

		*Received late – Not responded to.
Submission 2	Name withheld pursuant to Policy – P100602	<p><i>This is the position of DENMARK RATEPAYERS AND RESIDENTS’ ASSOCIATION</i></p> <p>Rates</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A 6% increase for residential rates is excessive because – <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Wages across the board have not increased and many casual and manual workers in Denmark do not earn more than \$25 per hour. 6% extra is a significant amount to find for lower income individuals and families. (b) Most businesses have taken a ‘Covid’ hit in the last 15 months or so and this will also impact on those operators. Should not the Shire wear some consequences of the pandemic as well and the community. Perhaps our Shire could follow the lead of the New Zealand Prime Minister and take a 20% cut on all Councillors and Staff salaries and payments. (c) 6% is 4 times the current CPI. 2. If the costs associated with Holiday accommodation properties require as much as 20% increase this could be mitigated by ensuring that all accommodation providers are registered with the Shire. This can be achieved by – <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Implement a fine for any non-registered properties following an amnesty period to allow them time to complete the registration. (b) Collect the trading name of each registered property so that an easy search of the internet will identify the unregistered properties. (c) All margin in ‘tourism’ differential should be quarantined for investment back into the tourism industry. 3. We support the split rating system for rural properties that also have a commercial (non-agricultural) use. <p>*Received late – Not responded to.</p>
Submission 3	Name withheld pursuant to Policy – P100602	<p><i>Owner of property with accommodation – Rural additional use holiday</i></p> <p>As a rural property the Shire provides no extra level of service to our property apart from the road to which our guests drive to get there.</p> <p>Our accommodation would have no impact on housing availability and affordability within the Shire as it is short term only, and never been or be available as long term.</p> <p>The costs associated with providing tourism related infrastructure and services should fall on ALL tourism related businesses, not just rural accommodation. We are not the only ones benefiting from tourism, so would it be better to place a “tourism levy” on tourism related businesses, including all retail businesses in the shire?</p> <p>*Received late – Not responded to.</p>

Submission 4	Name withheld pursuant to Policy – P100602	<p><i>Submission regarding Notice of Intention to Levy Differential rates 2021/2022</i></p> <p>With regards to the significant rate increase cited for the “Rural – Additional use Commercial”, we wish for the Shire to note our disapproval and concern.</p> <p>We own 210-acre farm that is also our home to our young family. We run a Murrey Grey Cattle stud, 12 acres of wine grapevines, and have built a cellar door and café. We own commercial property in town and run a business there. We employ three local people each year. We engage up to 12 contractors on a part-time basis throughout the year. We actively work with the Denmark Agriculture College and support local students to develop their skills for a career in agriculture or university studies.</p> <p>As Counsellors, you will be aware that vineyard and wine-producing ventures are at the whim of international forces, such as the recent actions by China which introduced wine tariffs at the time of harvest. Counsellors would note that farmers would need to spend substantial funds to maintain a vineyard over the previous 12 months to produce wine grapes. The introduction of the Chinese wine tariffs at the time of harvest resulted in a substantial loss in demand for local wine grapes earlier this year. As a result of those tariffs, agricultural ventures which operate small on-farm cellar doors have recently experienced significant financial hardship over the past six months. The Shire seems oblivious to this recent event and has decided to add further financial burden to those local businesses that support substantial employment in the Shire. Counsellors should note that many vineyards and cellar door staff shop locally and support local businesses like the Denmark Cooperative, two IGA supermarkets and retail clothing stores in the town of Denmark. Counsellors would be aware of the key statistics that every person employed in the primary industry supports another three to five people in the service and support industries.</p> <p>Denmark has many farming families who have developed value-adding enterprises to their farm holding to increase and stabilise their annual revenue. This means these families have used their savings to build facilities that provide tourist ventures that bring tourists to Denmark, thereby filling caravan parks, motels and local AirB&B venues. Imagine if Denmark was further stifled as a tourist destination based on the poorly considered rate rise of +70% for “rural - additional use commercial” ventures. The proposed rate increase is contrary to the current Denmark Shires strategy for development in the area.</p> <p>Increasing rates >70% on these properties guarantees that many of the Shire’s entrepreneurs will delay investment in the region. This will result in some closures of farm business resulting in loss of employment opportunities.</p> <p>The Shire remains silent on what the additional rates are being used for. Rural families do not receive the benefits that the town folk receive such as play equipment in their neighbourhood, footpaths or even the basic bitumen road. In fact, many local rural families have had to endure damage to their vehicles because the Shire has failed to deliver maintained road systems.</p> <p>We recently had to use licensed farm equipment to assist in the recovery of tourists who had become entrapped on local shire road. Perhaps all rural families should commence either individual or class actions to recover those types of costs from the Shire?</p>
--------------	--	--

