

**Attachment B: One Rate Submission Table – Summary of submissions provided in full to Councillors**

Number	Submission Type	Submission Comments	Direct Response Sent to Resident	Council Comment
1	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the proposal - understands there will be an increase to the rates.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission supports the change and the investment in new services and facilities.</li> </ul>
2	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Capacity to pay.</li> <li>Suggests Council can live within its means including salary cuts.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> <li>Both former councils' operational cost per capita (as assessed by the Office of Local Government) was among the lowest of all metropolitan councils.</li> <li>Since the merger, CBCity has been able to realise significant efficiency savings of \$7.6 million per annum, far exceeding the NSW Government estimates of \$4.5 million per annum. Despite these savings, Council is unable to adequately address the asset backlog it faces.</li> </ul>
	Indirect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would like Council to demerge.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The process of amalgamation was directed to both former councils, and was imposed by the NSW Government without the ability to refuse the merger.</li> <li>While de-amalgamation is not part of the One Rates Proposal, during the merger both former councils' 'Fit for the Future' submissions identified that significant financial reform was needed. The former Bankstown identified the need for an SRV of \$17M per annum while the former Canterbury identified the need to retain their Infrastructure Renewal Levy (one of their previous SRVs – which has now finished) as well as major cuts to services (reducing street sweeping), selling assets (such as community land), increasing charges to sporting fields and other facilities, accepting further deterioration in roads, footpaths, parks and buildings and borrowing \$36.5M.</li> </ul>

3	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Capacity to pay due to current climate and COVID-19.</li> <li>Suggests Councillor concessions should be cut.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> <li>Councillor expenses as a part of undertaking their role is governed by Council's Councillor Expenses and Facilities Policy. Councillor remuneration at every Council is bound by the NSW Local Government Remuneration Tribunal.</li> </ul>
	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned with cleanliness of streets/gardens.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recognised that there are some areas where services are not meeting the needs of the community. This is part of the reason for the SRV, to specifically target areas of community concern, such as cleanliness.</li> </ul>
4	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Wanted a letter to every ratepayer advising the rates increase amount.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A letter was sent to every ratepayer, with clear and transparent information regarding how rates would change based on land value.</li> </ul>
	Indirect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Did not support the amalgamation.</li> <li>Believed the mergers were meant to reduce costs.</li> <li>SRV should be funded by state Government.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Since the merger, CBCity has been able to realise significant efficiency savings of \$7.6 million per annum, far exceeding the NSW Government estimates of \$4.5 million per annum. Despite these savings, Council is unable to adequately address the asset backlog it faces.</li> </ul>
5	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal, believing that the proposed rate increase was an insult to the community.</li> <li>Suggests that Council can live within its means including sale of assets.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both former councils' operational cost per capita (as assessed by the Office of Local Government) was among the lowest of all metropolitan councils.</li> <li>Since the merger, CBCity has been able to realise significant efficiency savings of \$7.6 million per annum, far exceeding the NSW Government estimates of \$4.5 million per annum. Despite these savings, Council is unable to adequately address the asset backlog it faces.</li> <li>Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all of its services and delivered efficiencies where possible.</li> <li>Significant feedback in the current community feedback is more, not less, needs to be done.</li> </ul>

	Indirect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did not agree with amalgamation.</li> <li>• Believed that mergers were meant to save money, cheaper rates.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The process of amalgamation was directed to both former councils, and was imposed by the NSW Government without the ability to refuse the merger.</li> <li>• While de-amalgamation is not part of the One Rates Proposal, during the merger both former councils' 'Fit for the Future' submissions identified that significant financial reform was needed. The former Bankstown identified the need for an SRV of \$17M per annum while the former Canterbury identified the need to retain their Infrastructure Renewal Levy (one of their previous SRVs – which has now finished) as well as major cuts to services (reducing street sweeping), selling assets (such as community land), increasing charges to sporting fields and other facilities, accepting further deterioration in roads, footpaths, parks and buildings and borrowing \$36.5M.</li> <li>• As part of the amalgamation process, the NSW Government implemented a rate freeze policy (except IPART increase) to 2021. This has been in place for the last five years. After this period, rate reviews are allowed.</li> </ul>
6	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Partially supports proposal.</li> <li>• Suggests three options – lift current rates so they align, reduce those that exceed, or determine a middle ground as the basis of a new system.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council must harmonise its rates by 2021. The process of harmonisation does not raise a single extra dollar for Council. Some rates may go up and others down, but there is no change to the total amount of money that comes into Council.</li> </ul>
	Indirect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questions the former Canterbury SRV's and their compounding effect.</li> <li>• Suggests that Council can live within its means including removing non-core programs.</li> <li>• Questions the use of funds provided to Council by the State Government as part of the amalgamation process.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Each Special Rate Variation (SRV) is assessed and approved independently by IPART on the basis for which they are proposed. Where they consider appropriate, this may include more than one SRV being in place at once.</li> <li>• Information provided about the allocation and expenditure of funding to Council under the New Council Implementation Funds and the Stronger Communities Fund.</li> <li>• There were two components to this funding. \$10 million was allocated to Council as part of the New Council Implementation Fund. The purpose of this funding was to fund the administrative amalgamation costs. This was expended by June 2017. An additional \$10 million was allocated to Council under the Stronger Communities Fund. This was established by the NSW Government to provide newly merged Councils with funding to deliver projects that improve community infrastructure and services (as opposed to funding ongoing costs associated with existing Council services and infrastructure). This consisted of \$9 million for major projects and \$1 million for community grants. Council continues to report on this funding allocation quarterly.</li> </ul>

				While de-amalgamation is not part of the One Rates Proposal, during the merger both former councils' 'Fit for the Future' submissions identified that significant financial reform was needed. The former Bankstown identified the need for an SRV of \$17M per annum while the former Canterbury identified the need to retain their Infrastructure Renewal Levy (one of their previous SRVs – which has now finished) as well as major cuts to services (reducing street sweeping), selling assets (such as community land), increasing charges to sporting fields and other facilities, accepting further deterioration in roads, footpaths, parks and buildings and borrowing \$36.5M.
7	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Not currently value for money.</li> <li>Capacity to pay.</li> <li>More development means Council is receiving more money.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> <li>More development changes who/ how many people pay rates but the total income Council can bring in via rates is limited by IPART.</li> </ul>
	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned about street sweeping and condition of roads.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recognised that there are some areas where services are not meeting the needs of the community. This is part of the reason for the SRV, to specifically target areas of community concern.</li> <li>Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all of its services and delivered efficiencies where possible.</li> </ul>
8	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Is concerned that Canterbury residents will be paying more rates as there is more open space in Bankstown.</li> <li>Suggests that decisions should be made based on growth projections.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rates across the City currently differ in many aspects and it is not as simple as one former Council area being higher or lower than the other. For example, the former Canterbury area 'residential minimum rate' (rate generally paid by those living in units) is currently higher than the Bankstown area, however the Rate in the Dollar Charge (used to calculate for houses) for Canterbury is lower than the Bankstown area. There are also different rates for businesses.</li> <li>More development changes who/ how many people pay rates but the total income Council can bring in via rates is limited by IPART.</li> </ul>
	Indirect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Believed the mergers were meant to increase efficiency and reduce costs.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Since the merger, CBCity has been able to realise significant efficiency savings of \$7.6 million per annum, far exceeding the NSW Government estimates of \$4.5</li> </ul>

				<p>million per annum. Despite these savings, Council is unable to adequately address the asset backlog it faces.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If additional revenue is not provided, Council will need to explore other cost cutting options as set out in the Council report.</li> </ul>
	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned about the level of capital investment in town centres and disparity in investment on either side of the city.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recognised that there are some areas where services are not meeting the needs of the community. This is part of the reason for the SRV, to specifically target areas of community concern.</li> </ul>
9	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Partially supports the proposal.</li> <li>Capacity to pay.</li> <li>Uncertain of impact.</li> <li>Not currently value for money.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> <li>Referred resident to rate calculator for more detailed information.</li> </ul>
	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned about cleanliness of streets, road maintenance and customer service.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recognised that there are some areas where services are not meeting the needs of the community. This is part of the reason for the SRV, to specifically target areas of community concern.</li> </ul>
10	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Capacity to pay in current climate and COVID-19.</li> <li>State Government should assist.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> <li>Cost shifting continues to be an ongoing concern for Local Government, with more and more services and financial burdens being passed down from State and Federal Government.</li> <li>Although State Government support is important, Rates are the largest and most stable component of Council income, so it is critical for councils to get their Rating Policy and rates structure right.</li> </ul>

11	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Believes more development provides more rates.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More development changes who/ how many people pay rates but the total income Council can bring in via rates is limited by IPART.</li> <li>As part of the applications to IPART, Council will also propose annual reporting requirements to transparently report the use funds and outcomes of expenditure to the community. This will include detailed reporting as part of Annual Report and the End of Term Report.</li> <li>All materials (hard copy and digital) contain specific information on where funds will be spent.</li> </ul>
	Indirect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Believes there has been no improvements since amalgamation.</li> <li>Questioned how the funds would be spent.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information provided around savings post amalgamation, clarity around limits on Council income via rates, and where additional funding will be invested as part of this proposal.</li> </ul>
	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned about street cleanliness, over development and need for improved infrastructure.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recognised that there are some areas where services are not meeting the needs of the community. This is part of the reason for the SRV, to specifically target areas of community concern.</li> <li>Significant feedback in the current community submissions is more, not less, needs to be done.</li> </ul>
12	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Capacity to pay in current climate and COVID-19.</li> <li>Concerned the proposal does not create harmony.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> <li>Council must harmonise its rates by 2021 as required by current legislation.</li> </ul>	
13	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Capacity to pay and increasing cost of living.</li> <li>Wages are not going up, but rates are.</li> <li>Should cut pay to politicians.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> <li>It is recognised that some income is not keeping pace with inflation. Likewise Council's costs are increasing greater than inflation (such as electricity, materials).</li> </ul>	

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Councillor expenses as a part of undertaking their role is governed by Council's Councillor Expenses and Facilities Policy. Councillor remuneration at every Council is bound by the NSW Local Government Remuneration Tribunal.</li> </ul>
14	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Capacity to pay and increasing cost of living.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> <li>It is recognised that some income is not keeping pace with inflation. Likewise Council's costs are increasing greater than inflation (such as electricity, materials).</li> <li>If additional revenue is not provided, Council will need to explore other cost cutting options as set out in the Council report.</li> </ul>
15	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Capacity to pay in current climate and COVID-19.</li> <li>Wanted to make sure there was adequate time to lodge concerns.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> <li>No decision has been made. Council will consider all the community feedback at the Council meeting in February before making a decision. Further community consultation will be undertaken by IPART before a final outcome is determined.</li> </ul>
16	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned about the decision-making process and that this is given enough consideration.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information was provided about the consultation process and next steps.</li> <li>No decision has been made. Council will consider all the community feedback at the Council meeting in February before making a decision. Further community consultation will be undertaken by IPART before a final outcome is determined.</li> </ul>
17	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Questioned how the proposed increase has been calculated.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All materials (hard copy and digital) contain specific information on how the need for additional funds was calculated and where funds will be spent.</li> <li>As part of the applications to IPART, Council will also propose annual reporting requirements to transparently report the use funds and outcomes of</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questioned how the funds would be spent.</li> </ul>		<p>expenditure to the community. This will include detailed reporting as part of Annual Report and the End of Term Report.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All materials (hard copy and digital) contain specific information on where funds will be spent.</li> </ul>
	Indirect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about consultation over the Christmas period.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All councils are required to have notified IPART of intention to apply by 27 November 2020 and final applications due by 8 February 2021. Therefore exhibition and consultation cannot be extended.</li> <li>• While an earlier decision would have allowed more time for consultation a final option was adopted in November.</li> </ul>
	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about the need for more footpaths and adequate maintenance of parks.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant feedback in the current community feedback is more, not less, needs to be done.</li> </ul>
18	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>• Capacity to pay and the increasing cost of living.</li> <li>• Believes the land values of each former area are incomparable.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>• Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> <li>• Just as individual's cost of living increases, Council's costs are also increasing greater than inflation (such as electricity, materials).</li> <li>• Council rates are calculated based on land value.</li> </ul>
19	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>• Capacity to pay and the increasing cost of living.</li> <li>• Believes not currently value for money.</li> <li>• Rates are some of most expensive in state.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>• Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> <li>• Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all of its services and delivered efficiencies where possible.</li> <li>• Rates compare well to surrounding council areas.</li> </ul>



