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# Summary

Council consulted the community on proposed COVID-19 financial assistance for eligible ratepayers between 31 August and 28 September 2021. The community could indicate whether they support the proposal, provide comments and express interest in applying.

A total of 619 participants viewed the project page and 192 completed the feedback form.

Feedback received through Your Say Inner West:

Q1. 200 responses from 192 people (some people contributed more than once)

* 109 support the proposal
* 82 do not support the proposal
* 9 are not sure/don’t know.

Q2. 134 submissions were received. All comments provided by the participants are included in this report from page five. We have redacted all names and contact details from the submissions.

Q3. 76 people expressed interest in applying.

# Background

Council is proposing to give a one-time payment of up to $400 to Inner West Council ratepayers who qualify for and have already received a COVID-19 Disaster Payment, as part of its community support program during the pandemic. (Total to be capped at $250,000).

At its meeting on 24 August 2021, the Council decided the following:

1. Endorse the redistribution of a portion of Council’s annual Community Wellbeing grant funding by allocating $25,000 to Addison Road Food Pantry and $25,000 to Bill Crews Exodus Foundation to support the increased demand for food insecurity for families in the Inner West;
2. Support the redeployment of IWC staff where appropriate, to assist the work of local agencies;
3. Support the redistribution of $20,000 from the Targeted Early Intervention funding from Department of Communities and Justice, in keeping with guidelines to key services, working with vulnerable families and young people in the outreach and early intervention areas;
4. Notes Council Officer and Office of Local Government advice that financial assistance can be provided to ratepayers under s356 of the Local Government Act 1993;
5. Note that COVID-19 has had a significant impact on Council’s budget with $13.8M in 2020/21 and the forecast impact for 2021/22 could be as high as $11.7M;
6. Council’s response be reviewed should further impacts arise;
7. Provides financial assistance, up to $400, to residential ratepayers who qualify for the Commonwealth or State COVID-19 Disaster Payments;
8. Limit the assistance to owner-occupiers, to be claimed for one dwelling only, with total expenditure to be initially capped at $250 000, to be funded from consolidated revenue and considered in the next quarterly budget review;
9. Officers develop hardship criteria to allow applicants who have suffered the greatest disadvantage to be prioritised through the application process;
10. **Places the proposal on public exhibition for 28 days;**
11. Provide a mechanism for ratepayers to register or apply for the program immediately while the policy is on public exhibition;
12. Reviews this financial assistance package after two months with a report to be tabled at an ordinary Council meeting; and
13. Receive a report to the next council meeting addressing how up to $250,000 can be targeted to those most in need in our community eg through expanding Council’s own social programs, or via grants to community organization such as Addison Road and Exodus Foundation.

# Engagement methods

The community was invited to provide feedback online via Council’s engagement hub yoursay.innerwest.nsw.gov.au

Other options for the community to provide feedback were:

* By mail
* By phone
* Through an interpreter and voice relay via TTY and SMS

# Promotion

The project was promoted through Council’s communication channels:

* Council website
* Social media - Facebook
* Press release
* Council e-news
* Your Say Inner West special bulletin

# Engagement outcomes

Who did we hear from?
We asked respondents to select the suburb they lived in. The list of selected suburbs is extensive and shows that people across the Local Government Area have provided feedback.

The top five suburbs we received feedback from were:

* Marrickville – 30 responses (15%)
* Ashfield – 26 responses (13%)
* Leichhardt – 20 responses (10%)
* Dulwich Hill – 14 responses (7%)
* Summer Hill – 13 responses (6.5%)

**Question: Suburb**



## What did they say?

**Question one – Do you support Council's proposal to provide COVID-19 financial support for eligible ratepayers. Total to be capped at $250,000.**

This question received 200 responses from 192 people.

109 support the proposal
82 do not support the proposal
9 are not sure/don’t know.

Graph showing responses to question one.



