City of
Bayswater

Supplementary Information

Ordinary Council Meeting

Tuesday 23 June 2026

Contents

10.2.6 Differential Rates Submissions 2026-27......................2

10.2.6 Differential Rates Submissions 2026-27

Responsible Branch:	Financial Services
Responsible Directorate:	Corporate Services
Authority/Discretion:	Legislative
Voting Requirement:	Simple Majority Required.
Attachments:	1. Statement of Objects and Reasons 2026/27 [**10.2.6.1** - 3 pages] 2. Rates Table [**10.2.6.2** - 1 page] 3. Rates Submissions and Responses [**10.2.6.3** - 10 pages]
Refer:	Nil.
Officer Declaration:	*The officers involved in drafting and reviewing this report do not have any interests to disclose in the item.*

This item does not contain any information that is considered confidential in accordance with Section 5.23(2) of the Local Government Act 1995.

SUMMARY

For Council to consider the advertised differential rates submissions and request Ministerial approval of the proposed 2026/27 minimum payment for the Residential – Vacant category.

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

That Council:

1. **Requests the Chief Executive Officer to proceed with budget preparation based on the Statement of Objects and Reasons contained in Attachment 1 and the following table:**

Differential Category based on GRV	Rate in the Dollar	Minimum Payment
	$	$
Residential (Improved)	0.052992	1,248.50
Commercial/Industrial (Improved)	0.072535	1,708.90
Residential – Vacant	0.075249	1,772.90
Commercial/Industrial – Vacant	0.105454	2,484.50

2. **Authorises the Chief Executive Officer to proceed with the application for Ministerial Approval of the 2026/27 differential rates, specifically the minimum payment for the Residential – Vacant and Commercial/Industrial – Vacant categories.**

BACKGROUND

Preparation of the Annual Budget is a statutory requirement under the *Local Government Act 1995*; with the Annual Budget being presented at the 28 July 2026 Ordinary Council Meeting. Having introduced differential rates, the Council led business planning and budget process has been brought forward in order to comply with the following requirements of the *Local Government Act 1995:*

1. S6.36 of the *Local Government Act 1995* requires the proposed differential rates in the dollar and the minimum payments to be advertised by local public notice for a statutory 21-day period.
2. S6.35 of the *Local Government Act 1995* allows for the Minister to approve the imposition of a minimum payment that applies to more than 50% of the properties in a differential rate category for vacant land. This is the case for the Vacant Residential and Vacant Commercial/Industrial categories, and 21 days should be allowed for Ministerial approval.

At the Ordinary Council Meeting of 26 May 2026, Council endorsed:

1. Rates information table for the purpose of yielding the deficiency disclosed by the proposed 2026/27 Budget;
2. Statement of Objects and Reasons; and
3. Advertising by local public notice for a period of 21 days.

Following the advertising by local notice Council have received 16 submissions that are to be considered as part of the 2026/27 Annual Budget process.

EXTERNAL CONSULTATION

Public notice of the proposed differential rates for the statutory 21-day period occurred from (and inclusive of) Friday 29 May 2026 to Friday 19 June 2026.

Public notice was advertised through the following channels:

1. The West Australian;
2. City of Bayswater website;
3. Public notice boards in all three libraries and the Civic (Administration) Centre; and
4. eNewsletter.

Furthermore, the advertisement was also included on Engage Bayswater.

The Statement of Objects and Reasons and submission forms were also available electronically or in hardcopy.

This report is for Council to consider the submissions in accordance with S6.36 *Local Government Act 1995*.

OFFICER'S COMMENTS

Council led Business Planning and Budget Process

To date there have been six business planning and budget related workshops. Areas covered include:

1. Business Planning and Budget process (Council priority setting);
2. Forward Capital Works Program (10 years);
3. Long-Term Financial Plan;
4. Statement of Financial Activity (budget deficiency) including operating income and expenditure analysis and differential rates;
5. Service Plan analysis; and
6. Fees and Charges Review.

Differential Rating

The introduction of differential rates during 2024/25 was considered through a Rating Strategy that was underpinned by the Department of Local Government, Sport and Cultural Industries guiding principles of Differential Rating. The adopted differential ratios were based on considerable benchmarking and modelling though several workshops.

The proposed rate in the dollar and minimums for each category of differential rating was advertised for the statutory 21-day period through the City of Baywater website plus three other formal communication channels including the West Australian. A Statement of Objects and

Reasons was also made available that explains the objects and reasons of each proposed rate and minimum payment. This is detailed in **Attachment 1**.

The full rates table can be found in **Attachment 2**.

Following the advertising for the statutory 21-day period, 16 submissions have been received.

Across the 16 submissions received, the key themes raised by ratepayers centred on concerns about inflation and increasing cost of living pressures. Many submissions highlighted the financial strain experienced by households and businesses, with a common view that rate increases should be limited to, or below, CPI.

There was an expectation that the City should place a greater focus on controlling expenditure, improving efficiency, and reviewing internal costs before increasing rates. Some submissions specifically suggested deferring non-essential projects, limiting new initiatives, and ensuring that existing assets are maintained effectively.

A number of responses also sought clearer justification for the proposed increase, including greater transparency around how additional revenue will be used and what tangible benefits will be delivered to the community.

Overall, the submissions reflect a concern about affordability, alongside an expectation that the City demonstrate strong financial discipline while continuing to provide essential services and infrastructure.

The submissions and proposed responses are included in **Attachment 3.**

LEGISLATIVE COMPLIANCE

Council has several financial policies which have been taken into consideration in the budget process, including its policies on investments, assets, treatment of income and expenditure, rates arrears, cash-back reserves, borrowings and integrated planning.