				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both former councils' operational cost per capita (as assessed by the Office of Local Government) was among the lowest of all metropolitan councils.</li> </ul>
20	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No decision has been made. Council will consider all the community feedback at the Council meeting in February before making a decision. Further community consultation will be undertaken by IPART before a final outcome is determined.</li> </ul>
	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned about street cleanliness, the environment, ibis and maintenance of local parks.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recognised that there are some areas where services are not meeting the needs of the community. This is part of the reason for the SRV, to specifically target areas of community concern.</li> <li>Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all of its services and delivered efficiencies where possible.</li> <li>Significant feedback in the current community submissions is more, not less, needs to be done</li> </ul>
21	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Small business owner.</li> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Capacity to pay due to COVID-19.</li> <li>Concerned already received an increase in rates due to recent land valuations.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> <li>It is recognised that there are some areas where services are not meeting the needs of the community. This is part of the reason for the SRV, to specifically target areas of community concern.</li> <li>Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all of its services and delivered efficiencies where possible.</li> <li>Significant feedback in the current community submissions is more, not less, needs to be done.</li> </ul>
	Indirect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Believes there has been no improvements since amalgamation.</li> <li>Questioned how the funds would be spent.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Since the merger, CBCity has been able to realise significant efficiency savings of \$7.6 million per annum, far exceeding the NSW Government estimates of \$4.5 million per annum. Despite these savings, Council is unable to adequately address the asset backlog it faces.</li> <li>If additional revenue is not provided, Council will need to explore other cost cutting options as set out in the Council report.</li> </ul>

22	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Partially supports the proposal.</li> <li>Doesn't support the SRV proposal.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both former councils' operational cost per capita (as assessed by the Office of Local Government) was among the lowest of all metropolitan councils.</li> <li>Each Special Rate Variation (SRV) is assessed and approved independently by IPART on the basis for which they are proposed.</li> </ul>
	Indirect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggests that Council can live within its means including identifying wastage.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all of its services and delivered efficiencies where possible.</li> <li>Council did consider implementing some of the service cuts proposed by the former Canterbury (selling community land, cutting street sweeping) however it was considered the community would not support these.</li> <li>Significant feedback in the current community submissions is more, not less, needs to be done.</li> </ul>
	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned about condition of footpaths and kerb &amp; gutters, cleanliness of streets</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recognised that there are some areas where services are not meeting the needs of the community. This is part of the reason for the SRV, to specifically target areas of community concern.</li> </ul>
23	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Partially supports the proposal.</li> <li>Supports harmonisation but wants it to happen immediately – currently unfair to Bankstown house owners/ will result in Bankstown heavily subsidising former Canterbury residents for coming years.</li> <li>Recognises that rate increases need to happen to support all the work that needs to be done.</li> <li>Suggests other options.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ability to harmonise rates has been impacted by NSW Government policy.</li> <li>Proposed gradual approach is to limit the financial impact on all residents, not just those in the former Canterbury.</li> <li>Rates across the City currently differ in many aspects and it is not as simple as one former Council area being higher or lower than the other. For example, the former Canterbury area 'residential minimum rate' (rate generally paid by those living in units) is currently higher than the Bankstown area, however the Rate in the Dollar Charge (used to calculate for houses) for Canterbury is lower than the Bankstown area. There are also different rates for businesses.</li> </ul>
24	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Capacity to pay.</li> <li>Suggests averaging the rates of the two former Councils.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal, as outlined clearly in hard copy and digital formats, includes both the harmonisation proposal (aligns rate structures, must occur, brings in no additional income to Council) and a proposal to increase rates income by \$40 million pa through an SRV.</li> <li>Council must harmonise its rates by 2021. The process of harmonisation (e.g. by averaging rates as suggested here) does not raise a single extra dollar for</li> </ul>

				Council. Some rates may go up and others down, but there is no change to the total amount of money that comes into Council.
25	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Asks for details about how to discuss further.</li> <li>Believes it is not value for money as doesn't use many Council services.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rates fund a range of services and facilities for the community.</li> <li>Resident was sent details of drop in sessions or asked if they would like a phone call from a team member.</li> </ul>
	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned with an ongoing issue about car parking in street.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recognised that there are some areas where services are not meeting the needs of the community. This is part of the reason for the SRV, to specifically target areas of community concern.</li> <li>Other issue has been discussed with resident.</li> </ul>
26	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Partially supports proposal.</li> <li>Agrees with equality in the rating system.</li> <li>Doesn't support the SRV proposal.</li> <li>Questions timing of engagement sessions.</li> <li>Capacity to pay due to no increases in wages.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Respondent was sent details of consultation sessions and other options to talk directly to Council.</li> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> <li>It is recognised that some income is not keeping pace with inflation. Likewise Council's costs are increasing greater than inflation (such as electricity, materials).</li> </ul>
	Indirect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted that Council received additional funding at the time of amalgamation.</li> </ul>		
27	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council must harmonise its rates by 2021 as required by current legislation. The process of harmonisation does not raise a single extra dollar for Council. Some rates may go up and others down, but there is no change to the total amount of money that comes into Council.</li> </ul>
	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned there have been no major improvements in the Canterbury Town Centre along Canterbury Road.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recognised that there are some areas where services are not meeting the needs of the community. This is part of the reason for the SRV, to specifically target areas of community concern.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that Council improve its communication with residents about services and improvements.</li> <li>• Believes Council has been provided funding from the State Government to assist with planning for Canterbury Town Centre.</li> </ul>		
28	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not support the proposal – harmonisation and SRV.</li> <li>• Concerned about the notification period.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal, as outlined clearly in hard copy and digital formats, includes both the harmonisation proposal (aligns rate structures, must occur, brings in no additional income to Council) and a proposal to increase rates income by \$40 million pa through an SRV.</li> <li>• All councils are required to have notified IPART of intention to apply by 27 November 2020 and final applications due by 8 February 2021. Therefore exhibition and consultation cannot be extended.</li> <li>• While an earlier decision would have allowed more time for consultation a final option was adopted in November.</li> </ul>
29	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>• Wants to know how much their rates will change.</li> <li>• Believes decisions should be made collaboratively and being mindful of the financial situation.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resident was directed to the rates calculator and November Council report for more information.</li> <li>• It is recognised that there are some areas where services are not meeting the needs of the community. This is part of the reason for the SRV, to specifically target areas of community concern.</li> <li>• Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all of its services and delivered efficiencies where possible.</li> <li>• Significant feedback in the current community submissions is more, not less, needs to be done.</li> </ul>
	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about a drop in service levels since amalgamation including cleanliness, mowing of footpaths, health and compliance matters.</li> </ul>		
30	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>• Suggests alternative approach – raise rates in the former Canterbury area to harmonise and increase rates income.</li> <li>• Suggests that Council can live within its means.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The process of harmonisation does not raise a single extra dollar for Council. Some rates may go up and others down, but there is no change to the total amount of money that comes into Council.</li> <li>• It is recognised that there are some areas where services are not meeting the needs of the community. This is part of the reason for the SRV, to specifically target areas of community concern.</li> </ul>

	Indirect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Believed the mergers were meant to reduce costs.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all of its services and delivered efficiencies where possible.</li> <li>Significant feedback in the current community submissions is more, not less, needs to be done.</li> <li>Since the merger, CBCity has been able to realise significant efficiency savings of \$7.6 million per annum, far exceeding the NSW Government estimates of \$4.5 million per annum. Despite these savings, Council is unable to adequately address the asset backlog it faces.</li> </ul>
	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned with maintenance of existing infrastructure.</li> </ul>		
31	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Believes funding from former Bankstown will be used to make improvements in the former Canterbury.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>During the merger both former councils' 'Fit for the Future' submissions identified that significant financial reform was needed. The former Bankstown identified the need for an SRV of \$17M per annum while the former Canterbury identified the need to retain their Infrastructure Renewal Levy (one of their previous SRVs – which has now finished) as well as major cuts to services (reducing street sweeping), selling assets (such as community land), increasing charges to sporting fields and other facilities, accepting further deterioration in roads, footpaths, parks and buildings and borrowing \$36.5M.</li> <li>Both former councils' operational cost per capita (as assessed by the Office of Local Government) was among the lowest of all metropolitan councils.</li> <li>Since the merger, CBCity has been able to realise significant efficiency savings of \$7.6 million per annum, far exceeding the NSW Government estimates of \$4.5 million per annum. Despite these savings, Council is unable to adequately address the asset backlog it faces.</li> <li>If additional revenue is not provided, Council will need to explore other cost cutting options as set out in the Council report.</li> </ul>
	Indirect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Did not support the amalgamation.</li> <li>Believed the mergers were meant to reduce costs and create efficiencies.</li> </ul>		
32	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Partially supports the proposal.</li> <li>Does not support the SRV proposal.</li> <li>Capacity to pay due to current climate and COVID-19.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Resident was directed to the rates calculator for more information.</li> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> <li></li> </ul>

33	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Suggests that Council can live within its means including salary cuts.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all its services and delivered efficiencies where possible.</li> <li>Council did consider implementing some of the service cuts proposed by the former Canterbury (selling community land, cutting street sweeping) however it was considered the community would not support these.</li> <li>Significant feedback in the current community feedback is more, not less, needs to be done.</li> </ul>
	Indirect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Believed the mergers were meant to reduce costs and leverage economy if scale.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both former councils' operational cost per capita (as assessed by the Office of Local Government) was among the lowest of all metropolitan councils.</li> <li>Since the merger, CBCity has been able to realise significant efficiency savings of \$7.6 million per annum, far exceeding the NSW Government estimates of \$4.5 million per annum. Despite these savings, Council is unable to adequately address the asset backlog it faces.</li> <li>If additional revenue is not provided, Council will need to explore other cost cutting options as set out in the Council report</li> </ul>
34	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Capacity to pay, particularly for pensioners.</li> <li>Not currently value for money.</li> <li>Suggests that Council can live within its means.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>Report recommends a Review of the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy.</li> </ul>
	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would like to see an increase in services, facilities and infrastructure.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recognised that there are some areas where services are not meeting the needs of the community. This is part of the reason for the SRV, to specifically target areas of community concern.</li> <li>Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all its services and delivered efficiencies where possible.</li> <li>Significant feedback in the current community submissions is more, not less, needs to be done.</li> </ul>
35	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Capacity to pay in current climate and due to COVID-19.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggests that Council can live within its means, including salaries.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> </ul>
36	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Capacity to pay, particularly for pensioners.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>Report recommends a Review of the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy.</li> </ul>
	Indirect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Believes Council should advocate to the State Government for amalgamation funding, rather than increase rates.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although State Government support is important, Rates are the largest and most stable component of Council income, so it is critical for councils to get their Rating Policy and rates structure right.</li> </ul>
	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned about current service levels since amalgamation, including cleanliness and waste collection.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recognised that there are some areas where services are not meeting the needs of the community. This is part of the reason for the SRV, to specifically target areas of community concern.</li> <li>Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all of its services and delivered efficiencies where possible.</li> <li>Significant feedback in the current community submissions is more, not less, needs to be done.</li> </ul>
37	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Capacity to pay.</li> <li>Not currently value for money.</li> <li>Requested information about upcoming meetings.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> <li>Resident was provided with details of upcoming engagement sessions.</li> </ul>
	Indirect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggests they don't currently use many Council services.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rates fund a range of services and facilities for the community.</li> <li>It is recognised that there are some areas where services are not meeting the needs of the community. This is part of the reason for the SRV, to specifically target areas of community concern.</li> </ul>

38	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Doesn't support the proposal.</li> <li>• Supports equality in the rates system.</li> <li>• Capacity to pay.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rates across the City currently differ in many aspects and it is not as simple as one former Council area being higher or lower than the other. For example, the former Canterbury area 'residential minimum rate' (rate generally paid by those living in units) is currently higher than the Bankstown area, however the Rate in the Dollar Charge (used to calculate for houses) for Canterbury is lower than the Bankstown area. There are also different rates for businesses.</li> <li>• Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>• Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> </ul>
39	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Doesn't support the proposal.</li> <li>• Capacity to pay in current climate and COVID-19.</li> <li>• Believes Council rates should be raised in other Council areas.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>• Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> <li>• Council rates are calculated based on land value.</li> </ul>
	Indirect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that Canterbury-Bankstown does not receive appropriate level funding from other levels of Government.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although State Government support is important, Rates are the largest and most stable component of Council income, so it is critical for councils to get their Rating Policy and rates structure right.</li> </ul>
40	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>• Capacity to pay in current climate and due to COVID-19.</li> <li>• Believes Council rates should be raised in other LGAs.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>• Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> <li>• Council rates are calculated based on land value.</li> </ul>



