

**INQUIRY INTO ABILITY OF LOCAL GOVERNMENTS TO
FUND INFRASTRUCTURE AND SERVICES**

Organisation: Burwood Council

Date Received: 26 April 2024

Hon Emily Suvaal MLC
Chair
Standing Committee on State Development
Legislative Council
NSW Parliament

Dear Committee Members

BURWOOD COUNCIL SUBMISSION - INQUIRY INTO THE ABILITY OF LOCAL GOVERNMENTS TO FUND INFRASTRUCTURE AND SERVICES

Burwood Council appreciates the opportunity to provide input to the Standing Committee on State Development's inquiry into the ability of local governments to fund infrastructure and services.

Burwood Council is part of Metropolitan Sydney and we are eager to collaborate with the NSW Government to create a modern, thriving and well-managed Council that serves as both a global visitor destination and an ideal place for residents to live, work, and play.

The following outlines Council's key matters of concern and associated recommendations:

A) THE LEVEL OF INCOME COUNCILS REQUIRE TO ADEQUATELY MEET THE NEEDS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES

Burwood Council is facing a significant challenge in adequately meeting the evolving needs of our community due to the level of income increasing at a slower rate than the costs associated with delivering essential services. This growing disparity can be attributed to several key factors:

1. Expanding Scope, Complexity and Breadth of Services

Burwood Council has taken on responsibilities that extend beyond the traditional purview of local government. The number of services required to maintain a thriving community is not only increasing but also becoming more complex and costly due to external factors such as technological advancements, environmental changes, and shifting community expectations.

Today, Burwood Council provides a wide array of services, including but not limited to:

- Waste management with enhanced recycling initiatives like FOGO
- Urban planning and development
- Regulatory services, including health regulation of the hospitality sector
- Maintenance and expansion of an extensive network of roads, footpaths, and active transport options
- Stormwater infrastructure management
- Provision and upkeep of parks, recreation facilities, aquatic centres, and playgrounds
- Community facilities, services and programs, such as study spaces, libraries, youth and children's programs, and community development initiatives
- Environmental education and initiatives
- Arts and cultural programs, including festivals and events
- Place making and night-time economy development
- Comprehensive community engagement through various essential communication channels

- 24/7 customer service to respond to urgent requests
- Extended operating hours for Council facilities and direct services

These services are vital to the well-being and prosperity of our community, and reducing them would have severe consequences. Despite Council's efforts to operate efficiently, adequate funding levels are essential to maintain and enhance these services.

Recommendation:

Failing to create a vibrant and liveable community would be detrimental to the long-term success of Burwood, broader Sydney and NSW. Identifying additional funding sources and removing unnecessary statutory burdens should take precedence over cost-cutting measures to ensure the continued well-being of our residents. Investing in our NSW community's future should be a top priority for the NSW Government, not necessarily through additional State funding, but rather through a reduction in cost shifting and restructuring of the Rate and Developer Contributions systems.

2. Urbanization, Growth and the Current Structure of Developer Contributions

Burwood is contributing to Sydney's growth as a global destination and is a desirable place to live, work, and play. The high-density urban environment in the Burwood CBD can accommodate a growing population while maintaining a high standard of amenity. Developer contributions have been instrumental in delivering the necessary infrastructure to mitigate the impacts of development and ensure that public amenity is not compromised by growth.

However, developer contributions do not adequately address the ongoing maintenance and depreciation costs associated with public infrastructure. While they help Council manage the immediate effects of development, they fall short in covering the long-term costs, particularly as higher-density living leads to increased asset use and wear and tear.

Moreover, urban living and societal changes have led to new community behaviours and expectations, such as extended operating hours for Council facilities and 24/7 access to Council services.

Recommendation:

That the NSW Government commence a review of the structure of developer contributions to ensure that they cover both immediate and long-term infrastructure costs. There is an opportunity for the NSW Government to support the development of a contributions framework that addresses both upfront and recurrent funding requirements, such as the dedication of income-generating assets by Developers that provide an additional revenue stream for Council to cover ongoing expenses.

