

**Town of Victoria Park
Submissions**

| Suburb | Submissions | Administration Response |
|--------------------|--|---|
| St James | Stop wasting money on zero value add initiatives like FOGO and then perhaps the council can add some value back to ratepayers by not continually hiking rates. | Submission noted. |
| Lathlain | Please advise how much the budget surplus was last year and total carried forward surplus is to date? | The surplus for the 2024/25 financial year was \$15.6 million which was due to ongoing capital projects that had not been completed and an increase in both the fees & charges and interest revenue received. |
| East Victoria Park | I think it's a good idea. Vacant land should attract a higher rate so as to incentivise the owners to develop the land. Rental properties should also attract higher rates, given that these properties are a revenue generating source for the owners. Commercial properties should also attract higher rates given that they are generating revenue unlike residential, owner occupied, properties. | Submission noted. |
| East Victoria Park | The rates for vacant land should be increased to match that of occupied residential properties. This will give the council additional funding for other tasks and encourage the land to be developed. | Vacant land is proposed to be higher than residential rates. |
| Victoria Park | I do not support the proposed rate adjustment, as there are efficiencies within the council's direct control that should be made to offset increase. 1) Needless initiative's - roads, rates, rubbish. Core functions first, then allocate any remaining. 2) Security and safety in the area is getting worse, the homelessness problem increasing. Will additional revenue seek to combat or provide solution. It's your constituents who pay the bills, so should be first priority. 3) FOGO - while other councils are regretting or winding back the decision, Vic Park is doing the opposite, while simultaneously letting core functions lapse. | Submission noted. |
| Victoria Park | I'm accepting of a rate increase if it's going to the right places. For me the key issue in Victoria park is still public safety, and support for local business (rather than more monopoly of car yards). | Submission noted. |
| Burswood | Support 4.65 % increase not the 5% advocated. | Submission noted. |
| East Victoria Park | These should be frozen in light of the current cost of living crisis. You need to support those living in the Town, as much as your staff. Rate payers should not have to pay anything towards the costs associated with the "accidental" removal of trees at Baillie Hill. | Submission noted. |
| East Victoria Park | I strongly oppose the proposed increases in rates that should be held at current rates. There are current crisis of living costs whilst the Town has not provided a return on value or improvement in services. Levying an increase as outlined is not justified nor supported. | Submission noted. |
| East Victoria Park | Please publicly publish on the Facebook post about this subject. Key areas funds will be used and including any salary increase is proposed for ToVP employees. | Submission noted. |
| East Victoria Park | Here is a polished submission: As a Town of Victoria Park ratepayer, I understand the need to fund essential services and maintain community infrastructure. However, a proposed 5% overall rates revenue increase is significant at a time when many households and small businesses are already under pressure from cost-of-living increases, rents, mortgages, insurance and utilities. I ask the Town to clearly demonstrate why a 5% increase is necessary, what efficiency savings have been explored, and which services or projects will directly benefit residents. Ratepayers need confidence that any increase is linked to visible improvements, responsible financial management, and genuine community value. I also encourage the Town to communicate clearly how the Landgate revaluation will affect individual properties, as some residents may face increases above 5%. Transparency, restraint and fairness should guide this decision. | The proposed 5% overall increase in rates revenue reflects a range of factors, including rising costs associated with delivering core services, maintaining and renewing infrastructure, and meeting community expectations. Each year budgets are reviewed to determine cost savings and efficiencies. For the revaluation each individual properties will vary considerably. Some rate payers will see a reduction in their rate bill while others will see an increase above the 5% average. |
| Victoria Park | I think 5% is a good amount, in the context of economy pressures, long term planning for Long Park cost sand continuing to provide services and support staff. If there are discussions that seem reductions, which I don't support, I think reductions should only go as far as 4.5%. | Submission noted. |
| Carlisle | Consider drainage upgrade for Oats St from Harris St to Orong Road intersection. Constantly flooding. | Submission noted. |
| Lathlain | Big fan! I love the movement towards increasing value in the community through increased rate revenue, but with cost of living where it is, it's difficult to apply that to everyone without negatively impacting day to day finances. Vacant land rate increases are a great innovative rate source, as well as encouraging them to develop and join the community - win win! | Submission noted. |
