

Attachment 5 SRV Submissions (coded and verbatim)

Coding by CH, EF combined	Rating Preference	Submission received
OLG 3.11 OLG5.20 OLG 1.4 Preference - assume option 1 based on sentiment	1	<p>We understand that Council is once again considering Special Rate Variation (SRV) scenarios that would result in substantial increases to the average council rates for commercial properties—ranging from approximately 39.9% to 54.1% over the period 2025–26 to 2028–29. As owners and managers of multiple properties in Neutral Bay, including xxxxxx, we strongly oppose this proposal, including on behalf of our tenants, who, under the terms of their leases, bear primary responsibility for council rate charges. We previously raised concerns during the earlier consultation process regarding the existing council rate burden on business ratepayers within North Sydney Local Government Area (LGA). These concerns remain and continue to impact both our properties and tenants. Introducing an SRV that further increases rates for business ratepayers will significantly worsen these inequities for the reasons outlined in this submission. The proposed Special Rate Variation (SRV) will have significant adverse effects on existing commercial and retail properties within the North Sydney Council LGA as outlined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing Market Challenges: Commercial property within the North Sydney LGA has already been severely impacted by the broader post-COVID downturn. Elevated vacancy rates have resulted from reduced demand for office and retail space due to the rise of remote work, coupled with increased competition from alternative business hubs. Councils own ‘Capacity to Pay’ report states “at an overall level, North Sydney’s average business rates currently sit towards the higher end (using 2023 OLG time series data) when compared against comparable councils”. • Retail and Business Viability: The shift toward fewer and shorter office visits has directly reduced foot traffic, impacting retail sales and the overall viability of businesses. This, in turn, limits their capacity to absorb higher council rates. • Planning and Development Uncertainty: Ongoing uncertainty surrounding the future planning framework for the Neutral Bay Town Centre, combined with current and forecast construction activity within the precinct, continues to undermine confidence and commitment to commercial space in the area. This is evidenced by the large volume of vacancies and ‘For Lease’ signs currently advertised within Neutral Bay and along the Military Rd corridor. Quite simply, given the uncertainty in planning outcomes, there is limited retail and commercial demand and little commitment to sites in the precinct. Additional burden on business ratepayers will continue to impact confidence and commitment by business owners. • Impact on Future Development and Refurbishment: The proposed SRV poses a significant barrier to both new commercial development in North Sydney and the upgrading of existing office stock. The scale of the increase, combined with uncertainty and volatility in council rate charges, threatens project viability and diminishes the ability to secure tenants. Outgoings are already a critical concern for tenants, and further cost escalation will only compound this challenge. • Existing Rate Burden: As highlighted in previous submissions, current council rates already pose a challenge for tenants. The proposed SRV will exacerbate this issue by significantly increasing occupancy costs for commercial and retail premises. This concern was echoed by IPART, which noted that Council “did not adequately consider the impact of its proposed rate rise on business ratepayers.” • Competitiveness and Broader Economic Impact: The proposed increases will further erode the competitiveness of commercial assets within the LGA, hindering tenant retention and the attraction of new businesses. Additionally, the scale and volatility of these rate increases will influence broader business decisions, including employment levels and investment in other operational areas within the LGA. • Alternate Revenue Strategies: As highlighted by Council the proposed SRV is primarily to address liquidity issues, infrastructure backlogs and cost over-runs (including for the North Sydney Olympic Pool) and for new infrastructure and enhanced operational capacity. It is entirely inappropriate for the burden of that funding to fall to residential and business ratepayers, rather, alternative revenue strategies, such as asset sales, should be explored and pursued fully as a priority and

		<p>before a SRV is explored.</p> <p>We appreciate the opportunity to continue engaging with Council regarding the proposed SRV. If implemented as outlined, the variation will further diminish the competitiveness of our assets and significantly challenge our ability to retain existing tenants and attract new businesses.</p>
<p>OLG 2.9</p> <p>Preference - no option can be inferred</p>	n/a	<p>The tables on the back of that letter were not labelled sufficiently. I don't know how you would expect anyone to understand the difference between the tables and in any comparison come to any logical conclusion. Also below, when you ask me to select a project, there was none suitable, such as "general Feedback"</p> <p>-----</p> <p>I wasn't complaining about the rates.</p> <p>I was complaining about the incomprehensible information published on page 2 of the letter (if you would like to read my original complaint).</p>
<p>OLG 2.7</p> <p>OLG 1.2</p> <p>OLG 5.16</p> <p>OLG 5.20</p> <p>OLG 6.21</p> <p>Preference - assume option 1 based on sentiment</p>	1	<p>Why didn't Council contact all ratepayers via the last rate bill reminder that there was an opportunity to review and respond to these Special Rate Variations? I only found out about this by chance last week and have had no proper time to review all the information. This is the 2nd year that this type of mis- management has happened. After last year's fiasco most of the ratepayers who I know have lost complete faith and trust in the Council and their ability to set and manage budgets let alone handle effective communications. It appears to be a deliberate policy to keep ratepayer feedback to a minimum. In the survey there was also no opportunity to suggest a rate option between the Peg and 40%(option 2) which I think is still way too high. A more modest increase could be more palatable to a majority of ratepayers if more transparency and open discussion was available. Maybe Council should be considering an asset sale to cover the massive budget blow out for the North Sydney Pool and immediate infrastructure needs.</p>
<p>OLG 5.16</p> <p>OLG 6.21</p> <p>OLG 3.10</p> <p>OLG 2.6</p> <p>OLG 2.7</p> <p>OLG 1.2</p> <p>Preference - no option can be inferred</p>	n/a	<p>Hi, are we able to send a pdf copy of the SRV Micromex survey to XXXXXplease? I referred XXXto the Have Your Say site to take the survey. He replied that he got a copy of the last survey sent to him.</p> <p>(2/12) I have looked at the Your say rates site and would like to request the following feedback on these seven separate topics.</p> <p>Costs of the SRV processes I seek two clarifications about the cost of the two SRV processes. This is important for ratepayers to know and understand how Council funds are applied to these generally infrequent processes. 1. Is it possible to provide the total costs of preparing for, conducting and submitting the initial SRV, say between May 2024 and February 2025. If the costs could be itemised appropriately that would be appreciated. 2. Is it possible to provide an estimate of the total costs of preparing for, conducting and submitting the second SRV, say between May 2025 and February 2026. If the costs could be itemised appropriately that would be appreciated. Council staff numbers Could staff FTE numbers at 30 June 2025 please provided. The annual report provided a figure for 1 January 2025. The 30 June figure is important for understanding trends. North Sydney Pool Two SRV related questions about the NS Pool of relevance to understanding the project's demands on Council funds and accountabilities. 1. Is a revised cost of the NS Pool to be included in an updated LTFP prior to the SRV application being submitted? 2. Given the significant cost and time increases with the NS Pool since the PwC report of April 2023, will the full report now be released in the interests of transparency and accountability? Capacity to Pay Report Is a Capacity to Pay report (likely similar to last SRV) to be provided to residents within Council agenda papers before the second SRV application is submitted? Special levies On page 21 of LTFP total permissible income includes rates and special levies. Is Council looking to merge special levies into rates as proposed in the previous SRV? Business ad valorem figures The average ad valorem rates for business are not included separately on p25 of the LTFP. Could they be provided please. Surveys Council publicly relies on the results of surveys by Micromex, is Council responsible for them?</p> <p>(2/12) I was completing the survey and got to question 3a. I only wanted to support one option and could not then complete the rest of the survey. Why should I need to have a preference when I don't support the other two? The survey appears faulty,</p>

		<p>perhaps biased, as it requires you to have a preference for something you don't support. Is there a way around this so I can complete the survey? I believe it closes tomorrow.</p> <p>(3/12) I have just sent a PDF copy of the completed survey to Community Engagement Specialist. I did this as I did not receive a response from an email I sent yesterday to yoursay@north... I was having a problem with Q3a. I have asked xxx to forward my response to Micromex for inclusion in the survey and asked for confirmation of this. Below are so additional comments I have to make about the engagement process and the survey. The quality and delivery of the survey engagement provides little encouragement to provide any further feedback to Council. Effort is best reserved for writing a submission to IPART. This view is, I believe, representative of many residents' disrespect of the Council built up over the last year. Timing not conducive to engagement Resident engagement has been poorly managed by Council. Residents are disadvantaged by having to consider Council's proposed submission to IPART over Christmas/New Year. Council's meeting is on 19 January 2026. The meeting should have been in November had Council been more adept and agile. Council's engagement aim was to avoid the Christmas and New Year holiday period. IPART refused SRV1 on 16 May 2025. Council's SRV2 documentation is an adjustment of that for SRV1. However, engagement did not commence until August 2025. Had it commenced earlier and the gap between surveys reduced and the public could have considered the SRV2 application in November and prepare IPART submissions. Surveys The surveys have not been effective service level reviews, are not balanced and are therefore not representative of the community's views. Few options and limited analysis There are only three options for rate increases put to residents in late October 2025. SRV1 had four options. Had it included a base option there would have been five options. The Council has not presented sufficient strategic options to support reduced rate increases. Its financial strategy is not robust long term document.</p> <p>(3/12) I was completing the Rates (SRV2) survey online yesterday but struck a problem with Q3a. I sent a message to yoursay@northsy... But didn't get a reply.</p> <p>So I completed the survey using the copy that you provided to me and I have attached it. As well as ticking answers I have added comments in boxes provided. There are also some thoughts included on problems with the survey, but these don't affect my answers. I would appreciate it if you could send my completed survey to Micromex or other for inclusion in the results. If you could send me a response confirming that this has been done it would be appreciated.</p>
OLG 3.13 Preference - option 1	1	My preference is option 1 (one)
OLG 3.13 Preference - option 1 OLG 3.10 OLG 6.23	1	I prefer Option 1 as many North Sydney Council residents cannot afford more than the usual rate rise and the Council simply needs to adequately manage their budget. Emergency PA systems for North Sydney Oval are not necessary and are unlikely to be used - another waste of money. we need and have a right - to live in North Sydney, where I have lived for 37 years.
OLG 3.11 Preference - assume option 1 based on sentiment	1	As a resident it is somewhat evident as to what is provided to me as a rate payer, I'll even take rubbish collection as the only thing - put them up the maximum, the impact is minimal for myself, less than a couple of coffees a week or something... As a representative of a business owner in the area, it is NOT evident at all what we get for our rates, we don't even get rubbish collected. On that basis, the rates should not change, ~\$18,000 year is already too much, going to \$30,000 is ridiculous. I also think putting each individuals and business amounts on for public display is somewhat questionable....
OLG 3.13 Preference - option 3	3	Option 3 is preferred

