

From: [IPART Mailbox](#)
To: [Local Government Mailbox](#)
Subject: FW: Submission re Hawkesbury Special Rate increase
Date: Monday, March 12, 2018 8:46:09 AM

From: Anthony McKone [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, 11 March 2018 7:32 PM
To: IPART Mailbox
Subject: Submission re Hawkesbury Special Rate increase

We object to Hawkesbury Council increasing rates, as this council re-distributed rates in 2017 and has taken what was a fair rates structure and made it very unfair. Some suburbs have had increases of 180% and higher whilst 80% of the district was given a rate drop specifically to minimise the effect of an SRV.

Council have stated in their IPART submission that they have protected some suburbs so that they only get an increase of \$90, but we will be faced with a rates demand for \$ [REDACTED] at 30/6/18 - an increase of \$ [REDACTED] since 30/6/17 and an increase on the previous year of \$ [REDACTED]. 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 ratepayers and have been telling the community that the rates structure is fair.

Council says they polled people asking what new services they wanted, and implied we will get new services, but has NOT applied for new services or infrastructure in the IPART Submission.

It seems that the Submission is about retiring an \$80 Million debt accrued over decades by failing Councils.

Council has been running operating losses for 7 years: but have not managed their fiduciary responsibilities, and have neglected our assets to the point where the State Government needs to take 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 longterm ratepayers in rural/residential areas. It seems that Council has changed the rate structure to specifically gain support of the urban areas, and force the rural areas to pay for it.

In our case, we have lived at our address since 1979 and are now retired with no fixed income therefor the imposition of a 31.29% SRV on top of the recent revision of rates is not acceptable.

Yours sincerely

Anthony McKone
Edith M McKone

Address: [REDACTED]