

Public Comment Submissions List - Proposal for Levying Differential Rates for the 2020-21 Financial Year

Response	Objection/ Support/ Comment	Comments
1	Objection	<p>The City has more than 98%of residential; 97.5 % of Commercial and 98.5% of Industrial properties recorded as improved properties so that the imposition of a differential vacant land rate in the form of a 100% penalty of the normal rate is inappropriate where a Local Government is so fully developed. A very small percentage of vacant properties should be considered normal and there is little substance to the claim that a very few vacant properties will inhibit or have any adverse affect on development of the community.</p> <p>1. The objects and reasons rating statement for differential rates for vacant land refer to:</p> <p>Rate revenue from vacant property remains consistent with previous years: and Promoting development stimulating growth in the community</p> <p>The relative effectiveness of the policy over 5 years of published figures shows that the numbers of properties involved in application are few and the changes made over 5 years of figures taken from annual reports show the policy has had little effect. Eg in the case of industrial properties the number over 5 years has reduced from 7 to just 5 and overall the numbers are so small that the policy has little merit when better than 98% of properties are already developed.</p> <p>2. The application of Minimum Rates to Vacant properties</p> <p>The Minimum Differential Rate for vacant properties is characteristically a 2% premium (2018/9 - \$909 compared to the improved minimum \$889. Any Vacant property over the minimum pays a 100% premium. This is clearly an inequity in application of the policy for its claimed purposes.</p> <p>This inequity could have been addressed in the last review of the Local Government Act when Councils were invited to address rating issues with specific mention of Differential Rates.</p> <p>3. The Inequity of application of differential rates when properties are under development.</p> <p>By example: A property where a house is demolished and where : A planning approval has been given for a new development; A building Licence has been given for a new building; Building construction has commenced but not completed by 30th June</p>

Response	Objection/ Support/ Comment	Comments
		<p>Incurs a vacant land premium rate of 100% of the improved rate on the basis of encouragement of development when all action for this end has been taken.</p> <p>While the terms of the current law enables this to happen it is again the case as in the previous comment that this inequity could have been addressed in the last review of the Local Government Act when Councils were invited to address rating issues with specific mention of Differential Rates.</p> <p>In any event it would be possible to vary the definition of improved land for rating purposes to obviate this inequity.</p> <p>It is noted that because of the timing of revaluations the property in the example will certainly carry a value based upon it being an improved property.</p> <p>It is suggested that the continued application of differential rating of vacant land for the now highly developed City of Joondalup is inappropriate and should, in this year of new valuations, be abolished.</p>
2	Comment	<p>I completely disagree with the increase in Differential Rates on Residential Improved properties for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Australia is in the midst of a Recession. 2. We are in the midst of a Global Pandemic. 3. The unemployment rate in Western Australia for May 2020 has increased by 2.0% up to 8.1%. 4. From reading the West Australian, many of the local Shires have frozen price increases this year along with other large organisations such as HCF and HBF because of the above. <p>I bought the block to build on after retirement for the purpose of down-sizing. The Differential Rate for Residential Vacant was increased by approximately 50% for the period 2015-2016 and this huge increase has meant that keeping this block, during these unforeseeable times is becoming unviable. After researching the sale of the block, my husband and I stand to lose approximately \$70,000. For the reasons above I believe that the Differential Rate for Residential Vacant properties should be greatly decreased so that others who may have bought for the same reason may be able to keep their blocks. I also believe that the significant increase in 2015-2016 was not to see that the land was developed as stated, but as a way of raising funds for the Joondalup Performing Arts and Cultural Facility, which is no longer going ahead, thus reducing the need for such funding.</p>

