

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS - NOTICE OF INTENTION TO LEVY DIFFERENTIAL RATES 2012/2013

Assessment and Record Number	Verbatim Submission	Director of Finance and Administration Comment
<p>A9 ICR12714148</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "...farming community... is not and should never be seen as the 'Bank' for the town." • "...reeks of a gathering of people in positions of power... deciding how to avoid a backlash by meeting a shortfall of funds... [from] those who are... least likely to speak out openly against it... primarily because they are most likely not to be aware of it [due to the Denmark Bulletin not being delivered to] the farming community." • "...claim that as rates are tax deductible for the farming community this increase will be least impacting on them is complete rubbish. How many farmers... make a yearly profit...?... Very few indeed... Any claim against taxable farming income is just another cost." • "...most farmers... MUST have an off farm income... to simply meet day to day living costs. Costs which [Council] cites as contributing to the need for an increase." • "What do farmers get for their rates? We... get essentially nothing specific for our annual rates. Roads to our properties are generally gravelled, in dangerously poor condition, and stay that way year round." • "We provide at our own cost, our water, sewage, and drainage. We have no street lights, our road verges... fill the drains with litter, drop limbs onto our fences, and across the roads, and who is it who has to do the work and carry the costs of repairs? We do!" • "...the Valuer General's... 5.5% DECREASE... actually reflects the real situation. FARMERS ARE DOING IT TOUGH!" • "...this decision is nothing short of a blatant attempt to minimise backlash for an increase... due to over commitment to projects in and for the Town." • "...hard times are upon us all, and the need to tighten the belt is there. In private business if one can't meet their commitments, one might need to cut costs, or... cut staff." • "...something you never get away with in business is to dramatically increase the service costs to those you provide the least service to!" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Irrelevant comment. • Bulletin is available for purchase; also advertised in the West Australian and Albany Advertiser. • All UV properties are deemed viable for agriculture and hence able to attract tax deductions. Profitability is a management issue for the ratepayer, not Council. • External impacts to the agricultural sector are a management issue for the ratepayer, not Council. • Council services are provided to all ratepayers regardless of their property location. Townsites service the rural community. • Water and sewerage are serviced by the Water Corporation. Council's works program prioritises drainage works on public roads for the benefit of all. Street light power is a cost of Council; maintenance is a cost of Western Power. The public can report blocked drains, and tree debris to Council for its works crews to attend to. • Decrease in property valuations is based on the unimproved capital value, not on the profitability of an agricultural enterprise upon that land. • Town projects benefit all ratepayers. • Noted. • All ratepayers have equal access to all public services.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS - NOTICE OF INTENTION TO LEVY DIFFERENTIAL RATES 2012/2013

<p>A9 ICR1271414 (...cont.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "...the comparative chart in the public notice... clearly shows the increase... represents a real dollar 'value' of a minimum of \$130 higher than Albany..., \$220 higher than Plantagenet..., and a massive \$258 higher than Manjimup... To try to tell me this is the same or even similar is to treat... all the farming community as fools." • "A rate rise may be inevitable... but I... am not going to quietly accept a huge increase just so that those in 'town' (who actively have access to the so called benefits of the shire's activities) aren't equally encumbered." • "Any rate rise should be determined either as an equal distribution of the shortfall, or weighted the other way to reflect the determination of the Valuer General; so that those who have access to town facilities of water, sewage, street lighting, bitumen roads, etc., are the ones who pay a bit more for it all... In truth,... I use... the Library." • "I strongly oppose the imposition of a Differential Rate Rise, and insist at the very worst, the Denmark Shire distribute any rate rise equitably across all rate payers... [Council's] farming community are not Wealthy Landholders swanning around in a life on the land; rather a group of dedicated individuals struggling on the whole to make ends meet, whilst many actively volunteer time, effort, money, and energy to protect the community from fire... This would be a woeful way to show us the 'real' value placed on us as members of the community." 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The public notice states "these proposed rate charges are a significant increase... however,... the proposed rate charge per hectare is similar." The public notice makes no mention of the minimum rate charge being similar. • Noted. • The proposed increase is intended to increase rural rates, which have been underrated in the past, relative to other local governments. • Council recognises the valuable contribution that its volunteers provide through local Bush Fire Brigades and the Volunteer Fire and Rescue Service. However, this is not a consideration when setting the rate charges.
<p>A298 ICR12814175</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Following my complaint notice... last financial year... our business has continued in recession... with our turnover dropping by about 15%. This follows a similar fall in the previous 12 months. Our profit has been further eroded by increased energy costs... the Cabon [sic] Tax will have further ramifications." • "Talking to other accommodation providers and following press articles on the state of tourism in WA I believe our fall in revenue is due to forces largely beyond our control. " • "I feel it unreasonable... to increase our rates by 35% last year and proposing a further increase this year." • "If the intention... is to increase the total revenue by 8.95% but not change the GRV vacant rate can we expect an incese [sic] of more than 8.95%?" • "Perhaps it is time that... Council looked at what is happening to local business and accepted [sic] that it will have to reduce services or staff levels or both..." • "...if you don't have the money [then] you shouldn't be spending it." • "...an Aquatic Facility... would be sheer madness in the face of the shires inability to rein in other costs." 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Profitability is a management issue for the ratepayer, not Council. • External impacts to the tourism sector are a management issue for the ratepayer, not Council. • This property experienced a large valuation increase last year, compared to other developed properties. This was outside Council's control. • Most GRV-Developed properties will realise an 8 to 10% increase. • Noted. • Noted. • Council has not budgeted for the construction of an Aquatic Facility in 2012/2013, via rating revenue.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS - NOTICE OF INTENTION TO LEVY DIFFERENTIAL RATES 2012/2013

