford a rate for the central probability or process and very not afford a rate for the central probability or process and very not afford a rate for the central probability or process and very not afford a rate for the central probability or process and very not afford a rate for the proposition of the rates for this case and the probability or process and very not afford a rate for the proposition of the rates for this case and the probability of the probability or process and very not afford a rate for this case and the probability of t					
TL	due to this mismanagement is not fair or proper and we can not afford a rate increase of 15% and as I read after the harmonisation of the rates for this area could be up to 42% in my area an outrageous increase when we have no confidence in the organisations ability to manage the money.					
107 Anonymous Anonymous						
	This application by the Central Coast Council is problematic. There are many unanswered questions on the massive losses incurred by The Central Coast Council which have been left unanswered and may well be glossed over if a rate increase of 15% is granted.					
	Points I wish to raise:					
	# How reviews by three loss of consultants, including Price Waterhouse can yield a low risk financial outcome and yet we have a major financial crisis that requires a 15% rate increase to fix # Has enough work been done to review exceedibure in terms of looking at existing projects and slowing them down to spread the cost over longer terms. The administrator has not driven any detail on whether					
	this has been considered and has refused to answer any questions on this other than broad motherhood statements.					
	# Why was correspondence and questions posed by the formed CEO ignored and not answered but statements made by the administrator to the effect he stands by his report not investigated thoroughly. # Why was the outcome of a survey from the Council on ratepayers and citizens input survey on whether they agree with the path being taken simply ignored and the administrator went ahead with the					
	application of the 15% before the closing date of the citizens survey even completed.  If the simple solution for that Instructions provided in 15% variation places considerable burden on ratepayers smacks of simplistic solutions without providing sufficient evidence of a proper transparent forensic					
	investigation of all of the facts and potential solutions to the problem.  # Before any rate increases should be agreed to the citizens should be given a proper opportunity to have a say on in cutting programs and services that could reduce costs. This has not been done nor					
	contemplated. # A public enquiry has been asked for into the losses as many questions need answers and this course should be followed before any rate increases be granted.					
	in A public enquiry has been asked for mione lisses as many quesions need answers and his course should be blocked been any rate increases being many the properties of the pr					
108 Ray Alkinson	solutions which may require and increase in rates to tight on the court of the administrator to export or regards. It is count or the administrator to go do account of the administrator to account o					
109 Carolyn Ormsby	I believe it's unreasonable to change a higher percentage rate rise to rural properties i, order to ball out the poor management of Central Coast Council.	Balance the pain across multiple income streams. Introduce parking meters at holiday venues. To share the increase across residents and non residents.	I have only been notified through other on social media. I have not yet been notified by council that my rates will increase. This is another fail.	This is not a reasonable adjustment to rates. Anything over 5% YoY is unreasonable.	No comment	No comment
110 Anonymous Anonymous	Totally unreasonable to impose a 45% increase on anybody	I have no desire to support a 45% increase in rates. Apart from it being totally unfair it is absolutely unaffordable and undesirable	I am not aware that creating an awareness of a 45% increase in my rates will make it aMy fairer or affordable. Where am I supposed to get the money to pay for this? Totally inequitable	It is in no way a reasonable increase, 45% insane and totally unfair		
	It is appalling that we are expected as rate payers to pay for the incompetence of the council in getting this council into such dire straights.  We pay rates but have no curb and gutter, no town water, no sewerage. And are still stugged like everyone else for the privilege of having to provide and maintain our own.			How is a pensioner expected to sudden deal with a 42% rate rise when they are living below the poverty line already. Be realistic. This is not reasonable. We already have to deal with maintenance		
111 Anonymous Anonymous	Be smart about getting the money back. Charge tourists for parking. Hit the state for a bail out. Etc.  I find it completely disgraceful that in order to fix the mishandling & gross mismanagement of funds by the CCC. I am now being asked to pay a 10-15% rise (not to mention the harmonisation bringing it to a		The administrator Dick Persson initially proposed either a 10 or 15 % as the only option threatening to take away services (that barely exists as it is or of very	for our own sewerage and water as we don't have that in our area.		
	whopping 42% increase) without any explanation on why this happened and no guarantee this will not happen again. If the CEO & CFO were walked with a 380k payout, how do we as rate payers are		low standard). The option of not raising rates ever mentioned until the population roared in anger. He has now completed a survey from 400ppl (out of 320000+ opulation) with a solei on how not accepting rate rise will mean services cut. Disk also "forcof" to mention the harmonisation rate which would also			
	responsible to pay for their incompetence, including the use of restricted funds! Where were the failsafe flags the local government ministry should have. How did NSW Auditors miss this. This increase will mean we will struggle to pay our rates and for many more close neighbours, many of whom are single household income or pensioners, they will 100% lose their house. There is already a housing crisis on the		slam the former Gosford council properties, until confronted by the rate payers. There has been no transparency and no creative thinking on any other ways t	My rates will be going up by at least \$600 per year under the proposed 15% plus harmonisation I	How will lpart ensure we are not going to be asked again for a huge increase without	
112 Anonymous Anonymous	CC, this will only worsen the situation. If the CEO & CFO didn't do their job they were hired by the government to oversee. It is the government a responsibility to now pay for their poor hire & failed due processes, NOT the tax payers.		get the council back on track other than slumping the rate payers with a ridiculous increase. Dick initially said between \$3-6/week increasethis is double that figure. Not to mention Dick got the loans from the bank with a promise of rate rise before it was approved	won't lose my home but we will be severely impacted financially. My 2 neighbour stands to lose theil homes if this goes through	r any explanation or reasons given into how we got here in the first place. For lpart to grant this increase will mean many people will lose their home.	Id love to see this plan. I think everyone would also like to see how all the money gone was spent. Don't give this council any more money until we know where the leaks are.
	I am aghast at this exorbitant rate rise. I find it hand to beleive that such a debt could have ever occured and shows gross mismanagement.					
	My rates do not appear to be improving my area when I see numerous roads in disrepair and council strips that need cleaning or mowing. It continually strikes me as odd that Woy woy rd, the main road and entrance into Woy woy still has no guttering on one side.					
	This extra charge places further strain on my family increasing the cost of living.		Made not people and size we people forestic investigation into the accounts and missues of funds. This people to be before any rate size one came be	The rate rice is not responsible. I feel that we've been lied to and our manay not exect which On tender		To be honest council needs to somehow rebuild trust with its community as its community feels lied to and
	It's unfair for such gross mismanagement of funds to be shafted onto the public when they act in good faith and trust that their council will operate in integrity and it is an insult from council to expect locals to pay without any recourse or inquiry.		We do not need a rate rise, we need a forensic investigation into the accounts and misuse of funds. This needs to be before any rate rise can even be	The rate rise is not reasonable, I feel that we've been lied to and our money not spent wisely. On top	C	
1l. l.			out the contract of	of this, far too many rules and regulations for the people in the area wanting to improve their living		betrayed.
113 Anonymous Anonymous 114 Jennifer Refalo	Kind regards. It's unfair that rate payers have to pay for the incompetent council	No comment as I'm not sure I can trust Councils decisions on anything at this point.	This is extremely unfair and very un-Australian.	spaces and much red tape to have to deal with, while developers seem to have more lee way.	Council should have been transparent earner, before this accumulative debt became so dire.	betrayed.
113 Anonymous Anonymous 114 Jennifer Refalo	Kind regards.  Ts unfair that rate payers have to pay for the incompetent council	No comment as I'm not sure I can trust Councils decisions on anything at this point.	This is extremely unfair and very un-Australian.			betrayed.
113 Anonymous Anonymous 114 Jennifer Refalo	Kind regards. It's unfair that rate payers have to pay for the incompetent council	No comment as fin not sure I can trust Councils decisions on anything at this point.	This is extremely unfair and very un-Australian.	spaces and much red tape to have to deal with white developers seem to have more lee way.  "Harmonisation" of rates across the old Gosford and Wyong council areas is an extremely unfair policy which discriminates against those of the old Gosford council area, unfairly.		Defrayed.
113 Anonymous Anonymous 114 Jennifer Refato	Kind regards. It's unfair that rate payers have to pay for the incompetent council	No comment as fin not sure I can trust Councils decisions on anything at this point.	This is extremely unitair and very un-Australian.	spaces and much not tige to have to deal with, while developers seem to have more lee way. 'Harmonisation' of rates across the old Gosford and Wyong council areas is an extremely unifair policy which discriminates against three of the old Gosford council areas, unifairly, Land values in Gosford are generally higher. However, the average suburban block in Gosford do not receive any more services than one hypory, thor is fromessity's household with more		Defrayed.
113   Anonymous Anonymous   114   Jennifer Refato	Kind regards.  Ts unflair that rate payers have to pay for the incompetent council	No comment as I'm not sure I can trust Councils decisions on anything all this point.	This is extremely unfair and very un-Australian.	spaces and much red tiple to have to deal with, while developers seem to have more lee way.  That monisation of rates across the old Gosford and Wyong council areas is an extremely unifair policy which discriminates against those of the old Gosford council area, unifairly.  Land values in Gosford are generally higher. However, the average suburban block in Gosford doe		befrayed.
113 Anonymous Anonymous 114 Jennifer Refato	Kind regards.  It's unifier that rate payers have to pay for the incompetent council	No comment as fin not sure I can trust Councils decisions on anything all this point.	This is extremely unfair and very un-Australian.	spaces and much not tape to have to deal with, while developers seem to have more lee way.  "Harmonisation" of rates across the old Gosford and Wyong council areas is an extremely unflar policy which discriminates against those of the old Gosford council area, unfainty.  Land values in Gosford are generally higher. However, the average subunba block in Gosford doe not recisive any more series. Bain one in Wyong, Not it it necessarily a boundard with more more constant to the constant of th		Defrayed.
113 Anonymous Anonymous 114 Jennifer Refalo	Kind regards.  Ts unfair that rate payers have to pay for the incompetent council  "Harmonisation" of rates across the old Gosford and Wyong council areas is an extremely unfair policy which discriminates against those of the old Gosford council area, unfairly.	No comment as fin not sure I can trust Councils decisions on anything all this point.	This is extremely unfair and very un-Australian.	spaces and much not tape to have to deal with, while developers seem to have more lee way.  Tharmonisation of rates across the old Gosford and Wyong council areas is an extremely unfair policy which discriminates against those of the old Gosford comic area, unfairly,  Land values in Gosford are generally higher. However, the average suburban block in Gosford doe not recive any more services than one in Wyong, Nor is it necessarily a household with more screen. I and values in the Gosford area have recently changed prolify, but knowns have not necessarily followed:  The change as proposed represents a reality good example of the unfairness of a single land value rate schedule once a council area becomes excessively large.		Defrayed.
113 Arenymous Arenymous 114 Jerether Refails	"Harmonisation" of rates across the old Gosford and Wyong council areas is an extremely unfair policy which discriminates against those of the old Gosford council area, unfairly, Land values in Gosford are generally higher. However, the average suburban block in Gosford does not receive any more services than one in Wyong, Nor is it necessarily a household with more income - land	No comment as fin not sure I can trust Councils decisions on anything all this point.	This is extremely unfair and very un Australian.	spaces and much not tipe to have to deal with, while developers seem to have more lee way.  **Harmonisation** or have scross the edd Coodron and Wingou council leaves is an enterensity unifor policy which discriminates against those of the old Coolford council area. Uniform, the council area is an enterensity information of the council area. In an extensive the council area is a matter state of the council area is a matter of the council area becomes a council area becomes a reality state of the uniform soft as displayed in the council area becomes excessively have seen as a single land value rate schedule on one a council area becomes excessively became as a single land value rate schedule on one a council area becomes excessively busy.  To be this, and just to help illustrate I propose a merger of the Central Coast council with Hormoty Council, in order that the marmonisation of rate leases to a reaction of rates in the Golder area.		Defrayed.
113 Accommous Accommous 114 Jerester Refinis	"Harmonisation" of rates across the old Gosford and Wyong council areas is an extremely unifair policy which discriminates against those of the old Gosford council area, unfairly.	No comment as I'm not sure I can trust Councils decisions on anything at this point.	This is extremely unfair and very un-Australian.	spaces and much not tipe to have to deal with, while developers seem to have more lee way.  "Harmonisation" of rates across the old Gosford and Wyong council areas is an extremely unifair poolicy which discriminates against those of the old Gosford council areas, unfainty.  Land values in Gosford are generally higher, However, the averages suburban block in Gosford don receiver any more services than one bill willow, plot in Is increasity a household with more income, land values in the Gosford area have recently changed rapidly, but incomes have not necessary by lounced.  The change as proposed represents a really good example of the unfairness of a single land value and schedule conce a council area becomes excessively large.  To be trite, and just to help illustrate L propose a merger of the Certail Coast council with Hornsby		Defrayed.
115 Anonymous Anonymous 116 Jerester Refais	"Harmonisation" of rates across the old Gosford and Wyong council areas is an extremely unfair policy which discriminates against those of the old Gosford council area, unfairly, Land values in Gosford are generally higher. However, the average suburban block in Gosford does not receive any more services than one in Wyong, Nor is it necessarily a household with more income - land	No comment as I'm not sure I can trust Councils decisions on anything all this point.	This is extremely unfair and very un-Australian.	spaces and much not tipe to have to deal with, while developers seem to have more lee way.  "Hemoresation" fraites serous the did Conder and Wipron caucil seems is an enterently unfair policy which discriminates against those of the old Gosford council area, unfairly.  Land values in Gosford are generally higher. However, the averages subtrains block in Gosford does not recieve any more services than one in Wipron, Nor is it necessity a household with more of recieves any more services than one long the services that one close of the content of the conten		Defrayed.
	"Harmonisation" of rates across the old Gostord and Wyong council areas is an extremely unfair policy which discriminates against those of the old Gostord council area, unfairly.  Land values in Gostord are generally higher. However, the average suburban block in Gostord does not receive any more services than one in Wyong, Nor is it necessarily a household with more income - land values in the Gostord area have recently changed repidly, but incomes have not necessarily follower.  The change as proposed represents a really good example of the unfairment of a single land value rate schedule once a council area becomes excessively large.  The third is the literature of the bill illustrate (nonceae amones of the Central Coast council with Horrarby council, in order that the "harmonisation" of rates leads to a reduction of rates in the Gostord area, and a	No comment as fin not sure I can trust Councils decisions on anything all this point.	This is extremely unfair and very un-Australian.	spaces and much not tipe to have to deal with while developers seem to have more lee way.  **Harmonisation** or have scross the end Goodford and Wingou council leaves is an endementy unifor policy which discriminates against those of the old Goodford council area. Uniform the council was a size of the council area in an endementy information of the council area. Uniformation of the council area is considered to the council area becomes the household with more income: a most values in the Goodford area have receively changed registry, but recomes have not conceasily florescent and values in the Goodford area have receively changed registry, but recomes have not conceasily florescent and the council area becomes excessively have a second of the uniform so of a single land value as schools on one council area becomes excessively have.  To be fits, and just to help illustrate: [propose a merger of the Contrad Coast council with Hornety council, in order that the "mamorisation" of rate leases to a recording of the confidence and an assalve cross subsidy from Hornety residents. Would that be fair or reasonable to Hornety residents?  There is no moral case for a subsidiation of the Wyong area, by the Conford area. It represents an completely valing boil; Three cases to be separate rate schedules for council services and completely valing boil; Three cases to be separate rate schedules for council services and completely valing boil; Three cases to be separate rate schedules for council services and completely valing boil; Three cases to be separate rate schedules for council services and completely valing boil; Three cases to be separated as exchedules for council services and completely valing boil; Three cases are the services and completely valing boil; Three cases to be separated as exchedules for council services and completely valing boil; Three cases to be separated as exchedules for council services and completely valing boil; Three cases to be separated as exchedules for council services and council and the f		Defrayed.
	"Harmonisation" of rates across the old Gosbrid and Wyong council areas is an extremely unfair policy which discriminates against those of the old Gosbrid council area, unfairly.  Land values in Gosford are generally higher. However, the average adouts a look in Gosford does not recieve any more services than one in Wyong, Nor is it necessarily a household with more income - land values in the Gosford area have recently changed repidly; but incomes have not necessarily followed!  The change as proposed represents a really good example of the unfairness of a single land value rate schedule once a council area becomes excessively large.  To be tills, and just to holp illustrate [propose a reague of the Cosford Cosford Cosford area, and a massiver coses authority from Hornely residents. Would that be fair or reasonable to Hornely council.	No comment as fin not sure I can trust Councils decisions on anything at this point.	This is extremely unfair and very un-Australian.	spaces and much not tipe to have to deal with while developers seem to have more lee way.  "Harmonisation" of rates across the old Gosford and Wyong council areas is an extremely unifair proticy which discriminates against three of the old Gosford council areas, unfairly.  Land values in Gosford are generally higher, Horevere, the averages suburban block in Gosford don receiver any more services than one to Wyong, Nor Is In recessarily a household with more income: land values in the Gosford are have recently changed rapidly, but incomes have not necessarily histories.  The change as proposed represents a reality good example of the unfairness of a single land value rate schedule conce a council area becomes excessively large.  To be trite, and just to help illustrate Li propose a merger of the Central Coast council with Hornsby council, in order that the "harmonisation" of rates leads to a reduction of rates in the Gosford area. If expresses have a many continuous control area to the control area to the control area to the control area to the control area. The presents a real transport of the services of the Central Coast council with Hornsby council, in order that the "harmonisation" of rates leads to a reduction of rates in the Gosford area. It represents a real transport of the control area. The presents a fire the control case for a subsidiation of the Wyong area, by the Gosford area. It represents a		Defrayed.
	"Harmorisation" of rates across the old Gosford and Wyong council areas is an extremely unfair policy which discriminates against those of the old Gosford council area, unfairly.  Land values in Gosford are generally higher. However, the average suburban block in Gosford does not receive any more services than one in Wyong. Nor is it necessarily a household with more income - land values in the Gosford area have receiving thanged rapidly, but incomes have not increaseably blolwed!  The change as proposed represents a really good example of the unfairness of a single land value rate schedule once a council area becomes excessively large.  The bettle, and just to help illustrate: I propose a merger of the Certain Coast council with Horraby council, in order that the "harmonisation" of rates leads to a reduction of rates in the Gosford area, and a massive cross subolety from Horraby residents?  We also a fair the limit is council integronably & arrogantly wasted measure amounts of money.  We don't want this too keep happening!	No comment as I'm not sure I can trust Councils decisions on anything at this point.	This is extremely unfair and very un-Australian.	spaces and much not tipe to have to deal with while developers seem to have more lee way.  **Harmonisation** or have scross the end Goodford and Wingou council leaves is an endementy unifor policy which discriminates against those of the old Goodford council area. Uniform the council was a size of the council area in an endementy information of the council area. Uniformation of the council area is considered to the council area becomes the household with more income: a most values in the Goodford area have receively changed registry, but recomes have not conceasily florescent and values in the Goodford area have receively changed registry, but recomes have not conceasily florescent and the council area becomes excessively have a second of the uniform so of a single land value as schools on one council area becomes excessively have.  To be fits, and just to help illustrate: [propose a merger of the Contrad Coast council with Hornety council, in order that the "mamorisation" of rate leases to a recording of the confidence and an assalve cross subsidy from Hornety residents. Would that be fair or reasonable to Hornety residents?  There is no moral case for a subsidiation of the Wyong area, by the Conford area. It represents an completely valing boil; Three cases to be separate rate schedules for council services and completely valing boil; Three cases to be separate rate schedules for council services and completely valing boil; Three cases to be separate rate schedules for council services and completely valing boil; Three cases to be separate rate schedules for council services and completely valing boil; Three cases to be separated as exchedules for council services and completely valing boil; Three cases are the services and completely valing boil; Three cases to be separated as exchedules for council services and completely valing boil; Three cases to be separated as exchedules for council services and completely valing boil; Three cases to be separated as exchedules for council services and council and the f		Defrayed.
115 Anonymous Anonymous 116 Anonymous Anonymous	"Harmonisation" of rates across the old Gosford and Wyong council areas is an extremely unfair policy which discriminates against those of the old Gosford council area, unfairly.  Land values in Gosford are generally higher. However, the average suburban block in Gosford does not receive any more services than one in Wyong, Nor is it necessarily a household with more income - land values in the Gosford are have recently integrated gripply. In thoreones have not necessarily followed!  The change as proposed represents a really good example of the unfairness of a single land value rate schedule once a council area becomes excessively large.  To be life, and just to help illustrates (propose, merger of the Central Coast council with Hornely council, in order that the "harmonisation" of rates leads to a reduction of rates in the Gosford area, and a measure cross studies (from the receive prelate). Would fait the first crosscande to the transpressions of rates leads to a reduction of rates in the Gosford area, and a measure cross studies (from the receive prelate). Would fait the first crosscande to the remove prelates are studies of the council integer to expect with in the remarks. Would fait the first crosscande to the remove received and the remarks of the council integer to expect with in the remarks.			spaces and much not tipe to have to deal with shift developers seem to have more lee way.  "Harmonisation" of rates across the old Gosford and Wyong council areas is an extremely unifair proticy which discriminates against those of the old Gosford council areas, unfairly.  Land values in Gosford are generally higher, Horever, the averages suburban block in Gosford don receiver any more services than one Wyong, No is it necessarily shousehold with more income, land values in the Gosford area have recently changed rapidly, but incomes have not necessarily histories and values in the Gosford area have recently changed rapidly, but incomes have not necessarily histories.  The change as proposed represents a reality good example of the unfairness of a single land value rate schedule once a council area becomes excessively large.  To be trite, and just to help illustrate is propose a merger of the Central Coast council with Hornsby council, in order that the "harmonisation" of rates leads to a reduction of rates in the Gosford area. It represents a rad a massive cross suisibly from Hornsby residents. Would that the fair or reasonable be Hornsby residents. Would that the fair or reasonable be Hornsby residents. Would that the fair or reasonable be Hornsby residents. Would state fair for incomes be the control at the proposed against the proposed and a massive cross suisibility from Hornsby residents. Would that the fair or reasonable be Hornsby residents. Would state fair or reasonable be Hornsby reasonable and the proposed proposed by unfair policy. There ought to be separate rate schedules for council sub-regions and transparent justification for any intra-regional cross-subsidisation.		Defrayed.
115 Anonymous Anonymous 116 Anonymous Anonymous 117 Anonymous Anonymous 118 Meliesa Prinkerton	"Harmonisation" of rates across the old Gosford and Wyong council areas is an extremely unfair policy which discriminates against those of the old Gosford council area, unfairly.  Land values in Gosford are generally higher. However, the average suburban block in Gosford does not receive any more services than one in Wyong, Nor is it necessarily a household with more income - land values in the Gosford area have receively langed registly. Into comes have not necessarily followed!  The change as proposed represents a really good example of the unfairness of a single land value rate schedule once a council area becomes excessively large.  To be time, and just to help illustrate (propose a merger of the Central Coast council with Horraby council, in order that the "harmonisation" of rates leads to a reduction of rates in the Gosford area, and a amassive cross subsight from formative relations. Would fast be fair or reasonable to Prompty residents?  We can't afford a rate first The council irresponsibly & arrogantly wasted massive amounts of money.  Councils need to general with in there ensures the prompt in the Gosford area, and the down that the tokes phagepering I feeting veryely are see council excellent sharing around not working !  The accouncils and to general sharing around not working !  The accouncils and the accountable and I have no confidence in them!!	No comment as I'm not sure I can trust Councils decisions on anything all this point.  As above No confidence	This is extremely unfair and very un-Australian.  As above No confidence!	spaces and much not tipe to have to deal with while developers seem to have more lee way.  **Harmonisation** or have scross the end Goodford and Wingou council leaves is an endementy unifor policy which discriminates against those of the old Goodford council area. Uniform the council was a size of the council area in an endementy information of the council area. Uniformation of the council area is considered to the council area becomes the household with more income: a most values in the Goodford area have receively changed registry, but recomes have not conceasily florescent and values in the Goodford area have receively changed registry, but recomes have not conceasily florescent and the council area becomes excessively have a second of the uniform so of a single land value as schools on one council area becomes excessively have.  To be fits, and just to help illustrate: [propose a merger of the Contrad Coast council with Hornety council, in order that the "mamorisation" of rate leases to a recording of the confidence and an assalve cross subsidy from Hornety residents. Would that be fair or reasonable to Hornety residents?  There is no moral case for a subsidiation of the Wyong area, by the Conford area. It represents an completely valing boil; Three cases to be separate rate schedules for council services and completely valing boil; Three cases to be separate rate schedules for council services and completely valing boil; Three cases to be separate rate schedules for council services and completely valing boil; Three cases to be separate rate schedules for council services and completely valing boil; Three cases to be separated as exchedules for council services and completely valing boil; Three cases are the services and completely valing boil; Three cases to be separated as exchedules for council services and completely valing boil; Three cases to be separated as exchedules for council services and completely valing boil; Three cases to be separated as exchedules for council services and council and the f		Defrayed.
115 Anonymous Anonymous 116 Anonymous Anonymous 117 Anonymous Anonymous 118 Meliesa Prinkerton	"Harmonisation" of rates across the old Gostord and Wyong council areas is an extremely unfair policy which discriminates against those of the old Gostord council area, unfairly.  Land values in Gostord are generally higher. However, the average suburban block in Gostord does not recieve any more services than one in Wyong, Nor is it necessarily a household with more income - land values in the Gostord area have recently changed repidy, but incomes have not necessarily followed:  The change as proposed represents a really good example of the unfairness of a single land value rate schedule once a council area becomes excessively large.  To be tiltic, and just to help illustrate; Inpropose a merger of the Central Coast council with Horraby council, in order that the "harmonisation" of rates leads to a reduction of rates in the Gostord area, and a massive cross subsidy from Horraby residents. Would find that be fair or reasonable to Horraby residents?  We can't afford a rate in 1 The council resingue around not working !  The incomediated graph remed to change!  The incomediated graph remed to change!  The council sold sold as accounted when singing around not working!  We always the accountable and there no confidence in them!!  We always the accountable and there no confidence in them!!  We always the accountable and there no council no complete remembers and passed to get them out of thouble and as a company they should seep lay of your debt not put change more them crough assets to get them out of thouble and as a company they should seep lay down debt not put change more them crough assets to get them out of thouble and as a company they should seep lay council accountable and the search and the council a	As shove No confidence	As above	spaces and much not tape to have to deal with, while developers seem to have more lee way.  "Harmonisation" of rates across the old Goolford and Wyong council areas is an extremely unifor goodly which discriminates against those of the old Goolford council areas, unfainty.  Land values in Goolford are generally higher, However, the averages suburban block in Goolford don receiver any more services than one in Wyong, Nor is It necessarily a household with more income: land values in the Goolford area thave receively changed rapidly, but incomes have not increasingly florings on the council area becomes excessively blorings as proposed represents a reality good example of the unfairness of a single land value rate schedule once a council area becomes excessively blorings.  To be first, and just to help illustrate i propose a merger of the Central Coast council with Horonaty council, in order that the Tharmonisation of rates leads to a recision of rates in the Goolford area, and an ansative cross subsidy from Hornaby residents. Would that be fair or reasonable to Hornaby residents?  There is no mored case for a subsidiation of the Wyong area, by the Goolford area, It represents a completely unfair policy. There ought to be aperated rare schedules for council sub-regions and transparent justification for any intra-regional cross-subsidiation	as dire.  As above	Defrayed.
115 Anonymous Anonymous 116 Anonymous 117 Anonymous 118 Anonymous 119 Anonymous 119 Anonymous 119 Anonymous	"Harmonisation" of rates across the old Cosford and Wyong council areas is an externely unfair policy which discriminates against those of the old Cosford council area, unfairly, Land values in Goodford are generally higher. However, the average suburban block in Cosford does not receive any more services than one in Wyong, Nor is it necessarily a household with more income - land values in the Cosford area have necestry changed rapidly, but incomes have not receive any more services than one in Wyong, Nor is it necessarily a household with more income - land values in the Cosford area have necessarily changed rapidly but incomes have not receive any more services than one in Wyong, Nor is it necessarily a household with more income - land values in the Cosford area, and use the council area becomes excessively large.  To be title, and just to help illustrate: [propose a merger of the Certifal Costs council with Horraby council, in order that the "harmonisation" of rates leads to a reduction of rates in the Gosford area, and a massive cross subside him ton the reduction. Would that the first reasonable to Homestry residents?  We can't affect a rate inter I'the council irresponsibly 5 arroganity wasted massive amounts of money.  We can't affect in the love hampening!  Next your exployed we see council workers hamping around not working !  The council should be accountable and I have no confidence in them!!  The council should not account the grift professor or council complete mensuragement of funds.  The council is a job why should see play for their professor here received assets to pay down debt not just charge more than to the proper of the county of the play of the most of the professor council and the section of the play of the most of the professor council and the professor can be used to play your debt not just charge more than to the professor can be a company they should seed assets to pay your debt not just charge more than to	As above No confidence Let's have a quantity surveyor report on there works and visibility for 6 months. Us as shareholders should be	As above No confidencel	spaces and much not tipe to have to deal with shift developers seem to have more lee way.  "Harmonisation" of rates across the old Gosford and Wyong council areas is an extremely unifair proticy which discriminates against three of the old Cosford council areas, unfairly.  Land values in Gosford are generally higher, However, the averages suburban block in Gosford on ort recieve any more services than one flow Wyong, Nor Is In recessify a household with more income: land values in the Gosford area have recently changed rapidly, but incomes have not necessarily histories account and the control of the control of the unfairness of a single land value rate schedule one a curval area becomes accessively have.  To be trite, and just to help illustrate: [propose a merge of the Central Coast council with Hornsby council, in order that the "harmonisation" of rates leads to a reduction of rates in the Gosford area. If represents a real manual manual costs of the central coast council with Hornsby council, in order that the "harmonisation" of rates leads to a reduction of rates in the Gosford area. The present is a completely unfair policy. There caught to be separate rate schedules for council sub-regions and transparent justification for any intra-regional cross-subsidisation.  Yeah, you guess it AS ABOVE  It is not researchable.	as dire.  As above  R is all a joke that needs to be investigated before moving forward and approved by	
115 Anonymous Anonymous  116 Anonymous Anonymous  117 Anonymous Anonymous  118 Maissa Privertin  119 Anonymous Anonymous  320 Anonymous	"Harmonisation" of rates across the old Gostord and Wyong council areas is an extremely unfair policy which discriminates against those of the old Gostord council area, unfairly.  Land values in Gostord are generally higher. However, the average suburban block in Gostord does not recieve any more services than one in Wyong, Nor is it necessarily a household with more income - land values in the Gostord area have recently changed repidy, but incomes have not necessarily followed:  The change as proposed represents a really good example of the unfairness of a single land value rate schedule once a council area becomes excessively large.  To be tiltic, and just to help illustrate; Inpropose a merger of the Central Coast council with Horraby council, in order that the "harmonisation" of rates leads to a reduction of rates in the Gostord area, and a massive cross subsidy from Horraby residents. Would find that be fair or reasonable to Horraby residents?  We can't afford a rate in 1 The council resingue around not working !  The incomediated graph remed to change!  The incomediated graph remed to change!  The council sold sold as accounted when singing around not working!  We always the accountable and there no confidence in them!!  We always the accountable and there no confidence in them!!  We always the accountable and there no council no complete remembers and passed to get them out of thouble and as a company they should seep lay of your debt not put change more them crough assets to get them out of thouble and as a company they should seep lay down debt not put change more them crough assets to get them out of thouble and as a company they should seep lay council accountable and the search and the council a	As shove No confidence	As above	spaces and much not tape to have to deal with, while developers seem to have more lee way.  "Harmonisation" of rates across the old Goolford and Wyong council areas is an extremely unifor goodly which discriminates against those of the old Goolford council areas, unfainty.  Land values in Goolford are generally higher, However, the averages suburban block in Goolford don receiver any more services than one in Wyong, Nor is It necessarily a household with more income: land values in the Goolford area thave receively changed rapidly, but incomes have not increasingly florings on the council area becomes excessively blorings as proposed represents a reality good example of the unfairness of a single land value rate schedule once a council area becomes excessively blorings.  To be first, and just to help illustrate i propose a merger of the Central Coast council with Horonaty council, in order that the Tharmonisation of rates leads to a recision of rates in the Goolford area, and an ansative cross subsidy from Hornaby residents. Would that be fair or reasonable to Hornaby residents?  There is no mored case for a subsidiation of the Wyong area, by the Goolford area, It represents a completely unfair policy. There ought to be aperated rare schedules for council sub-regions and transparent justification for any intra-regional cross-subsidiation	As above  It is all a joke that needs to be investigated before moving forward and approved by needs voiced council members and the public	They have not explained there incompetents so we should not have reached this point.
