

Submission		Administration
Suburb	Content	Response
<b>East Victoria Park Residential Rate Payer</b>	Rates should be reduced. The council's performance measured on costs saved, with priority to the majority of actual ratepayers, not small minority groups.	Submission noted.
<b>East Victoria Park Residential Rate Payer</b>	Have your say? So no real consideration. You are just increasing rates again. If you can't balance your budget it's the ratepayers that foot the bill. How about cutting out a lot of the rubbish things you are doing. Cut back your overheads first before you stick it everyone else. Where is the report on how you will save money in the coming year?	<p>The Town is experiencing large price increases in many core contracts for materials, utilities, insurance, services and capital works.</p> <p>A lower increase was considered during the budgetary process, however this would limit Town's ability to achieve the outcomes needed to continue maintaining the Town's assets and achieving the strategic community plan.</p> <p>The Town seeks external funding where possible for projects, however, this is not always possible depending in the nature of the project.</p>
<b>Carlisle Residential Rate Payer</b>	Stop what we can't afford. A 200% raise on bulk verge collection is unreasonable and makes this service unjustifiable. Look at alternatives. Tip passes, skip bins or do the suburb in quarters only provide the service to a part of the suburb each 4 years. "Cycle path" is ridiculous the only thing with wheels I have seen in it is a car stuck. I'm all for adding to the suburb and generating jobs but it has to be quality, with purpose and the cost justified. Please be responsible when spending.	Submission noted.
<b>Anonymous</b>	An 8% increase in rates in this cost of living crisis is an astonishingly bad decision for ratepayers. This is on top of over 5% rise last year and over 3% the year before. We can not afford it. Last year's increase was above other neighbouring councils, e.g. Belmont has a 3.5% rise, after a similar rise last year. Belmont provides superior services for less - proposed residential rating for 2024/25 is 6.32 cents, compared to you 9.058 cents. This is a huge difference from several years of	<p>The net rate increase for the Town over the past five years is a total of 2.4%, in comparison with the producer price index was a total of 15.9% over the same period.</p> <p>The rate in the dollar is consistent throughout the Town though it differs by the type of property (residential, non-residential and vacant). This figure is multiplied by the gross rental value (GRV) that is provided by Landgate and</p>

	<p>large rate increases by ToVP. Your reasoning is that the GRV has increased after valuations. Can you provide a breakdown of value increased by suburb? Carlisle property prices don't seem to have risen anywhere near as much as the other suburbs and we are being unfairly penalised by these rates. The other reason given for such a high interest rise is an increase in service price, particularly waste removal. This is particularly galling considering our area had bulk waste sitting in the streets for almost a full month before it was collected this week. Clearly the system is not working and needs to be rethought out. Capital investments in Carlisle have been very disappointing. The bike lane on Archer St is a disaster and will cost a huge amount of money going forward creating a facility that doesn't make a lot of logical sense. The bike path is meant to transition into a shared path in the town centre, where the works are meant to be complete, but its not fit for this purpose. The Carlisle town centre project itself is grey and ugly and did not provide a good return for residents. Huge amounts of money are funnelled into Lathlain developments to benefit football, and projects in Carlisle are not well thought out and provide minimal amenity. Given this history of mismanaging capital projects I do not want such a huge rate rise paying for these projects. We cannot afford it. The rates also increase a 4.5% salary increase. Again, galling considering I havent received a pay increase in years. We would be better off .moving to Belmont, with similar house prices, better services and far less rates, but we can't afford to move. Please stop wasting money on councillors' passion projects and deliver a decent service to your ratepayers. I would support a maximum of 3.5% rate increase.</p>	<p>revalued every three years to reflect changes in the market. This method determined by the Department of Local Government, Sport and Cultural Industries to create a equitable and consistent way of calculating rates.</p>
<p><b>Lathlain Residential Rate Payer</b></p>	<p>With the cost of living crisis the rate increase seems excessive. I believe that we have has rate rises over the last 2 consecutive years. A lower increase, or a cost breakdown of why this is required.</p>	<p>The Town is experiencing large price increases in many core contracts for materials, utilities, insurance, services and capital works.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Waste gate fees have increased by approximately 22%.</li> <li>- Verge collection costs have increased by 90% and 200% for green and bulk waste collection.</li> <li>- Employee costs have increased by 4.5%, as per enterprise bargaining payments and superannuation payments.</li> <li>- Contracts have increased by between 5-15%, if not more. For example, road resurfacing and roads works have seen a 10-15% increase, park and tree maintenance costs (fertilizer, irrigation fittings, tree pruning) has increase 30-40%.</li> <li>- Insurance costs have increase by 7-10%.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Lathlain Residential Rate Payer</b></p>	<p>Council should be looking for way to reduce cost of living pressures for the residents of VP. A focus should be put on how Council can provide the same or better service with less. If a rate rise is required it must be kept as low as possible</p>	<p>Submission noted.</p>
<p><b>East Victoria Park Residential Rate Payer</b></p>	<p>An owner who is actively developing their land doesn't require <b>encouragement</b> to do so as they are already developing the land. In this instance, how do higher rates offer an incentive for them to develop the vacant land?</p> <p>Further, as the Town has granted permission for the land to be developed, it can be assumed that it considers the development is in the best interests of the community and that the development will improve the vibrancy of the Town and neighbourhood centres. Why then, levy these ratepayers at the higher Vacant Land – GRV rate when the Town already considers their actions to be in the <b>best interests of the community</b> and <b>improving the vibrancy of the neighbourhood</b>?</p> <p>For information, a similar situation exists with the Western Australia Department of Finance where Land Tax is levied on vacant land. In this circumstance where construction of a new home is in progress in a</p>	<p>The local Government Act 1995 does not allow the Town to stop or pause rates. However, when a situation arises to delay the building process, there is a review system in place allowing the ratepayer to apply to have the lower residential rates applied earlier. The Town of Victoria Park does not want to unduly penalise the ratepayer who is stuck due to circumstances outside of their control that delay the construction process.</p>