<p>A423 ICR12814242</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "...a 10% or more increase to the minimum rate I feel is unjust and unbalanced." • "... as [Council] is leaving the GRV vacant land the same as last year, then GRV developed and UV land minimum rate should also stay the same..." • "...the proposed... minimum rate for GRV developed and UV land... is a lot higher than all surrounding shires and... should reflect a similar minimum rate that the neighbouring shires have in place... (Dare I say that all shires be amalgamated into one to achieve this outcome.)" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum rate charge increase by 10% for GRV-Developed, 0% for GRV-Vacant, and 11.76% for UV. • Possible; however, the rate in the \$ for UV and GRV-Developed will require to be increased further to meet the same level of required revenue. • See previous comment. Council will not consider amalgamation with neighbouring local governments.
<p>A559 ICR12814161</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "...regarding the proposed rating increase of 18.2% on rural land...whilst I can understand the need to find revenue... I simply question the logic and fairness of this decision." • "...my property is half native bush and approx. 10-12 hectares pasture but is deemed by your definition to be general agricultural land... this is not a suitable sized land parcel to provide a substantial monetary return." • "This latest proposed rates rise will increase my rates bill to around \$2,500.00 which I consider to be extremely steep as I still have to pay every time I go to the Shire Tip. It seems I get very little in return for these hiking [sic] rates." • "I would hope that it is possible to adjust rates according to real valuations and assess charges on a case by case basis." 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase is intended to match the rate charge to neighbouring local government areas for similar properties in those districts. • Zoned rural and rated UV. Currently 22.1ha and possible candidate for a change of method of valuation to GRV. • 2011/2012 = \$2,131.97; 2012/2013 estimated to be \$2,649.69 which is a 24.29% increase. Property not currently in a Kerbside Waste Collection Service area. • Differential Rating should be limited to broad categories of properties, rather than individual rate setting, per guidelines from the Department of Local Government.
<p>A866 ICR12814220</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "...we feel strongly that an 18.2% increase in rates on rural properties is unrealistic and inappropriate. The fact that a more consistent increase across the Shire is not being adopted makes it even harder to accept." • "...we feel that any increase should be staggered and not be increased by any more that [sic] double the rate of inflation... Our rates increased by 8% last year!" • "As farmers we do not have the opportunity to increase our prices to whatever we need to 'recoup' our losses and we struggle to make a profit... We have had no increase in the value of our property over the last 12 to 24 months..." 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase matches the rate charged to neighbouring local government areas for similar UV properties in those districts. GRV-Vacant rate in the \$ increased dramatically in 2011/2012. GRV-Developed rate charge increases will be about 8 to 10% this year. • Noted. • Profitability and external cost pressures are a management issue for the ratepayer, not Council. Changes in property valuations are based on the unimproved capital value, not on the profitability of an agricultural enterprise upon that land.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS - NOTICE OF INTENTION TO LEVY DIFFERENTIAL RATES 2012/2013

