

No.	Responses regarding Differential Rates	Officer Comment
1	<p>This change in rates was not applied last year due to Covid. I cannot see how someone the lives next to a park,has footpaths outside their house, has scheme water, gas etc etc etc can pay less rates than our property. We live on a one lane road, have a water tank, no gas supply. It's a joke and money making scheme for the shire. Of course my property value is more simply due to land size nothing to do with the public amenities I am forking out for.</p>	Noted.
2	No do not agree with changes	Noted.
3	<p>You can put my rates up just means I will be calling on shire to cut my verges and clean all the drains outside of my property which means I will call in middle of night in winter when drains block up with leaves . This is just a money crab by the shire there is nothing fair about your rates you DONT PROVIDE THE SERVICE</p>	Noted.
4	No	Noted.
5	<p>We are currently rated UV I believe meaning our rates will increase by over \$200. SJ shire provide as with a rubbish service that we pay extra for, that is the extent of service. No footpath minimal lighting, no parks, no verge or drain maintenance, no scheme water (not that I want it), no gas line only bottles, so please tell me what we are paying for. Yes the size of our block is larger but the shire does nothing to maintain it either, just have us do fire breaks(this I don't mind) but are quick to fine property owners if something is amiss and expect us to clear trees that are on their side but overhang our fences.</p>	Noted.
6	I think the shire needs to do more in serpentine before asking for more money in rates. All the money goes to byford.	Noted.
7	I think it's a waste of time these people with different rates hardly get any services.	Noted.
8	I'm just don't understand how you can apply GRV to vacant residential land that has no rental value - you can't rent out a vacant residential site for any purpose.	Noted.
9	<p>Living in Oakford we do not receive many services from the rates we pay. We do not have footpaths, curbing, street lighting, or a local park. The bridal trail that backs onto our property is overgrown and never maintained. The local roads in the area are horrendous with potholes. We have to maintain firebreaks as per shire guidelines, which people living residential do not have to do. We also have a biodiversity fee that is not applied to residential properties. Both of these are added costs for us.</p>	Noted.
10	Suits me fine. Paying less for a tiny residential property sounds logical compared to those on many acres	Noted.
11	No	Noted.
12	Everyone should be brought up to the level that is fair and reasonable. Hitting rate payers in estates that pay huge amounts for small blocks compared to those on rural blocks paying half than I do? No fluffing way!!!	Noted.
13	<p>As an owner occupier on rural property I can not understand why we are being asked to fork out an extra \$290+ dollars, We already contribute a higher rate than most, I personally make no money off my property and feel it is unfair that we are being asked to pay even more while others have their rates reduced. We are no more of a draw on the shires facilities than anyone else. In the statement it mentions the shire is looking for a fair and equitable way to raise the needed funds, I suggest a smaller rate rise for everyone evenly would be fair not slug those who choose a quieter life outside of a suburban setting.</p>	Noted.
14	Understand this , we do not want anymore rate rises , you need to learn to budget with what you already receive	Noted.

No.	Responses regarding Differential Rates	Officer Comment
15	<p>Please note that when changing the rates, you need to take into account that we do not have street lighting, paths, closed drains, schools, shops, decent roads etc (I could go on).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If I want to go walking, I have to get in my car & drive into a suburban area as it is too unsafe to walk on our rural roads. 2. It cost us more for upkeep of vehicle as our roads are so bad (tyres, wheel alignment etc) 3. We have open drains on the side of the road which the shire does no maintenance on. In 20 years of living here, I have seen thee shire come out to dig out the drains & that is all they contribute to the upkeep. 4. No street lights which means not as much security as in suburbia where you can see a vehicle stopped on the road which would be a deterrent to criminals. Also dangerous if you have a breakdown & have to get out of your car. <p>I realise that we can get in the car & go to Byford to use rec ctr, shops etc but the people living there have the advantage over us as they can safely walk on footpaths under lighting (meaning the can exercise after dark & we can't). It is just as easy to go to Armadale to shop & they also have a wider range of shops & facilities.</p> <p>Therefore we should be having a reduced rates system for rural residents to allow for these shortcomings.</p>	Noted.
16	<p>Hope council actually considers all submissions and not just put these surveys out as a duty!</p>	Noted.
17	<p>It has been reiterated that the strategy is to provide "an equitable distribution of the rates burden" across residents - I believe for this to be implemented, then "an equitable distribution of infrastructure and services" must also apply.</p> <p>Planning and development approval is the Shire's (of Serpentine-Jarrahdale) responsibility and at its' discretion. As a consequence, this impacts availability of services and infrastructure for many rural properties that will receive an increase under the proposal. For context, our property is affected by this as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Scheme water not available, therefore cost of water tank installation, maintenance, water purchase when required, as well as maintaining emergency services requirements; - 3-phase power not available - we've had to sign a waiver for our solar power installation that Western power is unable to accept the majority of power returned to the grid; - Main sewerage not available, cost of ATU system installation and maintenance; - NBN not available and no cable internet available - we only have access to fixed wireless internet which is extremely poor. - Crime rates in neighbouring suburbs means constant increases to all insurances (perhaps placement of police stations needs to reconsidered). <p>In addition, rural land owners are already have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Emergency services levy and maintenance requirements - Machine ownership or hire, firebreak and fuel reduction maintenance; - Biosecurity pest rates. <p>I would add that the Shire's maintenance services in our area is almost non-existent, and rural landholders will make efforts to maintain shared areas for safety and aesthetics.</p> <p>Roads are neglected, street lighting is rare (which rural landholders want) which means less power consumption compared to the suburbs.</p> <p>The line of thought that rates reflect the ability of land owners to pay is simply unfounded and illogical. Rural landowners are aware of the cost (financial, time and physical) that it takes to own and maintain property, but to suggest the value of the property is a direct indicator of the ability to pay more is frankly ridiculous.</p> <p>To reiterate, I'm aware of the shire's responsibilities (e.g. scheme water attracts water rates from Water Corp), but planning and approving rural properties without infrastructure falls on the shire. Rural land owners are aware of the limitations I've mentioned and only have an issue with them we are told that paying higher rates makes it "fair".</p> <p>I hope these points are taken into consideration seriously and not dismissed.</p>	Noted.
18	<p>Rates need to be reflective of the services provided by the shire, including whole of shire, region/area and services provided to the individual property. Property value should be a secondary consideration.</p>	Noted.
19	<p>Byford rates are out of this world.</p> <p>We have to pay for our bins to be emptied no one else's areas do that. We don't get verge side pick up and the roads are terrible. Not clean and weeds everywhere what are we paying for absolute rubbish. No good parks for kids to pay around.</p>	Noted.
20	<p>Looks good to me as we must support all those rate payers paying the updated rates by having all those on out dated rates being updated.</p>	Noted.

No.	Responses regarding Differential Rates	Officer Comment
21	<p>Now that Jarrahdale has had the "Rural" zoning removed by Perth Transit Authority and the Shire did nothing to support its residents, I expect that we will meet the new zoning for our rates and see a significant reduction.</p> <p>The amount of money claimed by the shire for a distinct lack of and diminishing level of support is extortionate in proportion. If you want residents in Jarrahdale to pay a significant amount more than other areas of the shire then you should be providing a much better service, NOT reducing them.</p>	Noted.
22	<p>I don't believe it is fair to raise the rates of properties over 4000sqm or rural properties until we get the same facilities as residential. We don't have sewerage. We have septic tanks we have to maintain ourselves. We also don't have street lights. The bridal paths are a mess and the areas around them even the equestrian areas are a mess. Nothing gets cleaned up. Tree branches and over grown brush in many places. Until our area is maintained the same as a residential area I don't believe it is fair to charge rural households more than residential</p>	Noted.
23	<p>Take into account that I don't have a gas line my verge has never been maintained in the 3 years I have lived at this address there is no foot path on my street never seen the street sweeper in 3 years I don't have scheme water I pay for filling of water tank the only thing this council has done in 3 years is empty my bins will refuse to pay more in rate fees for something other areas in sj council ie byford that has all of the above at a less amount</p>	Noted.
24	<p>i dont feel we should be rated GRV, we dont have scheme water, deep sewage, gas, footpaths, parks or adequate street lighting, one light at the end of our road and thats it. I think the new rating of rural residential maybe more appropriate.</p>	Noted.
25	<p>We object to the proposed increase of around \$297 on our rural property this is based on the below The proposed \$297 increase is around 16.5% above last years min rate where the current CPI is less than 2% Your terminology of fair for residential is unjust as Rural properties do not have adequate street lighting, we have sub standard roads, no sealed footpath and general amenities as residential receive (no hard/green waste now) For us to accept this increase we shall request the below items fixed up in this calendar rate period 21-22 our surrounding roads (Country/Kargotich/Rowley) fixed up more street lighting (especially CNRs of Rowley, Kargotich and Rowley) Maintain stormwater drains and council trees every 2 years not 5 Reinstate Green and Hard Waste collections</p>	Noted.
26	<p>As you can see I live in the town of Serpentine, not the suburb! We have no drainage no footpaths, no street lighting no drainage one lane roads. We also don't have shopping precincts no take aways nothing. Seems only shire money is spent on the horse area and the serpentine oval? Actually I'm not in town but on a bigger block. Asked for better footpath in said area and were told costs too much. Verges are a disgrace. Maybe you could get fire brigade to do verges. Been told by shire we can't do it. Also told by shire can't touch trees, well get out and get trees off power lines and our properties. Your trees get them off our properties! Same with fire breaks remove your over hang so can have legal firebreaks. I'm not paying tree loppers. Public toilet wouldn't let my dog in. Stop sub divisions in this area if you're not going to use our rates to actually give this town anything. Why are we paying more? And actually getting nothing.</p>	Noted.
27	<p>Equitable - Fair and impartial. I do not consider it fair and impartial that my rates are increased based on the size of my property. What is not fair people who may pay less have nice streets, footpaths, lighting, running water, sewerage systems, cycle ways, parks and the list goes on, not like the area i live in. I sent the shire an email 9 months ago (twice) asking for some slight improvement to a common track at the back of my property, when it is heavily saturated (rain) the track is under water and becomes a safety concern...i have had no response. Why do we even pay rates? Oh we get our bins emptied once a week. I think people who are provided more services (residential luxuries) should have their rates increased, not the other way round. Lets see what happens.</p>	Noted.
28	Fair	Noted.
29	<p>I have been sent a letter regarding my property 2 Woolga Rd The letter provides the differential rates for different categories However further down the second page it gives me a dollar value for my rates but my category is GRV IMPROVED which is NOT listed on the table above I believe this is an error and needs correcting as I am unable to know what I am being charged (rate in dollar</p>	Noted for response