		<p>* Identifying holiday home operators who are not registered would enable the Shire to collect the correct amount of rate from these households & as such all would be contribution. The Shire for years now, have said that they are making roads into finding out those that are not registered as holiday homes, however they do not have the resources to find out who is not registered. I truly believe this would take 2-4 hours at best especially as Air BnB etc have advised they would provide a list of those that are listed with them. As a suggestion an option, for the Shire would be, to send out a letter with the rates advising everyone that an investigation will be conducted by the Shire in regards to unregistered holiday homes with a fine of \$2000. Including a moratorium where these homes have a chance to register without being fined.</p> <p>* It seems the Shire is penalising those that are doing the right thing (hard working Mum & Dad investors trying to create a better life for themselves & their family) & making no effort to fine those that are not. Not only do the registered homes pay more in rates – at present 10.7095 cents in the \$ extra – they also regularly pay for re-registration & inspections.</p> <p>* The advertised 20 % increase is actually a disincentive to register.</p> <p>* If the number of Holiday Homes is an issue why are the Shire still accepting & approving Development Applications?</p> <p>* Rental Shortage - it was not made clear how the increase in rates will assist the "housing availability and affordability". It was not mentioned at the meeting – however there seems to be a lot of talk about holiday homes causing a rental shortage – surely giving investors an incentive to rent their homes for long term will go a long way to improving this situation. What is the Shire’s proposal for providing homes for the long term rental market? I know this is a State Govt issue - however it must first come from Local Govt. If the extra funds raised via the increase of rates goes towards homeless or creating long term rentals – well then great – but no commitment has been made. 20% increase to 120 registered holiday home properties will raise about \$50,000 – what will this provide or what will it be spent on?</p> <p>* Where are the extra funds raised via increased Shire Rates going – it was only mentioned that there are added costs to Tourism infrastructure due to the increase in tourism. <i>Redacted</i> even mentioned that if a person is paying rates to have their bins collected why should they pay for the holiday home next door to have their rubbish collected. This is ludicrous – of course the holiday home next door also pays rates & their share of rubbish collection.</p> <p>* Other more viable solutions could be to allow people to have ancillary homes on their properties to rent for long term rentals; ask visitors to pay to visit local attractions (Greens Pool, Elephant Rocks); Stop approving huge property developments for sale for more properties to be built; Give incentives for property investors to choose long term renters e.g. Tax deductions.</p> <p>* <i>Councillor name redacted</i> kept saying “Fair & Equitable” in relation to how the rates increase was worked out – unsure how this is fair & equitable. Obviously unbeknown to Shire Personnel, running a holiday accommodation business is not lucrative in relation to the amount of work & related costs involved.</p> <p>* It was indicated by one of the <i>Councillor name redacted</i> - I believe that they knew someone who was charging \$1000 per night. Well I don’t know anyone charging that amount – I can only dream. It seemed to infer that due to</p>
--	--	---

