



Notice of Intention to Levy Differential Rates 2025-2026

Summary of Submissions
(Abridged) June 2025



City of
Melville

Executive summary

Each year, the City issues a Notice of Intention to Levy Differential Rates under Section 6.36 of the *Local Government Act 1995*. As part of the 2025–2026 Annual Budget process, public consultation was held from 21 May to 12 June 2025.

A total of 449 submissions were received. The majority (97.8%) objected to the proposed differential rates. Feedback was accepted via the City’s website, email, in-person, and other channels, with the consultation promoted across digital and print media.

Engagement findings

449 submissions were received, with 97.8% expressing objection to the Notice of Intention to Levy Differential Rates.

Object	Support	Neither support nor object
n439 / 97.8%	n5 / 1.1%	n5 / 1.1%

Communication and participation

The consultation was promoted through a range of channels including direct emails to over 5,000 residents, targeted social media posts, newspaper notices, public posters, and eNews publications. The Melville Talks engagement page received over 5,000 visits, with a total print distribution of approximately 45,000, ensuring strong visibility across both digital and traditional platforms.

Of the submissions received, 99.11% were from individuals who confirmed their residency within the City of Melville, indicating broad local representation.

Support by location

	Object	Support	Neither support nor object
Alfred Cove	15		
Applecross	21		1
Ardross	12		
Attadale	15		
Bateman	15		2
Bicton	25		
Booragoon	16		
Brentwood	5		
Bull Creek	10		
Kardinya	34	1	
Leeming	35	1	1
Melville	47		
Mount Pleasant	28	1	
Murdoch	6		
Myaree	10	1	
Palmyra	81	1	1
Willagee	32		
Willetton	1		
Winthrop	28		
Not supplied	3		
	n439 / 97.8%	n5 / 1.1%	n5 / 1.1%

Analysis of submission content

Submissions were reviewed to identify key themes and concerns raised by community members. The analysis reveals a predominantly negative sentiment toward the proposed rate increase, with several recurring issues consistently highlighted across responses.

Theme	Mentions	Summary	Example comments
Cost of living pressures	229	Many submissions highlighted financial hardship, including difficulty affording essentials, mortgage stress, and the rising cost of living. Respondents expressed concern that the proposed increase would exacerbate these pressures.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>"We are struggling to live pay check to pay check. You will place more pressure on our shoulders."</i> - <i>"We are a family of 4 with a mortgage and rising bills. Please consider the burden this puts on working families."</i> - <i>"Raising rates in this economic climate shows a lack of empathy for people already doing it tough."</i>
Value for services	100	Respondents questioned the value received for current rates, raising concerns about maintenance, infrastructure, and service delivery not meeting expectations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>"We are paying more in rates, but still have broken footpaths and poor lighting. What are we paying for?"</i> - <i>"No visible improvement in community services despite yearly increases."</i> - <i>"I don't mind paying more if we get something in return. But nothing has changed on my street in years."</i>
Lack of justification	90	A significant number of comments pointed to a lack of clear rationale for the increase, with calls for greater transparency and comparison against CPI/inflation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>"For residential rates, I am objecting to the stated increase with no justification."</i> - <i>"The increase is nearly double inflation. Where is the breakdown of how this is calculated?"</i> - <i>"There has been no clear rationale presented for why rates need to go up by 4.5%."</i>
Calls to reduce spending	43	Ratepayers urged the City to reduce internal costs or find efficiencies rather than increasing rates.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>"When will anyone actually reduce spending? Pretend it's your own money."</i> - <i>"Before raising rates, the City should cut unnecessary expenses."</i>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>"Look internally for cost savings before turning to ratepayers again."</i>
Equity and fairness	25	Concerns were raised around the fairness of rate distribution, particularly for corner blocks, unimproved land, and properties with reduced amenity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>"As a corner block, the majority of land belongs to Council...yet I maintain it at my own cost."</i> - <i>"Unimproved land should not be rated the same. There are no services provided."</i> - <i>"It's unfair to charge the same for high-density areas with fewer amenities."</i>
Disconnection and trust	19	A smaller but notable group expressed a lack of confidence in Council decision-making, suggesting a perceived disconnect between the City and its residents.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>"You are driving the community into the ground and should all be ashamed."</i> - <i>"It's frustrating to see the City in the media for spending issues, then be told we need to pay more in rates."</i> - <i>"Council needs to earn back trust before asking for more money."</i>

Sentiment overview

The overall sentiment across submissions was predominantly negative, with most respondents either objecting to the proposed increase or expressing frustration at the lack of justification or perceived value. A small number of submissions offered neutral or constructive feedback, and a limited number expressed support for the proposed changes.