

Manningham City Council

Group: metropolitan

This fact sheet uses graphs and data to examine this council's revenue, expenditure and financial sustainability over recent years. The information aims to help readers understand the impacts of rate capping. This was introduced in 2016–17 to restrict the amount councils can increase their general rates and municipal charges each financial year.

You can compare this council's data against its 'group' by looking at the fact sheet for metropolitan councils. Further information is available at <http://www.esc.vic.gov.au/outcomes-reports>. You'll find an interactive version of this fact sheet, a reader's guide to help you understand key terms and information about the sector as a whole.




© OpenStreetMap contributors

Key facts

Population (June 2021):	125,827
Size (km ²):	113
Length of local roads (km):	607
Population per km of roads:	207
Council employees (FTE, 2021–22):	532
Higher cap approved for any year between 2016–17 and 2021–22	No

Rates

What happened to average rates and charges (2021–22 dollars)?



Year	Average rates and charges	Applicable rate cap
2016–17	\$2,122	2.50%
2017–18	\$2,108	2.00%
2018–19	\$2,146	2.25%
2019–20	\$2,152	2.50%
2020–21	\$2,143	2.00%
2021–22	\$2,134	1.50%

Rates (continued)



See the reader's guide for data sources and useful information.
 Note: The numbers in this fact sheet have been adjusted for inflation and are expressed in 2021–22 dollars.

Did council's average rates comply with the applicable rate caps?

2020–21 (2.00%)	2021–22 (1.50%)	2022–23 (1.75%)
Yes	Yes	Yes


How did rates change for different ratepayers?

Council's rating strategy 2022–23

Council applies a single differential rate to all property types of and recovers the cost of waste services using service charges. The adopted budget contains more information about rate categories and charges.

Distribution of rates increases and decreases

The applicable rate cap is applied to council's average rate. So, some individual rates increased by more and some increased by less than the applicable cap (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

Ratepayers by property class (2021–22 dollars)

	Residential ratepayers	Commercial ratepayers	Industrial ratepayers	Rural ratepayers
	96% of ratepayers in 2021–22	3% of ratepayers in 2021–22	<1% of ratepayers in 2021–22	<1% of ratepayers in 2021–22
	\$105.7m (93%) of rates and charges revenue in 2021–22	\$7.3m (6%) of rates and charges revenue in 2021–22	\$0.4m (<1%) of rates and charges revenue in 2021–22	<\$0.1m (<1%) of rates and charges revenue in 2021–22
	0.1% average annual change between 2018–19 and 2021–22	2.0% average annual change between 2018–19 and 2021–22	5.9% average annual change between 2018–19 and 2021–22	0.3% average annual change between 2018–19 and 2021–22

Source: Victorian Local Government Grants Commission (unaudited data). Includes both capped and uncapped rates and charges. 'Other' category of property class has been omitted.

Revenue



See the reader's guide for data sources and useful information.
 Note: The numbers in this fact sheet have been adjusted for inflation and are expressed in 2021–22 dollars.

Where did council's money come from?


Revenue (2021–22 \$m and % of total revenue)

	2018–19		2019–20		2020–21		2021–22	
	\$m	%	\$m	%	\$m	%	\$m	%
Rates and charges	109.4	(69%)	111.8	(69%)	114.1	(70%)	114.3	(67%)
User fees and statutory fees and fines	15.6	(10%)	13.0	(8%)	10.1	(6%)	10.1	(6%)
Grants	15.2	(10%)	14.7	(9%)	18.0	(11%)	20.1	(12%)
Contributions	15.7	(10%)	19.5	(12%)	19.6	(12%)	23.1	(14%)
Other	3.4	(2%)	2.9	(2%)	2.5	(1%)	2.0	(1%)
Total	159.4		161.9		164.3		169.7	

Manningham City Council's total revenue increased in real terms between 2018–19 and 2021–22, reflecting increases in revenue from contributions, rates and charges, and grants.

Rates and charges was the largest source of revenue, accounting for 69 per cent of total revenue between 2018–19 and 2021–22.

Revenue per person (2021–22 dollars)



In terms of revenue per person (which adjusts for changes in population), revenue from rates and charges, grants and contributions increased between 2018–19 and 2021–22. This compares with a downward trend in revenue per person from user fees and statutory fees and fines and 'other' revenue.

Expenditure



See the reader's guide for data sources and useful information.
Note: The numbers in this fact sheet have been adjusted for inflation and are expressed in 2021–22 dollars.

How much money did council spend?


Expenditure (2021–22 \$m and % of total expenditure)

	2018–19		2019–20		2020–21		2021–22	
	\$m	%	\$m	%	\$m	%	\$m	%
Operating expenditure	104.8	(78%)	108.9	(68%)	107.1	(71%)	111.1	(73%)
Employee costs	57.2	(43%)	57.1	(36%)	58.5	(39%)	53.8	(35%)
Materials and services	25.2	(19%)	30.0	(19%)	29.0	(19%)	29.0	(19%)
Other operating expenditure	22.5	(17%)	21.7	(14%)	19.6	(13%)	28.3	(19%)
Capital expenditure	28.9	(22%)	51.1	(32%)	44.4	(29%)	40.5	(27%)
Total	133.8		160.0		151.4		151.6	

Manningham City Council's total expenditure increased in real terms between 2018–19 and 2021–22, reflecting increases in capital expenditure, 'other operating expenditure' and expenditure on materials and services.