Section 6.2 of the *Local Government Act 1995* requires that no later than 31 August in each financial year, or such extended time as the Minister allows, each local government is to prepare and adopt (by Absolute Majority) in the form and manner prescribed, a budget for its municipal fund for the financial year ending on the next following 30 June.

Other sections of the *Local Government Act* 1995 more relevant to differential rates include:

6.32. Rates and service charges

(1) When adopting the annual budget, a local government —

(a) in order to make up the budget deficiency, is to impose a general rate on rateable land within its district, which rate may be imposed either —*

(i) uniformly; or

(ii) differentially;

and

(b) may impose on rateable land within its district —*

(i) a specified area rate; or

(ii) a minimum payment;

and

(c) may impose a service charge on land within its district.*

** Absolute majority required.*

(2) Where a local government resolves to impose a rate it is required to —

(a) set a rate which is expressed as a rate in the dollar of the gross rental value of rateable land within its district to be rated on gross rental value; and

(b) set a rate which is expressed as a rate in the dollar of the unimproved value of rateable land within its district to be rated on unimproved value.

6.33. Differential general rates

(1) A local government may impose differential general rates according to any, or a combination, of the following characteristics —

(a) the purpose for which the land is zoned, whether or not under a planning scheme as defined in the Planning and Development Act 2005; or

(b) a purpose for which the land is held or used as determined by the local government; or

(c) whether or not the land is vacant land; or

(d) any other characteristic or combination of characteristics prescribed.

6.35. Minimum payment

(1) Subject to this section, a local government may impose on any rateable land in its district a minimum payment which is greater than the general rate which would otherwise be payable on that land.

(2) A minimum payment is to be a general minimum but, subject to subsection (3), a lesser minimum may be imposed in respect of any portion of the district.

(3) In applying subsection (2) the local government is to ensure the general minimum is imposed on not less than —

(a) 50% of the total number of separately rated properties in the district; or

(b) 50% of the number of properties in each category referred to in subsection (6),

on which a minimum payment is imposed.

(4) A minimum payment is not to be imposed on more than the prescribed percentage of —

(a) the number of separately rated properties in the district; or

(b) the number of properties in each category referred to in subsection (6),

unless the general minimum does not exceed the prescribed amount.

(5) If a local government imposes a differential general rate on any land on the basis that the land is vacant land it may, with the approval of the Minister, impose a minimum payment in a manner that does not comply with subsections (2), (3) and (4) for that land.

6.36. Local government to give notice of certain rates

(1) Before imposing any differential general rates or a minimum payment applying to a differential rate category under section 6.35(6)(c) a local government is to give local public notice of its intention to do so.

RISK MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATION

The table below shows the level of risk for each impact category, if the officer's recommendation is not adopted by the Council.

Impact Category	Appetite	Risk Rating
Workplace, Health and Safety	Low	Low
Financial	Medium	Medium
Reputation and Stakeholders	Medium	Medium
Service Delivery	Medium	Medium
Environment	Low	Low
Governance and Compliance	Low	Low
Strategic Risk	SR07 - Unethical or inadequate governance and/or decision-making.	

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

This report forms a crucial step in the adoption of the 2026/27 budget by 28 July 2026.

STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS

In accordance with the City of Bayswater Council Plan 2025 – 2035, the following applies:

Key Result Area: Leadership and Governance
Outcome 5.2 Stakeholder Leadership
Objective 5.2.1 Communicate and engage effectively to empower civic participation.

Key Result Area: Leadership and Governance
Outcome 5.3 Optimised Performance
Objective 5.3.1 Focus on operational efficiency, effective delivery and innovation to ensure our services are fit for purpose, contemporary and secure.

CONCLUSION

Council is required to consider submissions prior to endorsing the proposed differential rates with or without modification (including rate in the dollar and minimum payment by category) and Statement of Objects and Reasons. Council is also required to authorise the Chief Executive Officer to proceed with the application for Ministerial Approval of the 2026/27 minimum payment for the Residential – Vacant and Commercial/Industrial - Vacant categories.

City of
Bayswater

Differential Rating Categories - Statement of Objects and Reasons

Section 6.36 of the *Local Government Act 1995* requires Councils utilising differential rates and minimum payments to advertise these rates prior to adopting the budget. A minimum submission period of 21 days must be allowed following which all submissions must be considered by Council. Information regarding submissions is included in the advertisement to levy differential rates, which is available through public notice, including on the City's website.

Section 6.33 of the *Local Government Act 1995* empowers a Council to impose different rates in the dollar for different land zoning's or uses and different rates for improved or vacant land. This power is provided to help local governments achieve a better rating equity between different land uses.

Overall Increase and Revaluation Context

The City has applied an overall 5.90% increase in rate revenue across all differential rating categories (collectively) for the 2026/27 financial year, with the distribution to each individual category explained below. This increase is required to fund the City's operating and capital expenditure commitments as adopted through the annual budget process.

The 2026/27 rating year incorporates updated triennial Gross Rental Values (GRVs) as provided by Landgate. As a result, comparisons to the prior year are influenced by both:

- Movements in property valuations; and
- Adjustments to the rate in the dollar and minimum payments required to achieve the City's revenue requirement.

Impact of Valuation Movements

When comparing the 2025/26 base position (adjusted for 2025/26 valuations) to the proposed 2026/27 rates, the estimated increase in rates income (excluding interim rates) by category is:

- Residential (Improved): 5.50%
- Commercial/Industrial (Improved): 5.50%
- Residential – Vacant: 27.77%
- Commercial/Industrial – Vacant: 20.36%

These increases represent the average movement for properties within each category.

Explanation of Variances Between Categories

1. Improved Properties (Residential and Commercial/Industrial)

The increases for improved properties (5.50%) are broadly aligned with the overall rate revenue increase of 5.90%, demonstrating a relatively stable and equitable distribution of the rating burden across developed properties.