No.	Responses regarding Differential Rates	Officer Comment
30	<p>There should be no rate increase at all. I believe rates should be applied to residents based on the services the council actually provides to the resident. As I have to provide my own sewerage system along with its associated running and maintenance costs, the cost of collecting and disposing of rain water as well as a fire break around my property. The only thing the council provides is a rubbish collection service of which I had to pay for the bins myself. There is no reticulated natural gas system, I have to have bottled gas along with its increased costs. There is no cleaning out of the culverts on council land which are overgrown with weeds and sediment causing excess water to pool, this in turn creates flooding of the roads and an influx of mosquitoes and midges. There is poor street lighting and drainage, I understand that was built by the land developer, however the council approved this when the developer applied for building approval. We don't even get tip passes or verge collections so again I have to pay to take any larger rubbish items away. I am happy to pay for the services that the council provides, but from what I see, it isn't much. The developer put in the roads, power etc. The council will receive the rates from residents for the next 20 years without doing anything for it.</p>	Noted.
31	As per previous correspondence, would like to advise that our 2 properties (A399510 & A399511) are used for Primary Production.	Noted for response
32	This is a joke every year shame on you SJ shire	Noted.
33	<p>Based on 2020-2021 Rates of \$1383 the increased Rates for 2021-2022 at \$1750 is not in line with the letter received stating a 5% increase. The increase of \$367 equates to 26% increase. A 5% increase would be \$69 and an acceptable increase to us. As pensioners the proposed increase is unfair, unreasonable and unacceptable. Totally unjustifiable.</p> <p>Looking at the Stats: 8,236 properties will receive a reduction in Rates. 1,148 properties will have no change. the remaining 3,011 equivalent to 25% will have an increase and going by our proposed Rate it will be far greater than 5%. Eg. if all rate increases are 26% the net income on \$367 equals \$1,105,037. if 8,236 have a reduction of \$100 = 823,600. To me this looks like the Increased Rates are paying for the Decreased Rates, just so the SJ Shire receives the same income.</p> <p>This is totally unfair. if the Shire have been charging the 8,236 properties too much then that is their mistake and they need to cut costs in other areas. Maybe need to do some better budgeting and reduces Staff and Staff perks. Just a suggestion as this is very Frustrating for us. In order to find \$367 We have to Budget better and cut back on.... I don't know what as we live very simply already. The savings that we have is exactly that, our savings that we have worked hard to get and should not be used for the Shires benefit.</p> <p>The other issue that I ask about is where does the SJ Shire income from the Rates and the Increased Rates go to. When handing out the increased Rates why don't you give a description of exactly what the increases will be spent on in the area of each property. eg. Serpentine will be getting a new Fire Station in 2022, or Serpentine will be a new Public Amenities Building on the Clem Kentish Oval in 2022 something like that.</p> <p>Instead due to Public Outcry, we are led to believe that Byford will get all the money spent on them and their town. Much of what Byford receives is not always beneficial to those that live further out.</p> <p>So far we have not seen any of this as Fair or Equitable.</p> <p>However, we moved to Serpentine for a different life style and are happy to go without a lot of the rat race in Byford and bigger towns. But we also believe we are entitled to our life style at a cheaper Rate because the Shire doesn't provide a lot of services or put a lot of money or effort into the Serpentine area. We understand this, it is a small country town. But don't make us pay for what the people in Byford want or what the Shire wants to put into that area. If Byford wants everything within arms reach then they need to facilitate it. Not the rest of the Shire.</p> <p>The definition of Equitable is 'Something that is FAIR TO ALL PARTIES'. Our Rate Rise is not Fair.</p>	Noted.
34	I believe the Shire should be look at making the rating system more equitable by providing services based on the rates paid. Over and over again the Shire is given the response that rural landholders are not feeling like they are getting value for money. They are seeing ridiculous spending such as the library move and increased money spent in areas of high population while trying to communicate to all landholders that rural lots aren't paying their "due". Rural landholders do not feel supported by the Shire and yet will see their rates go up under the guise of "fairness".	Noted.
35	There has not been enough information sent too us about the change from special rural too UV - Rural residential, I have lived here for 26 years have horses, Will this still be allowed, why are we getting rate increase when the GRV residential are having a decrease, we don't have any amenities, so I don't understand, no water, sidewalks, sewage, busses, bridal paths, inadequate drainage and the list goes on, a letter explaining reasons.	Noted.

No.	Responses regarding Differential Rates	Officer Comment
36	<p>I am not opposed to a differential rating system as long as it is based on services and amenities provided in the local area ie footpaths, parks, maintenance etc.</p> <p>Currently Serpentine receives very little support from the Shire, footpaths leading into town are a pot holed, weed infested mess. Unsafe, and are the only pedestrian access to town for the retirement village The town sign has been missing for 2 years. The declared weeds growing on Shire land bounding the pot holed footpath is a disgrace.</p> <p>The library is being moved even further from the southern areas of the Shire, making it harder to access.</p> <p>The hard and green waste pick up has been cancelled, so we have a further reduction in services (not everyone has a trailer, or even a tow bar so they can borrow a trailer and attend the transfer station)</p> <p>If anything the outer areas of the Shire should have rate reductions as we have very few amenities, and no services outside of oval mowing. Most Shire attention and expenditure is around Byford</p>	Noted.
37	I am not happy about this, it seems that the shire is not looking after it ratepayers.	Noted
38	Nothing but a money grab	Noted
39	<p>You are being ridiculous we have no scheme water or any other services. No Street Lights. We have to look after the verges, have fire breaks and keep the paddock grasses short. We live next to the railway line and have to slash that reserve myself. You give us nothing back for the money we already pay you. You take services away eg; roadside pickups verge mowing and spraying and give nothing back expecting the owner to do it all. Stop the Take Take Take and give something back . Bloody Hell</p>	Noted.
40	<p>It's totally unfair to people living on Nicholson rd who get no services of scheme water and deep sewage and built in infrastructures like library, shops and bus stops etc. on the door steps of their estate.</p> <p>We still have to pay for quarterly sewage service and pay for the water truck to cart water in often which are even more expensive than having schem water and deep sewage which are not available to us.</p> <p>You may say some living in acerage are paying higher than us, but lot of those are not required to do qualterly sewage service and do not live on busy road who can enjoy the infrastructure and services in close proxomity to those estates sorrunding them.</p> <p>It's even worse when we currently are in a pandemic where lots of businesses are struggling and people are struggle to put food on the table and you start this crap again!</p> <p>The concept of being fair and equitable is context dependable, so for us who do not get those services others are enjoying of is totally unfair. By comparing apple with pear, the context itself is flawed and already demonstrating lack of fairness and revealing the true intention of revenue raising for the shire by getting people against each other!</p>	Noted.
41	<p>The letter written to explain the rates changes was not very clear, I needed to call and clarify with the SJ reception staff. My rates will go down approx \$15.00. Which while nice I feel should be more. I pay a huge amount in rates every year, over 2K for a block that is less than 500sq metres, and it goes up about \$100 every year. I feel this is grossly inflated, for the services provided. Considering that a block in kelmscott 750sq metres pays around \$1,200 a year with better services and a big shopping centre in Armadale and serveral smaller shopping centres around the area also. Most people who live in Byford are young families, the constant price rises are not sustainable.</p>	Noted.
42	I would like to see it lower but that's not going to happen, uv General if that's the lowest amount, no improvements done here been here 28 years and the rates just keep climbing	Noted
43	<p>I understand what the Shire is wanting to achieve but I DO NOT agree with the manner in which the attempt was made last year, nor the amount of increase that was proposed. In my case, I live on a property that requires more maintenance than properties in the residential estates do, due to its age, and the fact that I house and train horses from there causes higher than normal maintenance requirements and because I am not earning an income from the horses, do not have any additional funds to cover any high increases in rates.</p>	Noted