Q. 2 The 134 submissions are detailed below.

| **No.** | **Comment** |
| --- | --- |
| 1 | No. As a homeowner I do not believe this is a good use of council funds and should be redirected to those who are in more need. Renters are at most disadvantage of housing insecurity. More needs to be done to help those truly in need. |
| 2 | No. Universal for all residents not just rate payers. We all pay indirectly. |
| 3 | Yes. I have lost all my work since lockdown |
| 4 | No. IWC finances are in deficit each year and ratepayers can’t afford this. It is not ratepayers responsibility to fund support when it is already provided for at both federal and state levels and no other local council is proposing to offer this kind of support. |
| 5 | Yes. I’m not surviving without work. I need this assistance. |
| 6 | Yes. Good initiative & will really help. I have my own consulting business where I work from home & COVID restrictions have just about ended my business |
| 7 | Yes. We are living in Inner West area . I am single parent I live with my son Michael (6 years old).l no longer work, impacts COVID-19 lockdowns. We are in hard ship because I don’t have enough money to buy education technology items for my son in primary school as he need to follow online learning and do homework. I hope Sir/ Madam who may concern can consider my application so I can have enough money to buy educational items for Michael to learn. |
| 8 | Yes. Helping residents/businesses who have lost all income due to lockdown with a one off payment will be of great relief to many.  |
| 9 | Yes. Local government supporting local community when the going gets tough is why we have local councils. |
| 10 | Yes. Although I don't need it, I think it is a great idea for those in our community who have suffered financially as a result of the pandemic. |
| 11 | No. The federal and state governments are already providing Covid related relief to those that are eligible. Your proposal only applies to ratepayers and therefore misses a lot of other possible recipients such as tenants that also live in the IWC area. I would prefer this money to be provided through grants given to local community organisations that support people doing it tough in these trying times. $250k in grants to those organisations will go further than your proposed $400 per ratepayer (which is only 625 ratepayers). |
| 12 | Yes. The support would be very helpful. |
| 13 | Yes. Seems like a good initiative |
| 14 | Yes. I support this - so many people are doing it tough right now and are receiving barely any financial support from the federal government. |
| 15 | No. While the aim of this proposal is admirable, it makes no sense for residents to be treated differently depending on whether or not they own property. $250k could be better spent supporting local organisations who help people based on need |
| 16 | No. There should be consideration given to those who live in the inner west but are not home owners. This is hugely unfair given those who own homes are already at a financial advantage. It should be based on who LIVES in the home not owns the home |
| 17 | No. Waste of $Just a Publicity stunt. It is the role of the Commonwealth and state government to address such issue financially not LGA. Appalling |
| 18 | No. There are lots of people doing it tough, and there is money available from the state/federal government. This money could be used to better upgrade our main streets which will bring people back to our commercial centres. |
| 19 | Yes. Great idea to help |
| 20 | Yes. Help as many people as you can but considering having a bucket on the total sum available to people most at risk. Considering that speed will be important for the rest of the money, best to make it first come first serve. Eg 100k to at risk, determined by agreed guidelines by the council and $150k first come first serve. |
| 21 | Not sure/don’t know. $400 to ~625 inner west property owners (ie. people with a high net wealth)! How about helping those who \*actually\* have nothing. |
| 22 | Yes. Absolutely. So long as those who need it really get it. I think if you own multiple properties you should not be eligible. |
| 23 | No. I believe this is a measure that goes beyond the remit of local government. Money should be spent on services and upgrades to common areas / shopping strips (such as parramatta road). This seems to be nothing more than a vote buying exercise during the local government election cycle. |
| 24 | No. Social welfare is the responsibility of the federal government and they are providing it. These funds are better invested in alternate actions to benefit the community. |
| 25 | No. This seems to be a gross waste of local ratepayer’s money. How is this equitable for all residents? Why not put the money toward upgrading streets, beautifying high streets, planting trees and cutting red tape for businesses? |
| 26 | Yes. I wish the rate be lower because COVID hit the economy very hard. |
| 27 | No. This is the domain of Federal/State government. Use this money instead to improve parks and outdoor space which we need more than ever during covid. |
| 28 | No. I would prefer my rates to go into the community to help more generally in other ways. |