<p>OLG 3.11 OLG 4.15 Preference - assume option 1 based on sentiment</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>We understand that North Sydney Council is undertaking community consultation on a proposed Special Rate Variation (SRV) for a second time. We refer to the three SRV options that are on public exhibition which comprise No SRV, a +39.9% SRV and a 54.1% SRV respectively. In summary, the average council rates within the general business rating category would increase from \$7,193 in FY26, to between \$10,059 (+39.9%), and \$11,137 (+54.1%) in FY29 based on the option rate, which is significant for our tenants, mostly small business who will suffer from the impact. As Council is aware, xxxxx has Office assets in the North Sydney Council LGA, including xxxx Pacific Highway, St Leonards, and three office towers between xxxxx North Sydney. In addition, xxxxx has substantial development plans in place for both locations. This new SRV, whilst less than the amount sought in the prior SRV is however, extremely material. We surmise the following from the current proposed SRV:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whilst NSC have removed the cost of the North Sydney Olympic Pool in the allocation of the additional SRV revenue, it stands to reason that the SRV is required in part because the cost of the pool is now required to be funded through its existing budget. As NSC are obliged to complete the project, operate the facility and repay the debt, revenue will be required to fund these commitments <p>We believe the proposed SRV will have a direct impact on existing commercial and retail assets within the North Sydney Council LGA. This impact on tenants includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commercial property in the area has already suffered through the broader downturn in the commercial market post-COVID with inflated vacancy rates due, in part, to the rise of remote work reducing demand for floorspace and the attractiveness of competing accommodation in the Sydney CBD, CBD fringe and other economic centres including Macquarie Park and Parramatta • Retail property in the area has suffered due to the rise of remote work post-COVID as it is predominantly driven by office workers with limited retail activity occurring outside of business hours and on weekends. The trend of fewer and shorter trips into the office directly impacts sales and the viability of businesses and, in turn, capacity to pay higher levels of council rates • As raised in our response last year, the level of council rates in North Sydney is already an issue for our tenants and the proposed SRV will compound this issue by significantly increasing the cost for tenants to occupy commercial and retail premises. This concern was shared by IPART who found that Council did not adequately consider the impact of its proposed rate rise on business ratepayers. The proposed increases will further impact the competitiveness of our North Sydney assets and our ability to retain tenants and attract new businesses. Further, the extent of these increases and the volatility in the council rates charge will directly impact broader business decisions for our tenants such as employment and investment. The refurbishment of existing office buildings within North Sydney Council is equally challenged as the pressures on achievable market rents make it difficult to feasibly support the cost of refurbishment which has escalated significantly in recent years. The refurbishment of existing B-grade and C-grade office buildings is essential to supporting a diverse and vibrant local economy by providing engaging workplaces at varying cost levels: • The proposed SRV will significantly impact both future commercial development in North Sydney and the refurbishment of existing office stock given the impact the quantum of the proposed increase and the apparent volatility in council rate charges will have on project feasibility and the ability to attract tenants. • Future development and the continuing refurbishment of existing office stock is crucial to the ongoing success and competitiveness of the North Sydney office market for both existing asset owners and developers. • These impacts will directly counter the objectives of Council's Economic Development Strategy to 'revitalise and grow the North Sydney CBD as a high-amenity top-tier office precinct' and 'cultivate a diverse connected and resilient business environment'. Further, development provides significant direct and flow-on (indirect) economic benefits for the local economy
--	----------	---

		<p>and businesses. The proposed increases will only slow the progress of development into the future which will directly counter council's commitment to job creation and the long-term stability of the local economy.</p> <p>Due to the above factors, xxxxxx welcomes the opportunity to further engage with Council on this SRV, however we do not support it in its current form. If it proceeds, the impact on the competitiveness of our North Sydney office assets and our ability to retain tenants and move forwards with our development plans will be significantly impacted.</p>
<p>OLG 1.2</p> <p>OLG 5.16</p> <p>OLG 5.23</p> <p>OLG 6.24</p> <p>Preference - no option can be inferred</p>	n/a	<p>The above article, especially the Council's "financial losses" and the astronomical rate increases it proposes needs another angle. The attached photos illustrate how Council funds are being misallocated. While there is a lot of infrastructure that needs replacing, repairing, or upgrading, why waste money on infrastructure that is no longer put to use? This bus stop on the side of 124 Shirley Road on Nicholson Road, the corner off Shirley Road in Wollstonecraft, has not been used since around 14 years ago or more. There are no plans to replace the old bus route along this street. Therefore, why on earth was the bus stop not pulled down instead of wasting funds in repairing the trip and bench, and repainting it? I wonder how much is being misspent on other defunct infrastructure... Furthermore, when is Council going to clean up the filthy paths along Willoughby Road on both sides from the Pacific Highway down through the shopping area? They are a disgrace.</p>
<p>OLG 3.12</p> <p>Preference - assume option 1 based on sentiment</p>	1	<p>I am the Chairman of the Wondakiah Marina Strata SP 58231</p> <p>We are a 41-berth marina complex, each "owner" holding a lease over an envelope of water, the lessor being Waterways , now TforNSW. As a precondition to leasing an envelope of water, each lessee MUST be the registered proprietor of a residential lot in the Wondakiah Estate. Each berth owner therefore pays full Council rates in respect of their residential Lot. North Sydney Council also levies full minimum residential rates on each marina berth, notwithstanding that no additional services are delivered by Council for the water envelope comprising each marina Lot. Each proprietor is therefore paying double rates. The same situation used to apply to water rates, however Sydney water struck a special rate for marina berths resulting in one full set of water rates for the whole marina complex, and a small additional special rate for each Lot of the marina. We would submit that this is a fair, equitable and reasonable approach to rates, and one that ought be adopted by Council.</p> <p>There is no justification for effectively double charging for Council services, this particularly in an environment where significant increases in Council rates are expected in the future as per the information disseminated by Mayor Zoe Baker. In the circumstances outlined, we therefore respectfully request that Council strike a special low rate applicable to the lease of water envelopes which as a matter of convenience, are managed via a Strata Plan Scheme. Would you kindly refer this request to the appropriate Council department for early consideration, and advise of the Council's decision in due course.</p>
<p>OLG 4.14</p> <p>OLG 1.1</p> <p>OLG 6.22</p> <p>OLG 6.21</p> <p>OLG 1.4</p> <p>OLG 5.1</p> <p>OLG 5.18</p>	n/a	<p>Acknowledge your hard work and dedication. But where are the councilors ??? The survey and your newsletter does not say the financial position of council, other that it cannot survive on current services offered What is the debt--- how much interest is committed over time period Can STATE GOVERNMENT take over the debt over defined period What is the status of private schools making a rate contribution of occupying land mass?—Campaign to do this by you until council wins ! OFFER MORE USER PAY FOR SERVICES EVEN IF IT IS UNPOPULAR 2026---- likely tough financial year—inflation over 4 %---- jobs redundancies increasing North Sydney pool---- status of corporate sponsorship Entry fees—what has been agreed Parking fees for users---- rebate if ratepayer ? Appreciate comments re above Take care and have councillors take more “workload”</p>
<p>OLG 3.13</p> <p>Preference - option 1</p> <p>OLG 6.22</p> <p>OLG 6.23</p>	1	<p>With regards to Let's Talk</p> <p>I'm voting for Minimum Resident Rates. Option 1</p> <p>While we are talking about Rate Rises again.</p> <p>How much does the Colleges / Schools contribute to the North Sydney Council. Each and every College is expanding their footprint/ Construction to their Colleges which would be in the multi millions!!</p> <p>Council/Governments keep spending on new infrastructure etc, yet nothing is maintained just let it deteriorate and then panic</p>

OLG 6.21 OLG 4.14		<p>because it's cost blown out to repair this long term neglect.</p> <p>Council continues to waste money... Young Street Plaza- What an absolute waist of money and how ugly it was, now more money being wasted to remove it..</p> <p>You're allowing more and more apartments to be built which means more traffic yet you find ways to disrupt the flow of traffic. The BIKE tracks are another complete waste of money restricting traffic flow and parking spaces.</p> <p>On Miller Street opposite the Metro Station you extend the footpath out closing one lane, tables, chairs, flower pots, umbrellas. Now it's an eye sore never cleaned or maintained.. What a waste of money. Closing of a Busy Corridor and what you thought people would sit there and relax on a main road..</p> <p>The building on Miller Street and Brett-Whiteley Place.. The Government is pushing for more apartments, this is an obvious location... Shops/Gardens level 1-2, businesses level 3-4, Hotel Level 5-7 and Apartments 8 upwards.</p> <p>This building is NOT a HERITAGE building it's just a building that has out lived its life.</p> <p>Again Brett-Whiteley Place, discussing Cigarette Buts. papers, fast food boxes drink cans, The rubbish continues upDenison Street cigarette buts fast food wrappers and boxes... Why aren't these areas cleaned, the rubbish bins never cleaned always fluids running out the bottom of them again never maintained.</p> <p>The Swimming Pool Disaster this should be a State Government pool as it's for the public not just for North Sydney residents, so we get stung for higher rates to maintain the pool for the population.</p> <p>The same goes for the Oval this should also be State Government Owned and maintained as it's for the Sydney population not just for North Sydney residents.</p>
OLG 3.13 Preference - option 1 OLG 3.12	1	As a house owner in North Sydney I think option 1 is the best option. Council should focus on getting more income from apartment dwellers and Businesses who are receiving the same services as free standing homes .
OLG 1.1 OLG 3.12 Preference - no option can be inferred	n/a	I am a long-term rate payer and understand the financial predicament that our Council faces. I don't object to the necessity that all residents will have to pay more to provide services and maintain/improve infrastructure into the future. I note one of the options being considered is to increase Minimum Rate Charges. Again, I don't have a problem with this as residents and businesses receive services and use assets provided by Council however, there are 'rateable entities' within the North Sydney area that do not receive any services and do not use or rely on any infrastructure assets. I am referring to marina berths (eg Wondakiah) that operate under NSW Maritime Leases. They are not residential or business, receive no garbage services, do not use roads, footpaths, gardens etc. I question that these entities are rateable in any case but that is unlikely to change. Marina berths should receive a 'special classification' for rating purposes as charging a minimum rate is not fair. The letter from the mayor implies that future increases should be fair. I already pay significant rates on my residential property.
OLG 2.8 Preference - no option can be inferred	n/a	Please note that this rate calculator regarding the proposed rates does not take into account the cost we pay - attached to our rates - for our garbage collection. This is quite substantial and should be included as the calculator as it stands is VERY MISLEADING. I will note this in my individual survey submission as well. Kind regards
OLG 3.13 Preference - option 2 OLG 2.5	2	Option 2 is my preferred option. I could not find any other way to register my preference. Thank you

<p>OLG 1.1 OLG 5.16 OLG 1.4 OLG 6.25 Preference - assume option 1 based on sentiment</p>	1	<p>It is apparent that some form of special rate variation is required due to the financial position being in a poor position. I still believe a 40% increase over 3 years, which is being proposed in option 2, is too high. Government tends to be inefficient at all levels and based on history the council is not great with effectively utilising its budget. I have very little faith in the council not to repeat mistakes of the past and am not comfortable at all funding such a large rate hike. Rates in nearby council areas are higher in most cases which provides some rationale for asking for rates to be ratcheted higher to be more on par. With infrastructure there is capacity to take on more debt to fund projects if required, this can be a prudent strategy with long term loans as the real value of the debt falls over time while rates are increasing typically at a rate above inflation. Perhaps a more acceptable rate of increase above the minimum could be 25% over 3 years. The shortfall that is apparently needed can be managed through an increase in efficiency or extra debt if required. It was very poor form that this financial issue was not brought up during the council elections and was sprung in rate payers shortly after the election.</p>
<p>OLG 1.1 OLG 1.2 OLG 1.3 OLG 1.4 OLG 4.14 OLG 2.8 OLG 5.16 OLG 5.20 Preference - assume option 1 based on sentiment</p>	1	<p>(11/11) Where exactly do we find a detailed breakdown of what the council intend to do if one choose option 2 or option 3. Just naming Transport, Greenspaces roads is not enough. I would be grateful if anyone could send me the link to this. Thanks</p> <p>(11/11) On page 77 it includes the bleow "Blues Point Road traffic management works Year 1 \$600,000" Can we please have an exact breackdown of what this involves As you know we have horrific hooning most nights.</p> <p>(16/11) I am writing to provide feedback on the proposed Special Rate Variation (SRV). After reviewing your own financial statements and the material presented to the community, the conclusion is clear: the scale and permanence of the SRV being proposed is not justified.</p> <p>1. Your own financial results show Council is in strong health. You achieved a \$15M surplus in FY2025 and a \$13M surplus in FY2024, and you met all State Government financial benchmarks. These are not the numbers of a council in financial distress. This confirms the SRV is not being driven by immediate need, but by longer-term ambitions and strategic choices.</p> <p>2. The \$157M infrastructure backlog you cite appears overstated.You have calculated this number using full asset replacement, rather than realistic repair or partial renewal. Other councils use more appropriate costing methods. If North Sydney adopted the same approach, the backlog would materially decrease — and so would the size of any justified SRV. Putting forward the highest-cost option as the only option is not transparent fiscal planning.</p> <p>3. You are proposing a permanent SRV without offering a temporary alternative. A permanent SRV locks in the increase forever. A temporary SRV (3–5 years) allows accountability, review, and adjustment.</p> <p>The unanimous view of the Lavender Bay Precinct was: temporary SRV only, at lower levels, with revised asset costings. Your failure to include that option speaks for itself.</p> <p>4. You have not exhausted alternative funding sources. Council holds underperforming assets — the Ward Street car park being the most obvious example — and has property recycling options that could materially reduce the need for higher rates.Other councils pursue this approach. North Sydney has chosen not to, prioritising asset retention over residents’ cost-of-living pressure.</p> <p>5. Your public claim that North Sydney’s rates are “low” is not supported by State data. Government data shows North Sydney’s rates per capita are the second highest in Sydney and 27% above the metro average. The repeated narrative that we “pay less than neighbouring councils” is selective and misleading. Residents are already contributing at a very high level. 6. Council has allowed \$2.5M owed by Transport for NSW to remain uncollected for nearly three years. This amount represents 3% of annual rate revenue. If Council cannot collect funds clearly owed to it, ratepayers should not be expected to cover the gap. This is a governance issue — not a revenue issue.</p> <p>7. The way Council has framed “Option 1” (no SRV) is manipulative. You have presented Option 1 as “no facility upgrades, declining service levels, and deteriorating infrastructure.” This is not an evidence-based projection — it is a pressure tactic. A council that has reported two consecutive surpluses cannot credibly claim that choosing the base option will trigger service decline. This framing is designed to push residents into supporting the SRV rather than enabling a genuine choice. That is not</p>