tourism

		<p>having a spike right now the holiday sector could afford a rate increase. What will happen when things go back to normal – will they decrease our rates? When the farmers have a bumper year – do they increase their rates?</p> <p>* Of the 3000 “vacant homes” the Shire advised – not sure if this includes the 120 registered homes – however these people pay rates & do not use the facilities / infrastructure on a full time basis – they probably visit 2-4 times max per year. Let’s say there are another 120 homes unregistered – that is still 2,760 homes that pay rates towards that infrastructure that they are only using a very small percentage.</p> <p>* The holiday Homes provide jobs in Denmark - Restaurants, Cafes, Boutiques, Supermarkets, Plumbers, Electricians, Builders, Maintenance personnel, cleaners, Waitstaff, even The Chamber of Commerce AND THE SHIRE, just to name a few all rely on visitors directly or indirectly for their source of income. If it weren't for Tourism Industry, this town would not have such great restaurants, boutiques etc & the town would be much smaller & as such a much smaller Shire would be required.</p>
Submission 35	Name withheld pursuant to Policy – P100602	<p>RECEIVED 10/07/2021</p> <p>PROPOSED RATES FOR 2021/2022 FINANCIAL YEAR</p> <p>As a holiday home owner in Denmark we would be happy to pay additional rates if the extra income can be used for housing affordability. However let me describe my situation. We love Denmark, love holidaying here and our kids love it. We spent our school holidays here and want to be more involved with the community. When we don't stay at our holiday home, we share it with others. The goal of this is not to make money. We are happy breaking even. All of our outgoings are spent locally with local business.</p> <p>Holidaying in Denmark has never been so popular. However, when Australia goes back to open borders, at current spent, we may need to close the holiday home to visitors or pass on the extra fees to visitors. That would mean our home is not utilized to full potential. I would ask the shire to consider these potential future scenarios in making this decision please. For example is there another way to raise funds based on current economic conditions rather than a permanent on-going fee? Also the current \$2000 fine for people illegally letting their home is not sufficient. It cost us significantly more than that to establish our home to the safety standards needed for short term rent.</p>
Submission 36	Name withheld pursuant to Policy – P100602	<p>RECEIVED 11/07/2021</p> <p>PROPOSED RATES FOR 2021/2022 FINANCIAL YEAR</p> <p>I wish to protest the proposed differential rates proposal. In broad terms, I think you have this all wrong. Tourism is a huge benefit to the municipality, not a cost. Just ask all the places in Australia affected by the bushfires and then Covid restrictions.</p> <p>Those towns were miserable and going broke. Not once did the cry go out "If only we upped the rates on our holiday homes by 20% all will be well". Tourism is a vital business to Denmark and like all businesses, it has costs. The shire needs to manage those costs but the current proposal is ludicrous. The amount of money raised seems pathetically</p>

		<p>low to achieve any of the goals to start with. How much of what is raised will simply be consumed by the administrative costs of identifying all the properties not registered as holiday accommodation but none the less operating as such? (because if the much touted "fair and equitable" is to be true, every last one would need to be brought into the fold and that list would then need to be kept current forever).</p> <p>The notion that rental availability will be addressed by this is misplaced. We have a holiday house so we can stay in it and this must be true for many others. At no time will it be made available on the long term rental market even if holiday home rental was banned.</p> <p>It would just stay empty and unproductive most of the time. We would then stop being employers in the shire. We employ a property manager, cleaners, a firewood supplier, a mowing contractor, a slashing contractor and more. We have just crunched the numbers for a separate reason and although our holiday rental income is much higher than for a long term rental, the costs are huge and we pour tens of thousands of dollars of that tourist money back into the community each year. (The net result is still financially in favour of holiday rental but it is not great and ignores the huge amount of work in managing bookings, queries, guest problems, website maintenance, booking calendar maintenance and so on which doesn't appear on the balance sheet.)</p> <p>Although we pay rates to Denmark, our property is 17km out of town in Shadforth. We don't feel we get much for our rates anyway. No rubbish collection, no tip passes, no street lights, no street sweeping... no anything really on the face of it. Paying a special loading for that does not seem like a good deal any way you might look at it. I invite you to regard the pool of private holiday accommodation in the Denmark region as an asset to the vitality and financial health of the town and lose the false notion that it is cash cow waiting to be milked. And if anyone on the council has ever enjoyed the world class cuisine at a restaurant like Pepper and Salt or browsed in any of the numerous discretionary goods shops in town, just remember why they exist at all.</p>
Submission 37	Name withheld pursuant to Policy – P100602	<p>RECEIVED 12/07/2021 PROPOSED RATES FOR 2021/2022 FINANCIAL YEAR</p> <p>As an owner of a registered holiday home, I find your proposal to increase shire rates by 20% "to spread the associated costs fairly" (for tourism) counter intuitive. Tourism provides benefits to Denmark's economy both in revenue and jobs, however by singling out 'registered' holiday home owners, the shire is sending a negative/disincentive signal to those that are doing the right thing.</p> <p>Firstly - why aren't you trying to spread the associated costs fairly by identifying holiday home operators who are not registered? And by not doing that, is the concept of 'fairness' something that you can espouse? What is the shire going to do to address those that are not registered?</p> <p>As an owner of a registerd holiday property, I contribute to Denmark in the following way: - I provide income to property managers, maintenance/handyman services, cleaners, gardening and lawnmoving services on an ongoing</p>