	Indirect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did not support the amalgamation.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The process of amalgamation was directed to both former councils and was imposed by the NSW Government without the ability to refuse the merger.</li> </ul>
	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about service levels since amalgamation.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is recognised that there are some areas where services are not meeting the needs of the community. This is part of the reason for the SRV, to specifically target areas of community concern.</li> </ul>
41	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>• Capacity to pay and increasing cost of living.</li> <li>• Believes the proposal does not create equality.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>• Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> <li>• It is recognised that some income is not keeping pace with Inflation. Likewise Council's costs are increasing greater than inflation (such as electricity, materials).</li> <li>• Council must harmonise its rates by 2021 as required by current legislation. The process of harmonisation does not raise a single extra dollar for Council. Some rates may go up and others down, but there is no change to the total amount of money that comes into Council.</li> <li>• Council rates are calculated based on land value.</li> </ul>
42	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>• Capacity to pay and level of disadvantage.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>• Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> <li>• It is recognised that some income is not keeping pace with Inflation. Likewise Council's costs are increasing greater than inflation (such as electricity, materials).</li> </ul>
43	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not support the proposal.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg –</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capacity to pay due to current climate and COVID-19.</li> <li>Suggests Council should live within its means, including salaries and other costs.</li> </ul>		<p>increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> <li>Both former councils' operational cost per capita (as assessed by the Office of Local Government) was among the lowest of all metropolitan councils.</li> <li>Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all of its services and delivered efficiencies where possible. Cutting the services identified would not deliver the required annual saving needed.</li> <li>Council did consider implementing some of the service cuts proposed by the former Canterbury (selling community land, cutting street sweeping) however it was considered the community would not support these.</li> </ul>
	Indirect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Believed the mergers were meant to reduce costs.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As part of the amalgamation process, the NSW Government implemented a rate freeze policy (except IPART increase) to 2021. This has been in place for the last five years. After this period, rate reviews are allowed.</li> <li>Both former councils' operational cost per capita (as assessed by the Office of Local Government) was among the lowest of all metropolitan councils.</li> <li>Since the merger, CBCity has been able to realise significant efficiency savings of \$7.6 million per annum, far exceeding the NSW Government estimates of \$4.5 million per annum. Despite these savings, Council is unable to adequately address the asset backlog it faces.</li> <li>If additional revenue is not provided, Council will need to explore other cost cutting options as set out in the Council report.</li> </ul>
44	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Capacity to pay in current climate, cost of living and COVID-19.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> <li>It is recognised that some income is not keeping pace with Inflation. Likewise Council's costs are increasing greater than inflation (such as electricity, materials).</li> </ul>

	Indirect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did not support the amalgamation.</li> <li>• Believed the mergers were meant to reduce costs.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The process of amalgamation was directed to both former councils and was imposed by the NSW Government without the ability to refuse the merger.</li> <li>• As part of the amalgamation process, the NSW Government implemented a rate freeze policy (except IPART increase) to 2021. This has been in place for the last five years. After this period, rate reviews are allowed.</li> <li>• Both former councils' operational cost per capita (as assessed by the Office of Local Government) was among the lowest of all metropolitan councils.</li> <li>• Since the merger, CBCity has been able to realise significant efficiency savings of \$7.6 million per annum, far exceeding the NSW Government estimates of \$4.5 million per annum. Despite these savings, Council is unable to adequately address the asset backlog it faces.</li> <li>• If additional revenue is not provided, Council will need to explore other cost cutting options as set out in the Council report.</li> </ul>
45	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>• Suggests Council should live within its means.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all of its services and delivered efficiencies where possible. Cutting services would not deliver the required annual saving needed.</li> <li>• Council did consider implementing some of the service cuts proposed by the former Canterbury (selling community land, cutting street sweeping) however it was considered the community would not support these.</li> <li>• Significant feedback in the current community feedback is more, not less, needs to be done.</li> <li>• Both former councils' operational cost per capita (as assessed by the Office of Local Government) was among the lowest of all metropolitan councils.</li> <li>• Since the merger, CBCity has been able to realise significant efficiency savings of \$7.6 million per annum, far exceeding the NSW Government estimates of \$4.5 million per annum. Despite these savings, Council is unable to adequately address the asset backlog it faces.</li> </ul>
	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about existing service levels, cleanliness and dumped rubbish.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is recognised that there are some areas where services are not meeting the needs of the community. This is part of the reason for the SRV, to specifically target areas of community concern.</li> <li>• Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all its services and delivered efficiencies where possible.</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significant feedback in the current community submissions is more, not less, needs to be done.</li> </ul>
46	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Capacity to pay, particularly for pensioners.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>Report recommends a Review of the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy.</li> </ul>
	Indirect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggests they don't currently use many Council services.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recognised that there are some areas where services are not meeting the needs of the community. This is part of the reason for the SRV, to specifically target areas of community concern.</li> </ul>
47	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Suggests harmonisation means an increase.</li> <li>Capacity to pay.</li> <li>Suggests Council should live within its means, including removing non-core programs and services.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council must harmonise its rates by 2021 as required by current legislation. The process of harmonisation does not raise a single extra dollar for Council. Some rates may go up and others down, but there is no change to the total amount of money that comes into Council.</li> <li>The proposal, as outlined clearly in hard copy and digital formats, includes both the harmonisation proposal (aligns rate structures, must occur, brings in no additional income to Council) and a proposal to increase rates income by \$40 million pa through an SRV.</li> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> </ul>
	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Believes Council should return to delivering basic Council services.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all of its services and delivered efficiencies where possible. Cutting the services identified such as sister cities would not deliver the required annual saving needed.</li> <li>Council did consider implementing some of the service cuts proposed by the former Canterbury (selling community land, cutting street sweeping) however it was considered the community would not support these.</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significant feedback in the current community feedback is more, not less, needs to be done.</li> </ul>
48	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Believes there is inequality and their area is more comparable to neighbouring Councils.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council must harmonise its rates by 2021 as required by current legislation. The process of harmonisation does not raise a single extra dollar for Council. Some rates may go up and others down, but there is no change to the total amount of money that comes into Council.</li> <li>Rates across the City currently differ in many aspects and it is not as simple as one former Council area being higher or lower than the other. For example, the former Canterbury area 'residential minimum rate' (rate generally paid by those living in units) is currently higher than the Bankstown area, however the Rate in the Dollar Charge (used to calculate for houses) for Canterbury is lower than the Bankstown area. There are also different rates for businesses.</li> <li>Rates compare well to surrounding council areas.</li> </ul>
	Indirect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Believed the mergers were meant to reduce costs, including salaries and sale of assets.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both former councils' operational cost per capita (as assessed by the Office of Local Government) was among the lowest of all metropolitan councils.</li> <li>Since the merger, CBCity has been able to realise significant efficiency savings of \$7.6 million per annum, far exceeding the NSW Government estimates of \$4.5 million per annum. Despite these savings, Council is unable to adequately address the asset backlog it faces.</li> <li>Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all of its services and delivered efficiencies where possible. Cutting the services identified such as traffic management upgrades would not deliver the required annual saving needed.</li> <li>Council did consider implementing some of the service cuts proposed by the former Canterbury (selling community land, cutting street sweeping) however it was considered the community would not support these. Significant feedback in the current community feedback is more, not less, needs to be done.</li> </ul>
	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned about level of service since amalgamation.</li> <li>Concerned about street cleanliness and parks maintenance.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recognised that there are some areas where services are not meeting the needs of the community. This is part of the reason for the SRV, to specifically target areas of community concern.</li> <li>Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all of its services and delivered efficiencies where possible.</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significant feedback in the current community submissions is more, not less, needs to be done.</li> </ul>
49	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Capacity to pay due to current climate.</li> <li>Concerned about the timing of the consultation.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> <li>All councils are required to have notified IPART of intention to apply by 27 November 2020 and final applications due by 8 February 2021. Therefore exhibition and consultation cannot be extended.</li> <li>While an earlier decision would have allowed more time for consultation a final option was adopted in November.</li> </ul>
50	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the proposal - understands there will be an increase to the rates.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission supports the change and the investment in new services and facilities.</li> </ul>
51	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Concerned about the timing of the consultation.</li> <li>Questioned how the additional funding will be spent.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All councils are required to have notified IPART of intention to apply by 27 November 2020 and final applications due by 8 February 2021. Therefore exhibition and consultation cannot be extended.</li> <li>While an earlier decision would have allowed more time for consultation a final option was adopted in November.</li> <li>It is recognised that there are some areas where services are not meeting the needs of the community. This is part of the reason for the SRV, to specifically target areas of community concern.</li> <li>Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all of its services and delivered efficiencies where possible.</li> <li>Significant feedback in the current community submissions is more, not less, needs to be done.</li> <li>Both former councils' operational cost per capita (as assessed by the Office of Local Government) was among the lowest of all metropolitan councils.</li> <li>Since the merger, CBCity has been able to realise significant efficiency savings of \$7.6 million per annum, far exceeding the NSW Government estimates of \$4.5 million per annum. Despite these savings, Council is unable to adequately address the asset backlog it faces.</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If additional revenue is not provided, Council will need to explore other cost cutting options as set out in the Council report.</li> <li>• As part of the applications to IPART, Council will also propose annual reporting requirements to transparently report the use funds and outcomes of expenditure to the community. This will include detailed reporting as part of Annual Report and the End of Term Report.</li> <li>• All materials (hard copy and digital) contain specific information on where funds will be spent.</li> </ul>
52	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>• Concerned about the timing of the consultation.</li> <li>• Questioned how the additional funding will be spent.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All councils are required to have notified IPART of intention to apply by 27 November 2020 and final applications due by 8 February 2021. Therefore exhibition and consultation cannot be extended.</li> <li>• While an earlier decision would have allowed more time for consultation a final option was adopted in November.</li> <li>• It is recognised that there are some areas where services are not meeting the needs of the community. This is part of the reason for the SRV, to specifically target areas of community concern.</li> <li>• Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all of its services and delivered efficiencies where possible.</li> <li>• Significant feedback in the current community submissions is more, not less, needs to be done.</li> <li>• Both former councils' operational cost per capita (as assessed by the Office of Local Government) was among the lowest of all metropolitan councils.</li> <li>• Since the merger, CBCity has been able to realise significant efficiency savings of \$7.6 million per annum, far exceeding the NSW Government estimates of \$4.5 million per annum. Despite these savings, Council is unable to adequately address the asset backlog it faces.</li> <li>• If additional revenue is not provided, Council will need to explore other cost cutting options as set out in the Council report.</li> <li>• As part of the applications to IPART, Council will also propose annual reporting requirements to transparently report the use funds and outcomes of expenditure to the community. This will include detailed reporting as part of Annual Report and the End of Term Report.</li> <li>• All materials (hard copy and digital) contain specific information on where funds will be spent.</li> </ul>

53	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not currently value for money.</li> <li>• Suggests Council should live within in its means, including reducing costs.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council must harmonise its rates by 2021 as required by current legislation. The process of harmonisation does not raise a single extra dollar for Council. Some rates may go up and others down, but there is no change to the total amount of money that comes into Council.</li> <li>• Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all of its services and delivered efficiencies where possible. Cutting services would not deliver the required annual saving needed.</li> <li>• Council did consider implementing some of the service cuts proposed by the former Canterbury (selling community land, cutting street sweeping) however it was considered the community would not support these.</li> </ul>
	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about street cleanliness and illegal car / boat parking.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is recognised that there are some areas where services are not meeting the needs of the community. This is part of the reason for the SRV, to specifically target areas of community concern.</li> <li>• Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all of its services and delivered efficiencies where possible.</li> <li>• Significant feedback in the current community submissions is more, not less, needs to be done.</li> </ul>
54	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>• Capacity to pay in current climate and COVID-19.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>• Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> <li>• It is recognised that some income is not keeping pace with Inflation. Likewise Council's costs are increasing greater than inflation (such as electricity, materials).</li> </ul>
55	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>• Capacity to pay in current climate and COVID-19.</li> <li>• Concerned about the consultation process.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>• Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> </ul>



				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is recognised that some income is not keeping pace with Inflation. Likewise Council's costs are increasing greater than inflation (such as electricity, materials).</li> <li>• All councils are required to have notified IPART of intention to apply by 27 November 2020 and final applications due by 8 February 2021. Therefore exhibition and consultation cannot be extended.</li> <li>• While an earlier decision would have allowed more time for consultation a final option was adopted in November.</li> <li>• Resident was provided with the details of community engagement sessions.</li> </ul>
56	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>• Capacity to pay in current climate and COVID-19.</li> <li>• Concerned about the consultation process.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>• Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> <li>• It is recognised that some income is not keeping pace with Inflation. Likewise Council's costs are increasing greater than inflation (such as electricity, materials).</li> <li>• All councils are required to have notified IPART of intention to apply by 27 November 2020 and final applications due by 8 February 2021. Therefore exhibition and consultation cannot be extended.</li> <li>• While an earlier decision would have allowed more time for consultation a final option was adopted in November.</li> <li>• Resident was provided with the details of community engagement sessions.</li> </ul>
57	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>• Suggests Council should live within it means.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all of its services and delivered efficiencies where possible. Cutting services would not deliver the required annual saving needed.</li> <li>• Council did consider implementing some of the service cuts proposed by the former Canterbury (selling community land, cutting street sweeping) however it was considered the community would not support these.</li> <li>• Significant feedback in the current community feedback is more, not less, needs to be done.</li> </ul>