City of
Bayswater

This reflects the City's objective to:

- Maintain fairness between established residential and business ratepayers; and
- Ensure incremental increases remain broadly consistent with overall revenue needs.

2. Vacant Land Categories

Vacant land categories show significantly higher increases:

- Residential Vacant: 27.77%
- Commercial/Industrial Vacant: 20.36%

This is consistent with the objects of rating categories as explained below.

Minimum Payment Increases

The revaluation has altered the distribution and number of properties captured by minimum payments, particularly for vacant land.

Given the change in mix and number of properties captured by the minimum payments following the revaluation, increases to minimum payments are higher for all categories except for Residential (Improved). The following table compares the minimum payments, and rate in the dollar, for all categories.

Summary – Rates Table:

	2025-26		2026-27		*Annual Budget Comparison – Rates Income	
Differential Category based on GRV	Rate in the Dollar	Minimum Payment	Rate in the Dollar	Minimum Payment	2025-26	2026-27
	$	$	$	$	$	$
Residential (Improved)	0.077288	1,183.40	0.052992	1,248.50	47,647,389	50,706,074
Commercial/Industrial (Improved)	0.079993	1,224.80	0.072535	1,708.90	14,293,890	15,094,364
Residential - Vacant	0.088881	1,360.90	0.075249	1,772.90	1,065,525	1,165,401
Commercial/Industrial - Vacant	0.100474	1538.40	0.105454	2,484.50	256,206	403,176

*includes estimated interim rates

Minimum Payments

The minimum payments are set to ensure the minimum level of service required is adequately funded and are consistent with the differential ratios used for setting the rate in the dollar. The reasons and objects noted below for the different categories are reflected in the ratio's set for both the minimum payments and the rate in the dollar.

City of
Bayswater

- **Residential - Improved**

The object of this rate category is to apply a base differential rate to all improved land zoned residential and used for residential purposes. This supports the differential rates process in ensuring all property owners contribute equitably to the operations of the City, with the base rate allowing for residential property owners the contribute less than the other categories for the reasons provided below.

- **Commercial/Industrial - Improved**

The object of this rate category is to ensure those property's zoned and used for commercial or industrial purposes contribute equitably to the operations of the City by applying a higher differential rate. The additional rates revenue is sourced to offset the higher costs associated with servicing those infrastructure assets in commercial and industrial areas. It also reflects the inner City location and amenity to support a metropolitan Activity Centre and significant State investment into the area that positions this prime location.

- **Residential – Vacant**

The object of this rate category is to impose a higher differential rate on residential vacant land. The reason is to encourage owners of vacant land to develop, which is in the best interests of residents and commercial businesses residing within the City and considers the significant housing shortfall in the metropolitan area.

- **Commercial/Industrial - Vacant**

The object of this rate category is to impose a higher differential rate on commercial vacant land. The reason is that vacant commercial has a more significant adverse impact on residents and commercial businesses residing within the City by minimising the economic potential of the area. Development is encouraged to reflect the inner City location and amenity to support a metropolitan Activity Centre and significant State investment into the area that positions this prime location. This will also help offset the additional costs associated in servicing infrastructure assets in commercial and industrial areas.

RATES AND SERVICE CHARGES

(a) Rating Information

Rate Description	Basis of valuation	2026/27 Rate in dollar	2026/27 Number of properties	2026/27 Rateable value*	2026/27 Budgeted rate revenue	2026/27 Budgeted interim rates	2026/27 Budgeted total revenue	2025/26 Rate in dollar	2025/26 Number of properties	2025/26 Rateable value*	2025/26 Budgeted rate revenue	2025/26 Budgeted interim rates	2025/26 Budgeted total revenue
										$	$	$	$
(i) General rates													
Residential (Improved)	Gross rental valuation	0.052992	26,128	834,098,628	44,200,554	334,184	44,534,738	0.077288	24,574	515,849,076	39,868,944	314,741	40,183,685
Commercial/Industrial (Improved)	Gross rental valuation	0.072535	1,473	198,672,982	14,410,745	200,000	14,610,745	0.079993	1,639	176,346,629	14,106,496	0	14,106,496
Residential - Vacant	Gross rental valuation	0.075249	55	1,751,520	131,800	0	131,800	0.088881	115	2,464,480	219,045	0	219,045
Commercial/Industrial - Vacant	Gross rental valuation	0.105454	34	2,857,270	301,311	0	301,311	0.100474	38	2,519,350	253,129	0	253,129
Total general rates			27,690	1,037,380,400	59,044,410	534,184	59,578,594		26,366	697,179,535	54,447,614	314,741	54,762,355
(ii) Minimum payment		**Minimum** $						**Minimum** $					
Residential (Improved)	Gross rental valuation	1,248.50	4,943	104,505,760	6,171,336	0	6,171,336	1,183.40	6,307	84,415,984	7,463,704	0	7,463,704
Commercial/Industrial (Improved)	Gross rental valuation	1,708.90	283	4,824,310	483,619	0	483,619	1,224.80	153	1,720,830	187,394	0	187,394
Residential - Vacant	Gross rental valuation	1,772.90	583	7,508,880	1,033,601	0	1,033,601	1,360.90	622	5,764,340	846,480	0	846,480
Commercial/Industrial - Vacant	Gross rental valuation	2,484.50	41	381,610	101,865	0	101,865	1,538.40	2	16,600	3,077	0	3,077
Total minimum payments			5,850	117,220,560	7,790,421	0	7,790,421		7,084	91,917,754	8,500,655	0	8,500,655
Total general rates and minimum payments			33,540	1,154,600,960	66,834,831	534,184	67,369,015		33,450	789,097,289	62,948,269	314,741	63,263,010