		<p>consultation — it is strategic manipulation.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>Based on your own financial statements and the information presented, there is no justification for a large, permanent SRV. Residents should not be asked to fund inflated backlog estimates, uncollected revenue, or strategic decisions to retain underperforming assets while expanding Council's long-term revenue base.</p> <p>I request that Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recalculate the infrastructure backlog using realistic renewal costs • Consider asset sales or recycling before increasing rates • Collect the outstanding \$2.5M from Transport for NSW • Present a temporary, lower-level SRV option for genuine consultation <p>Until these steps are taken, a permanent SRV of the size proposed is not defensible.</p>
<p>OLG 1.4</p> <p>OLG 5.17</p> <p>OLG 5.19</p> <p>OLG 5.20</p> <p>Preference - assume option 1 based on sentiment</p>	1	<p>I'm choosing not to participate in the survey and would like my objection recorded.</p> <p>The proposal frames a rate increase as the only path forward. I haven't seen any discussion about alternatives, such as cost-saving measures, operational efficiencies, project reprioritisation, reducing discretionary spending, or assessing whether any non-essential assets could be sold or repurposed. These steps should be fully examined before asking residents to accept higher rates.</p> <p>Why haven't these options been presented to the community? The survey narrows residents into three versions of the same outcome, which limits transparency and genuine consultation.</p> <p>I'm asking the council to publish a broader set of scenarios, including cost reductions and asset strategies, so the community can make an informed decision.</p>
<p>OLG 1.2</p> <p>OLG 3.10</p> <p>Preference - assume option 1 based on sentiment</p>	1	<p>It is noted that you propose a selection of three options, with no possibility to deviate.</p> <p>Your Option 1 increases at 4% p.a. which is higher than the inflation rate.</p> <p>You do allow for concession rates, but only for a very limited few. Housing is becoming increasingly unaffordable in Sydney and more people cannot afford to buy property.</p> <p>Please (1) provide the current and future projected percentage of people renting rather than owning the property that they live in.</p> <p>Please (2) also clarify why there are no concessions for anyone who is renting a property.</p> <p>Please (3) explain why you use a very narrow definition of "pensioner", i.e. not the common law definition of a pensioner, but a much stricter and more limited definition.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to "say my say".</p> <p>Thank you for this response, but you clearly did not read my email submission.</p> <p>To repeat one aspect:</p> <p>Your HARDSHIP POLICY and alternative payment arrangements do NOTHING. for pensioners and people struggling who are renting. They are only aimed at the rich property owners.</p> <p>QUESTION: What are your policies and arrangements to help the massive number of people renting apartments, including pensioners?</p>
<p>OLG 1.1</p> <p>OLG 3.13 - option 3</p>	3	<p>Council is facing a financial crisis. It needs to plan for the future. Option 3 is the fiscally responsible option.</p>

OLG 5.17 OLG 5.16 OLG 6.23 Preference - assume option 1 based on sentiment	1	Stop wasting money on bicycle lanes, cut salaries of council employees and then ask us for more money.
OLG 5.17 OLG 5.16 OLG3.10 Preference - assume option 1 based on sentiment	1	I object to the ridiculous increase in rates. The council has previously mismanaged its resources and should not be passing this inefficiency and waste on. Nobody has been held to account, it's absolutely unfair. Rates should increase at the same level as the income of your residents and no more.
OLG 4.14 Preference - no option can be inferred	n/a	I was at a Let's Talk Rates session tonight and was directed to read the Productivity Plan which I am told details the measures Council is implementing to find savings or alternative income streams. Can you point me to where I can find this report online. (4/12) Option 2 says there is no funding for new infrastructure yet it also says New Community Centre Facilities. Is there an Option for only maintenance and renewal of existing infrastructure?
OLG 5.17 OLG 5.18 Preference - assume option 1 based on sentiment	1	Dear all, like all business we need to operate within our means. To put up the rates is unacceptable when your focus should be driving efficiency. I do not believe I see that with the level of central staffing. If you can not operate effectively then offer to merge with another council. Remove the duplication of all the central functions and get better leaders. It's what happens in business and I see no difference here.
OLG 3.13 - option 3 OLG 5.16	3	Our vote would be for option 3 Thank you for your news letter regarding rates. Being realistic I have no problem in the Council raising the rates and I do think over a time scale to when a break even is achieved is the correct way to do it. The present Council cannot be held responsible for errors in judgement and lack of proper financial advice. However the present Council must adhere to the strictest financial procedures now to regain the trust of the rate payers. You, as Mayor, bear this responsibility and I wish you well.
OLG 3.13 - option 3 OLG 5.16 OLG 6/21	3	(21/11) I would be supportive of a full rate increase as per the latest advice provided the Council returns to and maintains the governance and fiscal discipline that was evident in the era prior to the embarkation on the Olympic pool debacle. I would also urge Council to canvas options to dispose of the Pool complex which will undoubtedly continue to burden the budget in the medium to long term. In reality it is a State asset if not an asset of metro Sydney. (3/12) Thank you for taking the time to write. I had noted what was said about governance etc but it is vital to keep reminding oneself. I have lived in the municipality since 1981 and I think we have been fortunate that other than the aberration over the pool and some other historic issues the council has been very well run. This has created a very liveable community. Also I think our rates have been relatively modest. I hope sense will prevail over the rates issues. Regards

OLG 5.17 Preference - no option can be inferred	n/a	I would like to speak at any meeting that will be held about the use of Councils Funds and rates increases.. I have been the owner occupier of my house for 47 years. I have watched Crows Nest and North Sydney grow into a densely populated area. Whilst I appreciate the amount of work the Council has done, I feel there is still room for significant improvement. I have seen wastage of Council funds over the years and I would like the opportunity to address this topic at any meeting that is covering this.
OLG 3.13 - option 2 OLG 6.21 OLG 6.24	2	Hi I have registered as XXXX. I prefer option 2 on page 7 North Sydney News. I am dismayed at the cost of North Sydney Olympic Pool Redevelopment and wonder why staff of Council responsible for contracting and overseeing for redevelopment have not been demoted and lawyers involved sued or dismissed. Within limited powers remaining with the Council it is hoped that overdevelopment of North Sydney is carefully scrutinised to maintain quality of life for residents. Within the limited powers Council has action should be taken to protect aged residents and young children from speeding electric and battery scooters on footpaths. (19/11) My recent email message is for North Sydney Council only and not for general publication. Any comment is not meant to be defamatory to anyone as I don't have possession of all facts and hence is definitely not to be distributed to the public. It's not meant to be legal advice.
OLG 3.10 Preference - assume option 1 based on sentiment	1	I am not in favour of rates increase and prefer to leave it at the average residential rate . The cost of living is what is impacting my decision. If all costs are up and rates are up as well . We are back to the same situation of struggling to maintain a balance. Thanks
OLG 3.13 - option 3 OLG 4.15	3	I'm very supportive of the SRV option #3 as: * Option 1 (do nothing) is for low effort thinkers. This option will erode and undermine service levels, from what are already cheap rates by comparison to other LGA's * Option 2 (treading water) is okay, but barely the minimum standards that will just allow council to slowly catch up with maintenance and pay down interest and debts inherited from a poorly planned and contracted pool redevelopment (thanks Jilly) We must maintain and even lift standards, plus keeping an eye out for unforecastable threats and opportunities. It is very disappointing that IPART, whilst acknowledging the council's poor financial position, chose previously to deny any consideration to any rate increases. Finally, please do not be discouraged from advocating SRV's in future. The disgraceful behaviour from the 'rent a mob' protestors of the (mostly not from this LGA) Liberal party is not how democracies are run and do not represent any thoughtful input to how a lot of ratepayers truly value the hard working efforts of council to deliver great services on thin budgets.
OLG 1.2 OLG 5.17 OLG 5.19 OLG 3.13 - option 1	1	Thank you for the opportunity to give feedback on the proposed council rate increases. Having been in business all my life I appreciate the difficulty council has in managing costs given these tough economic times. Unfortunately your survey does not include an Option 1 which is unfortunate as it makes it difficult to see exactly how council is going to spend a base budget let alone options 2 and 3. There is obviously not a lot of project detail on exactly how Options 2 & 3 budgets will be spent but having read the survey results from earlier this year it would appear some of the initiatives are inconsistent with how residents rate their importance. e.g low support for cycleways, sustainability initiatives, reducing emissions, affordable housing etc. And given the total shambles with which the NSW Govt is fast tracking dramatic increases in housing availability, the various council initiatives such as planning for council owned properties and holistic reviews of parking across the entire LGA traffic mgt when council has no say in how the LGA is being overdeveloped is simply farcical. In the current uncertain economic climate, combined with a state govt that is ignoring all councils I strongly recommend Council be ruthless on what are "nice to have" projects and simply focus on the "must have" projects. Responsible governance is working within budget and if the revenue stream is not there then expenditure should be reduced accordingly. For these reasons I do not support Options 2 and 3.

OLG 5.18 Preference - no option can be inferred	n/a	Has council considered that perhaps the reason it is struggling financially is due to the low skilled staff + the failure to recruit the best professionals in the area? https://www.google.com/amp/s/www.news.com.au/national/nsw-act/news/north-sydney-councilasks-ratepayers-to-back-huge-jump-in-rates-to-cover-troubled-finances/newsstory/2333ac5eb4bb172ed8d7d8fe54991f77%3famp Council has a number of staff who occupy roles, whose existence doesn't even cover their own wages, let alone add value to the community
OLG 6.22 Preference - no option can be inferred	n/a	I request that thought be given to charging schools (especially the many private schools) for their ongoing & heavy use of council parks, ovals etc. As they they pay zero rates surely an annual facility/usage fee charged to them would generate funds that could be put towards ongoing maintenance of open space.
OLG 3.12 Preference - no option can be inferred	n/a	I have just read Mayor Baker's message concerning rate rises which was dropped in my letter box this morning. As a resident who lives in a house in North Sydney, I am compelled to react to the words of the Mayor in her message "Making Rates Fairer for Everyone". By Mayor Baker's figures, 77% of North Sydney's residents live in apartments and pay the minimum rate of \$743. If the average rate is currently \$1076, this means that the remaining 23% of residents who live in houses are currently paying an average rate of \$2191. Increasing rates across the board by, say, 20%, will therefore increase the average rate for house owners by \$438. A 20% increase in the rates for the 77% of North Sydney's residents who live in apartments is just \$149. The discrepancy between the rates paid by apartment owners and house owners will get greater. Mayor Baker, given that all residents of North Sydney receive the same Council services, this is not at all fair for everyone. In my view, Council should be working towards changing the rating system so that fairness for everyone is properly achieved. With Sydney moving more and more towards apartment dwelling, changes to the rating system are required because this problem in equity will increasingly arise right across the city. I would appreciate it if my sentiments can make their way to the appropriate decision makers in North Sydney Council.
OLG 3.13 - option 3 OLG 2.8 OLG 2.9	3	I spent time with the CEO last night at Ros Creighton pavilion and gained a much better understanding of the issues facing council and the necessity for rate increases. I am 100% behind option 3. I regard myself as reasonably savvy with finances etc but fell into the trap of thinking my TOTAL council bill of rates plus garbage etc was going to increase, when in fact its only the rates component that goes up under this proposal. Hearing 87% increase and knowing my current council bill was approx \$2400 I assumed my new bill would be about \$4500...this was a real eye opener and I didn't like it, and I'm sure most people think this. Council should explain this is not the case...it will make the story easier to tell. the majority of people are too busy not in touch or too lazy to look into this...the sv messaging needs to be simpler if possible. Thanks
OLG 3.13 - option 2 or 3 OLG 5.16	2 or 3	I would be inclined to support the rate increases - option 2 or 3 - but would definitely like some reassurances that the people responsible for us getting into this mess in the first place (especially those responsible for the pool, and for leaving the rates too low for so long) are kept a very long way from any financial decisions going forward, and ideally exited from the council altogether.