No.	Responses regarding Differential Rates	Officer Comment
44	<p>The proposed rates update does not sufficiently address the inequity in the rates. A reduction of \$18 is disappointing for our residential property, and takes the amount to just below the minimum for the UV properties and rates for intensive farmland and commercial/industrial. Our property is only just over 600m².</p> <p>If the proposal is to bring us in line with Armadale, our rates are still too high. For example, The City of Armadale's minimum for GRV residential improved is \$1179, \$100 less than our minimum.</p> <p>The GRV for Byford properties is less than an area such as the Cockburn Shire for similar properties; their average rates for 2021-22 is \$1596, cheaper than ours, and they also have a weekly recycling collection and a separate green waste collection fortnightly. Additionally, Cockburn residents still have a verge collection for hard waste as well as tip access.</p> <p>I do not understand why we are paying so much for so few services. We believe that there still needs to be a lot done to make the rates equitable.</p>	Noted
45	<p>Don't understand why our rates are listed as GRV Improved. Also the letter shows a table for rates for everything but the GVR Improved rates. Our home was built in 2014. Nothing of note with regard to the property has been improved on since the build. I would say a GVR Residential rating should be applied to our property. The block sizes in The Glades are so small even the "larger" lots don't leave much room for improvement upon the land.</p>	Noted
46	<p>EVERY YEAR OUR RATES GO UP WITH NO CONSIDERATION TO PEOPLES WAGES AND SITUATIONS. SERPENTINE PRICES ARE NOT AS HIGH AS BYFORD AND WE MOVED HERE 20 YEARS AGO BECAUSE AS IT WAS CHEAPER THAN BYFORD. ALSO AN 8% LATE FEE IS VERY HIGH. PEOPLES LIVES CHANGE AND ARE UNABLE TO KEEP TAKING THE INCREASES EVERY YEAR. LAST YEAR THE MINIMUM RATE WAS \$1276.00 BUT WAS CHARGED \$1818.58. SO IF YOU CHANGE IT TO \$1799.85 YOU WOULD SAVE \$18.73 WOW !</p>	Noted
47	<p>WE HAVE NOT RECEIVED 21 DAYS NOTICE FOR SUBMISSIONS AS PER THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT!!</p> <p>I do not believe this new rating figure is fair. The Shire are trying to charge general land owners who do not make a living from their properties, the same amount of rates as commercial businesses. Being charged a minimum fee of \$1750.00 would equate to 27% increase on my property. We receive no services from the Shire for this rate charge. The only service we receive is our rubbish collection which the Shire charge an extra fee for this service. We have open drains that are not maintained by the shire. Our roads are not kept in a safe condition. Street lighting is very poor at best. The Shire's growth has been over 10% for the year, yet the Shire wishes to over charge residents in the rural community, with the least amount of amenities supplied by the Shire including safe roads.</p>	Appropriate notice provisions under the act was provided
48	<p>Firstly I think the residents of Byford are getting ripped off in their rates, but of course you promote the hatred between the 2 areas based on Rating Equity. Secondly in Oakford we don't get the facilities that Byford do, so it's no wonder the people are up in arms. We have a one sided road drain, when that fills up guess where it runs into, yep our property. And those roadside drains have only been maintained (been here 13 years and you've only maintained them once - which took about 2 years of complaining to do). Then the new rating scheme, so you are putting someone that's on 4,500 sqm block in the same category as a commercial property & intensive farmland. How is that equitable? We move out here for a lifestyle (which in the pandemic was great as we could walk around our own property and get exercise). And then you "quote" about the GRV Residential rate to be reduced to less than City of Armadale - you do realize that they haven't raised their rates for the 2021/22 Financial Year.</p>	Noted.

No.	Responses regarding Differential Rates	Officer Comment
49	<p>In relation to your review of the valuation method for the rates, can you please advise how you ever expect there to be any equitably within this shire? This is like comparing apples with oranges, they are two totally different fruits, just as you have a diverse spreads of landholders within the shire of suburban and special rural and rural properties, which should be rated accordingly. When the suburban properties were built/purchased, they would have been on the understanding that their rates would be based on GRV (Gross Rental Value) as all suburban properties within Western Australia are based on this rating method as there are more amenities to warrant this rating system, which includes and is not limited to: Scheme Water, Sewerage, Pipe Gas, NBN Internet and Amenities such as Parks, Footpaths, Skate Parks, Street Lights, Shops etc.</p> <p>Just as when the rural property owners built or purchase their property's they were purchased on the understanding that the rates would be based on UV (Unimproved Value) as we have to pay for all of our own amenities which include and is not limited to: Water Storage Tank/s \$10 - \$15,000, Sewerage System with annual maintenance \$12 - \$20,000, Gas lines into the home to accommodate bottled gas \$8 - \$18,000 and there are no other facilities or amenities – most streets don't even have a streetlight or closed drains, which is what is expected by the rural living property owners and the rates are in accordance to this system.</p> <p>If you are wanting to change the rating estimate to have it based on GRV, maybe the shire should then consider reimbursing all of the rural property owners for the costs as outlined above for the amenities that were purchased by the landholders to be able to reside on their rural properties, as the shire does not provide any of these amenities!</p> <p>I am also a bit perplexed as to how a hobby farm isn't considered rural or for rural purposes as outlined in the submission form sent out on 14/9/20! You can't keep a horse along with a couple of sheep, a cow and a couple of alpaca's in a suburban 400-500m2 back yard in Byford central, but you are stating in this letter that the acreage properties can't be classified for rural purposes if this is the only livestock and animals on the property and aren't primary producers, so can't be rated with a UV rating! We use our land to have small hobby farms with our small herds of animals which are not income earning, but are not permitted to be kept on a suburban lot. I had always thought this shires main objectives and goals were to make this an equine based community, why would you want to push out the people who predominantly help these goals be achievable by the shire? I wouldn't be surprised is the shire receives funding and grants from federal or state government to assist with the equine strategy planning within the shire! Most horse owners will not be able to afford this increase, myself included and generally people can't afford this rate rise, because of the current economic climate, so ultimately you are going to push people off their properties who have probably resided in this shire for many year and most of the larger landholders are in the older and possibly pension age bracket who probably live from week to week. This is a very callous move by this governing body, who, I thought were doing their utmost to ensure in the current climate, that people weren't financially encumbered, by another unnecessary 'money grab'</p> <p>It saddens me deeply to think that if this rate rise happens, I may not be able to continue to live in the home that my deceased husband and I built due to the impact of the additional financial burden – I am a widower of almost 5 years with multiple sclerosis and I take great pride in my property and have done my utmost to ensure that my personal piece of paradise is maintained to a level higher than most properties, with every spare dollar I have being thrown into the property to ensure that this level and standards are upheld! This additional rate rise, would mean that I will either need to sell my property or not maintain it to its current standard, which to me would be absolutely devastating and heartbreaking.</p> <p>Another point is I don't understand why those of us that are being changed to rural residential have to pay as much as commercial and intensive farming, don't these 2 make an income from their land? I just own a small piece of land to be able to have my horses!</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to read my submission and I hope when everyone votes, that there is some empathy and compassion and you all vote against the rise for the little people who just want to be able remain on their piece of paradise with their little hobby farm and animals within the shire J</p>	Noted.