115 Anonymous Anonymous  116 Anonymous Anonymous  117 Anonymous Anonymous  118 Maissa Privertin  119 Anonymous Anonymous  320 Anonymous	"Harmonisation" of rates across the old Gostord and Wyong council areas is an extremely unfair policy which discriminates against those of the old Gostord council area, unfairly.  Land values in Gostord are generally higher. However, the average suburban block in Gostord does not recieve any more services than one in Wyong, Nor is it necessarily a household with more income - land values in the Gostord area have recently changed repidyb, but incomes have not necessarily followed:  The change as proposed represents a really good example of the unfairness of a single land value rate schedule once a council area becomes excessively large.  To be tills, and just only being illustrates (propose a merger of the Central Coast council with Horraby council, in order that the "harmonisation" of rates leads to a reduction of rates in the Gostord area, and a massaive cross subsidy from Horraby residents. Would find that be fair or reasonable to Horraby residents?  We can't afford a rate in life to Life the council interportably & arrangently waved massaive amounts of money.  Councils read to operate with in the means I  Noted that the "harmonisation" of rates leads to a reduction of rates in the Gostord area, and a wind property of the council of the land property of the land of the land prope	As above So confidence Let's have a quantity surveyor report on there works and visibility for 6 months. Us as shareholders should be given the francisis	As above No confidencel	spaces and much not tipe to have to deal with, while developers seem to have more lee way.  "Harmonisation" of rales across the edd Goofford and Wyong council areas is an externelly unifor policy which discriminates agained those of the old Goofford council areas. Unlikely, and the control of the council areas to a manual policy which discriminates agained those of the Goofford council areas to a make a service than one of Wyong, Nor all increasity a household with more income: hard values in the Goofford area have recently highly charged rapidly, but tocomes have not controlled to the controlled of	As above  R is all a joke that needs to be investigated before moving forward and approved by newly voted council members and the public  Documents will be doctored, hidden or destroyed if this Council to provide. These are the same people who open money by dolf have including \$200 MLLUNO no.	They have not explained there incompetents so we should not have reached this point.  Documents will be disclored, hidden or destroyed If left to Council to provide. These are the same people
116 Anonymous  116 Anonymous  117 Anonymous  118 Melissa Priverton  119 Anonymous  Anonymous  120 Anonymous  Anonymous  Anonymous  Anonymous  Anonymous	"Harmorisation" of rates across the old Gosbrd and Wyong council areas is an extremely unfair policy which discriminates against those of the old Gosbrd council area, unfairly.  Land values in Gosbrd are generally higher. However, the average adoutant block in Gosbrd does not recieve any more services than one in Wyong, Nor is it necessarily a household with more income - land values in the Gosbrd area have recently changed rapidly, but locames have not incomesally followed?  The change as proposed represents a really good example of the unfairness of a single land value rate schedule once a council area becomes excessively large.  To be little, and just hold plantative [propose a marger of the Costati Costa council all herebrdy council, in order that the "namonisation" of rates leads to a reduction of rates in the Gosbrd area, and a measure cross subsidy from thronly residents. Would find that the fair or reasonable be thromby residents?  Vecart afford or a time to 1 the council recomplete and the council complete manual and account of the council complete manual and account of the council complete manual and two council complete manual and the council complete m	As above  No confidence  Let's have a quantity surveyor report on there works and viability for 6 months. Us as shareholders should be above the financials  No and No. There was no option given to state No increase on the survey. You were only given too options to the financials with the complete and with the contraction of the survey. We were only given too options to the survey.	As above. No confidence!  The only need is driven from poor management no a necessity.  No and No. There was no ootion olven to state No increase on the survey. You were only given two options 10% and 15% and now they are actually.	spaces and much not tape to have to deal with, while developers seem to have more lee way.  "Harmonisation" of rates across the old Coolford and Wyong council areas is an extremely unifor profile, which discriminates against those of the old Coolford council areas, unfainty.  Land values in Coolford are generally higher. However, the averages suburban block in Coolford don't reciver any more services than one by Myong. Nor is Increasity in household with more income: land values in the Coolford area than the coolford area in the coolford area in the coolford area consisting thousehold with more income. Land values in the Coolford area have recently changed rapidly, but incomes have not consistently followed.  The change as proposed represents a really good example of the unfairness of a single land value rate schedule once a council area becomes occasively bilary.  To be this, and just to high literature I propose a marger of the Contral Coast council with Horousty council, in order that the Tharmonisation' of rate leasts to a recision of rates in the Contral Coast council with Horousty councils, in order that the Tharmonisation' of rates leasts to a recision of rates in the Contral Coast council with Horousty residents.  The is no more class for a subdisdiction of the Wyong stea, by the Coolford area. I represent a completely unit posity. There capit to be separate rate schedules for council sub-regions and transparent justification for any intra-regional cross-subsidiation.  This is simply not reasonable we were led to up and until there less breath.  It is completely unreasonable to charge entra 45%. You were only given two options 10% and 15% and now they are actually increasing by 45% to harmonies which will leave Coolford owners in	As above  It is all a joke that needs to be investigated before moving forward and approved by newly read council members and the public possible to the provided council members and the public possible to t	They have not explained there incompetents so we should not have reached this point.  Documents will be declared, hidden or destroyed If left to Course to provide. These are the same people who spent money they didn't have including \$200 MLLDN or wages for more middle management concerne when supposedly amangaments for Coursels. If the was private company heads would roll not
116 Anonymous  116 Anonymous  117 Anonymous  118 Melissa Priverton  119 Anonymous  Anonymous  120 Anonymous  Anonymous  Anonymous  Anonymous  Anonymous	"Harmorisation" of rates across the old Gostord and Wyong council areas is an externely unfair policy which discriminates against those of the old Gostord council area, unfairly.  Land values in Gostord are generally higher. However, the average suburban blook in Gostord does not recieve any more services than one in Wyong. Nor is it necessarily a household with more income - land values in the Gostord area here recently changed rapidly, but his comment have not receive any more services than one in Wyong. Nor is it necessarily a household with more income - land values in the Gostord area as proposed represents a really good example of the unfairness of a single land value and eschedule once a council area becomes excessively large.  The britis, and just to help illustrate. I propose a merger of the Central Coast council with Horraby council, in order that the "harmonisation" of rates leads to a reduction of rates in the Gostord area, and a massive cross subdiving from Horraby presidents. Which is the fact or resonable to thorsably residents?  Councils need to operate with in the emeans!  We don't want this to keep happening if the experiment of money.  We don't want this to keep happening if a sound not working I have been council as a contract of the properation and the properation of the properation	As above No confidence  Let's have a quantity surveyor report on there works and visibility for 6 months. Us as shareholders should be abven the financials.  No and No. There was no option given to state No increase on the survey. You were only given two options	As above No confidence!  The only need is driven from poor management no a necessity.	spaces and much not tipe to have to deal with while developers seem to have more lee way.  **Permonisation** or risks excess the did Conder and Wiyone causal leaves in an extremely unifor policy which discriminates against those of the old Godford council area, unfairly.  **Land values in Godford area generally higher. However, the averages suburban block in Godford council area, unfairly.  **Land values in Godford area generally higher. However, the averages suburban block in Godford confusioners are suburbanished.  **Land values in Godford area the Wiyong, Nor is it necessarily a household with more of confusioners. Godford area was also also also also also also also al	As above  It is all a joke that needs to be investigated before moving forward and approved by newly read council members and the public possible to the provided council members and the public possible to t	They have not explained there incompetents so we should not have reached this point.  Documents will be doctored, hidden or destroyed if that to Council to provide. These are the same people who spert more yellow dight have included. So DMILLION or wages for more middle management.
115 Anonymous Anonymous  116 Anonymous Anonymous  117 Anonymous Princeton  118 Meissa Princeton  120 Anonymous Anonymous  121 Anonymous Anonymous  122 Anonymous Anonymous  122 Anonymous Anonymous	"Harmonisation" of rates across the old Gosford and Wyong council areas is an extremely unfair policy which discriminates against those of the old Gosford council area, unfairly.  Land values in Bio Gosford are generally higher, Housever, the average suburban blook in Gosford does not receive any more services than one in Wyong, Nor is it necessarily a household with more income - land values in the Gosford area have recently changed repidity, but incomes have not necessarily followed!  The change as proposed represents a really good example of the unfairness of a single land value rate schedule once a council area becomes excessively large.  To be tilt, and just to help illustrate I propose a regner of the Control Coale Locanic lands the Herroby council, in order that the "harmonisation" of rates leads to a reduction of rates in the Gosford area, and a massaive cross subsidy from Hormaly residents. Would that be fair or reasonable to Hormaly residents?  We carn't afford a rate in IT- the council representably & arrangently washed massive amounts of money.  We don't want this outer plangening in ground on working?  The iscommediated plane needs to change!  We alreaded not have be got the proper plane of the or council's complete mismanagement of funds.  We alreaded not have be got the proper plane of the or council's complete mismanagement of funds.  We alreaded not have be got the protein plane of the council alreade and that the season is a size and the council alreade and that the council alreade	As above No confidence No confidence Lef's have a quantify surveyor report on there works and viability for 6 months. Us as shareholders should be about the financials  No and No. Three was no option given to state No increase on the survey. You were only given two options 10% and 15% and row they are actually increasing by 45% to "surmoraise" which will leave Gosford owners in financial ruin because of Councils pathetic management of money.	As above. No confidence!  The only need is driven from poor management no a necessity.  No and No. There was no ootion olven to state No increase on the survey. You were only given two options 10% and 15% and now they are actually.	spaces and much not tape to have to deal with, while developers seem to have more lee way.  "Harmonisation" of rates across the old Coolford and Wyong council areas is an extremely unifor profile, which discriminates against those of the old Coolford council areas, unfainty.  Land values in Coolford are generally higher. However, the averages suburban block in Coolford don't reciver any more services than one by Myong. Nor is Increasity in household with more income: land values in the Coolford area than the coolford area in the coolford area in the coolford area consisting thousehold with more income. Land values in the Coolford area have recently changed rapidly, but incomes have not consistently followed.  The change as proposed represents a really good example of the unfairness of a single land value rate schedule once a council area becomes occasively bilary.  To be this, and just to high literature I propose a marger of the Contral Coast council with Horousty council, in order that the Tharmonisation' of rate leasts to a recision of rates in the Contral Coast council with Horousty councils, in order that the Tharmonisation' of rates leasts to a recision of rates in the Contral Coast council with Horousty residents.  The is no more class for a subdisdiction of the Wyong stea, by the Coolford area. I represent a completely unit posity. There capit to be separate rate schedules for council sub-regions and transparent justification for any intra-regional cross-subsidiation.  This is simply not reasonable we were led to up and until there less breath.  It is completely unreasonable to charge entra 45%. You were only given two options 10% and 15% and now they are actually increasing by 45% to harmonies which will leave Coolford owners in	As above  It is all a joke that needs to be investigated before moving forward and approved by newly read council members and the public possible to the provided council members and the public possible to t	They have not explained there incompetents so we should not have reached this point.  Documents will be declared, hidden or destroyed if left to Courcil to provide. These are the same people who spent money they didn't have including \$200 MLLDN or wages for more middle management or concerne when supposedly amangaments for Courcils. If the was a private company heads would not be concerned when supposedly amangaments on Courcils. If they was a private company heads would not be concerned to the courcil or the courcil or they country to the courcil or they are a private company heads would not be concerned to the courcil or they country to the courcil or they are a private company heads would not be company to the country of the courcil or they are the courcil or they are the country of the
115 Anonymous Anonymous  116 Anonymous Anonymous 117 Anonymous Priveton 116 Melissa Priveton 120 Anonymous Anonymous 121 Anonymous Anonymous 122 Anonymous Anonymous 122 Anonymous Anonymous	"Harmonisation" of rates across the old Gosbrd and Wyong council areas is an extremely unfair policy which discriminates against those of the old Gosbrd council area, unfairly,  Land values in Gosbrd area pensally higher. However, the average abouton block in Gosbrd does not recieve any more services than one in Wyong, Nor is it necessarily a household with more income - land values in the Gosbrd area have recently changed repidly, but incomes have not necessarily followed!  The change as proposed represents a really good example of the unfairness of a single land value rate schedule once a council area becomes excessively large.  To be little, and just hold plantatine [propose] person among of the Control Coast council all Hermaly council, no order that the "tramonisation" of rates lesseds to a reduction of rates in the Gosbrd area, and a massive cross subsidy from thromly residents. Would that the fair or reasonable to Hornaby residents?  We can't afford a rate into The council representity & arrogantly wasted massive amounts of money.  Councils need to operate with in their means !  We don't want the to beep happening! I have been a substantial of money.  We don't want the to beep happening! I have go the properties of the properties with the properties with the properties will be a substantial to the properties properties, employ contractors, ding the 10 million is assets basine, such to community developments but we should NOT be poping 45% that its Othingous and not one expensive will be a longer properties will be read to be intered. The mone of thands are substantial to the properties properties will be read wi	As above No confidence No confidence Lef's have a quantify surveyor report on there works and viability for 6 months. Us as shareholders should be about the financials  No and No. Three was no option given to state No increase on the survey. You were only given two options 10% and 15% and row they are actually increasing by 45% to "surmoraise" which will leave Gosford owners in financial ruin because of Councils pathetic management of money.	As above. No confidence!  The only need is driven from poor management no a necessity.  No and No. There was no ootion olven to state No increase on the survey. You were only given two options 10% and 15% and now they are actually.	spaces and much not tape to have to deal with, while developers seem to have more lee way.  "Harmonisation" of rates across the old Coolford and Wyong council areas is an extremely unifor profile, which discriminates against those of the old Coolford council areas, unfainty.  Land values in Coolford are generally higher. However, the averages suburban block in Coolford don't reciver any more services than one by Myong. Nor is Increasity in household with more income: land values in the Coolford area than the coolford area in the coolford area in the coolford area consisting thousehold with more income. Land values in the Coolford area have recently changed rapidly, but incomes have not consistently followed.  The change as proposed represents a really good example of the unfairness of a single land value rate schedule once a council area becomes occasively bilary.  To be this, and just to high literature I propose a marger of the Contral Coast council with Horousty council, in order that the Tharmonisation' of rate leasts to a recision of rates in the Contral Coast council with Horousty councils, in order that the Tharmonisation' of rates leasts to a recision of rates in the Contral Coast council with Horousty residents.  The is no more class for a subdisdiction of the Wyong stea, by the Coolford area. I represent a completely unit posity. There capit to be separate rate schedules for council sub-regions and transparent justification for any intra-regional cross-subsidiation.  This is simply not reasonable we were led to up and until there less breath.  It is completely unreasonable to charge entra 45%. You were only given two options 10% and 15% and now they are actually increasing by 45% to harmonies which will leave Coolford owners in	As above  It is all a joke that needs to be investigated before moving forward and approved by newly reded council members and the public process of the p	They have not explained there incompetents so we should not have reached this point.  Documents will be declared, hidden or destroyed if left to Courcil to provide. These are the same people who spent money they didn't have including \$200 MLLDN or wages for more middle management more
115 Anonymous Anonymous  116 Anonymous Anonymous  117 Anonymous Anonymous  120 Anonymous Anonymous  121 Anonymous Anonymous  122 Anonymous Anonymous  123 Anonymous Anonymous  124 Anonymous Anonymous  125 Anonymous Anonymous	"Harmorisation" of rates across the old Gostord and Wyong council areas is an externely unfair policy which discriminates against those of the old Gostord council area, unfairly.  Land values in Goodord are generally higher. However, the average suburban block in Gostord does not recieve any more services than one in Wyong. Nor is it necessarily a household with more income - land values in the Gostord area here receively changed rapidly, but incomes have not incomes than one in the control of th	As above No confidence No confidence Lef's have a quantify surveyor report on there works and viability for 6 months. Us as shareholders should be about the financials  No and No. Three was no option given to state No increase on the survey. You were only given two options 10% and 15% and row they are actually increasing by 45% to "surmoraise" which will leave Gosford owners in financial ruin because of Councils pathetic management of money.	As above. No confidence!  The only need is driven from poor management no a necessity.  No and No. There was no ootion olven to state No increase on the survey. You were only given two options 10% and 15% and now they are actually.	Spaces and much not tipe to have to deal with while developers seem to have more lee way.  **Permonisation** or risks excess the disconfar and Wipron causif leaves in an extremely unifor policy which discriminates against those of the old Godford council area, unfairly.  **Land values in Godford area generally higher. However, the averages subtrainst block in Godford council area, unfairly.  **Land values in Godford area generally higher. However, the averages subtrainst block in Godford confusions are supported to the council of the counci	As above  It is all a joke that needs to be investigated before moving forward and approved by newly reded council members and the public process of the p	They have not explained there incompetents so we should not have reached this point.  Documents will be declared, hidden or destroyed if left to Courcil to provide. These are the same people who spent money they didn't have including \$200 MLLDN or wages for more middle management more
115 Anonymous Anonymous 116 Anonymous Anonymous 117 Anonymous Anonymous 118 Anonymous Anonymous 120 Anonymous Anonymous 121 Anonymous Anonymous 122 Anonymous Anonymous 123 Anonymous Anonymous 124 Anonymous Anonymous 125 Anonymous Anonymous 126 Anonymous Anonymous 127 Anonymous Anonymous 128 Anonymous Anonymous 129 Anonymous Anonymous 120 Anonymous Anonymous 120 Anonymous Anonymous 121 Anonymous Anonymous	"Harmorisation" of rates across the old Gosbord and Wyong council areas is an extremely unfair policy which discriminates against those of the old Gosbord council area, unfairly.  Land values in Gosford are generally higher. However, the average suburban block in Gosford does not receive any more services than one in Wyong, Nor is it necessarily a household with more income - land values in the Gosford area have recently changed registry, but incomes have not necessarily billowed?  The change as proposed represents a really good example of the unfairness of a single land value rate schedule once a council area becomes excessively large.  The change as proposed represents a really good example of the unfairness of a single land value rate schedule once a council area becomes excessively large.  We can't afford in a first in The council represents by As regarded water data schedule once a council area becomes excessively large.  Councils need to depress the intermediate of the council of the schedule of the council and the schedule of the council area to the council and the schedule of the council area to the council area to the schedule of the council area to the schedule of the council area to the council area to the schedule of the council area to the council area to the council area to the schedule of the council area to t	As above No confidence No confidence Lef's have a quantify surveyor report on there works and viability for 6 months. Us as shareholders should be about the financials  No and No. Three was no option given to state No increase on the survey. You were only given two options 10% and 15% and row they are actually increasing by 45% to "surmoraise" which will leave Gosford owners in financial ruin because of Councils pathetic management of money.	As above. No confidence!  The only need is driven from poor management no a necessity.  No and No. There was no ootion olven to state No increase on the survey. You were only given two options 10% and 15% and now they are actually.	spaces and much not tipe to have to deal with while developers seem to have more lee way.  **Partmonisation** or have serous the eld Goodnord and Wingon council leaves in an antimenty unifor policy which discriminates against those of the old Goodnord council areas, unfairly.  **Land values in Goodnord are generally higher, However, the averages suburban block in Goodnord concerns any times to be expensed as a series than one in Wingon, Nor Is Increasing's household with more income: a hard values in the Goodnord area have recently changed registly, but incomes have not concerns by the concerns any times.  **The change as proposed represents a reality good example of the unfairness of a single land value are schedule once a council area becomes excessively have present and the change as proposed represents a reality good example of the unfairness of a single land value are schedule once a council area becomes excessively have.  **To be first, and just to help illustrate: I propose a merger of the Central Coast council with Hornaty council, in order that the "namonisation" of rate lease to a recision of rates in the Goodnord area, and a massive cross subsidy from Hornaty residents. Would that to fair or reasonable to Hornaty residents.  **There is no moral case for a subsidiastion of the Wyong area, by the Coafford area, it represents a completely uniting locity. There ough to be separate rate schedules for council sub-regions and transparent justification for any intra-regional cross-subsidiastion  **Yeah you guess it AS ABOVE**  **This is simply not reasonable we were field to up and until there last breath.  **It is sompletely unreasonable to charge autor 45%. You were only given two options 10% and 15% and now they are estably increasing by 45% to harmonistic which will leave Coefford owners in transical ruln because of Councils pathetic management of money.	As above  It is all a joke that needs to be investigated before moving forward and approved by newly reded council members and the public process of the p	They have not explained there incompetents so we should not have reached this point.  Documents will be declared, hidden or destroyed if left to Courcil to provide. These are the same people who spent money they didn't have including \$200 MLLDN or wages for more middle management or concerne when supposedly amangaments for Courcils. If the was a private company heads would not be concerned when supposedly amangaments on Courcils. If they was a private company heads would not be concerned to the courcil or the courcil or they country to the courcil or they are a private company heads would not be concerned to the courcil or they country to the courcil or they are a private company heads would not be company to the country of the courcil or they are the courcil or they are the country of the
115 Anonymous         Anonymous           116 Anonymous         Anonymous           117 Anonymous         Anonymous           118 Melissa         Priverton           120 Anonymous         Anonymous           121 Anonymous         Anonymous           122 Anonymous         Anonymous           123 Anonymous         Mostherny	"Harmonisation" of rates across the old Gostord and Wyong council areas is an extremely unfair policy which discriminates against those of the old Gostord council area, unfairly.  Land values in Gostord are generally higher. However, the average aduction block in Gostord does not receive any more services than one in Wyong, Nor is it necessarily a household with more income - land values in the Gostord area have recently changed registry, but incomes have not necessarily followed!  The change as proposed represents a really good example of the unfairness of a single land value rate schedule once a council area becomes excessively large.  To be this, and just to help illustrate: I propose a merger of the Central Coast council with Horraby council, in order that the "harmonisation" of rates leads to a reduction of rates in the Gostord area, and a massive cross subsidy from Horraby residents. Would find that the fair or reasonable to Horraby residents?  We cart afford a rate in life in 1 the council services that the "harmonisation" of rates leads to a reduction of rates in the Gostord area, and a massive cross subsidy from Horraby residents. Would find the fair or reasonable to Horraby residents?  We cart afford as fairs in 1 the council services the propose of the council services having and the services of the council services having a council service that the "harmonisation" of rates leads to a reduction of rates in the Gostord area, and a massive cross subsidy from Horraby residents. Would be received to the services that the "harmonisation" of rates leads to a reduction of rates in the Gostord area, and a massive cross subsidy from Horraby residents. When the received have been been council to the tendent of the services that the "harmonisation" of rates leads to a reduction of rates in the Gostord area, and a massive cross subsidy from Horraby residents.  The Journal of the council to the services have been council to complete mismanagement of tards.  The accommonation of the part of the problem the part ha	As above No confidence Let's have a quantily surveyor report on there works and viability for 6 months. Us as shareholders should be obver the financials  No and No. There was no option given to state No increase on the survey. You were only given two options 10% and 15% and now they are actually increasing by 45% to "termonise" which will leave Godford owners in financial ruin because of Councils pathetic management of money.  Community need is assessed by those holding electorate seats to ensure their salary flows past the next election.	As above. No confidence!  The only need is driven from poor management no a necessity.  No and No. There was no ootion olven to state No increase on the survey. You were only given two options 10% and 15% and now they are actually.	Spaces and much not tipe to have to deal with while developers seem to have more lee way.  **Partmonisation** or have serous the eld colored and Wong council leaves in an anternety unfair policy which discriminates regimen those of the old Gouldnot council area, unfairly.  **Land values in Gosford are generally higher, However, the averages subtrain block in Gosford does not concern the service state of the Wings, Nor Is Incessity a household with more income; and the service state of the Wings, Nor Is Incessity a formation which in Gosford does not concern the service state of the Wings, Nor Is Incessity a formation.  **The change as proposed represents a really good example of the unfairness of a single land value asked schedule once a council area becomes successively thange.  **To be first, and just to help illustrate: I propose a merger of the Central Coast council with Hornaty and a service of the Wings of the Wings and the Service of the Wings and the Service of the Wings area, by the Gosford area, and a massive cross subsidy from Hornaty residents. Would that the fair or reasonable be Hornaty exidents.  **There is no moral case for a subsidiation of the Wings area, by the Gosford area, it represents a completely uniter policy. There ought to be separate rate schedules for council sub-regions and transparent justification for any intra-negional cross-subsidiation.  **Vest you guess it AS ABOVE**  **It is completely unreasonable we were find to up and until there last breath.  **It is completely unreasonable to charge exist. 5%: No were only given two options 10% and 10%, and 10%, and 10% and 10% and 10% areas and 10% an	As above  It is all a joke that needs to be investigated before moving forward and approved by newly reded council members and the public process of the p	They have not explained there incompetents so we should not have reached this point.  Documents will be doctored, hidden or destroyed if left to Council to provide. These are the same people with a spert money they ddn't have including \$200 MLLDN or wages for more middle management concerne when supposedly amalgaments place Councils. If the was private competent placed would not not concerne when supposedly amalgaments.
115 Anonymous         Anonymous           116 Anonymous         Anonymous           117 Anonymous         Anonymous           118 Melissa         Priverton           120 Anonymous         Anonymous           121 Anonymous         Anonymous           122 Anonymous         Anonymous           123 Anonymous         Mostherny	"Harmonisation" of rates across the old Gosford and Wyong council areas is an extremely unfair policy which discriminates against those of the old Gosford council area, unfairly.  Land values in Gosford area have recently changed rapidly, but incomes have not necessarily followed:  The change as proposed represents a really good example of the unfairness of a single land value rate schedule once a council area becomes excessively large.  The change as proposed represents a really good example of the unfairness of a single land value rate schedule once a council area becomes excessively large.  The change as proposed represents a really good example of the unfairness of a single land value rate schedule once a council area becomes excessively large.  The total real to be like the land land land land land land land land	As above No confidence No confidence Lof a have a quantily surveyor report on there works and viability for 6 months. Us as shareholders should be obvern the financials  No and No. Three was no option given to state No increase on the survey. You were only given two options 10% and 15% and now they are actually research by 45% to "harmonise" which will leave Gosford owners in financial run because of Councils pathetic management of money.  Community need is assessed by those holding electrorate seals to ensure their salary flows past the next electron. In essure, we are puring their re-section hands, continuation of salary funds!  In essure, we are puring their re-section hands, continuation of salary funds!	As above. No confidence!  The only need is driven from poor management no a necessity.  No and No. There was no ootion olven to state No increase on the survey. You were only given two options 10% and 15% and now they are actually.	spaces and much not tape to have to deal with while developers seem to have more lee way.  "Harmonisation" of rates across the eld Goofford and Wyong council areas is an externelly unifor profile, which discriminates against those of the old Goofford council areas, unfailed.  Land values in Goofford are generally higher, However, the averages suburban block in Goofford don of reciover any more services than one in Wyong, Nor is It necessity is household with more income: Intel values in the Goofford done and the profile of the control of the becomes excessively being as proposed represents a reality good example of the uniformess of a single land value rate schedule once a council area becomes excessively being.  To be talt, and just to help illustrate I propose a merger of the Central Coset council with Horousty Council, in order that the Tharmonisation of rate leasts to a recion of rates in the Goofford area, and a massive cross subsidy from Horneby residents. Would that be fair or reasonable to Horneby residents?  Then is no mored case for a subsidiation of the Wyong area, by the Control of cost area. I represent a completely unifore. Joining the control of the control of the council of the complete of the council of the council of the control of the council	As above  It is all a joke that needs to be investigated before moving forward and approved by newly reded council members and the public process of the p	They have not explained there incompetents so we should not have reached this point.  Documents will be doctored, hidden or destroyed if left to Council to provide. These are the same people with a spert money they ddn't have including \$200 MLLDN or wages for more middle management concerne when supposedly amalgaments place Councils. If the was private competent placed would not not concerne when supposedly amalgaments.
115 Anonymous Anonymous 116 Anonymous Anonymous 117 Anonymous Priveton 118 Melissa Priveton 120 Anonymous Anonymous 121 Anonymous Anonymous 122 Anonymous Anonymous 123 Anonymous Mosherry 124 Joseph Melissan Melissan	"Harmonisation" of rates across the old Gosbrd and Wyong council areas is an extremely unfair policy which discriminates against those of the old Gosbrd council area, unfairly.  Land values in Re-Gosbrd area personally higher. However, the average abouton block in Costord does not recieve any more services than one in Wyong, Nor is it necessarily a household with more income - land values in the Gosbrd area have recently changed repidly, but incomes have not necessarily followed!  The change as proposed represents a really good example of the unfairness of a single land value and the schedule core a council area becomes excessively large.  To be little, and just hold plantatine [propose] area may be represented to the plantatine [propose] are proposed for exemption of the plantatine [propose] area may be represented to the plantatine [propose] area massive cross subsidy from thorsely residents. Would that the fair or reasonable to the real to the control of the plantatine [propose] area massive cross subsidy from thorsely residents. Would that the fair or reasonable to the real to the control of the plantatine [propose] area to the plantation of the plantation [propose] area to the plantation of the plant	As above No confidence Lef's have a quantity surveyor report on there works and visibility for 6 morths. Us as shareholders should be given the financials.  No and No. There was no option given to state No increase on the survey. You were only given two options 10% and 15% and now they are actually increasing by 45% to "harmonise" which will leave Gosford owners in financial ruin because of Councils poshelic management of money.  Community need is assessed by those holding electoriate seals to ensure their salary flows past the next election.  In assence we are paying their re election funds, continuation of salary funds. Project spending should benefit the entire community, no more art galleries, specific interest group spending. Works to needs burget fill fist pays and should be set the entire community.	As above. No confidence!  The only need is driven from poor management no a necessity.  The only need is driven from poor management no a necessity.  No and No. There was no option given to state No increase on the survey. You were only given two options 10% and 15% and now they are actually increasing by 45% to "harmonise" which will leave Gosford owners in financial ruln because of Councils pathetic management of money.  No rate rise until Council can manage the funds provided efficiently, it's rather like throwing petrol on a fire! Just more money to burn, this is an ineffective	spaces and much not tape to have to deal with shift developers seem to have more lee way.  "Harmonisation" of rates across the old Coolford and Wyong council areas is an extremely unifor profile, which discriminates against those of the old Coolford council areas, unfainty.  Land values in Coolford are generally higher. However, the averages suburban block in Coolford don't criciove any more services than one in Wyong. Nor is it necessity in household with more income: Intel values in the Coolford area than the coolford area of the coolford area and the coolford area are always and the coolford area and the coolford area and the coolford area. The coolford area council area becomes occasively billiones or a council area becomes occasively billiones.  To be first, and just to help illustrate; I propose a merger of the Contral Coolford area, and an ansalve cross subsidy from Horraby residents. Would that be fair or reasonable to Horraby residents?  There is no mored case for a subsidiation of the Wyong area, by the Coolford area, it represents a completely uniter jointly. There capit to be separate rate schedules for council sub-regions and transparent justification for any intra-regional cross-subsidiation.  Yeah you guess it AS ABDVE  E's not reasonable were led to up and until there last breath  It is completely unreasonable to charge eafs 45%. You were only given two options 10% and 15% and now they are actually increasing by 45% to harmonism which will leave Gostord owners in financial ruin because of Councils pathetic management of money.  An increase of all lasts 15% will be destinated to many low increase earners and a council as a formed to council and the province of the council and the council of the council and the council of the council and the council and the counci	As above  It is all a joke that needs to be investigated before moving forward and approved by newly reded council members and the public process of the p	They have not explained there incompetents so we should not have reached this point.  Documents will be doctored, hidden or destroyed if left to Council to provide. These are the same people who sport money they ddirt have including \$200 MBLLON or wages for more middle management rosenese when supposedly amalgamanting two Councils. If this was a private company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$400K payout.  Rampant spending, only need based projects should be allowed, the Council is playing dress ups and
115 Anonymous Anonymous 116 Anonymous Anonymous 117 Anonymous Priveton 118 Melissa Priveton 120 Anonymous Anonymous 121 Anonymous Anonymous 122 Anonymous Anonymous 123 Anonymous Mosherry 124 Joseph Melissan Melissan	"Harmonisation" of rates across the old Gosford and Wyong council areas is an extremely unfair policy which discriminates against those of the old Gosford council area, unfairly.  Land values in Coolford are generally higher, However, the average suburban block in Gosford does not recieve any more services than one in Wyong, Nor is it necessarily a household with more income - hard values in the Gosford area here recently changed rapidly, but incomes have not receive any more services than one in Wyong, Nor is it necessarily a household with more income - hard values in the Gosford area here recently changed rapidly, but incomes have not described once a council area becomes excessively large.  The change as proposed represents a really good example of the unfaintees of a single land value rate schedule once a council area becomes excessively large.  The bits and got a large bit passed in the passed of the passed	As above No confidence Lef's have a quantity surveyor report on there works and visibility for 6 morths. Us as shareholders should be given the financials.  No and No. There was no option given to state No increase on the survey. You were only given two options 10% and 15% and now they are actually increasing by 45% to "harmonise" which will leave Gosford owners in financial ruin because of Councils poshelic management of money.  Community need is assessed by those holding electoriate seals to ensure their salary flows past the next election.  In assence we are paying their re election funds, continuation of salary funds. Project spending should benefit the entire community, no more art galleries, specific interest group spending. Works to needs burget fill fist pays and should be set the entire community.	As above No confidence!  The only need is driven from poor management no a necessity  No and No. There was no option given to state No increase on the survey. You were only given two options 10% and 15% and now they are actually increasing by 45% to "harmonise" which will leave Goldord owners in financial ruin because of Councils pathetic management of money.	Spaces and much not tipe to have to deal with while developers seem to have more lee way.  **Permonisation** or riskes serous the disconfar and Wyong council seems is an enterently unifor policy which discriminates against those of the old Gosford council area, unfairly.  **Land values in Gosford are generally higher. However, the averages subtrains block in Gosford does not create a service than one in Wyong, Nor is Increasity a household with more independent of the work of the council area becomes the Gosford deal than the creating sharped rigidity, but income have not accessarily 500well.  **The change as proposed represents a really good example of the unfairness of a single land value are schedule once a council area becomes excessively thange.  **To be tire, and just to help illustrate: I propose a merger of the Central Coast council with Horrary and a season of the Wyong area, by the Gosford area, and a massive cross subsidy from Horrarby residents. Would that to fair or reasonable to Hornarby residents. Would that to fair or reasonable to Hornarby residents area of the Wyong area, by the Gosford area, it represents a completely united policy. There ought to be expanded reas schedules for council sub-regions and transparent justification for any intra-regional cross-subsidiatation.  **Vest you guess it AS ABOVE** It is a simply roof reasonable we were lied to up and until there last breath  **It is a completely unreasonable to charge extra 45%. You were only given two options 10% and 10% and now they are actually increasing by 45% to harmonist which will leave Gosford owners in francial ruin because of causals increasing by 45% to harmonist which will leave Gosford owners in francial ruin because of councils pathetic management of money.  **An increason of at least 15% will be detrimented to many low income earmers  **It is a simply roof reasonable we were lied to up and until there last breath.  **An increason of at least 15% will be detrimented to many low income earmers  **It is a simply roof reasona	As above  It is all a joke that needs to be investigated before moving forward and approved by newly reded council members and the public process of the p	They have not explained there incompetents so we should not have reached this point.  Documents will be disclored. Midden or discloped if this b. Council by provide. There are the same people who spert more predicted in the including 200 MILLION wags for strone middle imanigement, nonsense when supposedly amalgamating two Councils. If this was a private company heads would not not segiven a nearly \$400X payout.
