

Name	Email	SUBMISSION IN RESPECT TO THE PROPOSED DIFFERENTIAL RATES 2021/22
Submission 1	Name withheld pursuant to Policy – P100602	<p>To the CEO, Shire of Denmark,</p> <p>I am the joint owner operator of <i>business name withheld</i>. We have been growing fruit on our property since planting the vines in 1998 and selling through our small cellar door / tasting room the last 15 years.</p> <p>It came to my attention recently, not through the shire informing me, but one of your shire councillors. Firstly, this is deeply disrespectful that you are considering a 70% rate increase on our property and didn't have the decency to inform us.</p> <p>When I questioned this during a phone call to your office, I was advised by one of your staff members that an email ' had been sent 'but clearly not to us.</p> <p>We are, first and foremost primary producers, who grow and then value add our products and sell mostly direct to our customers and tourists.</p> <p>The wines are produced off site at a contract winemaking facility. We only have a small, approximately 10square meter tasting room with a capacity for about 8 people.</p> <p>We provide a valuable tourist attraction and experience to visitors to the region.</p> <p>The shire provides us with very little services already. We have to supply our own water requirements, rubbish/ recycling we have to do ourselves and you have reduced the frequency of grading our road.</p> <p>So, it is somewhat of an insult, that we are being singled out for a rate increase. Our rates were already increased when we opened our cellar door.</p> <p><i>Business name withheld</i> is a small family owned and operated business. We have personally both contributed significantly to the shire over the 27 years we've been living here. Including the founding members of The Spirit of Play School, Butter factory studio, Owingup Kordabup bushfire brigade , South Coast Environment Group (who with Steve Selby, manages the Peaceful bay tip)among many other things that we have and continue to volunteer.</p> <p>I ask that you reconsider your rate increase and I would expect an apology that you did not even bother to consult with us and that it took a concerned councillor do so.</p>

		*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>We do not get waste services. We do not have street lighting. We are not connected to the town water supply. We are not on mains sewerage. It is a 45-minute return drive, including passing through vehicle-damaging roads to access the library or recreation centre, we do not use these facilities on a regular basis.</p> <p>We meet and pay on time for all Health and Environmental services. We have never required the Ranger services for our livestock. We meet all bushfire regulations and requirements. We have purchased and implemented additional fire suppression equipment to assist with keeping ourselves, our neighbours and our property safe.</p> <p>With all of the above in mind, we ask our Shire Councillors why we should pay an additional 70% on our rates? What's in it for us? How is this fair? Why would we invest further in our community?</p>
Submission 5	Name withheld pursuant to Policy – P100602	<p>Re: NOTICE OF INTENTION TO LEVY DIFFERENTIAL RATES 2021/2022</p> <p>This letter is in addition to the attached Submission Form in response to the 'Intention to levy differential rates 2021/2022'.</p> <p>We are a small family business located on a rural property in Denmark WA. Under the new differential rates our property will be reclassified as 'Rural – Additional Use Commercial' as we have both a winery/cidery and chalets on the property. This implies a rate rise of 70% from 0.005038 to 0.0086785. Both new 'Rural' categories have the most significant increase to the proposed rate structure. There is a clear lack in transparency surrounding the justification for such a significant rate rise.</p> <p>According to the published Statement of Objects and Reasons: 'The object of the rate in the dollar for this category is to recognise the additional non rural commercial use(s). The rate recognises the impact of such properties on infrastructure and the environment within the Shire. The reasons are to ensure that ratepayers within the differential rate category make a reasonable contribution towards the ongoing maintenance and provision of works, services and facilities in the Shire and to assist in meeting the additional costs associated with providing commercial related infrastructure and services.'</p> <p>Rural properties such as ours already receive limited infrastructure support from the local shire. We are mainly self-dependent with our additional 'needs' being met from our own pocket. The justification of needing to meet the additional costs of providing 'commercial related infrastructure and services' has not been backed with any transparency surrounding additional support that we would be provided. We already provide our own waste disposal, water, and upgrades to an inadequate power supply. Our main infrastructure needs which we rely on the local shire to provide is a well-maintained road. Our road however has not been maintained in over 20 years, regardless of how many 'road contributions' we have paid over the years (in the tens of thousands).</p> <p>The only clear message that is being provided by the local shire across the board for this rate rise is that it is a money grabbing exercise targeting businesses and individuals who are directly involved in the tourism industry. This is reflected also by the 20% rate rise for holiday properties. With again no clear transparency how these properties have a greater requirement than those who do not holiday let their properties. The main purpose is clearly to target particular sectors to help fund asset replacement and projects outlined in the 'Community Strategic Plan 2027'. It would be beneficial for the local government to look to other shires for guidance on how to adequately fund such</p>

		<p>projects without penalizing those within the community whose business and or activities have the biggest direct impact on the economic viability of the town.</p>
Submission 6	Name withheld pursuant to Policy – P100602	<p>RECEIVED 12/07/2021 PROPOSED RATES 2021/2022</p> <p>We sincerely make the following comment relating to the proposed rates 2021/2022.</p> <p>We commend any differential rating system that acknowledges land use and ensures properties within the Shire are rated appropriately. However, we would like it noted that we believe that a 6% to 20% increase in rates is grossly excessive.</p> <p>Our comments made in our original submission (Phase 1) to the Shire still stand and you have that on file. We have never received a response to that submission. For this current Financial year our rates are due to rise by 13.7%. Given that both the Annual Inflation rate and Annual Wages growth are both well below 2% we feel an increase of 13.7% is greedy at worst and misguided at best.</p> <p>We urge Council to look at other means of both generating revenue and reducing costs. For us and many other small businesses a 13% increase in rates is unsustainable.</p>
Submission 7	Name withheld pursuant to Policy – P100602	<p>RECEIVED 11/07/2021 PROPOSED DIFFERENTIAL RATING - OBJECTS AND REASONS</p> <p>I wish to lodge my objection to the differential rating scheme proposed by the Shire. The proposed rating seriously discriminates against rural property owners who have tried to establish a commercial activity on their property to supplement their rural income. These activities can vary widely in their establishment cost and financial returns.</p> <p>By way of example, let me explain our situation. We have owned the 40 hectare rural property at Kent River for 32 years and have practiced small scale agricultural and horticultural pursuits. We have supplemented our rural income by renting one of the residences on the property and at times renting part a building for commercial activity.</p> <p>Historically there has been some commercial activity on the property since the 1920's. In 1998 the property was rezoned Rural – Additional Use to allow the establishment of a cellar sales and restaurant by a third party. Facilities were upgraded at significant cost in 2005 to accommodate these commercial activities. Old Kent River's cellar sales operation utilized these facilities until 2017, when they relocated to Margaret River. Since then we have tried to get</p>

another tenant who is willing to operate a similar business such as a luncheon restaurant or café, however to date this has not been achieved.

As I understand from your “Statement of Objects and Reasons 2021/2022”, our rates will increase to at least \$2705 per annum. (Rural – Additional Use Commercial).

Our rates for 2020/21 were \$1510 so we are facing an increase of 79%. Our rates for 2019/20 were \$1970 due to a 30% surcharge applied as a result of additional uses. Even using the 2019/20 rates as a base the proposed increase is 38%.

In my opinion there are several considerations that relate to the proposed differential rating :-

- A Many rural properties including our own are remote from the town and receive very little service from the Shire.
- Increasing rates will discourage rural land-holders from establishing and/or operating businesses that can add to tourist attractions further from town. In the past such decentralization has been an objective of the Shire planning strategy.
- Smaller of businesses out our way struggle to survive due to the quiet winter season and more recently travel restrictions due to COVID. These impacts are probably less severe with businesses closer to town.
- I understand that the Shire believes that it needs to raise its revenue base to service the Shire and in particular the town. If this is the case, then in my opinion, additional revenue should be raised by taxing short stay residential, and holiday accommodation in town to a greater degree. rather than unrealistically levying rural property.
- If commercial activities on rural property are to be differentially taxed then it should be on a sliding scale depending on the projected profit of the activity. For example 4 holiday chalets are going to yield much more profit than a small cafe such as we hope we can re-establish on our property.
- I would like to see a breakdown of the financial impact to the Shire of the proposed rating changes. I suspect that the increase in revenue from rural property owners will not justify the financial hardship it will cause. I ask myself what additional benefit I am going to get from an increase of around \$1000 per year in rates.

The proposed differential rating scheme supports the view that the Shire does not value its rural residents and sees its future as a vacation town such as Margaret River.

I hope that further thought and consultation can take place before these changes are implemented.

Submission 8	Name withheld pursuant to Policy – P100602	<p>RECEIVED OBJECTION TO PROPOSED 20% RATE INCREASE ON SHORT-TERM ACCOMMODATION</p> <p>Dear David</p> <p>As you are acting CEO I would like to register my vehement objection to the proposed 20% rate increase on short-term accommodation.</p> <p>Denmark would not survive without tourists.</p> <p>Those that have short-term accommodation would have to increase rental prices to cover costs. This means tourists will look elsewhere for cheaper options.</p> <p>I consider this proposal to be very short-sighted and not in the interests of Denmark.</p> <p>Please formally register my lack of support.</p>
Submission 9	Name withheld pursuant to Policy – P100602	<p>Dear Sir, I have found the latest changes to the Differential Rates a little confusing, as there is no mention of my category, GRV-Rural !</p> <p>On previous rates notices (2019), I was listed as GRV-Rural Developed, which was accurate for my Rural Zone in the Kent/Nornalup Ward.</p> <p>On my latest Rate Notice, I am still in a Rural Zone, Kent/Nornalup Ward, but under details, have been rated NON-RURAL IMPROVED.</p> <p>I find this a bit confusing, as I do not live in town on a small block. I live out on a small farm in Scotsdale, which is zoned rural !!</p> <p>If GRV-Rural is rated the same as GRV NON-Rural Improved, then could you please edit the Rating Category (GRV) to “ Rural & Non-Rural Improved”.</p> <p>This would clarify my rural status in the rating process and dispel any confusion when printed on rates notices.By making these changes it would also dispel confusion for other people in the Shire of Denmark of their GRV-Rural Status.</p> <p>I hope by bringing this matter to your attention will make the rating and description of properties more clearer for myself and other property owners in the Shire of Denmark.</p>
Submission 10	Name withheld pursuant to Policy – P100602	<p>RECEIVED – 24/06/2021 OBJECTION TO PROPOSED 20% RATE INCREASE ON SHORT-TERM ACCOMMODATION</p> <p>I have been informed by a friend of this proposal, but have not seen the proposal itself and do not know the details.</p>

		<p>It seems to me quite unreasonable to impose a blanket rate increase on all holiday accommodation providers. I can see some justification in the case of absentee landlords whose properties in Denmark are not their places of residence or their primary business, but for people who provide accommodation at their place of residence and for whom it is their primary, or indeed their only source of income, it seems both unfair and potentially damaging to the tourist trade which is nowadays the basis of our local economy.</p> <p>Not all tourists are wealthy and able to afford expensive holiday accommodation, particularly at present when overseas tourists are out of the picture. Denmark needs to cater to a wide range of tastes and incomes if our tourist trade is to continue to prosper.</p> <p>Please consider these points before finalising the matter.</p>
Submission 11	Name withheld pursuant to Policy – P100602	<p>RECEIVED – 24/06/2021 OBJECTION TO PROPOSED 20% RATE INCREASE ON SHORT-TERM ACCOMMODATION</p> <p>I would like to register my vehement objection to the proposed 20% rate increase on short-term accommodation. Denmark would not survive without tourists. Those that have short-term accommodation would have to increase rental prices to cover costs. This means tourists will look elsewhere for cheaper options. I consider this proposal to be very short-sighted and not in the interests of Denmark. Please formally register my lack of support. I am a holiday maker who lives in Perth, and regularly visits Denmark, and stays in AirBnB locations across Australia. If Denmark becomes too expensive to visit, I will spend my holidays elsewhere.</p>
Submission 12	Name withheld pursuant to Policy – P100602	<p>RECEIVED – 24/06/2021 OBJECTION TO PROPOSED 20% RATE INCREASE ON SHORT-TERM ACCOMMODATION</p> <p>I would like to register my objection to the proposed 20% rate increase on short-term accommodation. Those that have short-term accommodation would need to increase rental prices to cover costs, making it more difficult to attract guests. This increase in costs also risks many potential tourists to Denmark, deciding to visit other South West regions for their holidays instead, where rental prices are cheaper. I would appreciate that you please formally register my lack of support. I am writing as a regular visitor to Denmark on holidays and always love our times spent there, thank you!</p>

Submission 13	Name withheld pursuant to Policy – P100602	<p>RECEIVED – 21/06/2021</p> <p>COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED DIFFERENTIAL RATES SYSTEM.</p> <p>I've been here in Denmark for 33 years, and I certainly don't want to go back through another Christmas and Easter as we have just had. It was bedlam. My view is that we have reached a saturation point for the amenities available. Denmark is being loved to death. Many of the visitors did not have a nice time, and many of the ratepayers of this town ended up extremely annoyed.</p> <p>The comments that I read, especially on Facebook, would say that the Shire is anti-tourism; I don't for one minute think that that is the case, nor do I think that a differential rating system will solve any of the problems long-term that Denmark has. It certainly won't create more rental properties; costs will just be passed on to the visitors. There are numbers quoted in the Denmark Bulletin of 3600 unoccupied properties (David King), sorry, but that is complete nonsense; there are only approximately 4000 rateable properties within the shire of Denmark; before that number starts being quoted as the norm, it should be corrected. I am well aware of the huge costs of catering for large numbers of visitors to this town. I am very much in favour of some form of "user-pay" system.</p> <p>The burden should not be the responsibility of the current ratepayers. The council in Denmark consists of many people who have not been here for a great period of time. I am aware of how many counsellors don't know the enormity of the problem. I know of people who move house during the summer and stay with relatives to let the house out; their income is boasted at 3 to \$4000 a week; I live in Bavin Street. I am well aware of the parking problem in this street during the four weeks of Christmas and Easter. I am sure that the residents in the Street don't have that many friends that wish to come and stay. There are hundreds of people making a cash income from supplying accommodation to visitors.</p> <p>When I moved into my present house, the house downstairs had been converted, and there were 10 beds. For several years my wife and I had to put up with people knocking at the door asking if we were still offering accommodation. Some of the most vocal on Facebook offer accommodation and are certainly not registered with the Shire.</p> <p>My opinion is that the Shire needs a visitors registration system such a system has been the norm in Switzerland, Germany, France most of Europe when you arrive at the hotel or any form of private accommodation you have to fill out a registration form, that registration form includes a primary source of identification such as a driver's license passport etc. those cards that are mandatory to fill-in firstly go to the police station so that the police are always aware of the numbers of people within the area they have names and addresses if there is a problem the cards are then transferred, in Switzerland to the Canton (Swiss shire or local authority) the Canton then bills the</p>
---------------	--	---

		<p>accommodation supplier on a per head per night basis everybody pays the same it doesn't matter if you're a five-star hotel or a caravan site with tents you pay the same. \$1.00 per head/night as a start.</p> <p>The penalties for not getting the cards filled in by visitors are really severe. Every hotel around the world has a registration book or cards. So what's the problem? What the system does is give a billing system but also a system whereby proper statistics can be built up so that amenities/infrastructure can be supplied for future years. If you don't know the numbers, how can you supply the roads, water, power, food, PARKING that this number of visitors require? You can't. Then you end up with the mess that is Denmark.</p> <p>If you don't know the number of people staying in your area, you can't supply medical facilities, ambulances, police, etc. and with COVID likely to continue for maybe 10 years or forever, then I feel that the population of Denmark needs to know who is vaccinated and who is not and boy is that controversial, but it gives you an excellent opportunity to put some form of a visitor registration system in place and at \$1.00 a bed a night could give the shire an additional \$35000.00 a week during the holiday season, perhaps more.</p> <p>Your recommendations are the easy option and penalise the people who have done the right thing and registered. The big numbers are the unregistered suppliers, those who wish an untaxed cash income. Every visitor should be captured and be made to contribute.</p> <p>That goes for caravan parks and campsites as well. The alternative is weeks building up lists from all the accommodation advertisers, Airbnb, Stayz, HomeAway, Homestay, VRBO, Booking .com Apartments, Trip Advisor, Hotels combined, Agoda Homes, One Fine Stay, Plumguide. A letter to all those providers found a huge fine, recurring on the rates for those who do not register. 4 X rates. How much will you make, and is it worth the trouble?</p>
Submission 14	Name withheld pursuant to Policy – P100602	<p>RECEIVED – 15/06/2021 HOLIDAY HOME RATE RISE PETITION</p> <p>Please find attached petition against the proposed holiday home rate rise.</p> <p>The petition list was sent to Councillors on the 15/06/21 and contained 36 signatures.</p>
Submission 15	Name withheld pursuant to Policy – P100602	<p>RECEIVED – 28/06/2021 PROPOSED 20% RATES INCREASE FOR HOLIDAY HOMES IN DENMARK</p>

		<p>Denmark is known for its tourism and many businesses rely heavily on tourism. Increasing the rates for holiday homes in most cases will be passed on to tourist/guest who stay in these holiday properties. This creating the risk that tourist may choose to holiday elsewhere as holiday homes in Denmark become too expensive. The Shire's argument for the increase <u>doesn't</u> make sense, putting more stress on infrastructure and services, tourism is what helps makes many Denmark businesses sustainable.</p> <p>My rates contribute too many shire services that we don't use, this includes getting bins collected each week, our holiday home is occupied on average 170 days a year therefore our bins don't require emptying. Should we argue that our rates should be reduced? No, because we understand that it's a service that is necessary.</p> <p>Having a holiday home in Denmark also means we are employing locals to provide services such as cleaning, gardening and maintenance. If this proposal was supported we would need to consider if it's viable to continue to operate, therefore impacting local employment.</p> <p>It's just not the tourist using the services / infrastructure at these amazing visitor attractions; therefore it is unfair for the increase to holiday home owners that are contributing to the ongoing costs to provide these visitor attractions.</p> <p>In the best interests of Denmark we hope that the 20% increase to property home owner's rates is rejected and not supported.</p>
Submission 16	Name withheld pursuant to Policy – P100602	<p>Received – 28/06/2021 RATES INCREASE FOR HOLIDAY ACCOMMODATION</p> <p>I like to holiday in Denmark and if the proposed rates increase has to be passed onto guests then it may impact negatively on visitor numbers. I find it extraordinary that at a time of restrictions the Council is even considering creating hardship for residents even those who are only in residence for short periods of time.</p> <p>I think this is not in Denmarks interest as a tourist destination and oppose this move.</p>
Submission 17	Name withheld pursuant to Policy – P100602	<p>Received – 28/06/2021 INCREASE IN RATES FOR SINGLE HOLIDAY ACCOMMODATION</p> <p>Regarding the increase in rates for Single Holiday Accommodation.</p>

		<p>As the owners 1 single holiday accommodation property we are already paying 10% more than residential houses, and this is now set to rise by 20% more again. The Shire has stated that this increase will apply to 120 registered single holiday accommodation homes.</p> <p>While we understand the Shire’s need to raise revenue through rates, I do not believe it is equitable to single out these individuals, 120, who have made the effort to comply and registered with the Shire. We object to being singled out by the mere fact that we are being responsible community members by fulfilling the Shire requirements for registration and paying the associated fees.</p> <p>We object to the Shire’s statement that our guests create an added burden on the community and therefore “we” must pay more for that. We pay for rubbish and recycling collection and we pay the fire levy for the property as well as the increased rates. Our guests bring more economically to the community coffers than the supposed “burden” they create on the infrastructure. Does this now mean that all retail shops and other tourist related commercial properties will have a substantial rate increase because they too create a burden on the infrastructure by providing a service to overnight and day tourists?</p> <p>I have no objection to this year’s rate rise however the Shire needs to police it properly so that all the single holiday accommodation homes are registered and thus rated the same. With just a quick look at accommodation platform providers, (obviously some homes are listed on multiple sites), there are more than 120 homes listed on these sites in Denmark Shire.</p> <p>If the Shire is not going to make these rates more equitable by pursuing the non-registered properties, there is little incentive for those registered to continue to do so. “Airbnb” Denmark Shire = 211 “Stayz” Denmark Shire = 100 “Vacation Renter” Denmark Shire = 34 “Homes to Go” Denmark Shire = 447 “Booking.com” Denmark Shire = 49</p>
Submission 18	Name withheld pursuant to Policy – P100602	<p>Received 06/07/2021 PROPOSED RATE INCREASE FOR HOLIDAY HOME OWNERS</p> <p>I strongly disagree with the proposed rates increase this year for the following reasons:</p>

		<p>We have been holiday home owners in Denmark since 2012, this increase in tourism to denmark is due to Covid, when the interstate/international borders reopen, tourism in Denmark will back to precovid numbers.</p> <p>One of the reason for the rates increase for holiday home owners was stated to be the increased need for portaloos etc. due to defecation near the prawn channel, what proof do you have that this was not locals?</p> <p>Locals with shops/cafes are reaping the benefits of increased tourism, is there a similar rates increase being proposed for these business owners?</p> <p>The extra funds you state are needed because of tourism, for infrastructure/amenities will be enjoyed by locals all year round.</p> <p>Can you please confirm that if this rates increase is accepted and when the tourist numbers go back to precovid times, our rates will be accordingly reduced by 15/20? As you will no longer have an excuse to penalise holiday home owners.</p>		
Submission 19	Name withheld pursuant to Policy – P100602	<p>RECEIVED 02/07/2021</p> <p>INTENTION TO LEVY DIFFERENTIAL RATES & MINIMUM PAYMENTS 2021/22</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="734 746 1863 1066"> <tr> <td data-bbox="734 746 1863 805"> <p>SUBMISSION (Give in full your comments and any arguments supporting your comments – continue on additional sheets if necessary)</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="734 805 1863 1066"> <p>I would presume, looking at the new "rates chart", that we may fall in the "Rural, additional use holiday".</p> <p>I would like to understand if the same rate is payable for a rural property that have only one small rental cottage (us) and one with a large number of rental buildings (commercial). Needs to be reminded that it is the volume of tourism that sustains local businesses and ammenities and indirectly Shire rates.</p> <p>Without the contribution of tourism Denmark would be a sleepy, boring and much poorer Shire in more than one way.</p> </td> </tr> </table>	<p>SUBMISSION (Give in full your comments and any arguments supporting your comments – continue on additional sheets if necessary)</p>	<p>I would presume, looking at the new "rates chart", that we may fall in the "Rural, additional use holiday".</p> <p>I would like to understand if the same rate is payable for a rural property that have only one small rental cottage (us) and one with a large number of rental buildings (commercial). Needs to be reminded that it is the volume of tourism that sustains local businesses and ammenities and indirectly Shire rates.</p> <p>Without the contribution of tourism Denmark would be a sleepy, boring and much poorer Shire in more than one way.</p>
<p>SUBMISSION (Give in full your comments and any arguments supporting your comments – continue on additional sheets if necessary)</p>				
<p>I would presume, looking at the new "rates chart", that we may fall in the "Rural, additional use holiday".</p> <p>I would like to understand if the same rate is payable for a rural property that have only one small rental cottage (us) and one with a large number of rental buildings (commercial). Needs to be reminded that it is the volume of tourism that sustains local businesses and ammenities and indirectly Shire rates.</p> <p>Without the contribution of tourism Denmark would be a sleepy, boring and much poorer Shire in more than one way.</p>				
Submission 20	Name withheld pursuant to Policy – P100602	<p>RECEIVED – 01/07/2021</p> <p>RATES 21/22</p> <p>Could I please have some clarification on the rate increase for standard residential properties that are not used for short term holiday accommodation? The statement outlined the additional toll on services caused by holiday homes while also suggesting an increase on non holiday homes? Is it about the holiday homes or is it simply a cash grab on top of the already high rates and lack of services?</p>		

		<p>Initially I thought the levy was to aid the rental shortage in town as brought forward by a community group but there is no mention of the rental availability in the statement extract. A levy or penalty is an unsustainable approach to both of these issues. Why not offer a rate rebate or refund for a short term holiday home owners who instead completes a 12 month fixed term lease? This would be a sustainable approach to both the rental shortage and the stress on services.</p> <p>Also could you clarify what category and rate increases will be imposed on caravan parks? If this is about extra demand on services perhaps they should cop the majority of the increase. Given there is a new caravan park being built with no public consultation or approval set to add huge strain on the newly developed greens pool precinct and being located on one of the most dangerous parts of the highway.</p> <p>A clear representation of what percentages of tourists who visit and stay in Denmark are associated with short term accommodation, private holiday homes, existing caravan parks, back packers and hotels would clearly display who needs to pay more and why.</p> <p>I do not see why an owner occupier should be penalised with rate increases due to growing tourism. We were not offered significant decreases during the quiet times or the long slow quiet winters over the years.</p> <p>It would also be helpful to see a rate comparison from other shires like Walpole, mt barker, Albany, Bridgetown Augusta etc.</p>
Submission 21	Name withheld pursuant to Policy – P100602	<p>RECEIVED 01/07/2021 RATE INCREASE - QUERY RE AIR BNB</p> <p>Can you confirm if the proposed rate increase for ‘holiday purpose’ properties includes air bnb’s that have one room in the house where the owners live and gets rented out on a minimal basis mainly when town is busy and availability is tight? If so it seems unfair to increase rates in these circumstances compared to much more commercial ventures and I suggest that owner occupied one room holiday rentals are exempted from this increase.</p> <p>It would be a pity if increasing rates put a stop to additional accommodation in times of need and that benefits town with no increase in council costs.</p>
Submission 22	Name withheld pursuant to Policy – P100602	<p>RECEIVED 19/06/2021 PROPOSED RATES FOR 2021/2022 FINANCIAL YEAR</p> <p>I agree that the proposed holiday home 20 per cent rate hike should go ahead.</p>

Submission 23	Name withheld pursuant to Policy – P100602	<p>RECEIVED 23/06/2021 PROPOSED RATES FOR 2021/2022 FINANCIAL YEAR</p> <p>Please reconsider proposed rate increase on holiday homes. Believe this will affect the attraction for building holiday accommodation within the shire of Denmark having an effect on building services and tourism. If the propose rate increase is introduced can each property be assessed with amount of days leased per year rather than set rate per property</p>
Submission 24	Name withheld pursuant to Policy – P100602	<p>RECEIVED 23/06/2021 PROPOSED RATES FOR 2021/2022 FINANCIAL YEAR</p> <p>I have concerns about increased rates for holiday home properties. Denmark markets itself as a tourist town and so many businesses survival is related to the tourism industry. Without accommodation for tourists the businesses struggle - as they did during covid lock down.</p> <p>To say that the increased visitor numbers cause the council to have increased costs that residents shouldn't have to pay for is flawed. It assumes that holiday premises are occupied 52 weeks of the year. As a holiday home owner I pay for weekly rubbish collections however my home is not occupied for 52 weeks of the year. So I pay for a service I don't use weekly. A resident uses it weekly or fortnightly. It also talks about increased visitor numbers are stressing services.</p> <p>The shire encourages tourism to boost its business base. As you enter Denmark there is a sign welcoming all visitors and recreational vehicles. Years ago you could only have a holiday home approved in specific areas designated by council. If too many holiday houses are the issue then cap them - as was done by having specific holiday areas.</p> <p>I pay for many services via my rates that I don't or visitors don't use 52 weeks of the year, be that recreation centres or community based services or ranger services however I don't then say you should reduce my rates as I don't use them. I also spend money in Denmark employing local cleaners, gardeners, maintenance people supporting many small businesses across the region. This seems to be conveniently forgotten.</p> <p>The visitor numbers have increased due to Covid not enabling locals to to travel overseas or even to eastern states in some cases. This will not last. To unfairly burden a holiday home owner (approved by council for this purpose) is neither a creative or thoughtful issue solving response. It comes across as discriminatory. When council approved my holiday home they did not indicate</p>

		I would then be treated differently to other ratepayers. I already have to conform to many regulations a resident does not to be approved as a holiday home. I accept that however I do not accept the premise because more people are choosing to visit Denmark that holiday home owners should burden the extra cost. The good and bad about visitor attraction should be shared by the community equally, as many across Denmark benefit besides holiday home owners
Submission 25	Name withheld pursuant to Policy – P100602	<p>RECEIVED 23/06/2021 PROPOSED RATES FOR 2021/2022 FINANCIAL YEAR</p> <p>A new levy for accommodation providers on their rates. I thought the Council valued tourism as a means of generating wealth for all. Apparently the influx of tourists stretches the Councils resources? Do all tourism destinations levy providers of accommodation? The proverb kill the goose that lays the golden egg springs to mind.</p>
Submission 26	Name withheld pursuant to Policy – P100602	<p>RECEIVED 24/06/2021 PROPOSED RATES FOR 2021/2022 FINANCIAL YEAR</p> <p>Firstly I would like to advise that I have no financial interest in this matter. I am strongly opposed to the proposal for differential rating for registered tourist accomodation providers for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Taxes of all descriptions are levied on an equivalent basis in a democratic society and there is generally no attempt to target groups for penalty or additional taxes because they happen to use more services than others. We don't seek to charge additional taxes to someone who uses the public hospital system more regularly than others. As residents we broadly accept that I pay the same rates per rateable value as my fellow residents even though we all use council services to a lesser or greater extent. For example, my wife and I are Denmark residents for about 50% of the time as we have 6 young grandchildren in Perth and we share our time with them. We pay the full rates for domestic rubbish collection even though we only put our bin out 50 % of the time. I accept this because this is how the system works and as I have a large garden I probably use the green waste services at the tip much more than the average resident. The current proposal takes the Council down the path of a "user pays" approach which will carry many unintended issues for the Council and ratepayers. 2. Actions speak louder than words. Whilst the CEO believes the Council is pro tourist their actions are the complete opposite. Residents who see tourists as that annoying group who takeover Greens Pool, take my parking spot, make me wait in a long que for coffee etc. etc. are now being told by the CEO that they are also costing ratepayers lots of money because they fill up the public rubbish bins. How can that rhetoric be seen as valuing tourists and recognising the enormous monetary value that tourists bring to the town both in the short and long term. Tourists provide massive benefits to Denmark and its residents. In the short term

		<p>it means businesses can grow hence providing employment opportunities including our youth - something that was non-existent 32 years ago when we first purchased our property. In the longer term tourism sees the town grow as people who visit as tourists return and buy property. We have 3 separate friends that have done that in the last 6 months and 1 of these intends to live in the town permanently. As such the town grows, demand will see new land releases, houses will be built and existing properties will be renovated and expanded. This will see the town's rateable value increase and the Council receives additional rates without targeting a small group of residents to bridge a short-term income/expense gap. Anti-tourist sentiment already exists in Denmark, I have experienced it. This proposal will receive media attention and tourists will be put off by this and choose to holiday elsewhere.</p> <p>3. The basis of the proposal is highly questionable. The example of additional costs purportedly driven by tourists filling public bins lacks integrity. Surely this problem is a result of all the additional people in town including those tourists who are visiting friends and family and not being accommodated in approved tourist accommodation. In the most recent summer there were caravans and tents set up in gardens all over town as visitor numbers soared. We personally had visitors for all but 1 week of the school holidays in summer. So to point the blame at a relatively small group of tourists staying in registered accommodation is misleading and lacks transparency.</p> <p>4. Council's Budget. I am left with the impression that Management are looking for an easy solution and financial management is lazy and lacks creative thought. I offer this criticism as someone who worked as CFO in financial services for over 40 years. I know the difficulty in satisfying the needs of all stakeholders and competing priorities but I don't believe there is merit in the easy solution of simply increasing the revenue base by adding new taxes. It is a short-term gain that will deliver long-term pain that all residents will ultimately have to pay for.</p>
Submission 27	Name withheld pursuant to Policy – P100602	<p>RECEIVED 26/06/2021 PROPOSED RATES FOR 2021/2022 FINANCIAL YEAR</p> <p>I wish to write in with my support for the increase in rates for holiday home properties. As a resident of the Ocean Beach area, there are 6 x holiday homes within a 500-meter radius of my house. I would support the original 20% increase proposed. The increase proposed is minimal in comparison to the amount they can make on holiday short-stay rentals.</p>

Submission 28	Name withheld pursuant to Policy – P100602	<p>RECEIVED 28/06/2021 PROPOSED RATES FOR 2021/2022 FINANCIAL YEAR</p> <p>It is with dismay that I find after having discussions with Judy, and then again after her consulting with her colleagues that our proposed Rates are to be increased by 13%! We do our utmost here to reduce our waste in that we compost "anything from the earth back to the earth" to prevent overflowing rubbish bins. I don't believe our BnB guests have an impact on our neighbours, as we live above the Studio and only take two adults at a time.</p> <p>Our guests are guided too, and do use, many of our local businesses ie thus leaving money in our town.</p>
Submission 29	Name withheld pursuant to Policy – P100602	<p>RECEIVED 28/06/2021 PROPOSED RATES FOR 2021/2022 FINANCIAL YEAR</p> <p>Dear Councillors.</p> <p>There seems to be this misconception that short term accommodation owners are some how cashing in on the current rental market. This in fact is simply not true. We have had our home property managed by S.C.P, the D.V.C. and now Southern Coastal Escapes for the previous ten years and not once over that period have we ever made a profit or even broke even for that matter.</p> <p>The cost of running and maintaining a holiday home is substantial when you take in to account the additional costs (management, maintenance and upkeep, gardening/mowing, cleaning, linen etc.) on top of all all standard outgoing/costs Denmark residents incur. All of these additional costs (on top of the standard outgoing) of owning a holiday home are helping pay the wages of local residents and service providers/operators, creating employment within the community. In addition to the employment creation, it must be remember that Denmark is a tourist town and money spent by tourists trickles down through the community to benefit everybody.</p> <p>Everyone in the community benefits from tourism. Also, I see this excessive rate increase as a knee jerk reaction to Covid and the current StayCations - travel within Western Australia policy. Once the travel ban is lifted and international travel resumes, small country towns like Denmark will return to the (near) status quo of peak tourism Christmas to Easter and an extended low season season (Excluding Festival of Voice etc.) for the remainder of the year.</p> <p>Also I think the excessive rate increase is mathematically flawed if a 20% rate increase for approximately 120 properties will "cover the cost to the shire from visitors to those properties and help with the town's rental shortage". Approximately \$50k/pa is not going to provide housing, accommodation or any solution when the real issue is the shortage of housing and/or the shortage of rental accommodation. Affordable land and housing is not short term accommodation owners responsibility, but the responsibility of the state and local government down, and they must take a greater responsibility.</p>

Submission 30	Name withheld pursuant to Policy – P100602	<p>RECEIVED 29/06/2021 PROPOSED RATES FOR 2021/2022 FINANCIAL YEAR</p> <p>I first wish to declare my position as an owner of a property that will be directly and negatively impacted by the current proposal. I have two points that I wish to make: Firstly, Denmark and the wider area rely heavily on tourists and tourism. While other industries exist, the economic buoyancy of Denmark is tourist-driven. Any action, such as this proposal, has the potential to discourage tourism and reduce the total dollars brought in directly by the tourist. Many local jobs depend on tourism and local people will be negatively impacted if the accommodation supply is tightened. Secondly, the acting CEO's comment about the current system being unfair to the "current family next door" is facile in that the subject is far more complex. An easy point to illustrate the direction he wishes the debate to go. It could be argued that lower rates would encourage more accommodation, more tourists and better gross benefit for the community.</p> <p>The current proposal is simply trying to raise more revenue from a "soft touch" and doesn't reflect well on the Shire. Focussing on Denmark becoming "the town that people want to live in and visit" is far more important to the vibrancy and overall wealth of all of the Denmark community.</p>
Submission 31	Name withheld pursuant to Policy – P100602	<p>RECEIVED 03/07/2021 PROPOSED RATES FOR 2021/2022 FINANCIAL YEAR</p> <p>I agree with the differential rates proposal. Additional consideration needs to be given to recovering the costs associated with day trippers. Perhaps increased rates for town centre commercial property? Parking fees with residents exempt?</p>
Submission 32	Name withheld pursuant to Policy – P100602	<p>RECEIVED 06/07/2021 PROPOSED RATES FOR 2021/2022 FINANCIAL YEAR</p> <p>I have no issue with the changes to the rates, I just think there could be lost opportunities here. There are a lot of wealthy people in Denmark, and also many that are keen to see to key environmental and sustainability improvements, such as pest/weed management, provision of facilities to store/share things like water and electricity, better use of public land for arts/environment, regeneration etc. Can I suggest that rate payers have the option of opting into paying towards a levy that would be considered restricted funds to support projects of this nature. Thank you, I do appreciate the efforts of the council</p>

Submission 33	Name withheld pursuant to Policy – P100602	<p>RECEIVED 07/07/2021 PROPOSED RATES FOR 2021/2022 FINANCIAL YEAR</p> <p>I fully support the proposal for a higher rate for dwellings used for holiday rentals, currently up for public comment. The reason I support the proposal is because of the very high number of dwellings used for that purpose in the Shire. My thinking stems from an article published in the Australian Weekend Magazine newspaper in September 2019 (or thereabouts).</p> <p>The article was centered on Byron Bay NSW, where the journalist who wrote the item had recently relocated to. After a few months he wondered why the road at the front of his home had potholes that weren't being repaired. He decided to investigate and found the issue of too many visitors and too few residents left to fund critical infrastructure, which copped a hammering with higher than normal traffic flow and overuse, year round. In his investigations, he found a lot of other infrastructure items also suffered the same fate; public toilets, parks, pavements and so on.</p> <p>The upshot is that the town was a victim of its own success in that the amount of funds able to be raised from the small ratio of permanent residents compared to the extremely high number of visitors simply could not keep up with current, and growing, capital costs to keep the community owned facilities in good order. In trying to redress this inequity, the Byron Bay Council was considering, among other things, a bed tax, with the aim of trying to have property owners with holiday homes in the area, from which they often derive, a very handsome income/profit, be more accountable in terms of their social responsibility to helping to finance the infrastructure renewal and upkeep of existing facilities, which, in turn, provide the backdrop to the very reason they are able to derive the income through property rentals in the area.</p> <p>I read the article and reflected on our own situation in this Shire and can see spectres of the same issue, therefore I support the proposal to have a higher rateable value imposed on absentee landowners who openly let out short term holiday properties. Added to the above, in terms of the actual dollar amount that would apply to each individual property, mostly, it would not even add up to one night's rental income, but, collectively, it would make quite a difference financially to our shire's income base, which in term benefits all, both residents and visitors alike. Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this issue.</p>
Submission 34	Name withheld pursuant to Policy – P100602	<p>RECEIVED 09/07/2021 PROPOSED RATES FOR 2021/2022 FINANCIAL YEAR</p> <p>As a small business owner in the holiday home / tourism sector, I find your proposal to increase shire rates by 20% for registered holiday home owners quite a negative impact on both my business & livelihood within the Denmark Shire. Also those struggling to make ends meet with a 6% increase is also very unfair.</p> <p>I have the following points I would like to make:</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.

* 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.

* The advertised 20 % increase is actually a disincentive to register.

* If the number of Holiday Homes is an issue why are the Shire still accepting & approving Development Applications?

* 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?

* 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. David King 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.

* 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.

* Ceinwen Gearon 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.

* It was indicated by one of the Councillors – Jan Lewis - 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 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 style="text-align: right;">Comment Approval ✕</p> <hr/> <p>Consultation: Have Your Say - Shire of Denmark Rating System Review</p> <p>Post Title: Simpler and Fairer Changes Merits Support</p> <p>Post Comments: 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