No.	Responses regarding Differential Rates	Officer Comment
50	<p>I strongly oppose the change in your proposed Rate Strategy.</p> <p>Due to the value of my property has substantially decreased over the years, (noted on your rate notice) Has changed from RURAL to UV GENERAL and now to the proposed UV RESIDENTIAL with a increase in rates in the dollar every time along with the yearly increase in the rates.</p> <p>Last year we had to pay \$3663.67 this is a huge amount, and this next year according to your correspondence with the new changes to rate category changes will again increase even more. With no benefit to me at all.</p> <p>Living in the outskirts of SJ close to Casuarina with no infrastructure ie foot paths, conveniences and extremely minimal up keep of the surrounding roads I do not personally benefit from the huge amount paid in rates. Absolutely no public transport to aid movement or cutting any vehicle costs.</p> <p>The verge side collection has now ceased, hence a service we are no longer receiving, less for services for our dollar.</p> <p>Please explain why my property has to change from UV GENERAL to UV RESIDENTIAL is this to extort more money from us? Because I can't see how this is equitable.</p> <p>My husband and self are getting close to retirement age and no longer can work full time, we will struggle to continue to pay unfair increasing rate charges, especially without any reasonable explanation. This has been my home for nearly 30 yrs now.</p> <p>We run a few sheep, to maintain the pasture, 1 horse (non 20yrs old) for pleasure and chickens for the scraps and eggs for our use. Hence we do not make any profit from the land to add to our income.</p> <p>Also, Every year I have to pay \$55 for the inspection of my swimming pool, but has never ever been inspected every year, please can you clarify why this is.</p>	Noted for response
51	<p>I strongly object to the re-introduction of the UV-Rural Residential rating category. I also feel that the increased rating being targeted at 1/3 of all properties in the Shire is grossly unfair when the Shire moves to address its funding in an - "equitable way"!!!!, while more than half have reduced rates and the remaining no change. My property is on the very western boundary of the North West Ward. It is a roughly 4.5 acre property with a very small 1 bedroom, 1 bathroom dwelling with a separate garage/shed. There are limited services provided to me, and many small acreages, except rubbish collection, recycling, and road management, that I am aware of. This new UV-Rural Residential rating system is unfair and very excessive for 1/3 of properties in the Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale.</p>	Noted.
52	<p>My GRV Rates hopefully will not be affected after the \$200 plus rise that we experienced last year despite our Gross Rental Value Decreasing and there supposedly being a rates freeze due to COVID.</p>	Noted.
53	<p>You are targeting people who you assume have more funds because they own land. You don't consider that they may have bought years ago when no one wanted to live here. You are not take kindly f I to account what they receive in return for their rates</p>	Noted.
54	<p>I am concerned by the Shire making there own adjustments to the State Government rates process. Whilst this change results in minimal increase to my rates for 2021/22, given the Shires history I do not trust that this is not the start of a process to allow for significant increases to rates for rural landholders in future years.</p>	Noted
55	<p>As long as it's cheaper than previous years and not more expensive...we down for it!</p>	Noted.
56	<p>While I support any change in the rating process for 2021/22 to ensure that groups of rate payers are not subsidising others (I have been advised that my rates will be lower) the issue I have is with the budget increases we see each year. Where is any evidence that the Shire is delivering any productivity improvements within it's FTE numbers and costs? No other responsible business simplify works out the \$'s it wants to spend and then divides the costs over its customers - the rate payers of SJ Shire. What independent review of how efficient the shires operations and structures has been undertaken to ensure it is delivering value for money? This is especially important as we deal with the COVID pandemic.</p>	Noted.

No.	Responses regarding Differential Rates	Officer Comment
57	<p>1/ Sub-division done in Mardella 10acre property originally had 20% to be revegetated all parties agreed, then the shire wanted 33% done before sales, fenced and no human or machine activity on. Leaves 6.7 acres then because the shire wanted drains installed at the rear after the survey was complete and then put a caveat on we pay rates on all this land which we are not supposed to use. This is not equitable.</p> <p>2/ There is also a bridle path & drain at the front of the property which we maintain because the shire do not, most of the bridle paths are not used due to long grass & over hanging trees they ride on the road instead. People I've spoken to say they are not going to maintain shire property because of their lousy attitude.</p> <p>3/ Now you people want to re-align the freight rail line through or past our properties and charge us higher rates for the service, WOW that's service only in S/J shire</p> <p>4/ Land values have decreased in this area so much we can't even sell at all let alone at a profit. Properties that have had prospective buyers have gone to the shire office & been told a train is coming & sales fall through</p> <p>5/ What are the shire guide lines on people living in sheds for years, there are plenty out here because the shire have poor planning. There is no certainty for there future</p> <p>6/ All public amenities are being built or transferred to Byford (e.g library) so there is further travel & time for people living south at their cost.</p>	Noted
58	<p>I don't understand why the change to rural residential and having to pay the same as commercial and intensive farming when I would think they make an income and probably able to get a tax concession , I am not rich, I work full time to pay my mortgage, I've been here over 20 years, I have to pay my rates in instalments as I can't afford to pay them in one hit. And to be honest we don't get much for our rates no water, no gas, shit roads, no verge maintenance in fact our street take it in turns to mow and maintain our street verges, we have the added cost of maintaining our property fire breaks ect we are also slugged the biosecurity levey for having over an acre of land again for WHAT the cotton bush ect is rampant along the road verges and rail lines NOT IN OUR PROPERTIES. I feel that as small land owners we are the ones that are constantly targeted by rising costs, we are lucky if our bins even get emptied some weeks but all in all I dont mine not having the water, gas ect we JUST want our little bit of land that I have struggled to pay for and still am as I said I am not rich,. I would like a reply to acknowledge receipt of this objection.</p>	Noted.
59	<p>I am writing this letter regarding the review of valuation method used for rating properties within the Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale for 2021/2022, your reference SJ274: E21/6513.</p> <p>Firstly, I must say I am vehemently opposed to any rating method changes that would increase the exorbitant amount I already pay.</p> <p>I note in the previous letter (September 2020) sent to us regarding this that it states, "This is being done to ensure the Shire is levying rates equitably". If you are going to rate our properties equitably, the same should apply to services provided to rate holders.</p> <p>If, as according to your most recent letter our rates are going to be more expensive than people in Byford or Mundijong, here is a list of services/provisions they have, but we do not;</p> <p>Kerbs, footpaths, underground drainage, decent roads, maintained verge, satisfactory street lighting, playing fields, public open space, deep sewerage, scheme water, nearby library.</p> <p>Although some of the above services/provisions are not supplied by the shire, it shows that they are not provided equitably and therefore the rates paid should differ, based on services provided. According to your letter dated 23/6/21, we will be paying more in rates than people in residential areas, yet they have immediate access to services and better conditions (roads, footpaths, verges, lighting etc).</p> <p>In your previous letter it also stated, "Please note that rates are levied based on the actual use of land, regardless of the zoning or services provided". Our actual use of land is as a horse property, hence the zoning. As such we are prepared to put up with less services, for the lifestyle. We cannot live in purely residential areas where no livestock is permitted, with all the aforementioned services, because we cannot have horses there. This shows that the actual use of the land is different, therefore should be rated differently. If the shire changes our rating system, the comment about actual use of land, is a lie.</p> <p>Basically, you are telling us that the rating system needs to be fair and equitable, whilst at the same time telling us it does not depend upon services provided. Therefore, it appears the provision of services DOES NOT have to be fair and equitable. The reason for this appears to be because the shire would have to spend money to provide services, whereas the rate change gives the shire additional money, whilst incurring no expense. Therefore, anything that provides the shire with money has to be equitable, but anything that costs the shire money doesn't.</p> <p>Outright hypocrisy.</p>	Noted.