115 Anonymous Anonymous 116 Anonymous Anonymous 117 Anonymous Priveton 118 Melissa Priveton 120 Anonymous Anonymous 121 Anonymous Anonymous 122 Anonymous Anonymous 123 Anonymous Mosherry 124 Joseph Melissan Melissan	"Harmonisation" of rates across the old Gostord and Wyong council areas is an extremely unfair picicy which discriminates against those of the old Gostord council area, unfairly.  Land values in Gostord are generally higher. However, the average suburban block in Gostord does not recieve any more services than one in Wyong, Nor is it necessarily a household with more income - land values in the Gostord area have recently changed repidity, but incomes have not necessarily followed:  The change as proposed represents a really good example of the unfairness of a single land value rate schedule once a council area becomes excessively large.  The bettine and just the liberation of the liberat	As above No confidence Lef's have a quantity surveyor report on there works and visibility for 6 morths. Us as shareholders should be given the financials.  No and No. There was no option given to state No increase on the survey. You were only given two options 10% and 15% and now they are actually increasing by 45% to "harmonise" which will leave Gosford owners in financial ruin because of Councils poshelic management of money.  Community need is assessed by those holding electoriate seals to ensure their salary flows past the next election.  In assence we are paying their re election funds, continuation of salary funds. Project spending should benefit the entire community, no more art galleries, specific interest group spending. Works to needs burget fill fist pays and should be set the entire community.	As above. No confidence!  The only need is driven from poor management no a necessity.  The only need is driven from poor management no a necessity.  No and No. There was no option given to state No increase on the survey. You were only given two options 10% and 15% and now they are actually increasing by 45% to "harmonise" which will leave Gosford owners in financial ruln because of Councils pathetic management of money.  No rate rise until Council can manage the funds provided efficiently, it's rather like throwing petrol on a fire! Just more money to burn, this is an ineffective	spaces and much not tape to have to deal with shift developers seem to have more lee way.  "Harmonisation" of rates across the old Coolford and Wyong council areas is an extremely unifor profile, which discriminates against those of the old Coolford council areas, unfainty.  Land values in Coolford are generally higher. However, the averages suburban block in Coolford don't criciove any more services than one in Wyong. Nor is it necessity in household with more income: Intel values in the Coolford area than the coolford area of the coolford area and the coolford area are always and the coolford area and the coolford area and the coolford area. The coolford area council area becomes occasively billiones or a council area becomes occasively billiones.  To be first, and just to help illustrate; I propose a merger of the Contral Coolford area, and an ansalve cross subsidy from Horraby residents. Would that be fair or reasonable to Horraby residents?  There is no mored case for a subsidiation of the Wyong area, by the Coolford area, it represents a completely uniter jointly. There capit to be separate rate schedules for council sub-regions and transparent justification for any intra-regional cross-subsidiation.  Yeah you guess it AS ABDVE  E's not reasonable were led to up and until there last breath  It is completely unreasonable to charge eafs 45%. You were only given two options 10% and 15% and now they are actually increasing by 45% to harmonism which will leave Gostord owners in financial ruin because of Councils pathetic management of money.  An increase of all lasts 15% will be destinated to many low increase earners and a council as a formed to council and the province of the council and the council of the council and the council of the council and the council and the counci	As above  It is all a joke that needs to be investigated before moving forward and approved by newly reded council members and the public process of the p	They have not explained there incompetents so we should not have reached this point.  Documents will be doctored, hidden or destroyed if left to Council to provide. These are the same people who sport money they ddirt have including \$200 MBLLON or wages for more middle management rosenese when supposedly amalgamanting two Councils. If this was a private company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$400K payout.  Rampant spending, only need based projects should be allowed, the Council is playing dress ups and
115 Anonymous Anonymous  116 Anonymous Anonymous  117 Anonymous Anonymous  118 Anonymous Anonymous  120 Anonymous Anonymous  122 Anonymous Anonymous  123 Anonymous Anonymous  124 Assert March March  125 Anonymous Anonymous  126 Anonymous Anonymous  127 Anonymous Anonymous  128 Anonymous Anonymous  129 Anonymous Anonymous  120 Anonymous Anonymous  120 Anonymous Anonymous  120 Anonymous Anonymous  121 Anonymous Anonymous  122 Anonymous Anonymous	"Harmonisation" of rates across the old Gosford and Wyong council areas is an extremely unfair policy which discriminates against those of the old Gosford council area, unfairly.  Land values in Coolford are generally higher, However, the average suburban block in Gosford does not recieve any more services than one in Wyong, Nor is it necessarily a household with more income - hard values in the Gosford area here recently changed rapidly, but incomes have not receive any more services than one in Wyong, Nor is it necessarily a household with more income - hard values in the Gosford area here recently changed rapidly, but incomes have not described once a council area becomes excessively large.  The change as proposed represents a really good example of the unfaintees of a single land value rate schedule once a council area becomes excessively large.  The bits and got a large bit passed in the passed of the passed	As above No confidence Lef's have a quantity surveyor report on there works and visibility for 6 morths. Us as shareholders should be given the financials.  No and No. There was no option given to state No increase on the survey. You were only given two options 10% and 15% and now they are actually increasing by 45% to "harmonise" which will leave Gosford owners in financial ruin because of Councils poshelic management of money.  Community need is assessed by those holding electoriate seals to ensure their salary flows past the next election.  In assence we are paying their re election funds, continuation of salary funds. Project spending should benefit the entire community, no more art galleries, specific interest group spending. Works to needs burget fill fist pays and should be set the entire community.	As above. No confidence!  The only need is driven from poor management no a necessity.  The only need is driven from poor management no a necessity.  No and No. There was no option given to state No increase on the survey. You were only given two options 10% and 15% and now they are actually increasing by 45% to "harmonise" which will leave Gosford owners in financial ruln because of Councils pathetic management of money.  No rate rise until Council can manage the funds provided efficiently, it's rather like throwing petrol on a fire! Just more money to burn, this is an ineffective	spaces and much not tape to have to deal with shift developers seem to have more lee way.  "Harmonisation" of rates across the old Coolford and Wyong council areas is an extremely unifor profile, which discriminates against those of the old Coolford council areas, unfainty.  Land values in Coolford are generally higher. However, the averages suburban block in Coolford don't criciove any more services than one in Wyong. Nor is it necessity in household with more income: Intel values in the Coolford area than the coolford area of the coolford area and the coolford area are always and the coolford area and the coolford area and the coolford area. The coolford area council area becomes occasively billiones or a council area becomes occasively billiones.  To be first, and just to help illustrate; I propose a merger of the Contral Coolford area, and an ansalve cross subsidy from Horraby residents. Would that be fair or reasonable to Horraby residents?  There is no mored case for a subsidiation of the Wyong area, by the Coolford area, it represents a completely uniter jointly. There capit to be separate rate schedules for council sub-regions and transparent justification for any intra-regional cross-subsidiation.  Yeah you guess it AS ABDVE  E's not reasonable were led to up and until there last breath  It is completely unreasonable to charge eafs 45%. You were only given two options 10% and 15% and now they are actually increasing by 45% to harmonism which will leave Gostord owners in financial ruin because of Councils pathetic management of money.  An increase of all lasts 15% will be destinated to many low increase earners and a council as a formed to council and the province of the council and the council of the council and the council of the council and the council and the counci	As above  It is all a joke that needs to be investigated before moving forward and approved by newly reded council members and the public process of the p	They have not explained there incompetents so we should not have reached this point.  Documents will be doctored, hidden or destroyed if left to Council to provide. These are the same people who sport money they didn't have including \$200 MILLON or wages for more middle management rosenese when supposedly amalgamanting two Councils. If this was a private company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$400K payout.  Rampant spending, only need based projects should be allowed, the Council is playing dress ups and
115 Anonymous Anonymous  116 Anonymous Anonymous  117 Anonymous Anonymous  118 Anonymous Anonymous  120 Anonymous Anonymous  122 Anonymous Anonymous  123 Anonymous Anonymous  124 Assert March March  125 Anonymous Anonymous  126 Anonymous Anonymous  127 Anonymous Anonymous  128 Anonymous Anonymous  129 Anonymous Anonymous  120 Anonymous Anonymous  120 Anonymous Anonymous  120 Anonymous Anonymous  121 Anonymous Anonymous  122 Anonymous Anonymous	"Harmorisation" of rates across the old Gosbord and Wyong council areas is an extremely unfair policy which discriminates against those of the old Gosbord council area, unfairly.  Land values in Gosford are generally higher. However, the average aduction block in Gosford does not receive any more services than one in Wyong, Nor is it necessarily a household with more income - land values in the Gosford area have receivily changed rapidly, but incomes have not necessarily billowed!  The change as proposed represents a really good example of the unfaintess of a single land value rate schedule once a council area becomes excessively large.  The observable of the land of the propose an energer of the Central Coast council with Horraby council, in order that the "harmonisation" of rates leads to a reduction of rates in the Gosford area, and a massive cross subsky from Horraby residents. Would have been for reasonable to Horraby residents?  We contributed in a first life the council responsibly & arrangent wasted massive amounts of money.  We don't want that soo keep happening!  Next offer the council should be accounted and the very subsky and the part of the second should be an accounted worker to change!  The incomediated bad accounted and in the work of the part of the pa	As above No confidence Lef's have a quantity surveyor report on there works and visibility for 6 morths. Us as shareholders should be given the financials.  No and No. There was no option given to state No increase on the survey. You were only given two options 10% and 15% and now they are actually increasing by 45% to "harmonise" which will leave Gosford owners in financial ruin because of Councils poshelic management of money.  Community need is assessed by those holding electoriate seals to ensure their salary flows past the next election.  In assence we are paying their re election funds, continuation of salary funds. Project spending should benefit the entire community, no more art galleries, specific interest group spending. Works to needs burget fill fist pays and should be set the entire community.	As above. No confidence!  The only need is driven from poor management no a necessity.  The only need is driven from poor management no a necessity.  No and No. There was no option given to state No increase on the survey. You were only given two options 10% and 15% and now they are actually increasing by 45% to "harmonise" which will leave Gosford owners in financial ruln because of Councils pathetic management of money.  No rate rise until Council can manage the funds provided efficiently, it's rather like throwing petrol on a fire! Just more money to burn, this is an ineffective	spaces and much not tape to have to deal with shift developers seem to have more lee way.  "Harmonisation" of rates across the old Coolford and Wyong council areas is an extremely unifor profile, which discriminates against those of the old Coolford council areas, unfainty.  Land values in Coolford are generally higher. However, the averages suburban block in Coolford don't criciove any more services than one in Wyong. Nor is it necessity in household with more income: Intel values in the Coolford area than the coolford area of the coolford area and the coolford area are always and the coolford area and the coolford area and the coolford area. The coolford area council area becomes occasively billiones or a council area becomes occasively billiones.  To be first, and just to help illustrate; I propose a merger of the Contral Coolford area, and an ansalve cross subsidy from Horraby residents. Would that be fair or reasonable to Horraby residents?  There is no mored case for a subsidiation of the Wyong area, by the Coolford area, it represents a completely uniter jointly. There capit to be separate rate schedules for council sub-regions and transparent justification for any intra-regional cross-subsidiation.  Yeah you guess it AS ABDVE  E's not reasonable were led to up and until there last breath  It is completely unreasonable to charge eafs 45%. You were only given two options 10% and 15% and now they are actually increasing by 45% to harmonism which will leave Gostord owners in financial ruin because of Councils pathetic management of money.  An increase of all lasts 15% will be destinated to many low increase earners and a council as a formed to council and the province of the council and the council of the council and the council of the council and the council and the counci	As above  It is all a joke that needs to be investigated before moving forward and approved by newly reded council members and the public process of the p	They have not explained there incompetents so we should not have reached this point.  Documents will be doctored, hidden or destroyed if left to Council to provide. These are the same people who sport money they didn't have including \$200 MLLDN on wages for more middle management rosenese when supposedly amaginamating two Councils. If this was a private company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$400K payout.  Rampant spending, only need based projects should be allowed, the Council is playing dress ups and
115 Anonymous Anonymous 116 Anonymous Anonymous 117 Anonymous Anonymous 120 Anonymous Anonymous 121 Anonymous Anonymous 122 Anonymous Anonymous 123 Anonymous Anonymous 124 Joanne McSterry 125 Anonymous Anonymous 126 Anonymous Anonymous 127 Anonymous Anonymous 128 Anonymous Anonymous 129 Anonymous Anonymous 120 Anonymous Anonymous 120 Anonymous Anonymous 120 Anonymous Anonymous	"Harmorisation" of rates across the old Gosbord and Wyong council areas is an extremely unfair pilicy which discriminates against those of the old Gosbord council area, unfairly.  Land values in Gosford are generally higher. However, the average suburban block in Gosford does not receive any more services than one in Wyong, Nor is it recessarily a household with more income - land values in the Gosford area have recently changed rapidly, but incomes have not necessarily billowed!  The change as proposed represents a really good example of the unfairness of a single land value rate schedule once a council area becomes excessively large.  The change as proposed represents a really good example of the unfairness of a single land value rate schedule once a council area becomes excessively large.  Level and forci a rate in 1 the council propose a merger of the Certail Coast council with Horrarby council, in order that the "harmonisation" of rates leads to a reduction of rates in the Gosford area, and a massive cross subskyl from Horrarby residents. Would find that be fair or reasonable to Horrarby residents?  We can't afford in a fair is 1 The council should be real The Council should be the service of the council work in the street of the council work in the street of the council work in the service of the council work in the street of the council work in the street of the council work in the service of the council work in the service of the council work in the street of the stre	As above No confidence Lef's have a quantity surveyor report on there works and visibility for 6 morths. Us as shareholders should be given the financials.  No and No. There was no option given to state No increase on the survey. You were only given two options 10% and 15% and now they are actually increasing by 45% to "harmonise" which will leave Gosford owners in financial ruin because of Councils poshelic management of money.  Community need is assessed by those holding electoriate seals to ensure their salary flows past the next election.  In assence we are paying their re election funds, continuation of salary funds. Project spending should benefit the entire community, no more art galleries, specific interest group spending. Works to needs burget fill fist pays and should be set the entire community.	As above  No confidenced  The only need is driven from poor management no a necessity  No and No. There was no option given to state No increase on the survey. You were only given two options 10% and 15% and now they are actually increasing by 45% to "harmonise" which will leave Goldord owners in financial ruin because of Councils pathetic management of money.  No rate rise until Council can manage the funds provided efficiently, it's rather like throwing petrol on a fire! Just more money to burn, this is an ineffective band aide not a first.  Council have not told the residents of the true increases, until February 25 and hastily produced a calculator. They have been lying for months and in the late.	spaces and much not tape to have to deal with, while developers seem to have more lee way.  Harmonisation of crisise across the edd Coolford and Wyong council areas is an extremely unifor policy which discriminates against those of the old Coolford council areas. Uniform the council areas to the control of the council areas to control of the council area to control of the council areas to control of the top council, in order that the "amonisation" of the electron of the council areas to council, are the council areas to council, and the council of the top council, and the the "amonisation" of these less the order of the council areas to council, and the council areas to council areas to consider the council areas to council, and the council areas to complete the council areas to consider a council areas to council, and the the "amonisation" of these less to a reduction of rises in the Good council of the theory of the council areas to	As above  It is all a joke that needs to be investigated before moving forward and approved by newly reded council members and the public process of the p	They have not explained there incompetents so we should not have reached this point.  Documents will be doctored, hidden or destroyed if left to Council to provide. These are the same people who sport money they ddirt have including \$200 MBLLON or wages for more middle management rosenese when supposedly amalgamanting two Councils. If this was a private company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$400K payout.  Rampant spending, only need based projects should be allowed, the Council is playing dress ups and
115 Anonymous Anonymous 116 Anonymous Anonymous 117 Anonymous Anonymous 120 Anonymous Anonymous 121 Anonymous Anonymous 122 Anonymous Anonymous 123 Anonymous Anonymous 124 Joanne McSterry 125 Anonymous Anonymous 126 Anonymous Anonymous 127 Anonymous Anonymous 128 Anonymous Anonymous 129 Anonymous Anonymous 120 Anonymous Anonymous 120 Anonymous Anonymous 120 Anonymous Anonymous	"Harmonisation" of rates across the old Gosford and Wyong council areas is an extremely unfair policy which discriminates against those of the old Gosford council area, unfairly.  Land values in Gosford area perceiply higher, However, the average suburban blook in Gosford does not receive any more services than one in Wyong, Nor is it necessarily a household with more income - land values in the Gosford area have recently changed rapidly, bul incomes have not necessarily followed:  The change as proposed represents a really good example of the unfairness of a single land value rate schedule once a council area becomes excessively large.  To be title, and just help literate it proposed a regressive of the Control Coale council with Herraby council, in order that the "harmonisation" of rates leads to a reduction of rates in the Gosford area, and a massaive cross subsidy from Hornaby residents. Would that be fair or reasonable to hornaby residents?  We carn't afford a rate in life to the properties of the expense of the control of the expense of the expense of the control of the expense	As above  No confliction as quantity surveyor report on there works and viability for 6 morths. Us as shareholders should be above the financials  No and No. There was no option given to state No increase on the survey. You were only given two options 10% and 15% and now they are actually price and polytomic processing by 45% to "harmonise" which will leave Gosford owners in financial ruin because of Councils published management of money.  Community need is assessed by those holding electrorise seats to ensure their salary flows past the next electron. We see any polytog their re-dection funds, continuation of salary funds?  Fine of the providing should benefit the entire community, no more art galleries, specific interest group spending, only projects that promote community slaps of well be length of the providing should benefit the entire community, no more art galleries, specific interest group spending, only projects that promote community slaps and well being.  Work to a needs budget full stop and adhere by all Or toney pory lick, should work along the lines of private enterprise, as good as your list budget achievement or the drove.	As above No confidence!  The only need is driven from poor management no a necessity  No and No. There was no option given to state No increase on the survey. You were only given two options 10% and 15% and now they are actually increasing by 45% to "harmonise" which will leave Gosford owners in financial ruin because of Councils pathetic management of money.  No rate rise until Council can manage the funds provided efficiently, it's rather like throwing petrol on a fire! Just more money to burn, this is an ineffective band aske not a fact!  Council have not lold the residents of the true increases, until February 26 and heality produced a calculator. They have been lying for months and in the late feet dispa we get the truth.	spaces and much not tape to have to deal with, while developers seem to have more lee way.  Harmonisation of crisise across the edd Coolford and Wyong council areas is an extremely unifor policy which discriminates against those of the old Coolford council areas. Uniform the council areas to the control of the council areas to control of the council area to control of the council areas to control of the top council, in order that the "amonisation" of the electron of the council areas to council, are the council areas to council, and the council of the top council, and the the "amonisation" of these less the order of the council areas to council, and the council areas to council areas to consider the council areas to council, and the council areas to complete the council areas to consider a council areas to council, and the the "amonisation" of these less to a reduction of rises in the Good council of the theory of the council areas to	As above  It is all a joke that needs to be investigated before moving forward and approved by newly reded council members and the public process of the p	They have not explained there incompetents so we should not have reached this point.  Documents will be doctored, hidden or destroyed if left to Council to provide. These are the same people who sport money they ddirt have including \$200 MBLLON or wages for more middle management rosenese when supposedly amalgamanting two Councils. If this was a private company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$400K payout.  Rampant spending, only need based projects should be allowed, the Council is playing dress ups and
115 Anonymous Anonymous 116 Anonymous Anonymous 117 Anonymous Anonymous 120 Anonymous Anonymous 121 Anonymous Anonymous 122 Anonymous Anonymous 123 Anonymous Anonymous 124 Joanne McSterry 125 Anonymous Anonymous 126 Anonymous Anonymous 127 Anonymous Anonymous 128 Anonymous Anonymous 129 Anonymous Anonymous 120 Anonymous Anonymous 120 Anonymous Anonymous 120 Anonymous Anonymous	"Harmonisation" of rates across the old Gosbrd and Wyong council areas is an extremely unfair policy which discriminates against those of the old Gosbrd council area, unfairly,  Land values in Gosbrd area peneally higher. However, the average about an Block in Gosbrd does not recieve any more services than one in Wyong, Nor is it necessarily a household with more income - land values in the Gosbrd area have recently changed rapidly; but incomes have not necessarily followed!  The change as proposed represents a really good example of the unfairness of a single land value and the schedule core a council area becomes excessively large.  To be little, and just hold plantative Importation Card council all Harmady council, in order that the "namonisation" of rates leseds to a reduction of rates in the Gosbrd area, and a measure cross subsidy from thorsely residents. Would that the fair or reasonable to Hornady residents?  We can't afford a rate into The council representably & arrogantly wasted massive emounts of money.  Councils need to operate with in these means!  We don't want the too been papeering!  The council should be accountable and There no confidence in them!!  The council should be accountable and There no confidence in them!!  The council should be accountable and There no confidence in them!!  The council should be accountable and There no confidence in them!!  The council should be accountable and There no confidence in them!!  The council should be accountable and There no confidence in them!!  The council should be accountable and There no confidence in them!!  The council should be accountable and There no confidence in them!!  The council should be accountable and There no confidence in them!!  The council should be accountable and There no confidence in them!!  The council should be accountable and There no confidence in them!!  The council should be accountable and There no counting complete insaminagement of funds.  The council is a joke why should we larry the problem to counting complete ins	As above  No confliction as quantity surveyor report on there works and viability for 6 morths. Us as shareholders should be above the financials  No and No. There was no option given to state No increase on the survey. You were only given two options 10% and 15% and now they are actually price and polytomic processing by 45% to "harmonise" which will leave Gosford owners in financial ruin because of Councils published management of money.  Community need is assessed by those holding electrorise seats to ensure their salary flows past the next electron. We see any polytog their re-dection funds, continuation of salary funds?  Fine of the providing should benefit the entire community, no more art galleries, specific interest group spending, only projects that promote community slaps of well be length of the providing should benefit the entire community, no more art galleries, specific interest group spending, only projects that promote community slaps and well being.  Work to a needs budget full stop and adhere by all Or toney pory lick, should work along the lines of private enterprise, as good as your list budget achievement or the drove.	As above  No confidenced  The only need is driven from poor management no a necessity  No and No. There was no option given to state No increase on the survey. You were only given two options 10% and 15% and now they are actually increasing by 45% to "harmonise" which will leave Goldord owners in financial ruin because of Councils pathetic management of money.  No rate rise until Council can manage the funds provided efficiently, it's rather like throwing petrol on a fire! Just more money to burn, this is an ineffective band aide not a first.  Council have not told the residents of the true increases, until February 25 and hastily produced a calculator. They have been lying for months and in the late.	spaces and much not tape to have to deal with, while developers seem to have more lee way.  **Harmonisation** of rates across the edd Goofford and Wyong council areas is an extremely unifor profice; which discriminates against these of the old Goofford council areas, unifolds.  Land values in Goofford are generally higher, However, the averages suburban block in Goofford don't criciover any more services than one in Wyong, Nor Is it necessarily a household with more income: land values in the Goofford done are suburban to the control of the bocomes consisting the control of the bocomes consisting the control of the bocomes consisting the control of the contr	As above  It is all a joke that needs to be investigated before moving forward and approved by newly voted council members and the public.  Occurrent will be doctored, lidden or destroyed if this Council to provide. These are the same people who spert money by didn't have including 3000 MLLION or wages for more middle management nonsense when supposedly amalgamating two Councils. If his was a private company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$400X payout.	They have not explained theire incompetents so we should not have reached this point.  Documents will be doctored, hidden or destroyed If left to Council to provide. These are the same people who spent money they didn't have including \$200 MLLON or wages for more middle management onceines when supposedly amalgamenting two Councils. If this was a private company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$400K payout.  Rampart spending, only need based projects should be allowed, the Council is playing dress ups and house with revenues research.  There are no productively improvements, its all motherhoods. Millions (around \$17 million) wasted on
115 Anonymous Anonymous 116 Anonymous Anonymous 117 Anonymous Anonymous 120 Anonymous Anonymous 121 Anonymous Anonymous 122 Anonymous Anonymous 123 Anonymous Anonymous 124 Joanne McSterry 125 Anonymous Anonymous 126 Anonymous Anonymous 127 Anonymous Anonymous 128 Anonymous Anonymous 129 Anonymous Anonymous 120 Anonymous Anonymous 120 Anonymous Anonymous 120 Anonymous Anonymous	"Harmorisation" of rates across the old Gosbrd and Wyong council areas is an extremely unfair policy which discriminates against those of the old Gosbrd council area, unfairly.  Land values in Cosbrd are generally higher. However, the average suburban block in Gosbrd does not recieve any more services than one in Wyong, Nor is it necessarily a household with more income - land values in the Gosbrd area have recently changed rapidly, but incomes have not in the control of the property of th	As above  No confidence  Let's have a quantity surveyor report on there works and visibility for 6 morths. Us as shareholders should be given the financials  No and No. There was no option given to state No increase on the survey. You were only given two options 10% and 15% and now they are actually increasing by 45% to Tharmoniser which will leave Gasford owners in Grancial ruth because of Councils pathode menagement of money.  Community need is assessed by those holding electorate seals to ensure their salary flows past the next election. Increase on the survey of the pathod of the seal of the pathod of the pat	As above  No confidenced  The only need is driven from poor management no a necessity  No and No. There was no option given to state No increases on the survey. You were only given two options 10% and 15% and now they are actually increasing by 45% to "harmonise" which will leave Goldord owners in financial rule because of Councils pathetic management of money.  No rate rise until Council can manage the funds provided efficiently, it's rather like throwing petrol on a fire! Just more money to burn, this is an ineffective band aside not a fiel!  Council have not told the residents of the true increases, until February 26 and hastily produced a calculator. They have been lying for months and in the late flew days we get the truth.  PART should not approve any increase. Council should sell assets and call in the Potice fraud squad.	Spaces and much not tipe to have to deal with while developers seem to have more lee way.  **Permovisation** or rivase sorces the disconfar and Wyono council leaves in an antimenty unifor policy which discriminates against those of the old Godford council area, unfairly.  **Land values in Godford are generally higher, However, the averages subtrain block in Godford conficiency any more services than one in Wyong, Nor Is Increasity a household with more income: a hard values in the Godford deep with the property of the confidence	As above  It is all a joke that needs to be investigated before moving forward and approved by newly reded council members and the public process of the p	They have not explained theire incompetents so we should not have reached this point.  Documents will be doctored, hidden or destroyed If left to Council to provide. These are the same people who spent money they didn't have including \$200 MLLON or wages for more middle management nonceres when supposedly amalgamating two Councils. If this was a private company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$400K payout.  Rampart spending, only need based projects should be allowed, the Council is playing dress ups and house with revenues reseed.  There are no productively improvements, its all motherhoods. Millions (around \$17 million) wasted on
115 Anonymous Anonymous 116 Anonymous Anonymous 117 Anonymous Anonymous 120 Anonymous Anonymous 121 Anonymous Anonymous 122 Anonymous Anonymous 123 Anonymous Anonymous 124 Joanne McSterry 125 Anonymous Anonymous 126 Anonymous Anonymous 127 Anonymous Anonymous 128 Anonymous Anonymous 129 Anonymous Anonymous 120 Anonymous Anonymous 120 Anonymous Anonymous 120 Anonymous Anonymous	"Harmonisation" of rates across the did Gosford and Wyong council areas is an externelly unfair policy which discriminates against those of the old Gosford council area, unfairly.  Land values in the Gosford area penerally higher. However, the average substant block in Gosford does not receive any more services than one in Wyong. Nor is it recessarily a household with more income - land values in the Gosford area have receively paraget (applic), but incomes have not necessarily billowed!  The change as proposed represents a ready good example of the unfairness of a single land value rate schedule once a council area becomes excessively large.  To be title, and just the light income the control of the council area in the Gosford area, and a massive cross subdity from Horney presidents. Would that be fair or resonable to Horney residents?  We can't afford an fair the 11 he council responsible. Would that be fair or resonable to Horney residents?  We can't afford an fair the 11 he council responsible. Would that the fair or resonable to Horney residents?  Councils need to change it an experiment of the council responsible and the president massive amounts of money.  Councils need to change it is a council work as harding ground not working!  The council ahould be accountable and in New recommended to the present of the councils and the councils will be the recommended to the present of the council and the councils will be the recommended to the councils and the late of change is a sea or council works and the late of change is a sea or council works and the late of change is a sea or council works and the late of change is a sea or council works and the late of change is a sea or council works and the late of change is a sea or council works and the late of change is a sea or council works and the late of change is a sea or council works and the late of change is a sea or council works and the late of change is a sea or council works and the late of change is a sea or council works and the late of the late of the	As above No confidence  Lof a have a quantity surveyor report on there works and viability for 6 months. Us as shareholders should be obver the financials  10% and No. There was no option given to state No increase on the survey. You were only given two options 10% and 15% and now they are actually received by 45% to "harmonise" which will leave Gosford owners in financial run because of Councils pathetic management of money.  Community need is assessed by those holding electrorials seals to ensure their salary flows past the next electron. In essence was priving their re-section funds, continuation of salary funds! In essence was priving their re-section funds, continuation of salary funds! In essence was priving their re-section funds, continuation of salary funds! In essence was priving their re-section funds, continuation of salary funds! In essence was priving their re-section funds, continuation of salary funds! In essence and priving their re-section funds, continuation of salary funds! In essence and priving their re-section funds, continuation of salary funds! In essence and priving their re-section funds, continuation of salary funds! In essence and priving their re-section funds, continuation of salary funds! In essence and priving their re-section funds, continuation of salary funds! In essence and priving their re-section funds. In essence and public salary and well being. Work to a need budget full stop and adhere is all Or toose proving by, should work storing the lines of private enterprise, as good as your list budget achievement or be door.  No, The documents were a lie, they laked about 10% and 15% increases, when the real numbers are 28% and over 45%. The harmonisation task is ronsense. We already have higher rates than parts of Sydney and section funds.  No, The documents were a lie, they laked about 10% and 15% increases, when the real numbers are 28% and over 45%. The harmonisation task is ronsense. We already have higher rates than parts of Sydney and section funds.	As above No confidence!  The only need is driven from poor management no a necessity  No and No. There was no option given to state No increase on the survey. You were only given two options 10% and 15% and now they are actually increasing by 45% to "harmonise" which will leave Gosford owners in financial ruin because of Councils pathetic management of money.  No rate rise until Council can manage the funds provided efficiently, it's rather like throwing petrol on a fire! Just more money to burn, this is an ineffective band aske not a fact!  Council have not lold the residents of the true increases, until February 26 and heality produced a calculator. They have been lying for months and in the late feet dispa we get the truth.	Spaces and much not tape to have to deal with, while developers seem to have more lee way.  **Harmonisation** or have some the did Goodford and Winocouchil leaves in an antimenty unfair policy which discriminates against those of the old Goodford council areas, unfairly.  **Land values in Goodford are generally higher, However, the averages suburban block in Goodford door recivers any more services than one in Winopo, Nor Is Increasity a household with more income; and the services are services than one in Winopo, Nor Is Increasity a household with more income; and the services are services than one of Winopo, Nor Is Increasity a household with more income; and the services are services than one of the content of the	As above  It is all a joke that needs to be investigated before moving forward and approved by newly vided coarcil mentions and the public  Documents will be doctored, hidden or destroyed if left to Council to provide. These are the same people who spert money led with have included yarmalgamating two Councils. If his was a private company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$4000 April 200 MELLON or provide.  This was a private company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$4000 April 200 MELLON or provide company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$4000 April 200 MELLON or provide company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$4000 April 200 MELLON or provide company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$4000 April 200 MELLON or provide company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$4000 April 200 MELLON or provide company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$4000 April 200 MELLON or provided to the provided roll not be given and	They have not explained there incompetents so we should not have reached this point.  Documents will be doctored, hidden or destroyed if left to Council to provide. These are the same people who spent money they don't have including \$200 MLLDN or wages for more middle management consense where supposedly analogamenting the Councils. If this was a private company heads would roll not be given a readily \$4000 payout.  It ampaint spending, only need based projects should be allowed, the Council is playing dress ups and touse with revenues raised.  There are no productively improvements, its all motherhoods. Millions (around \$17 million) wasted on solidely warming programs, nothing to 16 with Central Coset Council.