	<p>prompt and reasonable time frame, there is an option for an owner to apply for an exemption of the Land Tax levied on the vacant land.</p> <p>Why can't this principle be applied to the Town of Victoria Park?</p>	
<b>Lathlain Residential Rate Payer</b>	<p>The information provided does not enable proper informed consultation. Rate payers deserve to know what it means for them in plain simple language. We are in a cost of living crisis. Yes inflation peaked and there are cost pressures. This is the time to implement cost reductions and service rationalisation, not trying to raise more revenue from ratepayers. An appropriate rate increase would be 3 to 4 percent. Council should wind back expenditure for 24-25 then seek to progress development works when the economic climate normalises over the forward years.</p>	Submission noted.
<b>Victoria Park Residential Rate Payer</b>	<p>If we have building plans submitted to commence building on vacant land... should we be stung with vacant land rates?</p>	<p>When a situation arises to delay the building process, there is a review system in place allowing the ratepayer to apply to have the lower residential rates applied earlier. The Town of Victoria Park does not want to unduly penalise the ratepayer who is stuck due to circumstances outside of their control that delay the construction process.</p>
<b>Lathlain Residential Rate Payer</b>	<p>What are you spending it all on!? With so so many new properties over last decade via subdivision and large properties with larger rates bills... where is it all going? Please stop the creep of local government, just provides bins, parks and libraries. Invest in capital of value (land and or buildings)</p>	Submission noted.
<b>Lathlain Residential Rate Payer</b>	<p>I think it is way too high and should be around 2%. You pay our CEO and high paid officers the over top salaries that should be reduced drastically. They are not commensurate the size of the town and are ridiculous. The increase you are citing is over the top. You should consider concession card holders being given the ability to pay off their rates with regular payments and not be subjected to interest charges.</p>	Submission noted.
<b>East Victoria Park Residential Rate Payer</b>	<p>Rates for vacant land should be significantly increased so as to disincentivise people to continue to hold vacant land.</p>	<p>The vacant land rate in the dollar that has been proposed is just under double the residential rate in the dollar.</p>
<b>Lathlain Residential Rate Payer</b>	<p>With the rising cost of living this is the last thing we need</p>	Submission noted.