Submission Number	Submission	Responses
Submission 1	Rates should be kept to local cpi - In the 12 months to April 2026, Australia's headline annual inflation rate slowed to 4.2%. For Western Australia specifically, the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for Perth increased by 4.8% over the year to the March 2026. so 5.5% is way above and given property prices are looking to be lowered according to latest price surveys this seems well above what is required and would like to think keep it to 4.8% is more agreeable.	Thank you for your submission. Council acknowledges the current cost of living pressures facing households. In developing the 2026/27 Budget, Council has considered CPI alongside cost increases experienced by the City, and maintained its strategy of aligning rate increases with CPI, while putting 1% into reserves to maintain and renew our $1.2 billion assets for future generations. The proposed 5.5% increase for improved properties reflects Council's assessment of what is required to maintain services, deliver essential infrastructure and ensure the City remains financially sustainable into the future. Council has sought to minimise the increase where possible, while continuing its responsibility to deliver the services and assets our community relies on.
Submission 2	Submission regarding Proposed Differential Rates 2026–2027 I strongly object to the proposed increase in rates for the 2026/2027 financial year. Households in the City of Bayswater are already experiencing significant financial pressure due to the ongoing cost-of-living crisis. My family, like many others, is a single-income household with two children, one of whom has a disability requiring additional care and related expenses. At the same time, mortgage repayments have increased substantially due to rising interest rates, leaving very limited financial capacity to absorb further increases in council charges. Over recent years, residents have faced continuous increases in essential living costs, including housing, food, utilities, insurance, and transport. In this context, any additional increase in council rates places further strain on already stretched household budgets. While I acknowledge the need for local government to fund services and infrastructure, I do not believe the proposed increase adequately reflects the current financial reality faced by many residents. The cumulative impact of inflation and interest rate rises has significantly reduced disposable income for ordinary families. I am also concerned about Council spending priorities. Before considering any increase in rates, the City should conduct a thorough review of existing expenditure and ensure that all spending is necessary, efficient, and delivers clear value to residents. As a resident, I have observed expenditure on non-essential or low-priority items, including multiple informational signage installations and streetscape changes that may not represent the most effective use of public funds during a period of financial pressure. Residents need confidence that all reasonable cost-saving measures have been fully explored before additional financial burdens are imposed on ratepayers. I respectfully request that the Council reconsider the proposed rate increase and place greater emphasis on fiscal responsibility, efficiency, and protecting households already under financial strain. Thank you for considering my submission.	Thank you for your submission. Council acknowledges the current cost of living pressures facing households. In developing the 2026/27 Budget, a comprehensive zero-based budgeting approach has been undertaken, supported by detailed workshops, to ensure all expenditure is reviewed, prioritised and aligned to community needs as detailed in the City's Corporate Business Plan. The proposed 5.5% increase for improved properties reflects Council's assessment of what is required to maintain services, deliver essential infrastructure and ensure the City remains financially sustainable into the future. Council has sought to minimise the increase where possible, while continuing its responsibility to deliver the services and assets our community relies on.

Submission Number	Submission	Responses
Submission 3	Due to the cost of living crisis and interest rate rises, additional rates are completely unreasonable. Many people are struggling to keep a roof over their head.	Thank you for your submission. Council acknowledges the current cost of living pressures facing households. In developing the 2026/27 Budget, Council has considered CPI alongside cost increases experienced by the City, and maintained its strategy of aligning rate increases with CPI, while putting 1% into reserves to maintain and renew our $1.2 billion assets for future generations. A comprehensive zero-based budgeting approach has been undertaken, supported by detailed workshops, to ensure all expenditure is reviewed, prioritised and aligned to community needs as detailed in the City's Corporate Business Plan. The proposed 5.5% increase for improved properties reflects Council's assessment of what is required to maintain services, deliver essential infrastructure and ensure the City remains financially sustainable into the future. Council has sought to minimise the increase where possible, while continuing its responsibility to deliver the services and assets our community relies on.
Submission 4	While I appreciate the attempt to differentiate rates between residential, commercial, vacant and non vacant; and the explanations forthcoming; what I don't appreciate is the lack of clarity around what the additional 5.9% overall affords? It is untenable to add increasing levies of such magnitude, when ratepayers wages are unlikely to keep pace, cost of living is already increased substantially, and property appreciation is locked in to the asset. As a company manager, it is imperative on us to rationalise every cost, be targeted and strategic with our spend, and to increase efficiency across every measure so that we deliver maximum value per dollar spend.	Thank you for your submission. Council acknowledges the current cost pressures facing households. The proposed overall increase reflects Council's assessment of what is required to maintain services, deliver essential infrastructure and ensure the City remains financially sustainable into the future. This includes essential services such as waste management, community facilities, parks and reserves, road maintenance and community safety, as well as ongoing asset renewal to ensure infrastructure remains safe and fit for purpose. In developing the 2026/27 Budget, Council has considered CPI alongside cost increases experienced by the City, and maintained its strategy of aligning rate increases with CPI, while putting 1% into reserves to maintain and renew our $1.2 billion assets for future generations. A comprehensive zero-based budgeting approach has been undertaken, supported by detailed workshops, to ensure all expenditure is reviewed, prioritised and aligned to community needs as detailed in the City's Corporate Business Plan. Council has sought to minimise the increase where possible, while continuing its responsibility to deliver the services and assets our community relies on.

