

Ratepayer Survey Response

Given that as a ratepayer I will have my own personal opinion and bias, especially as to the future outcome of the QVMAG, nonetheless there is an overriding rule that will ultimately affect the answers to the questionnaire. If, as a council Alderman aspirant, I make decisions on important issues without polling the community, then I am no different to those that currently sit in office. As elected Aldermen, we are not there to rule, but to represent and serve our community.

In order that I reflect ratepayer and community values, I have surveyed a cross section of Launceston Ratepayers to arrive at the answers on contentious issues in your questionnaire.

1. [Concerning whether or not to sell the QVMAG to the State Government for a nominal fee.](#) In the 1980s the State Government wanted to take over the QVMAG, Aldermans Beams, Mc Kendrick, Wing, Hidding, and Godfrey voted against it. The reason was based on the possibility of the collections heading south to TMAG. If the handover came with an iron clad guarantee that the QVMAG would retain autonomy and that the collections would remain in the north, then the majority of those surveyed would agree in principle.
2. [Sale of York Park.](#) Yes it should be sold to the State Government.
3. [Sale of the Albert Hall.](#) The public would not allow it and of those surveyed, the majority were opposed. Leasing would be the only other option.
4. [Sale of the Princess Theatre.](#) Again public opinion was opposed to the sale, however leasing to the performing arts and/or drama societies was suggested.
5. [Flood Levee.](#) Yes overwhelming support. Opinion also supports adjoining councils whose rivers feed into the Tamar contributing to the silt problem should also share in the responsibility.
6. [Festivale.](#) Private enterprise has largely taken over the running of the event. There is need for council to have any involvement other than providing the venue with appropriate charges for services and remediation.
7. [Marketing for tourist facility/bureau/authority.](#) In 1990 there were only 3 in marketing at LCC, the number now has risen dramatically to the point where it would be hard to justify. Money would better be spent on more essential services like the hospital etc. On this issue opinion was divided.
8. [Sister City program.](#) In the past our association with Ikeda in Japan benefited the wool and fishing industry. Where commerce and trade have a beneficial influence on the program advantaging Launceston enterprises, opinion was that it should be retained.
9. [Council in camera meetings.](#) All meetings should be open and transparent.
10. [Brighton Council rate model.](#) Yes the option should be considered.
11. [4% reduction in AAV.](#) Yes
12. [UCV rating system.](#) Yes subject to seeing the model and community support.
13. [Water metering for all in municipality.](#) Yes but not at 70 cents a kilolitre.
14. [On rural rating opinion was again divided.](#) The reason against the proposal was based on the current system where rural properties are not charged for services

- that they don't receive. When the question was put to rural properties the answer was in the affirmative.
15. [Launceston promoting itself](#). Yes, given that future investment either by business or the private sector value adds to community, both socially and culturally. Affordable housing will always be an issue. Enticements to promote the city must be cost neutral and not at the expense of ratepayers
 16. [Artist in Residence Program](#). No not council's responsibility.
 17. [Bursaries](#). Opinion divided, the small majority suggesting that it was not council's responsibility.
 18. [Tennis facility](#). No this should have been a private enterprise.
 19. [Elector Poll](#). Overwhelmingly Yes. This is the only avenue open to ratepayers; the Pulp Mill is a prime example where elector poll would have determined ratepayer sentiment.
 20. [Regional Aquatic Centre](#). This issue, more than any other, raised comment and mostly criticism against the LCC. Bob Cheek's name was mentioned as having a hand in the initial proposal. It should have been a private enterprise initiative. Opinion by the majority of those surveyed was that if it falls below projected levels, it should either be taken over by State Government or sold outright.

Summary:

I have found talking to ratepayers throughout the Launceston Municipality, that public sentiment does not always reflect the values of the LRA. That's not to lay blame with either the LRA or the ratepayers. In all decisions relating to important issues, majority rules must take precedence.

Ian Norton,
Candidate for the Launceston City Council Elections.