<b>Anonymous</b>	The council should be more transparent with this rate increase, yes you meet the minimum requirement for disclosure but why not show your residence what the actual increase is? Will it be 8%. This is pure commercial wizardry trying to fool unsuspecting residence into accepting this increase without showing what the increase is. Very poor financial management. You can do better.	Submission noted.
<b>Lathlain Residential Rate Payer</b>	"Please consider that the substantial proposed increase in rates is based on rental values but this has no correlation to the home owner. Because rental values have increased doesn't provide any benefit to owner occupiers. Please also consider the high and unreasonable levy on vacant land, which in many cases is only vacant because of the current building crisis"	The method for how the rates are calculated is set by the Minister for Local Government and Youth who has decided that the gross rental value be used in the calculation for the types of properties that is in the Town. The calculation methods are consistent with all local governments in Western Australia.  When a situation arises to delay the building process, there is a review system in place allowing the ratepayer to apply to have the lower residential rates applied earlier. The Town of Victoria Park does not want to unduly penalise the ratepayer who is stuck due to circumstances outside of their control that delay the construction process.
<b>Lathlain Residential Rate Payer</b>	I am supportive of differential rates. Just a query..is land considered vacant during building a residential property because we are building and it's taking years!	When a situation arises to delay the building process, there is a review system in place allowing the ratepayer to apply to have the lower residential rates applied earlier. The Town of Victoria Park does not want to unduly penalise the ratepayer who is stuck due to circumstances outside of their control that delay the construction process.
<b>East Victoria Park Residential Rate Payer</b>	"Submission to the Local Government Regarding Proposed 8% Rate Increase  To Whom It May Concern,  I am writing to express my concerns regarding the proposed 8% increase in local rates. As a resident and taxpayer in this community, I believe that	Submission noted.

such an increase would have significant negative impacts on the residents and the overall economic health of our area. I urge the council to reconsider this decision for the following reasons:

**1. Economic Hardship for Residents:**

Many residents are already struggling with the rising cost of living, including higher prices for essential goods and services. An 8% increase in rates would further strain household budgets, particularly for low and middle-income families, pensioners, and those on fixed incomes. This increase could lead to financial distress and reduce the quality of life for many in our community.

**2. Impact on Small Businesses:**

Small businesses are the backbone of our local economy. An increase in rates will raise operating costs for these businesses, many of which are still recovering from the economic impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic. Higher rates could force some businesses to downsize, lay off employees, or even close their doors permanently, resulting in job losses and reduced local economic activity.

**3. Reduced Property Values:**

Higher rates can make our community less attractive to potential homebuyers and investors. This could lead to a stagnation or decline in property values, which would hurt current homeowners by reducing their equity and potentially increasing the difficulty of selling properties in the future.

**4. Inefficiency and Waste:**

Before resorting to rate increases, the council should conduct a thorough review of current expenditures to identify areas where cost savings can be achieved. Improving operational efficiency and eliminating wasteful spending could provide the necessary funds without placing additional burdens on residents.

	<p>5. Alternative Revenue Sources: The council should explore alternative revenue sources and funding mechanisms. This could include applying for grants, forming public-private partnerships, or implementing user fees for specific services that are used more frequently by certain groups. These alternatives could help raise the necessary funds without a blanket increase in rates.</p> <p>6. Community Consultation and Transparency: Decisions of this magnitude should be made with extensive community consultation and transparency. Residents deserve a clear understanding of why the rate increase is necessary, how the funds will be used, and what measures have been taken to minimize the financial burden on the community. Greater transparency can also build trust and ensure that the council is held accountable for its financial management.</p> <p>In conclusion, I strongly urge the council to reconsider the proposed 8% rate increase and explore more sustainable and equitable solutions. It is crucial to balance the need for adequate funding for public services with the economic realities faced by our residents and businesses.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my concerns. I look forward to your response and hope that the council will take these points into account when making their final decision."</p>	
<p><b>Lathlain Residential Rate Payer</b></p>	<p>Yes, the proposed increase is too high! As a government health employee with little to no increase in wages in recent years, who am I to be expected to afford an 8% "differential" rate increase</p>	<p>Submission noted.</p>
<p><b>Lathlain Residential Rate Payer</b></p>	<p>The rate increases are over CPI and should not be passed. Please seeks ways to reduce rates given cost of living pressures.</p>	<p>Submission noted.</p>
<p><b>Victoria Park Residential Rate Payer</b></p>	<p>"I agree with the need to have differential rates. I specifically agree with the higher rates for vacant land to encourage use to build more housing. I also argue the current minimum rate proposed is too low to make any meaningful impact. I think it should be at least \$5000 a year.</p>	<p>Submission noted.</p>