	Indirect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Believed the mergers were meant to reduce costs and not produce rate increases.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council must harmonise its rates by 2021 as required by current legislation. The process of harmonisation does not raise a single extra dollar for Council. Some rates may go up and others down, but there is no change to the total amount of money that comes into Council.</li> <li>Both former councils' operational cost per capita (as assessed by the Office of Local Government) was among the lowest of all metropolitan councils.</li> <li>Since the merger, CBCity has been able to realise significant efficiency savings of \$7.6 million per annum, far exceeding the NSW Government estimates of \$4.5 million per annum. Despite these savings, Council is unable to adequately address the asset backlog it faces.</li> <li>If additional revenue is not provided, Council will need to explore other cost cutting options as set out in the Council report.</li> </ul>
	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned about current service levels.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recognised that there are some areas where services are not meeting the needs of the community. This is part of the reason for the SRV, to specifically target areas of community concern.</li> <li>Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all of its services and delivered efficiencies where possible.</li> <li>Significant feedback in the current community submissions is more, not less, needs to be done.</li> </ul>
58	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Capacity to pay in current climate and COVID-19.</li> <li>Concerned about the timing of the consultation.</li> <li>Suggests Council should live within it means, including salaries.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> <li>It is recognised that some income is not keeping pace with Inflation. Likewise Council's costs are increasing greater than inflation (such as electricity, materials).</li> <li>All councils are required to have notified IPART of intention to apply by 27 November 2020 and final applications due by 8 February 2021. Therefore exhibition and consultation cannot be extended.</li> <li>While an earlier decision would have allowed more time for consultation a final option was adopted in November.</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council did consider implementing some of the service cuts proposed by the former Canterbury (selling community land, cutting street sweeping) however it was considered the community would not support these.</li> </ul>
	Indirect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Believed the mergers were meant to reduce costs and create efficiencies.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both former councils' operational cost per capita (as assessed by the Office of Local Government) was among the lowest of all metropolitan councils.</li> <li>• Since the merger, CBCity has been able to realise significant efficiency savings of \$7.6 million per annum, far exceeding the NSW Government estimates of \$4.5 million per annum. Despite these savings, Council is unable to adequately address the asset backlog it faces.</li> <li>• If additional revenue is not provided, Council will need to explore other cost cutting options as set out in the Council report.</li> </ul>
59	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not support the proposal.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal, as outlined clearly in hard copy and digital formats, includes both the harmonisation proposal (aligns rate structures, must occur, brings in no additional income to Council) and a proposal to increase rates income by \$40 million pa through an SRV.</li> <li>• No decision has been made. Council will consider all the community feedback at the Council meeting in February before making a decision. Further community consultation will be undertaken by IPART before a final outcome is determined.</li> </ul>
60	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>• Concerned about the consultation over the Christmas period and the process for consultation.</li> <li>• Questions the former Canterbury SRV's, their compounding effect and how they have been spent and reported on. Additionally, if the purpose of the new SRV duplicated previous SRV applications.</li> <li>• Capacity to pay in the current climate and COVID-19, particularly pensioners.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All councils are required to have notified IPART of intention to apply by 27 November 2020 and final applications due by 8 February 2021. Therefore exhibition and consultation cannot be extended.</li> <li>• While an earlier decision would have allowed more time for consultation a final option was adopted in November.</li> <li>• During the merger both former councils' 'Fit for the Future' submissions identified that significant financial reform was needed. The former Bankstown identified the need for an SRV of \$17M per annum while the former Canterbury identified the need to retain their Infrastructure Renewal Levy (one of their previous SRVs – which has now finished) as well as major cuts to services (reducing street sweeping), selling assets (such as community land), increasing charges to sporting fields and other facilities, accepting further deterioration in roads, footpaths, parks and buildings and borrowing \$36.5M.</li> <li>• Council rates are calculated based on land value.</li> <li>• Rates compare well to surrounding council areas.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests Council review the way the rating system is structured.</li> <li>• Suggests Council should live within its means, including creating efficiencies.</li> <li>• Suggests rates should be comparable with other LGA's.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all of its services and delivered efficiencies where possible. Cutting services would not deliver the required annual saving needed.</li> <li>• Council did consider implementing some of the service cuts proposed by the former Canterbury (selling community land, cutting street sweeping) however it was considered the community would not support these.</li> <li>• Significant feedback in the current community feedback is more, not less, needs to be done.</li> <li>• Resident also attended a community engagement session and discussed concerns with Council staff.</li> </ul>
	Indirect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Believe mergers were to create efficiencies and economy of scale.</li> <li>• Enquired as to the effect of cost shifting.</li> <li>• Enquired about Council's current financial situation/ sustainability.</li> <li>• Analysis of previous Fit for the Future submissions.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both former councils' operational cost per capita (as assessed by the Office of Local Government) was among the lowest of all metropolitan councils.</li> <li>• Since the merger, CBCity has been able to realise significant efficiency savings of \$7.6 million per annum, far exceeding the NSW Government estimates of \$4.5 million per annum. Despite these savings, Council is unable to adequately address the asset backlog it faces.</li> <li>• if additional revenue is not provided, Council will need to explore other cost cutting options as set out in the Council report.</li> <li>• During the merger both former councils' 'Fit for the Future' submissions identified that significant financial reform was needed. The former Bankstown identified the need for an SRV of \$17M per annum while the former Canterbury identified the need to retain their Infrastructure Renewal Levy (one of their previous SRVs – which has now finished) as well as major cuts to services (reducing street sweeping), selling assets (such as community land), increasing charges to sporting fields and other facilities, accepting further deterioration in roads, footpaths, parks and buildings and borrowing \$36.5M.</li> <li>• Cost shifting continues to be an ongoing concern for Local Government, with more and more services and financial burdens being passed down from State and Federal Government.</li> <li>• Although State Government support is important, Rates are the largest and most stable component of Council income, so it is critical for councils to get their Rating Policy and rates structure right.</li> </ul>
61	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Doesn't support the proposal.</li> <li>• Believes rate payers should get better value for money.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As part of the amalgamation process, the NSW Government implemented a rate freeze policy (except IPART increase) to 2021. This has been in place for the last five years. After this period, rate reviews are allowed.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Believes more development provides more rates.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all of its services and delivered efficiencies where possible.</li> <li>Significant feedback in the current community submissions is more, not less, needs to be done.</li> <li>More development changes who/ how many people pay rates but the total income Council can bring in via rates is limited by IPART.</li> <li>A significant portion of future growth will be in Units. While this will bring in some additional income, the majority of these ratepayers will be on 'minimum' rates. This is much lower than the average residential property, while using the same level of services.</li> <li>This proposal includes increasing the minimum rates to \$990.</li> </ul>
	Indirect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Believed the mergers were meant to reduce costs and create efficiencies.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both former councils' operational cost per capita (as assessed by the Office of Local Government) was among the lowest of all metropolitan councils.</li> <li>Since the merger, CBCity has been able to realise significant efficiency savings of \$7.6 million per annum, far exceeding the NSW Government estimates of \$4.5 million per annum. Despite these savings, Council is unable to adequately address the asset backlog it faces.</li> <li>If additional revenue is not provided, Council will need to explore other cost cutting options as set out in the Council report.</li> </ul>
	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned about current service levels.</li> <li>Concerned about parks maintenance and cleanliness.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recognised that there are some areas where services are not meeting the needs of the community. This is part of the reason for the SRV, to specifically target areas of community concern.</li> <li></li> </ul>
62	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Questions the fairness.</li> <li>Capacity to pay in current climate and COVID-19.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council must harmonise its rates by 2021 as required by current legislation. The process of harmonisation does not raise a single extra dollar for Council. Some rates may go up and others down, but there is no change to the total amount of money that comes into Council.</li> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> </ul>
63	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the proposal.</li> <li>• Believes that one rate is equitable and the minimum proposal is excellent.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission supports the change and the investment in new services and facilities.</li> </ul>
64	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>• Questions why their rates should subsidise other areas of the City.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rates across the City currently differ in many aspects and it is not as simple as one former Council area being higher or lower than the other. For example, the former Canterbury area 'residential minimum rate' (rate generally paid by those living in units) is currently higher than the Bankstown area, however the Rate in the Dollar Charge (used to calculate for houses) for Canterbury is lower than the Bankstown area. There are also different rates for businesses.</li> </ul>
	Indirect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Believes Council should remove non-core programs.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all of its services and delivered efficiencies where possible. Cutting the services identified such as cultural programs would not deliver the required annual saving needed.</li> <li>• Council did consider implementing some of the service cuts proposed by the former Canterbury (selling community land, cutting street sweeping) however it was considered the community would not support these.</li> <li>• Significant feedback in the current community feedback is more, not less, needs to be done.</li> </ul>
65	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports rates harmonisation over time.</li> <li>• Does not support the SRV proposal.</li> <li>• Requested information on engagement activities.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As part of the amalgamation process, the NSW Government implemented a rate freeze policy (except IPART increase) to 2021. This has been in place for the last five years. After this period, rate reviews are allowed.</li> <li>• Council must harmonise its rates by 2021 as required by current legislation. The process of harmonisation does not raise a single extra dollar for Council. Some rates may go up and others down, but there is no change to the total amount of money that comes into Council.</li> <li>• Resident was directed to the rates calculator and November Council report for more information.</li> </ul>

66	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the proposal - understands there will be an increase to the rates.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission supports the change and the investment in new services and facilities.</li> </ul>
67	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Partially supports the proposal.</li> <li>Does not support the SRV proposal.</li> <li>Capacity to pay in the current climate.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council must harmonise its rates by 2021 as required by current legislation. The process of harmonisation does not raise a single extra dollar for Council. Some rates may go up and others down, but there is no change to the total amount of money that comes into Council.</li> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> <li>It is recognised that some income is not keeping pace with Inflation. Likewise Council's costs are increasing greater than inflation (such as electricity, materials).</li> </ul>
68	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Suggests rates should align with the lowest rate.</li> <li>Capacity to pay in current climate and COVID-19, particularly retirees and pensioners.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rates across the City currently differ in many aspects and it is not as simple as one former Council area being higher or lower than the other. For example, the former Canterbury area 'residential minimum rate' (rate generally paid by those living in units) is currently higher than the Bankstown area, however the Rate in the Dollar Charge (used to calculate for houses) for Canterbury is lower than the Bankstown area. There are also different rates for businesses.</li> <li>Council must harmonise its rates by 2021 as required by current legislation. The process of harmonisation does not raise a single extra dollar for Council. Some rates may go up and others down, but there is no change to the total amount of money that comes into Council.</li> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Report recommends a Review of the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy.</li> </ul>
	Indirect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Believed the mergers were meant to reduce costs and create efficiencies.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both former councils' operational cost per capita (as assessed by the Office of Local Government) was among the lowest of all metropolitan councils.</li> <li>Since the merger, CBCity has been able to realise significant efficiency savings of \$7.6 million per annum, far exceeding the NSW Government estimates of \$4.5 million per annum. Despite these savings, Council is unable to adequately address the asset backlog it faces.</li> <li>If additional revenue is not provided, Council will need to explore other cost cutting options as set out in the Council report.</li> </ul>
69	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Capacity to pay in current environment.</li> <li>Suggests Council should live within its means, including greater efficiencies.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> <li>Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all of its services and delivered efficiencies where possible. Cutting services would not deliver the required annual saving needed.</li> <li>Council did consider implementing some of the service cuts proposed by the former Canterbury (selling community land, cutting street sweeping) however it was considered the community would not support these.</li> </ul>
	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned about community issues such as illegal fireworks.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recognised that there are some areas where services are not meeting the needs of the community. This is part of the reason for the SRV, to specifically target areas of community concern.</li> </ul>
70	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Suggests Council should live within its means, including efficiencies.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>During the merger both former councils' 'Fit for the Future' submissions identified that significant financial reform was needed. The former Bankstown identified the need for an SRV of \$17M per annum while the former Canterbury identified the need to retain their Infrastructure Renewal Levy (one of their previous SRVs – which has now finished) as well as major cuts to services (reducing street sweeping), selling assets (such as community land), increasing</li> </ul>



