

21 October 2018

Dear Sir/Madam

Submission to Review of Central Coast Council's Prices Assessment numbers	and

I have to say as a long term rate payer, I am extremely disappointed with Council's lack of consultation and communication on this matter. There has been very little detail provided until I received letters dated 8 October in relation to my land holdings and only a few days to consider the matter.

I appreciate the time for submissions being extended. Furthermore, I strenuously object to the suggested change.

My wife and I run a cattle herd of approximately 40 head and the latest rates for my 2 properties are \$2,229-16 for Assessment number and \$4,090-25 for Assessment number — a total of \$6,319-41 p.a.

For this I receive weekly rubbish collection services and if I am lucky, 2 road gradings a year. I provide all my own sewerage services, store all my own water in dams and billabongs that exist on the property and there is zero provision of <u>any</u> stormwater element on my properties. It is nothing like the services provided by Council in the typical residential situation in relation to stormwater works.

This appears to be an attempt to raise income by slugging a smaller number of property owners an unrealistic fee under the heading of "costs of delivering water, sewerage and stormwater drainage services". We take care of all those ourselves now!

The Valley involves a far different type of landholding than Gosford I suggest – that benchmark is just not relevant if you look at the facts of the matter.

Apart from wages, rates are the second highest expense category I experience each year on my property. Imagine how ridiculous it would be to then be slugged an additional \$5,427 for each propriety for this new charge – an extra \$10,850 for no extra services at all in relation to my properties.

This current suggestion is just not logical and will make many rural property owners marginal to say the least. Just ask yourselves the question - "what would my reaction be if I was presented with such a situation"? I have no doubt that it would be the same as the reaction I am registering.

It is simply NOT fair in any way. Again, I pay a big figure for rates currently and the proposal suggests that <u>this be increased from \$6,319-41</u> to \$\$17,173-41 – FOR ZERO ADDITIONAL SERVICES, as I have explained!

The suggested changes are clearly a case of cross subsidising residential properties for stormwater and drainage — at the expense of rural holdings.

I am happy to play my part as a member of the community, but this current suggestion I believe is structured to "lower the noise element" on the matter with the far greater number of residential property holders (and voters!) remaining silent, while the far fewer larger land holder are left to pick up the tab. It is unfair and wrong.

My appreciation to IPART for extending the submission date. I look forward to hearing further about the process to be followed to hopefully arrive at a fairer outcome.