115 Anonymous Anonymous 116 Anonymous Anonymous 117 Anonymous Anonymous 120 Anonymous Anonymous 121 Anonymous Anonymous 122 Anonymous Anonymous 123 Anonymous Anonymous 124 Joanne McSterry 125 Anonymous Anonymous 126 Anonymous Anonymous 127 Anonymous Anonymous 128 Anonymous Anonymous 129 Anonymous Anonymous 120 Anonymous Anonymous 120 Anonymous Anonymous 120 Anonymous Anonymous	"Hamorisation" of rakes across the old Goodord and Wyong council areas is an extremely unfair policy which discriminates against those of the old Goodord council area, unfairly.  Land values in Goodord are generally higher. However, the average substant block in Goodord does not receive any more services than one in Wyong, Nor is it necessarily a household with more income - land values in the Goodord area have receively planned rapped paged, but incomes have not necessarily blowed?  To be title, and just to help illustrate: I propose a merger of the Contract Coast council with Hornely council, no note that the "hamorisation" of rates is eads to a reduction of rates in the Goodord area, and a massive cross subsky from Hornely presidents. Would that to fair or resourcible is be thronely residents.  To be title, and just to help illustrate: I propose a merger of the Contract Coast council with Hornely council, no note that the "hamorisation" of rates is eads to a reduction of rates in the Goodord area, and a massive cross subsky from Hornely presidents. Would that to fair or resourcible is bitmathy residents.  We don't want this too keep happening!  We don't want this too keep happening!  The commod house is council workers bringing around not working!  The commod house is a council workers bringing around not working!  The council sould be consocrated as and it has a large a council workers bringing around not working!  The council sould be accouncilled with the more properation of the sould be an accouncil workers bringing around not working!  We should not have be pay the price for our councils complete mismanagement of funds.  The council sould be accouncilled and these no condidence in them?!  We should not have be pay the price for for an owner of the propening in the prope	As above  No confidence  Let's have a quantity surveyor report on there works and viability for 6 morths. Us as shareholders should be given the financials  Let's have a quantity surveyor report on there works and viability for 6 morths. Us as shareholders should be given the financials  No. and 15% on the May are statisty increases on the survey. You were city given two copions  No. and 15% on the May are statisty increases by 45% to Permonser-Which will leave Godford owners in  Enancial run because of Councils pathetic management of money.  Community need is assessed by those holding electorate seats to ensure their salary flows past the next election.  In essence we are paying their re election funds, continuation of salary funds!  Project spending suido benefit the entire community, no more attalleries, specific interest group spending, only projects that promote community salety and well being.  Or foliose you job, should work storing the lines of private enterprise, as good as your last budget achievement or the door.  No. The documents were a lie, they talked about 10% and 15% increases, when the real numbers are 28% and over 45%. The harmonisation talk is nonement. We already have higher rates than parts of Sydney and over 45%. The harmonisation talk is nonement. We already have higher rates than parts of Sydney and over 45%. The harmonisation talk is nonement. We already have higher rates than parts of Sydney and over 45%. The harmonisation talk is nonement. We already have higher rates than parts of Sydney and over 45%. The harmonisation talk is nonement. We already have higher rates than parts of Sydney and over 45%. The harmonisation talk is nonement.	As above  No configurated:  The only need is driven from poor management no a necessity.  No and No. There was no option given to state No increase on the survey. You were only given two options 10% and 10% and now they are actually increasing by 45% to "harmonise" which will serve Godord owners in financial rule because of Councils pathetic management of money.  No rate rise until Council can manage the funds provided efficiently, it's rather like throwing petrol on a fire! Just more money to burn, this is an ineffective band aide not a first.  Council have not look the residents of the bue increases, until February 26 and hastily produced a calculator. They have been lying for months and in the late days we get the turn.  PART should not approve any increase, Council should sell assets and call in the Police fraud squad  Council have been so anealty in this regard, simply stating that the rate rise contribities a few dollars a week in increase, however it is approximately a 45%.	spaces and much not tape to have to deal with, while developers seem to have more lee way.  "Harmonisation" of rates across the old Coolford and Wyong count lareas is an extremely unifor profile, which discriminates against those of the old Coolford council areas, unfailed.  Land values in Coolford are generally higher, Horever, the averages suburban block in Coolford on of crediver any more services than one in Wyong, Nor is it necessity in household with more income: Intel values in the Coolford area are serviced than one with Wyong, Nor is it necessity in household with more income: Intel values in the Coolford area have recently changed rapidly, but iscomes have not concessably florings on a council area becomes excessively blances for a single land value rate schedule one carcural area becomes excessively shape.  To be title, and just to help illustates I propose a merger of the Contral Coolford area, and an ansalve cross subsidy from Horraby residents. Would that be fair or reasonable to Horraby residents?  There is no mored case for a subsidisation of the Wyong area, by the Coolford area, a represent a completely until policy. There ought to be separate rare schedules for council sub-regions and transparent justification for any intra-negional cross-subsidisation.  Yeah you guess it AS ABOVE  E's not reasonable we were field to up and until there last breath  It is completely unreasonable to charge eath 45%. You were only given two options 10% and 15% and now they are actually increasing by 45% to harmonism which will leave Goldord owners in financial ruin because of councils pathetic management of money.  An increase of all taxes 15% will be destinated to many low income earmons are for a council and the profile of the council and the profile of the second of the second of the second of the council and the profile of the second of the sec	As above  It is all a joke that needs to be investigated before moving forward and approved by many voted council members and the public  Documents will be footbree, Middler or destroyed FRB to Council b provide. These is the the same people who open movel by both twice including 3000 MELLON or wages for more middle management nonsense when supposedly amalgamating two Councils. If his was a private company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$400K.	They have not explained there incompetents so we should not have reached this point.  Documents will be doctored, hidden or destroyed if left to Council to provide. These are the same people who spent money they didn't have including \$200 MLLDN or wages for more middle management onceres when supposedly amalgamating two Councils. If this was a private company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$400K payout.  Rampant spending, only need based projects should be allowed, the Council is playing dress ups and house with revenues raised.  There are no productively improvements, its all motherhoods. Millions (around \$17 million) wasted on
115 Anonymous Anonymous 116 Anonymous Anonymous 117 Anonymous Anonymous 118 Anonymous Anonymous 120 Anonymous Anonymous 121 Anonymous Anonymous 122 Anonymous Anonymous 123 Anonymous Anonymous 124 Joanne McSherry 125 Anonymous Anonymous 126 Anonymous Anonymous 127 Debbie Ryan	**Harmonisation** of rates across the old Gasterd and Wyong council areas is an extremely unfair policy which discriminates against those of the old Gasterd council area, unfairly.  Land values in Gosterd are generally higher. However, the average subultation block in Gosterd does not receive any more services than one in Wyong, Nor is it necessarily a household with more income - tand values in the Gosterd area have receively changed rapidly, but incomes have not receive any more services than one in Wyong, Nor is it necessarily a household with more income - tand values in the Gosterd area have receively presents a really good example of the unfairness of a single text visual met schedule once a council area becomes excessively large.  To be this, and just to help illustrates [propose a marger of the Certari Coast council with horary processor, which will be the certain Coast council with horary processor. We sent affect a real processor of the certain Coast council with horary processor, which will be the more in Coast council and the certain of the certain Coast council with horary and the certain of the certain Coast council and the certain of the certain of the certain Coast council and the certain of the certain of the certain of the certain Coast coast council and the certain of the certain of the certain Coast	As above  No confidence  Let's have a quantity surveyor report on there works and visibility for 6 morths. Us as shareholders should be given the financials  No and No. Time was no option given to state Noironseare on the survey. You were city given two coptions of the financials  No and No. Time was no option given to state Noironseare on the survey. You were city given two coptions of the financials on the part states proceeding 54.55 to "Perministre" which will leave Godford owners in financial risin because of Councils pathetic management of money.  Community need is assessed by those holding electorate seats to ensure their salary flows past the next election. In each community, and the community of the control	As above  No configurated:  The only need is driven from poor management no a necessity.  No and No. There was no option given to state No increase on the survey. You were only given two options 10% and 10% and now they are actually increasing by 45% to "harmonise" which will serve Godord owners in financial rule because of Councils pathetic management of money.  No rate rise until Council can manage the funds provided efficiently, it's rather like throwing petrol on a fire! Just more money to burn, this is an ineffective band aide not a first.  Council have not look the residents of the bue increases, until February 26 and hastily produced a calculator. They have been lying for months and in the late days we get the turn.  PART should not approve any increase, Council should sell assets and call in the Police fraud squad  Council have been so anealty in this regard, simply stating that the rate rise contribities a few dollars a week in increase, however it is approximately a 45%.	Spaces and much not tape to have to deal with, while developers seem to have more lee way.  **Harmonisation** or have some the did Goodford and Winocouchil leaves in an antimenty unfair policy which discriminates against those of the old Goodford council areas, unfairly.  **Land values in Goodford are generally higher, However, the averages suburban block in Goodford door recivers any more services than one in Winopo, Nor Is Increasity a household with more income; and the services are services than one in Winopo, Nor Is Increasity a household with more income; and the services are services than one of Winopo, Nor Is Increasity a household with more income; and the services are services than one of the content of the	As above  It is all a joke that needs to be investigated before moving forward and approved by newly vided coarcil mentions and the public  Documents will be doctored, hidden or destroyed if left to Council to provide. These are the same people who spert money led with have included yarmalgamating two Councils. If his was a private company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$4000 April 200 MELLON or provide.  This was a private company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$4000 April 200 MELLON or provide company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$4000 April 200 MELLON or provide company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$4000 April 200 MELLON or provide company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$4000 April 200 MELLON or provide company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$4000 April 200 MELLON or provide company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$4000 April 200 MELLON or provided to the provided roll not be given and	They have not explained there incompetents so we should not have reached this point.  Documents will be doctored, hidden or destroyed if left to Council to provide. These are the same people who spent money they don't have including \$200 MLLDN or wages for more middle management consense where supposedly analogamenting the Councils. If this was a private company heads would roll not be given a readily \$4000 payout.  It ampaint spending, only need based projects should be allowed, the Council is playing dress ups and touse with revenues raised.  There are no productively improvements, its all motherhoods. Millions (around \$17 million) wasted on solidely warming programs, nothing to 16 with Central Coset Council.
115 Anonymous Anonymous 116 Anonymous Anonymous 117 Anonymous Anonymous 118 Anonymous Anonymous 120 Anonymous Anonymous 121 Anonymous Anonymous 122 Anonymous Anonymous 123 Anonymous Anonymous 124 Joanne McSherry 125 Anonymous Anonymous 126 Anonymous Anonymous 127 Debbie Ryan	"Harmonisation" of rates across the old Godord and Wyong council areas is an extremely unfair policy which discriminates against those of the old Godord council area, unfairly.  Limid values in Godord are generally higher. However, the average subutation block in Godord does not receive any more services than one in Wyong, hor is it recessarily a household with more income - tand values in the Godord area have receively changed regioty, but incomes have not receive any more services than one in Wyong, hor is it recessarily higher.  The tartings any proceed represents a reality godord example of the unfairness of a single land value the schedule once a council area becomes excessively large.  The tartings and part to high Blantines (process a recept of the Cortical Council council part to the Cortical Council Co	As above  No confidence  Let's have a quantity surveyor report on there works and visibility for 6 morths. Us as shareholders should be given the financials  No and No. Time was no option given to state Noironseare on the survey. You were city given two coptions of the financials  No and No. Time was no option given to state Noironseare on the survey. You were city given two coptions of the financials on the part states proceeding 54.55 to "Perministre" which will leave Godford owners in financial risin because of Councils pathetic management of money.  Community need is assessed by those holding electorate seats to ensure their salary flows past the next election. In each community, and the community of the control	As above  No configurated:  The only need is driven from poor management no a necessity.  No and No. There was no option given to state No increase on the survey. You were only given two options 10% and 10% and now they are actually increasing by 45% to "harmonise" which will serve Godord owners in financial rule because of Councils pathetic management of money.  No rate rise until Council can manage the funds provided efficiently, it's rather like throwing petrol on a fire! Just more money to burn, this is an ineffective band aide not a first.  Council have not look the residents of the bue increases, until February 26 and hastily produced a calculator. They have been lying for months and in the late days we get the turn.  PART should not approve any increase, Council should sell assets and call in the Police fraud squad  Council have been so anealty in this regard, simply stating that the rate rise contribities a few dollars a week in increase, however it is approximately a 45%.	Spaces and much not tape to have to deal with, while developers seem to have more lee way.  **Harmonisation** or have some the did Goodford and Winocouchil leaves in an antimenty unfair policy which discriminates against those of the old Goodford council areas, unfairly.  **Land values in Goodford are generally higher, However, the averages suburban block in Goodford door recivers any more services than one in Winopo, Nor Is Increasity a household with more income: hard values in the Goodford does not necessary through the services of the control of the c	As above  It is all a joke that needs to be investigated before moving forward and approved by newly vided coarcil mentions and the public  Documents will be doctored, hidden or destroyed if left to Council to provide. These are the same people who spert money led with have included yarmalgamating two Councils. If his was a private company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$4000 April 200 MELLON or provide.  This was a private company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$4000 April 200 MELLON or provide company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$4000 April 200 MELLON or provide company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$4000 April 200 MELLON or provide company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$4000 April 200 MELLON or provide company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$4000 April 200 MELLON or provide company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$4000 April 200 MELLON or provided to the provided roll not be given and	They have not explained there incompetents so we should not have reached this point.  Documents will be doctored, hidden or destroyed if left to Council to provide. These are the same people who spent money they don't have including \$200 MLLDN or wages for more middle management consense where supposedly analogamenting the Councils. If this was a private company heads would roll not be given a readily \$4000 payout.  It ampaint spending, only need based projects should be allowed, the Council is playing dress ups and touse with revenues raised.  There are no productively improvements, its all motherhoods. Millions (around \$17 million) wasted on solidely warming programs, nothing to 16 with Central Coset Council.
115 Anonymous Anonymous 116 Anonymous Anonymous 117 Anonymous Anonymous 118 Anonymous Anonymous 120 Anonymous Anonymous 121 Anonymous Anonymous 122 Anonymous Anonymous 123 Anonymous Anonymous 124 Joanne McSherry 125 Anonymous Anonymous 126 Anonymous Anonymous 127 Debbie Ryan	"Harmonisation" of rates across the old Gasford and Wyong council areas is an externeely unfair policy which discriminates against those of the old Gasford council area, unfairly.  Land values in Gostord are generally higher. However, the average suburban block in Gostord does not recieve any more services than one in Wyong, Mor is it necessarily a household with more income - hand values in the Gostord area have receively changed rapidly, but incomes have not been accounted as the control of the change of proposed expressed in a religious desagle of the unfairly of the change of proposed expressed in a religious desagle of the unfairly council, in order that the "Teamonisation" of rates leads to a reduction of rates in the Gostord area, and a massalar cores subsidies from Horstary reduction. Would that the fair or exceedable to Promote the Council or an expression of the Council responsibly & arrogarily washed massive amounts of money.  Council hand a rate first I Team Council responsibly & arrogarily washed massive amounts of money.  Council hand a rate first I Team Council responsibly & arrogarily washed massive amounts of money.  Council hand a rate first I Team Council and the Promoter's Council or the Council or and the Council or an expressible of the Council or an expressible or an expressible of the Council or an expressible or an expressible or any or an expressible or	As above  No confidence  Let's have a quantity surveyor report on there works and visibility for 6 morths. Us as shareholders should be given the financials  No and No. Time was no option given to state Noironseare on the survey. You were city given two coptions of the financials  No and No. Time was no option given to state Noironseare on the survey. You were city given two coptions of the financials on the part states proceeding 54.55 to "Perministre" which will leave Godford owners in financial risin because of Councils pathetic management of money.  Community need is assessed by those holding electorate seats to ensure their salary flows past the next election. In each community, and the community of the control	As above  No configurated:  The only need is driven from poor management no a necessity.  No and No. There was no option given to state No increase on the survey. You were only given two options 10% and 10% and now they are actually increasing by 45% to "harmonise" which will serve Godord owners in financial rule because of Councils pathetic management of money.  No rate rise until Council can manage the funds provided efficiently, it's rather like throwing petrol on a fire! Just more money to burn, this is an ineffective band aide not a first.  Council have not look the residents of the bue increases, until February 26 and hastily produced a calculator. They have been lying for months and in the late days we get the turn.  PART should not approve any increase, Council should sell assets and call in the Police fraud squad  Council have been so anealty in this regard, simply stating that the rate rise contribities a few dollars a week in increase, however it is approximately a 45%.	Spaces and much not tape to have to deal with, while developers seem to have more lee way.  **Harmonisation** or have some the did Goodford and Winocouchil leaves in an antimenty unfair policy which discriminates against those of the old Goodford council areas, unfairly.  **Land values in Goodford are generally higher, However, the averages suburban block in Goodford door recivers any more services than one in Winopo, Nor Is Increasity a household with more income: hard values in the Goodford does not necessary through the services of the control of the c	As above  It is all a joke that needs to be investigated before moving forward and approved by newly vided coarcil mentions and the public  Documents will be doctored, hidden or destroyed if left to Council to provide. These are the same people who spert money led with have included yarmalgamating two Councils. If his was a private company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$4000 April 200 MELLON or provide.  This was a private company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$4000 April 200 MELLON or provide company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$4000 April 200 MELLON or provide company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$4000 April 200 MELLON or provide company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$4000 April 200 MELLON or provide company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$4000 April 200 MELLON or provide company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$4000 April 200 MELLON or provided to the provided roll not be given and	They have not explained there incompetents so we should not have reached this point.  Documents will be doctored, hidden or destroyed if left to Council to provide. These are the same people who spent money they don't have including \$200 MLICNN or wages for more middle management consense where supposedly amalgamenting the Councils. If this was a private company heads would not be given a readily \$400K payout.  It is a private company heads would not not given a readily \$400K payout.  It is a private company heads would not not given a readily \$400K payout.  It is
115 Anonymous Anonymous 116 Anonymous Anonymous 117 Anonymous Anonymous 118 Anonymous Anonymous 120 Anonymous Anonymous 121 Anonymous Anonymous 122 Anonymous Anonymous 123 Anonymous Anonymous 124 Joanne McSherry 125 Anonymous Anonymous 126 Anonymous Anonymous 127 Debbie Ryan	"Harmonisation" of rates across the old Godord and Wyong council areas is an extremely unfair policy which discriminates against those of the old Godord council area, unfairly.  Limid values in Godord are generally higher. However, the average subutation block in Godord does not receive any more services than one in Wyong, hor is it recessarily a household with more income - tand values in the Godord area have receively changed regioty, but incomes have not receive any more services than one in Wyong, hor is it recessarily higher.  The tartings any proceed represents a reality godord example of the unfairness of a single land value the schedule once a council area becomes excessively large.  The tartings and part to high Blantines (process a recept of the Cortical Council council part to the Cortical Council Co	As above  No confidence  Let's have a quantity surveyor report on there works and visibility for 6 morths. Us as shareholders should be given the financials  No and No. Time was no option given to state Noironseare on the survey. You were city given two coptions of the financials  No and No. Time was no option given to state Noironseare on the survey. You were city given two coptions of the financials on the part states proceeding 54.55 to "Perministre" which will leave Godford owners in financial risin because of Councils pathetic management of money.  Community need is assessed by those holding electorate seats to ensure their salary flows past the next election. In each community, and the community of the control	As above  No configurated:  The only need is driven from poor management no a necessity.  No and No. There was no option given to state No increase on the survey. You were only given two options 10% and 10% and now they are actually increasing by 45% to "harmonise" which will serve Godord owners in financial rule because of Councils pathetic management of money.  No rate rise until Council can manage the funds provided efficiently, it's rather like throwing petrol on a fire! Just more money to burn, this is an ineffective band aide not a first.  Council have not look the residents of the bue increases, until February 26 and hastily produced a calculator. They have been lying for months and in the late days we get the turn.  PART should not approve any increase, Council should sell assets and call in the Police fraud squad  Council have been so anealty in this regard, simply stating that the rate rise contribities a few dollars a week in increase, however it is approximately a 45%.	Spaces and much not tape to have to deal with, while developers seem to have more lee way.  **Harmonisation** or have some the did Goodford and Winocouchil leaves in an antimenty unfair policy which discriminates against those of the old Goodford council areas, unfairly.  **Land values in Goodford are generally higher, However, the averages suburban block in Goodford door recivers any more services than one in Winopo, Nor Is Increasity a household with more income: hard values in the Goodford does not necessary through the services of the control of the c	As above  It is all a joke that needs to be investigated before moving forward and approved by newly vided coarcil mentions and the public  Documents will be doctored, hidden or destroyed if left to Council to provide. These are the same people who spert money led with have included yarmalgamating two Councils. If his was a private company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$4000 April 200 MELLON or provide.  This was a private company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$4000 April 200 MELLON or provide company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$4000 April 200 MELLON or provide company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$4000 April 200 MELLON or provide company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$4000 April 200 MELLON or provide company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$4000 April 200 MELLON or provide company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$4000 April 200 MELLON or provided to the provided roll not be given and	They have not explained there incompetents so we should not have reached this point.  Documents will be doctored, hidden or destroyed if left to Council to provide. These are the same people who spent money they don't have including \$200 MLLDN or wages for more middle management consense where supposedly analogamenting the Councils. If this was a private company heads would roll not be given a readily \$4000 payout.  It ampaint spending, only need based projects should be allowed, the Council is playing dress ups and touse with revenues raised.  There are no productively improvements, its all motherhoods. Millions (around \$17 million) wasted on solidely warming programs, nothing to 16 with Central Coset Council.
115 Anonymous Anonymous 116 Anonymous Anonymous 117 Anonymous Anonymous 118 Anonymous Anonymous 120 Anonymous Anonymous 121 Anonymous Anonymous 122 Anonymous Anonymous 123 Anonymous Anonymous 124 Joanne McSherry 125 Anonymous Anonymous 126 Anonymous Anonymous 127 Debbie Ryan	"Harmonisation" of rates across the old Gasford and Wyong council areas is an externeely unfair policy which discriminates against those of the old Gasford council area, unfairly.  Land values in Gostord are generally higher. However, the average suburban block in Gostord does not recieve any more services than one in Wyong, Mor is it necessarily a household with more income - hand values in the Gostord area have receively changed rapidly, but incomes have not been accounted as the control of the change of proposed expressed in a religious desagle of the unfairly of the change of proposed expressed in a religious desagle of the unfairly council, in order that the "Teamonisation" of rates leads to a reduction of rates in the Gostord area, and a massalar cores subsidies from Horstary reduction. Would that the fair or exceedable to Promote the Council or an expression of the Council responsibly & arrogarily washed massive amounts of money.  Council hand a rate first I Team Council responsibly & arrogarily washed massive amounts of money.  Council hand a rate first I Team Council responsibly & arrogarily washed massive amounts of money.  Council hand a rate first I Team Council and the Promoter's Council or the Council or and the Council or an expressible of the Council or an expressible or an expressible of the Council or an expressible or an expressible or any or an expressible or	As above  No confidence  Let's have a quantity surveyor report on there works and visibility for 6 morths. Us as shareholders should be given the financials  No and No. Time was no option given to state Noironseare on the survey. You were city given two coptions of the financials  No and No. Time was no option given to state Noironseare on the survey. You were city given two coptions of the financials on the part states proceeding 54.55 to "Perministre" which will leave Godford owners in financial risin because of Councils pathetic management of money.  Community need is assessed by those holding electorate seats to ensure their salary flows past the next election. In each community, and the community of the control	As above  No configurated:  The only need is driven from poor management no a necessity.  No and No. There was no option given to state No increase on the survey. You were only given two options 10% and 10% and now they are actually increasing by 45% to "harmonise" which will serve Godord owners in financial rule because of Councils pathetic management of money.  No rate rise until Council can manage the funds provided efficiently, it's rather like throwing petrol on a fire! Just more money to burn, this is an ineffective band aide not a first.  Council have not look the residents of the bue increases, until February 26 and hastily produced a calculator. They have been lying for months and in the late days we get the turn.  PART should not approve any increase, Council should sell assets and call in the Police fraud squad  Council have been so anealty in this regard, simply stating that the rate rise contribities a few dollars a week in increase, however it is approximately a 45%.	Spaces and much not tipe to have to deal with, while developers seem to have more lee way.  **Permonisation** or rideas excess the disconfar and Wyono caucil seems is an enterently unfair policy which discriminates against those of the old Gosford council area, unfairly.  **Land values in Gosford are generally higher. However, the averages subtrain block in Gosford don't cricine any more services than one to Wyong, Nor is Increasity a household with more indicessarily blocked.  **Land values in Gosford done the Cosford deep white the control of the contro	As above  It is all a joke that needs to be investigated before moving forward and approved by newly vided coarcil mentions and the public  Documents will be doctored, hidden or destroyed if left to Council to provide. These are the same people who spert money led with have included yarmalgamating two Councils. If his was a private company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$4000 April 200 MELLON or provide.  This was a private company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$4000 April 200 MELLON or provide company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$4000 April 200 MELLON or provide company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$4000 April 200 MELLON or provide company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$4000 April 200 MELLON or provide company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$4000 April 200 MELLON or provide company heads would roll not be given a nearly \$4000 April 200 MELLON or provided to the provided roll not be given and	They have not explained there incompetents so we should not have reached this point.  Documents will be doctored, hidden or destroyed if left to Council to provide. These are the same people who spent money they don't have including \$200 MLICNN or wages for more middle management consense where supposedly amalgamenting the Councils. If this was a private company heads would not be given a readily \$400K payout.  It is a private company heads would not not given a readily \$400K payout.  It is a private company heads would not not given a readily \$400K payout.  It is
115 Anonymous Anonymous 116 Anonymous Anonymous 117 Anonymous Anonymous 118 Anonymous Anonymous 120 Anonymous Anonymous 121 Anonymous Anonymous 122 Anonymous Anonymous 123 Anonymous Anonymous 124 Joanne McSherry 125 Anonymous Anonymous 126 Anonymous Anonymous 127 Debbie Ryan	**Teamorisation* of rates across the old Coaterd and Wyong council areas is an extremely unfair policy which discriminates against those of the old Coaterd council area, unfairly, Luxel onlines in Coaterd are generally injuried. However, the wanges eluctural block in Coaterd deep not receive any more services than one in Wyong, Nor is it necessarily a household with more income in a control of the proper and the property of the coater and the property of the coater and the coater a	As above  No confidence  Let's have a quantity surveyor report on there works and viability for 6 morths. Us as shareholders should be given the financials  No and No. There was no option given to state No increase on the survey. You were only given two options 10% and 15% and now they are actually increasing by 45% to "harmonise" which will leave Gosford owners in financial rush because of Councils published management of morey.  Community need is assessed by those holding electorate seals to ensure their salary flows past the next election. In essence was are paying taker or section funds, confinentiation of salary funds in seasons was as paying taker or section funds, confinentiation of salary funds in seasons was as paying taker or section funds, confinentiation of salary funds. Or some paying taker of the seasons was as a paying taker or section funds, confinentiation of salary funds. Or some paying taker of the seasons was assessed by those holding electorate seals to ensure their salary flows past the next election. Or some paying taker of the seasons was assessed to ensure their salary flows past the next election of the seasons was as a supplied to season and some paying taker.  Community need is assessed by those holding electorate seals to ensure their salary flows past the next election of salary funds.  Or loose paying their season funds of the season of salary funds.  Or loose you job, should work slong the lines of private enterprise, as good as your last budget adherement or the door.  No. The documents were a lie, they taked about 10% and 15% increases, when the real numbers are 28% and over 45%. The harmonisation take is nonement, We already have higher rates than parts of Sydney and set of the real and addless and we have brown well from the site of the provides of projects, in fact, they are reducing all none essential services. Nothing is being manifelined, other than bins being empired.  Due diligence has not justified a different revenue path, took to the Central Coast Council's mismanage	As above  No confidenced  The only need is driven from poor management no a necessity  No and No. There was no option given to state No increase on the survey. You were only given two options 10% and 15% and now they are actually increasing by 45% to "harmonise" which will leave Goldord owners in financial ruin because of Councils pathetic management of money.  No rate rise until Council can manage the funds provided efficiently, it's rather like throwing petrol on a firet. Just more money to burn, this is an ineffective barel aide not a first  Council have not told the residents of the true increases, until February 26 and hastily produced a calculator. They have been lying for months and in the later days use get the truth.  PART should not approve any increase. Council should sell assets and call in the Police fraud squad  Council have been so manify in this regard, simply stating that the rate rise constitutes a few dollars a week in increase, however it is approximately a 45% increase for the majority of the former Costord City Council.	spaces and much not tape to have to deal with, while developers seem to have more lee way.  "Harmonisation" of rales across the edd Goofford and Wyong count laress is an extremely unifor profile, which discontinuities against these of the old Goofford council areas, unifolds.  Land values in Goofford are generally higher, However, the averages suburban block in Goofford on of recieves any more services than one Wyong, Nor Is Increasity a household with more income: land values in the Goofford deep services than one Wyong, Nor Is Increasity a household with more income: land values in the Goofford deep services than one of the Control of the Decoration of the Control of the Control of the Control of the Decoration of the Control of the Control of the Control of the Decoration of the Control	As above  It is all a joke that needs to be investigated before moving forward and approved by newly voiced council members and the public  Documents will be doctored, Indian or destroyed if left to Council to provide. These are the same people who apert more juvident or waspes for more middle management nonseries when supposedly amalgamating two councils. If this was a private company heads would not not be given a nearly \$400X and the providence of the pro	They have not explained there incompetents so we should not have reached this point.  Documents will be doctored, hidden or destroyed if left to Council to provide. These are the same people who spent noney they don't the including \$200 MLICH or wages for more mode management are given a nearly \$400K payout.  Rampant spending, only need based projects should be allowed, the Council is playing dress ups and noise with reversees raised.  There are no productivity improvements, its all motherhoods. Millions (around \$17 million) wasted on oldow warming programs, nothing to do with Central Coast Council.  Again, I haven't seen this document.