		<p>basis - The turnover in guests means there are a steady stream of people frequenting Restaurants, Cafes, Boutiques, Supermarkets which in turn provide jobs and revenue to Denmark and enables long term residents to also enjoy these facilities which may not be sustainable without the patronage of tourists.</p> <p>This is bound to be over and above what would be experienced if I lived permanently in the property or rented it out as a long term tenancy. Please note I do also own another property which is rented out as a long term tenancy. In addition, please advise how the increase in rates will assist the "housing availability and affordability". Is the Shire actively promoting that holiday homes be converted to long term rentals? See notes above on the impact to Denmark should this be the strategy. What is the Shire's position on the financial impact this will have on the residents and small business owners in Denmark?</p> <p>I was under the impression that I was already contributing over and above a normal residence by paying higher rates, registration and associated fees. However, if there needs to be a fair and equitable distribution of costs for tourism than I respectfully request that this is taken on in true spirit and the Shire provides transparency on how this will be achieved - as for the reasons above, singling out registered holiday homes alone is not the answer.</p>
Submission 38	Name withheld pursuant to Policy – P100602	<p>RECEIVED 10/07/2021 PROPOSED RATES FOR 2021/2022 FINANCIAL YEAR</p> <p>As the owners of a holiday home in beautiful Denmark, we find your proposal to increase shire rates by 20% for registered holiday home owners inequitable and an extremely negative strategy to rectify existing problems. We made a risky financial choice buying a derelict property full of asbestos in the centre of town and spent two years working hard renovating the house ourselves. In doing this we have improved the streetscape as well as providing accommodation during busy periods when the town is fully booked.</p> <p>Had we known that the shire would then hike the rates up by such a dramatic amount for holiday home owners AFTER holiday home approval was given, we may have made a completely different choice and invested elsewhere. I would like the following points considered</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would there be a full refund on all application fees and alterations to the property to meet holiday home regulations within the shire, such as sealing our driveway which we would not have done otherwise, if we were to return to long term rental due to rate increases? • I would like to know how the level of service provided to these holiday properties differs from other properties. Possibly a service I am unaware of? • If there are extra costs that result from visitors to these properties (tourists to Denmark) and infrastructure is not in place to manage the numbers, would it not also make sense to stop all tourism campaigns and/or charge all other tourism related operators who are 'bringing in' the tourists?