| 29 | Not sure/don’t know. If any relief is provided it should be for owner occupiers living in the area only. Or of the benefit is passed on entirely to renters (Eg evidence of rental relief is shown). Otherwise this seems like a regressive benefit for our wealthy residents. |
| 30 | No. Give all ratepayers some rate relief or just don’t put our rates up in the previous Marrickville LGA |
| 31 | Yes. Communities are supposed to help each other. I don't need a payment but I want others to get assistance. |
| 32 | No. This is a federal issue not a council issue. |
| 33 | No. Concentrate on what councils are meant to do and stop getting involved in state or federal affairs. Why don’t you reduce the rates to all rate payers - as our rates recently went up and services went down |
| 34 | No. Please use these funds for fixing issues like footpaths, poor lighting etc. Council can do many things that help our community. Federal and State Government are responsible for funding these kinds of things. We all pay rates so should all receive any benefits |
| 35 | No. Financial assistance is provided by the state and federal governments. Council should focus on their core responsibilities. |
| 36 | No. Rate payers shouldn’t have to fund financial support. Waste of money. |
| 37 | No. This is not the job of local council. I pay my rates to service garbage, roads, footpaths, parks etc. I pay my taxes/GST to service social security. |
| 38 | No. Shouldn’t happen. If you want to support people, pay it to every household. There are a lot of people doing it tough who don’t meet disaster eligibility. How about something for every year 12 student who have had a rubbish 2 years? People living in boarding houses or homeless who haven’t got their social connection. Parents who are paying for counseling for their kids or themselves. Singles who are isolated because their key group resides across the road in a different LGA, renters and so forth. In other words, use the funds communally to support the whole community. |
| 39 | No. I’d prefer the money spent offering residents equivalent of dine and discover vouchers or shop local enticements. This way you get to spread the love and keep the money ticking over the inner west economy. Creative classes, dining, experiences for all inner west households or at least those who apply up to the capped amount. Maybe $25 each? |
| 40 | No. Disaster relief has already been provided to those impacted, by the federal and state governments. Residents/ratepayers who have not received/or are not eligible for a disaster payment, are essentially paying for it through rates. Would much rather the support be blanket across the council. Just do as a council what you have been paid to do. |
| 41 | No. Have you checked how many people receiving disaster payment while having another job (cash in hand), don't pay tax and get more money than some still working? It is Fed’s role, not local government. |
| 42 | No. Focus on local services or refund local community or sports groups who paid fees to use council services that they were unable to use due to Covid, particularly kids. |
| 43 | Yes. Those who need it, should be granted it so long as it doesn't impact those who do not impact it negatively. |
| 44 | No. Not a matter for council, use the money for issues in your wheelhouse. Support our local businesses cutting your red tape. Give relief on rates. But this is not a council matter. |
| 45 | Yes. Comes off the rate bill and not a cash payment |
| 46 | No. I do not support this proposal as I believe it’s a gross waste of ratepayer’s money. This money would be better spent on improving our commercial streets which would then promote/encourage people to visit our LGA. I don’t believe this payment is fair or equitable as only a very limited percentage can access the payment. |
| 47 | Yes. Great idea to support locals |
| 48 | No. Please spend the money on local projects. |
| 49 | No. The proposal is not in the best interest of ratepayers. Leave such proposals to other levels of government and instead fix up the roadways, the footpaths and aging infrastructure of this area |
| 50 | No. Why apply to IPART for additional funding to give it away. |
| 51 | No. No this is a bad idea and not just because it excludes renters. Spend the money on useful things for everyone in IWC like the libraries, parks, better street lights etc. Leave welfare help to state and federal |
| 52 | No. Ratepayers don't pay rates for this. An appalling idea and an appalling waste of council resources. I/we pay taxes to state and Federal governments for these welfare needs, not rates which are to be used to pay for and improve areas of council responsibility. DON'T DO IT! |
| 53 | No. Spend the money on the community, not the individual. Fix footpaths, fix lighting, install more public rubbish bins to curb litter, etc. |
| 54 | Yes. I support this initiative because I believe members of the community (business and personnel) have been detrimentally effected financially by COVID-19 in ways outside of their control and it would be very good of the Council to provide some financial relief where they can. |
