From:	IPART Mailbox
To:	Local Government Mailbox
Subject:	FW: Objection to Hawkesbury City Council SRV of 31.29% rate increase.
Date:	Friday, March 09, 2018 10:44:24 AM

From: Anna Bilanenko [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 8 March 2018 7:13 PM
To: IPART Mailbox
Subject: Objection to Hawkesbury City Council SRV of 31.29% rate increase.

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

Objection to Hawkesbury City Council SRV of 31.29% rate increase.

I object to Hawkesbury council increasing rates, as this council had redistributed rates in 2017 and taken what was a fair rates structure and have made it **unjust and unfair**. Had instigated the removal of the Rural-Residential Category.

Some suburbs have had increases of 180% and higher and 80% of the district was given a rate drop, specifically to minimise the effect of an SRV.
Council have stated in the IPART submission that they protected some suburbs so they only get an increase of $90, while other suburbs have received increases of more than $6500.

> As a pensioner I have a very fixed income and so budget wisely – I cannot see the government doubling my income to compensate for the unjustness of the Hawkesbury City Council.

This is the opposite of the intention in the Local Government Act, which intends rates to be evenly distributed to pay for services.
The council has not been honest with the ratepayers and have been telling the community the rates structure they put in place is fair.

> Hawkesbury City Council Operational Plan 2017/2018 Adopted Extraordinary Meeting
>
> Page 77
>
> ""A Base Amount is used to **more equitably levy the** total amount of rates across ratepayers where land values vary greatly within categories or ratepayers or there are disproportionate variations in valuations arising from a new valuation. Essentially the application of a Base Amount reduces the effect of land valuations on the rates payable.
>
> Where a Base Amount is applied, it does not impact on the total overall rating income levied from that category or sub-category **but merely results in a redistribution of the rates burden** with that category or sub-category."""

Council also polled people and asked what new services we want, and implied we will get new services, but have NOT applied for new services or infrastructure in the IPART

Submission. The submission is about retiring an $80M debt accrued over decades by a failing council. – ***What polling? Rang 400 people in the urban area. How valid could this be??***

Council has been running operating losses for seven years, have not managed their fiduciary responsibilities, and have neglected our assets to the point where the state government requires immediate action.

Council spending is out of control, preferring to spend our money on frivolous things, pandering to minority groups, and neglecting the needs of long term ratepayers in rural areas
It seems the council have changed the rates structure specifically to gain support of the urban areas, and force the rural areas to pay for it.
People in the rural residential areas are dealing with hardship imposed by Council, with people paying between $4000 and $9000 before an SRV.

> Hawkesbury City Council Operational Plan 2017/2018 Adopted Extraordinary Meeting
>
> Page 77
>
> Section 536 "For the relevant categories and sub-categories, a rate that is wholly an **ad valorem would result in an uneven distribution** of the rate burden because a comparatively high proportion of assessments would bear a comparatively low share of the total rate burden." """

Council has been dishonest in its approach and are out of control.

Sincere Regards

Anna Bilanenko

[redacted]