				<p>charges to sporting fields and other facilities, accepting further deterioration in roads, footpaths, parks and buildings and borrowing \$36.5M.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both former councils' operational cost per capita (as assessed by the Office of Local Government) was among the lowest of all metropolitan councils.</li> <li>• Since the merger, CBCity has been able to realise significant efficiency savings of \$7.6 million per annum, far exceeding the NSW Government estimates of \$4.5 million per annum. Despite these savings, Council is unable to adequately address the asset backlog it faces.</li> <li>• If additional revenue is not provided, Council will need to explore other cost cutting options as set out in the Council report.</li> </ul>
71	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>• Capacity to pay, particularly for pensioners.</li> <li>• Suggests Council should live within its means, including rationalisation of assets.</li> <li>• Requested information about Council's financial sustainability.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>• Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> <li>• Report recommends a Review of the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy.</li> <li>• Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all of its services and delivered efficiencies where possible. Cutting services would not deliver the required annual saving needed.</li> <li>• Council did consider implementing some of the service cuts proposed by the former Canterbury (selling community land, cutting street sweeping) however it was considered the community would not support these.</li> <li>• Resident was directed to the November Council report for more information and provided details around the asset backlog.</li> </ul>
	Indirect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Believed the mergers were meant to reduce costs and create efficiencies.</li> <li>• Questions if the state Government provided assistance to amalgamated Councils.</li> <li>• Questioned how the funding will be spent.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both former councils' operational cost per capita (as assessed by the Office of Local Government) was among the lowest of all metropolitan councils.</li> <li>• Since the merger, CBCity has been able to realise significant efficiency savings of \$7.6 million per annum, far exceeding the NSW Government estimates of \$4.5 million per annum. Despite these savings, Council is unable to adequately address the asset backlog it faces.</li> <li>• If additional revenue is not provided, Council will need to explore other cost cutting options as set out in the Council report.</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There were two components to funding provided by the State Government. \$10 million was allocated to Council as part of the New Council Implementation Fund. The purpose of this funding was to fund the administrative amalgamation costs. This was expended by June 2017. An additional \$10 million was allocated to Council under the Stronger Communities Fund. This was established by the NSW Government to provide newly merged Councils with funding to deliver projects that improve community infrastructure and services (as opposed to funding ongoing costs associated with existing Council services and infrastructure). This consisted of \$9 million for major projects and \$1 million for community grants. Council continues to report on this funding allocation quarterly.</li> </ul>
72	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Uncertain as to what the proposal means.</li> <li>Capacity to pay in the current climate and COVID-19.</li> <li>Believes all residents should pay rates.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Resident was directed to the rates calculator for more information.</li> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> <li>Council rates are calculated based on land value and are payable by all landowners. This includes residential and business property owners.</li> </ul>
73	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Capacity to pay in the current climate and COVID-19.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> <li>It is recognised that some income is not keeping pace with Inflation. Likewise Council's costs are increasing greater than inflation (such as electricity, materials).</li> </ul>
	Indirect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Believed the mergers were meant to reduce costs and create efficiencies.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both former councils' operational cost per capita (as assessed by the Office of Local Government) was among the lowest of all metropolitan councils.</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Since the merger, CBCity has been able to realise significant efficiency savings of \$7.6 million per annum, far exceeding the NSW Government estimates of \$4.5 million per annum. Despite these savings, Council is unable to adequately address the asset backlog it faces.</li> <li>• If additional revenue is not provided, Council will need to explore other cost cutting options as set out in the Council report.</li> </ul>
74	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understands there will be changes to rates.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission supports the change and the investment in new services and facilities.</li> </ul>
	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questions why Council funds Roads, and not the State Government.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Councils are responsible for the management of local road networks, including road safety, road funding, road maintenance, and heavy vehicle access.</li> <li>• Some funding is received from the Federal and State Governments to contribute to maintenance of these roads.</li> </ul>
75	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the proposal - understands there will be an increase to the rates.</li> <li>• Suggests any increase should be balanced.</li> <li>• Capacity to pay.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council must harmonise its rates by 2021 as required by current legislation. The process of harmonisation does not raise a single extra dollar for Council. Some rates may go up and others down, but there is no change to the total amount of money that comes into Council.</li> <li>• Council rates are calculated based on land value.</li> <li>• Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>• Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> </ul>
76	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>• Not currently value for money.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all of its services and delivered efficiencies where possible.</li> <li>• Significant feedback in the current community submissions is more, not less, needs to be done.</li> </ul>
	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned with current service levels and cleanliness, illegal dumping, parks maintenance and over development.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is recognised that there are some areas where services are not meeting the needs of the community. This is part of the reason for the SRV, to specifically target areas of community concern.</li> </ul>

77	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>• Capacity to pay.</li> <li>• Requested clarification on impact of proposal.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resident was provided further information and details of community engagement sessions.</li> <li>• Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>• Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> </ul>
78	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Partially supports the proposal.</li> <li>• Suggests Council should live within its means, including salaries.</li> <li>• Believes more development provides more rates.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resident was provided further information and details of community engagement sessions.</li> <li>• Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all of its services and delivered efficiencies where possible</li> <li>• Council did consider implementing some of the service cuts proposed by the former Canterbury (selling community land, cutting street sweeping) however it was considered the community would not support these.</li> <li>• More development changes who/ how many people pay rates but the total income Council can bring in via rates is limited by IPART.</li> <li>• A significant portion of future growth will be in units. While this will bring in some additional income, the majority of these ratepayers will be on ‘minimum’ rates. This is much lower than the average residential property, while using the same level of services.</li> </ul>
79	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>• Capacity to pay in current climate, COVID-19, particularly for pensioners.</li> <li>• Believes the financial burden should be shared.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>• Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> <li>• During the merger both former councils’ ‘Fit for the Future’ submissions identified that significant financial reform was needed. The former Bankstown identified the need for an SRV of \$17M per annum while the former Canterbury identified the need to retain their Infrastructure Renewal Levy (one of their previous SRVs – which has now finished) as well as major cuts to services (reducing street sweeping), selling assets (such as community land), increasing</li> </ul>

				charges to sporting fields and other facilities, accepting further deterioration in roads, footpaths, parks and buildings and borrowing \$36.5M.
80	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support proposal.</li> <li>Suggests Council should live within its means, including more efficient use of assets.</li> <li>Questions how the increase was calculated.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Resident was directed to Council's financial statements for more information.</li> <li>During the merger both former councils' 'Fit for the Future' submissions identified that significant financial reform was needed. The former Bankstown identified the need for an SRV of \$17M per annum while the former Canterbury identified the need to retain their Infrastructure Renewal Levy (one of their previous SRVs – which has now finished) as well as major cuts to services (reducing street sweeping), selling assets (such as community land), increasing charges to sporting fields and other facilities, accepting further deterioration in roads, footpaths, parks and buildings and borrowing \$36.5M.</li> <li>Council did consider implementing some of the service cuts proposed by the former Canterbury (selling community land, cutting street sweeping) however it was considered the community would not support these.</li> <li>Both former councils' operational cost per capita (as assessed by the Office of Local Government) was among the lowest of all metropolitan councils.</li> <li>Since the merger, CBCity has been able to realise significant efficiency savings of \$7.6 million per annum, far exceeding the NSW Government estimates of \$4.5 million per annum. Despite these savings, Council is unable to adequately address the asset backlog it faces.</li> <li>As part of the applications to IPART, Council will also propose annual reporting requirements to transparently report the use funds and outcomes of expenditure to the community. This will include detailed reporting as part of Annual Report and the End of Term Report.</li> <li>All materials (hard copy and digital) contain specific information on where funds will be spent.</li> </ul>
81	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Requested clarification around proposed changes to rates.</li> <li>Capacity to pay, particularly for pensioners.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Resident was provided further information about estimated rate changes and how rates are calculated.</li> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>Report recommends a Review of the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy.</li> </ul>

82	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Suggests Council should live within its means, including leveraging economies of scale.</li> <li>Suggests one side of the city should not subsidise the other.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council must harmonise its rates by 2021 as required by current legislation. The process of harmonisation does not raise a single extra dollar for Council. Some rates may go up and others down, but there is no change to the total amount of money that comes into Council.</li> <li>During the merger both former councils' 'Fit for the Future' submissions identified that significant financial reform was needed. The former Bankstown identified the need for an SRV of \$17M per annum while the former Canterbury identified the need to retain their Infrastructure Renewal Levy (one of their previous SRVs – which has now finished) as well as major cuts to services (reducing street sweeping), selling assets (such as community land), increasing charges to sporting fields and other facilities, accepting further deterioration in roads, footpaths, parks and buildings and borrowing \$36.5M.</li> </ul>
83	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Suggests they do not use Council facilities.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all of its services and delivered efficiencies where possible.</li> <li>Significant feedback in the current community submissions is more, not less, needs to be done.</li> </ul>
	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned about street cleanliness, ibis and rubbish.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recognised that there are some areas where services are not meeting the needs of the community. This is part of the reason for the SRV, to specifically target areas of community concern.</li> </ul>
84	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Suggests Council should live within its means, including reducing costs.</li> <li>Capacity to pay in the current climate.</li> <li>Concerned about increases in land values.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both former councils' operational cost per capita (as assessed by the Office of Local Government) was among the lowest of all metropolitan councils.</li> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> <li>Council rates are calculated based on land value. The land value is set by the NSW Government.</li> </ul>

	Indirect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questions whether operational efficiencies and financial benefits have been gained from the merger.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Since the merger, CBCity has been able to realise significant efficiency savings of \$7.6 million per annum, far exceeding the NSW Government estimates of \$4.5 million per annum. Despite these savings, Council is unable to adequately address the asset backlog it faces.</li> <li>• If additional revenue is not provided, Council will need to explore other cost cutting options as set out in the Council report.</li> </ul>
85	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>• Supports the concept of harmonisation but at a lower rate.</li> <li>• Suggests Council should live within its means, including reducing costs.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council must harmonise its rates by 2021 as required by current legislation. The process of harmonisation does not raise a single extra dollar for Council. Some rates may go up and others down, but there is no change to the total amount of money that comes into Council.</li> <li>• Council did consider implementing some of the service cuts proposed by the former Canterbury (selling community land, cutting street sweeping) however it was considered the community would not support these.</li> </ul>
	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests Council reviews its service delivery model.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all of its services and delivered efficiencies where possible. Cutting the services identified such as reduction in parks maintenance would not deliver the required annual saving needed.</li> <li>• Significant feedback in the current community feedback is more, not less, needs to be done.</li> </ul>
86	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>• Capacity to pay in the current climate.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>• Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> </ul>
87	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not support the proposal.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No decision has been made. Council will consider all the community feedback at the Council meeting in February before making a decision. Further community consultation will be undertaken by IPART before a final outcome is determined.</li> </ul>

	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned about property ownership issues, Sydney Water pipeline and neighbourhood noise.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council staff have been speaking with resident about their Council related issues of concern.</li> </ul>
88	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Not currently value for money.</li> <li>Capacity to pay in current climate.</li> <li>Suggests Council reviews rates for storage units.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recognised that there are some areas where services are not meeting the needs of the community. This is part of the reason for the SRV, to specifically target areas of community concern.</li> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> <li>Council rates are calculated based on land value.</li> </ul>
89	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Capacity to pay in current climate, in particular for pensioners.</li> <li>Believes it is not value for money as doesn't use many Council services.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>Report recommends a Review of the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy.</li> <li>Rates fund a range of services and facilities for the community.</li> <li>It is recognised that there are some areas where services are not meeting the needs of the community. This is part of the reason for the SRV, to specifically target areas of community concern.</li> <li>Information provided to residents about development contributions.</li> </ul>
	Indirect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggest Council advocate to the State and Federal Government for additional funding.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although State Government support is important, Rates are the largest and most stable component of Council income, so it is critical for councils to get their Rating Policy and rates structure right.</li> </ul>
90	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Believes more development provides more rates.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More development changes who/ how many people pay rates but the total income Council can bring in via rates is limited by IPART.</li> <li>A significant portion of future growth will be in Units. While this will bring in some additional income, the majority of these ratepayers will be on 'minimum'</li> </ul>