	<p>Additionally, I think the council should also have an additional levy for empty residential houses. There are too many houses that are empty and underutilized in Victoria Park. Second homes, as defined by the ATO, could and should be levied a higher rate and a higher fixed minimum. Landlords get a lot from the town of Victoria Park, making it an attractive place to live and work in. This is not cheap. It must be part of their investment costs to pay a decent rate, higher than the owner occupiers.</p> <p>"</p>	
<p><b>Lathlain Residential Rate Payer</b></p>	<p>"Economic Burden</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cost of Living: Higher rates add to the cost of living, which can be especially challenging for families, retirees, and low-income households already struggling with expenses.</li> <li>2. Economic Conditions: In times of economic downturn or slow recovery, rate increases can place additional financial stress on residents and businesses.</li> </ol> <p>Accountability and Transparency</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Lack of Transparency: I feel that the local government has not been transparent about how the additional funds will be used, leading to skepticism about the necessity and effectiveness of the increase.</li> <li>2.Financial Management: Concerns about past financial mismanagement or wasteful spending by the local government can lead to opposition to providing more funds through higher rates.</li> </ol> <p>Service Quality</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Service Efficiency: I feel that the quality of local services has not improved or has declined despite previous rate increases, they may oppose further hikes.</li> <li>2.Value for Money. the current rates are not providing good value for money in terms of services and infrastructure.</li> </ol>	<p>Submission noted.</p>



Alternatives

1. Cost-Cutting Measures: local government should explore cost-cutting measures or efficiency improvements before resorting to rate increases.
2. Alternative Funding: Proposing alternative funding mechanisms, such as seeking state or federal grants or public-private partnerships, could be viewed as preferable to increasing rates.

Economic Impact on Local Businesses

1. Business Viability: Higher rates can increase operational costs for local businesses, potentially leading to reduced profitability, layoffs, or business closures.
2. Economic Development: Increased rates might deter new businesses from setting up in the area, negatively impacting local economic growth and employment opportunities.

Equity Concerns

1. Disproportionate Impact: Rate increases may disproportionately affect certain groups, such as pensioners, single-income families, and people with disabilities, leading to concerns about fairness and equity.
2. Property Value Link: Since rates are often linked to property values, areas with rapidly increasing property prices might face steep rate hikes, impacting long-term residents who might not have equivalent increases in income.

Community Engagement

1. Lack of Consultation: If ToV has not adequately consulted the community or sought public input before proposing the rate increase, residents may feel excluded from the decision-making process.

	<p>2.Representation: Concerns about whether the local government is truly representing the interests and priorities of the community might lead to opposition.</p> <p>Timing</p> <p>1.Poor Timing: Increases proposed during times of economic hardship, such as post-COVID recovery or during a recession, can be particularly contentious.</p> <p>2.Staggered Implementation: Proposing a large rate increase all at once, rather than a phased approach, might be more difficult for residents to accept.</p> <p>Specific Local Issues</p> <p>1.Infrastructure Projects: Specific projects funded by the rate increase might be controversial or unpopular with the community.</p> <p>2.Previous Commitments: If previous promises or commitments made by TOV have not been fulfilled, i feel distrust new proposals for increased funding"</p>	
<p><b>East Victoria Park Residential Rate Payer</b></p>	<p>"Sounds more equitable than assessing against values right now for home owners.</p> <p>Consider discounts this year for those properties adjacent to Carlisle and Oats Street stations who have been negatively impacted by Metronet works for the past 18 months - the disruption, noise, dust, extra traffic, and road closures continue to impact daily life of residents."</p>	<p>Submission noted.</p>
<p><b>Lathlain Residential Rate Payer</b></p>	<p>"The information provided for comment should include the details of the previous years' rates so that people can more easily identify the changes.</p> <p>Having a higher rate on vacant land to encourage development seems a worthwhile outcome, but only to the extent that the development and infill is smart... don't encourage rushing into cheap development that will have negative impacts down the long term.</p>	<p>Submission noted.</p>

	<p>It appears from the document provided that the aim is to keep residential rates steady despite the significant increases in GRV - fair, and needed. People who owner occupy are not getting a benefit from increased rental rates, and increasing rates of those already in a tight budget will only impact their ability to spend within the local community. "</p>	
<p><b>East Victoria Park Residential Rate Payer</b></p>	<p>This is not the definition of "consultation". Why has a % value increase not been stated in the information to rate payers? Why was there no justification for the increases? You should be providing detail of what rate payers gained from the Towns spending over the last period and a justification of why the rates must increase. You need to provide information on how your spending and rates input compares to other councils also - over the last few years this council has seen significant increases in rates, with neighbouring councils much more moderate. You have more infill each year, but somehow rates keep going up and up - and not in moderation like other councils. If this info is provided, rate payers can make an informed decision on their feedback. There is a lack of transparency here and it is not good enough. Overall, as a rate payer, I disagree with the substandard document disseminated.</p>	<p>Submission noted.</p>