OLG 2.6 Preference - no option can be inferred	n/a	<p>I totally disagree with the very invasive questionnaire which is required to be completed in order to address concerns regarding any matter within the council. Name and address should be adequate - why is there a need to ask personal information? In what way does that assist?</p> <p>Why should I give my life history just to comment on the new rates being proposed or anything else? It is no business of anyone in council. I live in the area, that is all that should be required.</p>
OLG 4.15 OLG 6.23 OLG 5.17 OLG 2.5 Preference - assume option 1 based on sentiment	1	<p>I have read your Let's Talk bulletin, and here we go again. The ink is barely dry on the IPART determination from earlier in the year, and yet you're having another go at trying to sting the ratepayers for the folly of NSC going beyond its 3Rs remit. To remind you, the Council's 3R job is roads, rubbish and ratcatching (the last R is not "rates" as you regularly insist: collecting rates is not the Council's job even if you spend more than inordinate time on the issue).</p> <p>Whenever a council goes beyond this remit, financial chaos is the result, as is the case with NSC.</p> <p>Nothing has changed since the last attempt to sting the ratepayers. Your job is to rein in spending, not perpetuate the profligacy of the past as I highlighted in my submission to last year's attempt to sting the ratepayers.</p> <p>Try to grasp this simple proposition: what you blithely call the "community's expectations" about the quality of services and infrastructure have to change. Start persuading the "community" that NSC does not have the money to lavish on their inflated expectations of what government provides.</p> <p>NSC suffers from the same problem of government at the higher levels – that there is an endless well of taxpayers (and ratepayers) money into which they think they can dip at any time they like to meet "expectations" about spending.</p> <p>I say again: change the expectations.</p> <p>Tell your ratepayers that there are financial constraints on the Council and, as a result, spending will be reduced and "expectations" will have to reduce accordingly.</p> <p>Therefore my position can be recorded as being that there should be NO INCREASE to rates at all (whether average or minimum), and certainly no SRVs.</p> <p>Cut your operating costs instead. I know, it's a novel proposition for government, but it's time to wake up.</p> <p>By the way, I am writing to you by e-mail because the NSC rates "Let's Talk" web page requires multiple hoops to be jumped through, the antithesis of good communication, no doubt designed to frustrate the process but enable the Council to crow about how "open" it was to receiving submissions.</p> <p>I look forward to your response.</p>
OLG 3.13 - option 1 OLG 2.5	1	<p>I tried unsuccessfully to register and put this on your website.</p> <p>I tried 3 times but could not gain entry to your relevant website.</p> <p>I am a residential ratepayer at xxxx Cremorne Point and I would like to register in favour of your option 1, the government rate peg.</p>
OLG 3.13 - option 1 OLG 5.16 OLG 6.21 OLG 6.24	1	<p>Dont agree on rate increase i believe council is responsible for the mess you are in Example the overrun of costs at North Sydney swimming pool and the disgusting development's that have been constructed in the area which has destroyed the character of the suburb</p>

OLG 2.5 Preference - no option can be inferred	n/a	I have registered with Have your Say with North Sydney Council web site, however, there is no link available on the web site page for Have your Say Rates to obtain the survey so that I can have my say. It is filled with everything else but the survey. It seems to be the same old story with North Sydney Council promise you the world but do not deliver.
OLG 2.5 OLG 2.6 Preference - no option can be inferred	n/a	I'd like to do the survey, but you want my year of birth? a 16 digit password? You won't be getting my views
OLG 2.5 OLG 2.8 Preference - no option can be inferred	n/a	My first say will be a rant against the ridiculous requirement for a 16-character password. No financial institution, no commercial site of the hundreds I deal with in my business life has required such a needlessly complex sign-in. Not even the "strong password" devising tool in Chrome could satisfy that. My second rant will be against the printed flyer that contained on its second page - the obverse face - an over-long letter of explanation from the Mayor. While the Mayor is doing a good job my opinion is that the issue of communication would have been better served by using that page for the table of costs associated with each payment projection option and their rationale. And lastly, I would have completed the survey if I could have found it. Please in future get a person of commonsense communication skills to devise or pub-test these publications. I was left frustrated and lost interest.
OLG 4.15 OLG 1.2 OLG 5.20 OLG 1.3 Preference - no option can be inferred as members voted for an option that has not been proposed.	n/a	Lavender Bay Precinct MINUTES 30 October 2025 6. Community Consultation On Special Rate Variation (SRV) Options Submissions close 3 December 2025 On Monday 27th October, Councillors agrees to undertake community consultation on Special Rate Variations, together with the Draft Long-Term Financial Plan, from Wednesday 29 October to Wednesday 3rd December. Details available on Council's website https://yoursay.northsydney.nsw.gov.au/lets-talk-rates Council is proposing three options: 1. No change - Deteriorating infrastructure - 10.33% (rate page) 2. Treading water - Restore renewal funding and address critical backlogs - 39.92% (including rate peg) 3. Eye to the future - Enhanced contribution to infrastructure investment and planning - 54.18% (including rate peg) Precinct members are encouraged to visit Council's Your Say website and provide their feedback either: i) by completing an online survey, opening on 3 November; and/or ii) emailing Council at yoursay@northsydney.nsw.gov.au The consultation paper considered by Council on 27th October is 324 pages long. To support residents in considering their response to Council's SRV proposal, Lavender Bay Precinct circulated a Briefing Paper to Precinct on 29th October. The following additional comments were raised at the meeting: *Comparison with Ku-ring-gai Council: Council deserves credit for considering a lower increase than the 87% rejected by IPART earlier this year. The justification for the rate increase is to fund infrastructure renewal. Ku-ring-gai Council is also consulting on an SRV to fund infrastructure, but it is seeking significantly smaller increases of 22%, 29% and 33% and is providing a choice of four options - rate peg of three possible increases. *Overall rates per capita: North Sydney Council regularly claims that "North Sydney's existing average residential rates are 35-40% lower than the neighbouring councils of Lane Cove, Mosman and Willoughby." However, 2023/24 figures from the Office of

		<p>Local Government show that North Sydney's overall rate revenue per capita was second highest after Woollahra in metropolitan Sydney. Council's total rates per capita was \$801 in 2023/24, which was 27% higher than the Sydney average of \$630. This is an indication that Council has comparatively more capacity, compared to most other councils, to service the needs of its population through its rate revenue.</p> <p>*Property sales and reinvestment in public infrastructure: Unlike the last SRV, Council is not considering sale of any assets. However, council does recognise in their Long-Term Financial Plan that property sales and reinvestment in public infrastructure can meet long-term community needs. For example, the sale of part or all of the underperforming Ward St carpark would provide substantial funding for paying off the pool's loans and the infrastructure backlog/renewal and go some way to reducing a rate increase.</p> <p>*Use of a temporary SRV: Council is applying for a permanent rather than a temporary SRV. Under a temporary SRV, Council's allowable rate income reverts to where it would have been at the end of the SRV period. Under a permanent SRV, Council's allowable rate income is permanently higher. This produces a much greater, ongoing tax on the future.</p> <p>*Quantification of the infrastructure backlog is overstated: Council's quantification of the infrastructure backlog is overstated, as Council has calculated this cost as the full renewal cost of both Category 4 and Category 5 assets. A more realistic strategy would be repair and/or partial replacement i.e. bring Category 4 and 5 assets to Category 3 (satisfactory condition) rather than Category 1 (excellent/very good condition). Council should clearly disclose how the infrastructure backlog figure of \$157 million was derived and what proportion of backlog is based on full vs partial renewal.</p> <p>Lavender Bay Precinct resolved to request Council to:</p> <p>i) include asset recycling to fund capital improvement/investments e.g. sale of the Ward Street car park and reduce the SRV FOR: 39, AGAINST: 0, ABSTENTIONS: 0</p> <p>ii) Reduce the size of the SRV application based on repair and/or partial replacement for assets in poor condition and, similar to Ku-Ring-Gai Council's approach, provide a more stepped approach to rate increase options of peg rate, 22%, 29% and 33%. FOR: 39, AGAINST: 0, ABSTENTIONS: 0</p> <p>iii) apply only for a temporary SRV of 3-5 years, with any need for additional revenue considered at that time. FOR: 38, AGAINST: 1, ABSTENTIONS: 0</p>
<p>OLG 3.13 - option 1</p> <p>OLG 6.23</p> <p>OLG 6.21</p> <p>OLG 5.17</p>	1	<p>I cannot support the newsletter from Mayor Baker which is asking for a Special Rate Variation.</p> <p>I have looked at the minimum residential rate stated on the brochure. Beneath "Making Rates Fairer for Everyone" it states "This minimum rate applies mostly to apartments because many units share the same block of land." I live in a block of 99 units sharing the one block of land and my rates are nearly double that quoted on the brochure. I don't support a Special Rate Variation.</p> <p>I would suggest council re-evaluate their Draft Long Term Financial Plan and support the essential programs already in place "protecting the services and facilities the North Sydney community values." Forget the additional new future projects and allocate the saved finance to concentrate on the North Sydney Pool project.</p> <p>Mayor Baker has stated the ratepayers are not responsible for the Pool project. It is Council's financial responsibility and ultimately Council's financial management.</p> <p>We all need to budget and live within our means.</p>
<p>OLG 5.17</p> <p>Preference - assume option 1 based on sentiment.</p>	1	<p>I don't believe we need a rate rise. We need the money to be used more efficiently. I can't ask for more if I use my money unwisely. Rates should stay where they are.</p>

<p>OLG 1.3 OLG 1.1 OLG 1.2 OLG 5.20 OLG 3.10 OLG 6.24 Preference - assume option 1 based on sentiment.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>I am writing this email as a concerned elderly resident, who lives in a small studio apartment. Whilst not on a pension at the moment, I feel I will be in a few years time. It worries me that an increased SRV could be permanent with an ever increasing rate rise. I understand that there needs to be more spent on infrastructure, but the increased SRV should be temporary. As I age I will be unable to use all facilities that will be offered. Yet, I will be paying for it with a retirement income which won't be increasing. I feel the scale and permanence of the SRV being proposed is not justified as NS council's surplus is in strong health. The infrastructure backlog is overstated as you have quoted full asset replacement rather than repair. A permanent SRV locks in the increase forever. A temporary SRV (3-5 years) allows accountability and review.</p> <p>NS Council still holds underperforming assets that if sold could materially reduce the need for higher rates. Other councils pursue this approach. N Syd has chosen to prioritise asset retention over residents cost- of-living pressure.</p> <p>Lastly, the harbour foreshore around Blues Point is a disgrace as it looks like the ugly duckling of Sydney Harbour. This is an area that should be a smaller version of Barangaroo, so that not only residents and office workers can enjoy, but visiting tourists can have a pleasant visual experience as they sight see around the harbour. As local residents we should be able to be proud of our local environment, but as current rate payers we are not getting value for our money. If the SRV is to be increased this issue should be addressed.</p>
<p>OLG 3.11 OLG 4.15 Preference - assume option 1 based on sentiment</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>We understand that council are again considering Special Rate Variation (SRV) scenarios which would significantly increase the average council rates charge for commercial premises by between +39.9% and +54.1% from 2025-26 to 2028-29.</p> <p>We write in strong opposition to this proposal on behalf of the owner and as investment manager of xxxxxxx and on behalf of our tenants, who are predominantly responsible for council rate charges in accordance with their leases.</p> <p>We raised concerns about the current council rates charge for business ratepayers within North Sydney as part of the prior consultation process and this remains an ongoing issue for our assets and tenants. An SRV that proposes to further increase council rates charges for business ratepayers will exacerbate these existing inequities for the reasons set out in this submission.</p> <p>The proposed SRV will have the following impact on existing commercial and retail assets within North Sydney Council.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commercial property in North Sydney Council has already suffered through the broader downturn in the commercial market post-COVID with inflated vacancy rates due, in part, to the rise of remote work reducing demand for floorspace and the attractiveness of competing accommodation in the Sydney CBD, CBD fringe and other economic centres including Macquarie Park and Parramatta. • Retail property in North Sydney Council has equally suffered due to the rise of remote work post-COVID as it is predominantly driven by office workers with limited retail activity occurring outside of business hours and on weekends. The trend of fewer and shorter trips into the office directly impacts sales and the viability of businesses and, in turn, capacity to pay higher levels of council rates. • As raised in our response last year, the level of council rates in North Sydney are already an issue for our tenants and the proposed SRV will compound this issue by significantly increasing the cost for tenants to occupy commercial and retail premises within North Sydney Council. This concern was shared by IPART who found that Council 'did not adequately consider the impact of its proposed rate rise on business ratepayers'. • The proposed increases will further impact the competitiveness of our North Sydney asset and our ability to retain tenants and attract new businesses. Further, the extent of these increases and the volatility in the council rates charge will directly impact broader business decisions for our tenants such as employment and investment / spending on other cost items within North Sydney Council. • There is a shared vision with commercial landowners to drive economic development in North Sydney to ensure it remains competitive and fosters a 'thriving business environment'. The suggested strategic steps to achieve this outcome should include addressing the competitiveness of the council rates charge for business ratepayers.

