First Name Last Name	If you have any general feedback regarding your council's proposed SV, please leave your comments in the comment box below.	Your comments on Criterion 1:	Your comments on Criterion 2:	Your comments on Criterion 3:	Your comments on Criterion 4:	Your comments on Criterion 5: 2 city's, 2 rates. Simple.
						Managing the balance is Councils role.
	This extremely high increase is unacceptable. Why should Canterbury Residents be impacted as a result of the					The forced amalgamation shouldn't be at the rate payers expense; especially if the
1 Luke Meehan	forced amalgamation with Bankstown. The constituents in the demographic are typical working class who can Ill afford this gross increase. Maybe the Council should look internally before stinging it's rate payers!	I don't dispute the need/desire for increased revenue! Find other ways to cost cut and/or find alter means to reduce overheads.	2 mail distributions is hardly a wide community campaign. Considering the financial impact this will have in families already struggling.	Over 36.34% is hardly reasonable.	Just because due process has been followed, doesn't make it right.	former Bankstown Council had greater running expenses. Which are now being passed on across the Canterbury Bankstown LGA.
2 Anonymous   Anonymous	I understand council had a minimum of 5 years before a rates increase and I believed it was fair. Sadly, the last year dealing with Council has me concerned where our rates are being used. I've sent in a request relating to parking issues which I never received a response - emailed the Mayor and Councillors of Roselands ward and did not receive a response from anyone. I sent a follow up and by them I took months for it to be sent to the traffic committee for consultation which could've probably been approved at the 5 previous committees held. Tree trimming request was sent in November 2020 and I again sent a follow up, 1 week ago I received a response but yet, the tree has not been trimmed. Illegal building was sent early January and received a response but was passed onto the correct department for further investigation. Thorough investigations need to be done for all on what our rates are actually being used for besides speed humps and roundabouts. I have not received any letters recently regarding the rates. Very appalling i reside in the council of bankstown, recently i have found out that the council of bankstown/canterbury has decided to raise our rates from a normal and understandable 2% hike to a 36% hike, we have been gathering with fellow neighbour's and we all agree that this like is very helfly and already with covid and lack of work, we are barely				If you allow such variations and powers to this council they will abuse it like they do everything else they can secure money from, its common sence if you allow someone who has the right to pull money out for whatever reason however	
	making ends meat and paying our bills and looking after and providing for our children and families, this rate is uncalled for, its nothing more then the means to fit the council members pockets, they are making more then enough money on the thousands upon thousands of units duplexes and granny flats they allowed into our communities, this hike is not justified,	The council already has enough revenue and income comming in, there boundaries or district was not affected so much in a negative but a positive, they have allowed developments all across the district for thousands upon thousands of unit duplexes town houses and granny flats enough homes to tax there rates on each one, they have parking officers, rangers everywhere according to my friend who is a ranger they are making enormous amount of money from fining people, I have worked for this council for years they have always been all to deal with one of the hardest to work for		new young family man father and husband, im barely making ends meat		Let them re evaluate there expenditure management plans and work accordingly, I earn x amount from my employer I dont say to him oh my council rate has gone up so you
	roads and paths have been there for yrs upon yrs.  Please help us and put a stop to this greed filled act by this council, we would appricate it please help	and deal with any sort of problem, it takes them mnths to agree to if not yrs to get anything out of them, i have been driving on miller rid christinar of waldron rid for over a decade and the same pot holes have been on the same place for that long, they don't fix things just put a <u>bandade over it</u> , which im not to concerned about becuase we just dont make to	by sheer chance when i spoke to other residents in my area they had no idea i	she can take the kids to school and back and her upkeeps for the home and work, I have been walking or being picked up to work and back, due to the lack of money and these scavengers at the councils saying we want	pay for it then be forced to sell, and with such a high rate our houses prices will fall due to lack of people who will want to pay such rates, when I purchased this house i was under the impression of the current rate, no one has ever heard of such hikes in rate to ever really impact a persons livelyhood so much to scare or	have to pay me more, i have to manage my expenses, we are already in as minimum as we can be any more we will go without eating, they get ripped by contracters for small jobs they get charged 10 times the amount just becuase there council people think hey they got money will get it they dont ask for other goutes and from what I have
	us, i have already spoken to the office of Tania Mihailuk, and they have tried to re assure me that they are trying there best to help us but they also asked me to inform you of this matter and in hoping that you be beside us and	a pay rise, there to concerned about on how they can fill more money in there backpockets then to care about the	classed as one of the richest councils if they are mismanaging our money thats	they is no evidence that they need it or will do anything good or benifitial	deter them into going into such an extreme debt and risk, but had i know this is a chance of a possibility that a council can so blatantly and obnoxiously state we	heard from others in those industried they hire
3 Anonymous Anonymous	her to help us regain some comfort and reassurance that this council cannot just do as they please like they have been for yrs, im against this so is allot of people in my neighbourhood, we have all been stressing about this,	people who reside in there district to help them, instead of showing morality and compassion they show us how sellfish and illogical and immoral they are by requesting such a hike, we will not pay more then the usual 2% not a cent more,		with it other then give them selves a pay rise and buy an amg or a range rover, like auburn council did before, there is no difference	want 36% i would have thought twice about comming to this district, and stayed well away from it, you cant allow this to go ahead	
4 Anonymous Anonymous	The Council have mis used funds for years. Littler collection, street sweeping, playground renovations and shades are non existent. The parks are barely maintained. As a resident I have to call the Council once a week to get the public bins emptied because they are always overflowing. I have constantly asked for a review for more bins and spoken to the Mayor about the lack of servicing our community receives but I was left with an inadequate reply with no intention for discussion. There have been two major works completed in the Picnic Point area -stabilisation of the riverbank and the clearing of the lagoon over the past 2 years. Both these projects were obviously completed with the cheapest contractor, who completed and who would have been paid. Then both projects absolutely failed within the first 6 months. For the council to then employ another contractor to do the whole job again at the expense to rate payers. The Council is mismanaged and spends money on the wrong things or double pays on those two occasions only to be left with little funding to provide basic services. A rate increase is not acceptable in this poor excuse for a Council area. They need to be looking at a restructure and community engagement to ensure our rates go to where we need it.	They should show where the money was spent over the last two years to justify an increase.  If they have double paid for community projects this is not acceptable. Also not to increase their wages or hire more staf as this was a merger and there was plenty of staff.	We do not need a rate rise as the Council has and will again mismanage all funds it receives	The area has many apartments, units and duplexes. Council has not only allowed big developments to happen they have completely over developed neighbourhoods where the infrastructure can not handle it eg. schools, parking. This is to get more fees in their pocket, the community is very multicultural with a lot of people struggling to keep a job. A rate increase will cause a lot of stress to these people.		
	really going to hurt many households and families on a low income including myself.  Besides that, they have already gone up above the 2% and the ser he s the council provides has never been so	This council is the worst - lazy who are just after more revenue to line their pockets. There is no reason to increase rates	Unaware - the only place I have seen this is through social media posted by residents. There has been no communication about this to residents. Residents	It is very unreasonable on residents. As I said, this is a low SES area so a		
5 Maysoon Elahmad	bad!	by such a significant amount after it has already gone up more than 2% in the last 12 months.	are very unaware this is happening !	30% increase is really going to hurt many households.		
6 Anonymous Anonymous	It's hard enough keeping on top of expenses now and with only one income we won't survive an increase like they are proposing. We weren't supposed to get an increase when they merged but we did! When I questioned it I was told it goes on land value but funnily enough our last valuation went down by \$100,000 But our rates stayed the same. This is a rip off. Someone is not managing their finances properly. And rate payers shouldn't be punished	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential
7 Lee Ellyard 8 Sam Sa	for the council's incompetence Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential
	I don't agree with the rate increase, especially a 33% rate increase or one off lump sums throughout the year, I'm not sure how such an extreme rate rise can be justified!!! As a low income household, i am already struggling to pul food on the table, there is no way I would be able to afford this!!	I'm curious to know how the funds are being spent and by whom at the council!!! this is super suspicious to me, I'm starting to lose confidence in my council for mismanagment of council rate funds.	no such evidence has been communicated to me!!! and even still it just can't be justified, i cant afford it!!	this is not reasonable at all!!!! its pretty unfair!!	as above	as above
10 Brian Appeldoorn 11 Annette Cairns 12 Riula Mubayyid	Council is changing their minimum rates, with the largest increase being to the lowest value ratepayers. As an example, my property has a rateable value of \$309,000 and the Council component of my rates will change from \$64.05 to \$724.18, being \$12.81 as the Rate Peg, and \$74.82 Additional Rate from the SV. That is 85% of the increase, or an increase of 11.7% (74.82/640,55)! Alternatively, if I was one of the lucky rich ratepayers with a rateable value of \$3.090,000, the Council component of my rates will change from \$6.405.54 to \$6.410.18. This additional \$4.64 is made up of a rate peg of \$128.11 and a very generous DISCOUNT of \$123.47! and is summary. Canterbury Barkstown Council is proposing to give massive discounts to large ratepayers and is sugging poorer ratepayers. The whole purpose of rating is to rate in an equitable manner, what Canterbury Barkstown Council is proposing is far from equitable. Been living in this area for over 30 years and it is unreasonable for this increase no new infrastructure in my area it is a case of money mismanagement and I am opposed to this increase. If u can't balance books probably resign!!!! . Rethink a lot of grand projects that are not necessary. This council will not be voted		Council has clearly stated that the purpose for change is NOT to increase revenue but to harmonise rates across the new LGA.  Therefore, there is no need for this criteria to be answered.  Have heard nothing from my local council  Confidential	Council's proposed changes are NOT reasonable. As can be seen from the examples given below (source: Council's rates calculator: https://form.jofform.com/20350834454049. Council is not being reasonable in their approach. They are significantly increasing the rates of owners with lower rateable values, whilst at the same time providing those with large rateable values with very large discounts! Council is changing their minimum rates, with the largest increase being to the lowest value ratepayers.  As an example, my property has a rateable value of \$309,000 and the Council component of my rates will change from \$640.55 to \$728.18, being \$12.61 as the Rate Peg. and \$74.62 &40tional Rate from the SV. That is \$5% of the increase, or an increase of 11.7% (74.82/64.055)! Alternatively, if vas one of the lucky in rhat payers with a rateable value of \$3,090.000, the Council component of my rates will change from \$6,405.54 to \$6,410.18. This additional \$4.64 is made up of a rate peg of \$128.11 and a very generous DISCOUNT of \$123.47! in summary, Carletbury Bankstown Council is proposing to give massive discounts to large ratepayers and is slugging poorer ratepayers. The whole purpose of rating is to rate in an equitable manner, what Canterbury Bankstown Council is proposing is far from equitable.  It is purely to top up their mismanagement of funds Confidential		Show me all the improvements in my local area please Confidential
13 Deb Simpson	books probably resign!!!. Rethink a lot of grand projects that are not necessary. This council will not be voted in next elections it's a disgrace to propose such an increase.  D.simpson					
14 Anonymous Anonymous  15 Anonymous Anonymous	30% increase is not justifiable, even over a couple of years. This is at a time of hardship with covid where people and businesses are suffering. This is an outrage! This increase is extreme, in a time when most of us have either reduced work hours therefore less income or some totally losing their jobs. The increase that this council is going to do over the next five years is severely going to hurt the ratepayers, services do not improve when we have had an increase previously and to be to by council saying it's due to a merge that's an absolute lie. With so many other things already increasing or about to increase I know not only will my family struggle to feed, cloth and keep a roof over our heads Absolutely wrong. Already pay close to \$500 a quarter at a time when jobs and money is tight and not seeing much in the way of much needed repairs and replacement to current infrastructure. Instead money wasted on for eg: installing ridiculous exarger condabouts then repairs to same roundabouts when repopel hit them.	As above  In certain areas of this council there has been big improvements in outdoor spaces, playgrounds or swimming pools.  No new parks have been added in the southern area, no new or updated play equipment in existing playgrounds, Birrong pool has a huge inflatable play area for kids yet Revesby pool which has lots of land is still untouched or updated the local kids dot get the same as those over Birrong way, council flavours that area in many ways	As above  This increase has not been really looked at by council the big increase has not worried council as to how households will afford it	They have not considered the financial impact at all on local residents  This increase needs to be lower	As above	As above  Improvements are little in the padstow Revesby milperra Panania and picnic point area  Council are allowing duplex homes without looking at the impact of parking and on their  own community contact us page there is no section for complaints or feedback plus  sometimes to lodge something on their contact us page it takes over an hour, I  personally gave up after 90 minutes trying to report an abandoned car due to a poorly  run webpage
16 Anonymous Anonymous		Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential
17 Anonymous Anonymous  18 Anonymous Anonymous	Conflidential  Absolutely against this proposal. The wrong time to implement when so many people are suffering financially.	Confidential  This rate rise will not serve this purpose.	Confidential  The proposal is unfair and too expensive for working class suburbs.	Confidential  An extremely unreasonable request, implemented too quickly when inflation is at an all time high and wages have never been lower.	Confidential	Confidential  No cost containment has been articulated. No other options have been given.
19 Anonymous Anonymous	Confidential Rates should only be CPI not anything higher especially in these times.	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	No dist containment has been articulated. No other opitions have been given.  Confidential
20 Anonymous Anonymous	And in our area.	Instead of wasting money changing signs they should not put up rates	Percentage is too high should be CPI	Too high especially for pensioners. And those self funded who have been hit by less income during these times	No rate rise	Have not heard what they intend to spend extra money on?
21 Anonymous Anonymous	Confidential  1. One of the justifications for the forced council amalgamations between Canterbury and Bankstown in 2016 was that it would deliver financial efficiencies. Recent media reports and parliamentary estimates hearings have shown that the State Government has mishandled the Strong Communities Fund which aimed to support forcibly amalgamated councils. It appears that this money has flowed to councils in Coalition seats. But why should the ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Why isn't Council putting pressure on Government to provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund?  2. Inner West Council (IWC) is going through the same harmonisation process, but has not proposed an SRV (special rate variation). By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new IWC rate is \$4284 compared to CBC rate of \$2,514 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Huristone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in 25/26.	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential

	If you have any general feedback regarding your council's proposed SV, please leave your comments in					
First Name Last Na	the comment box below.  One of the justifications for the forced council amalgamations between Canterbury and Bankstown in 2016 was	Your comments on Criterion 1:	Your comments on Criterion 2:	Your comments on Criterion 3:	Your comments on Criterion 4:	Your comments on Criterion 5:
23 Mark Wardle	that it would deliver financial efficiencies. Recent media reports and parliamentary estimates hearings have shown that the State Government has mishanded the Strong Communities Fund which aimed to support forcibly amalgamated councils. It appears that this money has flowed to councils in Coalition seats. But why should the ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Why isn't Council putting pressure on Government to provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund?  Inner West Council (IWC) is going through the same harmonisation process, but has not proposed an SRV (special rate variation). By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new IWC rate is \$850 compared to CBC rate of \$1,257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new IWC rate is \$1,264 compared to CBC rate of \$2,514 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in 25/26.					