| East Victoria Park | Start getting the basics of council right before adding the nice to have events. especially in a cost of living crisis Basics being, Parks maintained, footpaths maintained, enhanced safety, reticulation working in parks on sensors, (e.g. Stop overwatering Fraser Park). safer roads. more pedestrian crossings on Berwick. | Events are integral to the heart and culture of our Town. The events strategy enables delivery of events to build a strong community, both socially and economically, and a vibrant, liveable Town inclusive of all. The Town actively seeks community input to shape its events program, ensuring that it reflects the needs and preferences of residents. This collaborative approach helps the Town deliver events that are relevant, engaging, and contribute to a thriving Victoria Park. |
| Lathlain | As a recent first home buyer who has only just entered the market, I am concerned about the proposed increase in differential rates for the 2026-27 financial year. While I understand the need for councils to fund local services, the timing of rate increases places additional pressure on households that are already financially stretched due to high property prices and elevated interest rates. Although our property may be valued at over \$1 million on paper, this does not reflect our actual financial position. Like many first home buyers, we have taken on a very large mortgage to secure housing in the current market. A higher property value does not equate to disposable income, and increases in council rates effectively compound ongoing cost-of-living pressures that are already significant. We are concerned that rate increases based on property valuations disproportionately impact newer homeowners who are highly leveraged. For households like ours, even modest percentage increases translate into real monthly pressure on top of mortgage repayments, insurance, utilities, and other rising living costs. We would encourage Council to consider affordability impacts more carefully and ensure that rate changes do not unintentionally place undue strain on residents who are asset-rich on paper but cash-flow constrained in reality. | Submission noted. |

**Town of Victoria Park
Submissions**

| Suburb | Submissions | Administration Response |
|--------------------|---|---|
| St James | I see the increase as unfair and unjust. My red bin is full of maggots every week and I see my neighbour's fill their yellow recycling bins with rubbish because the red ones are full. You up our rates but do less of a service for us. Either up the rates and collection of the red bins or do not up the rates and continue to see people using the coloured bin system incorrectly. | If you require additional waste services this can be requested at an additional cost. Details of the additional services are included in the fees and charges document or you can contact the Town directly. |
| East Victoria Park | <p>Dear Council, I write to provide formal feedback on the current rate-calculation methodology and its relationship to waste collection services, which I believe creates a significant inequity for ratepayers. My concern centres on two compounding issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RATE CALCULATION METHODOLOGY Rates are calculated on Landgate Gross Rental Values, to which the Council has applied an additional 5% increase. This methodology means that larger properties — such as a five-bedroom family home — attract substantially higher rates than smaller dwellings such as a one-bedroom apartment. This is understood to reflect property rental value. However, the problem arises when this escalating rate structure is considered alongside the level of service delivered. 2. UNIFORM WASTE COLLECTION DESPITE UNEQUAL NEED Council applies a uniform waste collection structure regardless of dwelling size or the number of occupants. A family of five in a five-bedroom home will typically generate considerably more household waste than a single occupant in a one-bedroom apartment. Yet both dwellings receive identical waste collection services — the same bin sizes, the same collection frequency, and the same restrictions. This creates a clear and demonstrable inequity: larger households pay significantly more in rates, generate significantly more waste, yet receive no additional waste collection capacity or service to reflect either their contribution or their need. 3. REQUESTED OUTCOME I respectfully ask that Council review this inconsistency and consider one or more of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tiered waste collection services linked to dwelling size or occupancy; • A review of the waste service component of rates to ensure it reflects the service actually delivered, rather than property value alone; • Transparent reporting on how the waste collection levy is calculated and applied across different property types. I believe ratepayers deserve a system where the rates paid bear a reasonable relationship to the services received. In its current form, this methodology rewards smaller households with better value and penalises larger family homes without justification. Under the Fogo collection system, larger family homes are drowning in rubbish as they wait every fortnight for the general waste collection. I look forward to the Council's response. | <p>As per the Local Government Act 1995 s6.28, the Minister determines which valuation method is to be used by a local government, of which the Town of Victoria Park is required to use the gross rental value.</p> <p>For the 2026/27 year the Town will continue to include the waste charges within the total rates payable though this feedback is noted for future discussions on the matter. In addition, if you require additional waste services this can be requested at an additional cost. Details of the additional services are included in the fees and charges document or you can contact the Town directly.</p> |