115 Anonymous Anonymous 116 Anonymous Anonymous 117 Anonymous Anonymous 118 Anonymous Anonymous 120 Anonymous Anonymous 121 Anonymous Anonymous 122 Anonymous Anonymous 123 Anonymous Anonymous 124 Joanne McSherry 125 Anonymous Anonymous 126 Anonymous Anonymous 127 Debbie Ryan	"Hamonisation" of rates across the old Cooked and Wyong council areas is an extremely unfair policy which discriminates against those of the old Cooked council area, unfairly, Land ordinar is presently higher. However, the amongs adultant blook in Collect does not receive any more services than one in Wyong, Nor is it necessarily a household with more income - land values in the Goodston has been exceedly implicately period. Provided in the control council with more income - land values in the Goodston in the provided in the council area absonance excessively large.  To be this, and just to help illustrate is propose a merger of the Central Coast council with formerly council, in order that the "Hamonisation" of rates leads to a reduction of rates in the Goodston area, and a manual variety of the council and the council area and the council area absonance excessively large.  To be this, and just to help illustrate is propose a merger of the Central Coast council with informative cross studies from intervel, which we will be a form or reasonable to bromely received. For the council area and the council area.  Councils most to specific with in their mineral councils, a mineral received in the council area and the council area. The council area are also a studies of the council area and the council area and the council area.  The council area to specific with in their mineral councils are also and the council area.  The council area and the propose of the council area and the council area.  The council area and the council area and the council area and the council area. The council area are also a street to say down did not just charge the council area. The council area are also a street to say down did not just charge the council area.  The council area have been been presented as a part to the council area.  The council area have been been presented as a part to a street and the council area. The council area area are also as a s	As above  No confidence  Let's have a quantity surveyor report on there works and viability for 6 months. Us as shareholders should be above the financials  Is and No. There was no option given to state No increase on the survey. You were only given two options  10% and 10% and melty are stated in research by 45% to "harmonise" which will leave Gosford owners in  financial ruin because of Councils publish management of money.  Community need is assessed by those holding electorale seeds to ensure their salary flows past the next election.  In essence we are paying their re election funds, continuation of salary funds!  Project spending subde benefit the errice normality, no more affailered, specific interest group spending, only projects that premote community salary well being.  Of loose you job, should work stong the lines of private enterprise, as good as your last budget achievement or the door.  No. The documents were a lis, they talked about 10% and 15% increases, when the real numbers are 20% and over 45%. The harmonication talk is noncense. We already have higher rates than parts of Sydney and well don't have cut and quitters and we have brown water from tau.  This is inelevant. Cucroll are not going to provide any new services or projects, in fact, they are reducing all none essential services. Nothing is being maintained, other than birs being enopted.	As above. The only need is driven from poor management no a recessity.  The only need is driven from poor management no a recessity.  No and No. There was no option given to state No increase on the survey. You were only given two options 10% and 15% and now they are actually increasing by 45% to "harmonise" which will leave Gosford owners in financial rule because of Councils pathetic management of money.  No rate rise until Council can manage the funds provided efficiently, it's rather like throwing period on a firet. Just more money to burn, this is an ineffective band aide not a first.  Council have not loid the residents of the true increases, until February 26 and healily produced a calculator. They have been lying for months and in the later days we get the truth.  PART should not approve any increase. Council should self assets and call in the Police finaud squad.  Council have been so anealty in this regard, simply stating that the rate rise constitutes a few dollars a week in increase, however it is approximately a 45% increase for the majority of the former Cosford City Council.	spaces and much not tape to have to deal with, while developers seem to have more lee way.  "Harmonisation" of rales across the edd Goofford and Wyong count laress is an extremely unifor profile, which discontinuities against these of the old Goofford council areas, unifolds.  Land values in Goofford are generally higher, However, the averages suburban block in Goofford on of recieves any more services than one Wyong, Nor Is Increasity a household with more income: land values in the Goofford deep services than one Wyong, Nor Is Increasity a household with more income: land values in the Goofford deep services than one of the Control of the Decoration of the Control of the Control of the Control of the Decoration of the Control of the Control of the Control of the Decoration of the Control	As above  It is all a joke that needs to be investigated before moving forward and approved by newly voiced council members and the public  Documents will be doctored, Indian or destroyed if left to Council to provide. These are the same people who apert more juvident or waspes for more middle management nonseries when supposedly amalgamating two councils. If this was a private company heads would not not be given a nearly \$400X and the providence of the pro	They have not explained there incompetents so we should not have reached this point.  Documents will be doctored, hidden or destroyed if left to Council to provide. These are the same people who spert money they don't have including \$200 MLIDN on wages for more middle management reached the provide company heads would not not be given a making \$400K pagnal.  If this was a private company heads would not not be given a making \$400K pagnal.  If amparat spending, only need based projects should be allowed, the Council is playing dress ups and nouse with revenues raised.  There are no productivity improvements, its all motherhoods. Millions (around \$17 million) wasted on stocked warming programs, nothing to do with Center Council.
115 Anonymous Anonymous  116 Anonymous Anonymous  117 Anonymous Anonymous  118 Anonymous Anonymous  120 Anonymous Anonymous  121 Anonymous Anonymous  122 Anonymous Anonymous  123 Anonymous Anonymous  124 Janne McSherry  125 Anonymous Anonymous  127 Deable Syan  128 Jeremy Linton-Mann  129 Dean Innis	"Hammorisation" of rates across the old Gosford and Wyong council areas is an extremely unfair policy which discriminates against those of the old Gosford council area, unfairly.  Lund values in Koofford are perceivally higher. However, the average adultant blook in Conford does not receive any more services than one in Wyong, Nor is it recessarily a household with more income: Introduces the council area becomes excessively large.  To be this, we plus the help isotrate; I propose a merger of the Central Coast council will histories and the services of the services of the council area becomes excessively large.  To be this, we plus the help isotrate; I propose a merger of the Central Coast council will histories. I propose a merger of the Central Coast council will histories.  To be this, we plus the help isotrate; I propose a merger of the Central Coast council will histories.  To be this, we plus the help isotrate; I propose a merger of the Central Coast council will histories.  To be this, we plus the help isotrate; I propose a merger of the Central Coast council will histories.  To be this, we plus the help isotrate; I propose a merger of the Central Coast council will histories.  Council mend to operate with in them ensure. I we continue the council merger of the council merger of the council merger of the council will be the propose of the council will be the propose of the council will be the propose of the council will be the council	As above  No confidence  Let's have a quantity surveyor report on there works and viability for 6 morths. Us as shareholders should be given the financials  No and No. There was no option given to state No increase on the survey. You were only given two options 10% and 15% and now they are actually increasing by 45% to "harmonise" which will leave Gosford owners in financial rush because of Councils published management of morey.  Community need is assessed by those holding electorate seals to ensure their salary flows past the next election. In essence was are paying taker or section funds, confinentiation of salary funds in seasons was as paying taker or section funds, confinentiation of salary funds in seasons was as paying taker or section funds, confinentiation of salary funds. Or some paying taker of the seasons was as a paying taker or section funds, confinentiation of salary funds. Or some paying taker of the seasons was assessed by those holding electorate seals to ensure their salary flows past the next election. Or some paying taker of the seasons was assessed to ensure their salary flows past the next election of the seasons was as a supplied to season and some paying taker.  Community need is assessed by those holding electorate seals to ensure their salary flows past the next election of salary funds.  Or loose paying their season funds of the season of salary funds.  Or loose you job, should work slong the lines of private enterprise, as good as your last budget adherement or the door.  No. The documents were a lie, they taked about 10% and 15% increases, when the real numbers are 28% and over 45%. The harmonisation take is nonement, We already have higher rates than parts of Sydney and set of the real and addless and we have brown well from the site of the provides of projects, in fact, they are reducing all none essential services. Nothing is being manifelined, other than bins being empired.  Due diligence has not justified a different revenue path, took to the Central Coast Council's mismanage	As above  No confidenced  The only need is driven from poor management no a necessity  No and No. There was no option given to state No increase on the survey. You were only given two options 10% and 15% and now they are actually increasing by 45% to "harmonise" which will leave Goldord owners in financial ruin because of Councils pathetic management of money.  No rate rise until Council can manage the funds provided efficiently, it's rather like throwing petrol on a firet. Just more money to burn, this is an ineffective barel aide not a first  Council have not told the residents of the true increases, until February 26 and hastily produced a calculator. They have been lying for months and in the later days use get the truth.  PART should not approve any increase. Council should sell assets and call in the Police fraud squad  Council have been so manify in this regard, simply stating that the rate rise constitutes a few dollars a week in increase, however it is approximately a 45% increase for the majority of the former Costord City Council.	spaces and much not tape to have to deal with, while developers seem to have more lee way.  "Harmonisation" of rales across the edd Goofford and Wyong count laress is an extremely unifor profile, which discontinuities against these of the old Goofford council areas, unifolds.  Land values in Goofford are generally higher, However, the averages suburban block in Goofford on of recieves any more services than one Wyong, Nor Is Increasity a household with more income: land values in the Goofford deep services than one Wyong, Nor Is Increasity a household with more income: land values in the Goofford deep services than one of the Control of the Decoration of the Control of the Control of the Control of the Decoration of the Control of the Control of the Control of the Decoration of the Control	As above  It is all a joke that needs to be investigated before moving forward and approved by newly vided council mentions and the public  Documents will be doctored, Indian or destroyed if left to Council to provide. These are the same people who apert more juviden row except some simple provide company heads would not not be given a nearly \$400X or wide for more middle management nonzerne when supposedly amalgamating two councils. If this was a private company heads would not not be given a nearly \$400X or wide for more middle management nonzerne when supposedly amalgamating two councils. If this was a private company heads would not be given a nearly \$400X.  No there were not. We were not told of the real increases with harmonisation as well I have no idea where these documents are exhibited. We don't have a local hard copy paper any longer that would have communicated this news.	They have not explained there incompetents so we should not have reached this point.  Documents will be doctored, hidden or destroyed if left to Council to provide. These are the same people who spent noney they don't the including \$200 MLICH or wages for more mode management are given a nearly \$400K payout.  Rampant spending, only need based projects should be allowed, the Council is playing dress ups and noise with reversees raised.  There are no productivity improvements, its all motherhoods. Millions (around \$17 million) wasted on oldow warming programs, nothing to do with Central Coast Council.  Again, I haven't seen this document.

First Name Last Name						
	General comments regarding council's proposed SV Ido not believe the process has been fairly evaluated. There is a rate harmonisation program to be implemented in 2021. This will see southern areas of the old Gosford Council have a rate increase of	Comments on Criterion 1:	Comments on Criterion 2:	Comments on Criterion 3:	Comments on Criterion 4:	Comments on Criterion 5:
	approximately 26% occur. The old northern area, Wyong Shire will see a 20%+ rate reduction occur.  This being the case, the increase to the old Gosford ratepayer will not be 15%, but rather 42%, an untenable amount in my opinion.					
	The administrator has confinued to offer a blinkered position that it is a 0%, 10% or 15% rate increase being considered. It was never going to be a 0%, as harmonisation ensures there will be substantial change this year. It is only now many ratepayers are beginning to understand the full effect of change that is to occur.					
	Please consider the fact it is not 15% to be applied. The impact in southern regions will be 42% on average. Will anyone have taken into account the employment situation since COVID? If or one have been unemployed since APRIL 2020 and have had no Job Keeper or Job Seeker allowances given in that time; I have been forced to live on savings. How many others would fit in this category, or similar. A 42%	Council's submission has obfuscated the real outcome. Ratepayers have not been informed of the full effect of	L			Council has promoted savings initiatives and has recently advised a slightly better fiscal position.
131 Graham Jones	increase would make me destitute.		The 15% has been ringlenced from rate harmonisation. Council has turned away from any questioning on this matter, stating the harmonisation has no part to play in this process.	of Under COVID-19 employment and subsidisation, a 42% increase is in no way reasonable. It may introduce further hardship on many ratepayers.	I agree the variation detail has been promoted, but as stated above, they obscure the real variation to be effected.	It may be better to grant the rate variation, but to direct the halving of harmonisation and the conclusion of that process over, say, three years.
	Last year we recieved an increase of \$548 per year on our rates due to					
	the valuer general .					
	Now the council is expecting us to pay a further substantial increase which is due to the inability of our council to run efficiently or pay any attention to their auditors advice.					
	According to The Pelican Post newspaper on 12/1/21 page 34 an amount of \$388M is in investment funds. This ratepayers money should be spent on the ratepayers needs before any rate increase.					
John and	Therefore we vote for no increase in rates because hardship will be caused and the council doesn't seem to be able to manage money efficiently as has been shown previously					
132 Gloria Saley						
	I do not support the special variation. The council is highly inefficient. Giving more funds via the SV induces them to not to try to make savings, especially as executive salaries/numbers are too high.					
	There has been poor amalgamation management, with costs increasing not reducing. The council continues to operate as separate Gosford and Wyong entities. Staff answer some questions with I only deal with Gosford matters. In on orbiting about Wyong.					
	Savings from annaigamation not realised such as reduction in Gosford/Wyong council buildings/offices and staff rationalisation - WHERE IS THE SAVINGS REALISATION PLAN and a review process for the community to ensure savings will arise. Council increasing staff numbers by over 300 positions when they were meant to reduce staffing with the amalgamation is a prime example of financial mismanagement					
	Many recent capital projects are not essential and wasteful, such as the new \$50 million administrative IT system & regional library/meeting rooms building in Gosford					
	There has been no adequate explanation of why development, water authority, and government specific grants ('restricted funds') were used for unauthorised purposes, just bland statements that 'ratepayers benefited' from the spending. A detailed measurable plan of how the council will ensure that the financial mess will not recocur is required. This is not the first time Gosford based managers have got the			the impact of the increases is not reasonable especially in a region with a large number of retirees		
	ratepayers in a mess - remember the GFC investments of the former Gosford Council and denials there was any loss., which proved manifestly false			and low income earners.		
	before I could support a rate rise above the cap I suggest Council needs to clearly outline in detail not platitudes, what they will do to fix the mess and put policies/procedures in place to			Per the council site the increase for my property is :  * 2021 \$1.592		
	ensure council can in future live within its means. This includes:			* 2022 \$2020. (Harmonisation impact) an increase of \$429		
	*Benefit realisation plans, ongoing reviews of progress with independent oversight and assessment after the project completes to ensure delivery.	The Central Coast community through a petition to state parliament have clearly shown their opposition to the		\$2041 (peg increase ) A total impact of \$449 \$2318 (15% increase ) A total impact of \$726.		
	"Maintaining a budget with regular review to ensure at least annual break even outcomes plus controls of staff numbers based on budget funded positions not establishment positions.	special increase. The council survey did until recently not cover the option of no special increase and loaded the background in the survey to the increase. The council small phone survey was similarly biased and who		If the SV is granted my general rate increase is 45.6% relative the the prior year and is absolutely		There has been no cost containment or productivity improvements achieved, in fact the reverse has occurred more waste and mismanagement. (Refer my initial comments.)
	Four year rolling budgeling which allows for ongoing costs and new projects coming on line that have ongoing funding requirements such as new regional library. (All new projects should have a financial	has a landline these days hence the population surveyed was not representative	The council have not communicated this effectively. The central coast has a very wide range of property values and separated communities. Having an average for the whole area is meaningless, instead there should have been a range of impacts for each suburb.	unjustifiable.		Council has not outlined what future savings will be made in sufficient detail for anyone to evaluate. There
	impact statement similar to NSW Government requirements including details of material assumptions on which the project is based such as increased revenue projections or costs savings form staff	Council has resourcing alternatives through:  "the sale of surplus assets (e.g. Gosford Council chambers and relocate administration staff to Depots and		There will be a lot of us in this situation many of whom are on fixed incomes such as pensioners an		is no list of asset sales or plans for rationalise services only platitudes.
	reductions.)	Wyong Chambers	This is complicated by the move to a single rating methodology across the former Gosford and Wyong area, which has resulted in much larger increases for Gosford than Wyong. This is further complicated by the new VG values applying for the first time in 2020/21.	serrunded retirees		Council have engaged staff where there was no money available and have accessed restricted funds to
	"Where state government grants are offered to council, a clear outline of who will be responsible for ongoing maintenance and what existing capital projects need to be stopped to meet the council contribution requirements before any funds are accepted.	reviewing the salary levels closer to those in the central coast community rather than in Sydney *achieving amalgamation savings as promised by the State	Confusion runs wild in the community.		This was communicated in a glossy sales brochure. Another example of waste for by	cover their tracks. As someone who has been responsible for financial management of special deposit fund monies valued in the hundreds of millions, I am disgusted. Until systems and staff with integrity are in
	As a final plea please do not support the restoration of the existing councilors as they are ultimately to blame for the financial mess, as they did not undertake appropriate governance of council. Having to get	* reversing the creation of an additional 300 staff positions in 2020 * reducing capital projects that provide minimal direct benefit to the community	The process should have been a maximum increase and a maximum decrease in rates with the full impact being phased in over 3 years. This was the		a wasteful council.	place there can be no assurance it will not happen again. Giving a SV will not induce council to take action to improve financial management
133 Anonymous Anonymous	an emergency loan from the state to pay staff wages and not being unable to repay restricted funds that were misapplied, is akin to trading while insolvent.	* introducing a better targeted user pays philosphy  *All NSW councils have implemented IP&R. The special variation guidelines and IPART's assessment process	process used in the past for workers compensation tariff rates between industries		The council did not have any community representatives as they had been sacked	-
		are based on an expectation that councils will have engaged the community in a discussion about the funding				
		required to deliver community priorities through the IP&R process."  This application process has not been completed in guidance with the guidelines for completing an application				,
		to increase rates.  The council has not provided the community with an opportunity for discussion. We were simply sent a letter				
		putting us on notice for said rate increases.  There has been no adequate opportunity for local residents to speak to this proposed rent increase and nor			I imagine that since the council itself has stated that they	
	There has yet to be an official inquiry and assessment of where these millions of dollars of local rate payers money has gone.  It is unjust it in hour than payer once the data price of the payer of t	has there been appropriate evidence of where the council debt has been spent. Residents have yet to be appropriately informed of a breakdown of costings, expenses and spendings that total councils debt which they			"do not know where the money has gone" referring to the overspending that has accumulated over time to approximately half a hillion dollars, even if the paperwork	
	It is unjust & unlawful to have rate payers cover this deb using a huge rate increase that is unaffordable to many households including mine. As a local business owner I will not be able to afford both my residential and commercial rate increases.	are attempting rate payers to pay.	y  We have yet to see evidence or a breakdown of spendings that the council has accrued as a large scale debt.		has been filled out- there are holes where these 'missing' funds have not been	
134 Leanna Moneil	I refuse to pay this rate increase until a third party assessment body has been able to allocate this spending totalling almost half a billion dollars.  No one has been held accountable- and I am putting the council on notice - I will not be paying their debt unless they want to pay the debt I've accrued over the years.	Before applying to IPART for a special variation to get approval for this increase- they need to be providing ratepayers with appropriate opportunity for discussion.	We have yet to see evidence or a breakdown of spendings that the council has accrued as a large scale debt.  We are not yet able to approve a rate rise for we have yet to see proof of the spending that has occurred by council on behalf of ratepayers.	This prescribed rate increase places an unfair and unjust increase that is not affordable to my household. It is not a reasonable increase. I refuse to accept this increase on our rates.	appropriately tracked and accounted for. Until these funds are accounted for, it is unjust and unlawful to attempt to have the rate payers pay said debt.	
	My name is Kathy Payne and I live in the Central Coast suburb of Somersby (part of the old Gosford Council area). I have serious misgivings about the rate rise applied for by the current Central Coast Council. in 2019 our land was valued by the NSW Valuer General at a price that was higher than what we paid for the entire property with house, sheds and fencing 7 years ago! Due to the new valuation our base rates					
	have increased \$775 per year from 2020 to 2021. Using the CCCouncil online rate calculator (15%) our new rates will increase by a further \$1200 or \$23 per week. This \$2000 increase in 2 years is an unacceptable rise. Our home has no access to town water connection, no sewer service and no curb and guttering or stormwater services. I feel the rise in rates is unfair and will have an adverse effect on					
	secople like me and my family who cannot afford them. Please consider this when making your decision to support a service from an inept and mismanaged Council, who has lost the confidence of either the confidence of the confiden					
	population. Regards,					
135 Kathy Payne	Kathy Pune					
	Dear Madams and Sirs					
	I believe the Council's request for a special variation should not be granted this year and not be granted until					
	* the facts have been presented clearly - the current state of finances (numbers still seem to keep changing), restructuring plans (including an independent review?), where things went wrong since algamation, why not enough synergies were realised, how the risks will be managed in the future and what measures will be put in place to avoid a repeat					
	significant progress towards a balanced budget on the expenses side can be shown (eg realised savings over the next 12-24 months, ie a proven track record for improvement that instills confidence) and better custodinariby (by the Council and its representatives) has been demonstrated - even under the current administrative leadership, expensive capital projects (eg Gosford library) or expense decisions (eg					
	material payout to the terminated CEO) are progressing without it seems sufficient discussion, consultation and regard to the financial crisis that is being presented otherwise  * the petition to the NSW Parliament, signed by a significant number of Central Coast residents, has been heard and a potential investigation, as requested by the electorate, has been conducted					
	We all want sound local service delivery from Council, with quality and efficiency, that is ready for the future, and I believe it is important first to reestablish confidence in the leadership and its plans, before					
	we ail want sound local service delivery from Council, win quality and emiciency, that is ready for the tuture, and i deliver it is important first to reestablish confidence in the leadership and its plants, deliver releasing further tapager (rate pager funds pager) and an approximation of the pager funds.					No proven track record. Since amalgamation (when synergies should be expected), Council hired more
	I thank you for your consideration of these points.	No compelling track record on savings, neither against amalgamation synergies nor new restructuring plans.	Numbers seem to keep changing on the council's situation, as new facts are uncovered. Also, the consultation and communication of the respective impacts			employees and increased expenses materially. Current leadership has also not established a proven track record for the Central Coast, and leadership may or may not change again in Q3 this year (Sep/Oct). The
136 Anonymous Anonymous		This should be demonstrated first (over the next 12-24 months), before a special variation on revenue is granted	fromrate harmonisation (between the former Gosford and Wyong councils) and the special variation impact on rate payers in the different areas has been limited and seems not very clear.			SV request should be put on hold until a track record has been proven and leadership be firmed up (at least for the next 12-24 months).
100 FEBRUARIOUS PERSONNELS	PART needs to clearly understand that the CCC SRV is purely and simply because they mismanaged rate payers money. Looking through other council SRV they are almost all for new projects, or to make things better. CCC submission is to fix their own mistakes by gouging people who have already paid for what should have been done, and should not have to pay again.	grantos.	mined and acceptation ruly distal.			Research on the recovery and the research of t
	It's life if CCC were car service centre, you'd take your car for a set service. Go pick it up and pay. Sometime later they'd contact you and say 'hey look, we know you booked and paid for that service, but we idin't do all the things we were supposed to. We did do some rice other work on your car, to the value you paid, but now you need to bring it back and we'll be a set of the work of the w					
137 Darren Rickett	we're going to bill you for it again"  CCC want more money to fill the huge hole they themselves have dug, by gouging the rate payers for more money after we have already paid. They're not looking to build some new facility, or to make existing					
	resources better, but to fix their own mistakes that they made "unlawfully". IPART MUST say NO to this. IPART needs to tell the State Government that they are vicariously liable for the actions and omissions of their servant and as such need to face up to their own failures, take responsibility, and pay the money that CCC and the Gov want the rate payers to pay. There must be NO approval to rate rises, in any form					
	beyond "peg", unless and until the government puts in place legislation and any other instruments as needed to absolutely ensure that this same or similar situations can never happen again, AND there is an absolute guarantee by the State Gov that IF the proposed rate rise fails to meet the claimed outcome they will NOT pursue another, and will make good any shortfall.					
	Further, PART needs to understand that CCC are deliberately trying to deceive them by claiming the rate rise is 15%, and "sverage" is \$3.20/week, when in fact for very many it will be more like 45% and \$8.90/week ie SIGNIFICANTLY different to what is claimed.					
	When I questioned the true impact with CCC, an email reply admitted To communicate the hundreds possibly thousands of variables in this process is extremely difficult and there was a very tight timeline to					
138 Darren Rickett	lodge the request with IPART." So rather than telling IPART the truth, they made up what in one circumstance MIGHT seem vaguely reasonable, but in fact was HIDING a very SIGNIFICANT impact for many report reterement.					
130 Dallell Rickett	Itality issepayers: Totally appayers: Totally appayers:					
139 Anonymous Anonymous	directors, sent to prison. The same as HIH. directors	The money already being payed to the council is enough to carry on with all the requirement of the rate payers. I do not believe the SRV is necessary. Whilst the financial accounts show a loss, this loss is only a result of a	the community is aware of the need and why to cover the miss management of the council and no it should not happen	no it should not happen	documents can be supplied to support anything, whether it is real or not	Same as above, do not believe that we should have to pay extra for incompetence?
		large amount of depreciation. If the depreciation is omitted, the council is profitable.				delice as above, do not believe that we should have to pay owns for monthpost roc.
						Costa da dicord, del nos denere i visa tre arbana narre se pay esta da matemposarioni
		NSW Accounting guidelines for Local Government clearly states that depreciation shall not be used as a				Owner and according, and not obtained to that we arrived claims to pay Joseph and incomprehensive (
		NSW Accounting guidelines for Local Government clearly states that depreciation shall not be used as a mechanism to justify an increase in rates. This is exactly what the council are doing. Permitting the SRV or the grounds of financial deflict, due to depreciation would be in breach of NSW government guidelines. As such,				Section and section, we can accurate with the actioned section by payment on interroplements.
		NSW Accounting guidelines for Local Government clearly states that depreciation shall not be used as a mechanism by justify an increase in rates. This is exactly what the council are doing. Permitting the SRV on the grounds of financial deletic due to depreciation would be in breach of NSW government guidelines. As such, IPART would be complicit in this breach.				Section day section, section to discover with the allocate section for page section on management occ-
		NSW Accounting guidelines for Local Government clearly states that depreciation shall not be used as a mechanism by justly an increase in rates. This is exactly what the council are doing. Permitting the SPIV on the grounds of financial defict due to depreciation would be in breach of NSW government guidelines. As such IPART would be complicit in this breach.  Technicalities side, I also do not believe the council has exhausted every avenue open to them. The domestic waste charge generates \$15 min surplus per year, with the surplus going into restricted funds. The domestic				Salter and south, so the best of the state of the state of pay their our intemporal doct
		NSW Accounting guidelines for Local Covernment clearly states that depreciation shall not be used as a mechanism by justify an increase in rates. This is exactly what the council are doing. Premitting the SRV on the grounds of financial electric, due to depreciation would be in breach of SRV growment guidelines. As such JPART would be complicit in this breach.  Texthricallise side, take do not believe the council has exhalled every severue open to them. The domestic waste charge generates 515m is surplus per year, with the surplus going into restricted funds. The domestic waste charge generates 515m is surplus per year, with the surplus going into restricted funds. The domestic waste charge generates 515m is surplus per year, with the surplus going into restricted funds. The domestic waste charge generates 515m is surplus per year, with the surplus going into restricted funds. The domestic waste management exercise softwared on a fixed price contact. Both the annual surplus and the restricted management is sufficient to a fixed price contact.				