	One of the justifications for the forced council amalgamations between Canterbury and Bankstown in 2016 was that it would deliver financial efficiencies. Recent media reports and parliamentary estimates hearings have shown that the State Government has mishandled the Strong Communities Fund which aimed to support forcibly amalgamated councils. It appears that this money has flowed to councils in Coalition seats. But why should the ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Why isn't Council putting pressure on Government to provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund?  Inner West Council (IWC) is going through the same harmonisation process, but has not proposed an SRV (special rate variation). By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new IWC rate is \$\$500 compared to CBC rate of \$1.257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new IWC rate is \$1,284 compared to CBC rate of \$2,514 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Hurlstone Pafr residents will be paying almost double	would deliver financial efficiencies. Recent media reports and parliamentary estimates hearings have shown that the State Government has mishandled the Strong Communities Fund which aimed to support forcibly amalgamated councils. It appears that this money has flowed to councils in Coalition seats. But why should the ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Why isn't Council putting pressure on Government to provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund? Inner West Council (IWC) is going through the same harmonisation process, but has not proposed an SRV (special rate variation). By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new IWC rate is \$850 compared to CBC rate of \$1.257 in \$25/62 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new IWC rate is \$1.284 compared to CBC rate of \$2.574 in	means that for \$500,000 land value the new IWC rate is \$850 compared to	Communities Fund which aimed to support forcibly amalgamated is councils. It appears that this money has flowed to councils in Coalition seats. But why should the ratepayer be forced to bear this coast? Why isn't Council putting pressure on Government to provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund?  Inner West Council (IWC) is going through the same harmonisation process, but has not proposed an SRV (special rate variation). By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new IWC rate is	One of the justifications for the forced council amalgamations between Cantebury and Bankstown in 2016 was that it would deliver financial efficiencies. Recent media reports and parliamentary estimates hearings have shown that the State Government has mishandled the Strong Communities Fund which aimed to support forcibly amalgamated councils. It appears that this money has flowed to councils in Coation seats. But with should the ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Why snt Council putting pressure on Government to provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund?  Inner West Council (IWC) is going through the same harmonisation process, for the snot proposed an SRV (special rate variation). By way of example, this means that for \$50,000 land value the new WC rate is \$850 compared to CB rate of \$1.257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new IWC rate is \$1.254 compared to CB rate of \$2.514 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that	and Bankstown in 2016 was that it would deliver financial efficiencies. Recent media reports and parliamentary estimates hearings have shown that the State Government has mishandled the Strong Communities Fund which aimed to support forcibly amalgamated councils. It appears that this money has flowed to councils in Coalition seats. But why should the ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Why isn't Council
24 Anonymous Anonymo	the rate of IWC residents in 25/26.	25/26.	residents in 25/26.	paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in 25/26.	in 25/26.	paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in 25/26.
25 Barry Pierce	When the state government forced the amalgamation of the Canterbury and Bankstown councils in 2016 one of the justifications was that it would deliver financial efficiencies. That obviously isn't true if the new council needs to increase rates by over 35% over 5 years. Recent media reports and parliamentary estimates hearings have shown that the State government has mishandled the Strong Communities Fund which aimed to support forcibly amalgamated councils. In California outside in State (Sovernment to provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund?  Government to provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund?					
26 Kathryn Harwood						
21 Anonymous Anonymo	us Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential
28 Anonymous Anonymo		Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential
29 Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous		Confidential  Confidential	Confidential  Confidential	Confidential  Confidential	Confidential  Confidential	Confidential  Confidential
31 Anonymous Anonymo	We have lived and have been rate payers in the area for 33+ years and since Canterbury and Bankstown Councils have combined our area is looking like a third world country with lots of rubbish dumping, overgrown footpaths and parks, terrible roads, high rises and developments being erected everywhere and I could continue but I will not and they want to raise our rates I don't think it's fair. We moved into the area because we thought that the rates were					
33 Anonymous Ano	The amalgamation that became Canterbury-Bankstown Council meant one Council is now covering such an enormous amount of suburbs with many different needs. It is a ridiculous notion to have individuals and businesses be charged the same across the board and to have extremely small suburbs like Huristone Park be paying the same excessive rates as other suburbs in the Canterbury-Bankstown Council area where a lot more infrastructure is being put in place.  I have lived here for 13 years and all that's done is my bins are being collected. Once in a blue moon I have seen a sweeper van race by (not sure why they even bother). Council has not shown they are spending our money responsibly or equally and are now expecting us to start paying excessively more. For what? So they can finally provide basic Council responsibilities such as save roads? How are we as young families, pensioners and singles expected to afford these excessive rate rises? People who have lived here for many many years are being forced out.  One of the justifications for the forced council amalgamations between Canterbury and Bankstown in 2016 was that it would deliver financial efficiencies. Recent media reports and parliamentary estimates hearings have shown that the State Government has mishandled the Strong Communities Fund which aimed to support forcibly amalgamated councils. It appears that this money has flowed to councils in Coalition seats. But why should the ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Why isn't Council putting pressure on Government to provide funding from use.	One of the justifications for the forced council amalgamations between Canterbury and Bankstown in 2016 was that it would deliver financial efficiencies. Recent media reports and parliamentary estimates hearings have shown that the State Government has mishandled the Strong Communities Fund which aimed to support forcibly amalgamated councils. It appears that this money has flowed to councils in Coalition seats. But why should the ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Why jon't Council putting pressure on Government to provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund?	Confidential	One of the justifications for the forced council amalgamations between Canterbury and Bankstown in 2016 was that it would deliver financial efficiencies. Recent media reports and parliamentary estimates hearings have shown that the State Government has mishandled the Strong Communities Fund which aimmed to support forcibly amalgamated councils. It appears that this money has flowed to councils in Coalition seats. But wity should the ratepayer be forced to bear this coast? Why isn't Council putting pressure on Government to provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund?  Confidential		Confidential
35 Anonymous Anonymo	We object to the increasing in rates over the next 5 years as feel that we & other land owners I speak with are struggling to pay day to day basic items due to Covid-19 & its financial hardship caused to all. We feel that ever since the amalgamation with cantubury we have been worse off & do not believe that a rate increase will fix things. We strongly believe that this would be the straw that broke the camer's back & may need to relocate from an area we have spent more than 45 years living in. We strongly object to any proposal of increasing rates in the bankstown area (or anywhere for that fact)	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential
37 kristina Borserio	JS Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential
38 Anonymous Anonymo	us Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential
39 Anonymous Anonyme	us Confidential	Confidential  1 Council needs to justify the contraction of operating profit from a healthy \$41M in 2016/2017 down to a projected operating loss of \$53 M is this just write downs (depreciation calculations)  2. During the time of Covid regulation where the contact rate for abour has contracted the Council is projecting a 10% increase in employee benefits and on-costs, this cannot be best practice and as such would need a huge overhaul of labour replications and role replication. Further employment contracts should be renegotiated from the General Manager down the line to reflect the current lower rates being paid by the private sector.  3 The manner / structure of depreciation accounting should be reviewed and brought into line as to best practice as would be expected of a Public Listed Corporation. It appears that the current method has been adopted to assist in the dialogue of funding shortfall thereby supporting huge rate increases. 4 For all the reflection the Council is not actively investing back into the LGA with capital works projects, so they are financially stripping the LGA without improving the facilities available to residents and stakeholders (rate payers)  5 Accounting inconsistencies in respect to the Leisure and Aquatic Centre - the upgrade cost a set amount so reporting must reflect this rather what is now an ongoing cost.  6The burden of marked rate increases impacts stakeholders (ratepayers) this will have a detrimental impact on the investment into the LGA from the private sector, and see the lower income sector of the residents being pushed out. commercial tenants & occupiers will have this increased cost as part of their business budgetary considerations and will see a preference to lower cost LGAS*	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential
40 Anonymous Anonym	us    Object to the increases	This is all on the back of annual increases in the rates for decades , which has seen the damaging impact of compound growth to the cost of council rates. There has been a large increase of rateable households being added to the LGA in the form of tens of thousands of apartments , strata warehouses and retail buildings and development contributions being levied by council as well. In reality the Councils books should reflect a substantial surplus or cash held , so if this was an ASX listed entity heads would roll.  The role and operation of Council seems to have been forgotten , the executive and elected members are there to serve stakeholders, for without private ownership of property in the LGA who would the Council draw revenue from. This incessant ideology of being able to charge private owners of property increased levies / rates with little regard as to the economic viability of said rates shows a huge disconnect from the real world experience of the public and the public service / administrative bodies.				

First Name Last Name		Your comments on Criterion 1:	Your comments on Criterion 2:	Your comments on Criterion 3:	Your comments on Criterion 4:	Your comments on Criterion 5:
41 Emmanuel Farrugia	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential
2 Anonymous Anonymous	Confidential hat following huge job cuts and mergers designed to save money, rates have risen dramatically. This is	Confidential	Confidential There is no justification. If there was an effort to communicate the rate rise, I've		Confidential	Confidential
	unconscionable in a post Covid world, given the rate rise is so dramatic. In line with inflation the only acceptable rate rise. This should be obvious.	Confidential	missed it, and it still would not be justified given the huge cuts in costs associated with the very unpopular council mergers.	would undoubtedly also impact as Landlord's struggle to cover the costs and would pass this cost on in the firm of rent rises.  Confidential	Not seen anywhere.	No mention of the cost cutting except the obvious cuts from mergers. This results in long term lower costs yet somehow councils are justifying huge rises in rates? Confidential
	One of the justifications for the forced council amalgamations between Canterbury and Bankstown in 2016 was that it would deliver financial efficiencies. Recent media reports and parliamentary estimates hearings have shown that the State Government has mishandled the Strong Communities Fund which aimed to support forcibly amalgamated councils. It appears that this money has flowed to councils in Coalition seats. But why should the ratepayer be forced to bear this cost?	Nope. None seen.  No engagement with community in a genuine transparent manner.  Just this random request for higher rates. No explanation of why. No evidence of financial support gained for this forced amalgamation.  There is no widely available, published document to hand showing any sign of evidence to support this demand nor of any new community need or desire for increases to services above what is currently provided.  Simple. Nothing.	This amalgamation was intended to be financially beneficial to the ratepayers 8 residents of this LGA, however, these excessive increases are way out of line with the intentions of these changes, with normal cost changes, and certainly out of line with routine CPI adjustments, when the CPI is less than 3%.	even conscience considering such an egregious request.  Again there has been NO genuine effort to demonstrate a need for these punitive increases, with no apparent improvement in service or facilities.  36% 63% is bloody reasonable its no where near it its 2% is what we agreed to when we purchased our homes this is what it, always has been this the way it should stay, will not be bulled or forced	is not stakeholder engagement. Rather that seems an attempt to avoid scrutiny.	Inner West Council (IWC) is going through the same harmonisation process, but has not proposed an SRV (special rate variation). By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new MVC rate is \$50 compared to CBC rate of \$1.25° in 25/28 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new IWC rate is \$1,284 compared to CBC of \$2,514 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Hustistone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in 25/26. This troubles me, suggesting that none of these containment strategies have even been considered or attempted in Canterbury Bankstown.
6 Anonymous Anonymous	yr this is uncalled for and unjustified, ill sell the damb house if i have to i wont pay anything more due to the fact that i don't have any more to give, im barely managing as it is, don't allow them to have this they dont need it they are missmanaging our funds,  The current funding arrangements provide very generous rate revenue increases to Council. CBCC rates & annua	They have thousands upon thousands of new houses units duplexes and granny flats and town houses they made deals with and allwed investors and builders to make and self. They make millions extra since 2016 from these new homes everywhere. If they are crying poor to obtain this dont allow them to have it keep it at the nominal 2%	Community is and was not aware me and a few people around the area is making them aware everyone I speak to s in utter shock, this is ridiculous	to pay a single cent more, otherwise if i am to be placed in this situation, will retainlet, i wont sit there in idle and water hmy kids suffer becuase i was forced to pay for the councils and they hired for no reason, they put more rangers on the secretary's have secretary's, if they want to save money they need to manage there funds better and not waste it on	Didnt see any i was advised by a friend who is in the council his words were the are at it again this is how i was informed, they have tried there very best to hide there nature, but im a tradie iv delt with them for yrs	to make it seem like there going to do allot of things as they he for the last decade, yet my street and all allong there district where ever i drive there dings dent potholes signs falling apart, they wont do anything productive even if they had what good will it be for us nearly everyone works 6 days a week we dont go into bankstown to hang out or enjoy whatever facilities they do have already we drive out beaches to the mountains,
	charges (garbage) revenues increased by 2.4% year on year. When you take into account changes in land values over the year, CBCC could potentially be expecting up to a 3.2% notional rate increase into 2021.  In addition, the State Government has also increased funding to CBCC year on year.  Grants for capital and operating projects increased by over 4% year on year.  The result is that CBC is well-funded, and should easily be able to manage within its funding envelope. CBCC's cash position actually increased substantially over the year. Up from \$26million to over \$46million! The amount of cash is quite startling. The auditor's report highlights this amount of cash: - stating that the Council actually had a net operating cashflow of +8781 million. Quick ratio' or 'unrestricted current ratio' is 1,5 times the amount of their short-term obligations! CBCC has \$4.12 in the hank, to cover every \$1 dollar of its current labilities. Similarly operating cash was a massive 61.53 times the amount required to service its debt repayments. [p4 of the Audit Report]  Now this is not a bad thing – however it does raise the question of why the Council feels there is a need for increases of up to 30% from its long-suffering Ratepayers who all feel that they would spend this additional money move wisely and responsibly than Council.	So where's the majority of our money going? Well we've got future planning (0.41); events (0.51); art and culture (0.42); economic development (0.65); leadership & governance (\$2.83); regulation and compliance (\$4.26) chewing up more money than is spent on roads in a year!  And these costs are becoming out of control. Operating expenditure metric was a disappointing -2.83% (against a local Govt benchmark of >0%). Non-essential operating expenditure needs to be brought under control!  The Council GM is paid over half a million per year (- more than the Premier), and the next level down averages well over	The increases are hidden behind complex decimal points that most ratepayers don't understand. Once you realise that CBCC proposes that your rates should increase from \$1600 to over \$2000 the issue becomes much clearer and more objectionable.	In today's low CPI and low wage growth environment, proposing a 30% increase is simply out of touch with reality. Only a monopolist could exploar relationship in this wayand ratepayers don't seem to have any options		With a -2.83% result on expenditure to revenue control (against a >0% benchmark) clear that costs are not being contained. The GM's package is over half a million p, the next level down averages around \$320,000 each.  Then there's the \$160,000 for 'Marketing the City'. Plus a myriad of projects like \$1 for 'social outings for Maltese seniors'; \$1800 for 'relaxation meditation and theraper horticulture'the list of non-core expenditure is so detensive you have to wonder whether anyone in the Council has any time to repair a road these days.
	The council already has enough revenue and income comming in, there boundaries or district was not affected so much in a negative but a positive, they have allowed developments all across the district for thousands upon thousands of units duplexes town houses and granny flats enough homes to tax there rates on each one, they have parking officers, rangers everywhere according to my friend who is a ranger they are making enormous amount of money from fining people. I have worked for this council for years they have always been a joke to deal with one of the hardest to work for and deal with any sort of probleme, it takes them minths to agree to if not yrs to get anything out of them, in have been driving on millier rid christinar d waidron rid for over a decade and the same pol holes have been on the same place for that long, they dont fix things just put a bandade over it. which in not to concerned about because we just dort make to much of a fixes about it, but when these did ecide to rip us off even further with a rate hike, then i will make a fuss out of it for I have never seen anything productive from them why to they deserve a pay rise, there to concerned about on how they can fill more money in there backpockets then to care about the geoole who reside in there district to help them, instead of showing morality and compassion they show us how.  I have a fill not pay more then the usual 2% not a cent more,		The community is not aware I wasnt aware of any of these things, i was informed by 3rd party source who works for the council as a ranger who is my friend he told me about it as we were discussing other things and it came up, had he not told me i still would be oblivious to the fact. There trying to keep us all cuitle so we don't finith back or stand up to this, its always the case with the They have not communicated anything. They have not provided reasons for this	this is unjustified and uncalled for there too greedy our rates are enough dor them do as they please, there known to be one of rich councils iether there. and want mire money to give them selves a bonus and a pay rise or there missmanaging funds,	pay for it then be forced to sell, and with such a high rate our houses prices will fall due to lack of people who will want to pay such rates, when I purchased this house I was under the impression of the current rate, no one has ever heard of such hikes in rate to ever really impact a persons livelyhood so much to scare or deter them into going into such an extreme debt and risk, but had it know this is a chance of a possibility that a council can so blatantly and obnoxiously state we	; ;
	ratepayers finding out its happening  There is no way Canterbury Bankstown Council can justify a 37% rate rise, they are not entitled to any rate rise. I have been asking since January 2021 that they mow the lawn on Lakemba st Belmore, which has rubbish in it. The grass which is up to my knees and higher. This is not the only area that is not be kept. Since the almalgamation the Canterbury area is a disgrace. Our rates are the highest of any council and they are not spending them wisely	allowed to be built	increase	rather high  22-60% is not reasonable at all. To add fuel to councils proposed increas	activities	There are no improvements that explains the need for the drastic rise
1 lan Ramsay	22 to 60+% increase will certainly hurt pensioners, such as myself.		I have not seen any information from council by way of letter to landowners or via public dissemination by way of locall newspapers.	for 21-22 is the fact that the following years rates 22-23 (by way of the rate in the \$ of unimproved value) will be subject to an updated land value which is reviewed every 3 years with the last in July,2019.	Where are they exhibited?	
