

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:	
1	Luke	Meehan	This extremely high increase is unacceptable. Why should Canterbury Residents be impacted as a result of the 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 stringing it's rate payers!	I don't dispute the need/desire for increased revenue! Find other ways to cost cut and/or find other 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.	2 city's, 2 rates. Simple. Managing the balance is Councils role. The forced amalgamation shouldn't be at the rate payers expense, especially if the 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 then it 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 last week that it 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					
3	Anonymous	Anonymous	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 hike is very hefty and already with covid and lack of work, we are barely making ends meet and paying our bills and looking after and providing for our children and families, this rate is uncalled for, its nothing more than the means to fill the council members pockets, they are making more than enough money on the thousands upon thousands of units duplexes and granny flats they allowed into our communities, this hike is not justified. For the last 10 yrs I have seen little to no improvement by this council, the same holes dings and dents on the 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 appreciate it please help us, I have already spoken to the office of Tania Mihaluk, and they have tried to re assure me that they are trying their best to help us but they also asked me to inform you of this matter and in hoping that you be beside us and 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.	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 firing people, I have worked for this council for years they have always been a to deal with one of the hardest to work for 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 rd christina rd waltron rd for over a decade and the same pot holes have been on the same place for that long, they dont fix things just put a hump over it, which im not to concerned about because we just dont make to much of a fuss about it, but when these decide to rip us off even further with a rate hike, then i will make a fuss out of it for I never seen anything produtive from them why do they deserve a bonus why do they deserve a pay rise, there to concerned about how they can fill more money in there backpacks then to care about the people who reside in there district to help them, instead of showing morality and compassion they show us how selfish and illogical and immoral they are by requesting such a hike, we will not pay more then the usual 2% not a cent more.	There is no evidence that community is aware I found out my self 4 days after by sheer chance when I spoke to other residents in my area they had no idea I had to tell them about this and they were all laughing in hysteria, saying that cant be real thats a joke, this is the evidence that this council is , they are classed as one of the richest councils if they are mismanaging our money thats not our fault that we should be punished and have to pay further more to fulfill there materialistic irrelevant needs.	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 sense if you allow someone who has the right to pull money out for whatever reason however exagerated etc they will do so, they dont manage money well if they are asking for so much more of us a council who is known to be rich council and not for money just shows there we will not pay more then the required 2% please allow us to not go further into stress and discomfort, for the next step for many of us is to sell the homes we had such high hopes for to have the australian dream to live safely and securely to put a roof on our childrens and keep them healthy and safe, yet if this go ahead most of us here will struggle to 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 livelihood so much to scare or 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 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	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 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 contractors for small jobs they get charged 10 times the amount just because there council people think hey they got money will get it, they dont ask for other routes and from what I have heard from others in those industries they hire	
4	Anonymous	Anonymous	The Council have mis used funds for years. Litter 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 staff 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			
5	Maysoon	Elahmad	I completely oppose this proposal to increase rates above the minimum ! It is a low SES area so a 30% hike is 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 bad !	This council is the worst - lazy who are just after more revenue to line their pockets. There is no reason to increase rates by such a significant amount after it has already gone up more than 2% in the last 12 months.	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 are very unaware this is happening !	It is very unreasonable on residents. As I said, this is a low SES area so a 30% increase is really going to hurt many households.		
6	Anonymous	Anonymous	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	
7	Lee	Elyard	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 funny 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 for the council's incompetence					
8	Sam	Sa	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	
9	Anonymous	Anonymous	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 put 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 mismanagement 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	
10	Brian	Appeldoorn	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 \$12.81 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! In summary, Canterbury 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.	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.	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.	Council's proposed changes are NOT reasonable. As can be seen from the examples given below (source: Council's rates calculator: https://form.jotform.com/203350834454048), 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 \$12.81 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! In summary, Canterbury 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.		
