

EUROBODALLA SHIRE COUNCIL

PUBLIC FORUM

All members of the community who have registered have been advised that they have a **maximum of five minutes** to put their case.

Ordinary Meeting of Council on 10 February 2015

Name	Subject/Comments
Public Access Session – 9:30pm	
Nil	
Agenda Items – 10.00am	
Owen Cartledge	GMR15/001 Special Rate Variation
Damien Rogers	GMR15/001 Special Rate Variation
Ian Hitchcock	GMR15/001 Special Rate Variation
Peter Bernard	1. GMR15/001 Special Rate Variation 2. Confirmation of Minutes re accuracy of minutes
Patricia Hellier	1. Confirmation of Minutes re Code of Meeting Practice 2. IR15/003 Funding Offers – Traffic Signals, Batemans Bay

Owen Cartledge

Address to Council

10th February 2015

CARTS & HORSES

Good morning, my name is ^eOwen Cartledge, a resident of Malua Bay.

I commence this morning with the words of Councillor ^{Harding}~~Blaise~~ who on 9 December 2014 said:

'There should not be cuts to Council staff as this would flow through and have a depressing effect on the whole community.'

This statement in this chamber said it all.

I believe the majority of Councillors think the same way and have a protectionist culture and attitude towards the 450 or so council staff. I say to you seven councilors: You sure have had a depressing effect on the community over the last two months with your suggested 26 per cent SRV.

^eAt the 9 December meeting, two councilors tabled 11 amendments/suggestions to the SRV process. These amendments, while well meaning, are vague and do not quantify key issues. Point 5 and Point 10 (which concern efficiencies, and inevitably staffing levels) should be carried out prior to the SRV application process. Council has put the cart before the horse.

Staffing arrangements involving both grant staff and non-grant staff are opaque. I ask again, what are existing staff who are about to manage the new SRV income doing at the moment? Who does what? Surely we need a critical look at staff functions in the first instance. When Council undertakes a review of staffing and efficiencies (Point 5 and Point 10), ratepayers should have an assurance that the above protectionist viewpoint will not be used as a criterion by which to judge the value of Council officers.

^eCouncil seems to be seen by councilors in the first instance as a major employer, and an integral part of the economy of the region. The purpose of the organisation has been lost. The function of local government is to efficiently provide core services, not to employ people. This should be the objective of council decision making.

As Council continues to explore opportunities to identify efficiencies across the organisation, I think it is helpful to reflect on lessons learned from other local councils, to avoid repeating the same mistakes.

^{Toyota}Eighteen months ago the Mayor thought establishing sister city, ~~Tokyo~~ Toyota in Japan, might be a good idea. Recently Toowoomba City Council sent 2-3 councillors and their General Manager to their sister city in New Zealand. They had very clear documented objectives: Firstly, to cheer for their local Southern Queensland football team; Secondly, to participate in cultural exchange; and thirdly, to promote the sister city concept. I suggest these three objectives were merely an excuse for a well-funded junket that cost their rate-payers nearly \$20,000.

Are we heading down this same path? I suggest to Mayor Brown if this is what a sister city costs it might not be such a good idea, and is certainly one way to avoid those future inefficiencies you are now trying so hard to identify.

Returning to the impact of the proposed rate hikes: The Council information brochure dated 19 December 2014 informs ratepayers that the accumulative increase for an average residential rate would be \$212.52 after three years.

Do we assume that there will be no additional increases for water, sewerage, waste management and stormwater in addition to the \$212.52?

Point 8 of the Schwarz Burnside amendments concerns ring-fencing infrastructure funds in perpetuity; I am not convinced. This ring-fencing may be at the expense of existing renewal funds which quietly disappear into other non-core functions over time.

No country or region ever became sustainably wealthy by pump-priming the public sector. This economic approach disappeared 60 years ago.

To become fit for the future we don't need more flab (SRV), we need to become trim, taut and terrific.

Mr Damien Rogers

LOCAL government "exists for the community", council's newly appointed general manager told the Bay Post/Moruya Examiner yesterday, and no doubt the shire will be hoping she means it.

March 15 2013

"Local government has to provide services in a quality way that is not going to continually increase the burden on the ratepayer."

"How they continue to be prosperous is a key issue."

She said the shire's ageing population, unemployment, school retention, health services and transport demanded strong advocacy with other tiers of government.

"We need to put strong cases to the state and federal government and also ask, 'what is our solution to those ongoing issues?'," she said.

10 feb 2015 "Advocacy and partnerships are critical."

Dr Dale said that there were six broad issues that needed to be reviewed and enhanced to meet the community's expectations.

"These include financial sustainability, community relations and communication, organisational culture, land use planning, economic development and risk management," Dr Dale said.

20 aug 2013 "...has a clear focus to work with council to deliver what the **community** wants."