	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential
	I do not agree with this "Special Variation" plan as it is NOT justified in comparison to our economic situation and our living conditions in East Hills.					
4 Anonymous Anonymous	Rate rise by 30% is not required. This is unjust and unfair, especially during times of a pandemic where we worry	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential the rates we currently pay are high enough, one of the highest in the state how can a 30% rater rise be justified during a pandemic. how can people afford this, wages are frozen yet we need to come up with extra money to	Confidential 2.	Confidential
	At a time like this with many people out of work or working much less hours than pre-covid times, it is absolutely ridiculous to think raising the rates by any amount is a fair idea. People are struggling as it is financially, and to double down and make it harder for your residents that you are supposed to take care of to live their lives is appalling.  I believe the services provided by the council are below the standard expected, and I have no reason to believe tha more money for the council at this time will improve my experience in any way. Keep your rate hikes until people are back on their feet and making money again, then make a more reasonable rate hike to increase your funds. Do not raise them by 30% in one of the worst financial times of recent history.			pay for rates and rising costs in food.		
	The submission by CBCity for the SV application is based on adoption of the new minimum base rate across the city. The current residential base rates are \$636.80 for Bankstown and \$713.90 for Canterbury (pg 27 of their notification letter https://www.ipart.nsw.gov.au/files/9816cf086-68dd-485e-9e96-7d5a78c2162b/Application-Notification-Letter- 2020.pdf?/rbcid=wAR27tBIGSf:DB69YbOFZcbXD7L8YCe1qcA1pF1tK7UZqE3FmcC2R747ulhas)  CBCity proposes the Minimum be based on the Canterbury base rate plus 2% therefore \$728.18 ( which is a 14% residences in CBCity either next FV or over the next 3 financial years. All tables base this on the increase from the proposed adopted Minimum Rate Application of \$728.18. What it doesnts say is that for Bankstown Residents, the increase from \$636.80 to \$990 is an increase of 55.5% over the current rates. 55.5% is not sustainable for a community that includes many who have lost their jobs or had to take pay cuts as a result of the current Covid situation and face an uncertain future as a result of not knowing when 'norman' will return.  Council justify the increase based on CBCity rates being mid range, based on a table on page 22 of their letter. It	Residents only understand that Canterbury [LGA] was in debt while Bankstown [LGA] was in profit prior to the merger. The proposed rates increase is a 55% increase for Bankstown [LGA] residents and a 38.7% increase for Canterbury [LGA]. We dont understand why Bankstown should bare the burden of debt costs for the Canterbury end when we didnt cause it.  Additionally, Bankstown talks about how they wont consider consolidation of facilities, when use of libraries is low [I regularly use them, yet rarely see anyone in the small libraries like Chester Hill or Padstow, instead they all go to the big ones like Bankstown & Riverwood]. Maybe they should first look to how they can have multipurpose facilities [combo baby centres, bibraries etc] rather than having them all separate requiring more land space and more maintenance. Same goes for the poorly maintained playgrounds - more nature play, community run gardens and less parks with just a swing and slide may reduce maintenance.	[LGA] residents that is included in the proposed minimum rate base increase. I truth there is no talk of real percentage, only average year on year percentage increases.  Given that English is a second language to many residents, and that the existin rates are buried in a table on page 27 of their submission, without a compariso	increase proposed for existing Bankstown [LGA] residents included in the proposed minimum rate base increase, is not viable.  In The current rate for Bansktown LGA residences is \$636.80. Council proposes this increase to \$728.18 in 2021/22 as the new minimum base rate. They then propose this increase up to \$990 either immediately or in gli the two years after. That is a 55% increase over the 2020/21 base rate on the local country in the contraction of the country to		It is acknowledged that while Option 2 'does not enable it to implement: improveme and/or additional services or implement the Aquatics Strategy, Option 3 is propose result in \$40m for 'particularly realising our leisure and aquatics strategy, restoring our deteriorated roadways, embelishing and upgrading our recreational & sporting fields, replacing agreed community centres and service enhancements – with a focus on the cleanli and presentation of our centres, streets and public spaces while also maintaining services the former Canterbury Council proposed to (page 8).  It also mentioned the cost cutting ideas of Canterbury [LGA] that Bankstown propor reverse. This suggests that cost cutting is less a focus than increasing the revenue.
58 Anonymous Anonymous		Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential
59 Anonymous Anonymous	It's outrageous to hike up prices. Rates are already overpriced based on land value, which is way too high. For Pensioners, and families is already a struggle to make this payment. We are struggling already, now what are we supposed to do?	Us outrageous to hike up prices. Rates are already overpriced based on land value, which is way too high. For Pensioners, and families is already a struggle to make this payment. We are struggling already, now what are we supposed to do?	Connocinations and the prices. Rates are already overpriced based on land value, which is way too high. For Pensioners, and families is already a struggle to make this payment. We are struggling already, now what are we supposed to do?	It's outrageous to hike up prices. Rates are already overpriced based on land value, which is way too high. For Pensioners, and families is already	It's outrageous to hike up prices. Rates are already overpriced based on land value, which is way too high. For Pensioners, and families is already a struggle	It's outrageous to hike up prices. Rates are already overpriced based on land value, which is way too high. For Pensioners, and families is already a struggle to make th payment. We are struggling already, now what are we supposed to do?
	People are already struggling during this pandemic. People have lost their jobs and are on low income. Government agency are lucky they got to keep their jobs while others have been struggling to live day by day. Having just enough money to survive even going without. And council's want to ask us for more money. It's absolutely appalling. Council has flooded our area with duplexes which gives them double rates per those block's. Where is all this money going? I don't have a direct access driveway or kerb guttering to my property vie called and complained for 10+ year's and always get passed over. And now they want more rates. Disgraceful.					

	the comment box below. Confidential	Your comments on Criterion 1: Confidential	Your comments on Criterion 2:	Your comments on Criterion 3:	Your comments on Criterion 4:	Your comments on Criterion 5:
reg dinham	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential  The residents of this area have accepted previous rate rises, (2 or 3 %),	Confidential	Confidential
				but this proposal is just over the top.  Does the council assume that the ratepayers will get a 30% + pay rise in		We have yet to see any reasons for the rate rise. Council seems to be keeping the
lan Brown	The council, without any consultation with the areas ratepayers are proposing a huge, (30% plus), rate hike. This is	At no stage has the council informed residents of the need for such a huge rate rise.	As stated before, we, the ratepayers of the area, have not been consulted/informed of the council's justification for the obvious money grab.	the net 4/5 years? Where do they think the pensioners in the area are to	No consultation or exhibiting the reasons for the rise have been made.	advise quiet, hoping we will just accept it, if approved. All ratepayers should take nethose councillors who vote for this increase and boot them out at the next election
	a disgracefull act by the council with no regard to the aging population of our area.	At no stage has the council informed residents of the need for such a huge rate rise.	consulted/informed of the council's justification for the obvious money grab.	get the extra money?	No consultation or exhibiting the reasons for the rise have been made.	urose counciliors who vote for this increase, and boot them out at the next election
nonymous Anonymous	At a time when people have lost their jobs, council should be helping us not making us pay more money  As a resident of the Bankstown area over 45 years, I am not happy with the current rate increases, I have watched					
	the rates go up in past 3 years by about over \$300.00,we were told there will be no hikes when Bankstown and Canterbury merge that the fees will go cheaper,all crap,council has moved goal post to suit them,council					
	employees are already on high incomes if can't afford sack people or reduce ridiculous high incomes we were lied					
	to even if hikes go up I will refuse to not pay extra fees as I can't afford living expenses have gone up but wages have not gone up council will have to just lump it or we were told a and mark my words,I will not pay		_	_	_	_
nonymous Anonymous	anymore hikes		I will not pay extra hikes council ▲	I will not pay extra hikes council ★	I will not pay extra hikes council ♦	Council about no hikes when they merge,I will refuse to pay extra hikes
	This is absolutely disgusting. There is no acceptable reason for doing this. This will cause further stress on business and citizens during this tough period and the subsequent recovery. People will kill themselves. I doubt anyone can	S				
att Perry	live with that guilt but if you can, you are certainly not fit to represent the people on a Council.	If you need more money to do things you've been promising for years where the hell has the money gone in this time?		The impact will most certainly be unreasonable	Maybe; I don't recall this	
	The lack of infrastructure and services provided is dismal. The cut back in services is worse.	With the low socio economic ageing population how does council expect residents to pay for their rates and still have	With the low socio economic ageing population how does council expect residents to pay for their rates and still have food on the table at the end of the			
nonymous Anonymous	Don't think the increase in council levy will do anything more than create more red tape and less service provision.	food on the table at the end of the week	week	be able to pay the additional recommendated costs.  Council is inefficient and wastes too much money. One of the motherhood		
		There is no evidence of community need / desire for the SV rate hike. In their flyer, Council has said:	Council has provided fancy flyers to communicate the SRV. The flyers do not	reasons given for the SV is that \$31 million is needed to maintain new and existing assets. At least twice over the last 5 years, Council has wasted		
		"You told us you want a modern and clean City" To fund these new services and assets, \$40 million per year is	provide the proposed SV in percentage terms nor the total increase in dollar	money on studies and letters to residents to install speed humps in		
		needed".  Council is doing this, while letting valuable Community assets such as the Greenacre Swimming Pool complex lay idle,	terms for the average ratepayer by category.  Council should be spending ratepayer money more wisely instead of gouging	Chaseling Street, and both times it was rejected by residents, being unnecessary and a waste of funds. Part of the \$31 million "means more		
	not lead to any efficiency gains. Council should be forced to amend practices prior to gouging ratepayers.  Services are substandard as they are, and Council needs to be held accountable for the demise in services, not	costing ratepayers upkeep, while not being used as a swimming complex in over 10 years. Council's rhetoric is that the small pool would be too costly to fix and operate. I find this very hard to believe, and am of the opinion that Council wants		money for "your roads and footpaths"".  Council should look at saving wasted money and looking at better ways of		
rian Appeldoorn	ratepayers.	to have the Community Land at the Greenacre Swimming Pool complex sold off to developers.	rise as great as Council is requesting.	servicing the community, rather than gouging residents.		
nonymous Anonymous	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential
	As a rate payer I am utterly against it. There is no justification for a rate rise in these difficult times. All council			This has adverse effect on rate payers many of whom have lost their jobs		
nonymous A	services have been significantly reduced due to Covid. The council merger which occurred was supposed to pass on savings to the community due to a doubling of resources & staff but this is not being passed on to the rate payer	r Council already has anough funds	There is no need because council facilities and services have been significantly	on the past year and do not have the income to meet such a significant		There has not been a significant justification. There is no evidence that council is
			reduced during Covid	rise in rates		incapable of meeting its expenditure under the current budget
nonymous Anonymous	Confidential  A rate hike during job losses and COVID-19 impacts is not fair to the residents. Particularly when nearly every	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential
aca Eid	approved development is a duplex property. Rate income is increased to the council simply by the increase in households and dwellings. I oppose this increase					
acq Eid elli Tillman	households and dwellings. I oppose this increase Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential
nonymous Anonymous	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential
	I am against any increase in council rates. Also, the current council rate is too high for the service they provide.	I am against these changes.	I am against these changes and any increase in rates.	The impact will be far more than the capacity of residents.	I am against these changes and any increase in rates.	I am against these changes and any increase in rates.
ymous Paronymous		We didn't ask for our bin night to be changed or for new trucks so don't spend money where it's not broken so they can	талт адашах иного опануво ани ану шоговое ин lates.	mo impact will be fail more than the capacity of residents.	i am against triode originged and any interdate in Falles.	r ann against urose orianges and any indease in rates.
	We didn't ask for the merge therefore should NOT be forced to pay them the difference in their salaries which im sure where the funds are going to go. We didn't ask for our bin night to be changed or for new trucks so don't	ask for a rate increase				
nonymous Anonymous	spend money where it's not broken so they can ask for a rate increase	Our streets aren't any cleaner,				
nonymous Anonymous	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential
nonymous Anonymous	This will create a financial burden					
	How can you even consider this when we are all still recovering from Covid 19 and having lost so much income and time your answer is to charge your people more so to put them in higher debt to the point of loosing their Homes	1				
	Pensioners have not received any increase in their pensions for the last 25 years or so the one off payments			A committee with residents needs to be set up to help give ideas on these		
nonymous Anonymous	were as you well know to help pay billsyet the cost of living has gone up as has medical care Shame on you to think this is in any way acceptable	A committee with residents needs to be set up to help give ideas on these matters	A committee with residents needs to be set up to help give ideas on these matters	matters At this time there is no reasonable increase people need a decrease	Need to send copies to all residents so we all see what the proposals are	Need to see paperwork for this and residents committee to be involved in decision Voting should be allowed
	<ol> <li>One of the justifications for the forced council amalgamations between Canterbury and Bankstown in 2016 was that it would deliver financial efficiencies. Recent media reports and parliamentary estimates hearings have shown</li> </ol>					
	that the State Government has mishandled the Strong Communities Fund which aimed to support forcibly					
	amalgamated councils. It appears that this money has flowed to councils in Coalition seats. But why should the					
	ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Why isn't Council putting pressure on Government to provide funding from					
	ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Why isn't Council putting pressure on Government to provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund?					
	ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Why isn't Council putting pressure on Government to provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund?  2. Inner West Council (IWC) is going through the same harmonisation process, but has not proposed an SRV (special rate variation). By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new IWC rate is \$850					
	ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Why isn't Council putting pressure on Government to provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund?  2. Inner West Council (IWC) is going through the same harmonisation process, but has not proposed an SRV (special rate variation). By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new IWC rate is \$850 compared to CBC rate of \$1,257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new IWC rate is \$1,284 compared to CBC rate of \$2,541 in 25/26. Based on this, it alopears that Hutstone Park residents will be paying almost double					
	ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Why isn't Council putting pressure on Government to provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund?  2. Inner West Council (IWC) is going through the same harmonisation process, but has not proposed an SRV (special rate variation). By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new IWC rate is \$450 compared to C8C rate of \$1,257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new IWC rate is \$1,248 compared to C8C rate of \$2,514 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in 25/26.  Amalgamation of the Councils into the larger group Canterbury Bankstown Council was supposed to bring					
	ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Why isn't Council putting pressure on Government to provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund?  2. Inner West Council (IWC) is going through the same harmonisation process, but has not proposed an SRV (special rate variation). By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new IWC rate is \$850 compared to CBC rate of \$1,257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new IWC rate is \$1,284 compared to CBC rate of \$2,541 in 25/26. Based on this, it alopears that Hutstone Park residents will be paying almost double		I doubt the community understands why such a rate rise is necessary of the			
nonymous Anonymous	ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Why isn't Council putting pressure on Government to provide funding from the Strong Committies Fund?  2. Inner West Council (MVC) is going through the same harmonisation process, but has not proposed an SRV (special rate variation). By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new MVC rate is \$850 compared to CBC rate of \$1,257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new MVC rate is \$1,284 compared to CBC rate of \$2,514 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that thuristone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IMV C residents in 25/26.  Amalgamation of the Councils into the larger group Canterbury Bankstown Council was supposed to bring efficiencies, which means the same services for less cost to ratepayers, or more services for the same cost.  Around Huristone Park, the neglected parklets and public verges, as well as footpaths and gutters, have recently		I doubt the community understands why such a rate rise is necessary, given that the merger was supposed to deliver efficiences. I'd like to see what the			
nonymous Anonymous	ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Why isn't Council putting pressure on Government to provide funding from the Strong Commithies Fund?  2. Inner West Council (MVC) is going through the same harmonisation process, but has not proposed an SRV (special rate variation). By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new MVC rate is \$850 compared to CBC rate of \$1.257 in 2576 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new MVC rate is \$1.284 compared to CBC rate of \$2,514 in 25726. Based on this, it appears that thuristone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IMVC residents in 2526.  Amalgamation of the Councils into the larger group Canterbury Bankstown Council was supposed to bring efficiencies, which means the same services for less cost to ratepayers, or more services for the same cost.  Around Hurlstone Park, the neglected parklets and public verges, as well as footpaths and gutters, have recently become overgrown with long weeds and grasses due to Council no longer offering a mowing, trimming and weeding service, is this an example of greater efficiencies? After much complaining, some cleanup has been done,		that the merger was supposed to deliver efficiences. I'd like to see what the Council will be doing with the extra funding it receives.	Inner West Council (IWC) is going through the same harmonisation		
nonymous Anonymous	ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Why isn't Council putting pressure on Government to provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund?  2. Inner West Council (IWC) is going through the same harmonisation process, but has not proposed an SRV (special rate variation). By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new IWC rate is \$850 compared to CBC rate of \$1,25° in 25°0°6 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new IWC rate is \$1,264 compared to CBC rate of \$2,514 in 25°1.66. Based on this, it appears that Huristone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in 25°2.66. Amalgamation of the Councils into the larger group Canterbury Bankstown Council was supposed to bring efficiencies, which means the same services for less cost to ratepayers, or more services for the same cost.  Around Huristone Park, the neglected parklets and public verges, as well as footpaths and gutters, have recently become overgrown with long weeds and grasses due to Council no longer offering a mowing, trimming and weeding service. Is this an example of greater efficiencies? After much complaining, some cleanup has been done, but will we need to continue adjating for this? What other services will Council cut back with its proposed rate price.		that the merger was supposed to deliver efficiences. I'd like to see what the Council will be doing with the extra funding it receives.  We used to have regular council cleanups for large size trash - now gone. I	process, but has not proposed an SRV. By way of example, this means		
nonymous Anonymous	ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Why isn't Council putting pressure on Government to provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund?  2. Inner West Council (MC) is going through the same harmonisation process, but has not proposed an SRV (special rate variation). By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new IWC rate is \$51,284 compared to CBC rate of \$1,287 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new IWC rate is \$1,284 compared to CBC rate of \$2,514 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in 25/26.  Amalgamation of the Councils into the larger group Canterbury Bankstown Council was supposed to bring efficiencies, which means the same services for less cost to ratepayers, or more services for the same cost.  Around Hurlstone Park, the neglected parklets and public verges, as well as footpaths and gutters, have recently become overgrown with long weeds and grasses due to Council no longer offering a mowing, trimming and weeding service. Is this an example of greater efficiencies? After much complaining, some cleanup has been done, but will we need to confinue against for this? What other services will Council out back with its proposed rate price gouge of over 30% in 5 years?		that the merger was supposed to deliver efficiences. I'd like to see what the Council will be doing with the extra funding it receives.  We used to have regular council cleanups for large size trash - now gone. I personally have submitted a DA three months ago for a small, standard house renovation - still waiting for the approval. There are potholes that appear in loca	process, but has not proposed an SRV. By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new IWC rate is \$850 compared to CBC II rate of \$1,257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new IWC rate is		
nonymous Anonymous	ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Why isn't Council putting pressure on Government to provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund?  2. Inner West Council (MC) is going through the same harmonisation process, but has not proposed an SRV (special rate variation). By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new IWC rate is \$51,284 compared to CBC rate of \$1,267 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new IWC rate is \$1,264 compared to CBC rate of \$2,514 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in 25/26.  Amalgamation of the Councils into the larger group Canterbury Bankstown Council was supposed to bring efficiencies, which means the same services for less cost to ratepayers, or more services for the same cost.  Around Hurlstone Park, the neglected parklets and public verges, as well as footpaths and gutters, have recently become overgrown with long weeds and grasses due to Council no longer offering a mowing, trimming and weeding service. Is this an example of greater efficiencies? After much complaining, some cleanup has been done, but will we need to confinue agitating for this? What other services will Council cut back with its proposed rate price gouge of over 30% in 5 years?  Why is the price hike for Canterbury Council ratepayers so much ligher than other Councils (an anomaly strange enough to be mentioned on the news a couple of nights ago) and why will our rates in Hurlstone Park be almost		that the merger was supposed to deliver efficiences. I'd like to see what the Council will be doing with the extra funding it receives.  We used to have regular council cleanups for large size trash - now gone. I personally have submitted a DA three months ago for a small, standard house renovation - still waiting for the approval. There are potholes that appear in loca streets that are never attended to, or if they are, they are not properly repaired and become damaged again mimediately. I've already mentioned the verges	process, but has not proposed an SRV. By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new IMC rate is \$850 compared to CBC if rate of \$1,257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new IMC rate is \$1.284 compared to CBC rate of \$2.754 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the		
nonymous Anonymous	ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Why isn't Council putting pressure on Government to provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund?  2. Inner West Council (IWC) is going through the same harmonisation process, but has not proposed an SRV (special rate variation). By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new IWC rate is \$850 compared to CBC rate of \$2.5 f in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new IWC rate is \$1.284 compared to CBC rate of \$2.5 f in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in 25/26.  Amaigamation of the Councils into the larger group Canterbury Bankstown Council was supposed to bring efficiencies, which means the same services for less cost to ratepayers, or more services for the same cost.  Around Hurlstone Park, the neglected parklets and public verges, as well as footpaths and gutters, have recently become overgrown with long weeds and grasses due to Council no longer offering a mowing, trimming and weeding service. Is this an example of greater efficiencies? After much complaining, some cleanup has been done, but will we need to continue agitating for this? What other services will Council cut back with its proposed rate price gouge of over 30% in 5 y sears?  Why is the price hike for Canterbury Council ratepayers so much higher than other Councils (an anomaly strange enough to be mentioned on the news a couple of inglish ago) and why will our rates in Hurlstone Park be almost double that of rates in Inner West Council areas by 2025, for similarly valued properties?		that the merger was supposed to deliver efficiences. I'd like to see what the Council will be doing with the extra funding it receives.  We used to have regular council cleanups for large size trash - now gone. I personally have submitted a DA three months ago for a small, standard house renovation - still waiting for the approval. There are potholes that appear in loca streets that are never attended to, or if they are, they are not properly repaired	process, but has not proposed an SRV. By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new IWC rate is \$850 compared to CBC I rate of \$1,257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new IWC rate is \$1,284 compared to CBC rate of \$2,514 in 25/26. Based on this, it		I will search for these documents
nonymous Anonymous	ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Why isn't Council putting pressure on Government to provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund?  2. Inner West Council (MVC) is going through the same harmonisation process, but has not proposed an SRV (special rate variation). By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new MVC rate is \$850 compared to CBC rate of \$2.5 f in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new MVC rate is \$1.284 compared to CBC rate of \$2.5 f in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in 25/26.  Around Hurlstone of the Councils into the larger group Canterbury Bankstown Council was supposed to bring efficiencies, which means the same services for less cost to ratepayers, or more services for he same cost.  Around Hurlstone Park, the neglected parklets and public verges, as well as footpaths and gutters, have recently become overgrown with long weeds and grasses due to Council no longer offering a mowing, trimming and weeding service. Is this an example of greater efficiencies? After much complaining, some cleanup has been done, but will we need to continue agitating for this? What other services will Council cut back with its proposed rate price gouge of over 30% in 5 y sers?  Why is the price hike for Canterbury Council ratepayers so much higher than other Councils (an anomaly strange enough to be mentioned on the news a couple of rights ago) and why will our rates in Hurlstone Park be almost double that of rates in Inner West S Council areas by 2025, for similarly valued progetimates hearings have shown that it would deliver financial efficiencies. Recent media reports and parliamentary estimates hearings have shown		that the merger was supposed to deliver efficiences. I'd like to see what the Council will be doing with the extra funding it receives.  We used to have regular council cleanups for large size trash - now gone. I personally have submitted a DA three months ago for a small, standard house renovation - still waiting for the approval. There are potholes that appear in loca streets that are never attended to, or if they are, they are not properly repaired and become damaged again mimediately. I've already mentioned the verges	process, but has not proposed an SRV. By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new IMC rate is \$850 compared to CBC if rate of \$1,257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new IMC rate is \$1.284 compared to CBC rate of \$2.754 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the		I will search for these documents
nonymous Anonymous	ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Why isn't Council putting pressure on Government to provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund?  2. Inner West Council (IWC) is going through the same harmonisation process, but has not proposed an SRV (special rate variation). By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new IWC rate is \$850 compared to CBC rate of \$2.5 f in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new IWC rate is \$1.284 compared to CBC rate of \$2.5 f in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in 25/26.  Around Hurlstone of the Councils into the larger group Canterbury Bankstown Council was supposed to bring efficiencies, which means the same services for less cost to ratepayers, or more services for the same cost.  Around Hurlstone Park, the neglected parklets and public verges, as well as footpaths and gutters, have recently become overgrown with long weeds and grasses due to Council no Inager offering a mowing, trimming and weeding service. Is this an example of greater efficiencies? After much complaining, some cleanup has been done, but will we need to continue agitating for this? What other services will Council cut back with its proposed rate price gouge of over 30% in 5 y sers?  Why is the price hike for Canterbury Council ratepayers so much higher than other Councils (an anomaly strange enough to be mentioned on the news a couple of rights ago) and why will our rates in Hurstone Park be almost double that of rates in Inner West S Council areas by 2025, for canterbury and Bankstown in 2016 was that it would deliver financial efficiencies. Recent media reports and parliamentary estimates hearings have shown that the State Government has mishandled the Strong Communities Fund which aimed to support forcibly amalgamated councils. It appears that this money has flowed to councils in Captedine seats. But Why should the		that the merger was supposed to deliver efficiences. I'd like to see what the Council will be doing with the extra funding it receives.  We used to have regular council cleanups for large size trash - now gone. I personally have submitted a DA three months ago for a small, standard house renovation - still waiting for the approval. There are potholes that appear in loca streets that are never attended to, or if they are, they are not properly repaired and become damaged again mimediately. I've already mentioned the verges	process, but has not proposed an SRV. By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new IMC rate is \$850 compared to CBC if rate of \$1,257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new IMC rate is \$1.284 compared to CBC rate of \$2.754 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the		I will search for these documents
nonymous Anonymous	ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Why isn't Council putting pressure on Government to provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund?  2. Inner West Council (MCC) is going through the same harmonisation process, but has not proposed an SRV (special rate variation). By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new MC rate is \$850 compared to CBC rate of \$1.257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new MC rate is \$350 compared to CBC rate of \$1.257 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that thuristone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IMC residents in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that thuristone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IMC residents in 25/26. Amalgamation of the Councils into the larger group Canterbury Bankstown Council was supposed to bring efficiencies, which means the same services for less cost to ratepayers, or more services for the same cost.  Around Huristone Park, the neglected parklets and public verges, as well as footpaths and gutters, have recently become overgrown with long weeds and grasses due to Council no longer offering a mowing, trimming and weeding service. Is this an example of greater efficiencies? After much complaining, some cleanup has been done, but will we need to continue agitating for this? What other services will Council cut back with its proposed rate price gouge of over 30% in 5 years?  Why is the price hike for Canterbury Council ratepayers so much higher than other Councils (an anomaly strange enough to be mentioned on the news a couple of rights ago) and why will our rates in Huristone Park be almost double that of rates in Inner West's Council areas by 2025, for similarly valued properties?  One of the justifications for the forced council amalgamations between Canterbury and Bankstown in 2016 was that it would deliver financial efficienciese. Recent media reports and parliamentary estimates hearings have shown that the State Government has inshanded the Storn Council putting pressure on Gov		that the merger was supposed to deliver efficiences. I'd like to see what the Council will be doing with the extra funding it receives.  We used to have regular council cleanups for large size trash - now gone. I personally have submitted a DA three months ago for a small, standard house renovation - still waiting for the approval. There are potholes that appear in loca streets that are never attended to, or if they are, they are not properly repaired and become damaged again mimediately. I've already mentioned the verges	process, but has not proposed an SRV. By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new IMC rate is \$850 compared to CBC if rate of \$1,257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new IMC rate is \$1.284 compared to CBC rate of \$2.754 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the		I will search for these documents
nonymous Anonymous	ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Why isn't Council putting pressure on Government to provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund?  2. Inner West Council (MCC) is going through the same harmonisation process, but has not proposed an SRV (special rate variation). By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new MC rate is \$850 compared to CBC rate of \$1.257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new MC rate is \$450 compared to CBC rate of \$1.257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new MC rate is \$1.284 compared to CBC rate of \$2.514 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that thuristone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IMC residents in 125/26.  Amalgamation of the Councils into the larger group Canterbury Bankstown Council was supposed to bring efficiencies, which means the same services for less cost to ratepayers, or more services for the same cost.  Around Huristone Park, the neglected parklets and public verges, as well as footpaths and gutters, have recently become overgrown with long weeds and grasses due to Council no longer offering a mowing, trimming and weeding service. Is this an example of greater efficiencies? After much complaining, some cleanup has been done, but will we need to continue agitating for this? What other services will Council cut back with its proposed rate price gouge of over 30% in 5 years?  Why is the price like for Canterbury Council ratepayers so much higher than other Councils (an anomaly strange enough to be mentioned on the news a couple of nights ago) and why will our rates in Huristone Park be almost double that of rates in Inner West's Council areas by 2025, for similarly valued properties?  One of the justifications for the forced council amangamations between Canterbury and Bankstown in 2016 was that it would deliver financial efficiencies. Recent media reports and parliamentary estimates hearings have shown that the State Government has inshanded the Strong Communities Fund which aimed to support forcibly amalga		that the merger was supposed to deliver efficiences. I'd like to see what the Council will be doing with the extra funding it receives.  We used to have regular council cleanups for large size trash - now gone. I personally have submitted a DA three months ago for a small, standard house renovation - still waiting for the approval. There are potholes that appear in loca streets that are never attended to, or if they are, they are not properly repaired and become damaged again mimediately. I've already mentioned the verges	process, but has not proposed an SRV. By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new IMC rate is \$850 compared to CBC if rate of \$1,257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new IMC rate is \$1.284 compared to CBC rate of \$2.754 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the		I will search for these documents