11	Annette	Cairns	Been living in this area for over 30 years and it is unreasonable for this increase no new infrastructure in my area it's a case of money mismanagement and I am opposed to this increase.	A joke	Have heard nothing from my local council	It is purely to top up their mismanagement of funds	I would like to see what this unreasonable increase is giving me as a rate payer	Show me all the improvements in my local area please
12	Riula	Mubayyid	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	
13	Deb	Simpson	This is unbelievable that council would even suggest rate payers accept 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 in next elections it's a disgrace to propose such an increase. D.simpson					
14	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 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	As above	As above	They have not considered the financial impact at all on local residents	As above	
15	Anonymous	Anonymous	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 was wasted on for eg. installing ridiculous enlarge roundabouts then repairs to same roundabouts when people hit them. No more increases !!!	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 do get the same as those over Birrong way, council favours that area in many ways	This increase has not been really looked at by council the big increase has not worried council as to how households will afford it	This increase needs to be lower	Improvements are little in the padstow Revesby milperra Panania and picnic point areas 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	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	
18	Anonymous	Anonymous	Absolutely against this proposal. The wrong time to implement when so many people are suffering financially.	This rate rise will not serve this purpose.	The proposal is unfair and too expensive for working class suburbs.	An extremely unreasonable request, implemented too quickly when inflation is at an all time high and wages have never been lower.	No cost containment has been articulated. No other options have been given.	
19	Anonymous	Anonymous	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	
20	Anonymous	Anonymous	Rates should only be CPI not anything higher especially in these times. 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	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	
22	Anonymous	Anonymous	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 \$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 Hurststone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in 25/26.					

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:	
23	Mark	Wardle	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 \$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 Hurststone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in 25/26.					
24	Anonymous	Anonymous	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 \$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 Hurststone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in 25/26. Dear All I'm writing to protest the rate rise proposed by the above council, which is a large jump in rates. We pay \$600 a quarter currently and a jump of 30% would cause hardship to residents whom are retired and on pensions. Thank you Barry & Margaret Pierce	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 \$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 Hurststone 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 \$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 Hurststone 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 \$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 Hurststone 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 \$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 Hurststone Park residents will be 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. It appears this money has flowed to councils in Coalition seats. Why should we the ratepayer be forced to bear this cost? Also why isn't Council putting pressure on State Government to provide funding from the Strong Communities Fund?					
26	Kathryn	Harwood						
27	Anonymous	Anonymous	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	
28	Anonymous	Anonymous	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	
29	Anonymous	Anonymous	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	
30	Anonymous	Anonymous	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	
31	Anonymous	Anonymous	*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?					
32	Anonymous	Anonymous	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 very reasonable and over the years they have gone up but to hick it up by 36% is not right. 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 Hurststone 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 the Strong Communities Fund?	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?				
33	Anonymous	Anonymous	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	
34	Anonymous	Anonymous	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	
35	Anonymous	Anonymous	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	
36	Anonymous	Anonymous	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 & it's 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 camel'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)					
37	kristina	Borserio	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	
38	Anonymous	Anonymous	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	
39	Anonymous	Anonymous	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	
40	Anonymous	Anonymous	I Object to the increases	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 labour 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 rhetoric 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 LGA'S 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	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:
41	Emmanuel	Farrugia	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential
42	Anonymous	Anonymous	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential
43	Tracey	Adamson	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential
44	Tania	Lambros	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential
45	Anonymous	Anonymous	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential
46	Anonymous	Anonymous	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential
47	Anonymous	Anonymous	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential
48	Anonymous	Anonymous	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential
49	Anonymous	Anonymous	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential
50	Lesley	Meredith	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential
51	Ian	Ramsay	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential
52	Anonymous	Anonymous	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential
53	Ngoc Diep	Hoang	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential
54	Anonymous	Anonymous	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential
55	Anonymous	Anonymous	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential
56	Anonymous	Anonymous	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential
57	Anonymous	Anonymous	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential
58	Anonymous	Anonymous	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential
59	Anonymous	Anonymous	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential
60	Anonymous	Anonymous	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential

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:	
61	greg	dinham	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	
62	Allan	Brown	The council, without any consultation with the areas ratepayers are proposing a huge, (30% plus), rate hike. This is a disgraceful 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.	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 residents of this area have accepted previous rate rises, (2 or 3 %), but this proposal is just over the top. Does the council assume that the ratepayers will get a 30% + pay rise in the next 4-5 years? Where do they think the pensioners in the area are to get the extra money?	No consultation or exhibiting the reasons for the rise have been made.	We have yet to see any reasons for the rate rise. Council seems to be keeping the advice quiet, hoping we will just accept it, if approved. All ratepayers should take note of those councillors who vote for this increase and boot them out at the next election.