				<p>rates. This is much lower than the average residential property, while using the same level of services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This proposal includes increasing the minimum rates to \$990.</li> </ul>
	Indirect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Believed that mergers were meant to save money, cheaper rates.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both former councils' operational cost per capita (as assessed by the Office of Local Government) was among the lowest of all metropolitan councils.</li> <li>Since the merger, CBCity has been able to realise significant efficiency savings of \$7.6 million per annum, far exceeding the NSW Government estimates of \$4.5 million per annum. Despite these savings, Council is unable to adequately address the asset backlog it faces.</li> <li>If additional revenue is not provided, Council will need to explore other cost cutting options as set out in the Council report.</li> </ul>
91	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Supports reviewing rates.</li> <li>Concerned about consultation over the Christmas period.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As part of the amalgamation process, the NSW Government implemented a rate freeze policy (except IPART increase) to 2021. This has been in place for the last five years. After this period, rate reviews are allowed.</li> <li>All councils are required to have notified IPART of intention to apply by 27 November 2020 and final applications due by 8 February 2021. Therefore exhibition and consultation cannot be extended.</li> <li>While an earlier decision would have allowed more time for consultation a final option was adopted in November.</li> </ul>
92	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Concerned about consultation over the Christmas period.</li> <li>Believes it is not value for money as doesn't use many Council services.</li> <li>Capacity to pay in current climate.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All councils are required to have notified IPART of intention to apply by 27 November 2020 and final applications due by 8 February 2021. Therefore exhibition and consultation cannot be extended.</li> <li>While an earlier decision would have allowed more time for consultation a final option was adopted in November.</li> <li>Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all its services and delivered efficiencies where possible. Cutting services would not deliver the required annual saving needed.</li> <li>Council did consider implementing some of the service cuts proposed by the former Canterbury (selling community land, cutting street sweeping) however it was considered the community would not support these.</li> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg –</li> </ul>

				<p>increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Report recommends a Review of the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy.</li> </ul>
93	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Partially supports the proposal.</li> <li>Capacity to pay in current climate and COVID-19.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> <li>It is recognised that some income is not keeping pace with Inflation. Likewise Council's costs are increasing greater than inflation (such as electricity, materials).</li> </ul>
94	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Concerned about inequity between units and larger blocks of land.</li> <li>Capacity to pay in current climate, particularly for pensioners.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council must harmonise its rates by 2021 as required by current legislation. The process of harmonisation does not raise a single extra dollar for Council. Some rates may go up and others down, but there is no change to the total amount of money that comes into Council.</li> <li>Council rates are calculated based on land value.</li> <li>Ratepayers with land valued under a certain amount are classified as 'minimum rate payers' and will pay a set amount for their rates. This ensures the gap between what units (for example) and houses pay for the same Council services is not too large. For those ratepayers above the minimum rate, the rate is determined by a 'rate in the dollar' multiplied by the land value.</li> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>Report recommends a Review of the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy.</li> </ul>
95	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Small business owner.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council rates are calculated based on land value.</li> <li>Businesses are charged a higher 'rate in the dollar' amount than residential as business owners are able to generate income from the land.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Believes there is inequality between residential and business rates.</li> </ul>		
96	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Questions the former Canterbury SRV's and use of the funds.</li> <li>Suggests Council should live within its means.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Each Special Rate Variation (SRV) is assessed and approved independently by IPART on the basis for which they are proposed. Where they consider appropriate, this may include more than one SRV being in place at once.</li> <li>Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all of its services and delivered efficiencies where possible. Cutting services would not deliver the required annual saving needed.</li> <li>Council did consider implementing some of the service cuts proposed by the former Canterbury (selling community land, cutting street sweeping) however it was considered the community would not support these.</li> <li>Significant feedback in the current community feedback is more, not less, needs to be done.</li> </ul>
	Indirect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggests introduction of cost recovery model for some services and multi-use of existing assets.</li> <li>Questions whether Council has achieved any economies of scale through the amalgamation.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>During the merger both former councils' 'Fit for the Future' submissions identified that significant financial reform was needed. The former Bankstown identified the need for an SRV of \$17M per annum while the former Canterbury identified the need to retain their Infrastructure Renewal Levy (one of their previous SRVs – which has now finished) as well as major cuts to services (reducing street sweeping), selling assets (such as community land), increasing charges to sporting fields and other facilities, accepting further deterioration in roads, footpaths, parks and buildings and borrowing \$36.5M.</li> <li>Both former councils' operational cost per capita (as assessed by the Office of Local Government) was among the lowest of all metropolitan councils.</li> <li>Since the merger, CBCity has been able to realise significant efficiency savings of \$7.6 million per annum, far exceeding the NSW Government estimates of \$4.5 million per annum. Despite these savings, Council is unable to adequately address the asset backlog it faces.</li> <li>If additional revenue is not provided, Council will need to explore other cost cutting options as set out in the Council report.</li> </ul>
97	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Suggests Council should live within its means.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all of its services and delivered efficiencies where possible.</li> <li>Significant feedback in the current community submissions is more, not less, needs to be done.</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both former councils' operational cost per capita (as assessed by the Office of Local Government) was among the lowest of all metropolitan councils.</li> <li>Since the merger, CBCity has been able to realise significant efficiency savings of \$7.6 million per annum, far exceeding the NSW Government estimates of \$4.5 million per annum. Despite these savings, Council is unable to adequately address the asset backlog it faces.</li> </ul>
	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns about current service levels.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recognised that there are some areas where services are not meeting the needs of the community. This is part of the reason for the SRV, to specifically target areas of community concern.</li> </ul>
98	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the proposal - understands there will be an increase to the rates to improve services and facilities.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission supports the change and supports the investment in new services and facilities.</li> </ul>
99	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Capacity to pay due to no increases in wages and cost of living.</li> <li>Believes more development provides more rates.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> <li>It is recognised that some income is not keeping pace with Inflation. Likewise Council's costs are increasing greater than inflation (such as electricity, materials).</li> <li>More development changes who/ how many people pay rates but the total income Council can bring in via rates is limited by IPART.</li> <li>A significant portion of future growth will be in units. While this will bring in some additional income, the majority of these ratepayers will be on 'minimum' rates. This is much lower than the average residential property, while using the same level of services.</li> <li>This is the reason the proposal including increasing the minimum rates to \$990.</li> </ul>
100	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the proposal - understands there will be an</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission supports the change and the investment in new services and facilities.</li> </ul>

		increase to the rates to improve services and facilities.		
101	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the proposal - understands there will be an increase to the rates.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission supports the change and the investment in new services and facilities.</li> </ul>
102	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the proposal – understands there will be an increase to the rates to fund maintenance of facilities.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission supports the change and the investment in new services and facilities.</li> </ul>
103	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Small business owner.</li> <li>Supports the proposal.</li> <li>Suggests that Council reduces non-core services.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission supports the change and the investment in new services and facilities.</li> <li>Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all of its services and delivered efficiencies where possible. Cutting the services identified such as events and grants would not deliver the required annual saving needed.</li> <li>Council did consider implementing some of the service cuts proposed by the former Canterbury (selling community land, cutting street sweeping) however it was considered the community would not support these.</li> </ul>
104	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the proposal – understands there will be an increase to the rates.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission supports the change and the investment in new services and facilities.</li> </ul>
105	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the proposal - understands there will be an increase to the rates to improve services and facilities.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission supports the change and the investment in new services and facilities.</li> </ul>
106	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal, as outlined clearly in hard copy and digital formats, includes both the harmonisation proposal (aligns rate structures, must occur, brings in no additional income to Council) and a proposal to increase rates income by \$40 million pa through an SRV.</li> </ul>
107	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not currently value for money.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all of its services and delivered efficiencies where possible.</li> <li>Council did consider implementing some of the service cuts proposed by the former Canterbury (selling community land, cutting street sweeping) however it was considered the community would not support these.</li> </ul>

	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned with street cleanliness, parks maintenance, overdevelopment, traffic increases and illegal parking.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recognised that there are some areas where services are not meeting the needs of the community. This is part of the reason for the SRV, to specifically target areas of community concern.</li> <li>Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all of its services and delivered efficiencies where possible.</li> <li>Significant feedback in the current community submissions is more, not less, needs to be done.</li> </ul>
108	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the proposal - understands there will be an increase to the rates to improve services and facilities</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission supports the change and supports the investment in new services and facilities.</li> </ul>
109	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Capacity to pay in current climate, particularly for pensioners.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>Report recommends a Review of the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy.</li> <li>It is recognised that some income is not keeping pace with Inflation. Likewise Council's costs are increasing greater than inflation (such as electricity, materials).</li> </ul>
110	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Suggests Council should live within its means, including salaries and reduction of costs.</li> <li>Suggests one side of the city should not subsidise the other.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all of its services and delivered efficiencies where possible. Cutting the services identified such as operational support would not deliver the required annual saving needed.</li> <li>Council did consider implementing some of the service cuts proposed by the former Canterbury (selling community land, cutting street sweeping) however it was considered the community would not support these.</li> <li>During the merger both former councils' 'Fit for the Future' submissions identified that significant financial reform was needed. The former Bankstown identified the need for an SRV of \$17M per annum while the former Canterbury identified the need to retain their Infrastructure Renewal Levy (one of their previous SRVs – which has now finished) as well as major cuts to services (reducing street sweeping), selling assets (such as community land), increasing charges to sporting fields and other facilities, accepting further deterioration in roads, footpaths, parks and buildings and borrowing \$36.5M.</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rates across the City currently differ in many aspects and it is not as simple as one former Council area being higher or lower than the other. For example, the former Canterbury area 'residential minimum rate' (rate generally paid by those living in units) is currently higher than the Bankstown area, however the Rate in the Dollar Charge (used to calculate for houses) for Canterbury is lower than the Bankstown area. There are also different rates for businesses.</li> </ul>
	Indirect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Believed the mergers were meant to reduce costs.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both former councils' operational cost per capita (as assessed by the Office of Local Government) was among the lowest of all metropolitan councils.</li> <li>Since the merger, CBCity has been able to realise significant efficiency savings of \$7.6 million per annum, far exceeding the NSW Government estimates of \$4.5 million per annum. Despite these savings, Council is unable to adequately address the asset backlog it faces.</li> <li>If additional revenue is not provided, Council will need to explore other cost cutting options as set out in the Council report.</li> </ul>
111	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Questions the method for determining rates.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council rates are calculated based on land value.</li> </ul>
112	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No decision has been made. Council will consider all the community feedback at the Council meeting in February before making a decision. Further community consultation will be undertaken by IPART before a final outcome is determined.</li> </ul>
	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned with current service levels, including road maintenance and street cleanliness.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recognised that there are some areas where services are not meeting the needs of the community. This is part of the reason for the SRV, to specifically target areas of community concern.</li> <li>Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all of its services and delivered efficiencies where possible.</li> <li>Significant feedback in the current community submissions is more, not less, needs to be done.</li> </ul>
113	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Believes it is not value for money as doesn't use many Council services.</li> <li>Believes more development provides more rates.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all its services and delivered efficiencies where possible. Cutting services would not deliver the required annual saving needed.</li> <li>Council did consider implementing some of the service cuts proposed by the former Canterbury (selling community land, cutting street sweeping) however it was considered the community would not support these.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested more information about Council's financial sustainability.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More development changes who/ how many people pay rates but the total income Council can bring in via rates is limited by IPART.</li> <li>A significant portion of future growth will be in units. While this will bring in some additional income, the majority of these ratepayers will be on 'minimum' rates. This is much lower than the average residential property, while using the same level of services.</li> <li>This proposal includes increasing the minimum rates to \$990.</li> </ul>
114	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Questioned how the proposed increase has been calculated.</li> <li>Capacity to pay in the current climate and COVID-19.</li> <li>Suggests Council should live within its means.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> <li>Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all its services and delivered efficiencies where possible. Cutting services would not deliver the required annual saving needed.</li> <li>Council did consider implementing some of the service cuts proposed by the former Canterbury (selling community land, cutting street sweeping) however it was considered the community would not support these.</li> </ul>
	Indirect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Believed the mergers were meant to increase efficiency and reduce costs.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both former councils' operational cost per capita (as assessed by the Office of Local Government) was among the lowest of all metropolitan councils.</li> <li>Since the merger, CBCity has been able to realise significant efficiency savings of \$7.6 million per annum, far exceeding the NSW Government estimates of \$4.5 million per annum. Despite these savings, Council is unable to adequately address the asset backlog it faces.</li> <li>If additional revenue is not provided, Council will need to explore other cost cutting options as set out in the Council report.</li> </ul>
115	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the proposal – understands there will be an increase to rates.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission supports the change and the investment in new services and facilities.</li> </ul>
116	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the proposal – understands there will be an</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission supports the change and the investment in new services and facilities.</li> </ul>



		increase to rates to improve facilities and services.		
117	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Suggests one side of the city should not subsidise the other.</li> <li>Capacity to pay in current climate.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>During the merger both former councils' 'Fit for the Future' submissions identified that significant financial reform was needed. The former Bankstown identified the need for an SRV of \$17M per annum while the former Canterbury identified the need to retain their Infrastructure Renewal Levy (one of their previous SRVs – which has now finished) as well as major cuts to services (reducing street sweeping), selling assets (such as community land), increasing charges to sporting fields and other facilities, accepting further deterioration in roads, footpaths, parks and buildings and borrowing \$36.5M.</li> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> </ul>
	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned with traffic, potholes and speeding.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recognised that there are some areas where services are not meeting the needs of the community. This is part of the reason for the SRV, to specifically target areas of community concern.</li> <li>Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all of its services and delivered efficiencies where possible.</li> <li>Significant feedback in the current community submissions is more, not less, needs to be done.</li> </ul>
118	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Understands the proposal.</li> <li>Concerned about the timing of consultation over the Christmas period.</li> <li>Concerned about equity.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All councils are required to have notified IPART of intention to apply by 27 November 2020 and final applications due by 8 February 2021. Therefore exhibition and consultation cannot be extended.</li> <li>While an earlier decision would have allowed more time for consultation a final option was adopted in November.</li> <li>Council must harmonise its rates by 2021 as required by current legislation. The process of harmonisation does not raise a single extra dollar for Council. Some rates may go up and others down, but there is no change to the total amount of money that comes into Council.</li> <li>Council rates are calculated based on land value.</li> </ul>