No.	Responses regarding Differential Rates	Officer Comment
60	<p>A suspicious person would believe the shire has deliberately slightly decreased the residential rates, whilst increasing rural rates, because there are more residents who are likely to vote for the changes you are suggesting.</p> <p>We currently pay \$1794.46 for our yearly rates (doesn't include emergency services levy or rubbish collection), what do we get for that money, NOTHING. The road we live on is the worst in the shire and has been like that for the 13 years we have lived here. I brought this to the attention of the shire in May 2019 and nothing has been done to improve the road. We no longer get kerb pickups for rubbish, but can take it to the tip, some 15 kilometres away. Just like all services for people in Oakford, we have to travel quite a distance to get to them. We have to maintain our own verge because the shire only does it once a year. This ditch on our verge is constantly littered, which we have to pick up. Please advise me what we get for our money, I don't believe it will be an extensive list.</p> <p>If rate-payers in Oakford are forced to pay more, in what appears to be a money grabbing exercise by the shire, be prepared to start using that money to provide us with some services and better conditions.</p> <p>In summing up, I categorically state that I am absolutely opposed to a change in the rating system, or any increase in our rates.</p>	Noted.
61	<p>I think that all the rates should be lowered for all residents. Considering the council has taken away the Bulk Rubbish Collection from rate payers. The Council even has the Rudeness to say pensioners can pay a fee for collection if they can't get to the rubbish facility ? I find that just down right incentive as pensioners struggle to pay for living essentials bills. We have had the rubbish collection included in our rates and now it has been taken away. We have not been compensated by reduced rates or another option of collection. The Stirling Shire offers a skip bin once a year for its Residents and I think I and many other Rate Payers would rather this option. It is not fair for Rate Payers to be still paying for a service that is not supplied ? I hope you would look at reducing all rates as we are losing services and have the highest rates of all Perth. The residents are not happy, you just need to look on Facebook at the comments people make about the Shire of S/J. Mayby time to have a think about things and look after the resident a bit more ?</p>	Noted.
62	<p>I am writing in regards to the 2021/2022 rating strategy and update regarding ration equation for A11200 Lot 99 Gordon Road, Serpentine. In the proposal our property has now been classed as UV- Rural Residential for 2021-2022, which has changed from UV- general for 2020-2021. In your correspondence regarding this matter UV Rural residential is for properties 4,000sqm to 50,000sqm. Our property (lot 99 Gordon Road) is at 2,479sqm which is much less than the 4,000sqm. We received no explanation into why our property would fit into the UV-Rural Residential when it does not fit into the specified criteria.</p> <p>Furthermore, we did not receive any explanation as to why the proposed rate fee is so high. Currently we have limited services on our property supplied by the Shire. We have no gas connection, have installed our own septic tank at our cost and which we maintain the costly upkeep ourselves. We have frequent power cuts which could be a result of the overhead power lines and an unsealed road leading to our property which can cause floods of water into our property during heavy rainfall.</p> <p>We would appreciate if the Shire can take note of the above and provide an explanation of the proposed rate increase.</p>	No change recommended
63	<p>1. Council has not provided any specific justification of the need for a rate increase. Stating that the change is needed in order to address a budget deficit and to allow the building of infrastructure appears to be intentionally ambiguous. Council first needs to explain why there is a budget deficit. Was there a deficit for the previous year or has the deficit been created by the council's desire to increase spending? And what specific infrastructure will council provide in exchange for the increased funding? Exactly what will ratepayers receive for the extra money council is proposing to be levied?</p> <p>2. The proposed differential rates are neither fair nor equitable. If there is a budget deficit, why is council proposing a rate reduction for 66% of households? This is nonsensical! If a rate increase is genuinely warranted, this should be distributed fairly rather than burdening 24% of ratepayers with the full increase plus extra so that the remainder can enjoy either no increase or a rate reduction, whilst receiving the full benefit of the proposed "infrastructure" that is allegedly going to be provided.</p> <p>Any differential rate proposal should be based on the services each property type uses and therefore costs the council. A property which is self-sufficient for water supply and waste water treatment presents a lower cost to council and this should be reflected in the rates levied.</p>	Noted
64	Strongly disagree with proposal.	Noted

No.	Responses regarding Differential Rates	Officer Comment
65	<p>I fully agree that rates should be more equitable and also comparable to other local government areas. In my case my rate in the dollar is 25% more than Armadale and 50% more than Murray for no particular reason. I note residential rating was pegged to Armadale. This makes renting more difficult for little in the way of service provision.</p> <p>A huge number of people in the shire seem to be able to operate significant business activities or simply live on a large and valuable plots of land and pay fraction of the rates that are payable on my properties. For people operating businesses and live on the property they appear to pay far less than I do, why would anyone rent or buy a commercial unit when they can simply buy a rural residential, build a huge shed and operate from there whilst only paying rates for residential property or less? SJ should be doing what other councils do and stop non compliant uses.</p> <p>These larger properties often have significant road infrastructure associated with them, particularly in comparison to the amount of rates they pay yet other ratepayers are expected to pick up the tab. Many of these properties contain extensive houses and outbuildings and should probably be rated based on GRV rather than UV to reflect how valuable they are. Lifestyle properties should not be rated like farmland.</p> <p>I have read with interest recent WASAT outcomes of rural properties being used for transport depots. This highlights my concerns that these users will be able to pay rates based on rural strategy instead of a comparable industrial/commercial strategy which is what they are being used for. Based on your current proposal this allows property owners to buy rural land, built huge sheds and infrastructure yet only pay 50% on rural UV instead of comparable GRV rating for industrial.</p>	Noted.
66	<p>We are pensioners , we do not run any commercial lifestyle , we have our own sewerage , water tanks , no street lights ; no kerb side collections anymore only the weekly dustbins. so should not be paying commercial rates.</p>	Noted
67	<p>We are not getting value for money with the rates at the current amount, it is not in the Oakford rate payers best interests to support the differential rating. The shire does not provide any value for money for our suburb and but enforcing the differential rating on Oakford residents is extortion, which is a crime</p>	Noted.
68	<p>I would propose better street lights , footpaths and water to properties . If your going to charge me four hundred dollars more than I absolutely demand to have better than a green bin with no lid and not even curbs , paths or for that matter even a safety fire exit road out of medulla Rd . We have no water to our properties at all and I'd like to know what warrants "Under Valued Rural Residential " being worth \$367 more . It's preposterous to think a name change with no other changes increases my rates by that much . Over 25% increase ?</p>	Noted
69	<p>Bad timing with the negative effect covid is having on the economy. State govt preference for no fee and charge increases.</p>	Noted
70	<p>As per my letter last year, I believe in paying rates which in turns goes towards the infrastructure, facilities and services to be provided to the SJ community, but when it effects the pockets of ordinary people who want to live on acreage and have to pay more because they don't live on your standard suburban block then no I don't agree. We live away from parks, lights on our roads, local transport and willingly still pay as expected for having bin collection and fire services only.</p> <p>Our road has been used by large trucks for many years for the redevelopment on Delroy Court, they have destroyed the curbing at the top of Phar Lap Drive (which was pointed out a few years ago and never fixed), the road has deteriorated and is showing signs of cracks, crumbling and pot holes and was never built for the high volume it receives every day as it now is the only road in and out for access to Rowley Road. We are lucky so far for not having had an accident since the road is narrow built for cars not trucks and the blind corner we have just as you enter Phar Lap Drive.</p> <p>We purchased our property over 17 years ago to raise and live in a semi rural environment and understand that progress will always be there but if you're going to up our rates because we have worked hard to own a small holding what are you going to give us in return for the rates we have to pay.</p>	Noted
71	<p>There needs to be a more sustainable way of controlling shire costs and obtaining operating funds. Rates cannot continue to be raised as a way of dealing with budget shortfalls.</p>	Noted.

No.	Responses regarding Differential Rates	Officer Comment
72	<p>I understand you need money to run this shire council, but I do not understand why you think it is necessary to charge those of us on small acreage the same rates as a commercial or industrial property.</p> <p>They at least can earn money from their property to pay the rates.</p> <p>We do not earn anything from our property and are now on age pensions which means it we will struggle to find the extra rates you want to charge. We have not had the drainage ditch out the front of our property cleaned out for several years and it now has heaps of leaf litter in it. You took away the road verge rubbish collections, one thing we did use every time. You talk about fair and equitable rates well I've yet to see how that works for our area. We have very very little to show for our rates as it is.</p>	Noted
73	<p>After reading the proposal it appears we are going to get a 5% increase on our rates for our rural property, we are unclear what exactly we will get for this increase because currently we don't get anything for the amount we pay. We would like to see how our current rates are allocated and used throughout the shire and how the 5% increase will shift resources within my local area.</p>	Noted.
74	<p>We are proposed to be included in the new UV Rural Residential rating system. For context, the State Government of Western Australia acknowledges our current land use and setting by assessing our property under the aggregated unimproved value banner. With this in mind, the State government already charges the landowners for the privilege of residing on a landholding. For information, this equates to \$358.90 per year for our property.</p> <p>Property owners for 2020/21 were introduced to another State Government tax in the form of Biosecurity measures. For this pleasure, we receive an \$30 annual bill. To this day, we have not seen or heard of any proactive biosecurity occurring with our land holding or surrounding area.</p> <p>Simply, we already pay \$388.90 in 2020/21 for the privilege of maintaining our landholding which does not apply to suburban properties.</p> <p>The Shire of Serpentine and Jarrahdale seek to increase rates at our property by introducing a new rate strategy thus increasing rates by approximately \$297 per year. Firstly, I object to this average increase notification as 'average' does not inform the residents of the actual cost. Average could mean significantly higher or lower for select properties. An actual update of the proposed rate is required to be able to make an informed decision.</p> <p>Secondly, I note the rates are proposed to ensure a more equitable approach to the rating in the Shire. However, whilst rating should be equitable there is concern that the financial benefits of the rating system are not distributed equitably within the Shire. For example, our property would be subject to the change in rating system, however it is located on a road network with no street lighting, no footpath, no drainage maintenance or services provided by the Shire.</p> <p>I have not seen any actual maintenance completed by the Shire in the road reserve since we purchased the property almost 3 year ago. I have however seen a notable increase in services for the Byford townsite. This year we were given a warning regarding fire break breaches, however the breach is due to trees growing in the Shire's road reserve overhanging into our property. The lack of maintenance on the road reserves increases the risk of bushfire to more rural landowners. In my mind, the Shire needs to provide a more detailed description of what will be completed for rural landowners to make this 'equitable'. Currently, it appears to be a system which takes from the more sizeable landholders and provides for the suburban sprawl.</p>	Noted.
75	<p>Again SJ Shire, during the pandemic you want to RAISE "some" peoples rates by more than 20%? And the reason you are giving is to ensure fair and equitable rates for all. How can that be? How can it be FAIR or EQUITABLE to expect people living on 5 acres in a residential setting to pay the same as commercial/industrial and farm properties, who are using their property to earn money? We are not using our property for business, if we were then we would expect to pay higher rates. The argument that we get very little for these rates is still on the table. This is NOT a fair or equitable expectation in our view. It is very unfair in our view to expect pensioners to come up with 20% rises like this when their income has suffered so much over the past 18 months and still has NOT recovered. Therefore we OBJECT STRONGLY to a rise of this size in our rates.</p>	Noted.