3. Statutory, Environmental and Historical Liability Overheads

Burwood Council faces a multitude of challenges stemming from statutory, environmental, and historical liability overheads that significantly impact its ability to meet the community's future needs within current income levels. These overheads not only strain the Council's financial resources but will eventually hinder its capacity to deliver essential services and infrastructure effectively. The following represent the items that have caused a significant financially negative impact to Burwood Council over the last few years:

- Councils are increasingly vulnerable to legal action, at times spurious, due to past inconsistencies in exercising regulatory powers, which can significantly impact their resources as defending claims can be a costly exercise.
- As an inner-west Sydney Local Government Area, Burwood faces historical liabilities such as former landfill sites, asbestos contamination and other environmental issues that do not meet modern Environment Protection Authority (EPA) standards.

- Climate change and more frequent and intense flooding events are adversely affecting Council's extensive network of roads, footpaths, and stormwater infrastructure.
- The NSW Government and the Office of Local Government impose a significant regulatory burden on Councils, including:
 - i. The costly Integrated Planning and Reporting framework, which does not provide effective visibility and decision-making information to elected officials and the community.
 - ii. New ARIC and internal audit requirements.
 - iii. The uncompetitive external auditing environment created by mandating the use of the Audit Office of NSW, leading to unreasonable increases in auditing costs without discernible benefits.
 - iv. Rising cybersecurity costs due to increased technology dependence.
 - v. Growing waste and recycling costs, in part due to the State Government's Waste Levy.
 - vi. A low tender threshold that requires a burdensome process for relatively small procurement activities, with the current limit of \$250,000 remaining unchanged for many years.

Recommendations:

- The NSW Government should consider providing clear statutory liability limitations for historical issues arising from professional or environmental faults of Council or at the very least legal or material assistance through NSW Government agencies such as the EPA.
- The NSW Government should consider funding Audit Office costs for local government and reduce mandated requirements for ARICs.
- The NSW Government should review the Integrated Planning and Reporting Framework to make it more agile and effective, focusing on key aspects that aid decision-making by Councillors and the community regarding Council's direction and service portfolio.
- The NSW Government should consider increasing the assistance provided by CyberSecurity NSW to local government, including the provision of best practice IT tools, to support Council's cybersecurity efforts, or provide additional funding for local government to procure Cybersecurity tools and services.
- The NSW Government should remove or progressively reduce the Waste Levy imposed on local government.
- The NSW Government should raise the tender threshold to \$400,000 to streamline procurement processes and improve value for money outcomes.

Burwood Council is committed to meeting the evolving needs of our community, but the current level of income is insufficient to keep pace with the rising costs and complexities of service delivery. Addressing the identified challenges, such as the expanding scope of services, the impact of urbanization and growth, and the various statutory, environmental, and historical liability overheads, is crucial to ensure the long-term financial sustainability of the Council and the well-being of our community.

B) EXAMINING PAST RATE PEGS AND COST INCREASES BORNE BY LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

The role of local government has expanded significantly over the years, encompassing a wide range of services, growing community expectations, and an increase in statutory and regulatory overheads. However, the level of rates revenue has not kept pace with these changes, leading to a financial strain on Burwood Council and other Councils.

One of the primary reasons for this disparity is that past rate pegs have not adequately matched the substantial increases in material costs experienced by Burwood Council. The rate pegs have been insufficient to offset the major operational cost increases incurred, such as materials, wages,

software costs, and other recurring expenses necessary to maintain services. As a result, large increases in material costs have created a long-term systemic shortfall in funding for most Councils, including Burwood.

While Burwood Council appreciates the recent changes to the Rate Peg calculation, these modifications do not allow Council's income to sufficiently catch up to the required levels. The alternative for Councils like Burwood is to continue bearing the additional financial burden of applying for further increases through the resource-intensive Special Rate Variation (SRV) process.

The gravity of this issue was highlighted in the Final Report from IPART's Review of the Rate Peg in August 2023, which stated:

"As a result, we consider that councils with longstanding financial sustainability issues driven by an insufficient base level of rates income could benefit from a mechanism to reset their base."

This sentiment was echoed in a 2020 review conducted by the NSW Productivity Commission, which found that per capita rating income was lower than the required levels. The Commission's Review emphasized that rate pegging compelled councils to reduce the quality and quantity of infrastructure serving their communities or recover the cost from infrastructure contributions.

Recommendation:

To address this issue, the NSW Government should instruct IPART to consider implementing a higher optional rate peg for the next three to five years, which councils such as Burwood could access if deemed necessary for long term financial sustainability. This measure would help bring income levels in line with where they should be, ensuring that local governments have the financial resources to meet the growing needs of their communities. By considering a higher optional rate peg for the next few years, IPART can help local governments reset their base income levels and ensure long-term financial sustainability, enabling them to better serve their communities.