Submission Number	Submission	Responses
Submission 5	I don't believe it to be feasible to up the rates in Bayswater, other then emptying my bins what are you doing for me, it took property damage to get your trees maintained. The jetty in the lake across from my house has had a temporary fence on it for years, with no plans of repairing The mosquito problem is worse than ever.	Thank you for your submission. The proposed increase reflects Council's assessment of what is required to maintain services, deliver essential infrastructure and ensure the City remains financially sustainable into the future. This includes essential services such as waste management, community facilities, parks and reserves, road maintenance and community safety, as well as ongoing asset renewal to ensure infrastructure remains safe and fit for purpose. In relation to mosquito management, the City has a dedicated Mosquito Control Unit that operates a targeted treatment program. As mosquito trapping undertaken this financial year on City land has revealed significantly lower mosquito numbers than in recent years, the issue you are experiencing may be more localised. If you would like this matter investigated further, please contact the City's Mosquito Control Unit on 9279 3305. The Maylands Lakes Landscape Plan, which is being presented to Council for endorsement this month, includes remediation works to lakefront infrastructure at Lake Bungana and Lake Brearley. Following Council endorsement, these remedial works will be implemented in accordance with the Plan.
Submission 6	I object to the proposed increase to Council rates. Cost-of-living is causing hardship to many households, and almost every good and service provider is passing the buck of rising prices onto consumers. It is low and fixed income earners who bear the greatest economic burden, and that is egregiously unfair. I would like the City of Bayswater to look for ways to reduce expenditure. For a start, you cutting FTEs and freezing your CEO's salary would be a considerable saving to ratepayers. I urge the Council to exercise compassion and thrift instead of expecting cash-strapped ratepayers to bankroll your burgeoning budget. Fail to do that and you're failing the people whose interests you have a duty of care to protect.	Thank you for your submission. Council acknowledges the current cost of living pressures facing households. The proposed overall increase reflects Council's assessment of what is required to maintain services, deliver essential infrastructure and ensure the City remains financially sustainable into the future. In developing the 2026/27 Budget, Council has considered CPI alongside cost increases experienced by the City, and maintained its strategy of aligning rate increases with CPI, while putting 1% into reserves to maintain and renew our $1.2 billion assets for future generations. A comprehensive zero-based budgeting approach has been undertaken, supported by detailed workshops, to ensure all expenditure is reviewed, prioritised and aligned to community needs as detailed in the City's Corporate Business Plan. Council has sought to minimise the increase where possible, while continuing its responsibility to deliver the services and assets our community relies on. Staffing levels and remuneration of the CEO is considered as part of the annual budget process and ongoing organisational reviews, with a focus on ensuring the City continues to operate efficiently and deliver value to the community.

Submission Number	Submission	Responses
Submission 7	I wish to object to the proposed 5.5% increase in rates for the 2026–2027 financial year. While the City has presented this increase as equating to approximately $1.69 per week for the average household, many residents are already experiencing significant cost-of-living pressures, including increases in mortgage repayments, rent, insurance premiums, utilities, childcare costs, groceries, and other essential expenses. Even relatively small increases can place additional strain on household budgets. I am concerned that the proposed increase exceeds current inflationary pressures and places an additional burden on ratepayers at a time when many families are being required to make difficult financial decisions. I encourage the City to explore opportunities to reduce expenditure, improve operational efficiencies, and prioritise essential services before increasing rates above the level necessary to maintain core community services. I would welcome greater transparency regarding the specific projects, initiatives, and cost increases driving this proposed rate rise, and whether alternative options have been considered to minimise the impact on residents. I respectfully request that Council reconsider the proposed increase and investigate opportunities to reduce costs for the community. Thank you	Thank you for your submission. Council acknowledges the current cost of living pressures facing households. The proposed overall increase reflects Council's assessment of what is required to maintain services, deliver essential infrastructure and ensure the City remains financially sustainable into the future. This includes essential services such as waste management, community facilities, parks and reserves, road maintenance and community safety, as well as ongoing asset renewal to ensure infrastructure remains safe and fit for purpose. In developing the 2026/27 Budget, Council has considered CPI alongside cost increases experienced by the City, and maintained its strategy of aligning rate increases with CPI, while putting 1% into reserves to maintain and renew our $1.2 billion assets for future generations. A comprehensive zero-based budgeting approach has been undertaken, supported by detailed workshops, to ensure all expenditure is reviewed, prioritised and aligned to community needs as detailed in the City's Corporate Business Plan. Council has sought to minimise the increase where possible, while continuing its responsibility to deliver the services and assets our community relies on.
Submission 8	To the Chief Executive Officer, City of Bayswater, I am writing as a residential ratepayer to formally object to the proposed differential rates for the 2026/27 financial year. The proposed rate in the dollar for Residential (Improved) properties of $0.052992, with a minimum payment of $1,248.50, represents a significant financial burden on household budgets that are already under considerable strain. At a time when cost of living pressures — including rising mortgage rates, energy costs, and everyday expenses — are being felt acutely by residents across the City of Bayswater, I do not believe this is an appropriate time to increase rates. I urge the Council to consider the real impact this increase will have on ordinary residents and families. Before proceeding, I ask that the Council: 1. Explore opportunities to reduce expenditure and find efficiencies within existing operations before passing additional costs on to ratepayers. 2. Provide a clear and detailed breakdown of how the additional revenue will be spent and what tangible benefits residents can expect in return. 3. Consider freezing or reducing the rate increase to provide meaningful cost-of-living relief to the community. I strongly oppose the adoption of the proposed rates as presented and ask that my submission be formally noted. Yours sincerely, XXX	Thank you for your submission. Council acknowledges the current cost of living pressures facing households. The proposed overall increase reflects Council's assessment of what is required to maintain services, deliver essential infrastructure and ensure the City remains financially sustainable into the future.This includes essential services such as waste management, community facilities, parks and reserves, road maintenance and community safety, as well as ongoing asset renewal to ensure infrastructure remains safe and fit for purpose. In developing the 2026/27 Budget, Council has considered CPI alongside cost increases experienced by the City, and maintained its strategy of aligning rate increases with CPI, while putting 1% into reserves to maintain and renew our $1.2 billion assets for future generations. A comprehensive zero-based budgeting approach has been undertaken, supported by detailed workshops, to ensure all expenditure is reviewed, prioritised and aligned to community needs as detailed in the City's Corporate Business Plan. Council has sought to minimise the increase where possible, while continuing its responsibility to deliver the services and assets our community relies on.