| East Victoria Park | TOVP is raising rates above the rate of CPI. In the last three years the CPI and rate in dollar(RID) were: CPI 23/24 was 3.8% RID 5.9% CPI 24/25 was 3.2% RID 8.0% CPI 25/26 is 4.2% RID 5.0% That is an average increase of just over 3.0% each year above CPI, and if this continues, then within fifteen years time, rates may be nearly 50% higher than they are now. I appreciate that expenses are higher after Covid and that Trumps ill thought out war on Iran is placing further strain on everyone's budget but I don't believe a responsible budget should exceed CPI. I ask council to be prudent and not adopt a 5% rate increase but limit it to the same as CPI this year and every year going forward. Budgets are always tight and everything is important but council should do all in its power to urge administration to seek cost saving options that least impact ratepayers. You are completely justified in adopting a budget that is the same rate as the CPI. Councillors: you are our voice to the administration. Ratepayers do not want to see rate increases above CPI and I urge you to find cost savings, rather than imposing higher rates on people already struggling, and likely facing an interest rate rise and increased cost of living in the near future . | Submission noted. |
| Victoria Park | Once again up and up. The question that needs to be asked is why? There are more dwellings built in VP so theoretically rates should drop, as there are more to share the load, Has the council looked at reductions? Like stop funding unnecessary functions? Chinese new year, LQGBlah blah, and the multitude of other functions guarantee payer is paying for that just can't necessary. In a time where we need fiscal restraint more than ever 5 % is way to much and I suppose goes on the point that no one ever challenges it. If you go ask for a rate review to Landgate they have subtle threats like "your rates could actually rise"!!!!!! So a big No from. Cut the sill programs and focus on the core basics. | Submission noted. |
| Carlisle | The Town of Victoria Park should consider the current environment and the strains and everyday pressure experienced by their rate payers rather than just focus one their extra revenue. | Submission noted. |
| Burswood | You need to increase our rates no greater than CPI | Submission noted. |
| Carlisle | Please don't increase them | Submission noted. |
| East Victoria Park | As GRV will have increased this year, surely that will increase the payable rates. I feel that it is unfair to add an additional increase as well | The updated GRV values changes the distribution of how rates are charged rather than directly increases the rates received. As a result the proposed rate in the dollars have been reduced to counter the average change to the valuations. |

**Town of Victoria Park
Submissions**

| Suburb | Submissions | Administration Response |
|--------------------|--|--|
| East Victoria Park | <p>I acknowledge that the Town needs to maintain services and infrastructure for residents. However, I am concerned about the proposed overall 5% increase in rates revenue for 2026-27, particularly at a time when many households continue to face rising mortgage, insurance, utility and living costs. I would appreciate greater transparency regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The key factors driving the 5% increase and whether alternative cost-saving measures were considered before increasing rates revenue. • How the Town's proposed rates compare with neighbouring local governments and whether benchmarking has been undertaken. • The expected distribution of rate increases across residential properties following the GRV revaluation, including how many households are expected to experience increases significantly above 5%. • Measures being taken to improve efficiency and ensure ratepayers receive value for money from council expenditure. I support the Town providing quality services and maintaining community assets, but would encourage Council to minimise rate increases wherever possible and clearly demonstrate how additional revenue will benefit residents. | <p>The proposed 5% overall increase in rates revenue reflects a range of factors, including rising costs associated with delivering core services, maintaining and renewing infrastructure, and meeting community expectations. Each year budgets are reviewed to determine cost savings and efficiencies.</p> <p>Direct comparison between local governments can be misleading, as each has different service levels, infrastructure needs, growth pressures, and community priorities. For this reason, rates are not directly comparable on a like-for-like basis. For the revaluation each individual properties will vary considerably.</p> <p>Roughly 15% of residential properties will see their rates increase above 10%.</p> |
| East Victoria Park | Reduce council expenditure on 'nice to dos' such as gender diversity and cultural events and sustainability initiatives (eg the proposed bushland education centre) so our rates can be lower. | Submission noted. |
| Victoria Park | The calculation using rental income without considering inflation and cost of living have flaw and penalising genuine homeowners and long term residents while favouring investors. | As per the Local Government Act 1995 s6.28, the Minister determines which valuation method is to be used by a local government, of which the Town of Victoria Park is required to use the gross rental value. |
