

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, 19 February 2016 9:11 AM
To: IPART Mailbox
Subject: NO to Council Rate Increase for Wingecarribee Shire Council WSC

Dear IPART,

I would like to strongly oppose to any rate increase above the rate pegging amount, especially against the proposed 46.2% rate increase proposed due to the reasons below:

1369 surveyed residents said NO to a rate increase out of 2060 surveyed. 66.4% said NO.

WSC Rates Revenue increased 206% during the period 2001 to 2015, whereas the CPI increased 44.52%. WSC have given the reason "These increases were required as a result of the decisions made by Council in the 1990's". When is enough, enough.

WSC Governance & Administration Expenditure of \$626 per capita, whereas group average of \$266.44 in the OLG Comparative Information 2012-2013. The latest information available. Therefore there are inefficiencies in excess of \$15,840,000 – ie \$360 (\$626 - \$266) x 44,000 resident men, women and children in the shire. Apparently WSC does not consider excess costs of \$15 million worthy of investigation. A full investigation is required.

The Environmental and Financial Catastrophe of WSC ridding our garbage and recycle bins in June 2014 with a conservative cost in excess of \$3 million. These bins were unnecessarily replaced after only 10 years with a life expectancy of 25+ years. A dismissive explanation and reply has been given by WSC. Why is not WSC transparent and tell the residents the complete story?

Wingecarribee Shire has about 20,332 residential and 1,237 business premises in the Shire. So if the total 21,569 is multiplied by \$70 per bin by 2 bins per premises (1 x garbage and 1 x recycle), that equates to \$3,019,660. This does not take into account the distribution and pick up costs of the replaced bins and new bins. (Conservatively \$5 per bin - \$200,000)

"Investing in Our Future" stated that **WSC have made significant savings.** Comments made by WSC have made a wishy washy explanation with no specific details at all. Surely "significant" deserves a list of notable achievements, but none have been provided by WSC. Transparency is required.

WSC average rates are the 16th highest out of 150 Councils in NSW in 2012/13.

In 2020 WSC will be proud to have the highest rates in NSW if not Australia, based upon the ad valorem rate.

A fairer system of revenue raising needs to be adopted in NSW generally.

The administrating Act for Councils within NSW is the:

NSW Local Government Act

The OLG (Office of Local Government) is responsible for local governments across NSW. Under "Our Purpose", "Our Values" is stated. All of the 5 Values (Integrity, Innovation & excellence, Leadership, Collaboration and Equity & fairness) are very pertinent and relevant to the progression of the OLG.

"Equity and fairness: We will: value different views, treat each other and those who we deal with in a fair manner, ensure equity and fairness, promote diversity and adhere to social justice principles."

Innovation and Fairness are the driving force for my submission.

As stated in the "Department of Local Government Council Rating and Revenue Raising Manual"

The council's charter at section 8 of the Local Government Act includes the following:

"to raise funds for local purposes by **the fair imposition** of rates, charges and fees, by income earned from investments and, when appropriate, by borrowings and grants".

To give an example, a residential property with a ULV of **\$400,000, in 2015/2016,**

Wingecarribee pay \$1774 pa, Hornsby \$989, Wollondilly \$1795, Port Macquarie \$1309, Tweed \$2203, Burwood \$828, Woollahrah \$786, Parramatta \$1008, Ryde \$496, Camden \$929, Liverpool \$818, Rockdale \$858, Ku-ring-gai \$497, Canterbury \$976, Pittwater \$836, Bankstown \$1131, Fairfield \$736, Warringah \$852, Sutherland \$880, Botany Bay \$542, North Sydney \$497, Manly \$788, Blue Mountains CC \$2355, Auburn \$819, Marrickville \$885, Hurstville 925, City of Sydney \$680, Waverley \$618.

There is NO consistency and certainly NO fairness.

It is suggested an average NSW ad valorem rate (one for LGAs of more than say 30,000 population and another for less than say 30,000 population;

or maybe above and below LGA's with an average ULV of say \$100,000)

or one rate for the LGA to the east and one to the west of the Great Dividing Range. A study would be required to determine the "Fairest" method, but it would have to be better than the current system. A base rate of \$300 is preferable.

Please Please Please NO to any rate rise above the rate pegging amount.

Yours Sincerely

Alison Barnaby

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]