C) CURRENT LEVELS OF SERVICE DELIVERY AND FINANCIAL SUSTAINABILITY IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT, INCLUDING THE IMPACT OF COST SHIFTING ON SERVICE DELIVERY AND FINANCIAL SUSTAINABILITY, AND WHETHER THIS HAS CHANGED OVER TIME

Cost shifting has had a significant impact on the current levels of service delivery and financial sustainability in local government. Burwood Council, like many other councils, has experienced cost shifting in various forms, both directly and indirectly, which has put a strain on its ability to maintain high-quality services and ensure long-term financial stability.

Direct Cost Shifting:

Direct cost shifting is evident in several areas, such as the Emergency Services Levy, Waste Services Levy, and the numerous additional statutory requirements imposed on local government overtime. These direct costs place an additional financial burden on Burwood Council, forcing it to allocate resources away from essential services and infrastructure to meet these obligations.

The Emergency Services Levy, in particular, has had a significant impact on Council's budget. This levy, which is intended to fund emergency services across the state, is an additional expense that Council must bear, despite the fact that emergency services are a state government responsibility. Similarly, the Waste Services Levy, which is designed to encourage recycling and reduce waste, has increased the cost of waste management for Council, putting further pressure on its financial resources. The ever-increasing statutory requirements placed on local government have added to the administrative and compliance costs borne by Burwood Council. These requirements, while often well-intentioned, can be time-consuming and resource-intensive, diverting Council's attention and funds away from core service delivery for the community.

Indirect Cost Shifting:

Indirect cost shifting is evident in the existing regulation loopholes that result in a failure to ensure that local government can levy rates fairly. A prime example of this is the case of build-to-rent developments. These developments typically involve the construction of a large multi-dwelling building on a site previously occupied by one or a few houses. Because the developer is not required to subdivide the dwellings, they can continue to pay rates as before, rather than paying rates for each dwelling.

This arrangement is inherently unfair, as the burden of the additional dwelling population is absorbed by Council and indirectly charged to the rest of the community. The increased population density resulting from build-to-rent developments places additional strain on Council's services and infrastructure, such as parks, roads, waste management, and community facilities. However, without the ability to levy rates fairly on these developments, Council is forced to spread the cost across the entire community, leading to a disproportionate burden on other ratepayers.

Changes Over Time:

The impact of cost shifting on service delivery and financial sustainability has changed over time, with the burden on local government increasing steadily. As state and federal governments have sought to reduce their own costs and responsibilities, they have increasingly shifted the burden onto local government. As a result, Burwood Council, like many other councils, has found it increasingly difficult to maintain current levels of service delivery while also ensuring long-term financial sustainability. The cumulative impact of direct and indirect cost shifting has put significant pressure on Council's budget, forcing it to make difficult decisions about which services to prioritize and how to allocate limited resources.

The recently completed cost-shifting survey by Local Government NSW, published in November 2023, has revealed a total cost-shift to Councils amounting to \$1.36 billion in the 2021-22 financial year. This figure represents a significant increase of \$540 million since the previous report from the 2017/18 financial year, and it has far-reaching consequences for our communities.

The cost-shift translates to a loss of services, opportunities, and amenity for all our residents and businesses. To put this into perspective, it is equivalent to an additional \$460 per ratepayer annually. This is a substantial sum that could have been invested in improving local infrastructure, services, and community well-being.

As local government authorities, Councils are uniquely positioned to understand and respond to the needs of their communities. However, this cost-shift places an undue burden on Councils, forcing them to face the difficult task of explaining rate increases, service reductions, and infrastructure deterioration to their constituents.

It is imperative that we address this issue and find a sustainable solution. The current situation is untenable and unfairly penalises our local communities.

Recommendations:

- The NSW Government should consider exempting local government from paying the Emergency Services Levy, recognizing that emergency services are a state responsibility and that this levy places an unfair burden on councils.
- The NSW Government should also consider exempting local government from paying the Waste Levy, acknowledging that this levy increases the cost of waste management for councils and diverts resources away from other essential services.
- The NSW Local Government could reform how rates are calculated to ensure that build-to-rent developments pay their fair share of rates, with one rate charged for every occupiable dwelling on the land. This reform would help to distribute the cost of increased population density more equitably and ensure that Council has the resources to maintain high-quality services and infrastructure for all residents.