nonymous Anonymous	ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Why isn't Council putting pressure on Government to provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund?  2. Inner West Council (WC): Is going through the same harmonisation process, but has not proposed an SRV (special rate variation). By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new WC rate is \$50 compared to CBC rate of \$1.257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new WC rate is \$1.284 compared to CBC rate of \$2,514 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Huristone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in 125/26.  Amalgamation of the Councils into the larger group Canterbury Bankstown Council was supposed to bring efficiencies, which means the same services for less cost to ratepayers, or more services for the same cost.  Around Huristone Park, the neglected parklets and public verges, as well as footpaths and gutters, have recently become overgrown with long weeds and grasses due to Council no longer offering a mowing, trimming and weeding service. Is this an example of greater efficiencies? After much complaining, some cleanup has been done, but will we need to continue agitating for this? What other services will Council cut back with its proposed rate price gouge of over 30% in 5 years?  Why is the price hike for Canterbury Council ratepayers so much higher than other Councils (an anomaly strange enough to be mentioned on the news a couple of nights ago) and why will our rates in Huristone Park be almost double that of rates in Inner West's Council areas by 2025, for similarly valued properties?  One of the justifications for the forced council analgamations between Canterbury and Bankstown in 2016 was that it would deliver financial efficiencies. Recent media reports and parliamentary estimates hearings have shown that the State Government has inshanded the Storng Communities Fund with a him and to support forcibly amalgamated councils. It appears that this money has flowed to councils in Coalition seats. But why		that the merger was supposed to deliver efficiences. I'd like to see what the Council will be doing with the extra funding it receives.  We used to have regular council cleanups for large size trash - now gone. I personally have submitted a DA three months ago for a small, standard house renovation - still waiting for the approval. There are potholes that appear in loca streets that are never attended to, or if they are, they are not properly repaired and become damaged again mimediately. I've already mentioned the verges	process, but has not proposed an SRV. By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new IMC rate is \$850 compared to CBC if rate of \$1,257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new IMC rate is \$1.284 compared to CBC rate of \$2.754 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the		I will search for these documents
nonymous Anonymous	ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Why isn't Council putting pressure on Government to provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund?  2. Inner West Council (WC) is going through the same harmonisation process, but has not proposed an SRV (special rate variation). By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new WC rate is \$850 compared to CBC rate of \$1.257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new WC rate is \$1.284 compared to CBC rate of \$2.54 in 125/26. Based on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in 25/26.  Amalgamation of the Councils into the larger group Canterbury Bankstown Council was supposed to bring efficiencies, which means the same services for less cost to ratepayers, or more services for the same cost.  Around Hurlstone Park, the neglected parklets and public verges, as well as footpaths and gutters, have recently become overgrown with long weeds and grasses due to Council on longer offering a mowing, trimming and weeding service. Is this an example of greater efficiencies? After much complaining, some cleanup has been done, but will we need to continue agitating for this? What other services will Council cut back with its proposed rate price gouge of over 30% in 5 years?  Why is the price hike for Canterbury Council ratepayers so much higher than other Councils (an anomaly strange enough to be mentioned on the news a couple of rights ago) and why will our rates in Hurlstone Park be almost double that of rates in Inner West Council amalgamations between Canterbury and Bankstown in 2016 was that it would deliver financial efficiencies. Recent media reports and parliamentary and Bankstown in 2016 was that it would deliver financial efficiencies. Recent media reports and parliamentary estimates bearings have shown that the State Government has mishandled the Strong Communities Fund?  Inner West Council (WC) is going through the same harmonisation process, but has not proposed an SRV (special rate variat		that the merger was supposed to deliver efficiences. I'd like to see what the Council will be doing with the extra funding it receives.  We used to have regular council cleanups for large size trash - now gone. I personally have submitted a DA three months ago for a small, standard house renovation - still waiting for the approval. There are potholes that appear in loca streets that are never attended to, or if they are, they are not properly repaired and become damaged again mimediately. I've already mentioned the verges	process, but has not proposed an SRV. By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new IMC rate is \$850 compared to CBC if rate of \$1,257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new IMC rate is \$1.284 compared to CBC rate of \$2.754 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the		I will search for these documents
nonymous Anonymous	ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Why isn't Council putting pressure on Government to provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund?  2. Inner West Council (WC) is going through the same harmonisation process, but has not proposed an SRV (special rate variation). By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new WC rate is \$850 compared to CBC rate of \$2.54 in £95/26. Based on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in £95/26.  Amalgamation of the Councis into the larger group Canterbury Bankstown Council was supposed to thing efficiencies, which means the same services for less cost to ratepayers, or more services for the same cost.  Around Hurlstone Park, the neglected parklets and public verges, as well as footpaths and gutters, have recently become overgrown with long weeds and grasses due to Council no longer offering a mowing, trimming and weeding service. Is this an example of greater efficiencies? After much complaining, some cleanup has been done, but will we need to continue agitating for this? What other services will Council out back with its proposed rate price gouge of over 30% in 5 y sers?  Why is the price hike for Canterbury Council ratepayers so much higher than other Councils (an anomaly strange enough to be mentioned on the news a couple of rights ago) and why will our rates in Hurlstone Park be almost double that of rates in Inner West'S Council areas by 2025, for similarly valued properties?  One of the justifications for the forced council amalgamations between Canterbury and Bankstown in 2016 was that it would deliver financial efficiencies. Recent media reports and parliamentary estimates hearings have shown that the State Government has mishandled the Strong Communities Fund? Why should the ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Why isn't Council putting pressure on Government to provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund?" in 2576. Based on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will b		that the merger was supposed to deliver efficiences. I'd like to see what the Council will be doing with the extra funding it receives.  We used to have regular council cleanups for large size trash - now gone. I personally have submitted a DA three months ago for a small, standard house renovation - still waiting for the approval. There are potholes that appear in loca streets that are never attended to, or if they are, they are not properly repaired and become damaged again mimediately. I've already mentioned the verges	process, but has not proposed an SRV. By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new IMC rate is \$850 compared to CBC if rate of \$1,257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new IMC rate is \$1.284 compared to CBC rate of \$2.754 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the	As above	I will search for these documents  As above
nonymous Anonymous  Anonymous Anonymous	ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Why isn't Council putting pressure on Government to provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund?  2. Inner West Council (WC) is going through the same harmonisation process, but has not proposed an SRV (special rate variation). By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new WC rate is \$850 compared to CBC rate of \$2.54 in £35/£8 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new WC rate is \$1.284 compared to CBC rate of \$2.54 in £35/£8 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new WC rate is \$1.284 compared to CBC rate of \$2.54 in £35/£8 assed on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in £35/£8.  Amalgamation of the Councils into the larger group Canterbury Bankstown Council was supposed to bring efficiencies, which means the same services for less cost to ratepayers, or more services for the same cost.  Around Hurlstone Park, the neglected parklets and public verges, as well as footpaths and gutters, have recently become overgrown with long weeds and grasses due to Council on longer offering a mowing, trimming and weeding service. Is this an example of greater efficiencies? After much complaining, some cleanup has been done, but will we need to continue agitating for this? What other services will Council cut back with its proposed rate price gouge of over \$0% in 5 y sears?  Why is the price hike for Canterbury Council ratepayers so much higher than other Councils (an anomaly strange enough to be mentioned on the news a couple of nights ago) and why will our rates in Hurlstone Park be almost double that of rates in Inner West S Council areas by 2025, for similarly valued properties?  One of the justifications for the forced ouncil amalgamations between Canterbury and Bankstown in 2016 was that it would deliver financial efficiencies. Recent media reports and parliamentary estimates hearings have shown that the Strate Government has mishandied the Strong Communities Fund which aimed to support forcibly amal		that the merger was supposed to deliver efficiences. I'd like to see what the Council will be doing with the extra funding it receives.  We used to have regular council cleanups for large size trash - now gone. I personally have submitted a DA three months ago for a small, standard house renovation - still walting for the approval. There are potholes that appear in loca streets that are never attended to, or if they are, they are not properly repaired and become damaged again immediately. I've already mentioned the verges and parklets issue.	process, but has not proposed an SRV. By way of example, this means that for \$500.000 land value the new MVC rate is \$850 compared to CBC if rate of \$1.257 in 25/26 and for \$1.000,000 land value the new MVC rate is \$1.284 compared to CBC rate of \$2.514 in 25/26. Based on this appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in 25/26.	As above	
nonymous Anonymous  nonymous Anonymous	ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Why isn't Council putting pressure on Government to provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund?  2. Inner West Council (IWC) is going through the same harmonisation process, but has not proposed an SRV (special rate variation). By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new IWC rate is \$850 compared to CBC rate of \$2.54 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in 25/26.  Amalgamation of the Councils into the larger group Canterbury Bankstown Council was supposed to bring efficiencies, which means the same services for less cost to ratepayers, or more services for the same cost.  Around Hurlstone Park, the neglected parklets and public verges, as well as footpaths and gutters, have recently become overgrown with long weeds and grasses due to Council no longer offering a mowing, trimming and weeding service. Is this an example of greater efficiencies? After much complaining, some cleanup has been done, but will we need to continue agilating for this? What other services will Council cut back with its proposed rate price gouge of over 30% in 5 y sers?  Why is the price hike for Canterbury Council ratepayers so much higher than other Councils (an anomaly strange enough to be mentioned on the news a couple of injoint ago) and why will our rates in Hurlstone Park be almost double that of rates in Inner West's Council areas by 2025, for similarly valued properties?  One of the justifications for the forced council amalgamations between Canterbury and Bankstown in 2016 was that it would deliver financial efficiencies. Recent media reports and parliamentary estimates hearings have shown that the State Government has mishandled the Strong Communities Fund which aimed to support forcibly amalgamated councils. It appears that this money has flowed to councils in Coaldinion seats. But why should the ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Why isn't Council putting pressure on Govern		that the merger was supposed to deliver efficiences. I'd like to see what the Council will be doing with the extra funding it receives.  We used to have regular council cleanups for large size trash - now gone. I personally have submitted a DA three months ago for a small, standard house renovation - still walting for the approval. There are potholes that appear in loca streets that are never attended to, or if they are, they are not properly repaired and become damaged again immediately. I've already mentioned the verges and parklets issue.	process, but has not proposed an SRV. By way of example, this means that for \$500.000 land value the new MVC rate is \$850 compared to CBC if rate of \$1.257 in 25/26 and for \$1.000,000 land value the new MVC rate is \$1.284 compared to CBC rate of \$2.514 in 25/26. Based on this appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in 25/26.	As above	
nonymous Anonymous  nonymous Anonymous	ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Why isn't Council putting pressure on Government to provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund?  2. Inner West Council (MC) is going through the same harmonisation process, but has not proposed an SRV (special rate variation). By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new MC rate is \$50 compared to CBC rate of \$2.54 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in 25/26.  Arnalgamation of the Councils into the larger group Canterbury Bankstown Council was supposed to bring efficiencies, which means the same services for less cost to ratepayers, or more services for the same cost.  Around Hurlstone Park, the neglected parklets and public verges, as well as footpaths and gutters, have recently become overgrown with long weeds and grasses due to Council no longer offering a mowing, trimming and weeding service. Is this an example of greater efficiencies? After much complaining, some cleanup has been done, but will we need to continue agilating for this? What other services will Council cut back with its proposed rate price gouge of over 30% in 5 y sers?  Why is the price hike for Canterbury Council ratepayers so much higher than other Councils (an anomaly strange enough to be mentioned on the news a couple of injoint ago) and why will our rates in Hurlstone Park be almost double that of rates in Inner West's Council areas by 2025, for similarly valued properties?  One of the justifications for the forced council analgamations between Canterbury and Bankstown in 2016 was that it would deliver financial efficiencies. Recent media reports and parliamentary estimates hearings have shown that the State Government has mishandled the Strong Communities Fund which aimed to support forcibly amalgamated councils. It appears that this money has flowed to councils in Coaldinia seats. But why should the ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Why isn't Council putting pressure on Governmen		that the merger was supposed to deliver efficiences. I'd like to see what the Council will be doing with the extra funding it receives.  We used to have regular council cleanups for large size trash - now gone. I personally have submitted a DA three months ago for a small, standard house renovation - still walting for the approval. There are potholes that appear in loca streets that are never attended to, or if they are, they are not properly repaired and become damaged again immediately. I've already mentioned the verges and parklets issue.	process, but has not proposed an SRV. By way of example, this means that for \$500.000 land value the new MVC rate is \$850 compared to CBC if rate of \$1.257 in 25/26 and for \$1.000,000 land value the new MVC rate is \$1.284 compared to CBC rate of \$2.514 in 25/26. Based on this appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in 25/26.	As above	
nonymous Anonymous  nonymous Anonymous	ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Why isn't Council putting pressure on Government to provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund?  2. Inner West Council (IWC) is going through the same harmonisation process, but has not proposed an SRV (special rate variation). By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new IWC rate is \$850 compared to CBC rate of \$2.54 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in 25/26.  Amalgamation of the Councils into the larger group Canterbury Bankstown Council was supposed to bring efficiencies, which means the same services for less cost to ratepayers, or more services for the same cost.  Around Hurlstone Park, the neglected parklets and public verges, as well as footpaths and gutters, have recently become overgrown with long weeds and grasses due to Council no longer offering a mowing, trimming and weeding service. Is this an example of greater efficiencies? After much complaining, some cleanup has been done, but will we need to continue agitating for this? What other services will Council cut back with its proposed rate processory of very only in 5 y sers?  Why is the price hike for Canterbury Council ratepayers so much higher than other Councils (an anomaly strange enough to be mentioned on the news a couple of inglish ago) and why will our rates in Hurlstone Park be almost double that of rates in Inner West Council areas by 2025, for similarly valued properties?  One of the justifications for the forced council amalgamations between Canterbury and Bankstown in 2016 was that it would deliver financial efficiencies. Recent media reports and parliamentary estimates hearings have shown that the State Government has mishandled the Strong Communities Fund which aimed to support forcibly amalgamated councils. It appears that this money has flowed to councils in Coalition seats. But with should the rate payer be forced to bear this cost? Why isn't Council putting pressure on Governm		that the merger was supposed to deliver efficiences. I'd like to see what the Council will be doing with the extra funding it receives.  We used to have regular council cleanups for large size trash - now gone. I personally have submitted a DA three months ago for a small, standard house renovation - still walting for the approval. There are potholes that appear in loca streets that are never attended to, or if they are, they are not properly repaired and become damaged again immediately. I've already mentioned the verges and parklets issue.	process, but has not proposed an SRV. By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new MVC rate is \$\$50 compared to CBC it rate of \$1,257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new MVC rate is \$1,284 compared to CBC rate of \$2,514 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of MVC residents in 25/26.  As above	As above	
nonymous Anonymous  nonymous Anonymous  nonymous Anonymous	ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Why isn't Council putting pressure on Government to provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund?  2. Inner West Council (MC) is going through the same harmonisation process, but has not proposed an SRV (special rate variation). By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new MC rate is \$850 compared to CBC rate of \$2.54 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in 25/26.  Amaigamation of the Councils into the larger group Canterbury Bankstown Council was supposed to bring efficiencies, which means the same services for less cost to ratepayers, or more services for the same cost.  Around Hurlstone Park, the neglected parklets and public verges, as well as footpaths and gutters, have recently become overgrown with long weeds and grasses due to Council no longer offering a mowing, trimming and weeding service. Is this an example of greater efficiencies? After much complaining, some cleanup has been done, but will we need to continue agitating for this? What other services will Council cut back with its proposed rate price gouge of over 30% in 5 y sears?  Why is the price hike for Canterbury Council ratepayers so much higher than other Councils (an anomaly strange enough to be mentioned on the news a couple of inglish ago) and why will our rates in Hurlstone Park be almost double that of rates in Inner West Council areas by 2025, for similarly valued properties?  One of the justifications for the forced council amalgamations between Canterbury and Bankstown in 2016 was that it would deliver financial efficiencies. Recent media reports and parliamentary estimates hearings have shown that the State Government has mishandled the Strong Communities Fund which aimed to support forcibly amalgamated councils. It appears that this money has flowed to councils in Coalition seats. But Why should the ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Why isn't Council putting pressure on Government		that the merger was supposed to deliver efficiences. I'd like to see what the Council will be doing with the extra funding it receives.  We used to have regular council cleanups for large size trash - now gone. I personally have submitted a DA three months ago for a small, standard house renovation - still walting for the approval. There are potholes that appear in loca streets that are never attended to, or if they are, they are not properly repaired and become damaged again immediately. I've already mentioned the verges and parklets issue.	process, but has not proposed an SRV. By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new MVC rate is \$\$50 compared to CBC it rate of \$1,257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new MVC rate is \$1,284 compared to CBC rate of \$2,514 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of MVC residents in 25/26.  As above	As above	