No.	Responses regarding Differential Rates	Officer Comment
76	<p>I live in the Byford Trotting Complex buffer zone and have been advised that my rating category will change from UV General to UV Rural Residential. This is a new rating category that has been created – it seems just for this purpose so that the SJ Shire can extract more rates money from residents. The table on the letter says my rates will increase by a massive 26.54%!</p> <p>The matter of the rates increase was proposed in September 2020 and following intervention by the (then) local member Ms Alyssa Hayden and the (then) Minister for Local Government Mr David Templeman, the shire was forced to withdraw its proposal.</p> <p>Mr Templeman specifically asked the shire “to give ratepayers certainty that they will not be hit with massive increases to their rates during this global pandemic”. This pandemic is not over – evidence that over the past 2 weeks we have had a lockdown, followed by several restrictions.</p> <p>The properties in the trotting complex buffer zone are unique. The reason for the larger blocks in the buffer zone is because of the separation between the trotting complex and the urban part of Byford. These are not therefore “lifestyle blocks” as some people make it out to be. Yes, these blocks are larger, but not because of lifestyle, but because of the buffer zone. The buffer zone was put in place in 1995 and was the subject of much discussion, including in state parliament. These blocks are subject to operations of the trotting complex and the surrounding properties that have horse operations on them, and the particular things that come with that (trotting events, late night activities relating to horses and stables, etc).</p> <p>Ever so slowly there is the desire to change the nature of these properties. There has been regular attempts to change the type and size of homes surrounding this area, and now there is the desire to lable these properties as lifestyle properties without regarding the the peculiar nature of the properties.</p> <p>I believe that there sould be no change to to zoning of these properties from the current zonng as UV - General.</p>	Noted
77	<p>I am satisfied that a new category for Rural Residential has been established. The rate in the dollar MUST be less than that of a standard residential rate as we receive no Services eg. no footpaths, no sewerage lines, no gas lines, no water lines. I don't believe the rate in the dollar has been reduced enough because when it is multiplied out, our property sizes mean we are still paying more than a standard GRV residential property who are the ones reaping all the benefits. When we purchased our property, we budgeted on the rates being as they are, we cannot afford the increase in rates, especially with no additional services?</p>	Noted.
78	<p>I don't agree with the rate changes to our property as we are fully rural have been since we moved here. If we are changed I'm not sure if we can afford the extra charges and what do we get for the extra charges. If we compare what we have to other suburbs that have a lot more but less rate charges. In my opinion the shire don't need to change our category as it's a money grabbing idea only.</p>	Noted
79	<p>I feel that increasing the rates in rural areas is a disgrace. We get nothing for our rates. We have no street lights, footpaths, public transport, our local roads are an absolute disgrace. We no longer get verge pickups and maintain all of our own property grounds as well as the verges and drains surrounding our properties.</p> <p>We pay extra for our rubbish and emergency Levy which we agree is fair. But expecting us to pay even more is outrageous. We moved here so that we can enjoy our rural lifestyle and every year the rates go up and up but this new proposed rate rise is outrageous and a complete disgrace.</p>	Noted.
80	<p>I find the proposal unfair under the bases that properties rated as Commercial/Industrial and Intensive farming will be charged the same as a residential property just because it falls within the 4000sqm-50,000sqm.</p> <p>The Commercial and farming properties are able to claim their shire rates as part of their tax expenses, while normal properties just have to take the blow of the rates increase.</p>	Noted
81	<p>In this shire we all pay a high amount in rates. If the shire wishes to make it equitable the rate for residential should be lowered. With the GRV calculation being lower last year, instead of Residential finally having a reduction in their rates the Shire took that from them by increasing the rate in the dollar so many still had their rates increased. If the total average of rates in residential areas is significantly higher than the total average for rural zoned areas then increase the minimum slightly to rural properties. An increase of over \$300 (more than 20%) is unfair.</p>	Noted

No.	Responses regarding Differential Rates	Officer Comment
82	<p>Unfair to residents that are about to receive a huge increase (26/27%) in one foul swoop while still trying to get over the recent pandemic which wrecked havoc on most of our incomes. I don't mind a rate increase as the shire is growing but how about staging it over a few years. The pandemic could come back and then how do we pay. My block is just over 8000 m2. I have no sewerage (septics) which need to be emptied every 5/7 years(\$1000) Fire breaks that need to be done every year , our road has minimal lighting , increased traffic, road is in a poor state , no footpaths , open drains which we have to maintain to stop flooding, no verge collections any more and all this in the heart of Byford (Briggs Rd) We are surrounded by schools now and still the children in the area have to dodge cars everyday on there way to school. It has been like this since we got here 20 years ago. What am I paying rates for? I have land I can't really use unless I start training horses. This is not about equitable rates , it's about pandering to developers to get more rate payers in the shire. It's just wrong!!</p>	Noted
83	<p>We are opposed to the Shires proposed Rating strategy. It is not equitable and is just another attempt to move people off UV - general rates. We believe the minimum rate which will be around a 25% increase for many, is way too high. If you want rates to be equitable then charging a minimum rate for people on UV - rural residential the same as people deriving from income (UV - commercial/industrial) on their property is not fair.</p> <p>Secondly if it is to be equitable similar properties currently rated GRV but are also on "rural residential " properties should also be moved onto the same rating structure and rates!</p>	Noted
84	<p>the existing and proposed shire rates do not reflect a fair and equitable way for the rate payers.</p>	Noted
85	<p>it is not reasonable to expect the residents under current special rural zoning to be rezoned to rural residential for the specific reason to increase their rates when these residents do not receive the same services as the rate payers paying lesser rates in urban areas. If we were receiving the same services I would understand us paying the same rates but we don't and now you want to charge us more to fund your growth that should not be at the expense of the rural residents. The shire is transitioning from a traditionally rural to urban focus, please do not displace us residents that pursued a rural lifestyle and activities.</p>	Noted
86	<p>I strongly oppose these changes. For all the same reasons that this was stopped at the end of last year this is just another cash grab to balance your overspending in areas that do not benefit those you are penalising. Due to the current pandemic our household has taken a (long term) over 25% income hit (with future uncertainty still) and the council is planning a rate rise for me of over 18%! It is disgraceful. You have simply changed your strategy, to giving 8000 a token cut and hit others with a big increase to try and get this through - only 6 months after the state government told you that this was unethical. Services in the areas that you are planning to increase rates on see no value for this and in fact have lost services over the past few years (waste collection being a big one). It is a disgrace.</p>	Noted
87	<p>I agree with the amendments as the rates needs to be equally shared but I do think overall rates are high for the shire. The shire needs to have a budget set and make spending decisions based on budget, not make spending decisions and expect the costs to be covered by raising fees.</p>	Noted
88	<p>Our rates are set to rise \$367 above what we pay now changing to UV- Rural Residential from UV- General. Nothing has changed for us in over 25 years living here. We are part of the trotting complex which has been badly let down by council for general maintenance along with maintaining roads and bridle paths. Binshaw Ave is more patches than road! We do not have any of the facilities that new estates have. Traffic flow has become dangerous through this area. We make no income from our property. I don't think it fair to be charged more when nothing has changed for us.</p>	Noted
89	<p>I'm sorry but residents on rural properties that do not have parks, street lighting, underground sewerage, sufficient/adequate drainage, gas connections, water connections and the list goes on should not be classified or expected to pay similar rates as the people who do -regardless of rental return or property size.</p>	Noted
90	<p>The shire should charge their rates based on the services they provide to properties. We have no footpath, 1 streetlight hidden amongst the trees, no verge collection anymore, a driveway entrance on shire property with pot holes. We also have our own sewage system. The shire rate in the dollar is extremely high. 0.10 cents in the dollar is too much. Other shires/councils have much lower rates. Canningvale charge 0.04 cents in the dollar and get many more services and maintenance from their council. Yes, Byford is growing, but the shire is much bigger than Byford and mostly rural.</p>	Noted