| Lathlain | Happy for the Town to increase rates as required, but please continue to invest in community services & programs and the Urban Forest Strategy. Much more is needed to make Vic Park resilient to the climate crisis, starting with a real, committed effort to get people to drive less around town, choosing active transport for short trips. Pedestrian malls along Albany Highway, bike paths and serious negotiation with the State for shuttle buses (CAT) that connect all important areas in the town. Would also like to see investment to make all Town buildings energy self-sufficient, using solar and batteries, especially Aqualife and Leisurelife. Be bold, be courageous, use the money wisely for resilience for future generations, there will always be complaints. Keep the good work around Reconciliation with Indigenous Australians, and be more proactive in defence of immigrants and multiculturalism. Vic Park is made of and depends on immigrants, it should be at the forefront of showcasing how important they are for our communities. | Submission noted. |
| Burswood | Although I disagree with people holding onto vacant land for long periods of time, they do not use council services and should not pay a premium. Landgate might have a case if they want to discourage land banking, but the council shouldn't profit from this. Small businesses make Vic pk a great place to live. Many are struggling. The council should be finding ways to make it cheaper for them. A premium on commercial rates will only get passed onto the business owners. For clarity, I do not own land and I am not a business owner. | Submission noted. |
| East Victoria Park | Please bring back weekly red bin collection. We pay rates for a four bedroom house and get the same allowance as our single neighbours. This is a discriminatory policy against families and needs to change. | If you require additional waste services this can be requested at an additional cost. Details of the additional services are included in the fees and charges document or you can contact the Town directly. |
| St James | Should have been implemented years ago. | The Town of Victoria Park has been using the current differential rating categories for the last four years. |
| Victoria Park | Instead of deciding how much rent every individual house/unit is worth the rates should be based on the land size. I live in a 2 bedroom Unit (with 31 other units) and I find it unfair that I should have to pay a similar amount to a house that can have up to 5 bedrooms etc. For complex's like ours, the rates should be divided by how many units are on the block of land. Also with rent high already in Vic Park (because of the market) we are all going have to pay high rate fees anyway. This new proposed fee change is not equal to each individual property. | As per the Local Government Act 1995 s6.28, the Minister determines which valuation method is to be used by a local government, of which the Town of Victoria Park is required to use the gross rental value. |
| Lathlain | The Town's rates are already unreasonably high compared to other councils in Perth, and the proposed increase only makes them higher. The outcome of the elections held last year, where residents resoundingly chose to sack existing councillors when given the option, should hopefully show the council waste and increase efficiency in the council. Make the hard decisions and reduce events/initiatives/funding. Reduce Town expenditure and headcount - take a thorough look at the org chart and get rid of the dead wood. See attached comparison helpfully provided by our neighbours in Belmont. Do better ToVP. | The linked chart of council rates is incorrect. The Town of Victoria Park's average rate is not \$1,943 and the waste costs are included in the rates figure not added on top. The average residential rates for the Town for in 2025/26 was \$1,871 including waste and which puts the Town in the top 5 cheapest councils on the list of 16 provided. |
| St James | I support the proposed rates. I really value a lot of the services the town provides and I want to see a continuation of the level of service currently offered. It would be interesting to know if the town has any data about whether the higher rates on vacant land has directly led to any development applications. I think it's a good idea in theory. | The Town of Victoria Park has seen an increase in development of vacant blocks, however there is no data as to the cause of these applications. |

**Town of Victoria Park
Submissions**

| Suburb | Submissions | Administration Response |
|--------|--|---|
| | <p>We object to the Town's proposed rates increase for the 2026/27 financial year. The Town's justification for increasing rates by an average of 5.0% is based on projected increases in operating and capital costs. However, the Town's own financial history demonstrates a consistent pattern of overestimating expenditure requirements and collecting more revenue than is ultimately required. For many years the Town has recorded annual operating surpluses and has steadily increased its cash holdings and reserves. If the Town's financial modelling accurately reflected its actual funding requirements, one would expect annual financial results to be broadly in line with budget forecasts. Instead, the Town repeatedly generates surplus funds, indicating that rates revenue is routinely set higher than necessary. The continued growth in the Town's bank balances raises a fundamental question: if previous rates increases were genuinely required to meet operational and capital obligations, why does the Town continue to accumulate increasing amounts of cash year after year? It is important to note that this submission is not advocating for a reduction in services, infrastructure maintenance, community programs, capital works, or any other functions performed by the Town. Nor is it suggesting that necessary asset renewal or community investment should be deferred. Rather, this submission advocates for more accurate and responsible budgeting.