	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned with service levels following amalgamation.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recognised that there are some areas where services are not meeting the needs of the community. This is part of the reason for the SRV, to specifically target areas of community concern.</li> <li>Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all of its services and delivered efficiencies where possible.</li> <li>Significant feedback in the current community submissions is more, not less, needs to be done.</li> </ul>
119	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Capacity to pay in the current climate and COVID-19.</li> <li>Small business owner.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> <li>It is recognised that some income is not keeping pace with Inflation. Likewise Council's costs are increasing greater than inflation (such as electricity, materials).</li> </ul>
120	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Capacity to pay in the current climate and COVID-19.</li> <li>Concerned about how rates compare to other LGAs.</li> <li>Suggests Council explores other ways to raise revenue.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council rates are calculated based on land value.</li> <li>Rates compare well to surrounding council areas.</li> <li>Both former councils' operational cost per capita (as assessed by the Office of Local Government) was among the lowest of all metropolitan councils.</li> <li>Rates are the largest and most stable component of Council income, so it is critical for councils to get their Rating Policy and rates structure right.</li> </ul>
	Indirect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Believed that mergers would reduce costs and create more income.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both former councils' operational cost per capita (as assessed by the Office of Local Government) was among the lowest of all metropolitan councils.</li> <li>Since the merger, CBCity has been able to realise significant efficiency savings of \$7.6 million per annum, far exceeding the NSW Government estimates of \$4.5 million per annum. Despite these savings, Council is unable to adequately address the asset backlog it faces.</li> <li>If additional revenue is not provided, Council will need to explore other cost cutting options as set out in the Council report.</li> </ul>

121	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests Council should live within its means, including reducing costs.</li> <li>• Suggests Council improves communication with the community on expenditure.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all of its services and delivered efficiencies where possible. Cutting services would not deliver the required annual saving needed.</li> <li>• Council did consider implementing some of the service cuts proposed by the former Canterbury (selling community land, cutting street sweeping) however it was considered the community would not support these.</li> <li>• Both former councils' operational cost per capita (as assessed by the Office of Local Government) was among the lowest of all metropolitan councils.</li> <li>• Since the merger, CBCity has been able to realise significant efficiency savings of \$7.6 million per annum, far exceeding the NSW Government estimates of \$4.5 million per annum. Despite these savings, Council is unable to adequately address the asset backlog it faces.</li> <li>• Council reports to the community quarterly and annually on the progress of its annual budget, programs and services.</li> </ul>
122	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>• Signed petition from 35 residents.</li> <li>• Suggests greater efficiencies should be found.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all of its services and delivered efficiencies where possible. Cutting services would not deliver the required annual saving needed.</li> <li>• Council did consider implementing some of the service cuts proposed by the former Canterbury (selling community land, cutting street sweeping) however it was considered the community would not support these.</li> <li>• Met with resident in park.</li> </ul>
	Indirect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Believed that mergers would reduce costs and create efficiencies.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both former councils' operational cost per capita (as assessed by the Office of Local Government) was among the lowest of all metropolitan councils.</li> <li>• Since the merger, CBCity has been able to realise significant efficiency savings of \$7.6 million per annum, far exceeding the NSW Government estimates of \$4.5 million per annum. Despite these savings, Council is unable to adequately address the asset backlog it faces.</li> <li>• If additional revenue is not provided, Council will need to explore other cost cutting options as set out in the Council report.</li> </ul>
123	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>• Large business owner.</li> <li>• Questions the business rating structure.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council rates are calculated based on land value.</li> <li>• Businesses are charged a higher 'rate in the dollar' amount than residential as business owners are able to generate income from the land.</li> <li>• The business rating sub-category proposal aims to introduce equity into the rating structure to better reflect differences between large commercial</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capacity to pay in the current climate COVID-19.</li> </ul>		<p>operators as compared to local corner stores. No changes to the actual rates for these sub-categories have been made. The establishment of any change to sub-categories will be undertaken in consultation with the business community prior to any changes being made.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> </ul>
124	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal, as outlined clearly in hard copy and digital formats, includes both the harmonisation proposal (aligns rate structures, must occur, brings in no additional income to Council) and a proposal to increase rates income by \$40 million pa through an SRV.</li> </ul>
125	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Believes proposal will heavily subsidise former Canterbury residents.</li> <li>Questions how the funding will be spent.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>During the merger both former councils' 'Fit for the Future' submissions identified that significant financial reform was needed. The former Bankstown identified the need for an SRV of \$17M per annum while the former Canterbury identified the need to retain their Infrastructure Renewal Levy (one of their previous SRVs – which has now finished) as well as major cuts to services (reducing street sweeping), selling assets (such as community land), increasing charges to sporting fields and other facilities, accepting further deterioration in roads, footpaths, parks and buildings and borrowing \$36.5M.</li> <li>It is recognised that there are some areas where services are not meeting the needs of the community. This is part of the reason for the SRV, to specifically target areas of community concern.</li> <li>As part of the applications to IPART, Council will also propose annual reporting requirements to transparently report the use funds and outcomes of expenditure to the community. This will include detailed reporting as part of Annual Report and the End of Term Report.</li> <li>All materials (hard copy and digital) contain specific information on where funds will be spent.</li> </ul>
126	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Questioned previous rate charges.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council rates are calculated based on land value.</li> <li>Resident also attended community information session.</li> </ul>

127	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Questions the equity between minimum rate payers and other property owners.</li> <li>Requests reassessment of ratings structure.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rates across the City currently differ in many aspects and it is not as simple as one former Council area being higher or lower than the other. For example, the former Canterbury area 'residential minimum rate' (rate generally paid by those living in units) is currently higher than the Bankstown area, however the Rate in the Dollar Charge (used to calculate for houses) for Canterbury is lower than the Bankstown area. There are also different rates for businesses.</li> <li>Council rates are calculated based on land value.</li> </ul>
128	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the proposal – understands there will be an increase to rates to improve services.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission supports the change and the investment in new services and facilities.</li> </ul>
129	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Partially supports the proposal.</li> <li>Capacity to pay in current climate and COVID-19.</li> <li>Questions the impact of land values on rate pegging.</li> <li>Concerned the rating system is inequitable.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> <li>Council rates are calculated based on land value.</li> <li>Ratepayers with land valued under a certain amount are classified as 'minimum rate payers' and will pay a set amount for their rates. This ensures the gap between what units (for example) and houses pay for the same Council services is not too large. For those ratepayers above the minimum rate, the rate is determined by a 'rate in the dollar' multiplied by the land value.</li> </ul>
130	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Concerned about previous rate increases.</li> <li>Capacity to pay in current climate and COVID-19.</li> <li>Not currently value for money.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all of its services and delivered efficiencies where possible. Cutting services would not deliver the required annual saving needed.</li> <li>Council did consider implementing some of the service cuts proposed by the former Canterbury (selling community land, cutting street sweeping) however it was considered the community would not support these.</li> <li>Significant feedback in the current community feedback is more, not less, needs to be done.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggests Council should live within its means, including finding more efficiencies.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both former councils' operational cost per capita (as assessed by the Office of Local Government) was among the lowest of all metropolitan councils.</li> <li>Since the merger, CBCity has been able to realise significant efficiency savings of \$7.6 million per annum, far exceeding the NSW Government estimates of \$4.5 million per annum. Despite these savings, Council is unable to adequately address the asset backlog it faces.</li> </ul>
131	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Concerned about the consultation over the Christmas period and the process for consultation.</li> <li>Supports the rate harmonisation and provision of services.</li> <li>Suggests Council should live within its means, including selling assets.</li> <li>Capacity to pay in the current climate and COVID-19.</li> <li>Believes more development provides more rates.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All councils are required to have notified IPART of intention to apply by 27 November 2020 and final applications due by 8 February 2021. Therefore exhibition and consultation cannot be extended.</li> <li>While an earlier decision would have allowed more time for consultation a final option was adopted in November.</li> <li>Submission supports harmonisation and the investment in new services and facilities.</li> <li>Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all of its services and delivered efficiencies where possible.</li> <li>Council did consider implementing some of the service cuts proposed by the former Canterbury (selling community land, cutting street sweeping) however it was considered the community would not support these.</li> <li>During the merger both former councils' 'Fit for the Future' submissions identified that significant financial reform was needed. The former Bankstown identified the need for an SRV of \$17M per annum while the former Canterbury identified the need to retain their Infrastructure Renewal Levy (one of their previous SRVs – which has now finished) as well as major cuts to services (reducing street sweeping), selling assets (such as community land), increasing charges to sporting fields and other facilities, accepting further deterioration in roads, footpaths, parks and buildings and borrowing \$36.5M.</li> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>Report recommends a Review of the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy.</li> <li>More development changes who/ how many people pay rates but the total income Council can bring in via rates is limited by IPART.</li> <li>A significant portion of future growth will be in units. While this will bring in some additional income, the majority of these ratepayers will be on 'minimum'</li> </ul>

				<p>rates. This is much lower than the average residential property, while using the same level of services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This proposal includes increasing the minimum rates to \$990.</li> </ul>
	Indirect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggests Council should prioritise alternative options for infrastructure upgrades.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As part of its annual budget process, Council considers priority infrastructure upgrades. The draft Operational Plan and budget are placed on public exhibition each year for community feedback.</li> </ul>
132	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Partially supports the proposal.</li> <li>Supports rate harmonisation.</li> <li>Questions the former Canterbury SRV's and their compounding effect.</li> <li>Capacity to pay in the current climate and COVID-19.</li> <li>Suggests Council should live within its means and find additional income streams.</li> <li>Concerned about the timing of consultation over the Christmas period.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Each Special Rate Variation (SRV) is assessed and approved independently by IPART on the basis for which they are proposed. Where they consider appropriate, this may include more than one SRV being in place at once.</li> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>Report recommends a Review of the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy.</li> <li>Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all of its services and delivered efficiencies where possible.</li> <li>Council did consider implementing some of the service cuts proposed by the former Canterbury (selling community land, cutting street sweeping) however it was considered the community would not support these.</li> <li>All councils are required to have notified IPART of intention to apply by 27 November 2020 and final applications due by 8 February 2021. Therefore exhibition and consultation cannot be extended.</li> <li>While an earlier decision would have allowed more time for consultation a final option was adopted in November.</li> </ul>
	Indirect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Believed the mergers were meant to reduce costs and create efficiencies.</li> <li>Suggests rates should be comparable with other LGA's.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both former councils' operational cost per capita (as assessed by the Office of Local Government) was among the lowest of all metropolitan councils.</li> <li>Since the merger, CBCity has been able to realise significant efficiency savings of \$7.6 million per annum, far exceeding the NSW Government estimates of \$4.5 million per annum. Despite these savings, Council is unable to adequately address the asset backlog it faces.</li> <li>If additional revenue is not provided, Council will need to explore other cost cutting options as set out in the Council report.</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rates compare well to surrounding council areas.</li> </ul>
133	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No decision has been made. Council will consider all the community feedback at the Council meeting in February before making a decision. Further community consultation will be undertaken by IPART before a final outcome is determined.</li> </ul>
	Indirect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Believed the mergers were meant to reduce costs and create efficiencies.</li> <li>Would like Council to demerge.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The process of amalgamation was directed to both former councils and was imposed by the NSW Government without the ability to refuse the merger.</li> <li>While de-amalgamation is not part of the One Rates Proposal, during the merger both former councils' 'Fit for the Future' submissions identified that significant financial reform was needed. The former Bankstown identified the need for an SRV of \$17M per annum while the former Canterbury identified the need to retain their Infrastructure Renewal Levy (one of their previous SRVs – which has now finished) as well as major cuts to services (reducing street sweeping), selling assets (such as community land), increasing charges to sporting fields and other facilities, accepting further deterioration in roads, footpaths, parks and buildings and borrowing \$36.5M.</li> <li>Both former councils' operational cost per capita (as assessed by the Office of Local Government) was among the lowest of all metropolitan councils.</li> <li>Since the merger, CBCity has been able to realise significant efficiency savings of \$7.6 million per annum, far exceeding the NSW Government estimates of \$4.5 million per annum. Despite these savings, Council is unable to adequately address the asset backlog it faces.</li> <li>If additional revenue is not provided, Council will need to explore other cost cutting options as set out in the Council report.</li> </ul>
	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned about street cleanliness, general maintenance, rubbish collection, overdevelopment and condition of roads.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recognised that there are some areas where services are not meeting the needs of the community. This is part of the reason for the SRV, to specifically target areas of community concern.</li> <li>Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all of its services and delivered efficiencies where possible.</li> <li>Significant feedback in the current community submissions is more, not less, needs to be done.</li> </ul>
134	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Questions the former Canterbury SRV's and their compounding effect.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Each Special Rate Variation (SRV) is assessed and approved independently by IPART on the basis for which they are proposed. Where they consider appropriate, this may include more than one SRV being in place at once.</li> </ul>



