#### To the Special Variations Review board – IPART

Re Central Coast Council application for a Special Rate Variation

## We are the Administration team of an online activist group called Protest the extreme rate rise of Central Coast Council.

This is our second official letter to you. As the situation unfolds we feel the need to bring more information to your attention. Our group has grown to just under 10,000 members and shows no sign of slowing down. We are averaging 100 new members per day and the issues coming to light are very concerning. We understand that you have certain criteria<sup>1</sup> that council must address in their submission. We would like the opportunity to bring some concerns to your attention.

#### Central Coast Council need to show IPART there is: <sup>1</sup>

#### **Community Awareness**

#### Council Survey <sup>6</sup>

In order to finish the survey you must choose an option, the nature of this kind of survey is council trying desperately to bias the outcome with the controlling nature of "cannot proceed unless you choose 15% or 10%" this provides council a biased response to a 10 % option. The lesser of two evils presented to ratepayers and therefore must be discarded and discounted as contrived, controlled, misleading, manipulative and not an accurate survey response. The only true response to central coast council survey is in an unadulterated question 8 from survey 2.

Which provides the unadulterated summary of

10.3% preferred Option 1 – Temporary Fix - 10%

17.4% preferred Option 2 – Securing our Future – 15%

72.4% preferred No rate rise - rate peg only

May I reiterate the unadulterated, 72.4% preferred No rate rise – rate peg only from question 8 survey v2.

More sampling bias, from 2<sup>nd</sup> survey

In survey 2, Question 7

option 1 Temporary fix 10%

option 2 Securing our future 15%

Sampling bias of - must be answered before proceeding to question 8,

Followed by New question 8

Where three option were presented

Option 1 Temporary fix 10% (again)

Option 2 Securing our future 15% (again)

Option 3 No rate rise – Rate peg only

The sampling bias is this; Someone answering the survey can now vote twice, getting 2 ticks of approval against option 1 and or option 2 within the same single survey by asking repeat questions with repeat exact same answer (a biased double vote for an increase but only a single vote for option 3 No rate rise – Rate peg only)

With sampling bias

option 1 Temporary fix 10%Q7 + Q8 responses added togetheroption 2 Securing our future 15%Q7 + Q8 responses added together

option 3 No rate rise – Rate peg only Q8 only

With Councils media blitz, rate payers are very much aware of the ramifications of option 3 No rate rise – Rate peg only and still voted for it 72.4% preferred No rate rise – rate peg only.

The only fair, interpretation of Council survey is that it has built in bias in the hope of artificially raising response numbers to Option 1 and Option 2.

#### Page 2 of Councils own survey report <sup>6</sup> States "A majority of survey respondents do not support a rate rise"

#### A demonstrated need for higher increases to charges.

Council has a spending problem and structural mismanagement problem, and a refusal to adhere to a budget problem, not a revenue problem; We come to this conclusion with the following factual data<sup>5</sup> time series xlsx excel worksheets dated 2018/19<sup>5</sup>, which contains the following data;

Rates Revenue NSW <sup>5</sup>

•	1 <sup>st</sup>	Central Coast Council	142.9 Million Dollars
٠	2 <sup>nd</sup>	Northern Beaches	135.0 Million Dollars
٠	3 <sup>rd</sup>	Canterbury Bankstown	124.2 Million Dollars
٠	4 <sup>th</sup>	Blacktown	120.0 Million Dollars

• 5<sup>th</sup> Wollongong 115.6 Million Dollars

#### Administration costs NSW <sup>5</sup>

<ul> <li>1<sup>st</sup> Central Coast Council</li> <li>2<sup>nd</sup> Sydney City</li> <li>3<sup>rd</sup> Bayside</li> </ul>	272.4 Million Dollars 205.1 Million Dollars 83.0 Million Dollars
<ul> <li>4<sup>th</sup> Canterbury Bankstown</li> <li>5<sup>th</sup> Inner West</li> <li>6<sup>th</sup> Parramatta</li> <li>13<sup>th</sup> Wollongong</li> </ul>	82. 0 Million Dollars 76.1 Million Dollars 74.3 Million Dollars 42.9 Million Dollars

Central Coast Council must drastically reduce its administration costs; Wollongong council is also a seaside coastal area and its admin costs are only 42.9million. Northern Beaches is also a seaside coastal area and does not even make the list of top 6 in admin costs. Central Coast Council admin costs are unreasonable, unfair, and drastically monstrous compared to other seaside coastal areas.

Central Coast Council has bureaucratic budgeting issues, there is no reason whatsoever to be 70million dollars more expensive than the Capital of NSW; 190 Million Dollars more expensive than Bayside. We are not the highest population in NSW either.

Population size NSW <sup>5</sup>

- 1<sup>st</sup> Canterbury Bankstown
- 2<sup>nd</sup> Blacktown
- 3<sup>rd</sup> Central Coast Council
- 4<sup>th</sup> Northern Beaches
- 5<sup>th</sup> Paramatta

#### • A reasonable impact on ratepayers.

The only reasonable impact on rate payers is a 2% standard rate peg. We are all under financial stress due to Covid, Bushfires, Floods, unemployment, and every disaster that 2020 threw at society. Central Coast Council has woefully mismanaged their budgets.

We already have group members in our protest Facebook group talking about ways to not pay anything higher than the standard 2% rate peg.  $^{\rm 2}$ 

- In your determination of rates for the old Wyong council <sup>3</sup> Ipart stated "There appears to be some campaigning against the special variation, but we received no petitions or form letters."
- The Administrators, Moderators and Advisors of the "Protest extreme rates of Central Coast Council" Facebook group have endeavoured to tick all boxes in our objection efforts; We have supplied ipart with the highest ever number of submissions at over 4100 objections; We have held 2 protests on Council doorstep at both Wyong and Gosford Council Chambers; We have appeared on A Current Affair; We emailed our first form letter to you on 19/12/2020 and this second (2<sup>nd</sup>) form letter today 02/03/2021; We have also conducted our own petition against the special variation 3600+ signatures (please see attached pdf); We have endorsed and supported a call for a judicial enquiry into Central Coast Council which obtained 21000+ signatures in less than 3weeks which will be tabled and debated in the NSW Legislative Assembly at 4pm on 06/05/2021.
- We will defeat any attempt to impose a rate rise above the standard 2% Rate Peg.

Thankyou for your time in reading all of our 4100+ submissions and viewing our petition signatures<sup>4</sup>.

Sincerely

The Administration, Moderators and Advisors Team of "Protest against the extreme rate rise of Central Coast Council."

1 <u>https://www.ipart.nsw.gov.au/Home/Industries/Local-Government/Special-Variations</u>

2 Facebook : Protest against extreme rates of Central Coast Council

- 3 https://www.ipart.nsw.gov.au/files/6054c64a-9497-4025-93f6-a1da00871948/LG\_Determination -Wyong\_Shire\_Councils\_application\_for\_a\_special\_variation\_for\_2013-14.pdf
- 4 Attached pdf and online at : http://chng.it/Yyw5Mgdj

5 https://www.olg.nsw.gov.au/public/about-councils/comparative-council-information/your-council-report/

6 https://cdn.centralcoast.nsw.gov.au/sites/default/files/Council/Meetings\_and\_minutes/Attachment\_3\_-\_Securing\_Your\_Future\_Consultation\_report\_-\_4\_February\_2021\_Final\_Version.pdf

### change.org

Recipient: IPART, Central Coast Council

Letter: Greetings,

Central Coast against extreme rate rise

# Signatures

164 pages

Name	Location	Date