		NSW Accounting guidelines for Local Government clearly states that depreciation shall not be used as a mechanism by justly an increase in rates. This is exactly what the council are doing. Permitting the SPIV on the grounds of financial defict due to depreciation would be in breach of NSW government guidelines. As such IPART would be complicit in this breach.  Technicalities side, I also do not believe the council has exhausted every avenue open to them. The domestic waste charge generates \$15 min surplus per year, with the surplus going into restricted funds. The domestic	Whilst there has been consultation about the SRV, there has been a complete tack of transparency when combining the impact with rates harmonisation.	The problem of innert with rates have satisfant to execute the	The accounts for the last financial year have not been finalised so it is not possible to	
		NSW Accounting guidelines for Local Government clearly states that depreciation shall not be used as a mechanism by justly an increase in rates. This is easily what the council are doing. Permitting the SPV on the PMRY would be complicated in the breach one world be in treated in 1950 government guidelines. As such PMRY would be complicated in the breach of the properties of 1950 government guidelines. As such Technicalities side, I also do not believe the council has exhausted every extrus open to them. The domestic water change generates do not designed on a fixed price contract. Both the annual surplus and the restricted that are unrecessing world on the legislar operations. All the properties of	Whilst there has been consultation about the SRV, there has been a complete lack of transparency when combining the impact with rates harmonisation. The council misled on the "W impact due to this omission. The Dollar figure has also proven to be incorrect.		evaluate the financial situation properly.	The council has explained this well, although I do not agree with their strategy
140 Stephen Sizer	Ido not support the SRV. Not only do I feel it is punitive on a community that desert have capacity to pay & I do not believe it is necessary as the administration hasn't considered all the options open to them. We would like to put our objections forward towards the exterien rate rises the above council is proposed. The main reason being, as persioners, it's going to make life very hard. Aiready we have had to	NSW Accounting guidelines for Local Government clearly states that depreciation shall not be used as a mechanism by justly an increase in rates. This is excity what the council are doing. Permitting the SRY on the grounds of financial celled child. Set be depreciated on world be in breach of SRY government of SRY government guidelines. As some place in the first part of the complete in the first part of the council be completed in the first part of the set o	Whilst there has been consultation about the SRV, there has been a complete tack of transparency when combining the impact with rates harmonisation.	The combined impact with rates harmonisation is completely unreasonable for residents to meet. This criterion has not been met		
140 Stephen Sizer	We would like to put our objections forward towards the extreme rate rises the above council is proposed. The main reason being, as pensioners, it's going to make life very hard. Already we have had to cancel our private health due to higher costs of living happening now, so we will triave to find other necessities to get rid of now. Also we don't think it's fair that the rate payers have to fund the incompelence of the poor management of counciliors. The Central Coast is beginning to look disapsing due to the lack of upleap of areas such as median strips, council unalisayes, lack of our bar and guitering and poor.	NSW Accounting guidelines for Local Government clearly states that depreciation shall not be used as a mechanism by justly an increase in rates. This is excity what the council are doing. Permitting the SRY on the grounds of financial celled child. Set be depreciated on world be in breach of SRY government of SRY government guidelines. As some place in the first part of the complete in the first part of the council be completed in the first part of the set o	Whilst there has been consultation about the SRV, there has been a complete lack of transparency when combining the impact with rates harmonisation. The council misled on the "W impact due to this omission. The Dollar figure has also proven to be incorrect.		evaluate the financial situation properly.	The council has explained this well, although I do not agree with their strategy
140 Stephen Sizer	We would like to put our objections forward towards the extreme rate rises the above council is proposed. The main reason being, as pensioners, it's going to make life very hard. Already we have had to cancel our private health due to higher costs, of living happening now, so we will have to find other necessities to get it of now. Also we don't think it's lith at the rate payers have to bund the incompetence of	NSW Accounting guidelines for Local Covernment clearly states that depreciation shall not be used as a mechanism by justify an increase in rates. This is exactly what the council are doing. Premitting the SRV and proused of financial deletic, the be depreciation would be in breach of SRV growment guidelines. As such JPART would be complicit in this breach.  The chiralization state of the stat	Whilst there has been consultation about the SRV, there has been a complete lack of transparency when combining the impact with rates harmonisation. The council misled on the "W impact due to this omission. The Dollar figure has also proven to be incorrect.		evaluate the financial situation properly.	The council has explained this well, although I do not agree with their strategy
140 Stephen Sizer	We would like to put our objections forward towards he extreme rate rises the above council is proposed. The main reason being, as persioners, it's going to make life very hard. Already we have had to cancel our privise health due to higher council, living happening not so disqualing due to the lack of uplease of areas such as median strips, could not will be appears have to furth the incompetence of the poor management of councilions. The Central Cossi is beginning to look disqualing due to the lack of uplease of areas such as median strips, could will know, lack of our hard guiltering and poor maniferatemon of coaches. Morely seems to be wasted on unnecessary highing such as the two wild have wall not uniform first foring fices. So it will not not management of councilions in the contract providers of the contract providers and the contract pro	NSW Accounting guidelines for Local Covernment clearly states that depreciation shall not be used as a mechanism by justify an increase in rates. This is exactly what the council are doing. Premitting the SRV and proused of financial deletic, the be depreciation would be in breach of SRV growment guidelines. As such JPART would be complicit in this breach.  The chiralization state of the stat	Whilst there has been consultation about the SRV, there has been a complete tack of transparency when combining the impact with rades harmonisation. The council misled on the "N' impact due to this omission. The Dollar figure has also proven to be incorrect. As such, I do not feel to criterion has been met	This criterion has not been met	evaluate the financial situation properly.	The council has explained this well, although I do not agree with their strategy
140 Stephen Sizer	We would like to put our objections forward towards he extreme rate rises the above council is proposed. The main reason being, as persioners, it's going to make life very hard. Already we have had to cancel our privise health due to higher council (winky papering most, so, so we will have be not find to the recessities to get of of now. Also we don't think it's fail that the late papers have to furth incompetence of the poor management of councilions. The Central Coast is beginning to look disquasting due to the tack of upkeep of areas such as median strips, council waskways, lack of our hard guitering and poor maintenance of cauchions. Noteroy seems to be wasted on unnecessary highing such as the widneys affer right part will be wasted asy may in fail to grides. So look in first long rides. So look in first long rides. So look in the private removal devices is a pick as these are afreedy lacking. If we got behind in our mortgage, or not paying bits, we would be chased and made to pay, So we would also like answers as to why this waster picked up and how was I allowed to get to the large amount. Also assurances and measures takens not identify happen again. Those re-expossible should be charged and made responsible for this morey. It has been stated that we are alteracted of the Council, if so, where are out dividends to the last 30 lius wars we've been parkner taken.	NSW Accounting guidelines for Local Covernment clearly states that depreciation shall not be used as a mechanism by justify an increase in rates. This is exactly what the council are doing. Premitting the SRV and proused of financial deletic, the be depreciation would be in breach of SRV growment guidelines. As such JPART would be complicit in this breach.  The chiralization state of the stat	Whilst there has been consultation about the SRV, there has been a complete lack of transparency when combining the impact with rates harmonisation. The council misled on the "W impact due to this omission. The Dollar figure has also proven to be incorrect.		evaluate the financial situation properly.	The council has explained this well, although I do not agree with their strategy
140 Stephen Stzer	We would like to put our dejections forward towards the exterior rate rises the above council is proposed. The main reason being, as persioners, if going to make life very hard. Aiready we have held to cancel our private health due to higher council, or lived appearance in the country of the council or provided to the first of the recessive lived or lived to the provided or the first of the less persions have been contributed to the lived provided or the first of the less persions have been contributed to the less persions have been contributed to the lived provided to the lived to the lived provided to the lived to the lived provided to the lived to the lived provided to the lived provided to the lived provided to the lived provided to the lived to the lived provided to the lived provided to the lived provided to the lived provided to the lived	NSW Accounting guidelines for Local Covernment clearly states that depreciation shall not be used as a mechanism by justify an increase in rates. This is exactly what the council are doing. Premitting the SRV and proused of financial deletic, the be depreciation would be in breach of SRV growment guidelines. As such JPART would be complicit in this breach.  The chiralization state of the stat	Whilst there has been consultation about the SRV, there has been a complete tack of transparency when combining the impact with rakes harmonisation. The council misled on the "N' impact due to this omission. The Dollar figure has also proven to be incorrect.  As such, I do not feel to criterion has been met  We don't feel it is fair that this extreme rate rise goes sheed. It will make our cost of living impossible.	This criterion has not been met  Definitely not reasonable	evaluate the financial situation properly.	The council has explained this well, although I do not agree with their strategy
140 Slephen Sizer  141 Anonymous Anonymous  142 ANDREW NICHOLAS	We would like to put our objections forward towards the externer rate rises the above council is proposed. The main reason being, as persioners, if, going to make life very hard. Already we have had to cancel our private health due to higher council cold frowing beapering rows, so we will knew for find of the recessible to get of it of now. Already we would be council to be poor management of councilion. The Certai Coast is beginning to look disquisting due to the lack of upleaper of areas such as median stips, council walkways, lack of our hard guitering and poor management of councilion. The Certai Coast is beginning to look disquisting due to the lack of upleaper of areas such as median stips, council walkways, lack of our hard guitering and poor maniferations of coasts. Morroy seems to be wasted on unnecessary hytings such as the walkways all renight and will be wasted and will not be considered and the standard of the coast of the standard	NSW Accounting guidelines for Local Covernment clearly states that depreciation shall not be used as a mechanism by justify an increase in rates. This is easily what the council are cloring. Permitting the SRV on the grounder of financial clerk clore depreciation would be in breach of NSV government guidelines. As such PRKT would be complict in this breach.  The chrisicalities side, raised on the believe the council has exhausted every avenue open to them. The domestic waste charge generates 515m is surplus per year, with the surplus going into restricted funds. The comestic waste charge generates 515m is surplus per year, with the surplus going into restricted funds. The comestic waste charge generates 515m is surplus and per restricted funds. The connection waste management excited both the annual surplus and the restricted funds are unnecessary and can be legisly accessed under the LGA. However, the council have refused to designed with this did not a financial control of the council have refused to engage with this did not a financial control of the council have refused to engage with this did not be money.  Ansate peep of 2% ok so how is our councils intention to raise rates on Central Cosat so significantly and all as a	Whilst there has been consultation about the SRV, there has been a complete tack of transparency when combining the impact with rades harmonisation. The council misled on the "N' impact due to this omission. The Dollar figure has also proven to be incorrect. As such, I do not feel to criterion has been met	This criterion has not been met	evaluate the financial situation properly.	The council has explained this well, although I do not agree with their strategy
140 Stephen Sizer  141 Anonymous Anonymous  142 ANOREW NICHOLAS	We would like to put our dejections forward towards the exterior rate rises the above council is proposed. The main reason being, as persioners, if going to make life very hard. Aiready we have held to cancel our private health due to higher council, or lived appearance in the country of the council or provided to the first of the recessive lived or lived to the provided or the first of the less persions have been contributed to the lived provided or the first of the less persions have been contributed to the less persions have been contributed to the lived provided to the lived to the lived provided to the lived to the lived provided to the lived to the lived provided to the lived provided to the lived provided to the lived provided to the lived to the lived provided to the lived provided to the lived provided to the lived provided to the lived	NSW Accounting guidelines for Local Government clearly states that depreciation shall not be used as a mechanism by justly an increase in rates. This is easily what the council are doing. Premitting the SFV on the guideline was a considered to the depreciation would be intended in SFV government of NSF government against services. The Accounting the SFV on the guideline was a complete in this stream. The development of NSF government of NSF government guideline. As such particulations are also do not believe the council has exhausted every avenue open to them. The domestic waste change generates 515 ms surplus per year, with the surplus going into restricted funds. The domestic waste change generates 515 ms surplus per year, with the surplus going into restricted funds. The domestic waste change generates 515 ms surplus per year, with the surplus going into restricted funds. The domestic waste change generates 515 ms surplus per year, with the surplus going into restricted funds. The domestic waste change extra free per year. The surplus going into the restriction and the restriction and the restriction of the surplus going the restriction and the restriction and the restriction of the surplus going the restriction and the restriction of the surplus going the surplus going the restriction of the surplus going the surplu	Whilst there has been consultation about the SRV, there has been a complete tack of transparency when combining the impact with rakes harmonisation. The council misled on the "N' impact due to this omission. The Dollar figure has also proven to be incorrect.  As such, I do not feel to criterion has been met  We don't feel it is fair that this extreme rate rise goes sheed. It will make our cost of living impossible.	This criterion has not been met  Definitely not reasonable	evaluate the financial situation properly.	The council has explained this well, although I do not agree with their strategy
140 Stephen Sizer  141 Anonymous Anonymous  142 ANDREW NICHOLAS	We would like to put our dejections forward towards the exterior rate rises the above council is proposed. The main reason being, as persioners, if going to make life very hard. Aiready we have held to cancel our private health due to higher council, or lived appearance in the country of the council or provided to the first of the recessive lived or lived to the provided or the first of the less persions have been contributed to the lived provided or the first of the less persions have been contributed to the less persions have been contributed to the lived provided to the lived to the lived provided to the lived to the lived provided to the lived to the lived provided to the lived provided to the lived provided to the lived provided to the lived to the lived provided to the lived provided to the lived provided to the lived provided to the lived	NSW Accounting guidelines for Local Government clearly states that depreciation shall not be used as a mechanism the justify an increase in rates. This is excity what the council are doing. Premitting the SRY on the grounds of financial cellent. One to depreciation would be introduced in SRY government glodelines. As some PRRT would be completed in this breach.  PRRT would be completed in this breach.  To chrisicallises side, 1 and on on believe the council has exhausted every avenue open to them. The domestic waste charge generates 515 min surplus per year, with the surplus going into restricted funds. The domestic waste charge generates 515 min surplus per year, with the surplus going into restricted funds. The domestic waste charge generates 515 min surplus per year, with the surplus going into restricted funds. The domestic waste charge generates 515 min surplus per year, with the surplus going into restricted funds. The domestic waste charge generates 515 min surplus per year, with the surplus going into restricted funds. The domestic waste charge generates 515 min surplus per year, with the surplus going into restricted funds. The domestic waste charge generates 515 min surplus per year, with the surplus going into restricted funds. The domestic waste charge generates 515 min surplus per year, with the surplus going into going into the surplus going go	Whilst there has been consultation about the SRV, there has been a complete tack of transparency when combining the impact with rakes harmonisation. The council misled on the "N' impact due to this omission. The Dollar figure has also proven to be incorrect.  As such, I do not feel to criterion has been met  We don't feel it is fair that this extreme rate rise goes sheed. It will make our cost of living impossible.	This criterion has not been met  Definitely not reasonable	evaluate the financial situation properly.	The council has explained this well, although I do not agree with their strategy
	We would like to put our dejections forward towards the exterior rate rises the above council is proposed. The main reason being, as persioners, if going to make life very hard. Aiready we have held to cancel our private health due to higher council, or lived appearance in the country of the council or provided to the first of the recessive lived or lived to the provided or the first of the less persions have been contributed to the lived provided or the first of the less persions have been contributed to the less persions have been contributed to the lived provided to the lived to the lived provided to the lived to the lived provided to the lived to the lived provided to the lived provided to the lived provided to the lived provided to the lived to the lived provided to the lived provided to the lived provided to the lived provided to the lived	NSW Accounting guidelines for Local Covernment clearly states that depreciation shall not be used as a mechanism by justly an increase in rate. This is easily what the council are doing. Permitting the SPV on the PART would be complicated in the Local Council and Council are doing. Permitting the SPV on the PART would be complicated in SPV government and publishers. As such a state of the Council are doing to the SPV government of SPV government guidelines. As such a state change present and the supplication and the services of the surplication and the services of the surplication and the services of the surplication and the services waste management services to discussed on a flore price contract. Both the annual surplus and the restricted floats are unscreening and can be legally accessed under the LCA. However, the council have refused to engage with this date.  This criterion has not been met  Borrow the money.  Assist page from the Novi is our councils interiors to raise rates on Certifal Coast so apprificantly and all as a Assist processed under the LCA. However, the council have refused to engage with this details are considered to the council have refused to engage with this detail.  Borrow the money.  Assist page from the Novi is our councils interiors to raise rates on Certifal Coast so appreciately and all as a facility of the Novi is considered to the Novi in consideration to raise rates on Certifal Coast so appreciately and all as a March of the Novi in Coast so appreciately and all as a facility of the Novi in Coast so appreciately and all as a Novi in the Novi in Coast so appreciately and all as a Novi in Coast so appreciately and all as a Novi in Coast so appreciately and all as a Novi in Coast so appreciately and all as a Novi in Coast so appreciately and all as a Novi in Coast so are set that was ARE NOT RESPONSED. For I	Whitst there has been consultation about the SRV, there has been a complete tack of transparency when combining the impact with rates harmonisation.  The council missed on the "Vi impact due to this omission. The Dollar figure has also proven to be incorrect.  As such, I do not feed to criterion has been met  We don't feel it is fair that this extreme rate rise goes ahead. It will make our cost of living impossible.  There is no ned for a rate rise. We do not need to be burdened weith local government's incompetence	This criterion has not been met  Oetinitely not reasonable  No raise in rates is acceptable  My wages as a nurse went up by 0.3% yet it is ok to be hit with a rate rise that is simply too much	evaluate the financial situation property. This criterion has not been met  Council will provide this information so that it clears the "State" and does the job to fi	The council has explained this well, although I do not agree with their strategy This criterion has been med.
140 Slephen Sizer  141 Anonymous Anonymous  142 ANDREW NICHOLAS  143 Anonymous Anonymous	We would like to put our dejections forward towards the exterior rate rises the above council is proposed. The main reason being, as persioners, if going to make life very hard. Aiready we have held to cancel our private health due to higher council, or lived appearance in the country of the council or provided to the first of the recessive lived or lived to the provided or the first of the less persions have been contributed to the lived provided or the first of the less persions have been contributed to the less persions have been contributed to the lived provided to the lived to the lived provided to the lived to the lived provided to the lived to the lived provided to the lived provided to the lived provided to the lived provided to the lived to the lived provided to the lived provided to the lived provided to the lived provided to the lived	NSW Accounting guidelines for Local Government clearly states that depreciation shall not be used as a mechanism by justly an increase in rates. This is exactly what the council are doing. Premitting the SPV on the PMRY would be completed in the Increase of the PMRY would be completed in 1989 government guidelines. As such TMRY and the complete in 1989 between guidelines. As such TMRY and the complete in 1989 between the properties of 15 min is supplied by year, with the surplus going this residualist drude. The domestic waste change generated 515 min is supplied by year, with the surplus going this residualist drude. The domestic waste change generated 515 min is supplied by year, with the surplus going this residualist drude. The domestic waste change generated 515 min is supplied by year, with the surplus going this related trade. The domestic waste change with this date.  This criterion has not been met  Borrow the money.  A rate page of 275 ok to how is our councils interface to TMRY and the surplus going the related to the third of the	Whilst there has been consultation about the SRV, there has been a complete tack of transparency when combining the impact with rakes harmonisation. The council misled on the "N' impact due to this omission. The Dollar figure has also proven to be incorrect.  As such, I do not feel to criterion has been met  We don't feel it is fair that this extreme rate rise goes sheed. It will make our cost of living impossible.	This criterion has not been met  Definitely not reasonable  No raise in rates is acceptable	evaluate the financial situation property. This criterion has not been met	The council has explained this well, although I do not agree with their strategy
	We would like to put our dejections forward towards the exterior rate rises the above council is proposed. The main reason being, as persioners, if going to make life very hard. Aiready we have held to cancel our private health due to higher council, or lived appearance in the country of the council or provided to the first of the recessive lived or lived to the provided or the first of the less persions have been contributed to the lived provided or the first of the less persions have been contributed to the less persions have been contributed to the lived provided to the lived to the lived provided to the lived to the lived provided to the lived to the lived provided to the lived provided to the lived provided to the lived provided to the lived to the lived provided to the lived provided to the lived provided to the lived provided to the lived	NSW Accounting guidelines for Local Government clearly states that depreciation shall not be used as a mechanism by justly an increase in rates. This is excity what the council are doing. Premitting the SRY on the guideline council are included in the depreciation would be intended in SRY government of NSV government glodeline. As because the provide in the state of the Council are excited that complete in the stream.  The chrisicallies side, it also do not believe the council has exhausted every avenue open to them. The domestic waste charge generates 515 min surplus per year, with the surplus going into restricted funds. The domestic waste charge generates 515 min surplus per year, with the surplus going into restricted funds. The domestic waste charge generates 515 min surplus per year, with the surplus going into restricted funds. The domestic waste charge generates 610 min surplus per year, with the surplus going into restricted funds. The domestic waste charge generates for a fine of the strength of the surplus going into restricted funds. The domestic waste charge with this idea.  This criterion has not been met.  Borrow the money.  A rate peg of 725 ok so how is our councils interiors to raise rates on Certail Coast so significantly and all as a Arrive per grow of the surplus grows	Whitst there has been consultation about the SRV, there has been a complete tack of transparency when combining the impact with rates harmonisation.  The council missed on the "Vi impact due to this omission. The Dollar figure has also proven to be incorrect.  As such, I do not feed to criterion has been met  We don't feel it is fair that this extreme rate rise goes ahead. It will make our cost of living impossible.  There is no ned for a rate rise. We do not need to be burdened weith local government's incompetence	This criterion has not been met  Oetinitely not reasonable  No raise in rates is acceptable  My wages as a nurse went up by 0.3% yet it is ok to be hit with a rate rise that is simply too much	evaluate the financial situation property. This criterion has not been met  Council will provide this information so that it clears the "State" and does the job to fi	The council has explained this well, although I do not agree with their strategy. This critisrion has been med.
	We would like to put out objections forward towards the activement rate rises the above council is proposed. The main reason being, as persioners, if a going to make life very hard. Already we have held to cancel our private health due to higher council or private health due to higher council or high people rises, or level in the own to the first of the recessible to got of of now. Also we would have been for the point management to consider the point management of the council to the point of the recessible to got of of now. Also we would have been for the point management of	NSW Accounting guidelines for Local Government clearly states that depreciation shall not be used as a mechanism by justly an increase in rates. This is exactly what the council are doing. Premitting the SPV on the PMRY would be completed in the Increase of the PMRY would be completed in 1989 government guidelines. As such TMRY and the complete in 1989 between guidelines. As such TMRY and the complete in 1989 between the properties of 15 min is supplied by year, with the surplus going this residualist drude. The domestic waste change generated 515 min is supplied by year, with the surplus going this residualist drude. The domestic waste change generated 515 min is supplied by year, with the surplus going this residualist drude. The domestic waste change generated 515 min is supplied by year, with the surplus going this related trade. The domestic waste change with this date.  This criterion has not been met  Borrow the money.  A rate page of 275 ok to how is our councils interface to TMRY and the surplus going the related to the third of the	Whitst there has been consultation about the SRV, there has been a complete tack of transparency when combining the impact with rates harmonisation.  The council missed on the "Vi impact due to this omission. The Dollar figure has also proven to be incorrect.  As such, I do not feed to criterion has been met  We don't feel it is fair that this extreme rate rise goes ahead. It will make our cost of living impossible.  There is no ned for a rate rise. We do not need to be burdened weith local government's incompetence	This criterion has not been met  Oetinitely not reasonable  No raise in rates is acceptable  My wages as a nurse went up by 0.3% yet it is ok to be hit with a rate rise that is simply too much	evaluate the financial situation property. This criterion has not been met  Council will provide this information so that it clears the "State" and does the job to fi	The council has explained this well, although I do not agree with their strategy. This critisrion has been med.
143 Anonymous Anonymous  144 Anonymous Anonymous	We would like to put our objections forward towards the activement rate rises the above council is proposed. The main reason being, as persistores, it's going to make life very hard. Already we have had to cancel our private health due to higher council our joined with counting the council or provide settled to the lives being on the counting the council or provide settled to the lives of the counting the council or provide settled to the counting the coun	NSW Accounting guidelines for Local Government clearly states that depreciation shall not be used as a mechanism by justly an increase in rates. This is easily what the council are delique. Permitting the SPV on the PMSY was also as the council are delique. Permitting the SPV on the PMSY was also as the council are shall be completed in this break. The christian of his flag exheriment guidelines. As such a PMSY was also also also also not believe the council has exhausted every aversue open to them. The domestic waste change generates \$15 min suspian per year, with the surplus going time restricted funds. The domestic waste change generates \$15 min suspian per year, with the surplus going time restricted funds. The domestic waste change generates \$15 min suspian per year, with the surplus going time restricted funds. The domestic waste change generates \$15 min suspian per year, with the surplus going time restricted funds. The domestic waste change with this disease.  This criterion has not been met  Borrow the money  A rate peg of 2% ok by how is our councils intention to raise rates on Central Coast so significantly and all as a create waste of the council have refused to with incorporate part of the programment of the program	Whitst there has been consultation about the SRV, there has been a complete tack of transparency when combining the impact with rates harmonisation.  The council missed on the "Vi impact due to this omission. The Dollar figure has also proven to be incorrect.  As such, I do not feed to criterion has been met  We don't feel it is fair that this extreme rate rise goes ahead. It will make our cost of living impossible.  There is no ned for a rate rise. We do not need to be burdened weith local government's incompetence	This criterion has not been met  Oetinitely not reasonable  No raise in rates is acceptable  My wages as a nurse went up by 0.3% yet it is ok to be hit with a rate rise that is simply too much	evaluate the financial situation property. This criterion has not been met  Council will provide this information so that it clears the "State" and does the job to fi	The council has explained this well, although I do not agree with their strategy This criterion has been med.
143 Anonymous Anonymous  144 Anonymous Anonymous	We would like to put our objections forward towards the activement rate rises the above council is proposed. The main reason being, as persisiones, if, going to make life very hint. Already we have held to cancel our private health due to higher count, forwards when you so we will there for the form of the recessible to got if of now. Alse we would have the end to what the first in the payers have to that the incompletence of the poor management of councilisms. The Certifical Coast is beginning to look disquisting due to the fact, duyleegy of series such as median stips, council walkways, lack of our and giftering and poor the responsibility of the council to the poor the council walkways, lack of our and giftering and poor the strength of the poor management of councilisms. The Certifical Coast forwards and the property of the council walkways, lack of our and giftering and poor the strength or property of the poor that the p	NSW Accounting guidelines for Local Government clearly states that depreciation shall not be used as a mechanism by justly an increase in rates. This is easily what the council are delique. Permitting the SPV on the PMSY was also as a mechanism by justly an increase in rates. This is easily what the council are delique from the PMSY was also provided by the treat of 1959 government guidelines. As such TMSY was also provided by the council of 1959 government guidelines. As such a provided in the surplus design the service open to them. The domestic waste change generates \$15 min surplus per year, with the surplus going this restricted funds. The domestic waste change generates \$15 min surplus per year, with the surplus going this restricted funds. The domestic waste change generates \$15 min surplus per year, with the surplus going this restricted funds. The domestic waste change generates \$15 min surplus per year, with the surplus going this restricted funds. The domestic waste change with this delication of the provided funds of the surplus going this provided funds. The domestic waste change with this delication of the provided funds are understanded to engage with this delay.  Biorrow the money.  A rate peop of 2% ok we how is our councils intention to raise rates on Central Coast so significantly and all as a result of minimagement of 27 % not digit nor is it fair. For this vast increase we residently will not benefit with intensic prevents just clear a deet that we ARE NOT RESPONSELE for I was the generated will not benefit with the province of the	Whitst there has been consultation about the SRV, there has been a complete tack of transparency when combining the impact with rates harmonisation.  The council missed on the "Vi impact due to this omission. The Dollar figure has also proven to be incorrect.  As such, I do not feed to criterion has been met  We don't feel it is fair that this extreme rate rise goes ahead. It will make our cost of living impossible.  There is no ned for a rate rise. We do not need to be burdened weith local government's incompetence	This criterion has not been met  Oetinitely not reasonable  No raise in rates is acceptable  My wages as a nurse went up by 0.3% yet it is ok to be hit with a rate rise that is simply too much	evaluate the financial situation property. This criterion has not been met  Council will provide this information so that it clears the "State" and does the job to fi	The council has explained this well, although I do not agree with their strategy This criterion has been med.
143 Anonymous Anonymous  144 Anonymous Anonymous	We would like to put our objections forward towards the activement rate rises the above council is proposed. The main reason being, as persistores, if a going to make life very hard. Already we have held to cancel our private health due to higher count, of lively appearing mys. so we will these to the first off or recessibles to got off or now. Allew out of high the county is a county with the county of t	NSW Accounting guidelines for Local Government clearly states that depreciation shall not be used as a mechanism by justly an increase in rates. This is easily what the council are delique. Permitting the SPV on the PMSY was also as a mechanism by justly an increase in rates. This is easily what the council are delique from the PMSY was also provided by the treat of 1959 government guidelines. As such TMSY was also provided by the council of 1959 government guidelines. As such a provided in the surplus design the service open to them. The domestic waste change generates \$15 min surplus per year, with the surplus going this restricted funds. The domestic waste change generates \$15 min surplus per year, with the surplus going this restricted funds. The domestic waste change generates \$15 min surplus per year, with the surplus going this restricted funds. The domestic waste change generates \$15 min surplus per year, with the surplus going this restricted funds. The domestic waste change with this delication of the provided funds of the surplus going this provided funds. The domestic waste change with this delication of the provided funds are understanded to engage with this delay.  Biorrow the money.  A rate peop of 2% ok we how is our councils intention to raise rates on Central Coast so significantly and all as a result of minimagement of 27 % not digit nor is it fair. For this vast increase we residently will not benefit with intensic prevents just clear a deet that we ARE NOT RESPONSELE for I was the generated will not benefit with the province of the	Whitst there has been consultation about the SRV, there has been a complete tack of transparency when combining the impact with rates harmonisation.  The council missed on the "Vi impact due to this omission. The Dollar figure has also proven to be incorrect.  As such, I do not feed to criterion has been met  We don't feel it is fair that this extreme rate rise goes ahead. It will make our cost of living impossible.  There is no ned for a rate rise. We do not need to be burdened weith local government's incompetence	This criterion has not been met  Oetinitely not reasonable  No raise in rates is acceptable  My wages as a nurse went up by 0.3% yet it is ok to be hit with a rate rise that is simply too much	evaluate the financial situation property. This criterion has not been met  Council will provide this information so that it clears the "State" and does the job to fi	The council has explained this well, although I do not agree with their strategy. This critisrion has been med.
143 Anonymous Anonymous  144 Anonymous Anonymous	We would like to put our objections forward towards the activement rate rises the above council is proposed. The main reason being, as persistores, if going to make life very hard. Already we have held to cancel our private health due to higher count, fiving happering mys. so we will then to the first offer recessibles to got off or now. Alse would not be used to his in a first time to present when the first time of the poor management of councidins. The Certific Cost is beginning to look disguisting due to the flack of upleage of mans to such as median stips, council walkways, lack of our and guidering aird poor in the poor of the poor management of council management of the poor management of council management of the poor management of council management of the poor managem	NSW Accounting guidelines for Local Government clearly states that depreciation shall not be used as a mechanism by justly an increase in rates. This is easily what the council are delique. Permitting the SPV on the PMSY was also as a mechanism by justly an increase in rates. This is easily what the council are delique from the PMSY was also provided by the treat of 1959 government guidelines. As such TMSY was also provided by the council of 1959 government guidelines. As such a provided in the surplus design the service open to them. The domestic waste change generates \$15 min surplus per year, with the surplus going this restricted funds. The domestic waste change generates \$15 min surplus per year, with the surplus going this restricted funds. The domestic waste change generates \$15 min surplus per year, with the surplus going this restricted funds. The domestic waste change generates \$15 min surplus per year, with the surplus going this restricted funds. The domestic waste change with this delication of the provided funds of the surplus going this provided funds. The domestic waste change with this delication of the provided funds are understanded to engage with this delay.  Biorrow the money.  A rate peop of 2% ok we how is our councils intention to raise rates on Central Coast so significantly and all as a result of minimagement of 27 % not digit nor is it fair. For this vast increase we residently will not benefit with intensic prevents just clear a deet that we ARE NOT RESPONSELE for I was the generated will not benefit with the province of the	Whitst there has been consultation about the SRV, there has been a complete tack of transparency when combining the impact with rates harmonisation.  The council missed on the "Vi impact due to this omission. The Dollar figure has also proven to be incorrect.  As such, I do not feed to criterion has been met  We don't feel it is fair that this extreme rate rise goes ahead. It will make our cost of living impossible.  There is no ned for a rate rise. We do not need to be burdened weith local government's incompetence	This criterion has not been met  Oetinitely not reasonable  No raise in rates is acceptable  My wages as a nurse went up by 0.3% yet it is ok to be hit with a rate rise that is simply too much	evaluate the financial situation property. This criterion has not been met  Council will provide this information so that it clears the "State" and does the job to financial will provide this information so that it clears the "State" and does the job to financial will provide this information so that it clears the "State" and does the job to fin	The council has explained this well, although I do not agree with their strategy. This critisrion has been med.