		<p>Furthermore, the proposal will have the following impact on the future development and repositioning of commercial and retail assets within North Sydney Council.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of commercial property has become increasingly challenged post-COVID with several planned projects in North Sydney Council either paused indefinitely or not proceeding due to slowing demand for commercial and retail floorspace (impacting achievable rents) and the ongoing significant escalation in construction costs. These outcomes have significant cost implications for the owners / developers. • The proposed SRV will significantly impact both future commercial development in North Sydney and the refurbishment of existing office stock given the impact the quantum of the proposed increase and the apparent volatility in council rate charges will have on project feasibility and the ability to attract tenants. The level of outgoings are already an issue for prospective tenants in our buildings. • Future development and the continuing refurbishment of existing office stock is crucial to the ongoing success and competitiveness of the North Sydney office market for both existing asset owners and developers. • These impacts will directly counter the objectives of council's Economic Development Strategy to 'revitalise and grow the north Sydney CBD as a high-amenity top-tier office precinct' and 'cultivate a diverse connected and resilient business environment'. • Additionally, development provides significant direct and flow-on (indirect) economic benefits for the local economy and businesses. The impact the proposed increases will only slow the progress of development into the future which will directly counter council's commitment to job creation and the long-term stability of the local economy. <p>We welcome the opportunity to further engage with Council on this SRV which, if it proceeds as proposed, will further impact the competitiveness of our North Sydney asset and our ability to retain tenants and attract new businesses.</p>
<p>OLG 6.21 OLG 6.24 Preference - assume option 1 based on sentiment</p>	1	<p>I do not think you can look at a rate increase until you have opened the pool. No one trusts the council, it's not fair. I would be all for a rate rise once the pool is open if council offered the following: A parking scheme for locals, similar to the beaches pass or the Bondi beach pass. So locals could pay a yearly fee and park at balmoral, Clifton gardens, kirribilli/mcmahons point, Cremorne point and any other area by the water without paying for a parking metre. Especially given the new pool is going in. I would also like to ensure that you keep all roads open in north Sydney, the idea of a pedestrian square is terrible given the amount of apartments being built in the area and the already huge build up of traffic with all the schools and new schools (reddam) and the propaganda on the news showing people j- walk there was ridiculous because if they turned the camera they would see that the pedestrian access has been closed forever due to the metro and building works!!</p>

<p>OLG 2.5</p> <p>OLG 2.6</p> <p>OLG 2.8</p> <p>OLG 6.24</p> <p>OLG 5.20</p> <p>OLG 5.18</p> <p>OLG 1.4</p> <p>OLG 3.12</p> <p>OLG 6.23</p> <p>OLG 6.25</p> <p>OLG 3.13 - option 3</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>feedback in attached pdf. It should not be so difficult to make a submission. I have wasted at least half an hour registering on another occasion and now having to go through all this nonsense.</p> <p>I have been aware of the initial rate increase proposal and now that ratepayers are encouraged to “have your say”. It was made difficult by having to register before I could do the survey. I completed the survey but like all surveys the questions and possible answers did not allow me to enter my real concerns or answers. Why did the survey ask about male or female or gay, aboriginal, education level and a host of other personal details that have little or no bearing on the survey outcome? All this information is collected by a third party. How do I know that it is secure? I consider that the survey will provide no useful information and is an unnecessary waste of money.</p> <p>Some of the survey questions required a detailed knowledge of the matter behind the question, e.g. the maintenance of assets or the delay and cost of the North Sydney Pool. Like most of the residents and councillors I am not an accountant, engineer or other specialist so I rely on reports that clearly identify the reasons for any action.</p> <p>There is a lack of information on Council matters that affect us. Apart from the Mosman Daily that get delivered occasionally or a mention on a couple of on line news bulletins the only source of information is at Precinct meetings but few people attend these. Social media is a minefield of misinformation and only inflames any issue. I discovered yesterday that I could get a copy of the North Shore Times at the Coles centre at Lane Cove but it is almost a carbon copy of the Mosman Daily and it had Kuringai News but no North Sydney News. My interest in the LGA for the last 15 years has been centred on Berrys Bay and issues in other areas have not been looked at in detail. I did not submit the survey and I list my comments on the question of a rate rise here. There was a question; how do you rate the Council’s performance and I rated it unsatisfactory but there was no option to clearly state why.</p> <p>1. Council failed to get an annual fire certificate from Noakes Boatyard for 4 years and now, four years later the required equipment has still not been installed. Why has Council allowed this to continue in spite of frequent requests from the community? The regulations are there for a purpose and should not be ignored. The extent of a fire cannot be predicted as shown by the recent Hong Kong fire that spread to and destroyed eight high rise buildings with loss of life more than 100. It appears to have been caused by a lack of compliance which is exactly what has happened at Noakes.</p> <p>2. I walk every day in the connected areas of The Merrett Playground, Waverton Park, Waverton Oval and Carradah Park and sometimes on to Balls Head Reserve. The area is used by hundreds of people every day with many coming from out of the area to see the iconic views of the harbour and the city. Carradah Park is an embarrassing neglected area that has not been maintained. There is nothing parklike about it and the vegetation is of little interest or value and weeds predominate and windblown branches are often a tripping hazard on the pathways. The grassed areas are generally just mown patches of various types of grass and are poorly drained with the recently upgraded Merrett Playground being the worst example with some new turf, dirt or sand patches and some very patchy grass. There has been some published criticism and suggestions of how to fix the problems without the need for a permanent rate increase but I am not aware of any explanation from Council to counteract the matters raised. Such as sell off some assets that are not providing a return. There was criticism of councillors spending a large amount on travel and conferences with what appeared to be unnecessary duplication.</p> <p>Council is now considering increasing the minimum rate so that owners of units pay the same rate as owners of houses who at present pay more. I believe that they should pay more as they have the benefit of some open space, a backyard for the kids to play in or a vegie patch. Unit owners may have less than 100 m2, a small balcony or no balcony and no privacy in any common area provided outside. This is why we need parks that are inviting and well maintained. Council gets far more rates from a unit development. In my case, there are five units in what was previously a single dwelling block. In Woolcott St there are 18 buildings and at least 105 ratepayers. Council is saying some of the extra rates will allow it to provide low cost housing. That is not a Council responsibility. Council says it will seek ways to relieve the car parking problems. It is more important to try to</p>
--	----------	--

		<p>reduce the road congestion problems that are getting worse month by month.</p> <p>I cannot understand why we were told when the new councillors were elected that our finances were healthy. Why the sudden change? There is a long history of public infrastructure being built and forgotten about. The State is the worst with example in schools, hospitals, roads and transport. At the local level we have a responsibility to maintain our assets. So, I support the third option for a rate increase but there is a lack of detail of the proposed costs. I question the need for it to be permanent. It is so easy to spend other people's money that all expenditure should be well planned, essential and of benefit. Council staff should be productive or get rid of.</p>
--	--	---

<p>OLG 6.21 OLG 5.20 OLG 2.5 OLG 1.2 OLG 1.4 OLG 5.17 Preference - assume option 1 based on sentiment</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Re Following feedback on three proposed rate options to help repair and renew the infrastructure we all rely on sends the best solution as s CPI and other economic conditions. NSC plans are full of high maintenance high cost programs, assets and services. Councillors, CEO/General Managers and senior staff/Directors need to review these plans, and for the time being, until finances are restored and normalised, commence seriously culling or delaying non essentials, not a priority for the next 1-5 years likely to be a minimal benefit to residents, businesses, agencies, local services (eg education, health, housing). For instance, NSC needs to sell (eg 99 year lease) the North Sydney Pool because it is not essential, the majority of residents go to the beach. If Federal or State Government want to own, operate and maintain this facility then give them the opportunity, otherwise go to market. This action alone (selling a 99 lease on the pool) should correct a diabolical mismanaged mess of corrupted practices and processes. ICAC should be investigating this utter shambles, and prosecuting those responsible for allowing it to happen. In addition, NSC has gone out of it's way to obstruct registration to this website, let alone get honest feedback. NSC's information and knowledge management needs expertise to correct and streamline the electronic processing, accessing and handling of general and specialised information. Hope this sends the correct message and underlines corrective measures to get North Sydney back on an even footing.</p> <p>(2/12) Thanks XXXX - YourSay probably very busy, so will keep this short,.</p> <p>No one envies the task to find solutions that sustainably produce an effective and efficient approach/strategy to providing public assets and services. However, North Sydney Council has not demonstrated it has learnt the embarrassing lesson from the last iPART decision, or even bothered to explain the " vision" of the future in a reference to some " masterplan" or similar planning instrument? Although the following are just examples, they represent areas/actions/considerations where Council/General Manager can seek to do better, find solutions instead of using some financial algorithm in a spreadsheet to do the talking, recognise that local residents are not a full bucket of cash or a sponge either. Following for Council, Senior Staff, Consultant/s and iPART consideration, examples only:</p> <p>1. (Long Term) Financial Plan: • does not demonstrate any significant asset sales/disposals/changes/shifts (at a competitive market rate) • does not identify significant segmented list of assets that are: high maintenance, low return, past use-by-date, whatever</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • does not describe strategic focus on consolidation of assets, or dollar return, or lease back (post sale) or lease (any other kind, incl peppercorn) • does not demonstrate rejuvenation approach • does not provide detailed modelling methodologies for offered Option 2 or Option 3 (rate payer is clueless) • does not provide significant/extraordinary quantitative \$s with significant/extraordinary qualitative justifications • does not demonstrate NSC understands suburbs or precincts or commercial centres or industrial estates <p>2. Table Asset Class: • ageing asset inventory shows no futureproofing strategy eg consolidate, sell, refurbish, lease/commercialise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • accum depreciation (method?) indicates 30% consumed/redundant/worthless • demonstrate Council unwilling to sell/dispose/close/mothball <p>3. Expenses re "\$maintenance to sustain its operational capacity"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • does not demonstrate any strategy about paying off/down the two significant/extraordinary loans for NS Pool • \$Satisfactory investment: Buildings > Drainage > Roads > Other > Footpaths > Open spaces • Drainage issues - seek Federal/State \$assistance/grants • Bushland walkways - close down/restrict/rotate access (seasonal, annual, 3 year) • Share with other Councils/Agencies/Enterprises/Organisations • Water harvesting - \$Sydney water cheap unless restrictions or service fees exponentially increase (drought impact) • Renewable energy - \$80k pa seems shortsighted, no clear strategy to accelerate private/public take-up • HR: Enterprise bargaining versus Contract • Change \$Level, \$Intensity or \$focus of \$assets and \$services
---	----------	--

