

LG Submission Form 2021-2022 - notifications

Submission date: **12 February 2021, 8:45PM**
Receipt number: **4198**
Related form version: **3**

IPART Special Variation Submission Form

Industry	Local Government
Review	(LG) Special Variations & Minimum Rates 2021-2022
Document Reference	
Council	Canterbury-Bankstown Council, Application Notification Letter

Please leave your comments in the comment box below.

Attached is an email sent to CBCity Council on 27 December 2020 about the rate proposal. This was sent by email – we received a proforma email response – nothing to address our concern. The report to Council does not address these questions.

Before any rate increase should be considered, this council should be looking at quantifiable efficiencies. At the time of writing our email (27 December 2020) the council did not have a copy of their financial statements on their website making it impossible to evaluate the financial position of the council. The report to council does not give the opposing view of no increase in rates vs the hamonisation of rates. (04 February 2021).

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the OneRate suggestion being presented.

I look forward to your acknowledgement of this feedback and any written response.

One Rate – Council information provided/ comments / questions:

- a. There is a general lack of information provided in the letter. The OneRateSystem information assumes a level of financial literacy.
- b. Assumption that all people can access websites to be able to review the information provided.
- c. Not everyone wants to speak with an employee
- d. Full set of the Financial Statements NOT on the website (27 December). Only limited information available :

<https://haveyoursay.cbcity.nsw.gov.au/annual-financial-statements-20192020>

- e. There is no comment about the fact that the State Government did provide assistance to all amalgamated Councils. How much was that?
- f. How has the amalgamated council demonstrated how this money was utilised with the rationalisation of quantifiable efficiencies.
- g. Was there a major restructure of the Management structure (i.e. number of directors, rationalisation of managers) or has it been Business as Usual?
- h. Things like improved town centres, cleaning streets, parks and waterways, improving aquatic facilities and creating more recreational and family friendly spaces.”

Didn't the Council just close down an aquatic facility. These are generalisations.

How does this statement demonstrate that it will assist in an improved Building and Infrastructure Renewals Ratio.

<https://haveyoursay.cbcity.nsw.gov.au/annual-financial-statements-20192020> states that the ratio is 46.80% : 100% minimum requirement.

**** Note this is an unaudited statement. ****

- i. What timeframe has been included in the Asset Management Plans to improve the Building and Infrastructure Renewals Ratio?**
- j. What is the current Infrastructure Backlog Ratio?**
- k. What other options has the Council considered if IPART rejects this application.**
- l. How much forward planning has occurred to utilise the additional \$40M. How much of this funding will be in additional employee costs? (on-going fixed costs).**
- m. Utilisation of and collection of Section 7.11 contributions – there has been major developments in the LGA – and therefore there must be contributions to accompany these developments. The LEP should indicate how they are being utilised – why not prioritise these works?**
- n. Why is the document silent on the harmonisation of the Annual Charges between the two Councils? I understand your comment in the documentation about these not being included in the SRV – however when will Council harmonise these charges?**
- o. Other councils who have been successful in achieving an approval from IPART, have had to show demonstrated / quantifiable Efficiency Dividends - imposed by IPART for a period of up to 10 years. This document is silent on this possibility.**
- p. The harmonisation has been known since amalgamation has occurred. Why has this not been communicated by the council over the past 4 years?**

General Comments and Observations

- 1. Council has not rationalised accommodation. The website shows 2 places of operation. There would be instant harvestable savings with one place of operation. There has been 4 years at least to review and to make this decision.**
- 2. The hours of operations : Your website indicates**

that the hours of operation for forward facing staff is 9am – 4pm. Other council timings which are more appealing to the ratepayer. i.e.8.30am – 4.30pm (as a minimum)

3. Pensioner – Voluntary Rebate How are you assisting the aging population. The State Government provides a rebate – not a voluntary rebate as provided by other Councils.

4. Ability to address financial hardship if this increase is applied? Current maximum interest rate approved by the Court on outstanding rates and annual charges is 7%p.a.

Closing comment

As information is missing from the website it is not possible to analyse the Cash, Cash Equivalents and Investments. – including the Externally and Internally Restricted Assets.

It appears that the rationalisation of rates is being used as an excuse to increase rates (with the known harmonisation applied as part of the amalgamation rules) – rather than improving management practices.

If you have attachments you would like to include with your feedback, please attach them below.

Your Details

Are you an individual or organisation?

Individual

If you would like your submission or your name to remain confidential please indicate below.

Anonymous - my submission can be published but my name should remain anonymous

First Name

Last Name

Organisation Name

Position

Email



IPART's Submission Policy

I have read & accept IPART's Submission Policy