

From: Matthew Delfendahl
To: [Local Government Mailbox](#)
Cc: [Matthew Delfendahl](#)
Subject: Randwick, Special Variation Application, resident comment
Date: Tuesday, March 13, 2018 1:13:24 PM

Hi Scott

Rather than explain, below is a letter I drafted to send to local paper. (It's a little provocative in its wording so that it grabs attention).

How can I as a voter, land owner and rate payer of randwick council make a submission to IPART.
I want to know how a survey that was crudely designed to unfairly gain support for the councils desired outcome and of which the results were manipulated and of which the response rate could not be consider significant?

Also how can variance be approved on only suggested projects when the alternatives are not put forward?
It appears to me the projects suggested are mostly the vote gaining type. What about some long term infrastructure improvements, restructuring of council to save costs, user pay schemes to raise monies. No alternatives suggested.

So even though they have put forward emotional, visible, vote gaining projects utilising a cleverly worded survey they were still only able to get 11% response, of those only half supported and that represented less than 4% of the voting population.

I hope you look at the numbers carefully and come to the same conclusion that only 4% support for the special rate variance based on biased surveys is not community support.

My letter-

It is hard to believe that Randwick Council can claim that "Community Backs Randwick Council Rate Variation; (Our Community, Our Future, newsletter 2018-21, 14/2/18)" for their proposed 19% Special Variation rate increases. They are publishing fake data and releasing fake news to convince IPART that there is community support. A condition of a "Special Variation" rate increase application to IPART is that there is community support. We'll here are the numbers that show no significant support. These numbers are available in the small print when you dig down on Council website. Of the mailed out surveys (56,000) only 11% responded. That is 89% (50,000) didn't complete the survey or express an opinion at all. Of the the 11% (6,000), only 49% (3,000) supported the rate increase. Randwick city has 58,000 households and a voting population of 78,000 (Census 2016). That works out at only 3.8% of Randwick's voters or only 5% of households support the rates increase option. Therefore the majority in the mail-out survey said NO to rate increases. But council used a composite number that included results from telephone surveys and shopping centre approach surveys. With these (far less numbers than the mail-out survey) they manipulated the raw number and came up with a majority of 51% in support of rate increase. How can they claim there is community support when only 11% of those surveyed expressed an opinion and only 3.8% of the adult population of Randwick support the Special Variation rate increase. Council will argue that they can only go on the the response rate even though that response only represented 11%. They will say the majority supported the increase. But only just at 51%. And yes, after the manipulation of the data to their desired outcomes. The methodology is flawed. The result not statistically significant. They will say what choice do they have. They can't help it if so few people respond. Well bad luck. If you can't get a significant result well that's no result at all. When we go to the polls to vote for our councillors only a 100% response is acceptable. That is voting is compulsory. So how can the the rates be increased based on only 3.8% of those voters supporting it. Ludicrous: [REDACTED]. Fake news.

Regards

Matt Delfendahl