

East Gippsland Shire Council

Group: Large Shire

This fact sheet uses graphs and other data to show whether there have been any significant changes in this council's services, infrastructure and financial outcomes since the introduction of rate capping — a system that restricts the amount a council can increase its general rates and municipal charges in each financial year.

A reader's guide is available to help you understand the terms used in this fact sheet. You can compare this council's data against its 'group' by looking at the fact sheet for large shires. View the reader's guide, all available fact sheets and information for the sector as a whole at <http://www.esc.vic.gov.au/outcomes-reports>.




© OpenStreetMap contributors

Key facts

Population:	46,142
Size (km ²):	20,940
Length of local roads (km):	2,968
Population per km of roads:	15.5
Council employees (FTE, 2017–18):	316
Submitted an application for a higher cap for 2016–17 or 2017–18?	No

Rates

What has happened to average rates and charges?



Year	Average rates and charges	Applicable rate cap
2014–15	\$1,567	n/a
2015–16	\$1,644	n/a
2016–17	\$1,684	2.50%
2017–18	\$1,739	2.00%

Rates (continued)

See the reader's guide for data sources and useful information.
 Note: The numbers in this fact sheet have not been adjusted for inflation.


Have council's average rates complied with the applicable rate caps?

2016–17 (2.50%)	2017–18 (2.00%)	2018–19 (2.25%)
Yes	Yes	Yes

How have rates changed for individual ratepayers?

Distribution of rates increases and decreases in revaluation years

The applicable rate cap is applied to council's average rate, which means some individual rates increased by more and some increased by less (or even decreased).




- % of rates notices decreasing
- % of rates notices increasing by less than the applicable cap
- % of rates notices increasing by more than the applicable cap


Note: In 2017–18, properties were not revalued so most rates notices would have increased by a similar percentage.

Ratepayers by property class

Proportion of rates and charges revenue from each property class in 2017–18



Percentage change in average rates and charges since 2015–16



Source: Victoria Grants Commission (unaudited data). Includes both capped and uncapped rates and charges.

Residential ratepayers pay the majority of East Gippsland Shire Council's rates and charges. This group of ratepayers, on average, experienced a 6.7 per cent increase in their rates notices between 2015–16 and 2017–18. The difference in rate increases can be due to relative changes in property valuations, and changes in property numbers, the council's rating structure, and uncapped rates and charges. Council's average rates and charges (a combination of all classes) increased from \$1,644 to \$1,739 (5.7 per cent) over the same period.

Revenue

See the reader's guide for data sources and useful information.
 Note: The numbers in this fact sheet have not been adjusted for inflation.

Where is council's money coming from?


Revenue source	Before rate capping (average of 2014–15 and 2015–16)		After rate capping (average of 2016–17 and 2017–18)	
	\$m	% of revenue	\$m	% of revenue
Rates and charges	49.5	51	53.9	52
Grants	26.7	28	29.3	29
User fees and statutory fees and fines	12.4	13	13.2	13
Contributions	3.7	4	1.7	2
Other	4.4	5	4.6	4
Total	96.7	100	102.7	100

East Gippsland Shire Council's average revenue from all sources (except contributions) increased in the two years following the introduction of rate capping compared to the two years before rate capping.

The proportions of council's revenue from each source remained relatively stable after the introduction of rate capping except for the decrease in the proportion of revenue from contributions.

Note: Revenue from grants may have been affected by the advance payment of annual Commonwealth grant allocations in 2014–15, 2016–17 and 2017–18.

Revenue growth by source



Expenditure

See the reader's guide for data sources and useful information.
 Note: The numbers in this fact sheet have not been adjusted for inflation.


How much money is council spending?

Year	Operating expenditure	Capital expenditure	Operating expenditure per head of population	Capital expenditure per head of population
2014–15	\$67.8m	\$29.1m	\$1,532	\$657
2015–16	\$66.5m	\$25.9m	\$1,481	\$576
2016–17	\$67m	\$23.7m	\$1,468	\$520
2017–18	\$66.5m	\$22.3m	\$1,441	\$484


East Gippsland Shire Council's operating expenses have been relatively stable in recent years. Capital expenditure has trended downward from a peak in 2013–14, reflecting a decline in spending on new assets.

How is council spending its money?

Average expenditure by category in the 2 years before rate capping




Average expenditure by category in the 2 years after rate capping



There was a change in the composition of East Gippsland Shire Council's expenditure, reflecting decreases in average capital expenditure and spending on materials and services in the two years after rate capping was introduced. There were increases in average employee costs and 'other' expenditure over the same period.

Is council renewing its assets (such as roads, parks and buildings)?



Year	Asset renewal expenditure as a percentage of depreciation (%)
2014-15	82
2015-16	100
2016-17	90
2017-18	72
2018-19	145 (forecast data)
2019-20	101 (forecast data)

East Gippsland Shire Council's spending on the renewal of its assets has fluctuated below the amount of depreciation (the decline in value of its assets caused by age and use) in recent years. Renewal expenditure was 100 per cent of depreciation in 2015-16, and is planned to increase above 100 per cent of depreciation in 2018-19 and 2019-20.

Has council's capital expenditure pattern changed?

Capital expenditure	Before rate capping (average 2014-15 and 2015-16)		After rate capping (average 2016-17 and 2017-18)		Council's average spending in the two years after rate capping was introduced has decreased across all categories except upgrade projects, with a decline in new assets in particular. Asset renewal increased as a share of total spending (despite decreasing in average dollars spent).
	\$m	% of total	\$m	% of total	
Renewal	18.3	67	17.5	76	
New	6.9	25	3.2	14	
Upgrade	2.1	7	2.4	10	
Expansion	0.2	1	0.0	0	
Total	27.5	100	23.0	100	


Services

See the reader's guide for data sources and useful information.
Note: The numbers in this fact sheet have not been adjusted for inflation.

Which service areas is council spending its money in?


Expenditure by function	Before rate capping (average 2014–15 and 2015–16)		After rate capping (average 2016–17 and 2017–18)	
	\$ per person	% of expenditure	\$ per person	% of expenditure
Local roads and bridges	604	31.1	489	26.4
Governance	373	19.2	407	22.0
Recreation and culture	340	17.5	327	17.7
Business and economic services	215	11.1	241	13.0
Waste management	222	11.4	224	12.1
Traffic and street management	23	1.2	45	2.4
Family and community services	44	2.3	44	2.4
Environment	103	5.3	39	2.1
Aged and disabled services	16	0.8	34	1.8
Other	4	0.2	0	0.0

Which service areas have experienced the biggest changes in spending?



Source: Victoria Grants Commission (unaudited). Council Annual Reports may provide further explanation of these expenditure changes.




Has there been a change in service quality? (selected services only)



Financial position

See the reader's guide for data sources and useful information.
 Note: The numbers in this fact sheet have not been adjusted for inflation.

Is council operating sustainably?



Between 2014–15 and 2017–18, East Gippsland Shire Council reported an average **adjusted underlying result** of 2.9 per cent. A positive result suggests that there is enough ongoing revenue to continue to fund the current level of service provision.

Council is able to meet its short-term financial obligations with an average **working capital ratio** of 263 per cent between 2014–15 and 2017–18.

The falling **indebtedness ratio** was reflects a reduction in provisions for landfill rehabilitation.

Note: Some of the year on year change in the adjusted underlying result and the working capital ratio may be due to the timing of Commonwealth grant payments.