nonymous Anonymous  nonymous Anonymous  nonymous Anonymous	ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Why isn't Council putting pressure on Government to provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund?  2. Inner West Council (MCC) is going through the same harmonisation process, but has not proposed an SRV (special rate variation). By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new MC rate is \$850 compared to CBC rate of \$1.257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new MC rate is \$41,284 compared to CBC rate of \$2,514 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that thuristone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IMC residents in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that thuristone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IMC residents in 25/26. Amalgamation of the Councils into the larger group Canterbury Bankstown Council was supposed to bring efficiencies, which means the same services for less cost to ratepayers, or more services for the same cost.  Around Huristone Park, the neglected parklets and public verges, as well as footpaths and gutters, have recently become overgrown with long weeds and grasses due to Council no longer offering a mowing, trimming and weeding service. Is this an example of greater efficiencies? After much complaining, some cleanup has been done, but will we need to continue agitating for this? What other services will Council cut back with its proposed rate price gouge of over 30% in 5 years?  Why is the price hike for Canterbury Council ratepayers so much higher than other Councils (an anomaly strange enough to be mentioned on the news a couple of nights ago) and why will our rates in Huristone Park be almost double that of rates in Inner West Council areas by 2025, for similarly valued properties?  One of the justifications for the forced council analgamations between Canterbury and Bankstown in 2016 was that it would deliver financial efficiencies. Recent media reports and parliamentary estimates hearings have shown that the State Government has inshanded the Storng Communities Fund with a mined	As above	that the merger was supposed to deliver efficiences. I'd like to see what the Council will be doing with the extra funding it receives.  We used to have regular council cleanups for large size trash - now gone. I personally have submitted a DA three months ago for a small, standard house renovation - still walting for the approval. There are potholes that appear in loca streets that are never attended to, or if they are, they are not properly repaired and become damaged again immediately. I've already mentioned the verges and parklets issue.	process, but has not proposed an SRV. By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new MVC rate is \$\$50 compared to CBC it rate of \$1,257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new MVC rate is \$1,284 compared to CBC rate of \$2,514 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of MVC residents in 25/26.  As above	As above	
nonymous Anonymous  nonymous Anonymous  nonymous Anonymous  thryn Harwood	ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Why isn't Council putting pressure on Government to provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund?  2. Inner West Council (MCC) is going through the same harmonisation process, but has not proposed an SRV (special rate variation). By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new MC rate is \$850 compared to CBC rate of \$1.257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new MC rate is \$41,284 compared to CBC rate of \$2,514 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that thuristone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IMC residents in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that thuristone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IMC residents in 25/26. Amalgamation of the Councils into the larger group Canterbury Bankstown Council was supposed to bring efficiencies, which means the same services for less cost to ratepayers, or more services for the same cost.  Around Huristone Park, the neglected parklets and public verges, as well as footpaths and gutters, have recently become overgrown with long weeds and grasses due to Council no longer offering a mowing, trimming and weeding service. Is this an example of greater efficiencies? After much complaining, some cleanup has been done, but will we need to continue agitating for this? What other services will Council cut back with its proposed rate price gouge of over 30% in 5 years?  Why is the price hike for Canterbury Council ratepayers so much higher than other Councils (an anomaly strange enough to be mentioned on the news a couple of nights ago) and why will our rates in Huristone Park be almost double that of rates in Inner West Council areas by 2025, for similarly valued properties?  One of the justifications for the forced council analgamations between Canterbury and Bankstown in 2016 was that it would deliver financial efficiencies. Recent media reports and parliamentary estimates hearings have shown that the State Government has inshanded the Storng Communities Fund with a mined	As above	that the merger was supposed to deliver efficiences. I'd like to see what the Council will be doing with the extra funding it receives.  We used to have regular council cleanups for large size trash - now gone. I personally have submitted a DA three months ago for a small, standard house renovation - still walting for the approval. There are potholes that appear in loca streets that are never attended to, or if they are, they are not properly repaired and become damaged again immediately. I've already mentioned the verges and parklets issue.	process, but has not proposed an SRV. By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new MVC rate is \$\$50 compared to CBC it rate of \$1,257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new MVC rate is \$1,284 compared to CBC rate of \$2,514 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of MVC residents in 25/26.  As above	As above	
nonymous Anonymous  nonymous Anonymous  nonymous Anonymous	ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Why isn't Council putting pressure on Government to provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund?  2. Inner West Council (MCC) is going through the same harmonisation process, but has not proposed an SRV (special rate variation). By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new MC rate is \$50 compared to CBC rate of \$1.257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new MC rate is \$1.284 compared to CBC rate of \$1.257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new MC rate is \$1.284 compared to CBC rate of \$2.514 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Huristone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IMC residents in 25/26.  Armalgamation of the Councils into the larger group Canterbury Bankstown Council was supposed to bring efficiencies, which means the same services for less cost to ratepayers, or more services for the same cost.  Around Huristone Park, the neglected parklets and public verges, as well as footpaths and gutters, have recently become overgrown with long weeds and grasses due to Council no longer offering a mowing, trimming and weeding service. Is this an example of greater efficiencies? After much complaining, some cleanup has been done, but will we need to continue aglisting for this? What other services will Council cut back with its proposed rate price gouge of over 30% in 5 years?  Why is the price hike for Canterbury Council ratepayers so much higher than other Councils (an anomaly strange enough to be mentioned on the news a couple of nights ago) and why will our rates in Huristone Park be almost double that of rates in Inner West S Council areas by 20/25, for similarly valued properties?  One of the justifications for the forced council analgamations between Canterbury and Bankstown in 2016 was that it would deliver financial efficiencies. Recent media reports and parliamentary estimates hearings have shown that the State Government has mishandled the Strong Communities Fund which aimed to support forcibly amal	As above	that the merger was supposed to deliver efficiences. I'd like to see what the Council will be doing with the extra funding it receives.  We used to have regular council cleanups for large size trash - now gone. I personally have submitted a DA three months ago for a small, standard house renovation - still walting for the approval. There are potholes that appear in loca streets that are never attended to, or if they are, they are not properly repaired and become damaged again immediately. I've already mentioned the verges and parklets issue.	process, but has not proposed an SRV. By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new MVC rate is \$\$50 compared to CBC it rate of \$1,257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new MVC rate is \$1,284 compared to CBC rate of \$2,514 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of MVC residents in 25/26.  As above	As above	
nonymous Anonymous  nonymous Anonymous  nonymous Anonymous	ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Why isn't Council putting pressure on Government to provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund?  2. Inner West Council (WC) is going through the same harmonisation process, but has not proposed an SRV (special rate variation). By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new WC rate is \$850 compared to CBC rate of \$2.54 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in 25/26.  Around Hurlstone Park, the neglected parklets and public verges, as well as footpaths and gutters, have recently become overgrown with long weeks and grasses due to Council no longer offering a mowing, trimming and weeking service. Is this an example of greater efficiencies? After much complaining, some cleanup has been done, but will we need to continue agitating for this? What other services will Council out back with its proposed rate price group of the justifications for the result of the properties. Why is the price hike for Canterbury Council ratepayers on much higher than other Councils (an anomaly strange enough to be mentioned on the news a couple of rights ago) and why will our rates in Hurlstone Park be almost double that of rates in Inner West S Council areas by 2025, for similarly valued properties?  Why is the price hike for Canterbury Council ratepayers so much higher than other Councils (an anomaly strange enough to be mentioned on the news a couple of rights ago) and why will our rates in Hurlstone Park be almost double that of rates in Inner West S Council areas by 2025, for similarly valued properties?  One of the justifications for the forced council amalgamations between Canterbury and Bankstown in 2016 was that it would deliver financial efficiencies. Recent media reports and parliamentary estimates hearings have shown that the Strate Government has mishandled the Strong Communities Fund which aimed to support forcibly amalgamated councils. It appears that this mome hys has flowed t	As above	that the merger was supposed to deliver efficiences. I'd like to see what the Council will be doing with the extra funding it receives.  We used to have regular council cleanups for large size trash - now gone. I personally have submitted a DA three months ago for a small, standard house renovation - still walting for the approval. There are potholes that appear in loca streets that are never attended to, or if they are, they are not properly repaired and become damaged again immediately. I've already mentioned the verges and parklets issue.	process, but has not proposed an SRV. By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new MVC rate is \$\$50 compared to CBC it rate of \$1,257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new MVC rate is \$1,284 compared to CBC rate of \$2,514 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of MVC residents in 25/26.  As above	As above	
nonymous Anonymous  nonymous Anonymous  athryn Harwood  nonymous Anonymous	ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Why isn't Council putting pressure on Government to provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund?  2. Inner West Council (MCC) is going through the same harmonisation process, but has not proposed an SRV (special rate variation). By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new MCr ate is \$850 compared to CBC rate of \$2.54 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in 25/26.  Around Hurlstone Park, the neglected parklets and public verges, as well as footpaths and gutters, have recently become overgrown with long weeds and grasses due to Council no Inoquer offering a mowing, trimming and weeding service. Is this an example of greater efficiencies? After much complaining, some cleanup has been done, but will we need to continue agitating for this? What other services will Council out back with its proposed rate price gouge of over 30% in 5 y sears?  Why is the price hike for Canterbury Council ratepayers so much higher than other Councils (an anomaly strange enough to be mentioned on the news a couple of rights ago) and why will our rates in Hurlstone Park be almost double that of rates in Inner West S Council areas by 2025, for similarly valued properties?  One of the justifications for the forced council analgamations between Canterbury and Bankstown in 2016 was that it would deliver financial efficiencies. Recent media reports and parliament year general estimates the article will be a supported to the strate part of the publications for the forced council analgamations between Canterbury and Bankstown in 2016 was that it would deliver financial efficiencies. Recent media reports and parliamentary estimates hearings have shown that the Strate Covernment has mishandled the Strong Communities Fund which aimed to support forcibly amalgamated councils. It appears that this money has flowed to councils in Coalition seats. But why should the ratepayer be forced to bear this cost	As above	that the merger was supposed to deliver efficiences. I'd like to see what the Council will be doing with the extra funding it receives.  We used to have regular council cleanups for large size trash - now gone. I personally have submitted a DA three months ago for a small, standard house renovation - still walting for the approval. There are potholes that appear in loca streets that are never attended to, or if they are, they are not properly repaired and become damaged again immediately. I've already mentioned the verges and parklets issue.	process, but has not proposed an SRV. By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new MVC rate is \$\$50 compared to CBC it rate of \$1,257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new MVC rate is \$1,284 compared to CBC rate of \$2,514 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of MVC residents in 25/26.  As above	As above	
nonymous Anonymous  nonymous Anonymous  athryn Harwood  nonymous Anonymous	ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Why isn't Council putting pressure on Government to provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund?  2. Inner West Council (MCC) is going through the same harmonisation process, but has not proposed an SRV (special rate variation). By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new MC rate is \$50 compared to CBC rate of \$1.257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new MC rate is \$1.284 compared to CBC rate of \$2.54 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in 25/26.  Arnalgamation of the Councils into the larger group Canterbury Bankstown Council was supposed to bring efficiencies, which means the same services for less cost to ratepayers, or more services for the same cost.  Around Hurlstone Park, the neglected parklets and public verges, as well as footpaths and gutters, have recently become overgrown with long weeds and grasses due to Council no longer offering a mowing, trimming and weeding service. Is this an example of greater efficiencies? After much complaining, some cleanup has been done, but will we need to continue aglitating for this? What other services will Council cut back with its proposed rate price gouge of over 30% in 5 years?  Why is the price hike for Canterbury Council ratepayers so much higher than other Councils (an anomaly strange enough to be mentioned on the news a couple of nights ago) and why will our rates in Hurlstone Park be almost double that of rates in Inner West S Council areas by 20/25, for similarly valued properties?  One of the justifications for the forced council analgamations between Canterbury and Bankstown in 2016 was that it would deliver financial efficiencies. Recent media reports and parliamentary estimates hearings have shown that the State Government has mishandled the Strong Communities Fund which aimed to support forcibly amalgamated councils. It appears that this money has flowed to councils in Coalition seass. But why	As above	that the merger was supposed to deliver efficiences. I'd like to see what the Council will be doing with the extra funding it receives.  We used to have regular council cleanups for large size trash - now gone. I personally have submitted a DA three months ago for a small, standard house renovation - still walting for the approval. There are potholes that appear in loca streets that are never attended to, or if they are, they are not properly repaired and become damaged again immediately. I've already mentioned the verges and parklets issue.	process, but has not proposed an SRV. By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new MVC rate is \$\$50 compared to CBC it rate of \$1,257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new MVC rate is \$1,284 compared to CBC rate of \$2,514 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of MVC residents in 25/26.  As above	As above	
nonymous Anonymous  nonymous Anonymous  athryn Harwood	ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Why isn't Council putting pressure on Government to provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund?  2. Inner West Council (MC) is going through the same harmonisation process, but has not proposed an SRV (special rate variation). By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new MC rate is \$50 compared to CBC rate of \$2.54 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new MC rate is \$1,284 compared to CBC rate of \$2.54 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in 25/26.  Arnalgamation of the Councils into the larger group Canterbury Bankstown Council was supposed to bring efficiencies, which means the same services for less cost to ratepayers, or more services for the same cost.  Around Hurlstone Park, the neglected parklets and public verges, as well as footpaths and gutters, have recently become overgrown with long weeds and grasses due to Council no longer offering a mowing, trimming and weeding service. Is this an example of greater efficiencies? After much complaining, some cleanup has been done, but will we need to continue agilating for this? What other services will Council cut back with its proposed rate price gouge of over 30% in 5 years?  Why is the price hike for Canterbury Council ratepayers so much higher than other Councils (an anomaly strange enough to be mentioned on the news a couple of injath sago) and why will our rates in Hurlstone Park be almost double that of rates in Inner West S Council areas by 2025, for similarly valued properties?  One of the justifications for the forced council analgamations between Canterbury and Bankstown in 2016 was that it would deliver financial efficiencies. Recent media reports and parliamentary estimates hearings have shown that the State Government has mishandled the Strong Communities Fund which aimed to support forcibly amalgamated councils. It appears that this money has flowed to councils in Coaldins seats. But why shou	As above	that the merger was supposed to deliver efficiences. I'd like to see what the Council will be doing with the extra funding it receives.  We used to have regular council cleanups for large size trash - now gone. I personally have submitted a DA three months ago for a small, standard house renovation - still walting for the approval. There are potholes that appear in loca streets that are never attended to, or if they are, they are not properly repaired and become damaged again immediately. I've already mentioned the verges and parklets issue.	process, but has not proposed an SRV. By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new MVC rate is \$\$50 compared to CBC it rate of \$1,257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new MVC rate is \$1,284 compared to CBC rate of \$2,514 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of MVC residents in 25/26.  As above	As above	
nonymous Anonymous  nonymous Anonymous  athryn Harwood  nonymous Anonymous  sanet Stankiewicz	ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Why isn't Council putting pressure on Government to provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund?  2. Inner West Council (MC) is going through the same harmonisation process, but has not proposed an SRV (special rate variation). By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new MC rate is \$50 compared to CBC rate of \$2.54 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new MC rate is \$1,284 compared to CBC rate of \$2.54 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in 25/26.  Arnalgamation of the Councils into the larger group Canterbury Bankstown Council was supposed to bring efficiencies, which means the same services for less cost to ratepayers, or more services for the same cost.  Around Hurlstone Park, the neglected parklets and public verges, as well as footpaths and gutters, have recently become overgrown with long weeds and grasses due to Council no longer offering a mowing, trimming and weeding service. Is this an example of greater efficiencies? After much complaining, some cleanup has been done, but will we need to continue agilating for this? What other services will Council cut back with its proposed rate price gouge of over 30% in 5 years?  Why is the price hike for Canterbury Council ratepayers so much higher than other Councils (an anomaly strange enough to be mentioned on the news a couple of injust ago) and why will our rates in Hurlstone Park be almost double that of rates in Inner West S Council areas by 2025, for similarly valued properties?  One of the justifications for the forced council analgamations between Canterbury and Bankstown in 2016 was that it would deliver financial efficiencies. Recent media reports and parliamentary estimates hearings have shown that the State Government has mishandled the Strong Communities Fund which aimed to support forcibly amalgamated councils. It appears that this money start and parliamentary estimates hearings have shown t	As above	that the merger was supposed to deliver efficiences. I'd like to see what the Council will be doing with the extra funding it receives.  We used to have regular council cleanups for large size trash - now gone. I personally have submitted a DA three months ago for a small, standard house renovation - still walting for the approval. There are potholes that appear in loca streets that are never attended to, or if they are, they are not properly repaired and become damaged again immediately. I've already mentioned the verges and parklets issue.	process, but has not proposed an SRV. By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new MVC rate is \$\$50 compared to CBC it rate of \$1,257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new MVC rate is \$1,284 compared to CBC rate of \$2,514 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of MVC residents in 25/26.  As above	As above	