63	Anonymous	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, I can't afford sack people or reduce ridiculous high incomes, we were led 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 on [redacted] we were told [redacted] and mark my words, I will not pay anymore hikes					
64	Anonymous	Anonymous	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 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?!	There is no evidence of this	The impact will most certainly be unreasonable	Maybe, I don't recall this	
65	Matt	Perry	The lack of infrastructure and services provided is dismal. The cut back in services is worse. Don't think the increase in council levy will do anything more than create more red tape and less service provision.	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 week...	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 week...	I have ageing neighbours. I cut their grass and care for them. They won't be able to pay the additional recommended costs.		
66	Anonymous	Anonymous	Council is too large and too inefficient as it stands. A Special Rate Variation will merely paper over any cracks, and 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 ratepayers.	There is no evidence of community need / desire for the SV rate hike. In their flyer, Council has said: "You told us you want a modern and clean City"... To fund these new services and assets, \$40 million per year is needed". Council is doing this, while letting valuable Community assets such as the Greenacre Swimming Pool complex lay idle, 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 to have the Community Land at the Greenacre Swimming Pool complex sold off to developers.	Council has provided fancy flyers to communicate the SRV. The flyers do not provide the proposed SV in percentage terms nor the total increase in dollar terms for the average ratepayer by category. Council should be spending ratepayer money more wisely instead of gouging ratepayers. There is no detailed information provided to prove that there is a need for a rate rise as great as Council is requesting.	Council is inefficient and wastes too much money. One of the motherhood lessons 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 money on studies and letters to residents to install speed humps in Chaseling Street, and both times it was rejected by residents, being unnecessary and a waste of funds. Part of the \$31 million "means more money for "your roads and footpaths". Council should look at saving wasted money and looking at better ways of servicing the community, rather than gouging residents.		
67	Brian	Appeldoorn	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	
68	Anonymous	Anonymous	As a rate payer I am utterly against it. There is no justification for a rate rise in these difficult times. All council 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	Council already has enough funds	There is no need because council facilities and services have been significantly reduced during Covid	This has adverse effect on rate payers many of whom have lost their jobs on the past year and do not have the income to meet such a significant rise in rates	There has not been a significant justification. There is no evidence that council is incapable of meeting its expenditure under the current budget	
69	Anonymous	Anonymous	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	
70	Anonymous	Anonymous	A rate hike during job losses and COVID-19 impacts is not fair to the residents. Particularly when nearly every 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	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	
71	Jacq	Eid	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	
72	Kelli	Talman	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	
73	Anonymous	Anonymous	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	
74	Anonymous	Anonymous	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.
75	Anonymous	Anonymous	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 spend money where it's not broken so they can ask for a rate increase	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 ask for a rate increase				
76	Anonymous	Anonymous	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	
77	Anonymous	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 losing their Homes. Pensioners have not received any increase in their pensions for the last 25 years or so... the one off payments were as you well know to help pay bills...yet the cost of living has gone up as has medical care... Shame on you [redacted] 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	A committee with residents needs to be set up to help give ideas on these matters	Need to send paperwork for this and residents committee to be involved in decisions... Voting should be allowed...	
78	Anonymous	Anonymous	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 \$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.	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	A committee with residents needs to be set up to help give ideas on these matters	Need to send copies to all residents so we all see what the proposals are...	
79	Anonymous	Anonymous	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 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?					
80	Anonymous	Anonymous	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 \$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.					