Submission Number	Submission	Responses
Submission 9	Don't increase the rates and perhaps do more with less? Little has been done on tree canopy which is the main issue ratepayers are concerned about but instead we get a heap of speed bumps and other projects. It would be great to see a justification for why the increase is going up and what the council is doing to be more efficient with rates given we are in a time when households are cutting back on expenses. Councillors could lead by example, suggest ways to stabilise rates and be more sensitive to the current economic climate.	Thank you for your submission. Council acknowledges the current cost of living pressures facing households. The proposed overall increase reflects Council's assessment of what is required to maintain services, deliver essential infrastructure and ensure the City remains financially sustainable into the future.This includes essential services such as waste management, community facilities, parks and reserves, road maintenance and community safety, as well as ongoing asset renewal to ensure infrastructure remains safe and fit for purpose. In developing the 2026/27 Budget, Council has considered CPI alongside cost increases experienced by the City, and maintained its strategy of aligning rate increases with CPI, while putting 1% into reserves to maintain and renew our $1.2 billion assets for future generations. A comprehensive zero-based budgeting approach has been undertaken, supported by detailed workshops, to ensure all expenditure is reviewed, prioritised and aligned to community needs as detailed in the City's Corporate Business Plan. Council has sought to minimise the increase where possible, while continuing its responsibility to deliver the services and assets our community relies on. Tree canopy is recognised as a priority and Council has made a clear commitment to urban greening, tree planting and canopy retention across the City. These initiatives form part of long-term planning and investment programs, and while progress can take time, they remain a key focus area in balancing environmental outcomes with other service and infrastructure needs. Projects such as traffic calming measures, including speed bumps, are generally implemented in response to identified safety concerns and community feedback. These works are aimed at improving road safety and reducing risk for all road users, even where they may not align with individual preferences.

Submission Number	Submission	Responses
Submission 10	I am writing as both a resident of the City of Bayswater and the Director of Community Engagement Services at Vinnies to highlight what I believe is one of the most significant issues currently affecting our community: the escalating cost-of-living crisis. Through both my professional role and personal connection to the community, I am witnessing unprecedented levels of financial hardship among local residents. In all my years living and working within the City of Bayswater, I have never seen such a broad cross-section of the community struggling to meet the costs of everyday living. Rising housing costs, increasing grocery prices, higher electricity and utility bills, insurance premiums, fuel costs, and other essential expenses are placing enormous pressure on households. As a result, more residents are seeking assistance from charities, food relief providers, and community support organisations simply to meet their basic needs. What is particularly concerning is that financial hardship is no longer confined to those traditionally considered vulnerable. Working families, pensioners, single-parent households, young people, and individuals in full-time employment are increasingly finding themselves unable to keep pace with rising costs. Behind these economic pressures are real people making difficult decisions every day—whether to pay rent, purchase food, fill essential prescriptions, or meet utility expenses. The impacts extend beyond financial strain, affecting physical and mental health, family wellbeing, social connectedness, and community resilience. While I acknowledge that many of the drivers of the cost-of-living crisis sit beyond the direct control of local government, councils have an important role to play in supporting residents, strengthening local services, and advocating on behalf of their communities. I respectfully encourage Council to consider the following actions: • Continue to strengthen partnerships with local charities, community service organisations, and food relief providers that are experiencing increased demand. • Explore opportunities to expand hardship assistance programs, including flexible payment arrangements, fee concessions, and support for residents experiencing financial distress. • Increase community awareness of available support services through coordinated information campaigns and improved referral pathways • Advocate strongly to State and Federal Governments for greater investment in affordable housing, homelessness prevention, energy affordability measures, and cost-of-living relief initiatives. • Support the development of community programs that improve financial wellbeing, social inclusion, and access to emergency relief. • Ensure that cost-of-living impacts are considered in future strategic planning, community development initiatives, and budget deliberations. The City of Bayswater has a proud history of supporting its community. As financial pressures continue to affect a growing number of residents, I believe Council has an important opportunity to provide leadership, strengthen local support networks, and advocate for meaningful solutions. I thank Council for its consideration of this matter and for its ongoing commitment to the wellbeing of our community. Yours sincerely, XXX	Thank you for your submission. Council acknowledges the current cost of living pressures facing households. In developing the 2026/27 Budget, Council has maintained its strategy of aligning rate increases with CPI, while putting 1% into reserves to maintain and renew our $1.2 billion assets for future generations. The proposed overall increase reflects Council's assessment of what is required to maintain services, deliver essential infrastructure and ensure the City remains financially sustainable into the future. Council has sought to minimise the increase where possible, while continuing its responsibility to deliver the services and assets our community relies on. The City acknowledges financial hardship is affecting a wider cross-section of the community than in previous years, including working families, pensioners and those who may not have previously required support. The broader impacts on wellbeing, health and social connectedness are also acknowledged as important considerations. While many of the drivers of these pressures sit beyond the control of local government, the role the City plays in supporting its community is well understood. The range of services delivered, including community programs, facilities, public spaces and support initiatives, focus on fostering wellbeing, connection and making Bayswater a safe and inclusive place to live. Your suggestions regarding partnerships with community organisations, hardship support, awareness of available services and advocacy have been noted. These considerations align with the City's broader role in supporting the community.