		<p>4. Income generation - sell, lease back, lease, regen opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sell high cost/high maintenance assets • sell North Sydney Pool, achieve \$highest return. <p>Note: Luna Park privately owned (Oscars Group). Opportunities eg "Wet & Wild" theme.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sell or reinvent Ovals/Open Spaces • sell or reinvent redundant sites • sell or reinvent carparking • sell to open market, supperannuation/pension/SMSF • sell to (any) State Govt eg State Significant • sell to Federal Govt eg State Significant • sell or share with other local Councils/Agencies/Enterprises/Organisations • sell to O/S private or government enterprises • establish/sustain commercial events eg concerts, marathons, entertainment/creative, X-fests • establish PPP entertainment/events precinct eg Moore Park/Sports/Creative • establish PPP "Town Hall" for mixed income generating events <p>5. Blue Sky Thinking - PPP, Local/State/Federal Govt</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reinstate wasted property development opportunities, such as over/across the "canyon" of Bradfield Hwy/Warringah Fwy-Tollway • Renew/Reconnect North Sydney and Neutral Bay/Kirribilli communities/residents with elevated expansive "land bridges", establish open spaces, gardens, mixed commercial-residential facilities/accommodation, transit ways for pedestrians, bicycles, vehicles, monorail (yes, why not), ligh-rail, renewable tech (water harvesting, solar & battery energy)
--	--	---

<p>OLG 2.6 Preference - no option can be inferred</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>(3/11) I have just completed the Micromex survey about the proposed 54% SRV. Please be aware that Question 2 contains an ERROR after Option 3. The details about Option 3 should be followed by a Q2c asking whether you support Option 3, NOT a second Q2b referring to Option 1. Best Regards, Please see below. This is your current wording. The section shown in red is incorrect and needs to be updated. In its current form, your survey asks about Option 1 twice, Option 2 once, and does not allow a response about Option 3 at all (there is no Q2c). I tried leaving this section blank, however, I was not allowed to proceed until completing the incorrect section: Option 3: Special Rate Variation – Three year spread This proposed SRV option would also be introduced over 3 years: · In year one (2026/27) rating revenue would rise by 23%, which includes the 4% rate peg. This means the average residential ratepayer currently paying \$1,076 per annum would pay \$1,327 in Year 1, an increase of \$251 · In year two (2027/28) rating revenue would rise by an additional 15%, which includes the estimated 3% rate peg. This means the average residential ratepayer would pay \$1,520 in Year 2, a further increase of \$193 · In year three (2027/28) rating revenue would rise by an additional 9%, which includes the estimated 3% rate peg. This means the average residential ratepayer would pay \$1,654 in Year 3, a further increase of \$134 In subsequent years, the annual rate rise would return to the rate peg amount, which is estimated at 3%. With this additional funding, Council will provide the services and infrastructure mentioned for the previous option, plus... · Increased commitment to addressing infrastructure in poor or very poor condition with backlogs forecast to reduce from 14% to 7% over the next ten years · Critical backlogs will be prioritised · A small number of new or upgraded infrastructure projects would be supported including: o Upgrades to maximise the use of existing open space such as improved drainage, bushland walking paths, multi-purposing etc. o Accessibility improvements to infrastructure o Support towards traffic management and active transport initiatives o Stormwater harvesting and reuse · Council can provide some response to current community pressures as well as preparing for increasing population through small scale initiatives such as: o A holistic review of parking within the council area o Developing of master plans for key sites such as those close to Metro or on foreshore locations o Small programs that support accessibility, inclusion, and cohesion o Strategic planning projects responding to concerns such as affordable housing To achieve the desired outcomes of Option 3 - by the end of Year 3, this option will cost an additional \$148 over Option 2... Q2b. How supportive are you of Council proceeding with Option 1? Q2b. How supportive are you of Council proceeding with Option 1?</p>
---	------------	---

		<div>1 - Not at all supportive</div> <div>2 - Not very supportive</div> <div>3 - Somewhat supportive</div> <div>4 - Supportive</div> <div>5 - Very supportive</div>
--	--	---

<p>OLG 1.1 OLG 6.22 OLG 6.24 Preference - no option can be inferred.</p>	n/a	<p>Your latest edition of North Sydney News has prompted me to make contact with you. Firstly, regarding proposed rate increases (and I accept there is a need for this), how earnestly is Council pursuing private schools in the NSC catchment area to pay their fare share, or any share at all ? They should be forced to contribute and help lessen the load on business and residents who have been shouldering this burden.</p> <p>Secondly, I live at xxxxx St Cammeray, and while the speed humps in the stretch of road between West Street and Miller Street are, on paper, a good initiative, they have proved to be not just ineffective, but dangerous. As I exit from the ramp of our building's car park into Amherst St, either by car or on foot, I have repeatedly been close to being wiped out by a car swerving around the hump so that they don't have to reduce their speed or drive over the hump. I would suggest lengthening the line of the speed hump so that it no longer allows for risky driver behaviour. I invite you to stand with me for 10 minutes to observe the ineffective and dangerous nature of what should have been a positive initiative.</p>
<p>OLG 3.13 - option 1 OLG 6.22</p>	1	<p>I am in favour of keeping rates at their lowest which is option 1 - on your form. I am a home owning resident and I have stayed in the north sydney council area for over 30 years because the rates are reasonable for the services offered. I believe strongly the council should tax the schools a small amount before it asks faithful residents and business to pay more for its short comings. That the school children overtake our public spaces and their parents put wear and tear on our streets with drop off and pick up with no regard for resident quality of life is unacceptable. It's high time they contributed to ease the burden on residents.</p>
<p>OLG 4.14 OLG 2.6 Preference - no option can be inferred.</p>	n/a	<p>Please can you send me the full findings summary report for the Let's Talk research study you conducted earlier this year. I would like to see the answers to all the questions we were asked. Thanks</p> <p>1. The Rate survey was carefully written to encourage people to vote for a rate rise. For example, there were no questions which asked if we would like North Sydney Council to be run more efficiently and to stop spending money on things we don't need. 2. From what I can see only around 440 people completed the survey. This is not a surprise because the survey was not widely promoted. Most people did not know about it, again this would qualify as very poor community consultation. 3. I would like to know what % of North Sydney ratepayers completed the survey. 4. And therefore what % of North Sydney voters supported a rate rise and what % (including all those who did not complete the survey) did not vote for a rate increase. I think we would find that the number of people supporting a rate rise would not be statistically relevant, and certainly not a mandate.</p>
<p>OLG 3.12 OLG 1.4 OLG 3.11 OLG 4.15 OLG 2.8 Preference - assume option 1 based on sentiment</p>	1	<p>By way of introduction, xxxx is a Sydney-based real estate investment and development firm and the owner and manager of xxxx Street, North Sydney. We write in response to the current community consultation on the proposed Special Rate Variation (SRV) scenarios, which, if adopted, would significantly increase the average council rates charge for commercial premises by between 39.9% and 54.1% from FY26 to FY29.</p> <p>We wish to express our strong opposition to the proposal, both as owners/managers of xxx street, North Sydney and on behalf of our tenants, who are responsible for council rate charges in accordance with their lease obligations. Our concerns regarding the current council rates charge for business ratepayers within North Sydney remain unresolved, and the proposed SRV would exacerbate these existing inequities for the reasons set out below.</p> <p>Key Concerns and Impacts</p> <p>1. Impact on Tenants and Business Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commercial property in North Sydney has already suffered through the broader downturn in the commercial market post-COVID, with inflated vacancy rates due in part to the rise of remote work and increased competition from other economic centres. • Retail property has equally suffered, as reduced office attendance directly impacts sales and the viability of businesses,

		<p>limiting their capacity to absorb higher council rates.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed SRV will compound the issue of high occupancy costs, further impacting the competitiveness of North Sydney assets and our ability to retain and attract tenants. This concern was also highlighted by IPART, which found that Council “did not adequately consider the impact of its proposed rate rise on business ratepayers.” • The volatility and magnitude of the proposed increases will directly affect broader business decisions, including employment, investment, and operational expenditure, undermining Council’s vision for a diverse and vibrant local economy. • There is a shared vision among commercial landowners to drive economic development in North Sydney. Strategic steps to achieve this outcome should include addressing the competitiveness of council rates for business ratepayers. <p>2. Impact on Development and Investment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The feasibility of both new developments and the refurbishment of existing properties is already challenged by slowing demand, escalating construction costs, and tightening finance conditions. • The proposed SRV will significantly impact both future commercial development and the refurbishment of existing office stock, given the increased outgoings and volatility in council rate charges. • These impacts will directly counter the objectives of Council’s Economic Development Strategy to “revitalise and grow the North Sydney CBD as a high-amenity, top-tier office precinct” and “cultivate a diverse, connected, and resilient business environment.” • Reduced development activity and tenant attrition will have significant flow-on effects for the local economy, impeding job creation, business growth, and the overall revitalisation of the North Sydney CBD. <p>3. Ongoing Concerns from Prior SRV Application</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While the current SRV options are less material than the previous proposal, the increases remain significant and set a new baseline for council rates moving forward. • The inequity of the minimum rates charge is only partially addressed, and the existing high business rates in North Sydney remain a concern. • The consultation process, while improved, still lacks sufficient justification for further increases in the average council rates charge for business ratepayers, especially given that North Sydney’s average business rates already sit towards the higher end compared to comparable councils. • There remains a risk of future reforms, such as the introduction of a differential rating category for the North Sydney CBD, which could further compound the impact of the SRV. <p>Request for Consideration</p> <p>We urge Council to reconsider the proposed SRV and explore alternative strategies for addressing its financial challenges that do not disproportionately burden the business community. Should Council intend to proceed, we request an opportunity for an urgent meeting with the Mayor and CEO to discuss the impact on our property and tenant.</p> <p>Thank you for considering this submission. We trust Council will weigh the broader economic implications and the feedback from the business community carefully before deciding on this matter.</p>
<p>OLG 1.2 OLG 5.19 Preference - assume option 1 based on sentiment</p>	2	<p>I have not seen any evidence of cost management as an option. Could we not consider slightly reducing services - e.g. monthly not fortnightly green bin and council clean up collections? It might well be that the existing surplus plus Option Two rises is adequate for Option Three outcomes with some belt tightening. This 'line of thinking' is not shown as an option. I would like it to be please.</p>

OLG 6.22 Preference - no option can be inferred.	n/a	Private Schools should pay council rates. They report a considerable profit each year, pay their teachers and executives higher salaries than public schools. They should not be exempt as they are essentially a business.
OLG 1.4 OLG 3.10 OLG 5.17 OLG 5.20 Preference - assume option 1 based on sentiment	1	Why isn't the council proposing to sell some assets. ? You are expecting rate payers to contribute to much with Options 2 & 3. There is a cost of living crisis occurring. What will landlords do with rents to pass on the increased rates? Are you considering this. I think the council should bring in an outside consultant to investigate and streamline its running costs. I await your response on these matters.
OLG 6.21 Preference - assume option 1 based on sentiment	1	North Sydney Council has created a financial disaster for the rate payers of NS through a hugely mismanaged pool project. Rate payers should not now be required to bailout the council. Bite the bullet, admit the failure then sell the pool to recover the costs
OLG 6.23 OLG 5.18 Preference - assume option 1 based on sentiment	1	Stop wasting money on bicycle lanes, cut salaries of council employees and then ask us for more money.
OLG 5.18 OLG 3.10 OLG 5.17 OLG 4.15 Preference - assume option 1 based on sentiment	1	Thank you for the email While the General manager continues to receive over \$500,000 salary with all the add-ons and the executives receive salaries over \$300,000, there is no justification for the Council to ask the rate payers to tighten their belt. We have inflation soaring, cost of services including Council rates being major contributor to the last quarterly jump, and lots of family struggling, it would be immoral and unjustified to ask for any increase over the 4 % you received last year. The council with Mayor Baker is so out of touch with the community. You have just had one year without your 87% increase, you can manage another . Please cut back on your salary bill before you come back to ask rate payer again.
OLG 3.13 - option 3	3	I support Option 3
OLG 2.8 OLG 1.2 OLG 4.14 Preference - no option can be inferred	n/a	(30/10) On the Let's Talk Rates website there is a heading titled "What you will get for your money ?" There is Option 2 and then Option 3 (everything in option 2 plus...) - is this really correct for option 3 eg \$151 million and \$186 million to renew infrastructure ??? My calculations show option 3 raises a total extra \$278 million in rates over 10 years - can Council really propose to spend \$337 million (151 +186) on infrastructure ? So in summary, the table is wrong ! This website page Lets Talk Rates is very unhelpful. You only show options 2 and 3 - where is option 1 ? Option 1 is valid and should be shown as comparison. Again Council is assuming the rates variation will go through and ratepayers should be kept in the dark.Again I have to comment on the proposal. Under option 2 Council will spend \$151 million on infrastructure - where is a simple to read list of the projects ? Same for option 3 - \$186 million to be spent on what ?