143 Anonymous Anonymous  144 Anonymous Anonymous	We would like to put our objections forward towards the actient rate rises the above council is proposed. The main reason being, as persistores, if, going to make life very hard. Already we have held to cancel our private health due to higher count, fiving happening more, so we will then to the first off or recessibles to get off or now. Aller would not be not think it is fall that be payed have to the incompletence of the poor management of councilism. The Certifical Costs is beginning to look disquisting due to the fact, drugheep of series such as median stips, countil walkways, lack of our and guidering and poor of the poor management of councilism. The Certifical Costs is the countil of the stips of the poor management of councilism. The Certifical Costs is the stips of	NSW Accounting guidelines for Local Government clearly states that depreciation shall not be used as a mechanism by justly an increase in rates. This is easily what the council are delique. Permitting the SPV on the PMSY was also as a mechanism by justly an increase in rates. This is easily what the council are delique from the PMSY was also provided by the treat of 1959 government guidelines. As such TMSY was also provided by the council of 1959 government guidelines. As such a provided in the surplus design the service open to them. The domestic waste change generates \$15 min surplus per year, with the surplus going this restricted funds. The domestic waste change generates \$15 min surplus per year, with the surplus going this restricted funds. The domestic waste change generates \$15 min surplus per year, with the surplus going this restricted funds. The domestic waste change generates \$15 min surplus per year, with the surplus going this restricted funds. The domestic waste change with this delication of the provided funds of the surplus going this provided funds. The domestic waste change with this delication of the provided funds are understanded to engage with this delay.  Biorrow the money.  A rate peop of 2% ok we how is our councils intention to raise rates on Central Coast so significantly and all as a result of minimagement of 27 % not digit nor is it fair. For this vast increase we residently will not benefit with intensic prevents just clear a deet that we ARE NOT RESPONSELE for I was the generated will not benefit with the province of the	Whitst there has been consultation about the SRV, there has been a complete tack of transparency when combining the impact with rates harmonisation.  The council missed on the "Vi impact due to this omission. The Dollar figure has also proven to be incorrect.  As such, I do not feed to criterion has been met  We don't feel it is fair that this extreme rate rise goes ahead. It will make our cost of living impossible.  There is no ned for a rate rise. We do not need to be burdened weith local government's incompetence	This criterion has not been met  Oetinitely not reasonable  No raise in rates is acceptable  My wages as a nurse went up by 0.3% yet it is ok to be hit with a rate rise that is simply too much	evaluate the financial situation property. This criterion has not been met  Council will provide this information so that it clears the "State" and does the job to financial will provide this information so that it clears the "State" and does the job to financial will provide this information so that it clears the "State" and does the job to fin	The council has explained this well, although I do not agree with their strategy This critisrion has been met
143 Anonymous Anonymous  144 Anonymous Anonymous	We would like to put out objections forward towards the activement rate rises the above council is proposed. The main reason being, as persistores, if going to make life very hard. Aiready we have held to cancel out private health due to higher count, of his propers and out of his propers and the private of his propers and the count of his result is the count think if it is that peops have but not the incompetence of count of his read that the count think if it is that peops have but not the incompetence of the count of his read to the coun	NSW Accounting guidelines for Local Government clearly states that depreciation shall not be used as a mechanism by justly an increase in rates. This is easily what the council are delique. Permitting the SPV on the PMSY was also as a mechanism by justly an increase in rates. This is easily what the council are delique from the PMSY was also provided by the treat of 1959 government guidelines. As such TMSY was also provided by the council of 1959 government guidelines. As such a provided in the surplus design the service open to them. The domestic waste change generates \$15 min surplus per year, with the surplus going this restricted funds. The domestic waste change generates \$15 min surplus per year, with the surplus going this restricted funds. The domestic waste change generates \$15 min surplus per year, with the surplus going this restricted funds. The domestic waste change generates \$15 min surplus per year, with the surplus going this restricted funds. The domestic waste change with this delication of the provided funds of the surplus going this provided funds. The domestic waste change with this delication of the provided funds are understanded to engage with this delay.  Biorrow the money.  A rate peop of 2% ok we how is our councils intention to raise rates on Central Coast so significantly and all as a result of minimagement of 27 % not digit nor is it fair. For this vast increase we residently will not benefit with intensic prevents just clear a deet that we ARE NOT RESPONSELE for I was the generated will not benefit with the province of the	Whitst there has been consultation about the SRV, there has been a complete tack of transparency when combining the impact with rates harmonisation.  The council missed on the "Vi impact due to this omission. The Dollar figure has also proven to be incorrect.  As such, I do not feed to criterion has been met  We don't feel it is fair that this extreme rate rise goes ahead. It will make our cost of living impossible.  There is no ned for a rate rise. We do not need to be burdened weith local government's incompetence	This criterion has not been met  Oetinitely not reasonable  No raise in rates is acceptable  My wages as a nurse went up by 0.3% yet it is ok to be hit with a rate rise that is simply too much	evaluate the financial situation property. This criterion has not been met  Council will provide this information so that it clears the "State" and does the job to financial will provide this information so that it clears the "State" and does the job to financial will provide this information so that it clears the "State" and does the job to fin	The council has explained this well, although I do not agree with their strategy This critisrion has been met.
143 Anonymous Anonymous  144 Anonymous Anonymous	We would like to put our objections forward towards the actient rate rises the above council is proposed. The main reason being, as persistores, if, going to make life very hard. Already we have held to cancel our private health due to higher count, fiving happening more, so we will then to the first off or recessibles to get off or now. Aller would not be not think it is fall that be payed have to the incompletence of the poor management of councilism. The Certifical Costs is beginning to look disquisting due to the fact, drugheep of series such as median stips, countil walkways, lack of our and guidering and poor of the poor management of councilism. The Certifical Costs is the countil of the stips of the poor management of councilism. The Certifical Costs is the stips of	NSW Accounting guidelines for Local Government clearly states that depreciation shall not be used as a mechanism by justly an increase in rates. This is easily what the council are delique. Permitting the SPV on the PMSY was also as a mechanism by justly an increase in rates. This is easily what the council are delique from the PMSY was also provided by the treat of 1959 government guidelines. As such TMSY was also provided by the council of 1959 government guidelines. As such a provided in the surplus design the service open to them. The domestic waste change generates \$15 min surplus per year, with the surplus going this restricted funds. The domestic waste change generates \$15 min surplus per year, with the surplus going this restricted funds. The domestic waste change generates \$15 min surplus per year, with the surplus going this restricted funds. The domestic waste change generates \$15 min surplus per year, with the surplus going this restricted funds. The domestic waste change with this delication of the provided funds of the surplus going this provided funds. The domestic waste change with this delication of the provided funds are understanded to engage with this delay.  Biorrow the money.  A rate peop of 2% ok we how is our councils intention to raise rates on Central Coast so significantly and all as a result of minimagement of 27 % not digit nor is it fair. For this vast increase we residently will not benefit with intensic prevents just clear a deet that we ARE NOT RESPONSELE for I was the generated will not benefit with the province of the	Whitst there has been consultation about the SRV, there has been a complete tack of transparency when combining the impact with rates harmonisation.  The council missed on the "Vi impact due to this omission. The Dollar figure has also proven to be incorrect.  As such, I do not feed to criterion has been met  We don't feel it is fair that this extreme rate rise goes ahead. It will make our cost of living impossible.  There is no ned for a rate rise. We do not need to be burdened weith local government's incompetence	This criterion has not been met  Oetinitely not reasonable  No raise in rates is acceptable  My wages as a nurse went up by 0.3% yet it is ok to be hit with a rate rise that is simply too much	evaluate the financial situation property. This criterion has not been met  Council will provide this information so that it clears the "State" and does the job to financial will provide this information so that it clears the "State" and does the job to financial will provide this information so that it clears the "State" and does the job to fin	The council has explained this well, although I do not agree with their strategy This critisrion has been met.
143 Anonymous Anonymous  144 Anonymous Anonymous	We would like to put out objections forward towards the activement rate rises the above council is proposed. The main reason being, as persistores, if going to make life very hard. Aiready we have held to cancel out private health due to higher count, of his propers and out of his propers and the private of his propers and the count of his result is the count think if it is that peops have but not the incompetence of count of his read that the count think if it is that peops have but not the incompetence of the count of his read to the coun	NSW Accounting guidelines for Local Government clearly states that depreciation shall not be used as a mechanism by justly an increase in rates. This is easily what the council are delay, Premitting the SPV on the IMPAT would be compiled in the break.  TREMENT would be compiled in this break.  TREMENT would be compiled the service of the council has exhausted every avenue open to them. The domestic waste change generates \$15 min suspian per year, with the surplus going this restricted funds. The domestic waste change generates \$15 min suspian per year, with the surplus going this restricted funds. The domestic waste change generates \$15 min suspian per year, with the surplus going this restricted funds. The domestic waste change generates \$15 min suspian per year, with the surplus going this restricted funds. The domestic waste change with this decide to the surplus going this restrict waste of the surplus going this restrict the consistency of the surplus going this restrict the surplus going the surplus going this restrict the surplus going this restrict the surplus going the	Whitst there has been consultation about the SRV, there has been a complete tack of transparency when combining the impact with rates harmonisation.  The council missed on the "Vi impact due to this omission. The Dollar figure has also proven to be incorrect.  As such, I do not feed to criterion has been met  We don't feel it is fair that this extreme rate rise goes ahead. It will make our cost of living impossible.  There is no ned for a rate rise. We do not need to be burdened weith local government's incompetence	This criterion has not been met  Oetinitely not reasonable  No raise in rates is acceptable  My wages as a nurse went up by 0.3% yet it is ok to be hit with a rate rise that is simply too much	evaluate the financial situation property. This criterion has not been met  Council will provide this information so that it clears the "State" and does the job to financial will provide this information so that it clears the "State" and does the job to financial will provide this information so that it clears the "State" and does the job to fin	The council has explained this well, although I do not agree with their strategy. This critisrion has been med.
143 Anonymous Anonymous  144 Anonymous Anonymous	We would like to put out objections forward towards the activement rate rises the above council is proposed. The main reason being, as persistores, if going to make life very hard. Aiready we have held to cancel out private health due to higher count, of his propers and out of his propers and the private of his propers and the count of his result is the count think if it is that peops have but not the incompetence of count of his read that the count think if it is that peops have but not the incompetence of the count of his read to the coun	NSW Accounting guidelines for Local Government clearly states that depreciation shall not be used as a mechanism by justly an increase in rates. This is easily what the council are oding. Premitting the SPV on the PMST would be comploid in the breach of the Council are oding. Premitting the SPV on the PMST would be comploid in the breach.  Technicalities also, also do not believe the council has exhausted every avenue open to them. The domestic waste change generates \$15 min surplus per year, with the surplus going into restricted funds. The domestic waste change generates \$15 min surplus per year, with the surplus going into restricted funds. The domestic waste change generates \$15 min surplus per year, with the surplus going into restricted funds. The domestic waste change generates \$15 min surplus per year, with the surplus going into restricted funds. The domestic waste change of the legislary accessed under the LGA. However, the council have related to ensure the surplus and the restricted to ensure the surplus of \$25 min. The council have related to ensure the surplus of \$25 min. The council have related to ensure the ensure and the surplus of \$25 min. The council have related to ensure the surplus of \$25 min. The council have related to ensure the surplus of \$25 min. The council have related to the surplus of \$25 min. The council area body needs each that we ARE NOT RESPONDELE for!  The council area body needs each funds to support the needs of the community. One only has to waste council to decided and see the preject throughout the three personables can were their surplus of the community. One only has to waste council and colored and the responsible can were the surplus of the property the first time the same patch up job get patched upon and over again.  In it suce of any alternate eventure shown as that could make the reconsory import.  This accompliant of certains Coast Council brought all of this decided on leaf and great we releasely to to contribute to toking decide in which we had not only at a	Whilst there has been consultation about the SRV, there has been a complete lack of transparency when combining the impact with rates harmonisation.  The council misled on the "Vi impact due to this omission. The Dollar figure has also proven to be incorrect.  As such, I do not feel to criterion has been met  We don't feel it is fair that this extreme rate rise goes ahead. It will make our cost of living impossible.  There is no ned for a rate rise. We do not need to be burdened weith local government's incompletence  Evidence of mis management ask the administrator? He has all this information.	This criterion has not been met  Oetinitely not reasonable  No raise in rates is acceptable  My wages as a nurse went up by 0.3% yet it is ok to be hit with a rate rise that is simply too much	evaluate the financial situation property. This criterion has not been met  Council will provide this information so that it clears the "State" and does the job to financial will provide this information so that it clears the "State" and does the job to financial will provide this information so that it clears the "State" and does the job to fin	The council has explained this well, although I do not agree with their strategy. This critisrion has been med.
143 Anonymous Anonymous  144 Anonymous Anonymous	We would like to put out objections forward towards the activement rate rises the above council is proposed. The main reason being, as persistores, if going to make life very hard. Aiready we have held to cancel out private health due to higher count, of his propers and out of his propers and the private of his propers and the count of his result is the count think if it is that peops have but not the incompetence of count of his read that the count think if it is that peops have but not the incompetence of the count of his read to the coun	NSW Accounting guidelines for Local Covernment clearly states that depreciation shall not be used as a machinism by justly an increase in rate. This is exactly what the council are doing. Permitting the SPV on the PMRY would be completed in the Local and the PMRY would be completed in 1992 representations of 1992 government guidelines. As such a PMRY would be completed in 1992 government of 1992 government of 1992 or 1992 government of 1992 gover	Whilst there has been consultation about the SRV, there has been a complete lack of transparency when combining the impact with rates harmonisation.  The council misled on the "Vi impact due to this omission. The Dollar figure has also proven to be incorrect.  As such, I do not feel to criterion has been met  We don't feel it is fair that this extreme rate rise goes ahead. It will make our cost of living impossible.  There is no ned for a rate rise. We do not need to be burdened weith local government's incompletence  Evidence of mis management ask the administrator? He has all this information.	This criterion has not been met  Oetinitely not reasonable  No raise in rates is acceptable  My wages as a nurse went up by 0.3% yet it is ok to be hit with a rate rise that is simply too much	evaluate the financial situation property. This criterion has not been met  Council will provide this information so that it clears the "State" and does the job to financial will provide this information so that it clears the "State" and does the job to financial will provide this information so that it clears the "State" and does the job to fin	The council has explained this well, although I do not agree with their strategy This criterion has been med.
143 Anonymous Anonymous  144 Anonymous Anonymous	We would like to put out objections forward towards the activement rate rises the above council is proposed. The main reason being, as persistores, if going to make life very hard. Aiready we have held to cancel out private health due to higher count, of his propers and out of his propers and the private of his propers and the count of his result is the count think if it is that peops have but not the incompetence of count of his read that the count think if it is that peops have but not the incompetence of the count of his read to the coun	NSW Accounting guidelines for Local Government clearly states that depreciation shall not be used as a mechanism by justly an increase in rates. This is easily what the council are delique. Permitting the SPV on the MPARY would be comploid in the breach in read to make the new council and oding. Permitting the SPV on the MPARY would be comploid in the breach.  Technicalities also, it also do not believe the council has exhausted every aversue open to them. The domestic waste change generates \$15 min surplus per year, with the surplus going this restricted funds. The domestic waste change generates \$15 min surplus per year, with the surplus going this restricted funds. The domestic waste change generates \$15 min surplus per year, with the surplus going this restricted funds. The domestic waste change generates \$15 min surplus per year, with the surplus going this restricted funds. The domestic waste change are done to the surplus going this restricted funds. The domestic waste change with this decide.  This criterion has not been met  Borrow the money.  A rate peg of 2% ok to how its our councils intention to raise rates on Central Coast so significantly and all as a result of instangage and the significantly and all as a first with the poperate (A77 % not inglif nor is it fair. For this wast increase we residents will not benefit with improvements just clear a deat that we ARE NOT RESPONSIBLE for!  If were the poperator of a public company the those who managed would be responsible and liable. Seems in council those responsible can wise their hands and ask for recognised from the payers. All Bio NO AVI.  The contract and sylvent each that we know the property the first time the same patch up judge get patched up over any over again.  If m. 8 sure of any alternative revenue streams that could make the necessary impact.  If m. 8 sure of any alternative revenue streams that could make the necessary impact.  This incompetent Central Coast Council to returnly dear in my view to change at all from bytes were it i	Whilst there has been consultation about the SRV, there has been a complete lack of transparency when combining the impact with rates harmonisation.  The council misled on the "Vi impact due to this omission. The Dollar figure has also proven to be incorrect.  As such, I do not feel to criterion has been met  We don't feel it is fair that this extreme rate rise goes ahead. It will make our cost of living impossible.  There is no ned for a rate rise. We do not need to be burdened weith local government's incompletence.  Evidence of mis management ask the administrator? He has all this information.	This criterion has not been met  Oetinitely not reasonable  No raise in rates is acceptable  My wages as a nurse went up by 0.3% yet it is ok to be hit with a rate rise that is simply too much	evaluate the financial situation property. This criterion has not been met  Council will provide this information so that it clears the "State" and does the job to financial will provide this information so that it clears the "State" and does the job to financial will provide this information so that it clears the "State" and does the job to fin	The council has explained this well, although I do not agree with their strategy. This critisrion has been med.
143 Anonymous Anonymous  144 Anonymous Anonymous	We would like to put out objections forward towards the activement rate rises the above council is proposed. The main reason being, as persistores, if going to make life very hard. Aiready we have held to cancel out private health due to higher count, of his propers and out of his propers and the private of his propers and the count of his result is the count think if it is that peops have but not the incompetence of count of his read that the count think if it is that peops have but not the incompetence of the count of his read to the coun	NSW Accounting guidelines for Local Government clearly states that depreciation shall not be used as a mechanism by justly an increase in rates. This is easily what the council are oding. Premitting the SPV on the PMST would be comploid in the breach mode to in those of 1987 government guidelines. As such TSMST would be comploid in the breach.  Tachnicalities side, lated do not believe the council has exhausted every avenue open to them. The domestic waste change generates \$15 m in surplus per year, with the surplus going into restricted funds. The domestic waste change generates \$15 m in surplus per year, with the surplus going into restricted funds. The domestic waste change generates \$15 m in surplus per year, with the surplus going into restricted funds. The domestic waste change generates \$15 m in surplus per year, with the surplus going into restricted funds. The domestic waste change with this idea.  This criterion has not been met  Berrow the money.  A rated peep of 2% ok to how is our councils intention to make rates on Central Coast so agginficantly and all as a required of the council has been provided by the council have reliated to engage with this idea.  This criterion has not been met  Berrow the money.  A rated peep of 2% ok to how is our councils intention to make rates on Central Coast so agginficantly and all as a transfer of the council have reliated to engage with this idea.  This criterion has not been met  Berrow the money.  Berrow the money.  Berrow the money.  Berrow the money.  Berrow the money with the surplus per council have reliated to the surplus per council have reliated to the surplus per council and the surplus per council and the surplus per council area bady to a surplus per council and the surplus per council area bady to a surplus per council and the surplus per council area bady to a surplus per counc	Whilst there has been consultation about the SRV, there has been a complete lack of transparency when combining the impact with rates harmonisation.  The council misled on the "Vi impact due to this omission. The Dollar figure has also proven to be incorrect.  As such, I do not feel to criterion has been met  We don't feel it is fair that this extreme rate rise goes ahead. It will make our cost of living impossible.  There is no ned for a rate rise. We do not need to be burdened weith local government's incompletence.  Evidence of mis management ask the administrator? He has all this information.	This critierion has not been met  Definitely not reasonable  No raise in rates is acceptable  My wages as a nurse went up by 0.3% yet it is ok to be hit with a rate rise that is simply too much and not justified to benefit the ratepayers.  If Council rates are raised ratepayers will be seriously disadvantaged especially retrees on	evaluate the financial situation properly. This criterion has not been met  Council will provide this information so that it clears the "State" and does the job to to a problem that natepayers are NOT RESPONSIBLE for.	The council has explained this well, although I do not agree with their strategy. This critisrion has been med.
143 Anonymous Anonymous  144 Anonymous Anonymous	We would like to put out objections forward towards the activement rate rises the above council is proposed. The main reason being, as persistores, if going to make life very hard. Already we have held to cancel our private held due to higher out, of high papering may, so we will there for the informer feeting the post of an own Andrew word that it is the late appears have to hard the incompetence of the poor managements (and out of high papering may, so we will then to the informer feeting of the poor managements (and out of high papering may), so we will all so the total of the control of the poor managements (and out of high papering may). The competition of the poor managements (and out of high papering may) are all the poor to the poor managements (and out of high papering may). The competition of the poor managements (and out of high papering may) are all all so well as the papering may are all all all all all all all all all al	NSW Accounting guidelines for Local Government clearly states that depreciation shall not be used as a machinism by justly an increase in rate. This is easily what the council are doing. Permitting the SPV or the PMPX would be composed in the local or doing. Permitting the SPV or the PMPX would be composed to the thorse of NSV government guidelines. As such a PMPX would be composed to the NSV government guidelines. As such a PMPX would be composed to the NSV government guidelines. As such a character of NSV government guidelines, and such a character of NSV government guidelines. As such a character of NSV government guidelines, and such a character of NSV government guidelines. As such a character of NSV government guidelines, and such a character of NSV government guidelines. As such a character of NSV government guidelines, and the services and such guidelines. As such a character of the NSV government guidelines, and the services and such guidelines. As such as a character of the NSV government guidelines, and the services of the NSV government guidelines. The comment guidelines are considered as a character of the NSV government guidelines and such guidelines. The comment guidelines are considered to the national program of the NSV government guidelines. The national guidelines are considered to the national guidelines and guidelines are considered to the national guidelines. The comment guidelines are considered to the national guidelines and guidelines are considered to the national guidelines and guidelines. As such guidelines are considered to the national guidelines and guidelines are considered to guidelines and guidelines. As such guidelines are considered to guidelines and guidelines are considered to guidelines and guidelines. As such guidelines are guidelines and guidelines are guidelines and guidelines. As such guidelines are guidelines and guidelines are guideli	Whitst there has been consultation about the SRV, there has been a complete lack of transparency when combining the impact with rates harmonisation.  The council misted on the "Vi impact due to this omission. The Dollar figure has also proven to be incorrect.  As such, I do not feel to criterion has been met  We don't feel it is fair that this extreme rate rise goes ahead. It will make our cost of living impossible.  There is no ned for a rate rise. We do not need to be burdened weith local government's incompetence.  Evidence of mis management ask the administrator? He has all this information.	This critierion has not been met  Definitely not reasonable  No raise in raise is acceptable  My wages as a nurse went up by 0.3% yet it is ok to be hit with a rate rise that is simply too much and rare justified to benefit the ratepayers.  If Council rates are raised ratepayers will be sectiously disadvantaged especially retires on superarraised persons and also ratepayers on the government person. Lunderstand interest waying or fartepays is now down to accompletely facilities.	evaluate the francial situation properly. This criterion has not been met  Council will provide this information so that it clears the "State" and does the job to fis a problem that natepayers are NOT RESPONSIBLE for.  The Council IPART request by the Council should be rejected. It is sectional under the bod us natepayers with increased debt as, contrary to claims by.	The council has explained this well, although I do not agree with their strategy This criterion has been met
143 Anonymous Anonymous  144 Anonymous Anonymous	We would like to put out objections forward towards the exterior rate firsten the above council is proposed. The main reason being, as persioners, if going to make life very hard. Aiready we have held to consider a considerability of the control of the pressessible to the informer pressessible of the control of the pressessible of the informer pressessible of the control of the pressessible of the informer pressessible	NSW Accounting guidelines for Local Government clearly states that depreciation shall not be used as a machinism by justly an increase in rates. This is easily what the council are delign. Permitting the SPV on the MPARY would be comploid in the breach in results of the instead of 1987 government guidelines. As such 1987 the 1987 of 1987 government of 1987 government guidelines. As such 1987 the 1987 guidelines are such as the property of the supplies going this restricted funds. The domestic vasie change generates \$15 min surplain per year, with the surplus going this restricted funds. The domestic vasie change generates \$15 min surplain per year, with the surplus going this restricted funds. The domestic vasie change generates \$15 min surplain per year, with the surplus going this restricted funds. The domestic vasie change generates \$15 min surplain per year, with the surplus going this restricted funds. The domestic vasie change generates \$15 min surplain per year, with the surplus going this restricted funds. The domestic vasie change with this delea.  This criterion has not been met  Borrow the money  A rate peop of 2% ok so how is our councils intention to raise rates on Central Coast so significantly and all as a result of minimanegament of 27% in ori fight nor in it flar. For this vasit increase we residently will not benefit with improvements just clear a deal that we ARE NOT RESPONSEE, for if 18 were the posterior of a public company then those who managed would be responsible and liable. Seems in council those responsible can wise their throughout the same. Poor marks and poor workmantly because there is not except that most be the registed throughout the same. Poor marks and poor workmantly because there is not except throughout the same. Poor marks and poor workmantly because there is not except throughout the same and poor workmantly because there is not except through the council of the poor through the poor through the poor through the property the first time the same potich up job get get	Whitst there has been consultation about the SRV, there has been a complete lack of transparency when combining the impact with rates harmonisation.  The council misted on the "Vi impact due to this omission. The Dollar figure has also proven to be incorrect.  As such, I do not feel to criterion has been met  We don't feel it is fair that this extreme rate rise goes ahead. It will make our cost of living impossible.  There is no ned for a rate rise. We do not need to be burdened weith local government's incompetence.  Evidence of mis management ask the administrator? He has all this information.	This critierion has not been met  Definitely not reasonable  No raise in rates is acceptable  My wages as a nurse went up by 0.3% yet it is ok to be hit with a rate rise that is simply too much and not justified to benefit the ratepayers.  If Council rates are raised ratepayers will be secondly disadvardaged especially retrieve on continuous processing and the continuous processing and the continuous processing of interception	council will provide this information so that it cleans the "Siste" and does the job to final provide this information so that it cleans the "Siste" and does the job to final providers that ratepuyees are NOT RESPONSIBLE for.  The Council IPART request by the Council should be rejected. It is sentous based on the province of the council IPART request by the Council should be rejected. It is sentous based on the province of the council	The council has explained this well, although I do not agree with their strategy This criterion has been met
143 Anonymous Anonymous  144 Anonymous Anonymous	We would like to put out objections forward towards the activement rate rises the above council is proposed. The main reason being, as persistores, if going to make life very hard. Already we have held to cancel our private held due to higher out, of high papering may, so we will there for the informer feeting the post of an own Andrew word that it is the late appears have to hard the incompetence of the poor managements (and out of high papering may, so we will then to the informer feeting of the poor managements (and out of high papering may), so we will all so the total of the control of the poor managements (and out of high papering may). The competition of the poor managements (and out of high papering may) are all the poor to the poor managements (and out of high papering may). The competition of the poor managements (and out of high papering may) are all all so well as the papering may are all all all all all all all all all al	NSW Accounting guidelines for Local Government clearly states that depreciation shall not be used as a machanism by justly an increase in rates. This is easily what the council are delique. Permitting the SPV on the PMRY would be comploid in the breach.  PMRY the world be comploid to the breach of his order of his order of his order. The domestic waste change generates \$15 min surplus per year, with the surplus going this restricted funds. The domestic waste change generates \$15 min surplus per year, with the surplus going this restricted funds. The domestic waste change generates \$15 min surplus per year, with the surplus going this restricted funds. The domestic waste change generates \$15 min surplus per year, with the surplus going this restricted funds. The domestic waste change generates \$15 min surplus per year, with the surplus going this restricted funds. The domestic waste change generates \$15 min surplus per year, with the surplus going this restricted funds. The domestic waste change with the surplus going this restricted funds. The domestic waste change with this delice.  This criterion has not been met  Borrow the money.  A rate peop of 2% ok by how is our councils intention to raise rates on Central Coast so significantly and all as a result of minimagement ox77 % not night nor is this. For this wast increase we residently will not benefit with intention to the surplus of the	Whilst there has been consultation about the SRV, there has been a complete lack of transparency when combining the impact with rates harmonisation. The council misled on the "W impact due to this omission. The Dollar figure has also proven to be incorrect.  As such, I do not feel to criterion has been met  We don't feel it is fair that this extreme rate rise goes ahead. It will make our cost of living impossible.  There is no ned for a rate rise. We do not need to be burdered weith local government's incompetence.  Evidence of mis management selk the administrator? He has all this information.  It is no unpopular position, because people are looking with only short term vision. Council has been clear on its position and the impacts of these decisions.  It is no unpopular position, because people are looking with only short term vision. Council has been clear on its position and the impacts of these decisions.	This critierion has not been met  Definitely not reasonable  No raise in raise is acceptable  My wages as a nurse went up by 0.3% yet it is ok to be hit with a rate rise that is simply too much and rare justified to benefit the ratepayers.  If Council rates are raised ratepayers will be sectiously disadvantaged especially retires on superarraised persons and also ratepayers on the government person. Lunderstand interest awaying of ratepays is now down to accompletely find the immediate the sample will be received by the sample of the council of the counci	council will provide this information so that it cleans the "Siste" and does the job to final provide this information so that it cleans the "Siste" and does the job to final providers that ratepuyees are NOT RESPONSIBLE for.  The Council IPART request by the Council should be rejected. It is sentous based on the province of the council IPART request by the Council should be rejected. It is sentous based on the province of the council	The council has explained this well, although I do not agree with their strategy. This criterion has been met.

First	Name Last Name G	eneral comments reparding council's proposed SV	Comments on Criterion 1:	Comments on Criterion 2:	Comments on Criterion 3:	Comments on Criterion 4:	Comments on Criterion 5:
	P	retty simple really. The Council significantly overspent public monies and should not be rewarded with a rate rise to compensate for their incompetence.					
	Is	teps needed before any consideration is given to a rate rise: Implement policies that must be auditable to prevent this happening again ie reduce the Council and councillors executive powers to overspend (or borrow) without going to the rate payers for approval.					
		Set the culture within the council of serving the community and not treating them with disdain.  Review how to reduce the debt levels by selling off unessary assets, review staff contracts, review efficiency of each department, reduce services if needed. As a rate payer I would prefer a reduction in					
	c	nuncil services rather than have to pay more to overcome debt. This should be managed by a multi disciplinary team which must have significant rate payer membership (not just councillors).					
	4	Give rate payers more say (and rights) in running the council other than through councillors. The current situation has come about as a result of no rate payers knowing anything. Make the council more open and accounts more visible.					
	a						
147 Anom	Anomenia E	emocracy is a loser in this process. With no councillors the decision to after rates is being managed by one fier of government (state) for another fier (local) and as a voter we really have no choice but to go the cutcomes so please hear what the community is saying and act accordingly.	The current claim is to recover debt and not to provide more community services. Until Council demonstrates the ability to manage it's finances no increases to rates should be permitted.	In pockets. Some very active people are aware. Council has done a very poor job of explaining the situation and the need to repay debt from the rate payers	Rate payers should NOT have to pay off Councils debt due to mismanagement. The Council should	No relevant documents have been made available to me.	Not seen anything. As far as I know it's all about reducing debt brought about by Councils incompetence.
147 741011	iyindas peronyindas ii	ar an obsorred so produce near what are comments to during that we secondaryly:	the doing to manage it a manage in minimages to make another be permitted.	are position. Come very source people and simulate Godinal rate doing a very poor job of explaining the simulation and the recent of epily decir. Horn the late payers		TWO TELEVISINE GOODSTRANGE SECTIONS OF THE SECTION	The section of the se
		strongly object to the CCC proposed SV as I do not believe the ratepayers should be asked to pay for the total incompetence of the CCC and its financial mismanagement.			I do NOT believe a 10% or 15% SV is in anyway at all reasonable when The Reserve Bank forecasts the CPI to be < 2% !!		
	T T	here is no history of responsible fiscal management by council so ratepayers should not be asked to hand over more money until the council can demonstrate their ability to balance a budget.			Rate payers should NOT be expected to pay off the CCC debt caused by its own financial		
		he Reserve Bank has forecast a <2% CPI (which is in keeping with the IPART rate peg of 2% for 2021-2022), given the year we've had with CoVid how dare council consider such an outrageous increase in test to pay for their own incompetence.			mismanagement.  The Council needs to work their way out of debt without a handout from the ratepayer.		
	l l	to not believe the CCC has adequately engaged with the community to inform them of their rights to submit their objections to iPART most of the information to me has come through small local action groups			I do not trust council and how it will manage any iPART approved rate rise.		
	e	facebook. There has been no opportunity that I have been made aware of for genuine community consultation. Only a rather skewed on line council survey.  ne man. Council administrator 'bock Person seems to have all the say and all the control, Who says his solution is the best! The administrator's solution seems to have been a knee ierk response, the		The community has been TOLD by Mr Persson what is to happen with a small insert in their rate notices. There has been NO CONSULTATION with the	In 2013 when IPART approved the then Wyong Council 6.9% SRV our rates increased by 32.72%.		
	c	ouncil has run out of funds, let's hit the ratepayer to cover the outstanding debt. The council needs to work it's way out of debt using it's current budget and the 2% rate peg and sell off unnecessary assets		RATEPAYERS.	If iPART were to approve any SRV it needs to state that any rise would be applied evenly across the		
	(t	such as the giant white elephant of the Warmervale Airport, which when sold would provide not only funds but also annual income in the form of rates). The council needs to increase efficiency and become one transparent and completely accountable.	Until CCC can demonstrate an ability to responsibly manage public money no rate increase should be	Ratepayers have had to be very proactive in seeking information.  I believe there is still a significant percentage of the CC population who are genuinely unaware of the impact of the rate rise and most importantly their rights	shire.  However I strongly recommend that iPART DO NOT APPROVE any SRV above the Rate peg of		
440	iii	ART Please do NOT approve this SV .	permitted.	to make a submission to iPART.	2%.	I have not seen or even been made aware of where these documents may have been	And the same of th
146 Anony	lymous Anonymous C	CC must first demonstrate its ability to balance a budget and responsibly manage rate payers money before any increase is even to be considered.  The were told that the CCC rate increase would be 15% which was bad enough, given that the ratepayers of the CCC were not responsible for the horrendous financial mess the Councillors left us with but in	Essential services only with any new projects put on hold.		CCC needs to demonstrate its ability to manage public money before it gets any more.	exhibited.	Again, I have not seen any of these documents.
	ti	e local paper we now read that, for ratepayers in the old Gosford Council region, the increase will be more like 42%. That is totally outrageous - nearly half again as much as we are currently paying. For that oney we get nothing - we do not have curbed and guttered roads, we do not have roads that are smooth and easy to drive on - instead we have rutted tracks that constantly break up whenever it rains. We					
	h	ave the most dreadfully dirty and unpleasant tasting water, beaches that are collapsing and pathways on to them that are falling apart. Over the years that I have lived on the Peninsula in the Gosford Council		I have not received anything from Council to show exactly what I would have to pay if the increase in our rates goes through. Instead, the local paper has the			
		sign, it has become increasingly apparent that we are "the forgotten land" as far as Council are concerned and especially so now that we have been forced to be part of the Gosford/Myong Shire Area. I do at understand with these CC councilions are not up on charges of fival and an imanagement of funds - they quite happing yard themselves a pay increase - but can't bother to look at the books properly to see		ratepayers in the Gosford region paying 42% more (not 15% which is bad enough). Are they right? Where are we as ratepayers supposed to get that money from. As it is we get nothing from Council. They spend money haphazardly and most inappropriately most of the time - they most certainly do not spend it on	As a retenance in the old Conferd region the proposed 429/ increase to our rates is polither		
	if	their spending can be covered by available funds. These Councillors should never be allowed to get back into power again and I would like to see if they could be held personally responsible for paying back		curb and guttering, on maintaining our roads or general infrastructure. They spend outrageous amounts of money on waterfront parks in Gosford that will only	ly reasonable nor do I believe it can be justified. How are people, aged, pensioners, those that have		
440	ss	ome of the money they allowed to be misappropriated. They are totally at fault and should be made to be responsible at law for their actions. Perhaps confiscation of some of their property would go some		get a few people visiting them and they will not bother to maintain the area properly as well. Within a few months of the park opening, there will be broken	lost their jobs due to Covid-19, supposed to be able to afford nearly a 50% increase on what they		
150 Ming	Huang S	ay to pay back what they have cost us. A full judicial enquiry should be held and criminal charges laid where appropriate.  ay Not rise		flutures and weeds everywhere, just like Ettalong Beach where they can't bother to maintain the area at all.	already have to pay.		