</p> <p>Overestimating expenditure requirements</p> <p>We object to the Town's proposed rates increase for the 2026/27 financial year. The Town's justification for increasing rates by an average of 5.0% is based on projected increases in operating and capital costs. However, the Town's own financial history demonstrates a consistent pattern of overestimating expenditure requirements and collecting more revenue than is ultimately required. For many years the Town has recorded annual operating surpluses and has steadily increased its cash holdings and reserves. If the Town's financial modelling accurately reflected its actual funding requirements, one would expect annual financial results to be broadly in line with budget forecasts. Instead, the Town repeatedly generates surplus funds, indicating that rates revenue is routinely set higher than necessary. The continued growth in the Town's bank balances raises a fundamental question: if previous rates increases were genuinely required to meet operational and capital obligations, why does the Town continue to accumulate increasing amounts of cash year after year? It is important to note that this submission is not advocating for a reduction in services, infrastructure maintenance, community programs, capital works, or any other functions performed by the Town. Nor is it suggesting that necessary asset renewal or community investment should be deferred. Rather, this submission advocates for more accurate and responsible budgeting.</p> <p>The proposed rates yield for 2026/27 is estimated at more than \$58 million. The Town also continues to benefit from growth in the number of rateable properties. Combined with existing cash reserves, accumulated surpluses and investment balances, there appears to be little justification for imposing a further increase on ratepayers without first demonstrating why previously collected surplus funds are insufficient to meet future expenditure requirements. Ratepayers should not be treated as a source of excess revenue simply because the Town has the power to levy rates. The purpose of rates is to fund the reasonable cost of delivering local government services, not to continually accumulate cash beyond what is reasonably required.</p> <p>Before imposing any increase, the Town should demonstrate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why existing cash reserves, investments and accumulated surpluses are insufficient to meet projected expenditure. • Why previous years' surplus funds have not been taken into account when determining the proposed rate increase. • Why ratepayers should continue to fund additional revenue collection when the Town has consistently generated more income than required. • What steps have been taken to improve the accuracy of the Town's budgeting and forecasting processes given the repeated occurrence of year-end surpluses. <p>The community should not be required to fund inflated budget estimates year after year. The Town should instead focus on improving the accuracy of its financial forecasting so that rates are set at a level that more closely reflects the genuine and anticipated cost of delivering services and infrastructure to the community. A rates increase should only be imposed where there is a demonstrated funding shortfall. The Town's history of recurring surpluses and growing cash balances suggests the opposite. Before seeking additional revenue from ratepayers, the Town should first explain why previous years' excess collections have not been sufficient to meet its obligations and why its budgeting forecasts continue to materially exceed actual expenditure. In the absence of such justification, the proposed rates increase appears excessive, unnecessary and inconsistent with the principles of responsible financial management. We therefore request that Council reject the proposed increase and instead adopt a rate model that reflects the Town's actual funding requirements, taking into account accumulated surpluses, cash reserves and historical budget performance. Any increase should be limited to what is genuinely required after consideration of the Town's existing financial resources. The Town should prioritise accurate budgeting and value for ratepayers rather than continuing the practice of collecting funds that exceed its demonstrated operational needs.</p> | <p>If the Town were to prioritise the use of reserves to supplement rates increases that would only provide a short-term gain for a ratepayer. Cash reserves in local government support long-term financial sustainability by ensuring funds are available to maintain services and assets over time without an over reliance on debt. They enable the Town to fund upcoming large strategic projects smoothly, reducing sudden rate increases for the community and are to used respond to emergencies and unexpected events.</p> <p>Every year as part of the annual budget an estimated prior year position is included as part of the calculation. For the upcoming year this is estimated to be \$6,150,505. This balance is made up of additional revenue received and projects that aren't expected to be completed by the end of June 2026. This balance will either offset the carry forward amounts of be used to offset the reliance for additional rates in the 2026/27 financial year.</p> <p>The rates increase has been determined to ensure the Town can meet both current service delivery requirements and future obligations. This consistent approach provides the financial capacity needed for infrastructure, asset renewal, and community priorities while supporting long-term sustainability.</p> <p>The Town budgets are constructed through zero-based method to ensure that every budget is justified. However, year-end surpluses can still occur due to the timing of project delivery, as some projects can take longer than twelve months to completed or are delayed by factors outside the Town's control. These timing differences mean funds are carried forward to ensure projects are completed as planned rather than indicating over-budgeting.</p> |