<p>OLG 1.2 OLG 1.3 OLG 1.4 OLG 5.16 OLG 2.8 OLG 5.20 Preference - assume option 1 based on sentiment</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Dear North Sydney Council</p> <p>I'm writing to provide feedback on the proposed Special Rate Variation (SRV).</p> <p>After reviewing Council's own financial statements and the material presented to the community, the conclusion is clear: the scale and permanence of the SRV being proposed is not justified.</p> <p>1. Council's own financial results show that it is in strong health. In the 2025 Financial Year it achieved a \$15M surplus and in the 2024 Financial Year it achieved a \$13M surplus, as well as meeting all State Government financial benchmarks. These figures aren't those of a struggling council in financial distress. What these figures alone show is that Council's proposed SRV is not 'needs driven' and instead more about longer term ambitions.</p> <p>2. The proposal is for a permanent SRV without offering a temporary alternative. A permanent SRV locks in the increase forever. A temporary SRV (lasts typically 3–5 years) and allows accountability, review, and adjustment. The unanimous view of the Lavender Bay Precinct is for a temporary SRV only, at lower levels, with revised asset costings. Council's failure to include the option for a temporary SRV speaks volumes.</p> <p>3. Council has not exhausted alternative funding sources. It holds underperforming assets, among them the Ward Street car park as the most obvious example, and has property recycling options that could materially reduce the need for higher rates. Other councils pursue this approach. North Sydney has chosen not to, prioritising asset retention over residents' cost-of-living pressure.</p> <p>4. North Sydney Council claim that current rates are “low” isn't supported by State data. Government data shows North Sydney’s rates per capita are the second highest in Sydney and 27% higher than the metro average. The repeated narrative that we “pay less than neighbouring councils” is selective and misleading.</p> <p>5. Council has failed to collect the sum of \$2.5M owed by Transport for NSW For close to three years. This amount represents 3% of annual rate revenue. If Council can't collect funds clearly owed to it, ratepayers shouldn't be expected to bridge the gap. This is a governance issue, not a revenue issue.</p> <p>6. How Council has chosen to frame “Option 1” (no SRV) is manipulative. Council has presented Option 1 as “no facility upgrades, declining service levels, and deteriorating infrastructure.” This isn't an evidence-based projection. It's a purposely negatively worded pressure tactic. A council that has reported two consecutive surpluses can't credibly claim that choosing the base option will trigger service decline. This framing is designed to push residents into supporting the SRV rather than enabling a genuine choice. This tactic in itself is not consultation, it's outright manipulation.</p> <p>In conclusion, based on your own financial statements and the information presented, I see no justification for a large, permanent SRV.</p> <p>Residents should not be asked to fund inflated backlog estimates, uncollected revenue, or strategic decisions to retain underperforming assets while expanding Council’s long-term revenue base.</p> <p>I request that Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recalculate the infrastructure backlog using realistic renewal costs • Consider asset sales or recycling before increasing rates • Collect the outstanding \$2.5 million from Transport for NSW and • Present a temporary, lower-level SRV option for genuine consultation with ratepayers. <p>Until these steps are taken, a permanent SRV of the size proposed is not defensible.</p>
--	----------	--

<p>OLG 1.4 OLG 6.21 OLG 4.15 Preference - no option can be inferred</p>	n/a	<p>Questions from Precinct Members with verbal responses</p> <p>Q: Is NSC able to issue municipal bonds?</p> <p>A: No. Local Government is a creature of an Act of the State Government and there are strict guidelines as to how Councils can bring in revenue. Councils cannot issue bonds.</p> <p>Q: Could NSC sell the pool to a private operator?</p> <p>A: The reality is the revenue from the swimming pool would result in a price that would be very much less than the amount invested in the project. Swimming pools are not financially desirable investments.</p> <p>Q: Is there any push to get the Constitution changed to recognise Councils as a third tier of Government?</p> <p>A: Federal and NSW LGA associations campaigned for a referendum and got close, but The Voice was prioritised. Local Government has been trying to get a referendum on this since the seventies. To help address financial sustainability there is a campaign to bring back the Commonwealth Federal Assistance Grant to one percent of Federal revenue.</p> <p>Q: With the minimum rate amount, does that depend on the State Government as well?</p> <p>A: It depends on IPART. NSC does two concurrent applications: a rate variation and a change to the minimum rate. In the last SRV in May, IPART found that 2 out of the 3 criteria for the minimum rate were met. The third criterion was that IPART did not like and that was the timing.</p> <p>Q: Should developer contributions be paying for essential things like schools and hospital beds and sewerage?</p> <p>A: No they should be funded by the Health Budget and the Infrastructure Budget. Sydney Water is about to embark on a major upgrade of the sewer network from Crows Nest connecting in at Angus Park. NSC was previously able to use voluntary planning agreements which allowed Council to negotiate with a developer for the provision of public benefits such as contributions to open space or a childcare centre. However, the effectiveness of voluntary planning agreements has been totally undermined by the State Government and now the Council no longer has the negotiating position since the developers go directly to the State Government and ask for a rezoning.</p>
<p>OLG 3.13 - option 2 (based off sentiment 'modest increases')</p> <p>OLG 1.1</p>	2	<p>Thankyou for your attendance at the Parks Precinct November meeting last week.</p> <p>Your information and insights were greatly appreciated by all.</p> <p>For your information, (and hopefully encouragement), the extract below is copied from our July '25 meeting:</p> <p>There was extensive discussion on the implications of the Council's failure to secure its revenue base through the recent SRV application.</p> <p>Parks Precinct supports Council continuing to apply for modest SRV rate increases to provide resources for the community and ensure its financial independence.</p> <p>Moved GD, Seconded.SM. Passed unanimously</p>
<p>OLG 1.2 OLG 1.3 Preference - no option can be inferred</p>	n/a	<p>It was observed that other councils (e.g., including but not limited to Willoughby, Waverley, Parramatta, Mosman, Inner West, Hills Shire, Fairfield, Georges River, Burwood, City of Sydney) do not charge separate Environment or Infrastructure Levies (based on financial statements from FY24). In those LGAs, all rates relating to infrastructure and environment are included in ordinary rates. This is relevant when comparing rates across councils, as NSC's ordinary rates exclude costs that other LGAs include—meaning such comparisons are not necessarily like-for-like.</p> <p>Options 2 and 3 involve a permanent increase in rates above the NSW Government rate peg (known as special rate variations - SRV) that will escalate in perpetuity through the compounding effect via the application of the annual rate-peg or any future SRV.</p> <p>It was observed that there is no option put forward for a temporary and time-limited rate increase above the rate-peg to fund discrete projects (for example the proposed \$18M upgrade to corporate systems).</p>

<p>OLG 5.18 OLG 5.17 OLG 1.2 OLG 1.4 Preference - no option can be inferred</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>NSC effort to engage their community regarding identified concerns is appreciated as are their decisions to engage in-house staff instead of contract staff and the implementation of some natural systems in the area. Efforts to review and streamline processes are also commended. In the broader environment the recent high interest rates have severely impacted NSC & anyone with debt. There is a salutary but necessary lesson to learn here - the debtor is the servant of the lender. The employment outlook by many professionals is not favourable should governments and the population continue to choose and replace jobs with technology. NSC residential rates have increased by over 30% in the last five years and the 'average residential rate' figure quoted in the recent Survey appears to be on the low side. 1B NSC: Current situation is an opportunity to reflect on:</p> <p>a. The cause(s) leading up to the current situation - what bad decisions lead here? b. Big picture - what issues arose? What direction for NSC? What are the consequences? c. Understand what the consequences of uptake of a technological centric with heavy energy reliance system without human input will actually have on resources, employment, lifestyle, comfort etc. What impact has technology already had on the youth of today - ability to operate independently, emotional health, manual skills, understanding of the created world, ability to critically think, reference and research outside the technological framework? d. Explore a radical(?) new approach to local governance (ie opt out of the current global local governance trajectory, look at systems that are still working after hundreds of years. What other lessons can NSC glean from their current scenario? Whilst comparatively small savings from paperless transactions may provide financial benefits for providers, many people still require paper copies for record keeping. As a result, instead of a suburb having a few printers for public useage and paper documents issued by a couple of computers across departments, now most homes have to own a home printer. This creates an environmentally negative circle. Mobile phones too - instead of having one telephone in a household of six people over 30 year period, now that same household would have six mobile telephones (one for each person at least) & they are usually changed every 3-5 years to keep up with changing technology. So in a 30 year period it is likely that a six person family would own 36 to 60 mobile phones (and paid for the monthly usage of same) instead of one landline - an increasing financial burden on all. Note: The negative social impact & higher risk of these changes in behaviours (of fraud, theft and abuse etc) is not included here. All these factors, and others should be in NSC thinking when making decisions at the local community level. Indeed, NSC & across the world, society is at cross roads of critical decision making - so the choices we make today should reflect that. External Reality Impacts NSC and its Community All technological partners and major institutional investors are collaborative members of one international business group. According to a paper by Andrew Leigh, as Shadow Treasurer, the same group of businesses and institutional investors also own the majority of Australia's other sectors including food, utility, finance, transportation, communications etc. So how can a nation retain it's sovereignty, democracy, prosperity and higher standard of living in that scenario? Of particular concern is the transition of government administration services to privately-owned international companies which is exposing Australians to high risk and reduced Australian jobs resulting in less public money for spending and spiralling lower cost of living. Internationally the two top Web Servers 1. Google 89.7% global market share (Major shareholders of Google (Alphabet Inc.) are co-founders Larry Page and Sergey Brin, with institutional investors like Vanguard Group and BlackRock also holding significant stakes) 2. Microsoft Bing 3.97% global market share (Major shareholders are also the American and British institutional investors) Internationally the three top cloud platforms are mostly privately owned 1. AWS Amazon web services 33% global market share (90% of AWS is owned, a private individual, American Jeff Bezos) 2. Microsoft Azure 23% global market share (Major shareholders are a private individual Bill Gates, together with Canadian and American Institutional investors) 3. Google 13% global market share (Major shareholders of Google (Alphabet Inc.) are co-founders Larry Page and Sergey Brin, with institutional investors like Vanguard Group and BlackRock also holding significant stakes) Cognosant of these facts, NSC is in an ideal position to identify alternative opportunities, make decisions that move towards greater uptake of real sustainable systems with greater local resilliance and policies based on uptake and promulgation of proven nature based systems. Examples of English large country houses, French Chateaux and European medieval villages and towns who have maintained their effective urban planning of the past five hundred years or so, whilst also</p>
---	------------	--

		<p>incorporating the best of modern thought such as passive house principles etc. Perceived Residents Risk in the Future • Water, Food and Energy security • Technological risks & loss of self-determination and the real ability to govern at local level • Solar panel, electrical and eWaste waste management • Declining employment if technological adaptation continues and the inability to finance current lifestyles & choices. AI, robots etc don't pay taxes or spend in the local economy! Additional Revenue Streams? • Council assets could be used to create additional revenue incomes for NSC and individuals eg local mushroom farm, bee hives, egg/poultry, mini goats (milk, cheese, meat - perhaps partnership with schools too?) local farm (small scale - like at Coal Loader), sale of animal manures to local residents. These would benefit sustainability goals too in reducing food miles, green house gases etc. • Grey water recycling into black water systems (reduce costs etc) • Local rain water collection and utilisation (reduce costs etc) • Biomass energy to provide alternative to non Australian owned energy companies which would reduce demands on the national energy system also. Alternative Rate Funding Model? Offer Option 1 to Concession Holders and Seniors with other rate holders to pay option 2. 3B and 2C NSC Priorities 1. Clear all debt. Whilst in the short term, the borrowed money (potentially) enables NSC to complete the NSW renovations, in the long run, prioritising clear the debt and putting aside funds to complete the NS pool renovations would prove more cost effective and reduce risk of exposing NSC to potential unpredictable market fluctuations in the cost of borrowing. 2. Determine course of the future Whilst more labour intensive and slower to establish, natural systems have proven to be continually effective for hundreds of years - think English and European medieval towns. If implemented appropriately, they have positive and beneficial impact on the natural environment. 3. Work Towards Creating Sustainable Independent Environment Shifting away from existing national and international dependencies for utilities and food etc. NSC financial Independence away from rates revenue and create other income streams.</p>
--	--	---