D) ASSESS THE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF THE RATE PEG IN NEW SOUTH WALES FOR RATEPAYERS, COUNCILS, AND COUNCIL STAFF OVER THE LAST 20 YEARS AND COMPARE WITH OTHER JURISDICTIONS

Over the last 20 years, the rate peg in New South Wales has had significant social and economic impacts on ratepayers, councils, and council staff. These impacts have been felt across various aspects of local government operations, from infrastructure and community services to financial sustainability and staff well-being.

Impact on Community:

The rate peg has had an enormous impact on unmet infrastructure and community service needs in our communities. Councils are faced with growing backlogs in infrastructure and services, as well as a backlog in maintaining and replacing depreciating community service assets. This situation has left councils in tight positions, even as community needs and demands from local government continue to increase.

The inability to adequately fund infrastructure and services has a direct impact on the quality of life for residents. Inadequate or poorly maintained infrastructure, such as roads, footpaths, and community facilities, can lead to safety concerns, reduced accessibility, and a lower overall standard of living. Similarly, a lack of funding for place creation and community services, such as libraries, recreational programs, and social support services, can limit opportunities for social interaction, personal development, and community well-being.

Moreover, the rate peg's impact on infrastructure and services can have long-term economic consequences for communities. Inadequate infrastructure can hinder economic growth and development, making it more difficult to attract businesses and create jobs. This, in turn, can lead to reduced economic opportunities for residents and a lower overall standard of living.

Impact on Council:

The practice of rate-pegging has had cumulative negative impacts on councils, eroding their financial sustainability and contributing to their difficulties with funding operational services, infrastructure, and asset maintenance. Rates have clearly not kept pace with inflation, severely affecting councils whose costs rise with inflation the same as any other organization.

The rate peg has been an unhelpful mechanism for councils' financial sustainability, effectively restricting revenue without regard to costs. This has forced councils to make difficult decisions about which services and infrastructure projects to prioritize, often leading to deferred maintenance, reduced services, and a growing backlog of unmet needs.

The financial constraints imposed by the rate peg have also limited councils' ability to invest in long-term planning and strategic initiatives. This can hinder the capacity to address emerging challenges, such as population growth, demographic changes, and environmental sustainability, which require proactive and forward-thinking approaches.

Impacts on Council Staff:

When service delivery is reduced due to resource constraints, council staff, particularly those in customer-facing roles, can face verbal and sometimes even physical abuse as a result. This can lead to increased stress, reduced job satisfaction, and potentially higher rates of sick leave among staff.

Some staff may find their workloads increasing to unmanageable levels due to resource constraints, forcing them to provide a lower level of service than is deemed satisfactory. This can be both stressful and demoralizing for staff, who may feel that they are unable to meet the needs of their community despite their best efforts.

The rate peg can also impact the attraction and retention of skilled staff in the local government workforce. Local government positions, including planners, engineers, community, and park

specialists, play a critical role in addressing and responding to a range of urban challenges, balancing competing demands, and managing sustainable long-term growth. However, if councils are unable to offer competitive salaries and benefits due to financial constraints, they may struggle to attract and retain the skilled staff necessary to provide efficient and effective services.

Recommendation:

It is timely that the NSW Government and local councils work together to develop a more sustainable and equitable funding model for local government. This may involve reforming the rate-pegging system to provide councils with greater flexibility to generate the revenue necessary to meet the needs of their communities, while also ensuring that rate increases are justified, transparent, and subject to community consultation. By doing so, we can create a stronger, more resilient local government sector that is better equipped to meet the challenges of the future and deliver the services and infrastructure that our NSW communities need and deserve.

E) COMPARE THE RATE PEG AS IT CURRENTLY EXISTS TO ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES WITH REGARDS TO THE OUTCOMES FOR RATEPAYERS, COUNCILS, AND COUNCIL STAFF

The current rate peg system in New South Wales has been a subject of ongoing discussion and debate, with many councils expressing concerns about its effectiveness in providing the level of income necessary to meet the evolving needs of their communities. As we consider alternative approaches to the rate peg, it is imperative to address the unique challenges faced by councils, such as new and emerging costs, external cost shifts, and the need for a more consultative process in determining a rate peg.