81	Anonymous	Anonymous	Inner West Council (IWC) is going through the same harmonisation process as the Canterbury Bankstown council, 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 Hurlstone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in 25/26 and we are neighbours, in some cases across the road.	As above	As above	As above	As above	
82	Kathryn	Harwood	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	
83	Anonymous	Anonymous	definite No is my answer, reasons for the past decades, and I have to say decades, ever since 1953 we have repeatedly requested to correct our driveway and to which the driveway is not in alignment with the curb as you drive in. To put it in simple words we have become frustrated to say the least, over the years with numerous other incidents. Notoriously as we speak putting salt on an open wound, the council has the audacity to announce to jack up 30% on our rates. what for? show us that you care, service has not been rendered only bold attitudes and hear play-gives us some respect instead of avarice game playing! we in past now as pensioners and to inform us of these rates, we fall into that category how we will survive with this [redacted]!!!! I object to the proposed huge increase in my rates. From my readings of the information that has been sent to me by the council it would make more sense for our rate to be lowered considering we (Canterbury Council rate payers) were already paying more than the other areas that were amalgamated with us. If the amalgamations were supposed to cut financial waste then why are we going to be paying even more now? The council needs to be applying for more funds from the Strong Communities Fund not pushing the costs onto the ratepayers who already pay higher rates.					
84	Janet	Stankiewicz	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	
85	Anonymous	Anonymous	Canterbury Bankstown council is now the largest and should therefore have been a textbook case of the benefits and efficiency gains from amalgamation (efficiency of scale and all that...). Instead we now see a massive increase proposed over 5 years, which is completely at odds with the rates proposed for the adjacent Inner West council, itself amalgamated. The figures I have seen are the rates for \$1M land value in 25/26 will be \$1257 for IWC and double that for CBC (\$2514). What possible justification can there be for such a disparity? Everybody knows that the old Canterbury council was broke before the amalgamation. Is this increase required to get them out of this hole? Please get to the bottom of their real need for these increases.					

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:	
86	Anonymous	Anonymous	Council Rate Rises 1. -With 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 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 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 Hurststone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in 25/26. This is unacceptable.					
87	Anonymous	Anonymous	this is totally unjustified. 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 the booked date and the verges are no longer maintained as they were under the old Canterbury council. I repeat where are the benefits? and now they want to increase the rates to double what the neighbouring Inner West council are charging. Please do not allow this.	The services have deteriorated since amalgamation. we were promised that we would not be worse off after amalgamation so they need to honour that before any increase is considered. If the inner west council has no need for a special variation the why does Canterbury-Bankstown? And the increase is HUGE		utterly unreasonable - they have cpi increases and rate harmonisation and other councils manage just fine. 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	there has been no improvement since amalgamation. Services have deteriorated. Where are the promised improvements and efficiencies?
88	Anonymous	Anonymous	the rationale for amalgamating councils was to save money! 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 barreling?					
89	Nicholas and pameila	Stoves	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 as we. I respectfully ask IPART to decline the current application by council for its huge increases and keep any increase to a Manageable level. Yours faithfully Pam and Nick Stoves.					
90	Anonymous	Anonymous	This is ridiculous, we are already paying enough and this feels like an absolute money-grab for council. They should spend less money on frivolous projects, such as the one they announced in 2020 to trial 3D crossings, and maybe they wouldn't need to take more money from an area that is full of families from low socio-economic backgrounds.					
91	Anonymous	Anonymous	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 Hurststone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in 25/26.					
92	Anonymous	Anonymous	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	
93	Anonymous	Anonymous	NO to the Canterbury-Bankstown Council rate hike					
94	Anonymous	Anonymous	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 Hurststone 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 Hurststone 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 \$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 Hurststone 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 \$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 Hurststone 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?		
95	Anonymous	Anonymous	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	
96	Christopher	Bird	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	
97	Anne	Gurney	Hello As a resident of Hurststone 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 Hurststone 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 a very big increase in rates already Awaiting your reply Anne Gurney					
98	Sam	Konstantelos	In the 5 years since Canterbury and Bankstown councils have merged, Hurststone 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 Hurststone 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? 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 government have given us reprieves during covid but council wants to take all that money for what? This is ridiculous.	Provide Hurststone 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)		
99	Anonymous	Anonymous	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	
100	Anonymous	Anonymous	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	
101	Anonymous	Anonymous	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	
102	David	Finnis	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 \$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 Hurststone Park residents will be paying almost double the rate of IWC residents in 25/26.					