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not currently value for money.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all its services and delivered efficiencies where possible.</li> <li>Significant feedback in the current community submissions is more, not less, needs to be done.</li> </ul>
	Indirect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Believed the mergers were meant to reduce costs.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both former councils' operational cost per capita (as assessed by the Office of Local Government) was among the lowest of all metropolitan councils.</li> <li>Since the merger, CBCity has been able to realise significant efficiency savings of \$7.6 million per annum, far exceeding the NSW Government estimates of \$4.5 million per annum. Despite these savings, Council is unable to adequately address the asset backlog it faces.</li> <li>If additional revenue is not provided, Council will need to explore other cost cutting options as set out in the Council report.</li> </ul>
	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned about street cleanliness, parks maintenance, condition of roads and town centres.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recognised that there are some areas where services are not meeting the needs of the community. This is part of the reason for the SRV, to specifically target areas of community concern.</li> </ul>
135	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Capacity to pay in the current climate and COVID-19.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> <li>It is recognised that some income is not keeping pace with Inflation. Likewise Council's costs are increasing greater than inflation (such as electricity, materials).</li> </ul>
136	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Believes it is not value for money as doesn't use many Council services.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rates fund a range of services and facilities for the community.</li> <li>Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all its services and delivered efficiencies where possible.</li> <li>Significant feedback in the current community submissions is more, not less, needs to be done.</li> </ul>

	Indirect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Believed the merger would reduce costs and create efficiencies.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both former councils' operational cost per capita (as assessed by the Office of Local Government) was among the lowest of all metropolitan councils.</li> <li>Since the merger, CBCity has been able to realise significant efficiency savings of \$7.6 million per annum, far exceeding the NSW Government estimates of \$4.5 million per annum. Despite these savings, Council is unable to adequately address the asset backlog it faces.</li> <li>If additional revenue is not provided, Council will need to explore other cost cutting options as set out in the Council report.</li> </ul>
	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned about current service levels, including maintenance of verges, rubbish collection, condition of roads, traffic congestion and DA processes.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recognised that there are some areas where services are not meeting the needs of the community. This is part of the reason for the SRV, to specifically target areas of community concern.</li> </ul>
137	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Capacity to pay in current climate and COVID-19.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> <li>No decision has been made. Council will consider all the community feedback at the Council meeting in February before making a decision. Further community consultation will be undertaken by IPART before a final outcome is determined.</li> </ul>
138	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Suggests rates should be decreased.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rates across the City currently differ in many aspects and it is not as simple as one former Council area being higher or lower than the other.</li> <li>Council rates are calculated based on land value.</li> <li>No decision has been made. Council will consider all the community feedback at the Council meeting in February before making a decision. Further community consultation will be undertaken by IPART before a final outcome is determined.</li> </ul>
139	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Partially supports the proposal.</li> <li>Suggests rates should be paid by every resident.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rates fund a range of services and facilities for the community.</li> <li>Council rates are calculated based on land value and are payable by all landowners. This includes residential and business property owners.</li> <li>Council rates are calculated based on land value.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggests rates should not be based on land value but on occupancy of the property.</li> </ul>		
	Indirect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned with the land valuation process.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The land value is set by the NSW Government.</li> </ul>
140	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Believes it is not value for money as doesn't use many Council services.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No decision has been made. Council will consider all the community feedback at the Council meeting in February before making a decision. Further community consultation will be undertaken by IPART before a final outcome is determined.</li> <li>Rates fund a range of services and facilities for the community.</li> <li>It is recognised that there are some areas where services are not meeting the needs of the community. This is part of the reason for the SRV, to specifically target areas of community concern.</li> </ul>
141	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Capacity to pay in the current climate and COVID-19.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recognised that some income is not keeping pace with Inflation. Likewise Council's costs are increasing greater than inflation (such as electricity, materials).</li> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> </ul>
142	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Concerned about the consultation over the Christmas period and the process for consultation.</li> <li>Capacity to pay in current climate, particularly for pensioners.</li> <li>Questions the former Canterbury SRV's and their compounding effect.</li> <li>Suggests a new rating structure, using base rates.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All councils are required to have notified IPART of intention to apply by 27 November 2020 and final applications due by 8 February 2021. Therefore exhibition and consultation cannot be extended.</li> <li>While an earlier decision would have allowed more time for consultation a final option was adopted in November.</li> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>Report recommends a Review of the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enquired as to the effect of cost shifting.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Each Special Rate Variation (SRV) is assessed and approved independently by IPART on the basis for which they are proposed. Where they consider appropriate, this may include more than one SRV being in place at once.</li> <li>Council rates are calculated based on land value. This proposal does not consider changing the rating system.</li> <li>Cost shifting continues to be an ongoing concern for Local Government, with more and more services and financial burdens being passed down from State and Federal Government.</li> <li>Although State Government support is important, Rates are the largest and most stable component of Council income, so it is critical for councils to get their Rating Policy and rates structure right.</li> </ul>
143	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Capacity to pay in current climate, COVID-19 and no increases in wages.</li> <li>Concerned rates are not comparable with other LGA's.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recognised that some income is not keeping pace with Inflation. Likewise Council's costs are increasing greater than inflation (such as electricity, materials).</li> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> <li>Rates compare well to surrounding council areas.</li> <li>Both former councils' operational cost per capita (as assessed by the Office of Local Government) was among the lowest of all metropolitan councils.</li> </ul>
	Indirect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggests Council advocate to the State Government for funding to assist with the amalgamation.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although State Government support is important, Rates are the largest and most stable component of Council income, so it is critical for councils to get their Rating Policy and rates structure right.</li> </ul>
144	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Questions what harmonisation is.</li> <li>Suggests Council lives within its means, including salaries.</li> <li>Questions the justification for the rate increase.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council must harmonise its rates by 2021 as required by current legislation. The process of harmonisation does not raise a single extra dollar for Council. Some rates may go up and others down, but there is no change to the total amount of money that comes into Council.</li> <li>Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all of its services and delivered efficiencies where possible. Cutting the services identified such as Christmas celebrations would not deliver the required annual saving needed.</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council did consider implementing some of the service cuts proposed by the former Canterbury (selling community land, cutting street sweeping) however it was considered the community would not support these.</li> <li>• Significant feedback in the current community feedback is more, not less, needs to be done.</li> <li>• During the merger both former councils' 'Fit for the Future' submissions identified that significant financial reform was needed. The former Bankstown identified the need for an SRV of \$17M per annum while the former Canterbury identified the need to retain their Infrastructure Renewal Levy (one of their previous SRVs – which has now finished) as well as major cuts to services (reducing street sweeping), selling assets (such as community land), increasing charges to sporting fields and other facilities, accepting further deterioration in roads, footpaths, parks and buildings and borrowing \$36.5M.</li> <li>• As part of the applications to IPART, Council will also propose annual reporting requirements to transparently report the use funds and outcomes of expenditure to the community. This will include detailed reporting as part of Annual Report and the End of Term Report.</li> <li>• All materials (hard copy and digital) contain specific information on where funds will be spent.</li> </ul>
	Indirect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about the size of the LGA.</li> <li>• Believes Council should demerge.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The process of amalgamation was directed to both former councils and was imposed by the NSW Government without the ability to refuse the merger.</li> <li>• While de-amalgamation is not part of the One Rates Proposal, during the merger both former councils' 'Fit for the Future' submissions identified that significant financial reform was needed. The former Bankstown identified the need for an SRV of \$17M per annum while the former Canterbury identified the need to retain their Infrastructure Renewal Levy (one of their previous SRVs – which has now finished) as well as major cuts to services (reducing street sweeping), selling assets (such as community land), increasing charges to sporting fields and other facilities, accepting further deterioration in roads, footpaths, parks and buildings and borrowing \$36.5M.</li> <li>• Resident was directed to the November Council report and financial statements for more information.</li> </ul>

	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned about service levels, particularly rubbish removal, footpaths and maintenance of parks.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recognised that there are some areas where services are not meeting the needs of the community. This is part of the reason for the SRV, to specifically target areas of community concern.</li> </ul>
145	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Capacity to pay.</li> <li>Suggests Council should live within its means, including salaries.</li> <li>Concerned with timing of consultation and requests an extension.</li> <li>Believes there is inequality in the rating system.</li> <li>Questions why their rates should subsidise other areas.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> <li>Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all of its services and delivered efficiencies where possible. Cutting the services identified such as operational support would not deliver the required annual saving needed.</li> <li>Councillor expenses as a part of undertaking their role is governed by Council's Councillor Expenses and Facilities Policy. Councillor remuneration at every Council is bound by the NSW Local Government Remuneration Tribunal.</li> <li>All councils are required to have notified IPART of intention to apply by 27 November 2020 and final applications due by 8 February 2021. Therefore exhibition and consultation cannot be extended.</li> <li>While an earlier decision would have allowed more time for consultation a final option was adopted in November.</li> <li>Ratepayers with land valued under a certain amount are classified as 'minimum rate payers' and will pay a set amount for their rates. This ensures the gap between what units (for example) and houses pay for the same Council services is not too large. For those ratepayers above the minimum rate, your rate is determined by a 'rate in the dollar' multiplied by your land value.</li> <li>During the merger both former councils' 'Fit for the Future' submissions identified that significant financial reform was needed. The former Bankstown identified the need for an SRV of \$17M per annum while the former Canterbury identified the need to retain their Infrastructure Renewal Levy (one of their previous SRVs – which has now finished) as well as major cuts to services (reducing street sweeping), selling assets (such as community land), increasing charges to sporting fields and other facilities, accepting further deterioration in roads, footpaths, parks and buildings and borrowing \$36.5M.</li> </ul>

	Indirect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggests community should benefit from prioritising infrastructure upgrades such as parks, libraries and footpaths.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission supports the investment in new services and facilities.</li> <li>As part of its annual budget process, Council considers priority infrastructure upgrades. The draft Operational Plan and budget are placed on public exhibition each year for community feedback.</li> </ul>
146	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Capacity to pay.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> </ul>
	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned with the environment, illegal dumping, car parking and traffic management.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recognised that there are some areas where services are not meeting the needs of the community. This is part of the reason for the SRV, to specifically target areas of community concern.</li> <li>Council has been undertaking a detailed review of all of its services and delivered efficiencies where possible.</li> <li>Significant feedback in the current community submissions is more, not less, needs to be done.</li> </ul>
147	Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support the proposal.</li> <li>Capacity to pay in current environment and COVID-19.</li> <li>Concerned about timing of consultation.</li> <li>Understands the need for the investment in services and facilities.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal recognises current economic conditions - Year one sees a smaller increase in rates across the community (reflective of only a 2.0% - rate peg – increase to total rates income), with larger increases spread over years two to five.</li> <li>Council has a number of mechanisms to support those who need support, including the Rates and Charges, Debt Recovery and Hardship Assistance Policy, which has support options depending on circumstances.</li> <li>All councils are required to have notified IPART of intention to apply by 27 November 2020 and final applications due by 8 February 2021. Therefore exhibition and consultation cannot be extended.</li> <li>While an earlier decision would have allowed more time for consultation a final option was adopted in November.</li> <li>Generally supportive of a rate increase to support the investment in new services and facilities.</li> <li>Resident spoke with Council staff.</li> </ul>