Incorporating New and Emerging Costs:

One of the key limitations of the current rate peg system is its inability to adequately account for new and emerging costs faced by councils. These costs, which are becoming increasingly significant, include cybersecurity measures, environmental impacts, and the 24-hour economy. As the world becomes more digitally connected and the effects of climate change become more pronounced, councils are required to invest in new technologies, infrastructure, and mitigation strategies to protect their communities and assets and therefore require adjustments to the standard peg.

Recommendation:

Setting an adjusted peg may require a more detailed and nuanced approach to assessing the costs faced by councils, as well as a mechanism for ongoing review and adjustment as circumstances change.

Addressing Cost Shifts from Other Levels of Government:

Another significant challenge faced by councils is the impact of cost shifts from other levels of government. These cost shifts, which can include changes to funding arrangements, new regulatory requirements, or the transfer of responsibilities, can have a profound impact on the financial sustainability and capacity of councils to serve their communities.

Recommendation:

To address this issue, an alternative model for the rate peg could include a specific provision for external costs emanating from cost shifts. This would allow councils to recover the additional costs imposed upon them by other levels of government, ensuring that they are not forced to continually absorb these expenses at the expense of other essential services and infrastructure.

Enhancing Consultation and Collaboration:

Any alternative approach to the rate peg should prioritise consultation and collaboration between IPART and councils. The current system, which relies primarily on a formulaic approach to

determining the rate peg, can feel disconnected from the real-world experiences and challenges faced by councils.

Recommendation:

An alternative model could involve a simple up-front consultation process by IPART across all councils, possibly as part of preparing for an annual review of the rate peg. This consultation would provide an opportunity for councils to share their insights, concerns, and specific needs, allowing IPART to gather valuable information about the demands faced by councils and the potential need for adjustments to the rate peg.

F) REVIEW THE OPERATION OF THE SPECIAL RATE VARIATION PROCESS AND ITS EFFECTIVENESS IN PROVIDING THE LEVEL OF INCOME COUNCILS REQUIRE TO ADEQUATELY MEET THE NEEDS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES

The Special Rate Variation (SRV) process, while intended to provide councils with an avenue to generate additional income to meet the needs of their communities, has several shortcomings that limit its effectiveness and efficiency.

Resource-Intensive and Burdensome:

One of the primary concerns with the SRV process is that it is extremely resource-intensive and overly burdensome for councils. The application process requires councils to invest significant time, effort, and financial resources to prepare a comprehensive case for an SRV, including detailed financial projections, community consultation, and justification for the proposed rate increase.

This process diverts council staff from their core responsibilities of delivering services and managing infrastructure and can lead to reduced service levels and delayed projects during the application period, as staff are focused on the SRV process rather than their day-to-day duties.

Moreover, the SRV process requires councils to engage in extensive community consultation, which, while important for ensuring transparency and accountability, can be time-consuming and costly. Councils must allocate resources to developing consultation materials, conducting surveys and workshops, and analysing feedback, all of which add to the overall burden of the SRV process.

Uncertain:

Another issue with the SRV process is that it can be uncertain and inconsistent. Councils are not guaranteed approval of their SRV application, even if they have invested significant resources in preparing a comprehensive case. This uncertainty can make it difficult for councils to plan for the future and make long-term financial decisions, as they cannot be sure whether they will have the additional revenue needed to fund essential services and infrastructure.

Inadequate:

While the SRV process can provide councils with additional revenue in the short term, it is not a long-term solution to the underlying issues of financial sustainability and inadequate funding for local government. SRVs are typically approved for a limited period, after which councils must reapply or revert to the standard rate peg. This means that councils may face the same financial pressures and challenges once the SRV period ends, as they have not had the opportunity to address the underlying structural issues in their funding model.

The additional revenue generated by an SRV may not be sufficient to fully meet the needs of the community, particularly in areas with significant infrastructure backlogs or growing populations. Councils may still need to make difficult decisions about which services and projects to prioritize, even with the additional revenue from an SRV.

Exploring Alternative Approaches:

Given the limitations and challenges of the SRV process, it is essential to explore alternative approaches to providing councils with the level of income they require to adequately meet the needs of their communities. One option, as suggested earlier in this submission, is to reform the rate-pegging system to provide councils with greater flexibility and autonomy in setting their own rates, subject to a fair and transparent process of community consultation and engagement.