					As a resident on the central coast who has resided on the central coast for over 30 years I feel outraged that we are now being asked to pay for the mismanagement of funds by the now outed		
					council.		
	A	s a resident on the central coast who has resided on the central coast for over 30 years I feel outraged that we are now being asked to pay for the mismanagement of funds by the now outed council. lease do not grant there application to increase rates. I know I speak for many who feel that such a rate rise would impose great hardship on themselves & there families.			Please do not grant there application to increase rates. I know I speak for many who feel that such a rate rise would impose great hardship on themselves & there families.		
151 Dean	n Golfis ti	ank you			thank you		
152 Anom	Tymous Anonymous n	his Council have is just being greedy, and causing grief for rate payers, because of their inappropriate use of Council Funds, and be stopped from raising council rates to cover their own miss use of rate syers monies					
					We pay far to much for very little in return just garbage and water and sewer.		
153 Anon		fe get very little for what we pay now and even less if you raise the rates	Fines should enforced many offences by residents go unpunished	They can't handle many			
	E	ing a resident of Central Coast Council at I am totally against this extraordinary rate increase. Council own mismanagement caused this situation.					
	v	thy should the Taxpayers of the Central Coast have to fund this. We have one of Australia's lowest wage demographic, yet have to fund the councillors incompetence. Let them trade out of this situation via					
		Reducing Council Head Counts					
	3	Reducing Councillor wages and Perks Selling excess Council Assets					
154 PHILL		Sell and lease back the Council Offices y husband has been made redundant from his job 17/2/21. As he is aged 59, he is finding it extremely difficult to even get an interview let alone a job. He has been told his experience and education is of					
	l le	emplary caliber but unfortunately on this occasion We are now on an income of \$750per week net and cannot afford any increase in any of our expenses. Our health insurance is going now which we					
155 Helon		re very scared of losing. Please do not make this any harder for us. I am unable to work alm due to a work place injury 2 years ago and therefore not receiving my pre injury pay - 80% of that which wasn't nough to live on before. People are doing it tough behind all the closed doors that you have no idea about unless we plead with you not to raise our rates.			1		
ioo meier		nave already sent an email but I can't stress enough how unfair it would be to penalise rate payers for the incompetence of CCC. A lot of us, including myself, are pensioners who can not afford this					
	s	ubstantial rate rise being suggested. Why should we, iso I believe all suspended councillors should be sacked & lets start a fresh with Government heliping us out financially.					
156 Bever	erly Browne T	so I believe all suspended councillors should be sacked & lets start a fresh with Government helping us out financially.  his whole situation is not the rate payers fault or responsibility to fix					
		ate payers should not be forced to pay for incompetence. We are all suffering greatly as a result of Covid and this rate rise will break many families.					
	lf lf	I had even the slightest hope that this rate increase would help to fix the regions third world infrastructure, I would support it. However, I do not trust the directors or leadership that are making vital decisions.					
		is also grossly unfair that the south of the region will be hit with such massive rate increases, whilst the north is barely impacted. Particularly as the majority of future projects seem to favour the north of the					
	n	gion, leaving the south to slowly crumblet					
	v	to have been waiting over 6 years to get a 500m stretch of road fixed. This isn't a side road, this is the main road that provides a single exit point from Saratoga and Davistown. Workmen, come, go					
		and six years later it's a worse mess than when it was started.					
	T	he PAMP that CCC produced (put together by a consultant) didn't even mention our region (Saratoga Davistown). We were left out of the strategy!					
	c	ur drains are left open and this creates a mosquito infestation ever summer, so bad that our kids can't play outside in the daytime.					
	į.	he Gosford swimming pool is so decrepit, old and dirty I won't take my kids there. Hand it to a private operator to build a world class facility with slides etc that makes the most of the facility being located in a orld class location on the foreshore of Brisbane Waters.					
		have lived in developing countries that have their act more together!					
	lt.	is not just a case of changing the the Councillors the Director's roles need seriously reviewing too. They have had the greatest role in the decisions that have led to this catastrophe.					
	т	he area is simply too large to be run by a single Council. Marry of the merged councils are struggling.					
		CC requires NSW government support to help redress this mess they created by forced amalgamation. It does take a genius to realise that merging a Councils doesn't save money. The number of people					
	9	at require services doesn't change, the km of roads and drains requiring repair doesn't change, the number of facilities that need to be managed remains the same. You may save a couple of directors					
	s	alaries, but this certainly does balance the cost of the actual merger, the impact on staff and the need to manage all of these things over a much greater area.					
	v	That an almightly mess!					
157 Anony	nymous Anonymous	support the councils 15% Rate rise. If you want good services, you have to pay for it. Also without a rate rise, I believe many more jobs could be lost at council, so I am happy to pay a little more of it means					
158 Anony		ore people remain employed.					
	l v	Te have lived on the Central Coast since 1978.  or the bulk of those years we have out up with some of the worst roads in Australia and this is no exaggeration, to make matters worse we have no kerb and guittering, no footpaths and no sewer connection					
		ut yet we are required to pay appry\$4,000 in rates per year. Why?					
	V	fe have continued to watch a deterioration in services whilst the Central Coast Council has squandered millions and millions of dollars without anyone being held accountable and now we the ratepayers are eing asked to pay more for someone else's negligence.					
	v	Thy?  Mul & Yustle Rheinberger					
159 Paul	Rheinberger	all a Welle Krieinberger					
		ive in the Old Gosford Area council boundaries and if the proposed rate hikes of over 2% go ahead as planned, with the inside word being it will actually amount to nearly 42% rate hike, our family will be riven out of the home in which we have resided for the past 29 yrs.					
	N.	y husband is a medically retired teacher who is too young to access his super or age pension and thus is reliant on my meagre income from my superannuation to sustain us both. Since the government has					
	ts.	rice raised the age of eligibility for me to receive the pension from 60 to 64 and now to 67, I am now forced to stretch my limited super (40% lower than most men of my age group) for 4 more years before I an access the pension. We are already living on less than \$ 50,000 per annum for the 2 of us and this rate hike will drive us even further into poverty, esp with recent increases in food prices due to the					
		rought and pandemic					
	T	his rate increase is totally unsustainable for 10s of 1000s of persioners on the coast like myself who will be driven out of our homes and away from our families if it goes through. Surely the local government an extend the period over which the "loans" or Tost money' can be repaid from 7 yrs to 15-20 yrs since it was not our fault that our incompetent and possible criminal council created this situation, esp with			A rate rise of 42% for Old Gosford region would drive us out of our home of 29 yrs. We are 2 people in the 56-63 yr age range who are both already dependent on my single superannuation - less than		
		terest rates at historic lows.			\$52,000 per annum - and unable to qualify for the pension for many more years. Such a planned		
		re urge Parliament to reject this proposal and force the administrators to rethink ways of repaying the money without slugging and sacrificing we residents.			rate rise above the normal 2% would be an unsustainable burden on our life and income which is already suppressed by the current pandemic and increased costs of food and fuel and would force		
160 Moira	a Mackay N	oirs Mackay			us to have to sell our home and move away from our family.		
	l T	cannot afford the 40 plus percent rates increase in the Gosford area. We have just gone through COVID, just on job keeper, how do you expect us to afford this?					
		'e should not be punished for incompetence, mismanagement, greed and fraud by the previous Council members and staff.	Nothing is clearly articulated, we don't know where they lost \$800 million, except to say it was spent and		The impact is a wipe out for us, you are asking for an extra \$900 a year. How do we fund this on job	They were hidden on Central Conet Council website	
161 Allan	Border F	lease do NOT improve this increase.	missing, we do not know why the reserve funds were used.	We are not aware, there has been no Police, fraud or ICAC investigation	keeper?	I hey were hidden on Central Coast Council website, not easy to find, was this deliberate	No productivity improvement have been listed
		he council has been criminally neolectful of it's duty of care. It has wasted money, knowing that they were in debt and attempted to borrow out of it.	Cut the pay of central coast counsellors. Cut hack administration numbers.		A 45% effective increase is totally unacceptable.  This has again been clandestinely introduced with fudged numbers and doctored praganda.		Set KPIs with penalty clauses.
		he end result is that we, on the Central Coast are expected to pay the highest rates for , at best, mediocre services. This is unacceptable, the council, it's administration and the state government are	Cut back or eliminate all unnecessary costs.	We were advised of the multimillion dollar debt far too late to take effective action.	designed to confuse and LIE to the ratepayers.	Make this document plain English.	Set Targets and specific timeframes.
162 Anom	nymous Anonymous T	rsponsible for this mess, not the ratepayers. The council administration and the state government must be held accountable, not the ratepayers.  hat is, of course, if there is any justice, fairness or honesty left in the government at all.	Stop employing consultants and contractors, if the council does not have the know how to do the job, remove them and employ someone who can.	It was hidden from the ratepayers, those who pay the wagers of the council.  Rate rises should be minimal, with the onus being on the council to perform within the limits of their budget.	If the ratepayers have to pay 45% increase, the administration of the CCC must suffer a 45% wage reduction.	State facts, state the truth, something that appears very very difficult for the CCC to swallow.	Monitor and report on a 6 monthly basis as to the progress and or failures.  No more lies.
	1	sains, or course; in series any tractice, sames or undersyries in the preference in an ac- do not support the extraordinary rate feetinese proposed by Council. urthermore, I would like to know who is responsible for breaking the law in regard to illegal use of funds and what palna are in place to prosecute the responsible parties for their unbelievable abuse of power		, and the second			
163 antho	ony johnson a	urthermore, I would like to know who is responsible for breaking the law in regard to illegal use of funds and what palna are in place to prosecute the responsible parties for their unbelievable abuse of power and responsibility thank you			<u> </u>		
	f					The document has not been clearly provided to the residents. Their has been no	
			Central Coast Council was previously split in two councils, with the special variation increase that has been			indication of where the link of the report is. When attempting to access the	
			put forward to consume most of the debt from Gosford city council and the projects the council to benefit the community do not directly benefits the originating Wyong council area and only benefit the southern end of the		How was an impact analysis competed, in essence, how were they able to determine the average, given that pre amalgamation the central coast consisted of two very different demographics. Who	administrators current reports a 404 error appears so the reports cannot be accessed.  The problem we still face today with current council even with the administrator is	
			coast, being the Gosford region. This is also evident by the community comments and photographic evidence	We have received a notification from the administrator about the rate raise including option a and option b dollar variances, however the document is not	has defined 'reasonable' in this statement? One person has determined this instead of an open	things are not transparent, we don't have the ability to freely view the information, we	
			that the residence of the former Wyong council are still not benefitting from the amalgamated council because the residents of the former Wyong council that their land is not being maintained on councils tands for the	e written in plain English, it is difficult to interpret how it effects the rate payer personally and we have not been informed on the proposed works that are being prioritised and on what has been prioritised first, or issues that the council have identified to fix and we are concerned that the elderly rate payers of the	forum to the community to come through with a decision. The decision maker does not have an understanding of the demographics of the central coast, they are heavily swayed by their own prior	have to request for it, which is then met with push back and comments regarding the way other residents are expressing their views to the administrator, essentially	Again the council proposed community projects and how they are going to get the funds and budget back
	L.		grasses not being mowed in suburbs on council land, lack of weed management on those lands, roads	central coast may not completely understand what this means for them. An additional note this questionnaire and all other questionnaires put forward to us	knowledge of deficit councils without taking into account that the central coast council is not a major	categorising all residents as being rude and ignorant when we are just wanting	up into a positive status only benefits the southern part of the central coast and not including the former
164 EJ	Murray E	o not support the increase.	remaining damaged with weeds growing also).	have been in a digital manner so our elderly rate payers are not having their voices heard.	city base like the decision makers previous posts.	information freely provided and more of a collaborative decision with the community.	Wyong shire residents.
	F	hease consider my comments in the light of the pending Central Coast Council application to IPART for a special Rate variation from 2021.					
		he Council has sent us a letter today re 'its time to talk about water, sewer, and stormwater prices'.					
		fe live on a small 2 acre rural holding near to the Mardi Dam. As retirees, we manage our own water supply via tanks on the property, at our cost. We also handle our own sewerage disposal on property via					
		ouncil licence at our cost, and only depend on the Council for weekly rubbish collections. We also have taken it upon ourselves to tidily mow and maintain the roadside verges on Zoriana Close. The storm					
	w	ater, as of now, finds its way out to the Tuggerah Lakes naturally.  the light of the above, why is there not a special rate reduction for self sufficiant and refired rate payers? Please give this your earnest consideration.					
1 1		www.mgm.namev.comerce, may be used not a special nate reduction for sell summant and retired rate payers r Prease give this your earliest consideration.  **The second Control of the Cont					
1 1							
	d Hollingsworth						
165 David	4	ny rate increases are unacceptable. Local rate-payers should not be expected to fund council financial incompetence and total lack of accountability allowed by councillors who were too focused on their own stitical ideologies to focus on the greater good. I do not agree to any rate increases or special levies.					
165 David	l P						
165 David		egree with esponse to the application - it lacks strategic and innovative thinking. We must determine and explore opportunities to retain ratepayer services whilst practicing financial restraint.	Not satisfactory.	Not enough public debate or consultation provided.	This substantial rate increase is unreasonable and unfair.	No comment.	Lack of strategic thinking and innovation results in unclear future goals for the community at large.
165 David				y ,	AND THE STREET OF THE STREET OF THE STREET		government of the control of the con
165 David		addition, identification of continued high (over \$300K) executive salaries is unacceptable. Who is auditing the auditor?			1	İ.	I I
165 David							Į į
165 David						There are now more named working at Castral Coast Council that some	
165 David					There are now more people working at Central Coast Council that earn above \$300 thousand than	There are now more people working at Central Coast Council that earn above \$300 thousand than when the Administrator took over the running of Council even though	There are now more people working at Central Coast Council that earn above \$300 thousand than when
165 David			There are now more people working at Central Coast Council that earn above \$300 thousand than when the		when the Administrator took over the running of Council even though the Administrator said that he	thousand than when the Administrator took over the running of Council even though the Administrator said that he had reduced the number from 9 to 5. Therefore at this	There are now more people working at Central Coast Council that earn above \$300 thousand than when the Administrator took over the running of Council even though the Administrator said that he had reduced
165 David			Administrator took over the running of Council even though the Administrator said that he had reduced the number from 9 to 5. Therefore at this stage there are more than 9 people earning over this amount. Why?		when the Administrator took over the running of Council even though the Administrator said that he had reduced the number from 9 to 5. Therefore at this stage there are more than 9 people earning over this amount. Why?	thousand than when the Administrator took over the running of Council even though the Administrator said that he had reduced the number from 9 to 5. Therefore at this stage there are more than 9 people earning over this amount. Why? These are all extra costs that as ratepayers we cannot afford. If we couldn't afford	the Administrator took over the running of Council even though the Administrator said that he had reduced the number from 9 to 5. Therefore at this stage there are more than 9 people earning over this amount. Why?
165 David			Administrator took over the running of Council even though the Administrator said that he had reduced the number from 9 to 5. Therefore at this stage there are more than 9 people earning over this amount. If These are all extra costs that as ratepayers we cannot afford. If we couldn't afford them prior to the crisis we	There are now more people working at Central Coast Coast in that earn above \$500 thousand from when the Administrator took over the enring of Council that the first think the coast of the	when the Administrator took over the running of Council even though the Administrator said that he had reduced the number from 9 to 5. Therefore at this stage there are more than 9 people earning over this amount. Why? These are all extra costs that as ratepayers we cannot afford. If we couldn't afford them prior to the	thousand than when the Administrator took over the running of Council even though the Administrator said that he had reduced the number from 9 to 5. Therefore at this stage there are more than 9 people earning over this amount. Why? These are all extra costs that as ratepayers we cannot afford. If we couldn't afford them prior to the crisis we can least afford them now.	the Administrator took over the running of Council even though the Administrator said that he had reduced the number from 9 to 5. Therefore at this stage there are more than 9 people earning over this amount. Why?  These are all extra costs that as ratepayers we cannot afford. If we couldn't afford them prior to the crisis
165 David	ymous Anonymous Ir	addition, identification of continued high (over \$300K) executive satartes is unacceptable. Who is auditing the auditor?  there are now more people working at Central Coast Council that earn above \$300 thousand than when the Administrator took over the numming of Council even though the Administrator said that he had	Administrator took over the running of Couroll even though the Administrator said that he had reduced the number from 9 to 5. Therefore at this stage there are more than 9 people earning over this amount. Why? These are all extra costs that are atlepayers we cannot afford. If we couldn't afford them prior to the crisis we can least afford them now.	even though the Administrator said that he had reduced the number from 9 to 5. Therefore at this stage there are more than 9 people earning over this amount. Why?	when the Administrator took over the running of Council even though the Administrator said that he had reduced the number from 19 G. Therefore at this stage there are more than 9 people earning over this amount. Why?  These are all exist acosts that as ratepayers we cannot afford. If we couldn't afford them prior to the crisis we can least afford them now.  The Administrator hant's sufficiently reduced the spend of Council but we as ratepayers are	thousand than when the Administrator took over the running of Council even though the Administrator acid that he had reduced the runnber from 9 to 5. Therefore all this stage there are more than 9 people earning over this amount. Why? These are all office oncols that as integripes we cannot afford. Two couldn't afford These are all reduced to the second of the second of the second of the second of the third than the second of the second of the second of the second of the second tradepayers are expected to pay, pay and pay some more for the outrageous spend by	the Administrator took over the running of Council even though the Administrator said that he had reduced the number from 9 b. 5. Therefore at this tabge there are more fam. 9 sepple earning over this amount. Why? These are all extra costs that as ratepayers we cannot afford. If we couldn't afford them prior to the crisis we can least afford them now.
165 David	nymous Anonymous b	addition, identification of continued high (over \$300K) executive salaries is unacceptable. Who is auditing the auditor?  there are now more people working at Central Coast Council that earn above \$300 thousand than when the Administrator took over the running of Council even though the Administrator said that he had discret the running for the council even though the Administrator said that he had discret the running for the council even though the Administrator said that he had discret the running for the council even though the Administrator said that he had discret the running for the council even though the Administrator said that he had discret the running for the council even though the Administrator said that he had discret the running for the council even though the Administrator said that he had discret the running for the r	Administrator took over the running of Council even though the Administrator said that he had reduced the number from 9 to 5. Thereforce at this state there are more than 9 people earning over this amount. Why? These are all extra costs that as ratepayers we cannot afford. If we couldn't afford them prior to the crisis we can least afford them now.  The Administrator hasn't sufficiently reduced the spend at Council but we as ratepayers are exceeded to pay, pay and pay some more for the outlapeous spend by an aging bureaucust calling hismestian Administrator.	even though the Administrator said that he had reduced the number from 9 to 5. Therefore at this stage there are more than 9 people earning over this amount. Why?  These are all earts costs that as ratepayers we cannot afford. If we couldn't afford them prior to the crisis we can least afford them now.	when the Administrator took over the running of Council even though the Administrator said that the and reduced the number form 9 to 5. Therefore at this stage have are now than 9 people earning over this amount. Why? over this amount. Why? over the amount of the people are not a stage of the people are not a consider a find of the people are not a considerable and the people are not a considerable and the people are not a considerable and the people are not not people are not people are not not not people are not people are not	flowand have when the Administrator book over the number of no SC council even though the Administrator said than he had reduced he number from 10 Sc. Therefore at this stage there are more than 9 people earning over this amount. Why? These are all exits costs that as relappears we cannot affort. If we couldn't afford them prior to the crisis we can least afford them now. The Administrator than't sufficiently reduced the spend at Council but we as relappears are expected to pay, pay and pay some more for the outrageous spend by an anging Durescuric calling timmed in Administrator when he knows full well that the anging pure success calling timmed in Administrator when he knows full well that the spending that the second section of the second section of the section of the second section of the section of the section of the section of the section of the section of the section of section of	the Administrator took over the numining of Council even though the Administrator said that he had reduced the number from 10 of 3. Therefore at this stage there are more than 9 people earning over this amount. Name of the properties of the stage of
165 David	nymous Anonymous le	addition, identification of continued high (over \$300K) executive salaries is unacceptable. Who is auditing the auditor?  there are now more people working at Central Coast Council that earn above \$500 thousand than when the Administrator took over the running of Council even though the Administrator said that he had disclosed the number from \$0.5. Therefore at this stage there are now more people working at Central Coast Council that earn above \$500 thousand than when the Administrator took over the running of Council even though the Administrator said that he had disclosed the number from \$0.5. Therefore at this stage there are now to the popule earning over this amount. Why?  The continued of the stage of the stage that the council council is the stage that the had disclosed the stage that the stage th	Administrator took over the running of Council evem hough the Administrator said that he had reduced the number from 10 s. Therefore at this safe there are more than people earning over this amount. Why? These are all extra costs that as ratepayers we cannot afford. If we couldn't afford them prior to the crisis we can least afford them now.  The Administrator heart sufficiently reduced the spend of Council but we as ratepayers are expected to pay, pay and pay some more for the outrageous spend by an aging these cancel calling himself and Administrator when he knows full well that the outrageous spend by the ascents and senior managers at Council has got up the total from the contrageous spend by threascrates and senior managers at Council has got up the total from the contrageous spend by threascrates and senior managers at Council has got up the total from the contrageous spend by threascrates and senior managers at Council has got up the total from the council produced the counc	even though the Administrators and that he had reduced the number from 9 to 5. Therefore at this stage there are more than 9 people earning over this amount. Why? These are all exits costs that an enterpress or control different conducts filled or the prior to 9 be crists are unless affected earning over this amount. The exit of the stage of the prior to 9 be crists are control affected and exit of the stage of the 9 between the stage of the 9 between the 9 be	when the Administrator took over the running of Council even though the Administrator said that the and reduced the number form 8 to 5. Therefore at this stage there are now than 9 people earning over this amount. Why?  These are all either costs that as ratispayers we cannot afford. If we couldn't afford them prior to the crisis we can least afford them now.  If the control of the set ratispayers are expected to pay pay and pay some more for the outlappose, send by an aging the macurat calling himself an Administrator when he knows this well that the outlappose spend by burseaucrats aims enter managers at Council has got us in both stransfer all risks in the first place. And PART are	trousand base when the Administrator took over the number of not Social even though the Administrator and dath the had reduced the number from 10 Soi. Therefore at 18 studge there are more than 10 people earning over this amount. Why the social had find the proof to the crisis we can least affect of them now.  The Administrator heart sufficiently reduced the spend at Council but we as transpers are expected to purp you and purp some more for the outsignous spend by an aging bureascraft calling timeself and Administrator when he knows full well that the financial crisis in the fat place. And PSAT are open gallow the Countle bin creases.	the Administrator took over the numining of Council even though the Administrator took over the numining of Council even though the Administrator said that he had reduced the number from 10 50. Therefore at this saight per sea more than the people earing one thris amount. Why?  These are all edits costs that as ratepayers we cannot afford. If we couldn't afford them prior to the crisis we can least afford them now.  We can least afford them now.  By any of the council of the council of the spend of Council but we as indepayers are expected to pay, pay and pay prior more for the foundations yeared by an again presenced calling himself an Administrator when he knows full well that the collapseous spend by a major presence and senten managers at Council has got use those flamation in the feet splace. And PATE are going all well to Council he
165 David	nymous Anonymous le	addition, identification of continued high (over \$300K) executive salaries is unacceptable. Who is auditing the auditor?  there are now more people sording at Central Coard Council that earn above \$300 thousand than when the Administrator took over the running of Council even though the Administrator said that he had discred the number from 9 to 5. Therefore at this stage here are more than 5 people earning over this amount. Why?  These are all extra costs that as ratespares we cannot afford. Two couldn't afford them prior to the crisis we can less afford from now.  A diministrator suit sufficiently received the spent of Council to we are integers are copied to pay, by any pay some more for the outrageous spend by an aging bureaucrat calling himself an	Administrator took over the unranje of Council even though the Administrator sold that he had reduced the number from 10 to 1. Therefore at this safe there are more than 10 to 1. Therefore at this safe there are more than 10 people earning over this amount. Whily These are all extra costs that as ratepayers we cannot afford. If we couldn't afford them prior to the crists we can least afford them from the council that the crists we cannot afford. The council that the county are appeared to put on the council that the county are appeared to put on the county and the council that the county are appeared by the season that the county are a Council that got when he knows the unfail that the county appeared put have access and serior managers at Council has got or when he knows the unfail that the county appeared put have access and serior managers at Council has got or when he knows the unfail that the county appeared put have access and serior managers at Council has got or the county and the county are considered to the county are considered to the county are considered to the county and the county are considered to	even though the Administrator said that he had reduced the number from 9 to 5. Therefore at this stage there are more than 9 people earning over this amount. Why? These are all extra costs that as relepayers we cannot afford. If we couldn't afford them prior to the crisis we can least afford them now.  If the Administrator share full-fielding recorded the spent ad Council but we as relepayers are expected to put, you and pay some more for the outrageous	when the Administrator took over the running of Council even though the Administrator said that the and reduced the number form 8 to 5. Therefore at this stage there are now than 9 people earning over this amount. Why?  These are all either costs that as ratispayers we cannot afford. If we couldn't afford them prior to the crisis we can least afford them now.  If the control of the set ratispayers are expected to pay pay and pay some more for the outlappose, send by an aging the macurat calling himself an Administrator when he knows this well that the outlappose spend by burseaucrats aims enter managers at Council has got us in both stransfer all risks in the first place. And PART are	trousand base when the Administrator took over the number of not Social even though the Administrator and dath the had reduced the number from 10 Soi. Therefore at 18 studge there are more than 10 people earning over this amount. Why the social had find the proof to the crisis we can least affect of them now.  The Administrator heart sufficiently reduced the spend at Council but we as transpers are expected to purp you and purp some more for the outsignous spend by an aging bureascraft calling timeself and Administrator when he knows full well that the financial crisis in the fat place. And PSAT are open gallow the Countle bin creases.	the Administrator took over the numining of Council even though the Administrator took over the numining of Council even though the Administrator said that he had reduced the number from 10 50. Therefore at this saight per sea ence the main page of the proper to the crisis. These are all edits costs that as ratepayers we cannot afford. If we couldn't afford them prior to the crisis we can least afford them now.  We couldn't afford them now.  We could not not not make the now that the number of the nu

	First Name Last Name	General comments regarding council's proposed SV	Comments on Criterion 1:	Comments on Criterion 2:	Comments on Criterion 3:	Comments on Criterion 4:	Comments on Criterion 5:
			A different revenue path for the council's General Fund is not required as the Central Coast Council should				
l			obtain funding from:				
			A. the NSW Government for its decisions and cost shifting activities including the following:				
			1. reduction in revenue of @ \$2.7m in the third quarter 2019-2020 and this has been ongoing since beginning				
			of 2020. (Council Minutes 25.5.20: "There has been a decrease in application income (fees for lodgement of				
			applications) fees paid) directly to the Department of Planning Industry & Environment Note that Council				
			officers are still required to undertake assessment work for these applications"). (Using the reported \$2.7m				
l			figure by the end of 2020-2021 Council would have lost \$16.2m in fees)				
			establishment of planning panels and ongoing costs				
l			funding for emergency infrastructure work where the decision to zone the area was prior to Council				
l			establishment e.g. flooding, coastal erosion				
l			appointment and costs of Administrator of the Central Coast Council and increased costs associated with				
			the Administrator's decision making e.g. CEO payout, borrowings				
			B. Increased Compliance and User Pays				
1		As a ratepayer of the Central Coast thank you for considering my submission. I disagree with the proposed special variation application. Please see my comments to the five criterion below. My general	Identify and raise funds on developments with no DA or not in accordance with DA.		L <u>.</u>		
		feedback is that if the Central Coast Council is trying to unfairly influence the outcome of the IPART assessment process by:  - restriction the ouestions/colors in the first bublic survey to an outcome within only revo	<ol><li>Charge two residential rates were there is more than one dwelling or overlarge house structures on site e.g. over 2,500 holiday rentals online. This can be obtained by searching online, looking at how many waste bins</li></ol>		If the impact on affected ratepayers is anywhere near 42% as reported it is not reasonable. In the Attachment F presented by the Council its opening line is "In determing capacity to pay" and then		
			and also looking at water usage (advantage to Central Coast Council who owns this utility). This of course		it goes onto compares rates charged by councils. This does not show a capacity to pay, and then		
			and also looking at water usage (advantage to Central Coast Council who owns this utility). This of course would not include pensioners who are not self funded.		the socio economic data "In 2016 the median weekly household income was \$1.256 per week		
		<ol> <li>a. auempting to apply pressure on the assessment process by using a contract which presumed the decision of IPAR1 to be to increase rates i.e. The loans were provided on the basis of Council seeking and receiving a 15% rate variation" (soae 14.5 Secial Variation Application Form Part B for 2021-22).</li> </ol>	Charge for use of Council land e.g. numerous instances of everyday overflow parking on sides of roads on		(compared to \$1.481 for NSW and \$1.745 for Greater Syrinev)* (sourced from the ARS) shows that		
			<ol> <li>Charge for use of Council land e.g. numerous instances of everyday overflow parking on sides of roads of Council land.</li> </ol>		there is no capacity to pay. With the low employment rate, impacts of Covid-19 and withdrawal of		
		a. intreatening the Central Coast ratepayers with reduced services e.g. significant reduction in minerative or lactures and minastructure such as road, popper and drawingle it a rate rise was not agreed to a The Central Coast Council states that restricted funds were unlawfully accessed and this needs to be immediately referred for investigation and prosecution if required. In addition the NSW Audit Office and the		As admitted by the Central Coast Council it did not communicate the extent of the rate rise correctly. It has also combined the rate Harmonisation process	job seeker and job keeper there is most likely going to be less capacity to pay. The bottom line will		This criterion cannot be addressed by Council as the proposed need for a rate rise has only come to light
			conducting a business i.e. rental holiday market.	as administed by the Central access countries in the first of the countries are selected to the case the countries are a countries and the countries are countries are considered as a 42% rate increase. It should be noted that other	be increased homelessness and suffering on Central Coast residents as some residents would be		this financial year and no productivity improvements or cost containment strategies have been realised in
168	Anonymous Anonymous	Office of the second of the se	to rate and a second se	into the late has which has induce to children in all payers some determing that the impact count of a 42.9 rate increase. It should be noted that other Councils below my individual rotation are with the amount relation to their individual rotation are countries.	forced to eall se they would not be able to afford this increase.		neet were