Submission Number	Submission	Responses
Submission 11	I write as a concerned community member to formally express my opposition to the proposed differential rates for the 2026/27 financial year. While I acknowledge the City's need to maintain sustainable revenue to support services and infrastructure, I do not believe the proposed increases are adequately justified—particularly given that they appear to exceed CPI and are being introduced at a time when key local issues remain unresolved. Key Concern: Rate Increase Above CPI The proposed rate increases are notably higher than CPI, placing additional financial pressure on households already managing rising living costs. In the absence of clear, proportionate improvements in services or infrastructure, this level of increase raises concerns regarding equity and fairness for ratepayers. Rate increases above CPI should be accompanied by strong justification and demonstrable benefits to the community. At present, this connection is not sufficiently evident. Key Concern: Unresolved Traffic Issues A significant concern for residents, particularly around Drake Street and Burnside Road, is the ongoing high traffic volume and excessive vehicle speeds. These longstanding issues have not been adequately addressed. The impacts include: Reduced safety for pedestrians, cyclists, and families Increased noise and diminished residential amenity Heightened risk of accidents due to speeding and congestion It is difficult to support above-CPI rate increases when fundamental safety and livability concerns remain unresolved. The lack of visible progress or committed timelines for mitigation undermines confidence in the proposed increases. The proposed rates, including minimum payments, represent a meaningful financial burden for residential ratepayers. Without clear evidence of improved outcomes—particularly in addressing priority concerns such as traffic management—these increases risk being perceived as disproportionate. I respectfully request the Council consider the following: Limit Increases to CPI or Provide Clear Justification Align rate increases more closely with CPI, or clearly demonstrate why exceeding CPI is necessary and how it delivers direct, measurable community benefit. Commit to a funded, time-bound plan to address traffic volume and speed concerns in Drake Street and Burnside Road, and around the station area including: Traffic calming measures Improved enforcement and signage Road design or intersection upgrades Direct engagement with affected residents Introduce increases gradually over multiple years to reduce immediate cost impacts. Provide clearer reporting linking rate increases to specific projects, timelines, and outcomes, particularly for high-impact local issues. Ensure the City has fully explored internal savings and alternative funding options before increasing rates beyond CPI. In its current form, I cannot support the proposed differential rates. Above-CPI increases must be matched by clear improvements in safety, infrastructure, and service delivery. Addressing the ongoing traffic concerns would be a meaningful and necessary step toward demonstrating value to the community. Thank you for the opportunity to provide this submission. I trust these concerns will be given due consideration.	Thank you for your submission. Council acknowledges the current cost of living pressures facing households. The proposed overall increase reflects Council's assessment of what is required to maintain services, deliver essential infrastructure and ensure the City remains financially sustainable into the future. In developing the 2026/27 Budget, Council has considered CPI alongside cost increases experienced by the City, and maintained its strategy of aligning rate increases with CPI, while putting 1% into reserves to maintain and renew our $1.2 billion assets for future generations. Traffic management and road safety remain priorities of Council, and issues of speeding, congestion and pedestrian safety are actively considered through traffic studies, engineering assessments and infrastructure planning. Works such as traffic calming measures, signage improvements and road upgrades are implemented based on identified risks, data and community feedback, with prioritisation across the broader road network. Continued planning and prioritisation of traffic and safety improvements form part of the City's ongoing infrastructure and service delivery programs.

Submission Number	Submission	Responses
Submission 12	People already have a lot of pressure via the cost of living. Your overview does not provide any insight on why a 5% increase is needed or what additional projects etc are. Recent posts have also indicated that services like FOGO are being reduced because much of this cannot be processed, and I would imagine fewer of the blue bin services are also being used as a result of privatizing the tip pass system. Given that, why the increase?	Thank you for your submission. Council acknowledges the current cost of living pressures facing households. The proposed overall increase reflects Council's assessment of what is required to maintain services, deliver essential infrastructure and ensure the City remains financially sustainable into the future. This includes essential services such as waste management, community facilities, parks and reserves, road maintenance and community safety, as well as ongoing asset renewal to ensure infrastructure remains safe and fit for purpose. In developing the 2026/27 Budget, Council has considered CPI alongside cost increases experienced by the City, and maintained its strategy of aligning rate increases with CPI, while putting 1% into reserves to maintain and renew our $1.2 billion assets for future generations. A comprehensive zero-based budgeting approach has been undertaken, supported by detailed workshops, to ensure all expenditure is reviewed, prioritised and aligned to community needs as detailed in the City's Corporate Business Plan. The City continues to provide a high level of waste services to the community. The previous tip pass system was replaced with proof of residency access at the Baywaste Transfer Station, making the service simpler for residents without reducing service levels. There has also been no reduction in the weekly FOGO collection service. Like all local government services, waste operations are subject to increasing costs associated with labour, fuel, disposal, processing and contract services. The annual waste charge has been adjusted to reflect these cost increases and ensure the ongoing delivery of these services to the community.