Another option is to simplify the SRV process itself, making it less resource-intensive and burdensome for councils. This could involve streamlining the application requirements, providing clear guidance on the assessment criteria.

Conclusion:

The current rate peg system, rating structure and developer contributions framework in NSW have significant limitations that hinder the ability of local councils to meet the evolving needs of their communities. To address these challenges and ensure the long-term financial sustainability of local government, it is imperative to explore alternative approaches that prioritise flexibility, responsiveness, and consultation.

These alternatives should allow for adjustments based on specific external costs, provisions for recovering costs from other levels of government, and enhanced collaboration between IPART and councils. Furthermore, the developer contributions framework should be restructured to ensure that it covers both immediate and long-term infrastructure costs.

By implementing a more equitable, transparent, and accountable system, we can empower local councils to deliver essential services and infrastructure while ensuring that ratepayers are not unduly burdened. This requires a comprehensive approach that addresses the root causes of the financial strain on councils, such as the expanding scope of services, the impact of urbanisation and growth, and various statutory, environmental, and historical liability overheads.

All stakeholders must work together to develop and implement a sustainable, resilient, and responsive funding model for local government. By embracing change, innovation, and a holistic view of local government funding, we can create a stronger, more effective local government sector that is well-equipped to meet the challenges and opportunities of the future, ultimately enhancing the quality of life for all residents.

If you have any questions regarding this submission, please contact Fab Zincone, Director Corporate Services

Yours sincerely,

Brooke Endycott
Acting General Manager

If you require information in other languages contact the Telephone Interpreter Service directly on 131 450 (free service) and ask them to call Burwood Council on 9911 9911 on your behalf.

ARABIC

إذا كنت بحاجة إلى معلومات بلغات أخرى، اتصل بخدمة الترجمة الشفهية عبر الهاتف على الرقم 131 450 (خدمة مجانية) واطلب منهم الاتصال بالنيابة عنك بمجلس بيروود على الرقم 9911 9911.

CANTONESE

如果您需要以其他語言瞭解信息，請致電131 450聯繫電話傳譯服務中心（免費服務），並請他們代您致電9911 9911聯繫Burwood市議會。

GREEK

Εάν χρειάζεστε πληροφορίες σε άλλες γλώσσες επικοινωνήστε με την Υπηρεσία Μετάφρασης και Διερμηνείας στο 131 450 (δωρεάν υπηρεσία) και ζητήστε τους να καλέσουν εκ μέρους σας το Δήμο Burwood στο 9911 9911.

HINDI

यदि आपको अन्य भाषाओं में जानकारी की आवश्यकता है, तो सीधे 131 450 (निःशुल्क सेवा) पर टेलीफोन दुभाषिया सेवा से संपर्क करें और उनसे बरवुड काउंसिल को 9911 9911 पर आपकी ओर से कॉल करने के लिए निवेदन करें।

ITALIAN

Se avete bisogno di informazioni in altre lingue contattate il servizio di interpretariato telefonico direttamente al numero 131 450 (servizio gratuito) e chiedete loro di chiamare il Burwood Council al numero 9911 9911 per conto vostro.

KOREAN

다른 언어로 정보가 필요하시면 전화통역서비스(Telephone Interpreter Service)에 바로 연락하셔서(131 450번, 무료) 귀하를 대신해 버우드 카운슬(9911 9911번)로 전화를 걸어 달라고 요청하십시오.

MANDARIN

如果您需要以其他语言了解信息，请致电131 450联系电话传译服务中心（免费服务），并请他们代您致电9911 9911联系Burwood市议会。

NEPALI

अरू भाषामा यहाँलाई जानकारी आवश्यक भएमा 131 450 (निःशुल्क सेवा) मा सिधै टेलिफोन दोभाषे सेवामा सम्पर्क गर्नुहोस् र आफ्नो तर्फबाट 9911 9911 मा बर्नवुड काउन्सिलमा सम्पर्क गर्नका लागि उनीहरूलाई भन्नुहोस्।

VIETNAMESE

Nếu quý vị cần thông tin bằng các ngôn ngữ khác xin liên lạc trực tiếp với Dịch vụ Thông dịch qua Điện thoại qua số 131 450 (dịch vụ miễn phí) và nhờ họ thay quý vị gọi cho Hội đồng Thành phố Burwood qua số 9911 9911.