No.	Responses regarding Differential Rates	Officer Comment
91	<p>Equity: The equality of being fair and impartial. My comments to the way in which the Shire has approached this has been abhorant. The Shire has singled out larger landholdings in their "equity" rating review. This is both unfair and not impartial. The fair thing to do would have been a small increase on all rates across the Shire. The graphic on your website under rates review says it all. People on larger landholdings do not have access to the basic services that residential ratepayers do, such as underground services (water, power, sewer, gas, NBN) Rate-payers on most larger landholdings have to maintain their own SEWER, (tanks and pumps, maintenance and disposal) WATER (tanks and pumps) no access to GAS unless they pay for gas bottles to be delivered and maintained, underground power (ongoing power issues due to power lines being in the weather and not underground like residential areas - therefore generators are required to be purchased and maintained) NBN - most larger landholdings have poor access to any internet services and have NO access to cable NBN. Other ongoing costs are firebreaks, large fenced boundary lines (maintenance and upgrade), weed maintenance that benefits the whole shire. The Shire's graphic gives the impression that the larger landholdings are paying much less and are "rich" in terms of what type of property and improvements that they own as a comparison to a smaller residential property. I find this highly offensive. If I have PAID and worked hard to have a swimming pool, spa or a larger parcel of land, why should I have to pay more and receive LESS service or benefits from my rates.....? This is where the inequality in the shire arises. Larger landholders generally don't have access to street footpaths, (in my area we don't have any) very few street lights, poor road condition, open drains (often not maintained) no council crossovers. In closing - there has also been a lot of mis-information by the Shire to the greater community about rating inequity. My rates are almost \$3,000 (which is not shown on the graphic) The Shire has clearly only put the base rate of \$1700 in the graphic for the rates review, but have put the correct amount on the graphic for residential properties. It appears from the graphic and the focus on the larger land-holdings, that the Shire is happy to cause a rift between ratepayers for a misguided attempt to raise further revenue from ratepayers.</p>	Noted.
92	<p>I don't believe the rural sector of the shire should be made to pay for the shire not obtaining the correct developer contribution for the urban spread. There should be a special levy on the residents of the shire that are actually utilising the parks and enjoy an increased value to their property because of the parks, roads, footpaths etc.</p>	Noted
93	<p>I understand that essential services have to be paid for. However in my view a lot of the Shire's spending is not essential (eg \$250 for street parties, baby massage courses, school holiday activities) and if the Shire cannot balance its budget whilst including these frivolous vanity projects then they should be cut. I also agree with Cr. Morgan Byas that rates increases of 5-25% in the middle of a pandemic are inappropriate. Whilst I accept in principle that similar properties should have a similar rating value, increases to rectify historical mismanagement by the Shire should not unduly penalise the ratepayer. The disparity should be communicated transparently and there should be a plan to increase rates to sitting ratepayers over several years at 3-5% a year. If a property is sold then the new rates will apply (as is currently the case).</p>	Noted

No.	Responses regarding Differential Rates	Officer Comment
94	<p>Our property is 5acres (approx 20,000 sqm) and is primarily used for residential purposes. Local Government rating is a complex issue that is difficult for residents to understand and therefore comment on. We will however attempt to express our concerns as they relate to our property. Whilst researching this matter, we did note in a report that went to Council on the 18 May 2020 that a Council Resolution from 2007 was not acted upon. For such an important Council Resolution not to be acted upon at the time is very concerning and we can only hope that the Management of the Council is more professional now. That report goes on to say "Large residential properties where the Unimproved Valuation (UV) Methodology is used for the calculation of rates appear to pay substantially less rates than small lot residents where the Gross Rental Value (GRV) Methodology is used for the calculation of rates".</p> <p>As per your letter dated 23-6-21, the rates levied on our property for 2020-2021 were \$1830.40. On top of that we pay a separate rubbish removal fee, a swimming pool inspection fee and the State Government imposed Emergency Services Levy giving a total amount paid of \$2,555.29. In item 10.3.4 that Council adopted on the 21 June 2021 we note the following comment – "The intention behind applying differential rates is to take into account the levels of services provided to different types of properties, to reflect the cost of provision of services to those categories or properties as well as the need to encourage specific types of activities within the Shire".</p> <p>It is also noted throughout the various reports to Council that the term equity is used often in relation to rating, however, it doesn't appear to be applied to service delivery. In our case, we seem to pay a fee for services as there are few if any other services supplied to or near our property. In the report to Council on 21-6-21 under the section on Rating Equity it states "Equity is an important concept in taxation, The Department of Local Governments Guidelines on Changing Rating Methodology states that Rating principles should be applied fairly and equitably. Each property should make a fair contribution to rates based on a method of valuation that appropriately reflects the predominate use". Is it unreasonable for residents in Oakford to therefore expect some equity in service delivery? Whilst we may be paying an amount similar to a smaller residential property in a higher density area, the difference in access to Council Services is significant.</p>	Noted
	<p>Whilst it appears that Local Government Rates are considered to be a broad based tax and therefore we cannot make a direct correlation between the rates we pay and the services we receive, a further complicating factor for the broader area we live in is that there are a variety of land uses. In our own small community there are purely Residential properties, Horse Agistment, Distribution businesses, Racehorse training and many other uses. How would the Council fairly address this wide variety of uses to achieve an equitable rating strategy ? We note in the Department's Rating Guidelines that spot valuations can be applied but do not know if this is something Council has or would consider.</p> <p>To provide possibly the most glaring obvious example of inequity in service provision to the Oakford and surrounding areas is the condition of Kargotich Road at the Rowley Road end and Rowley Road from Kargotich to Tonkin Highway. These sections of road and others in adjoining streets are dangerous and have been in extremely poor condition for many years with Council erecting signs to warn drivers of the dangerous road conditions. There have been fatal accidents in recent times and we are sure that if these road conditions existed anywhere else, they would have been fixed years ago. These roads need urgent reconstruction. The intersection of Kargotich and Thomas Roads is another example of no investment in Infrastructure that has resulted in a very dangerous intersection.</p> <p>If the Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale wants to convince the residents of Oakford that a change in rating methodology is fair and equitable, then a more equitable approach to service delivery and provision of infrastructure is urgently required.</p>	Noted
95	<p>In regards to the new rating we do not agree with these. The rates we currently are too high and we barely ever see any maintenance being done in our estate. Rates should be reduced not increased. Proposed differential ratings is not fair on those its affecting.</p>	Noted