| 55 | No. It’s not a local government responsibility. The amount would make a huge impact on council budget for little impact on individuals. What other council projects miss out? Focus on issues identified as part of CSP. Stay focused inner west on core issues. |
| 56 | No. This is not your job! Leave it to the State Government. In the old Marrickville council area we have just received a huge increase in rates. If you can afford to give money away, reduce the rates or spend it in local amenities. |
| 57 | Yes. Yes I am going through a lot of problems at the moment with my health and extra monies I need to get other services that were provided on an NDIS service but those therapists who refuse to take a vaccine can still get the jobkeeper disaster payment so they’ve left the disabled pensioners without help now. As there has been no help from the govt for dsps during this whole covid time there has been no compensation to pay for alternate therapists not on a Govt scheme and no help from govt for dsps out of pocket expenses now. |
| 58 | No. No, the state of council infrastructure such as roads and paths are already at a questionable state. Leave social welfare to the federal government. Focus on spending that money on other programs to support residents during this time. |
| 59 | No. It should be available for all residents or none. Use it to improve something in the community instead |
| 60 | Yes. I think this is a great idea and demonstrates how the council are supporting the community who are struggling at the moment |
| 61 | Yes. I am in the position where I am getting the disaster payment and I have lost so much of my income that the extra $400 would really help me and show that you are supporting people that are doing it tough right now |
| 62 | No. Leave financial support to the state and federal government. The local council should not be using our rates to make these payments. |
| 63 | No. (redacted) Do your job as per your normal purview. |
| 64 | No. It seems to exclude renters, a huge proportion of IW residents, who may be harder hit than many ratepayers, and not discriminate between those ratepayers who might genuinely need help and those who don’t. It doesn’t seem to come under council’s duties. If it’s capped at a certain level, doesn’t that mean another level of unfair distribution? |
| 65 | Yes. This is definitely needed, some residents completely out of work, or have lost significant work and we have multiple residents I am aware of in our Suburb that have lost their businesses, cafes and work are in extreme financial duress right now, with mortgages on pause. |
| 66 | No. Not a Local Govt responsibility |
| 67 | Yes. Inner west has been locked down longer than greater Sydney. Very difficult for lots of residents and the support from council will display empathy and support. Being on Centrelink benefits and not receiving any extra government support as previously in 2020 makes it twice as difficult. |
| 68 | No. It’s a State and Federal Govt matter. Shortfalls shouldn’t be filled with Council budgets that the State Govt limits with IPART caps on rates, whilst routinely shifting regulatory associated costs to the Council budget. I would think offering a process to delay rate payments for those in financial difficulty would be more appropriate. And supporting community members in lockdown in other ways more appropriate, such as calling older residents for a chat and welfare checks, like Melbourne librarians did in 2020 lockdowns. |
| 69 | No. Very disappointing that renters aren’t include in the program. Nothing in section 356 of the act prevents council from giving renters support. |
| 70 | Not sure/don’t know. Unfortunately I don't trust any scheme like this because I bet for any scheme that's been abused (whether by design or not) I bet there's hundreds of others that have been abused. So my problem is a general one; I'd like to see repayment in full + penalties for identified abuses. |
| 71 | No. I think council focus its Covid-19 financial support on things that help the entire community, whether renters, owners or local businesses. The government disaster payments already provide more support to individuals than people on Newstart have been forced to subsist for years. Instead, council could support local schools and not-for-profits to improve ventilation and improve outdoor spaces. Similarly businesses could be supported to Covid proof, by building capacity for online ordering, outdoor dining etc. |
| 72 | Yes. Please include renters in supporting them getting the grant. If this money is to support the inner west community that is where the need is as covid has impacted them on an unjust manner |
| 73 | No. Council needs to focus on its core job. Our footpaths are a disaster. Plenty of potholes in our nearby streets. You need to do your core and basic job. This is well intentioned but is definitely not something council should spend our rates on. Do not do this. |
| 74 | No. There are far more urgent projects that require council involvement including much needed repair of many Inner West foot paths, as some are extremely dangerous. More support for Community groups during the pandemic. |
| 75 | No. A strenuous NO. With capitals. Waste of money. Looks like tokenism. What is to stop people buying grog or smokes? Why not offer services - shopping, doing chores etc that people stuck in isolation can't do. |
