



KOMMETJIE

Kommetjie Residents and Ratepayers Association
P O Box/Posbus 48342 Kommetjie 7076

11 January 2018

Dear Sir or Madam

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the proposed water levy.

Kommetjie Residents' and Ratepayers' Association understands that there are legal grounds on which the proposed charge is being challenged. We trust that clarity about its lawfulness will be established before further implementation of the plan.

While acknowledging the severity of the drought situation and need for new infrastructure such as desalination, the majority of Kommetjie residents polled are opposed to the drought charge for several reasons including:

- People have already accepted the loss of the free 6kl per month allocation and are paying the significantly increased water tariffs that have been hiked in successive years.
- Most have massively reduced consumption as requested.
- The City could not have been unaware of the loss of income consequent to restrictions and should have planned better and earlier to deal with the effect.
- For many the levy will take their monthly water bill to higher than it was before the restrictions owing to their sparing use.
- Unrelated to consumption the charge is essentially a wealth tax and could be precedent setting, allowing government to demand more financial support from citizens whenever it has a problem, often of its own making.
- Compensating for loss of income in this way allows national government to abrogate its responsibilities in terms of water security for citizens and this could become a trend.
- Both national and local government have been remiss in not taking heed of the scientifically backed predictions of water shortages as a result of climate change and unrestricted growth and development. All development approvals should have been conditional on significant up-front levies being paid beforehand to ensure that the City did not slide into infrastructural deficit.

We would appreciate information about what other efforts to raise money for infrastructure have already been explored and why the option to make ratepayers support such costs has been chosen instead of, say, the issuing of water bonds that people could purchase and redeem at a later date.

Yours sincerely

Patrick Dowling
KRRRA Chair