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why, out of a town of where so many rely on tourism, single out 120 individuals to carry the burden of the cost of improving infrastructure for all, local residents included? • I feel that many of us are doing the right thing by registering our properties as holiday homes, so surely the shire could raise more revenue if they were to identify homes that are being used for that purpose but not registered and put in place a substantial fine for those who still don't register after a moratorium period. A 20 % increase in rates in only incentive NOT to register, again leaving those doing the right thing carrying the burden. • Is the shire still accepting and approving Development applications if the number of existing holiday homes is such an issue? • Short stay accommodation provides jobs within the community such as management, cleaning, gardening, maintenance, retail, waitstaff etc. I would like to know if all the cafes, restaurants, gift shops and tour operators of Denmark have been asked if they would like the number of tourists to decrease and how that would affect them financially. Reducing the existing number of homes available for short term rental would certainly bring this about. • It was mentioned that the rates increase would assist the housing availability and affordability. Could you please be more clear in how you intend to do this? If our money is going directly to assisting those who are homeless, I have no problem paying, but how is that going to be managed? What exactly will the increase be spent on? We love Denmark and feel this proposal has been a slap in the face after the hard work and risk that we faced as a medium income family trying to renovate a run-down, unsafe property, not only to earn some income but a place to stay that we love and treasure. Thank you for consideration in this matter.
Submission 39	Name withheld pursuant to Policy – P100602	<p>To the DENMARK SHIRE COUNCILLORS 11 July 2021</p> <p>I write to express my objection to the proposed rating increase in the strongest possible terms. I attended the previous meeting to address you however I was called away on urgent business prior to getting the chance to address you.</p> <p>In your plan to increase rates, what you have clearly not taken into account is rating a business that opens for just 2 days per week (11 hours) and a business that opens 7 days per week (45-50 hours) and based upon what I discovered in the meeting was the fact that our rates will rise significantly.</p> <p>We are in the wine business and to be perfectly honest, the wine industry has been feeling a huge amount of price pressure over the years and this year is proving that the situation is becoming even more dire. For example (without naming names) we have a producer here in Denmark selling wines at below cost of production and please note the advertisement below; just one of many. Allow me to do the math for you...and by the by the way, IF you can get a bottle of red made cheaper, I'll deliver 6 bottles free of charge to your Reception.</p>

We're delivering!
 6 of our top rated bottles - only \$5 a bottle
 Exclusive, indepe... See more



NAKEDWINES.COM.AU
 We deliver to your door - only \$29.99 for 6 bottles! [Learn More](#)

543 273 comments 83 shares

RETAIL	\$ 29.99		
Less GST		\$ 2.73	
Freight		\$ 10.00	
Credit Card fee		\$ 0.37	
COGS		\$ 36.00	
TOTAL	\$ 29.99	\$ 49.10	-\$ 19.11

So now I ask you, where do you believe the money is going to come from to pay for the proposed “RATE INCREASE?” Now it is true, I do have other business interests and can afford to pay the increase, however, what I believe you have failed to address is that a business has to support itself, otherwise it is not a business. If I do not have a viable business, then I am required to address that. In the event I decide to cease business, or substantially alter the way we operate in Denmark, I believe it will have direct impact on:

- two permanent employees’ positions,
- seasonal workers,
- substantial reduction in purchases made within Denmark,
- an impact on tourism, to whatever extent you feel,
- many people come to Denmark primarily to visit *Business name withheld* and whilst here they obviously support businesses in Denmark,

So, by your proposed action of increasing the rates to attract more income for the Denmark Shire, for whatever your agenda may be, there will certainly be an opposing reaction.

Submission 40	Name withheld pursuant to Policy – P100602	<p data-bbox="734 86 1099 129">Comment Approval ✕</p> <hr data-bbox="734 164 1890 167"/> <p data-bbox="734 197 904 223">Consultation:</p> <p data-bbox="734 237 1384 266"><u>Have Your Say - Shire of Denmark Rating System Review</u></p> <p data-bbox="734 301 864 327">Post Title:</p> <p data-bbox="734 343 1234 371">Simpler and Fairer Changes Merits Support</p> <p data-bbox="734 406 943 432">Post Comments:</p> <p data-bbox="734 448 1877 576">Reducing the property rating categories from 14 to 4 makes rating simpler and easier to administer, saving costs. Another rating reform long overdue, is to amend to Local Government Act to ensure that pensioner rates concessions take effect from the date that the concession is granted. A letter from the Shire to the Premier on this issue is requested.</p>
---------------	--	---

Each submission received prior to 13 July 2021 was responded to on 23 July 2021 by email and advised that their submission would be presented for formal consideration at the Special Council Meeting on August 3, 2021