| 76 | Yes. Providing it is only paid to ratepayers who demonstrate that they have lost income in the form of wages / salary; self employed die to a reduction in turnover / net profit after tax; landlords where they have agreed to a rental reduction due to tenants having been financially disadvantaged due to covid loss of wages. Combined household income is less than $75k or pre-covid median income of the district (whichever is the lower). |
| 77 | Not sure/don’t know. Council must reconsider the eligibility of its financial assistance to include renters and local workers. These are people who contribute much to the Inner West community yet are absent from this targeted support package. These are locals who have been impacted by COVID-19, who have lost jobs, are currently stood down without pay, are experiencing rent stress and are currently in Lockdown.Council should also exclude ratepayers (landlords) who do not live in the Inner West, but own investment properties. Instead, Council could communicate with representatives of local community groups, such as First Nations, Migrant, Queer, Women, public housing tenants, etc., to encourage their members to apply. |
| 78 | Not sure/don’t know. Why is this only for property owners? There are a lot of renters who live in the Inner West and vote at council elections who could use this money more. |
| 79 |  Yes. The financial support should go to the occupant of an address and not the owner. If the owner occupies then they get the benefit, otherwise it goes to the renter. |
| 80 | No. This hand out only reinforces the privilege of owner occupied wealth. Spend it elsewhere like fixing the unhygienic state or Arthur St. |
| 81 | No. Can you please fix the roads, in particular Livingstone Rd between Sydenham Rd and marrickville Rd , it is a nightmare to drive on everytime with the pot holes and very rough road to drive on |
| 82 | No. This is not what I pay rates for. My taxes already help with this area of support. |
| 83 | No. While it is a nice idea to help people in need, this is not the role of local government. Rates are for providing community services and infrastructure. What is the funding proposal I.e what services are being reduced or not funded at the expense of this proposal? This will reduce benefit to the broader community. |
| 84 | No. 1. Not council’s role2. Should be everyone or no one.3. Looks like an election stunt.4. If this is NOT an application, why ask for my property number to indicate my intention to apply? |
| 85 | No. I have significant concerns about the lack of equity as there is no way that it will reach all IWC residents experiencing financial hardship. 1. Not all who have lost income are eligible for any Covid-19 disaster payments (e.g. many arts workers who rely on short-term contracts or are sole traders are ineligible) 2. Renters will be ineligible for this scheme. I believe there are more strategic ways council could support those suffering economic impacts of the pandemic. For instance, via arts grants (that go beyond funding painted murals, please), hospitality vouchers like NSW govt ones, etc. |
| 86 | Yes. Is there a way to also assist residents who rent |
| 87 | Yes. I’m in tourism and the pandemic hit me hard. I was able to work 3 trips as a tourguide since Apr 2020, each trip being 5 days. I had a part time contract at a retail outlet which I left in May 2021 because of tourism started again. Due to the lockdown tourism suddenly came to a stop and the retail outlet has only click and collect and does not need additional staff. I was not entitled to jobseeker as I am not searching for a job. Eg my colleague in Tasmania was able to work 80 days in tourism. |
| 88 | No. You can even copy delivering core services like fixing footpaths. You are asking for feedback but also have a registration form is this just a way to give a selected few who know how the system works to get money. Registration should come after surveying residents |
| 89 | No. This proposal excludes renters wh have been hard hit by covid despite renters living in this LGA and contributing to the local economy and community in so many ways whereas honeowners who rent their places out don;t necessarily live elsewhere in the LGA they collect rent and pay rates. Why should renters be excluded from fiscal support during the pandemic? Homeowners who are landlords already get tax benefits if they spend money maintaining their rental properties as well as getting income from rent. This proposal is grossly unfair, exclusionary and elitist. |
| 90 | No. Use the funds to improve our community. Welfare support should be provided by state and federal governments. This also excludes a large part of the community (ie, renters).  |
| 91 | No. Leave it to the federal and state government. |
| 92 | Yes. Will help offset the massive increase in our rates this year. |
| 93 | No. It is the responsibility of everyone to get the vaccination and should not be paid for the privilege. Vaccines are free and necessary for our safety and the safety of others. Why not use the money to open at least 1 library for click and collect, other libraries in adjacent LGA give their residents the opportunity to use the library in that way. They also keep the residents informed regarding vaccination clinics and testing in the area. I haven’t heard anything from Inner West Council, I barely know who the Mayor is. Do not waste rate payers money in this way. Anyone who chooses not to get vaccinated will suffer the consequences either by getting Covid or lose privileges like right to travel or attend clubs, restaurants etc. it’s their choice. |
| 94 | No. I am opposed to grants to property owners. Financial assistance is already available from two levels of government. Homeowners are already in an advantaged position. Property prices have increased significantly over the lockdown period. Those in financial distress could apply for a delay in repayments. |
| 95 | No. This is not an area of council responsibility. Also, it unfairly doesn't include tenants (who are the hardest hit by the pandemic), given you're only proposing to pay the supplement to ratepayers. Put the money into more trees and other amenities that make lockdown more bearable! |
| 96 | No. Sounds good, but it’s not what our rates are paid for. If you have surplus funds reduce rates or fix/improve the local government area amenities. We can choose ourselves if we want to donate funds to those in need. |
| 97 | No. This proposal excludes renters - a large portion of homes in the Inner West - and could even go to people who own more than one property (unlikely candidates to be in great need of $400 of council support) |
| 98 | No. That's ridiculous. We are struggling but don't get financial assistance and our rates are so high. Reduce our rates so everyone gets the benefit. Charities are set up to provide extra help. |
| 99 | No. I find the wording of the IWC Facebook post ambiguous. Is it implying that \*because\* some people have received a "Disaster Payment" they are in for $400 municipal dollars, or \*despite" \*having receive such, they are getting $400 more?" Either way - or whichever way I'm meant to take it - this question is posed disingenuously. Darcy, Your Worship: if you're going to go all NGO on our behalf, then consider flicking this rates-funded largesse to the Asylum Seekers Centre or the Bill Crews Foundation. But they're not on our patch, you will say? Then spend some to find out what the homeless are doing in your own fiefdom, and when you do, give the bulk to them. |
| 100 | No. It’s not fair to all rate payers. |
| 101 | No. Relief already provided |
| 102 | No. It's a classy gesture, but it's not the role of Local Council to dispense welfare. That role is rightly for other levels of government. I am however supportive of a well designed scheme that would support local businesses who are genuinely struggling and on the brink. However, topping up the federal governments scheme is not the way to do it. Not least of all, because the scheme is limited to ratepayers. There are many high Streets in the IWC that struggled well before COVID, and the money would be better spent on fuelling the recovery and investing in our high streets once things kick off. Offering incentives to people to buy local would be preferable to just dishing out cash. IWC shouldn't be plugging income gaps for business owners, that's not their responsibility. If there are businesses located in the Inner West that are genuinely against the wall and on the verge of shutting down - then better targetting a larger payment to those specific businesses. It's unclear why a rate payer, who's business is in another LGA, should receive funding from the IWC. The program should be limited to businesses within the IWC - and apply to both renters and ratepayers. |
| 103 | No. Use the money for improving services. This type of financial assistance should not be done by Council. Very poorly thought through policy. |
| 104 | Yes. I think this is a great idea!. Will those who are on the limited version of the disaster payment (those on YA/Jobseeker etc who receive $200) still be eligible for the same $400 amount? |
| 105 | Yes. Some of our community are experiencing an extreme challenge to make ends meet and the Covid payment only covers the rent. |
| 106 | No. It is not landlords who are suffering the most financially in this pandemic. Many landlords have rental properties and do not even reside in the council area. Please stop favouring those who own significant equity in the Sydney housing market and focus initiatives that impact our diverse community. |
| 107 | Yes. My small business has not been able to operate during the covid lockdown. Govt support is welcome but it's not enough and I'm struggling to pay mortgage/rates rtc |
| 108 | No. help poor people first eg pensioners by expanding eligibility to those who didn’t have work before covid. I’ll apply for help then. You could even waive the rates for pensioners |
| 109 | Yes. Great initiative but I ask that it be extended to renters who are also under enormous stress in our inner west community. I do not wish to register just comment. Thank you |
| 110 | Yes. I think this will be really helpful as a lot of people in the area are struggling with this lockdown. |
| 111 | Not sure/don’t know. Only if ot includes renters |