103	alberta	isgro	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	
104	Anonymous	Anonymous	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	

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:		
105	Anonymous	Anonymous							
		<p>Basic services not delivered, roads</p> <p>Concerns how they will spend the rate increase there not going to spend it correctly</p> <p>Get contribution from developers rather than putting up the rates</p> <p>Affordability</p> <p>Centralised Services, lower cost for bins, road, development.</p> <p>Rates should be going to pay for larger companies to be fixing roads property not left to council as roads are never fixed properly.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Open up new areas so that our cities are not overcrowded and we have increases in health costs now and in the future.</p> <p>Broad representation among the elected representatives now real estate, represented. Need a broad representation of the community represented.</p> <p>It won't be the same for the next Generation it will make it harder for the next generation.</p> <p>Mistake with Rate amount as my property is R3 but paying rates for R4.</p>							
106	David	Reynolds			<p>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.</p> <p>The omission of this immediate increase is another example of Councils either 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.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>The omission of this immediate increase is another example of Councils either 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.</p>			
107	Anonymous	Anonymous	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential		
108	Anonymous	Anonymous							
		<p>I fail 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.</p> <p>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 [redacted] in place at the Wingecarribee Council. Given the [redacted] 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 same process.</p>	<p>The reasons do not justify the increase. Appreciate they need to remain high level, more clarity is required for rate payers.</p>	<p>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 the box on consultation, but they did this without the greater community knowing about it.</p>	<p>The impact is unreasonable given the increase in rates due to development and revenue stream from these developments.</p>	<p>great they are exhibited, but it would have been even better to issue communications on this so rate payers were aware.</p>	<p>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 corruption, kickbacks and unnecessary expenditure to the personal benefit of the councillors.</p>		
109	Anonymous	Anonymous							
		<p>I disagree with the increase in rates as per the following:</p> <p>When and how did the Canterbury Community endorse the level of funding</p> <p>Lack of Community engagement in the consultation and level of process.</p> <p>SRV Justification, Depreciation, Capital Expenditure, Productivity improvements</p> <p>Capacity to Pay (low income earners).</p> <p>Impact will be disproportionately on non min. rate payers</p> <p>This is ridiculous 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.</p> <p>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</p>							
110	Andsley	Dennis	NO	NO - poorly communicated and unjustified	This is unreasonable	YES	YES		
111	Dorota	Killy	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential		
112	Murray	Waldron	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential		
113	Anonymous	Anonymous							
		<p>I note Canterbury-Bankstown is one of eight NSW councils that have applied for a SRV.</p> <p>I also note Canterbury-Bankstown is one of only two NSW Councils to be applying for both SRV & Minimum Rate Variation.</p> <p>As a ratepayer of the previous Canterbury Council, I do not support CBC's SRV application which will present a cumulative increase of over 36% over 5 years, on top of Canterbury Council's 2014/15 successful 2014/15 SRV.</p> <p>And to think one of the major selling points of the NSW Government's Council amalgamation strategy was efficiency - financial and process.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>The so called 'community support' for the pet projects that the Council seeks to support via the SVA is completely asset.</p> <p>It is self-evident that ratepayers will always agree that it would be nice to have a new swimming pool, a new stadium, a new town hall etc...however the mood reverses when they are advised of the cost to them of these ribbon cutting opportunities.</p> <p>The CBCC has not evidenced any 'need' for the SVA revenues - merely a wish to spend more and more on marginal and non-core activities.</p>						
114	Anonymous	Anonymous							
		<p>There is no justification for the CBCC SVA. Council is cash rich (as evidenced by its Quick Ratio; cash balance; and debt cover ratio). It's issue is that it spends excessively on non-core activities that benefit the few but rob from the many.</p> <p>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.</p>		<p>Council have hidden the rate increase behind difficult to understand decimal amounts based on per dollar of rateable value. It is unlikely 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.</p>	<p>Any assessment of CPI would indicate that the escalations sought by Council are excessive. As the proposed purpose is largely for non-core activities, the proposed increases should be rejected.</p>		<p>CBCC's audited reports indicate a -2.83% result in control of operating expenditure (against a benchmark of 0%). Core expenditure seems to be declining as expenditure on 'peripheral' Council interests increase.</p>		