PRESENTATION ON THE PETITION AGAINST THE SPECIAL RATE VARIATION THE COUNCIL MEETING OF 10TH FEBRUARY 2015

THE MAYOR AND COUNCILLORS OF THE EUROBODALLA SHIRE.

AS SECRETARY TO THE ORGANISERS OF THE PETITION OPPOSING THE INTRODUCTION OF A SPECIAL RATE VARIATION IN THE SHIRE OF EUROBODALLA, I WISH TO ADVISE THAT AS OF THIS MORNING 7,326 SIGNATURES HAVE BEEN OBTAINED FROM A BROAD RANGE OF RESIDENTS, NON RESIDENT RATEPAYERS AND INTERESTED PARTIES, WHO WHOLLY REJECT THE PROPOSED SPECIAL RATE VARIATION.

THE COMMUNITY HAS MADE ITS VIEW VERY CLEAR IN THIS PETITION, IN THEIR RESPONSE TO THE MICROMEX SURVEY, AND AT OFFICIAL AND UNOFFICIAL SRV MEETINGS THROUGHOUT THE SHIRE.

THE ORGANISERS OF THIS PETITION REQUEST ELECTED COUNCILLORS TO RESPECT THE WILL OF THE PEOPLE, AND TO VOTE NOT TO PROCEED WITH THE APPLICATION FOR A SPECIAL RATE VARIATION.

IF COUNCIL VOTES TO WITHDRAW FROM THE SRV PROCESS, I WILL MAKE IMMEDIATE ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE PETITION TO BE HANDED OVER TO COUNCIL, THROUGH COUNCILLOR LESLIGHT.

ON THE OTHER HAND, IF COUNCIL VOTES TO PROCEED WITH THE APPLICATION FOR A SPECIAL RATE VARIATION, THE PETITION WILL REMAIN OPEN UNTIL THE 10TH MARCH 2015. AFTER THE NEW CLOSING DATE, THE PETITION WILL BE PASSED TO THE LOCAL MEMBER MR. ANDREW CONSTANCE, FOR PRESENTATION TO THE SPEAKER AND MEMBERS OF THE NEW SOUTH WALES LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

THE PETITION AND THE NUMBERS PROTESTING AGAINST THE SRV, WILL ALSO BE BROUGHT TO THE ATTENTION OF THE INDEPENDENT PRICING AND REGULATORY TRIBUNAL.

WE WISH TO THANK MRS HILLIER AND THE COMMUNITY MEMBERS WHO ASSISTED HER IN ORGANISING AND DISTRIBUTING THIS PETITION.

WE WOULD ALSO LIKE TO THANK COUNCILLOR LESLIGHT FOR HIS ASSISTANCE, AND COUNCILLORS INNES AND LESLIGHT FOR THEIR SUPPORT.

THANK YOU.

Prepared and presented by Ian Hitchcock, 47 Myuna Street, Dalmeny, Tel: 44768821

Council Address 10-2-2015 Rate rise

Mr Mayor.

By attempting to improve the image of the Eurpobodalla Shire as being financially stable and meet the requirements of "fit for the future " it has probably succeeded in getting first marks for doing the opposite . It has put its community on the path towards amalgamations, a path that will deprive its community from the closest form of government in any democracy

From the very first meeting the selling of the proposed rate rise has shown a lack of leadership, mismanagement, and lofty disregard for the intelligence and understanding of the community. Within the first five minutes of questioning at the first public meeting at Narooma the General Manager had to concede that costing information and other information was required .There were many questions concerning the information that had been sent to the public and what was presented

at the meeting. Some of the information sent to ratepayers needed correction and apologies for the confusion were made in a letter to me. In response this letter sent to me by a genuinely concerned staff person I queried whether updated information and revised graphs would be passed on to all resident and non resident ratepayers. I was told emphatically by a senior staff "no it would be too expensive ". This argument cannot be supported as an additional confusing unsigned letter by some phantom was claimed to be sent out to some 21, 000 ratepayers at the final stages of the process. At the first meeting questions were asked why some of the \$72 Million investment funds couldn't be used in lieu of a rate rise. The answer was that they "were all quarantined ". Further questioning revealed that was not the case and this was changed from none to " \$10 or \$ 12 million " and reported by others as over \$20 million from auditors reports . About triple the rate rise being sought. Further clarification has sought be me in open council and the answer was taken " on notice ". A reply concerning the correct amount has not been

**forthcoming .Madam General Manager
“Does any body really know what the
correct figure was at the time .Other Public
meetings revealed further confusion ,
public dissatisfaction , unsatisfactory
managerial input , overwhelming votes of
no confidence and the conspicuous absence
many councillors. Attempting to bribe
people will Monkey bars, Slippery dips,
Merry Go Rounds and now free ashtrays
will not work.**

**Mr Mayor time does not permit me to
say all what should be said. However
council final submission to IPART is to be
submitted by Monday the 16th February 2015
and questionable programming by senior
staff appears to have denied the public,
councillors and investing local journalism
further input? However, if some councillors
are not happy with the final resolution it
would be courageous of them to submit
their views to IPART on behalf of
themselves and ratepayers after that date.**

**Irrespective of the council decision Mr
Mayor it would also be courageous of all
councillors to authorise that a letter to sent
to all residents and non resident ratepayers**

Detailing

1.0 Tonight's report and council final resolution

2.0 Copy of Management submission to IPART

3.0 Advice to ratepayers to may make their own submission to IPART. I know that this will be considered highly desirable by IPART but it must be lodged before 16 th March 2015. Confirm details on [www.ipart.nsw.gov .au](http://www.ipart.nsw.gov.au).