| 112 | Yes. Great idea!! It will definitely help those rate payers in financial difficulties due to COVID and lockdowns! If the federal and state levels can do something to help and they did, why can’t the local governments? |
| 113 | No. Don't renters also need support? This should be available to ALL rate payers. If someone has already got support from the COVID Disaster Payment it should go to this who haven't received anything as yet. Let's not get ready. Let's share it around. |
| 114 | Yes. Relief should be provided for rent payers as well |
| 115 | No. I would rather it goes into services provided for ALL residents not just home owners who qualify for the disaster payment. |
| 116 | No. This is not the job of local councils. This is the job of the federal government.  |
| 117 | No. This is not within the council's mandate and council rates should not be used this way. Leave this to the federal government where it belongs. |
| 118 | No. How will this be funded? From what I’ve heard. The Council isn’t flush with funds. |
| 119 | Yes. I’m affected by covid-19 and lost 21 hours of work so any bit helps. |
| 120 | Yes. Rate relief would be very welcome. |
| 121 | No. What about people who are renting, young people who don't own a home. This money could be put to much better use. |
| 122 | Yes. As an active citizen of my local community, I support this financial assistance initiative, and strongly advocate that Council extend it to Renters as well as Homeowners. Renters contribute to Council rates through the rent they pay to landlords. However unlike homeowners, who had access to the federal HomeBuilder grant, Renters have faced comparative neglect re covid support. By rights, Council should start its assistance with those residents who are already doing it toughest. Renters are often subject to living on small incomes and insecure work, which has been heavily impacted by Covid. Other renters are dealing with disability or caring responsibilities that marginalize them from the labor market altogether. Yet income support recipients have been almost completely cut out of any state or federal covid disaster-relief payment. Importantly, supporting this cohort offers the added advantage of immediately boosting the local economy, as it is established fact that this cohort spends their income on local goods and services, rather than locking it up in financial instruments. Thank you for your consideration. |
| 123 | Yes. Much needed. |
| 124 | Yes. Household’s are turned upside down when one family member finds themselves unemployed or under-employed. But when both parents are out of work, and children are home every day busy with school work, routines are changed our financial future uncertain. Any support to do with reducing the cost of maintaining a house and trying to keep a family together in this suburb where we’ve grown up, would be very much appreciated. |
| 125 | Yes. This would help me immensely. I have been profoundly affected by Covid and had a total loss of income. All assistance would be greatly appreciated. |
| 126 | No. It is really unfair to the community of inner west, for those who don’t own property but still pay rates when it is generally known that landlords will factor in the cost of rates into rent. I am a home owner and would prefer the money to go to the community as a whole. It’s a really strange idea ….. !  |
| 127 | Yes. I think it is a great idea. I receive the disaster recovery payment. |
| 128 | Not sure/don’t know. Will not be worthwhile if there are hours of hoops to jump through. And Covid relief received needs to include business ones - a lot of people are self-employed and suffering (like me ;)) |
| 129 | Yes. Ive had to apply for covid distater payment, through centrelink, this has helped my family cope, though i feel a bit anxious when i have to go to addison road food bank and attempt to feed my family every week of which it is astruglle as my hours have dropped signicantly, i support the councils proposal.  |
| 130 | Yes. This would make a huge difference for many. |
| 131 | No. Assistance should be being delivered through existing food outlets such as those of churshes, Sydney Mission etc as those in need are already receiving assistance and the structures are in place to assess and determine residents' needs. That would save IWC staff from undertaking the task of assessing each application (in effect doubling up on what someone else has already done in heir organisation) as the process will be time consuming and will take taff from their normal duties |
| 132 | Yes. Home owners should not be excluded as their stress is just as great as renters. |
| 133 | Yes. Ayy assistance should go to the resident occupier, not a non-resident owner/investor |
| 134 | Yes. I am now stuck overseas and could not go back to Sydney. All my tenants have moved out my house. It was very hard for me to cover the rate due to no income. |

**Question three – If you intend to apply, are a ratepayer in the Inner West LGA and believe you would qualify for the payment, please type your property number in the box below. You can find your property number on the top right and bottom left of your Rates and Charges Notice. You can also call Customer Service on 9392 5000.**

This question received 76 responses. They are not detailed as it is private information.