Submission Number	Submission	Responses
Submission 13	I believe that the rates for this year should stay below CPI. The current economic climate does not allow for families to sustain further unnecessary costs. Council should curb all new projects and focus on the maintenance of existing assets to reduce costs as well as refraining from employing new staff for the next financial year. Council could restrict staff and council pay increases to CPI or lower and reduce vehicle purchases for the next financial year. For Example:There are many vehicles that are often seen around the city where two vehicles are used by maintenance crews when one would suffice. There are many existing assets like parks and recreation areas that need more maintenance that could be worked on by council staff or utilise small contracts where only absolutely necessary. Or focus on completion of works that are underway. Putting new asset prijects on hold would surely significantly reduce costs for the upcoming financial year. Council should not be adding to inflation. Just like federal and state governments, local government has a responsibility to reduce inflation and assist its ratepayers to be able to afford their homes and prevent further homelessness. I do not agree with the planned rate increase!	Thank you for your submission. Council acknowledges the current cost of living pressures facing households. The proposed overall increase reflects Council's assessment of what is required to maintain services, deliver essential infrastructure and ensure the City remains financially sustainable into the future. This includes essential services such as waste management, community facilities, parks and reserves, road maintenance and community safety, as well as ongoing asset renewal to ensure infrastructure remains safe and fit for purpose. In developing the 2026/27 Budget, Council has considered CPI alongside cost increases experienced by the City, and maintained its strategy of aligning rate increases with CPI, while putting 1% into reserves to maintain and renew our $1.2 billion assets for future generations. A comprehensive zero-based budgeting approach has been undertaken, supported by detailed workshops, to ensure all expenditure is reviewed, prioritised and aligned to community needs as detailed in the City's Corporate Business Plan. Council has sought to minimise the increase where possible, while continuing its responsibility to deliver the services and assets our community relies on. Further to this the proposed budget includes significant investment in the maintenance and renewal of existing assets while balancing the need to provide essential services to the community. The City continually reviews operational expenditure and asset replacement programs to ensure resources are used efficiently. As part of its review of the Asset Management Plan, vehicle and plant replacement timeframes have been optimised to balance operating costs, reliability, downtime risk and resale value.
Submission 14	I do support differential rates for Commercial/Industrial properties. I do not support differential rates for Residential properties as vacancies occur while new homes are being built and it seems unfair to penalise vacancy during building. I strongly do not support Residential rate increases for residents that are higher than inflation. This has the effect of driving inflation higher as it is a cost that cannot be avoided. It is bad economic thinking and bad for residents.	Thank you for your submission. In developing the 2026/27 Budget, Council has considered CPI alongside cost increases experienced by the City, and maintained its strategy of aligning rate increases with CPI, while putting 1% into reserves to maintain and renew our $1.2 billion assets for future generations. In the case of residential vacant land, interim ratings are applied during the year where there is a change in a property's circumstances, such as completion of a dwelling, to ensure the applicable rating category accurately reflects the property's status.

Submission Number	Submission	Responses
Submission 15	We write to oppose the City's proposed increase in rate revenue for 2026/27. The proposed overall revenue increase of 5.90% is not supported. In the current economic environment, the City should be focused on identifying opportunities to reduce expenditure and improve efficiency, rather than increasing the financial burden on ratepayers. We are particularly concerned by the proposed 27.77% increase for residential vacant land, which is excessive and unjustifiable. While the City has indicated that higher rates are intended to encourage development, this approach is misplaced. Development is not being constrained by landowner unwillingness, but by broader planning and delivery challenges. A punitive rating response risks discouraging investment and making Bayswater a less attractive location for residential development. In our experience, the City's planning processes and engagement with developers require significant improvement. Addressing these issues would be far more effective in facilitating development than imposing disproportionate rate increases. We strongly submit that: 1. The overall increase in rate revenue should be reduced; and 2. The proposed increase for residential vacant land should be significantly scaled back. A more disciplined approach to expenditure, combined with meaningful planning reform, would better support housing delivery, investment, and the long-term growth of the City.	Thank you for your submission. In developing the 2026/27 Budget, Council has considered CPI alongside cost increases experienced by the City, and maintained its strategy of aligning rate increases with CPI, while putting 1% into reserves to maintain and renew our $1.2 billion assets for future generations. The proposed overall increase reflects Council's assessment of what is required to maintain services, deliver essential infrastructure and ensure the City remains financially sustainable into the future. Council has sought to minimise the increase where possible, while continuing its responsibility to deliver the services and assets our community relies on. The City acknowledges a range of factors influence development activity, including effective planning processes and broader market conditions and remains committed to reviewing and improving its planning processes to support investment and growth.
Submission 16	The 'reasons and objects' noted by the City of Bayswater are meaningless, generalised statements with very little substance (especially, given that they are exactly the same wording as during the last few years)? There is absolutely no valid reason to increase the Council's rates on Commercial/Industrial Land (Improved) by an average of 5.5% in a Landgate revaluation year!!! The Council should be seeking to minimise rates increases to ALL ratepayers in the current 'cost of living crisis' and not trying to justify ongoing/increasing spending on many projects that could just be deferred to future years!!! Small businesses are already struggling with the ongoing / never-ending cost increases to their inputs and they do not need further (unnecessary) cost and rates increases by the City of Bayswater!!! The Council should be trying to do everything to assist its residents and ratepayers in these difficult times!!! If that means deferring certain projects then so be it! The (proposed) overall rate revenue increase of 5.9% is unacceptable in the current cost of living climate and the Council of the City of Bayswater should be doing much more to reduce the overall (proposed) expenditure during the next financial year!! Time to lift your game, City of Bayswater Councillors! Maybe, the City's officers should also improve their game? [See the online submission box above which states that residents and ratepayers submissions will be "presented to Council at the Ordinary Council Meeting of 28 May 2024"???]	Thank you for your submission. Council acknowledges the current cost of living pressures facing households. The proposed overall increase reflects Council's assessment of what is required to maintain services, deliver essential infrastructure and ensure the City remains financially sustainable into the future. In developing the 2026/27 Budget, Council has considered CPI alongside cost increases experienced by the City, and maintained its strategy of aligning rate increases with CPI, while putting 1% into reserves to maintain and renew our $1.2 billion assets for future generations. A comprehensive zero-based budgeting approach has been undertaken, supported by detailed workshops, to ensure all expenditure is reviewed, prioritised and aligned to community needs as detailed in the City's Corporate Business Plan. Council has sought to minimise the increase where possible, while continuing its responsibility to deliver the services and assets our community relies on. Reference to the incorrect meeting date in the submission portal is acknowledged. All submitters received an acknowledgement email confirming submissions will be considered by Council at its meeting on Tuesday 23 June 2026.