Response	Objection/ Support/ Comment	Comments
3	Comment	<p>With all the COVID issues and financial strain on many households I would have thought the council would be more mindful of adding to this strain.</p> <p>Secondly the neighbouring City of Stirling's Differential Rate this year was only 5.0117. The City of Joondalup's was 5.5886. That is a whopping 11.5% higher than the City of Stirling rate! What is the City of Joondalup doing that it is requiring ten percent more than a neighbouring Council? And now it is going to increase the rate again to 5.9669! That is over a 6% nearly 7% increase! I am shocked, disappointed and angry and am astonished that the council believes it can be substantiated.</p>
4	Comment	<p>I have just seen some information in the local Joondalup Times (dated 11th June) to notify that the Joondalup Shire intends to increase the 'Cents in \$' from 5.5886 to 5.9669 for the 2020/21 financial year for Residential Improved Property.</p> <p>In the current COVID conditions I strongly oppose any increase in the rate at all. My understanding is that the State Government has on previous occasions suggested that all parties (including Shire Councils) need to work together to get through these difficult COVID times.</p> <p>So I find it difficult to understand that you can justify, or even consider a rate increase at all in the next financial year, particularly one in the magnitude of 6.769%</p> <p>Also as the rates we pay are already extremely high for the area we live in, and taking consideration the very poor condition and upkeep of our local vicinity, I believe that you should strongly consider a reduction in the 'Cents in \$' amount.</p> <p>I base this proposal, of a reduction, on the my observations, in that I live across the road from Carine, which is in the City of Stirling. I have a friend who lives Carine and his current 'Cents in \$' is 5.0117. That is an astonishingly 11.51% reduction to our present rate!</p> <p>And the other notable observation I make, is that the streets in his area are well maintained. The curbs are in good condition, the parks are well maintained. The entire area and street scape is very well maintained and in much, much better presentation than my local area. I know this as I often walk my dog around Carine as it is basically across the road.</p> <p>Our street on the other hand is very poorly maintained. our curbs are all cracked (and have been for the last 27 years). Across from our street (between Yarrowarra Mews and Beach Road) is very shrubby bush that is and absolute eyesore and constant hazard of falling and build up of debris. Our roads are cracked. Our street scape is a disgrace. So I find it inexplicable that we are currently paying 11.51% more in rates compared to Carine across the road (Beach Road) which seems to be in pristine condition.</p>

Response	Objection/ Support/ Comment	Comments
		<p>My feeling is we are paying 11.51% higher rates than in Carine, but receiving virtually nothing from our Shire in return.</p> <p>I am still struggling to understand the 11.51% difference.</p> <p>And you want to increase it another 6.769%, while we are going through COVID.</p> <p>Please reconsider any increase and consider a decrease in rates.</p> <p>Also, could you please give me a justifiable reason why my current rates are 11.51% higher than that of City of Stirling?</p>
5	Comment	<p>In light of Covid – 19 and its consequences to many households are affected by loss of earnings and wages, I on behalf of many Kingsley residence like to request and plea to hold the increase in charges of Rates and Services for 2020/2021.</p> <p>Transperth has announced that there will be no increase in fare this year until next Financial Year.</p> <p>We hope you and the Councillors would endorse this request and uphold the increase this year.</p>
6	Comment	<p>I believe the ongoing increase each year in the overall rates bills which is consistently above the prevailing CPI rate most years, and has over the last 13 years been on average 2.9% above CPI, needs to be reduced to reflect CPI only on average. In particular the 2020 year will be a particularly difficult one due to the COVID-19 related economic hardships. It would therefore be prudent for the council to reduce rates overall, not just keep the bill the same (for most, not all) as 2019, through a 6.8 increase in the percentage rate in the dollar valuations to compensate for what would be a lower rateable value of properties as the Mayor has intimated.</p> <p>This may require cost cutting in the budget. This is long overdue and the current circumstances require such action. I trust that the Council will review and adjust rates bills to reflect the current reality.</p>
7	Comment	<p>Please advise how the new Residential rate will affect me, in other words, how does the new rate compare with existing rates?</p>
8	Comment	<p>I read the newspaper and I found that the city of Joondalup is changing rates for Residential Improved from 5.4656 cents of 2019-2020 to 5.9669 of 2020/21, which is a 9.17% increase. I didn't know any change of my GRV yet.</p>

Response	Objection/ Support/ Comment	Comments
9	Comment	<p>I refer to your recent publication of the new proposed differential rates for the 2020/21 financial year and notice that the average increase to households for residential improvements will be 6.8%.</p> <p>My comments are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Australian official CPI runs at ~ 2% or slightly above or below; 2. Salary increases in Australia do not measure up to your proposed increase – more linked to the CPI; 3. We are in the midst of a pandemic where numerous households are experiencing real hardship and it is common knowledge that so many have had to access their superannuation to survive; 4. Despite all the above and current poor economic climate in Australia and globally, Joondalup City sees it fit to come with this outrageous increase; 5. Maybe you can share the justification for this out of the norm increase proposed and how the City intends assisting people experiencing financial hardship?? 6. It was also widely advertised earlier in the year when Covid struck that rates would be frozen for this year to assist people – so even more surprised by your announcement; 7. Not sure if there are more surprises in the refuse removal and emergency services levy as I have not seen anything to that effect. 8. I believe this proposed increase should be reconsidered and if an increase is required then it should be pegged to CPI cause that is typically how salary increases are pegged – it should be a cost of living adjustment and not sure why the City should have increases 3x that of the annual measured CPI? <p>I trust that my submissions will be considered in the finalization of the rate for 2020/1.</p>
10	Comment	<p>I refer to the proposed rates advertised on June 11,2020. Kindly advise if the proposed rate of 5.9669 cents in the dollar for 2020/2021 [which is .3783 cents in the dollar greater than 2019/2020] will achieve lower rates for ratepayers for 2020/2021.</p>