<p>A866 ICR12814220 (...cont.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "...the values are down and expenses (including Shire rates) are up. The shire councils are not the only ones with increased costs." • "...we feel that a decrease in the council spending over the next 12-24 months would be a fairer way to go..." • "Please reconsider... [as] regular, smaller increases will make ratepayers much more accepting of increases." 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted. • Noted. • Noted.
<p>A2268 ICR12714024</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "We... object to the... proposed minimum rate for UV (Rural) properties... the minimum rate is outstandingly higher (\$950 in Denmark compared with Albany \$820 and Plantagenet \$730)." • "We are a self-funded retiree couple living on a 33ha rural property... [and] we are actually being rated at \$28.78 per hectare. This is almost twice the proposed quote of \$17.53 per hectare." • "While we do carry on a grazing enterprise... less than 60 acres (25 hectares) of pasture... is extremely difficult to turn a profit in the present climate. Because of this and the fact we do not (unlike most other farmers) have off-farm jobs, the tax deductibility of the rates is of little value to us." • "Even if we were to cease our business,... we would not be eligible for a... [pensioner or senior] rebate because of the potential for carrying out an agricultural enterprise." • "It would be more equitable to retain the minimum rate at the previous level (\$850)..." 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted • The public notice used a sample property based on approximately 100ha. Smaller properties were not compared between local governments. • Zoned rural and rated UV. Currently 31ha, with 25ha of cleared land, and NOT a candidate for a change of method of valuation to GRV, due to rural enterprise. • Rating staff are currently drafting a policy in relation to rebates on land over 20ha. • Noted.
<p>A3318 ICR12814306</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "...Public Notice... includes the declaration... [that there is] no provision to fund the proposed Denmark Aquatic Facility..." • "...Denmark Aquatic Centre Association... has... 850 [supporters]. Most... represent families rather than individuals... therefore account for more than half of the 1437 families normally resident in the Shire." • "[The Denmark Aquatic Centre Association] is... the biggest club in Denmark... [and] has no facilities." • "...DACCI has worked to address this... alongside council... first in the Needs Assessment stage and currently in the Feasibility Study stage. In good faith and without prejudice, it has devoted hundreds of hours to the DSR approved analytical process." • "...three months ago this team [Council and DACCI]... adopted a concept plan... and agreed we had a concept robust enough for councillors to decide whether or not to initiate a reserve fund and commit to the pool. It recommended both." 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Correct from rating revenue; however, a transfer is proposed from the Land and Buildings Reserve. • Figures not yet verified. • Noted. • Council appreciates the passion and immense effort that DACCI has provided to this project. • The proposed 2012/2013 Municipal Budget does not provide any municipal revenue be allocated to a Reserve Fund, however a transfer from the existing Land and Buildings Reserve is proposed to be used to match DACCI funds, to create an Aquatic Facility Reserve.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS - NOTICE OF INTENTION TO LEVY DIFFERENTIAL RATES 2012/2013

<p>A3318 ICR12814306 (...cont.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "...concept... included the essence of a financial model designed to impose a more commercial perspective... [and] the model proposed a fixed annual operating subsidy within which user revenue would have to be adjusted to balance the books." • "...the subsidy could be accumulated during the capital raising stage when it was not actually needed for operations... By establishing such a savings fund, every 'subsidy' dollar saved [now]... would save roughly twice as much over the life of the pool." • "...the annual subsidy... has the status of a quarantined special purpose fund [which is buffered from fluctuations such as those presented in the public notice]." • "[The concept plan] also proposed a solution to depreciation and... replacement." • "DACCI has explained these features... to the community and we believe that it is understood and its common sense approach is much appreciated. Evidence in support of this belief can be found in the pile of written submissions that we seek leave to table today." • "I ask Council to reconsider its (implied) decision to exclude... a reserve fund..." • "...Council will send the clearest possible signal to all grant agencies that it has no intention of listening to the majority of its ratepayers. Rejection would be a slap in the face to your community." 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted – financial model has many limitations requiring further investigation and consideration. • Noted. • Noted. • Noted. • Near to 500 submissions have been received by Council in support of an Aquatic Facility. • The Public Notice clearly stated that no Reserve Fund would be funded from Rating Revenue. Note: a transfer is proposed to occur from the existing Land and Buildings Reserve to match DACCI funds. • Council is required to ensure that any rating revenue does not create an unnecessary burden on ratepayers. Council already proposes an 8.95% rate rise, which is well above inflation. Although significant, 500 submissions is not a majority of ratepayers.
	<p>An additional 13 submissions have been received, which directly request the creation of a Reserve Fund for the construction of an Aquatic Facility. It is unclear whether the respondents were addressing the Notice of Intention to Levy Differential Rates, or were writing solely in support of the construction of an Aquatic Facility.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted.