

AGENDA ITEM 9.12 (A) ATTACHMENT

**SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS REGARDING AVERAGED AREA RATE PROPOSAL**

**MARCH 2014**

<b>Total number of notices regarding proposal sent to residential ratepayers</b>	<b>3139</b>
<b>Total number of submissions received</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>Total number of submissions against proposal</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Total number of submissions supporting the proposal</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Total number of submissions providing no comment of support or otherwise (in the nature of an information request)</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Percentage of submissions received to notices sent</b>	<b>1.18%</b>

**Source of localities for submissions against proposal**

George Town	7
Hillwood	5
Low Head	6
Pipers River	4
Mt Direction	2
Lulworth	3
Weymouth	2
<b><u>Total</u></b>	<b><u>29</u></b>

**Source of localities for submissions for the proposal**

George Town	3
Pipers Brook	1
<b><u>Total</u></b>	<b><u>4</u></b>

# SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS REGARDING AVERAGED AREA RATE PROPOSAL

MARCH 2014

Name	Locality	Stance on proposal	Reasons for stance	Other Comments
P McClure	George Town	Against	Would prefer to pay rates based on Capital Value as calculated rather than AAR.	
P Cameron	Pipers Brook	For	Not given	
R Nicholls	Hillwood	Against	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Properties with lower values subsidising the higher value ones.</li> <li>- Links higher value properties with more occupants and greater use of services.</li> <li>- Likened to a poll tax.</li> </ul>	Suggests amendment to proposal to allow for different AARs for different ranges of capital values within each locality.
R Nicholls on behalf of Hillwood Area Resident & Ratepayers' Association	Hillwood			Request for information session at Hillwood prior to the due date for submissions
G Collier	Low Head	Against	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Would prefer to pay rates based on Capital Value as calculated rather than AAR.</li> <li>- Critical of Council services in area</li> <li>- Properties with lower values subsidising the higher value ones.</li> </ul>	
S Lloyd	George Town	Against	Prefers AAR as per 2013-14	
G Guinane	Weymouth			Information request
M & C Jex	Hillwood	Against	Prefers AAR as per 2013-14	
J Holland	Low Head	Against	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ratepayers not previously on AAR may suffer significant increase</li> <li>- Rates should apply upon the property value</li> <li>- Particularly unfair on pensioners and retirees</li> </ul>	
A & J Reid	Low Head	Against	- Properties with lower values	

# SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS REGARDING AVERAGED AREA RATE PROPOSAL

MARCH 2014

Name	Locality	Stance on proposal	Reasons for stance	Other Comments
			subsidising the higher value ones. - Disadvantages those less able to afford the rates.	
M McCulloch	Pipers River	Against	- Large increase from previous year - Affordability issue for pensioners - Council services in area not the same as George Town but rate similar	
D Visser	Hillwood			Information request
A Kaushal	Low Head	Against	- Previously in Village Planning Zone so increase significant. - That area of Low Head does not receive the same services as other parts of Low Head	
B McKinless	Hillwood	Against	- Properties with lower values subsidising the higher value ones. - Larger blocks require greater service from Council - Majority of rate payers disadvantaged - Many land owners have purchased their property with the understanding that rates were calculated according to value - No need to change rating by planning scheme	
R & V Hogarth	George Town	For	Not given	
S & D Schroeter	Hillwood	Against	- Would prefer to pay rates based on Capital Value as calculated rather than AAR.	

# SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS REGARDING AVERAGED AREA RATE PROPOSAL

MARCH 2014

Name	Locality	Stance on proposal	Reasons for stance	Other Comments
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Critical of Council services in area</li> <li>- Properties with lower values subsidising the higher value ones.</li> <li>- Property values are a good indication of people's ability to pay</li> </ul>	
C Spears	Pipers River	Against	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Large increase from previous year</li> <li>- Critical of Council services in area</li> <li>- Affordability issue for pensioners</li> </ul>	
J Baker	Mount Direction	Against	Unfairly disadvantages the most vulnerable in our community	
Members of Baker/Burns household	Mount Direction	Against	Families already in financial distress will not cope.	
L Payne	Lulworth	Against	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Majority of Lulworth homes are not the owners' permanent residences; unfair to rate these "weekenders" the same as those who live there permanently in higher value homes.</li> </ul>	
W & M Nicholas	George Town	For	Not given	
K Pike	George Town	Against	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Many people in the area bought cheaper houses so that they can afford to pay the rates</li> <li>- Immediate implementation doesn't give enough time to adjust</li> </ul>	Proposes delaying implementation until 2016-17 to allow residents to financially prepare
J & T Smyth	Weymouth	Against	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Shack owners have made long term commitment</li> </ul>	

# SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS REGARDING AVERAGED AREA RATE PROPOSAL

MARCH 2014

Name	Locality	Stance on proposal	Reasons for stance	Other Comments
			to the region and do not deserve to be pushed out of the region with higher rates. - AAR on multiple tenures unfair - Services in area are limited - Shacks (holiday homes) are subsidising mansions (permanent residents)	
E Stewart on behalf of Old Launceston Seaport Pty Ltd	George Town			Queried 'residential' status of an individual property
G Archer	George Town	Against	- Local Government Act intends for rates to be paid according to property values - Capacity to pay can be measured by property values - Properties with lower values subsidising the higher value ones.	
L Trevithick	Pipers River	Against	- Properties with lower values subsidising the higher value ones - Services in area nowhere near equivalent to George Town - Wealthy boutique wineries may end up paying same rates as bush blocks - Fairness is paying for what you have, not what others have	
L A Trevithick	Pipers River	Against	- Properties with lower values subsidising the higher value ones	

# SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS REGARDING AVERAGED AREA RATE PROPOSAL

MARCH 2014

Name	Locality	Stance on proposal	Reasons for stance	Other Comments
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Services in area nowhere near equivalent to George Town</li> <li>- Wealthy boutique wineries may end up paying same rates as bush blocks</li> </ul>	
B Cameron	Lulworth	Against	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Poorer socio-economic class subsidising the well off.</li> <li>- Capacity to pay can be measured by property value</li> <li>- People most disadvantaged least likely to suitably voice their objections</li> </ul>	
W Quon	Weymouth	Against	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Larger properties consume larger services</li> <li>- Properties with lower values subsidising the higher value ones</li> <li>- Retirees that have opted to downsize properties to cut costs get no rate relief</li> </ul>	Based on the same logic put forward by the Council for the AAR, an average Council employee salary remuneration proposal would be in order.
G Dineen	Low Head	Against	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Would prefer to pay rates based on Capital Value as calculated rather than AAR.</li> <li>- Reduction in rates for higher valued properties</li> </ul>	Suggests putting a "reasonable percentage" cap on the level of disadvantage to an individual property
L Archer	George Town	Against	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Properties with lower values subsidising the higher value ones</li> <li>- More residences disadvantaged by proposal than advantaged</li> <li>- Local Government Act states that rates are a tax and</li> </ul>	

# SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS REGARDING AVERAGED AREA RATE PROPOSAL

MARCH 2014

Name	Locality	Stance on proposal	Reasons for stance	Other Comments
			not a fee for service. Also states that capacity to pay can be gauged by property values	
J Osborne	Hillwood	Against	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Properties with lower values subsidising the higher value ones</li> <li>- Bigger families make larger demands on community facilities</li> </ul>	Suggests a two tiered system to alleviate disadvantage at lower end of property value scale.
D Robinson	George Town	Against	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Would prefer to pay rates based on Capital Value as calculated rather than AAR.</li> <li>- Objects to rate increases on basis of a decline in George Town's economy</li> </ul>	
S Robinson	George Town	Against	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Would prefer to pay rates based on Capital Value as calculated rather than AAR.</li> <li>- Objects to rate increases on basis of a decline in George Town's economy</li> </ul>	
A & K Henderson	George Town	For	All property owners have an equal entitlement to Council services so they should be charged the same.	
J Vincent	Low Head	Against	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Discriminates against older, lower value properties and the long standing residents (often pensioners) who tend to reside in them</li> <li>- Would prefer to pay rates based on Capital Value as</li> </ul>	

# SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS REGARDING AVERAGED AREA RATE PROPOSAL

MARCH 2014

<b>Name</b>	<b>Locality</b>	<b>Stance on proposal</b>	<b>Reasons for stance</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
			calculated rather than AAR.	
R & G Donohue	Lulworth	Against	- Lack of services in Lulworth area	Suggests less frequent garbage collection in seaside areas to cut costs