nonymous Anonymous  nonymous Anonymous  athryn Harwood  nonymous Anonymous  sanet Stankiewicz	ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Why isn't Council putting pressure on Government to provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund?  2. Inner West Council (MCC) is going through the same harmonisation process, but has not proposed an SRV (special rate variation). By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new MC rate is \$50 compared to CBC rate of \$2.57 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new MC rate is \$1,284 compared to CBC rate of \$2.54 in 125/26. Based on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in 25/26.  Amalgamation of the Councils into the larger group Canterbury Bankstown Council was supposed to bring efficiencies, which means the same services for less cost to ratepayers, or more services for the same cost.  Around Hurlstone Park, the neglected parklets and public verges, as well as footpaths and gutters, have recently become overgrown with long weeds and grasses due to Council no longer offering a mowing, trimming and weeding service. Is this an example of greater efficiencies? After much complaining, some cleanup has been done, but will we need to continue agitating for this? What other services will Council cut back with its proposed rate price gouge of over 30% in 5 years?  Why is the price hike for Canterbury Council ratepayers so much higher than other Councils (an anomaly strange enough to be mentioned on the news a couple of rights ago) and why will our rates in Hurlstone Park be almost double that of rates in Inner West's Council areas by 2025, for similarly valued properties?  One of the justifications for the forced council amalgamations between Canterbury and Bankstown in 2016 was that it would deliver financial efficiencies. Recent media reports and parliamentary estimates hearings have shown that the Strate Government has mishandled the Strong Communities Fund?  Inner West Council (WC) is going through the same harmonisation process, but has not proposed an SRV (special rate variation). By wa	As above	that the merger was supposed to deliver efficiences. I'd like to see what the Council will be doing with the extra funding it receives.  We used to have regular council cleanups for large size trash - now gone. I personally have submitted a DA three months ago for a small, standard house renovation - still walting for the approval. There are potholes that appear in loca streets that are never attended to, or if they are, they are not properly repaired and become damaged again immediately. I've already mentioned the verges and parklets issue.	process, but has not proposed an SRV. By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new MVC rate is \$\$50 compared to CBC it rate of \$1,257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new MVC rate is \$1,284 compared to CBC rate of \$2,514 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of MVC residents in 25/26.  As above	As above	
nonymous Anonymous  nonymous Anonymous  athryn Harwood  nonymous Anonymous  sanet Stankiewicz	ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Why isn't Council putting pressure on Government to provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund?  2. Inner West Council (WC) is going through the same harmonisation process, but has not proposed an SRV (special rate variation). By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new WC rate is \$850 compared to CBC rate of \$2.57 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new WC rate is \$1,284 compared to CBC rate of \$2.54 in 125/26. Based on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in 25/26.  Amalgamation of the Councis into the larger group Canterbury Bankstown Council was supposed to bring efficiencies, which means the same services for less cost to ratepayers, or more services for the same cost.  Around Hurlstone Park, the neglected parklets and public verges, as well as footpaths and gutters, have recently become overgrown with long weeds and grasses due to Council no longer offering a mowing, trimming and weeding service. Is this an example of greater efficiencies? After much complaining, some cleanup has been done, but will we need to continue agitating for this? What other services will Council cut back with its proposed rate price gouge of over 30% in 5 years?  Why is the price hike for Canterbury Council ratepayers so much higher than other Councils (an anomaly strange enough to be mentioned on the news a couple of rights ago) and why will our rates in Hurlstone Park be almost double that of rates in Inner West's Council areas by 2025, for similarly valued properties?  One of the justifications for the forced council amalgamations between Canterbury and Bankstown in 2016 was that it would deliver financial efficiencies. Recent media reports and parliamentary estimates hearings have shown that the Strate Government has mishandled the Strong Communities Fund. Which aimed to support forcibly amalgamated councils. It appears that this work of the support of the part of the support of the suppo	As above	that the merger was supposed to deliver efficiences. I'd like to see what the Council will be doing with the extra funding it receives.  We used to have regular council cleanups for large size trash - now gone. I personally have submitted a DA three months ago for a small, standard house renovation - still walting for the approval. There are potholes that appear in loca streets that are never attended to, or if they are, they are not properly repaired and become damaged again immediately. I've already mentioned the verges and parklets issue.	process, but has not proposed an SRV. By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new MVC rate is \$\$50 compared to CBC it rate of \$1,257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new MVC rate is \$1,284 compared to CBC rate of \$2,514 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of MVC residents in 25/26.  As above	As above	
nonymous Anonymous  nonymous Anonymous  athryn Harwood  nonymous Anonymous  Stankiewicz	ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Why isn't Council putting pressure on Government to provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund?  2. Inner West Council (WC) is going through the same harmonisation process, but has not proposed an SRV (special rate variation). By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new WC rate is \$850 compared to CBC rate of \$2.54 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in 25/26.  Amalgamation of the Councis into the larger group Canterbury Bankstown Council was supposed to thing efficiencies, which means the same services for less cost to ratepayers, or more services for the same cost.  Around Hurlstone Park, the neglected parklets and public verges, as well as footpaths and gutters, have recently become overgrown with long weeds and grasses due to Council no longer offering a mowing, trimming and weeding service. Is this an example of greater efficiencies? After much complaining, some cleanup has been done, but will we need to continue agitating for this? What other services will Council cut back with its proposed rate price gouge of over 30% in 5 years?  Why is the price hike for Canterbury Council ratepayers so much higher than other Councils (an anomaly strange enough to be mentioned on the news a couple of rights ago) and why will our rates in Hurlstone Park be almost double that of rates in Inner West's Council areas by 2025, for similarly valued properties?  One of the justifications for the forced council amalgamations between Canterbury and Bankstown in 2016 was that twould deliver financial efficiencies. Recent media reports and parliamentary and Bankstown in 2016 was that two deliver financial efficiencies. Recent media reports and parliamentary setmates hearings have shown that the Strate Government has mishandled the Strong Communities Fund. Which aimed to support forcibly amalgamated councils. It appears that this more parts that this more parts that this more parts	As above	that the merger was supposed to deliver efficiences. I'd like to see what the Council will be doing with the extra funding it receives.  We used to have regular council cleanups for large size trash - now gone. I personally have submitted a DA three months ago for a small, standard house renovation - still walting for the approval. There are potholes that appear in loca streets that are never attended to, or if they are, they are not properly repaired and become damaged again immediately. I've already mentioned the verges and parklets issue.	process, but has not proposed an SRV. By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new MVC rate is \$\$50 compared to CBC it rate of \$1,257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new MVC rate is \$1,284 compared to CBC rate of \$2,514 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of MVC residents in 25/26.  As above	As above	
nonymous Anonymous  nonymous Anonymous  athryn Harwood  nonymous Anonymous  Stankiewicz	ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Why isn't Council putting pressure on Government to provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund?  2. Inner West Council (MC) is going through the same harmonisation process, but has not proposed an SRV (special rate variation). By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new MC rate is \$50 compared to CBC rate of \$2.54 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in 25/26.  Amalgamation of the Councils into the larger group Canterbury Bankstown Council was supposed to bring efficiencies, which means the same services for less cost to ratepayers, or more services for the same cost.  Around Hurlstone Park, the neglected parklets and public verges, as well as footpaths and gutters, have recently become overgrown with long weeds and grasses due to Council no longer offering a mowing, trimming and weeding service. Is this an example of greater efficiencies? After much complaining, some cleanup has been done, but will we need to continue agitating for this? What other services will Council cut back with its proposed rate price gouge of over 30% in 5 years?  Why is the price hike for Canterbury Council ratepayers so much higher than other Councils (an anomaly strange enough to be mentioned on the news a couple of inglish ago) and why will our rates in Hurlstone Park be almost double that of rates in Inner West Council areas by 2025, for similarly valued properties?  One of the justifications for the forced council amalgamations between Canterbury and Bankstown in 2016 was that it would deliver financial efficiencies. Recent media reports and parliamentary estimates hearings have shown that the State Government has mishandled the Strong Communities Fund which aimed to support forcibly amalgamated councils. It appears that this more park and parliamentary estimates hearings have shown that the State Government has mishandled the Strong Communities Fund which aimed to support forcibly	As above	that the merger was supposed to deliver efficiences. I'd like to see what the Council will be doing with the extra funding it receives.  We used to have regular council cleanups for large size trash - now gone. I personally have submitted a DA three months ago for a small, standard house renovation - still walting for the approval. There are potholes that appear in loca streets that are never attended to, or if they are, they are not properly repaired and become damaged again immediately. I've already mentioned the verges and parklets issue.	process, but has not proposed an SRV. By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new MVC rate is \$\$50 compared to CBC it rate of \$1,257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new MVC rate is \$1,284 compared to CBC rate of \$2,514 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of MVC residents in 25/26.  As above	As above	

		If you have any general feedback regarding your council's proposed SV, places leave your comments in					
First Name	Last Name	If you have any general feedback regarding your council's proposed SV, please leave your comments in the comment box below.	Your comments on Criterion 1:	Your comments on Criterion 2:	Your comments on Criterion 3:	Your comments on Criterion 4:	Your comments on Criterion 5:
		Council Rate Rises  1With the forced council amalgamations between Canterbury and Bankstown in 2016 we were told it would deliver financial efficiencies. But recent media reports and parliamentary estimates hearings have shown that the State Government has mismanaged the Strong Communities Fund which was supposed to forcibly amalgamated councils. This money has flowed to councils or Califloria seats. As residents and taxayers we shouldn't be forced					
		councis. Ins money has nowed to councis in Coalition seats. As residents and taxpayers we shouldn't be forced to bear this cost. The council should be putting pressure on Government to provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund.  2. •Inner West Council (IWC) is going through the same process, but has not proposed an SRV. This means that					
86 Anonymous	Anonymous	La mine wheat count (WO) is going through the same process, but he proposed in a forty. This incarnal this, if appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of fWC residents in 25/26. This is unacceptable.					
		What has the council done with the funds provided for amalgamation? where are the promised savings? instead we have reduced services - the streets are no longer swept, hard rubbish collection can take 3 weeks from					
		where are the benefits?	we were promised that we would not be worse off after amalgamation so they need to honour that before any increase is considered.		utterly unreasonable - they have cpi increases and rate harmonisation and other councils manage just fine.		there has been no improvement since amalgamation. Services have deteriorated.
87 Anonymous	Anonymous	and now they want to increase the rates to double what the neighbouring Inner West council are charging.  Please do not allow this.  the rationale for amalgamating councils was to save money!	If the inner west council has no need for a special variation the why does Canterbury-Bankstown? And the increase is HUGE	this was not done - hiding the table with the values on page 53 is deceptive.	we are involuntary retirees and simply cannot afford this huge increase	minimal publicity and what I did see emphasised the compulsory rate harmonisation and downplayed this enormous money grab	Where are the promised improvements and efficiencies?
88 Anonymous	s Anonymous	the NSW Government has also pork barrelled (the Premier's words) its amalgamation fund away from labour councils - not the councils fault though also not the ratepayers. Why am I being asked to pay for Government pork bar					
Nicholas		I wish to lodge an objection to Canterbury bankstown proposed land rates increase over the next five years. I believe the increase is unfair, is not justified, due to Council's poor budgeting and non prioritizing of their Works. It is a fundamental fact that we all need to live And work within our respective budgets, it appears Council for many years has not prioritized their work. Nor their spending. Thereby they have overspent our Monies. By not prioritizing and sticking to the Necessity of their core responsibilities they have spent More than they have collected or been allocated by Government grants. We the rate payers cannot be expected to dig the council out of their self imposed Wastefulness. As a pensioner my family and I cannot afford extravagant increases in our rates as we are on a Fixed income. There are many people within the council. Area who are similarly financially placed us we.					
89 and pamela	Sloves	to a Manageable level. Yours faithfully Pam and Nick Stoves. This is nidiculous, we are already are paying enough and this feels like an absolute money-grab for council. They should spend less money on frivious projects, such as the one they announced in 2020 to trial 3D crossings, and					
90 Anonymous	Anonymous	maybe they wouldn't need to take more money from an area that is full of families from low socio-econmic backgrounds.  Inner West Council (IWC) is going through the same harmonisation process, but has not proposed an SRV					
91 Anonymous	Anonymous	(special rate variation). By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new IWC rate is \$850 compared to CBC rate of \$1,257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new IWC rate is \$1,284 compared to CBC rate of \$2,514 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in 25/26.					
92 Anonymous	Anonymous	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential
93 Anonymous	Anonymous	NO to the Canterbury-Bankstown Council rate hike The amalgamation that became Canterbury-Bankstown Council meant one Council is now covering such an					
		enormous amount of suburbs with many different needs. It is a ridiculous notion to have individuals and businesses be charged the same across the board and to have extremely small suburbs like rhuristone Park be paying the same excessive rates as other suburbs in the Canterbury-Bankstown Council area where a lot more infrastructure is being put in place.  I have lived here for 13 years and all that's done is my bins are being collected. Once in a blue moon I have seen a sweeper van race by (not sure why they even bother). Council has not shown they are spending our money responsibly or equally and are now expecting us to start paying excessively more. For what? So they can finally provide basic Council responsibilities such as save roads? How are we as young families, pensioners and singles expected to afford these excessive rate rises? People who have lived here for many many years are being forced out.  Inner West Council (IWC) is going through the same harmonisation process, but has not proposed an SRV					
		(special rate variation). By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new IWC rate is \$850 compared to CBC rate of \$1,257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new IWC rate is \$1,284 compared to CBC rate of \$2,514 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Huristone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in 25/26.  One of the justifications for the forced council amalgamations between Canterbury and Bankstown in 2016 was that it would deliver financial efficiencies. Recent media reports and parliamentary estimates hearings have shown that the State Government has mishandled the Strong Communities Fund which aimed to support forcibly amalgamated councils. It appears that this money has flowed to councils in Coalition seats. But why should the ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Why isn't Council putting pressure on Government to provide funding from	Inner West Council (IWC) is going through the same harmonisation process, but has not proposed an SRV (special rate variation). By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new IWC rate is \$850 compared to CBC rate of \$1,257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new IWC rate is \$1,248 compared to CBC rate of \$2,251 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Hirstone Park residents will be paring almost double the rate of IWC residents in 25/26. One of the justifications for the forced council amalgamations between Canterbury and Bankstown in 2016 was that it would deliver financial efficiencies. Recent media reports and parliamentary estimates hearings have shown that the state Government has mishanded the Strong Communities Fund which aimed to support forcibly amalgamated councils. It appears that this money has flowed to councils in Coalition seats. But why should the ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? With soft Council puthing pressure on Government to provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund?		Inner West Council (IWC) is going through the same harmonisation process, but has not proposed an SRV (special rate variation). By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new IWC rate is \$850 compared to CBC rate of \$1.257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new IWC rate is \$1.242 compared to CBC rate of \$2,524 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in 25/26.		One of the justifications for the forced council amalgamations between Canterbury and Bankstown in 2016 was that it would deliver financial efficiencies. Recent media reports and parliamentary estimates hearings have shown that the State Government has mishandled the Strong Communities Fund which aimed to support forcibly amalgamated councils. It appears that this money has flowed to councils in Coalition seats. But why should the ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Why isn't Council putting pressure on Government to provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund?
	Anonymous	the Strong Communities Fund?  Conflictential	Dear this cost: why isn't council putting pressure on Government to provide running from the Shorty Communities Parity:  Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential
96 Christopher		Confidential Helio	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential
		As a resident of Hurlstone Park and home owner, I strongly object to the huge increase projected over the next 4 years by the Canterbury Bankstown Council which is totally not justified. Neighbourhood councils have much lower rates (see IWC ones and will not increase theirs to the same extent as CBC.  What can be done for this decision to be changed. I read from my HP association:  @Inner West Council (IWC) is going through the same harmonisation process, but has not proposed an SRV (special rate variation). By way of example, this means that for \$500,000 land value the new IWC rate is \$850					
		compared to CBC rate of \$1,257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new IWC rate is \$1,284 compared to CBC rate of \$2,514 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Huristone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in 25/26°.  It thought the merging of Councils was going to be offering reductions, not huge increases. Also with the huge increase of units, the council must be receiving an very big increase in rates already  Awaiting your reply  Anne Gurney					
97 Anne	Gurney	compared to CBC rate of \$1,257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new IWC rate is \$1,284 compared to CBC rate of \$2,514 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in 25/26/9.  It thought the merging of Councils was going to be offering reductions, not huge increases. Also with the huge increase of units, the council must be receiving an very big increase in rates already  Awaiting your reply  Anne Gurney  In the 5 years since Canterbury and Bankstown councils have merged, Hurlstone Park has been forgotten about.					