<p>OLG 5.16 OLG 5.18 OLG 6.25 OLG 5.17 Preference - assume option 1 based on sentiment</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>I am replying to the most recent correspondence from the Mayor re rate increase options.</p> <p>The letter states that the people responsible for the financial mismanagement of the pool project (biggest budget blow out \$63M - \$91M) are no longer in situ. I checked. Here are elected members to Council in Sept 2017 and currently elected members:</p> <p>2107 Elected Council Members: The Mayor, Jilly Gibson, in the Chair, and Councillors Baker, Barbour, Beregi, Brodie, Carr, Drummond, Gunning, Keen and Mutton</p> <p>Current Elected members: Zoe Baker, MaryAnn Beregi, NicoleAntonini, Efi Carr, Chris Holding, Angus Hoy, Jessica Keen, Godfrey Santer, James Spenceley, Shannon Welch</p> <p>As you can see most of the members on council in 2017 when the pool upgrade was decided continue to serve on the Council. Mention was made of various Committee's set up within Council to prevent further mismanagement - no guarantees. Nonetheless, The Council members have the overriding responsibility to make sure all expenditure is managed within budget. The buck stops there otherwise why pay the Mayor \$90K pa and all other Councillors \$30K pa plus benefits whilst overseeing a 50% hike in the cost of the pool upgrade.</p> <p>I now draw your attention to the North Sydney Sun article of 19 November 2025 which states that the 10 councillors have increased their expense by 222% over last year's expenses. Including taking a salary increase of 3%.</p> <p>So we are being asked to find money to pay for Council financial mismanagement whilst in the same breath the Councillors vote to accept a pay rise and benefits. This is preposterous. If I am expected to bear an increase in rates because of Council mismanagement/incompetence, then I expected a quid pro quo reduction in salary and expenses from the Councillors and down. That's the way normal business and households operate. If we overspend somewhere then we have to tighten our belts elsewhere. That's what I expect from Council.</p> <p>I have written before where that I am of the firm beliefs that all the current members on the previous council (most of you) who ran in 2024, knew before the election but did not advise the community that Council finances were in dire straits. Why - to protect self-interest ie your positions and cushy benefits. I believe that North Sydney Council should be put into administration and have a competent outside unbiased party installed until Council structure and budget is brought back into alignment.</p>
--	----------	--

<p>OLG 1.2 OLG 1.4 OLG 1.3 OLG 2.8 OLG 5.16 OLG 5.20 Preference - assume option 1 based on sentiment</p>	1	<p>I'm writing to provide feedback on the proposed Special Rate Variation (SRV). After reviewing Council's own financial statements and the material presented to the community, the conclusion is clear: the scale and permanence of the SRV being proposed is not justified. 1. Council's own financial results show that it is in strong health. In the 2025 Financial Year it achieved a \$15M surplus and in the 2024 Financial Year it achieved a \$13M surplus, as well as meeting all State Government financial benchmarks. These figures aren't those of a struggling council in financial distress. What these figures alone show is that Council's proposed SRV is not 'needs driven' and instead more about longer term ambitions. 2. The proposal is for a permanent SRV without offering a temporary alternative. A permanent SRV locks in the increase forever. A temporary SRV (lasts typically 3–5 years) and allows accountability, review, and adjustment. The unanimous view of the Lavender Bay Precinct is for a temporary SRV only, at lower levels, with revised asset costings. Council's failure to include the option for a temporary SRV speaks volumes. 3. Council has not exhausted alternative funding sources. It holds underperforming assets, among them the Ward Street car park as the most obvious example, and has property recycling options that could materially reduce the need for higher rates. Other councils pursue this approach. North Sydney has chosen not to, prioritising asset retention over residents' cost-of-living pressure. 4. North Sydney Council claim that current rates are “low” isn't supported by State data. Government data shows North Sydney's rates per capita are the second highest in Sydney and 27% higher than the metro average. The repeated narrative that we “pay less than neighbouring councils” is selective and misleading. 5. Council has failed to collect the sum of \$2.5M owed by Transport for NSW for close to three years. This amount represents 3% of annual rate revenue. If Council can't collect funds clearly owed to it, ratepayers shouldn't be expected to bridge the gap. This is a governance issue, not a revenue issue. 6. How Council has chosen to frame “Option 1” (no SRV) is manipulative. Council has presented Option 1 as “no facility upgrades, declining service levels, and deteriorating infrastructure.” This isn't an evidence-based projection. It's a purposely negativelyworded pressure tactic. A council that has reported two consecutive surpluses can't credibly claim that choosing the base option will trigger service decline. This framing is designed to push residents into supporting the SRV rather than enabling a genuine choice. This tactic in itself is not consultation, it's outright manipulation. In conclusion, based on your own financial statements and the information presented, I see no justification for a large, permanent SRV. Residents should not be asked to fund inflated backlog estimates, uncollected revenue, or strategic decisions to retain underperforming assets while expanding Council's long-term revenue base. I request that Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recalculate the infrastructure backlog using realistic renewal costs • Consider asset sales or recycling before increasing rates • Collect the outstanding \$2.5 million from Transport for NSW and • Present a temporary, lower-level SRV option for genuine consultation with ratepayers. <p>Until these steps are taken, a permanent SRV of the size proposed is not defensible</p>
<p>OLG 3.13 Preference - option 2</p>	2	<p>We wish to advise that we agree a rate increase is necessary for the NSC LGA and our preference is for OPTION 2.</p>
<p>OLG 3.12 Fairer rates Preference - no option can be inferred</p>	n/a	<p>The greatest anomaly in the rates payments is the tiny rates on the 75% of ratepayers who are on the minimum rate, many of them in multi-million dollar dwellings. This should be increases substantially.</p>

<p>OLG 3.13 Preference - option 1 OLG 3.10 Cost of living OLG 3.11 Business OLG 1 Alternatives OLG 1.4 OLG 5.20 OLG 5.16</p>	1	<p>I just missed the deadline for closure of the consultation, but wanted to have my say anyway. As a homeowner in North Sydney, I object to the council's proposal to increase rates at all, but if they must be increased I support Option 1 (increase limited to rate peg), for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We're in a cost of living crisis and increasing rates will materially worsen the situation for many households • North Sydney hosts a large number of offices of large corporations that are in a far better position to afford increased rates • The Council has not exhausted all other possibilities, such as levying large corporations, seeking relief from State/Federal Government, or selling assets • Households are not morally responsible for the Council's financial mismanagement
<p>OLG 3.13 Preference - option 3 OLG 1.3 Temp/Perm OLG 4.15 IPART</p>	3	<p>Hello Sorry I'm late with this submission. Thanks to Council for coming back to residents with more moderate proposal options compared to the earlier more extreme option. I'm OK with option 3. My view is that for every cost there is a benefit and in this case the benefits seem worthwhile. My first question is what happens after 2029? Do levies revert back to previous levels? My second question is what is the process for making the decision about the best option? Will IPART be involved again? Will Council just go with the option preferred by the community or will it exercise some discretion? Thanks again. Good luck with your admiral goal of improving services and facilites under a difficult financial situation. Sincerely</p>
<p>OLG 3.13 Preference - option 1</p>	1	<p>There were 3 proposals for rates raises. I vote for option number 1 and ask that this option be supported by council.</p>
<p>OLG 2.7 Timings OLG 3.13 Preference - option 3 OLG 1.1 Position OLG 6.21 Pool</p>	3	<p>I received a copy of the Spring/Summer edition of North Sydney News in my mailbox today which, on the front page, invited me to have my say on the SRV along with a QR code to assist me in doing that. I was very keen to do this but found that submissions have closed a week before I received the notice. This seems emblematic of North Sydney's well meaning but fault ridden approach to administration.</p> <p>For the record, I'm a supporter of Option 3. We can't expect good service provision without Council having a secure financial position. Having said that, I've been a resident long enough to remember when Council was very efficiently run and could manage an excellent service portfolio with very low rates.</p> <p>I'm well aware of how Council's position was wrecked by the Pool project and, while there's nothing we can do about that now, I'm very disappointed that there's been almost no attempt to assign responsibility where it belongs. I'm also aware that you were not a supporter of the project but a majority of Councillors, at that time, were. Given the dire consequences for the entire municipality, they should be specifically named and called upon to explain their actions.</p>
<p>OLG 2.7 Timings OLG 6.21 Pool Preference - no option can be inferred</p>	n/a	<p>Yesterday Friday 5 December we received in our mailbox the North Sydney News My Cremorne Road neighbours report receiving their News yesterday too Page 1 of the News "Have Your Say" announces consultation about the proposed rate options closes on 3 December, that's 2 days prior to receiving your message saying "please, participate in the consultation". Surely Council can organise matters better than this, or like the pool, may be not.</p> <p>Sincerely</p>

<p>OLG 2.7 Timings OLG 6.21 Pool OLG 4.15 IPART OLG 6.24 Local issues Preference - assume option 1 based on sentiment</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Very Dear (aka expensive) Drongos, No you don't want to hear from me, however..... Of course delivered on Dec 11 with a deadline of Dec 3 in you 'newsletter'. As a ratepayer for near 4 decades, I don't want a 'strong future' as defined by what is close to what is now the most incompetent, arrogant and apparently dishonest council in the country. (Somewhat an achievement.) No I most certainly do not want "Strong civic engagement" as defined by yourselves and I irrefutably do not want to pay for your thought bubbles. it. Like most residents I chose my friends and the last on the list would be lower less literate lifeforms like lawyers (a low bar), let alone 'para legals' and those chosen by such people. Lets turn to specifics. I noted the boast that the \$120 million pool fiasco included the 'largest gymnasium in the southerner hemisphere" Who responsible and by what process was this made as a ratepayer liability? Oh ratepayers don't get to ask questions or get answers (this side of a court action). While there maybe some itinerant CBD office workers who desire access to a gym, there are already such facilities in the CBD owned and operated by those who are ratepayers. The probability of such folks trekking to the pool? About zero. The probability of ratepayers trekking to such a facility, costing millions of dollars given the required excavation? Irrefutably zero. I assume that the treat of contempt will be required to extract an answer. One could list a near never ending projects which provide no benefit to the ratepayers. Even the insane paving of Arthur St foot path, creating dangerous traffic situations. Not that anyone in council cares, just another (PC?) thought bubble. Pre reference to IPART which objectively determined that the outrageous demand to increase rates by 85% to cover up the council's incompetence and avoid transparency and accountability, I received a sensible suggestion. Organise a civil class action based on 'maleficence in public office'. Of course that would also be followed by damage recovery of the order of say \$100 million. Looks like a good idea to me. Could be fun. Want to try to raise rates by ~50%? Make my day.</p>
---	----------	--

<p>OLG 3.13 Preference - option 3 x 21 & option 2 x 10 meeting attendees OLG 6.21 Pool OLG 4.15 IPART</p>	<p>2 = 10 3 = 21</p>	<p>At the Wollstonecraft Precinct meeting on 10 December 2025, a vote was conducted on the three options put forward by North Sydney Council for a Special Rate Variation application for the three years 2026/27, 2027/28 and 2028/29.</p> <p>Options were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do nothing: Deteriorating infrastructure: Minimum rates would be subject to a rate peg decided by the NSW government. 2. Treading Water: Restore renewal funding and address critical backlogs. 3. Eye to the Future: Enhanced contribution to infrastructure investment and planning. <p>Questions from the meeting:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has Council addressed the issues raised by iPart when it rejected Council's application last year 2. Has Council also satisfied itself that all of the known costs arising from the contracts from the construction and design of the North Sydney Olympic Pool have been properly assessed and that the final cost will not exceed @122 million <p>Answers to those questions were addressed and answered by Mayor Zoe Baker.</p> <p>The Options were put to the meeting with the results being calculated by a show of hands and a formal record of attendees registered at the door:</p> <p>Total attendees: 37 Non-owners: 1 Councillors: 3 Abstain: 2 Option 1: 0 Option 2: 10 Option 3: 21</p>
---	--------------------------	--