Employee costs was the largest area of expenditure, accounting for 38 per cent of total expenditure between 2018–19 and 2021–22.

Expenditure per person (2021–22 dollars)



In terms of expenditure per person (which adjusts for changes in population), council's expenditure on materials and services, 'other operating expenditure' and capital expenditure increased between 2018–19 and 2021–22. This compares with a downward trend in expenditure on employee costs per person.



See the reader's guide for data sources and useful information.
 Note: The numbers in this fact sheet have been adjusted for inflation and are expressed in 2021–22 dollars.

Did council's capital expenditure pattern change?

Capital expenditure (2021–22 \$m and % of total capital expenditure)


	2018–19		2019–20		2020–21		2021–22	
	\$m		\$m		\$m		\$m	
Renewal	19.3	(67%)	33.2	(65%)	22.0	(50%)	23.2	(57%)
Upgrade	3.1	(11%)	4.5	(9%)	7.0	(16%)	4.8	(12%)
Expansion	1.3	(5%)	1.2	(2%)	1.8	(4%)	1.5	(4%)
New	5.1	(18%)	12.2	(24%)	13.6	(31%)	11.0	(27%)
Total	28.9		51.1		44.4		40.5	

Manningham City Council's spending on asset renewal trended upwards in real terms, despite fluctuating between 2018–19 and 2021–22. Asset renewal accounted for the highest share of capital expenditure over this period (59 per cent).

Council's spending on all other categories increased in real terms between 2018–19 and 2021–22.

Did council renew assets (such as roads, parks and buildings)?

Council assets: comparing renewal and upgrade expenditure with depreciation (2021–22 dollars)



Renewal & upgrade expenditure as a percentage of depreciation

2018–19	102%
2019–20	161%
2020–21	118%
2021–22	118%
2022–23	146% (forecast data)
2023–24	122% (forecast data)

Council's spending on renewing and upgrading assets trended downwards in real terms between 2019–20 and 2021–22, following a peak in 2019–20. Renewal and upgrade expenditure remained above the amount of depreciation (the decline in value of council's assets caused by age and use) between 2018–19 and 2021–22. It was forecast to remain above the amount of depreciation in 2022–23 and 2023–24.




See the reader's guide for data sources and useful information.
Note: The numbers in this fact sheet have been adjusted for inflation and are expressed in 2021–22 dollars.

Which service areas did council spend its money on?

Expenditure by function (2021–22 \$m and % of total services expenditure)


	2018–19	2019–20	2020–21	2021–22
	\$m	\$m	\$m	\$m
Aged and disabled services	11.7 (9%)	11.2 (8%)	9.7 (7%)	9.2 (7%)
Business and economic services	8.9 (7%)	8.3 (6%)	8.0 (6%)	7.6 (6%)
Environment	11.2 (9%)	14.8 (11%)	15.3 (11%)	12.0 (9%)
Family and community services	8.7 (7%)	8.5 (6%)	7.7 (6%)	9.4 (7%)
Governance	22.0 (17%)	22.9 (17%)	28.4 (21%)	23.3 (17%)
Local roads and bridges	17.3 (13%)	18.8 (14%)	14.8 (11%)	13.8 (10%)
Recreation and culture	25.1 (20%)	26.8 (20%)	26.0 (19%)	28.8 (21%)
Traffic and street management	8.1 (6%)	7.7 (6%)	9.1 (7%)	8.2 (6%)
Waste management	12.4 (10%)	12.9 (10%)	13.6 (10%)	15.7 (12%)
Other	2.8 (2%)	0.5 (0%)	1.8 (1%)	7.0 (5%)
Total	128.2	132.5	134.2	135.1

Which areas experienced the biggest changes from 2018–19 to 2021–22?



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

Did service quality or community satisfaction change?




Financial position



See the reader's guide for data sources and useful information.
 Note: The numbers in this fact sheet have been adjusted for inflation and are expressed in 2021–22 dollars.


Did council operate sustainably?

Adjusted underlying result
 (adjusted underlying surplus or deficit as a percentage of adjusted underlying revenue)




Between 2018–19 and 2021–22, Manningham City Council reported an average **adjusted underlying result** of 6.2 per cent. An ongoing positive result suggests ongoing revenue can fund the current level of service provision.

Working capital (current assets as a percentage of current liabilities)



Council could meet its current financial obligations with a reported average **working capital ratio** of 202 per cent between 2018–19 and 2021–22.

Indebtedness (non-current liabilities as a percentage of own-source revenue)



Between 2018–19 and 2021–22, council reported an average **indebtedness ratio** of 2.4 per cent. The lower the percentage, the greater a council's ability is to repay debt from revenue it controls.

Note: Some of the year-on-year changes in these financial indicators may be due to changes to accounting standards or the impact of coronavirus. See the reader's guide for more information.