My Mayor. Irrespective of councils decision, today 10/02/2015 I believe that if council carries this out it will become an unchallenged pillar of communication by the public and amongst Local Government.

Mr Mayor. Would you recommend the authorisation of 1, 2, and 3 with any addendums you may consider necessary as a motion or Mayoral Minute. I would expect media interests to lend a hand in a manner consistent with its public duties of reporting the truth

Peter Bernard
10 the February 2015

Good Afternoon Mayor Brown, Councillors attendees in the Gallery and at home

MY name is Patricia Hellier from North Batemans Bay I am currently holding **2 DOCUMENTS**

The first document is the **Code of Meeting Practice** that was put out for public exhibition on the 15th October for 42 days for the public exhibition. I will call this **DOCUMENT 1**.

2. This second **DOCUMENT** I will call **DOCUMENT 2** this is the document that the Council adopted on the 9th December 2014 – you will notice that this document has a number of pink tags on it – these tags represent the amount of changes that are in **DOCUMENT 2** that differs from **DOCUMENT 1** which was the document that was put out for public exhibition.

I do not have the time to go through all of the changes that are represented by these pink tags the facts are the Code of Meeting Practice that the Council adopted on the 9th December 2014 -words have been added, words have been deleted, sections have been added, sections have been deleted. I will touch on just a couple - the first one I will touch on I find PERSONALLY OFFENSE from **DOCUMENT 2**

PAGE 13 SECTION 3.4 COUNCILLOR ATTENDANCE AT MEETINGS – Vacancy in a civic office FROM Document 2

1. A civic office becomes vacant if the holder:

(a) Dies, - that's right Dies - there are far better words that could have been used ie Becomes deceased, Passes Away –there are additional point that have been added to this section which were not in the Original Code of Meeting Practice ie **Document 1**

2. PAGE 8 - PART 2 – This I believe is a VERY IMPORTANT ISSUE

2.1 Frequency and time of Meetings from the Code of Meeting Practice that was placed in the Library **Document 1** I QUOTE FROM

(e) Ordinary Council Meetings will commence at 4.00pm and conclude at 9.00pm.

This commencement time may vary for PARTICULAR MEETINGS if the Council resolves. The operate word being PARTICULAR MEETINGS!!!

PRACTICE- FROM **Document 1** I QUOTE FROM

2. From 10th September 2013 Council resolved to conduct late afternoon Ordinary Council meeting for a trial period of 6 months, which was extended to 12 months. On conclusion of the trial period and AFTER CONSULTATION WITH THE PUBLIC Council resolved in (date TBA) that the ongoing timing of Ordinary meetings would remain from 4.00-9.00pm.

THIS DID NOT OCCUR – THERE WAS NO CONSULTATION WITH THE PUBLIC – THEREFORE THESE MEETING MUST REVERT BACK TO 4PM – TO 9PM. Regardless of the Motion Moved by Clr. Pollock and seconded by Clr. Harding on the October 2014, **THIS MOTION I BELIEVE IS INVALID AND SHOULD NOT HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED.**

Chairperson, Councillors attendees in the gallery and at home –

My name is Patricia Hellier from North Batemans Bay

I have in my possession a petition, I am not presenting this petition at this time, however I am here to draw it to your attention to it.

THIS PETITION IS HEADED

THE UNDERSIGNED PETITIONERS THEREFORE REQUEST THAT EUROBODALLA COUNCILLORS:

Wholly reject the proposed traffic lights at the corner of NORTH AND PERRY STREET

There are over 1000 signature on this PETITION – the Business Community of Batemans Bay are against these lights and this was reflected in the submission that were received in 2014 by the public.

The Business People of the area affected are now aware that funding has now been received from the NSW State Government for this project and they believe that there must be an alternative to this set of traffic lights which are located within a short distance from the Traffic Lights on the Princes Highway.

It is strong belief by the business community that the installation of these lights will not improve vehicle or pedestrian flow in this area particularly over the holiday period and they are asking for a review on this issue.

It is estimated that around \$200,000.00 of Rate Payers monies is being used for this project that nobody wants, not to mention the ongoing maintenance . Is this a FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY given that a Government Grant is also involved?