97 Anne	Gurney	compared to CBC rate of \$1.257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new IWC rate is \$1,284 compared to CBC rate of \$2.514 in 25/26 ased on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in 25/26'g.  It thought the merging of Councils was going to be offering reductions, not huge increases. Also with the huge increase of units, the council must be receiving an very big increase in rates already  Awaiting your reply  Anne Gurney  In the 5 years since Canterbury and Bankstown councils have merged, Hurlstone Park has been forgotten about. We don't have regular lawn maintenance, including overgrown weeds in our lanes. Mill lane has only been maintained five in the 5 years since amalgamation. And both times was due to myself presenting emails and images to the council via Facebook messenger.					
		compared to CBC rate of \$1.257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new IWC rate is \$1,284 compared to CBC rate of \$2.54 in 25/26. Based on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in 25/26'g.  I thought the merging of Councils was going to be offering reductions, not huge increases. Also with the huge increase of units, the council must be receiving an very big increase in rates already  Awaiting your reply  Anne Gurney  In the 5 years since Canterbury and Bankstown councils have merged, Hurlstone Park has been forgotten about, We don't have regular lawn maintenance, including overgrown weeds in our lanes. Mill ane has only been maintained twice in the 5 years since amalgamation. And both times was due to myself presenting emails and images to the council via Facebook messenger.  The council is not putiting OUR money to any form of use in the suburb of Hurlstone Park. Cracked footpaths, drains dougling due to no street cleaning, dirty roads, graffiti not being removed. That's ZERO maintenance in our area, yet the council has the audacity to propose a 35% increase over 5 years?	Provide Hurlstone Park with the service we used to receive pre amalgamation. Zero service apart from bin collection		Immigrants and retirees already struggle with the expensive rates		
98 Sam	Konstantelos	compared to CBC rate of \$1.257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new IWC rate is \$1,284 compared to CBC rate of \$2.54 in 25/26 ased on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in 25/26'g.  I thought the merging of Councils was going to be offering reductions, not huge increases. Also with the huge increase of units, the council must be receiving an very big increase in rates already  Awaiting your reply  Anne Gurney  In the 5 years since Canterbury and Bankstown councils have merged, Hurlstone Park has been forgotten about. We don't have regular lawn maintenance, including overgrown weeds in our lanes. Mill lane has only been maintained twice in the 5 years since amalgamation. And both times was due to myself presenting emails and images to the council via Facebook messenger.  The council is not putting OUR money to any form of use in the suburb of Hurlstone Park. Cracked footpaths, drains dogging due to no street cleaning, dirty roads, graffiti not being removed. That's ZERO maintenance in our area, yet the council has the audacity to propose a 35% increase over 5 years?  Normal rate increase per annum is approximately 2%. They want to raise by 30%. Even divided by 5 years that is more than the average person gets a wage increase. Where are we supposed to get the extra money from, certefierink?? State and federal givernment have deview our speries we do yet ne extra money from, certefierink??	Provide Huristone Park with the service we used to receive pre amalgamation. Zero service apart from bin collection days does not warrant any form of increase.	We have not been advised that the increase was to be 35% over 5 years.	Immigrants and retirees already struggle with the expensive rates (beachside suburbs are cheaper than our rates)		
98 Sam	Konstantelos s Anonymous	compared to CBC rate of \$1.257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new IWC rate is \$1,284 compared to CBC rate of \$2.51 4 in 25/26 ased on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in 25/26 g.  It hought the merging of Councils was going to be offering reductions, not huge increases. Also with the huge increase of units, the council must be receiving an very big increase in rates already  Awaiting your reply  Anne Gurney  In the 5 years since Canterbury and Bankstown councils have merged, Hurlstone Park has been forgotten about. We don't have regular lawn maintenance, including overgrown weeds in our lanes. Mill lane has only been maintained twice in the 5 years since amalgamation. And both times was due to myself presenting emails and images to the council via Facebook messenger.  The council is not putting OUR money to any form of use in the suburb of Hurlstone Park. Cracked footpaths, drains clogging due to no street cleaning, dirty roads, graffiti not being removed. That's ZERO maintenance in our area, yet the council has the audacity to propose a 35% increase over 5 years?  Normal rate increase per annum is approximately 2%. They want to raise by 30%. Even divided by 5 years that is more than the average person gets a wage increase. Where are we supposed to get the extra money from, centrelinke? State and federal givernment have given us reprieves during coved but council wants to take all that money for what? This is ridiculous.	days does not warrant any form of increase.		(beachside suburbs are cheaper than our rates)	Confidential	Confidential
98 Sam  99 Anonymous 100 Anonymous	Konstantelos  Anonymous  Anonymous	compared to CBC rate of \$1.257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new IWC rate is \$1,284 compared to CBC rate of \$2.54 in 25/26 ased on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in 25/26 g.  It hought the merging of Councils was going to be offering reductions, not huge increases. Also with the huge increase of units, the council must be receiving an very big increase in rates already  Awaiting your reply  Anne Gurney  In the 5 years since Canterbury and Bankstown councils have merged, Hurlstone Park has been forgotten about. We don't have regular lawn maintenance, including overgrown weeds in our lanes. Mill lane has only been maintained twice in the 5 years since amalgamation. And both times was due to myself presenting emails and images to the council via Facebook messenger.  The council is not putting OUR money to any form of use in the suburb of Hurlstone Park. Cracked footpaths, drains dogging due to no street cleaning, drity roads, graffiti not being removed. That's ZERO maintenance in our area, yet the council has the audactify to propose a 55% increase over 5 years?  Normal rate increase per annum is approximately 2%. They want to raise by 30%. Even divided by 5 years that is more than the average person gets a wage increase. Where are we supposed to get the extra money from, centrelink?? State and federal givernment have given us reprieves during coved but council wants to take all that money for what? This is ridiculous.	days does not warrant any form of increase.  Confidential	Confidential	(beachside suburbs are cheaper than our rates)  Confidential	Confidential Confidential	Confidential
98 Sam  99 Anonymous 100 Anonymous	Konstantelos Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous	compared to CBC rate of \$1.25 in 25/26 and for \$1.000,000 land value the new MVC rate is \$1.284 compared to CBC rate of \$2.55 if a 1.25/26 assed on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in 25/26 g.  I thought the merging of Councils was going to be offering reductions, not huge increases. Also with the huge increase of units, the council must be receiving an very big increase in rates already  Awaiting your reply  Anne Gurney  In the 5 years since Canterbury and Bankstown councils have merged, Hurlstone Park has been forgotten about. We don't have regular lawn maintenance, including overgrown weeds in our lanes. Mill lane has only been maintained twice in the 5 years since amalgamation. And both times was due to myself presenting emails and images to the council via Facebook messenger.  The council is not putting OUR money to any form of use in the suburb of Hurlstone Park. Cracked footpaths, drains dogging due to no street cleaning, drity roads, graffiti not being removed. That's ZERO maintenance in our area, yet the council has the audacity to propose a 35% increases be justified by the council?  Normal rate increase per annum is approximately 2%. They want to raise by 30%. Even divided by 5 years that is more than the average person gets a wage increase. Where are we supposed to get the extra money from centrelink? State and federal givernment have given us reprieves during coved but council wants to take all that money for what? This is indiculous.  Confidential  Confidential  Confidential  Confidential  Confidential is pressed to the property of the provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund? his copie of the provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund? his past of provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund? his past of provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund?	days does not warrant any form of increase.		(beachside suburbs are cheaper than our rates)	Confidential Confidential	Confidential
98 Sam  99 Anonymous 100 Anonymous	Konstantelos Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous	compared to CBC rate of \$1.257 in 25/26 and for \$1,000,000 land value the new IWC rate is \$1,284 compared to CBC rate of \$2.55 it in 25/26 assed on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in 25/26 g.  It hought the merging of Councils was going to be offering reductions, not huge increases. Also with the huge increase of units, the council must be receiving an very big increase in rates already  Awaiting your reply  Anne Gurney  In the 5 years since Canterbury and Bankstown councils have merged, Hurlstone Park has been forgotten about. We don't have regular lawn maintenance, including overgrown weeds in our lanes. Mill lane has only been maintained wice in the 5 years since amalgamation. And both times was due to myself presenting emails and images to the council via Facebook messenger.  The council is not putting OUR money to any form of use in the suburb of Hurlstone Park. Cracked footpaths, drains clogging due to no street cleaning, dirty roads, graffiti not being removed. That's ZERO maintenance in our area, yet the council has the audacity to propose a 35% increase over 5 years?  Normal rate increase per annum is approximately 2%. They want to raise by 30%. Even divided by 5 years that is more than the average person gets a wage increase. Where are we supposed to get the extra money from, centrelink?? State and federal givernment have given us reprieves during coved but council wants to take all that money for what? This is ridiculous.  Confidential	days does not warrant any form of increase.  Confidential	Confidential	(beachside suburbs are cheaper than our rates)  Confidential		
98 Sam  99 Anonymous 100 Anonymous	Konstantelos Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous	compared to CBC rate of \$1.257 in 25/26 and for \$1.000,000 land value the new MVC rate is \$1.284 compared to CBC rate of \$2.55 it in 25/26 abased on this, it appears that Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in 25/26*g.  Ithought the merging of Councis was going to be offering reductions, not huge increases. Also with the huge increase of units, the council must be receiving an very big increase in rates already  Awaiting your reply  Anne Gurney  In the 5 years since Cantierbury and Bankstown councils have merged, Hurlstone Park has been forgotten about. We don't have regular lawn maintenance, including overgrown weeds in our lanes. Mill lane has only been maintained twice in the 5 years since amalgamation. And both times was due to myself presenting emails and images to the council via Facebook messenger.  The council is not putting OUR money to any form of use in the suburb of Hurlstone Park. Cracked footpaths, drains clogging due to no street cleaning, drity roads, graffith not being removed. That's ZERO maintenance in our area, yet the council has the audicality to propose a 35% increase over 5 years?  Most people in the area are retirees and immigrants. How can 35% increases be justified by the council?  Normal rate increase per annum is approximately 2%. They want to raise by 30%. Even divided by 5 years that is more than the average person gets a wage increase. Where are we supposed to get the extra money from, centrelink?? State and federal givernment have given us reprieves during coved but council wants to take all that money for what? This is ridiculous.  Confidential  One of the justifications for the forced council amalgamations between Canterbury and Bankstown in 2016 was that it would deliver financial efficiencies. Recent media reports and parliamentary estimates hearings have shown that the State Government has mishandled the Strong Communities Fund with a mismad to support forcibly amalgamated councils. It appears that this money has flowed to council	days does not warrant any form of increase.  Confidential	Confidential	(beachside suburbs are cheaper than our rates)  Confidential		

First Name	. I ant Name	If you have any general feedback regarding your council's proposed SV, please leave your comments in the comment box below.	Your comments on Criterion 1:	Your comments on Criterion 2:	Your comments on Criterion 3:	Your comments on Criterion 4:	Your comments on Criterion 5:
FIRST NAME	E Last Name	the comment box below.  Basic services not delivered, roads  Concerns how they will spend the rate increase there not going to spend it correctly  Get contribution from developers rather than putting up the rates	Your comments on Citterion 1:	Your comments on Criterion 2:	Your comments on Unterior 3:	Your comments on Uniterion 4:	Your comments on Unterion 5:
		Affordability					
		Centralised Services, lower cost for bins, road, development.  Rates should be going to pay for larger companies to be fixing roads properly not left to council as roads are never fixed properly.					
		Put our roads up in the sky like M4/M5/M7. Now I'm peak times it takes 30mins to get from one end of Stacey Street to the other.					
		Freeze on new development and open up new area don't allow what has happened overseas where people move out of the centre and middle ring of cities for the outer ring.					
		Open up new areas so that our cities are not overcrowded and we have increases in health costs now and in the future.					
		Broad representation among the elected representatives now real estate, represented. Need a broad representation of the community represented.					
		It won't be the same for the next Generation it will make it harder for the next generation.					
105 Anonymous	s Anonymous	Mistake with Rate amount as my property is R3 but paying rates for R4.					
		I have made previous submissions, however I have not made the point that CBCity Council has not made any mention of a \$50 increase in 2021/22 in the Domestic waste levy on the former Canterbury LGA rate payers. This detail is only shown in the workbooks Council has provided IPART.		I have made previous submissions, however I have not made the point that CBCity Council has not made any mention of a \$50 increase in 2021/22 in the Domestic waste levy on the former Canterbury LGA rate payers. This detail is only shown in the workbooks Council has provided IPART.  The omission of this immediate increase is another example of Councils either			
106 David	Reynolds	The omission of this immediate increase is another example of Councils either careless approach to community consultation or at worst a wilful omission to again confuse and minimize the financial ask Council is wanting to impose on Rate Payers.		careless approach to community consultation or at worst a willful omission to again confuse and minimize the financial ask Council is wanting to impose on Rate Payers.			
107 Anonymous	s Anonymous	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential
		If all to understand why this has been put forward by the council. The merger was supposed to bring savings thru cost efficiencies which we are yet to see. In addition to this, the amount of development in our local area means the councils revenue through rates has increased, as would fees associated with renovations and development of land.					
		To be honest I now have zero faith in the council, and from what I have observed over the past five years believe they are now following the in place at the Wingecarribee Council. Given the which is being uncovered at Wingecarribee, and layering actions such as this I think councils need to be providing more clarity on expenditure. Companies listed on the ASX do, so I do not see why Council shouldn't follow the		No do not agree. I am on email lists for council. The only notification I received on this was after the community consultation period. So they may have ticked			This is not communicated clearly, they need to provide more account of their actions.  From what i have read and observed I am now thinking the issue with council is one of
108 Anonymous	e Anonymous	same process.	The reasons do not justify the increase. Appreciate they need to remain high level, more clarity is required for rate	the box on consultation, but they did this without the greater community knowing	The impact is unreasonable given the increase in rates due to development and revenue stream from these developments.	great they are exhibited, but it would have been even better to issue communications on this so rate payers were aware.	corruption, kickbacks and unnecessary expenditure to the personal benefit of the
100 Publiymou	raionymodo	I disagree with the Increase in rates as per the following; When and how did the Canterbury Community endorse the level of funding Lack of Community engagement in the consultation and level of process. SRV Justification, Depreciation, Capitol Expenditure, Productivity improvements	jegure.	Secretaria.	not compared a trial of trial of contract and the contrac	Commission of the delice payor were district.	See disconnective.
109 Anonymous	s Anonymous	Capacity to Pay(low income earners).  Impact will be disproportionately on non min.rate payers  This is ridculous and absurd to increase rates by 30% over 5 years when the CPI and GDP are around 1% and we					
		are in a covid recovery period where unemployment is still high, businesses are struggling.  What justifies this increase. Workers will be lucky to get 6-8% pay increases over the next 5 years and will have cost of expenses increasing faster than the income and salaries					
110 Andsley	Dennis	cost of expenses invitability faster than the mounte and salaries	NO	NO , poorly communicated and unjustified	This is unreasonable	YES	YES
111 Dorota		Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential
112 Murray	Waldron	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential
113 Anonymous	s Anonymous	I note Canterbury-Bankstown is one of eight NSW councils that have applied for a SRV. I also note Canterbury-Bankstown is one of only two NSW Councils to be applying for both SRV & Minimum Rate Variation.  As a ratepayer of the previous Canterbury Council, I do not support CBC's SRV application which will present a cumulative increase of over 3% over 5 years, on top of Canterbury Council's 2014/15 successful 2014/15 SRV. And to think one of the major selling points of the NSW Government's Council amalgamation strategy was efficiency. Financial and process	Asking residents if they want improved infrastructure or services or amenities will always receive a positive response.  Asking residents if they still really need all those things if they're going to pay 36% more in rates is a different question.				
	,23	There is no justification for the CBCC SVA. Council is cash rich (as evidenced by its Quick Ratio; cash balance;	The so called 'community support' for the pet projects that the Council seeks to support via the SVA is completely asset. It is self-evident that ratepayers will always agree that it would be nice to have a new swimming poot, a new stadium; a new town hall etchowever the mood reverses when they are advised of the cost to them of these ribbon cutting opportunities.	Council have hidden the rate increase behind difficult to understand decimal amounts based on per dollar of rateable value. It is unlikely that ratepayers	Any assessment of CPI would indicate that the escalations sought by		CBCC's audited reports indicate a -2.83% result in control of operating expenditure
114 Anonymous	s Anonymous	the triarry.  CBC - like all businesses - needs to manage within its means. IPART already allows a very generous revenue indexation each year: To allow the SVA would be to add insult to injury.		amounts based on per doubt or rateable value. It is unlinkely that ratepayers would appreciate that their annual rate expenses will increase from \$1600 to well over \$2000 due to the various increases sought by CBCC from IPART.	Council are excessive. As the proposed purpose is largely for non-core activities, the proposed increases should be rejected.		(against a benchmark of 0%). Core expenditure seems to be declining as expenditure on 'peripheral' Council interests increase.