No.	Responses regarding Differential Rates	Officer Comment
96	<p>Firstly it must be noted that your "notice" was received on 30 June 2021. Under the Local Government Act 6.36.3(b)(ii) that "an invitation for submission to be made by an elector or a ratepayer in respect of the proposed rate or minimum payment and any related matters within 21 days (or such longer period as is specified in the notice) of the notice;"... We have received your notice much less than the specified 21 days, as have the majority of rural ratepayers affected by this notice. This should, under the provisions of the Local Government Act see the notice reissued, and the correct period of 21 days provided. If the actual 21 days were provided, this and many other submissions could be more accurately researched, although the benefit in doing so would be limited given this Council's lack of care for Ratepayer's submissions</p> <p>Certain Councillors are asking for rating equity. What is "equity"? According to the dictionary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the quality of being fair or impartial; fairness; impartiality: the equity of Solomon. - something that is fair and just: the equities of our criminal-justice system. <p>What is fair and just in increasing the rates of rural ratepayers who receive little or no services from the Shire to the benefit of those ratepayers who receive all the services, meanwhile reducing their rates, simply because they own more land, for which they paid, and they maintain at their own expense?</p> <p>Rural ratepayers are required to maintain our own drains, streetscapes if we have them, maintain firebreaks or be fined, we have no street lighting or security, no parks or reserves, poor and dangerous roading, no footpaths. However you want to improve these services and others for Byford, at our expense. You are wanting to improve Council accommodations which seems a short-term unnecessary expense and this is the the cost of your short-fall according to Hugh Jones' letter to ratepayers.</p> <p>It would seem that certain Councillors are determined to look after their Byford residents, despite those residents agreeing (if you asked them) that rural residents should not bear the burden you seek. However given the bullying and crusade against the rural mob, those councillors are looking for a "win".</p>	Noted
97	<p>In your letter dated 23/06/2021 you highlighted the Councils intended strategy to apply rates equitably, you use this word regularly as if by using it often it will sound as though there is a huge difference between various properties. How do you make it Equitable and what inequality do you refer? You imply that our property and by extension We, are not paying our fair share. I could argue that each person in the Shire should pay exactly the same, after all, everyone has the same access to facilities. Could you explain to us what it is that we either receive or have access to that others don't. We bought our property in 1988, vacant land, special rural, no fences, no crossover, no water, no sewerage, no paths, no streetlights. When the Shire announced the housing estates I went to the Council and asked what were the plans for Darling Downs. I was told Council intended to keep the area as a green zone, has this changed and are we going to be rated out of our properties. Last year you proposed to increase some property rates almost doubled, is that your idea of equity. I have very little faith, based on your proposals last year, that this years rate increase is anything other than a temporary halt to your original plans. Thank you for allowing me to comment, it would be nice to get a honest response to my questions.</p>	Noted for response
98	<p>I received this same paperwork last September regarding an increase in my rates of \$367. This is an increase of 26%. Being a single person household on a part time wage this is outrageous and is not something that I will be able to afford. I am not the only one in this position.</p> <p>Also the change to UV Rural Residential is for properties that are 4000sqm to 50000 sqm and my property is less than 4000sqm. So which category do I fit into. Certainly not the one you are trying to put me into with a large increase in rates.</p> <p>I look forward to some clarification from the Shire and information on why I have been put into this category.</p> <p>I don't know if I will be able to pay my rates in the future at the new rates and I am probably not alone in this situation.</p>	No change recommended
99	Not impressed leave as is wrong time to look at changing to much happening in the world. People with no Monet and support	Noted
100	<p>I live on a special rural property! How can you justify putting up my rates when we don't have lights on our street; no footpaths, no kerbing, the shire has NEVER mowed or maintained our front or back verge, I have to maintain my property with fire breaks, the shire never keeps maintenance of the bridal paths in the area and we have to contact you to mow and remove trees, we have open drains at the front and back of our properties, our roads are not maintained, I'm not allowed to subdivide. I can no longer turn right onto Abernathy road from renaud, so ease of access has been restricted ::::::::::so please help me understand how you can justify putting up the rates for our property???????</p>	Noted

No.	Responses regarding Differential Rates	Officer Comment
101	<p>I object to the proposed rating strategy put forward in correspondence dated 23 June 2021.</p> <p>The Shire's push for a fair & equitable approach to rating is biased and far from equitable for myself as a ratepayer.</p> <p>A proposal to increase revenue within the Shire under the guise of "fair and equitable" when I'm offered no additional services or community upgrades and facilities and/or significant changes to the use of my land in return is unfounded; illogical and unreasonable.</p> <p>The proposal again is a way to divide the residents into those who get facilities & benefits from their rates versus those who are squeezed and forced to pay to support others without any advantage; value or assistance.</p> <p>Applying this method of valuation to each property is viewed as truly inconsistent and inequitable treatment by myself.</p> <p>Town planning scheme amendments restrict the type of development that is permitted on my land and changes to land use are forbidden by the Shire, however, the Shire believe they have the right to abuse myself as a ratepayer just because my land is what it is.</p>	Noted
102	I think it is more better in sharing the cost of expenses required to build our community in our area.	Noted
103	<p>I am against the change of rating for larger land areas, such as Darling Downs, where I live. I am against this because we have commitments to maintenance that is required by the council and this costs landowners. Such as fire breaks, keeping the riding trails clear of branches and leaf burning during the winter. We don't mind doing this but we should not have to deal with a rate rise as well. We are helping to maintain the trails that the shire its so very proud of and is a big asset to our community. The Shire is asking too much of people that already are actively helping to maintain parts of this community.</p>	Noted
104	The rates paid should reflect on the services received. If we are getting less service in our rural area compared to suburbia then yes we should pay less rates.	Noted
105	Against any increase in rates when there is little to no service in the south ward of the shire even after years of rate increases.	Noted
106	<p>I agree that rates should be equitable, but think that there should be more transparency as to why someone's rates are higher than the minimum payment. For example, base rate for UV Rural residential is proposed at \$1750 minimum, but we already pay \$1976, with another \$86 increase proposed.</p> <p>How is a property valued? Who does the valuing? When?</p> <p>What effect does an unsightly property full of junk and car bodies have on the GRV and the rates of surrounding property?</p> <p>Is there a map of lots / sizes and the rates paid available online, so anyone can see how properties in different areas are rated?</p>	Noted for response
107	WE ARE QUITE HAPPY TO STAY RURAL	Noted
108	<p>Disagree with the proposed increase to Rural Residential rates, the rural residents do not utilize facilities to the same extent that the people on higher density land closer to the town centers do, they do have larger verge areas that they maintain and now that verve pickup is not longer provided address a greater amount of dumping on the sides of the access roads. They are not collecting additional income from their properties like the commercial and industrial and have larger maintenance cost to those on smaller blocks.</p>	Noted
109	<p>I object to the rating strategy outlined in your letter of the 23rd June 2021 for Rural properties proposed new rating as UV-Rural Residential, which proposes an increase in rates valuations. My objection is due to the unchanged land use. My property is a 5 acre property which is mostly native bush land. This land is under the Ground Water Protection zoning, cannot be subdivided, and will remain native bush land in the foreseeable future, therefore should not be subject to any future rate increase.</p>	Noted
110	<p>I do not agree to the change in rating for rural properties in the strategy outlined in your letter of the 23rd June 2021 outlining a proposed new rating as UV-Rural Residential, which proposes an increase in our rates valuations. I do not agree as the land or land use has not changed. I am on 5 acres most of which is native bush land. The land Zoning is Ground Water Protection, it cannot be subdivided or developed or used for commercial purposes, and will remain native bush land in the foreseeable future, therefore should not be subject to any future rate change or increase.</p>	Noted
111	<p>We fully disapprove of any differential rating change. The change will make it unfair for ratepayers who will be change to Rural Residential. The change in rating will mean there will be an approximate rate increase of at least 5% and as high as 25% for some of us. How is this fair? What are we getting for our money? for the rates we even pay now? NOTHING!</p>	Noted

No.	Responses regarding Differential Rates	Officer Comment
112	<p>I have owned and lived in my home on a semi-rural block in SJ Shire since 1993 and have tolerated annual increases in Rates over that period of time until now without protest.</p> <p>The property is my home and at no stage during the 28yrs of dwelling there has there been any form of commercial activity that has realized fiscal gain.</p> <p>We, as do many of our neighbors here in Millbrook fail to understand as to why the Shires new strategy effectively places us into the zoning of UV Commercial/Industrial</p> <p>UV – Intensive farmland with a projected 20% increase in our current rates.</p> <p>Many of us who were fortunate to move here 20 to 30 years ago to enjoy the wonderful lifestyle are now Pensioners or reaching Pension age: WHERE are we expected to find another \$335.60 (my case) annually?</p> <p>If SJ Shire proceeds to push this amendment our annual rates will increase to well over \$2000 per year.</p>	Noted for response
113	<p>How can raising MY rates address rating inequity in this shire. I have been here for 20 years and have no scheme water, no street lights, no footpaths, and no opportunity to subdivide. The storm water drain out front of my house disappeared a decade ago through lack of maintenance and hardwaste collection has also disappeared - (no good offering free trailers when I have no towball!). What am I getting for the proposed rate increase while those properties with most of the above get reduced rates? That IS rating inequity!</p>	Noted
114	we want GRV rating -	Noted
115	<p>As a ratepayer of SJS I want to express my concern about the proposed changes to the rating system being considered by Council affecting some 8000 odd rate payers including my wife and me.</p> <p>We live on a property of "rural purposes" on which we stable and have 1 to 2 horses for pleasure for my son to ride, 8 chickens to provide our family with eggs and a vegetable garden and small orchard to allow us to be semi self-sufficient in an unprecedented time of economic and emotional hardship. We are zoned as a rural property and receive none of the benefits that residential properties on GRV receive. We do not have street lighting, verge mowing or weeds control (we mow our verge and spray), gas connection, no NBN, sewer connection, no public transport, ill maintained local roads within Serpentine and Keysbrook, or footpaths are not regularly maintained (which are currently underwater).</p> <p>I also want to express our concerns that the executive and Councillors, through considering massive increases in rates, is totally out of touch with community expectations. The fact that the Premier has had to step in 2020 to highlight this fact is troubling and disappointing.</p> <p>From the start of this campaign to jack up rates the Shire has been extremely insincere in failing to advise in the September "survey" it issued the enormous increases in rates this proposal would have on many rate payers. This is on top of an increase in 2019/2020 which you claimed did not even occur!</p> <p>The fundamental claim of the Shire that somehow land usage which has not changed in 10,20,30 and in some cases 50 years is now "deemed" non-rural is preposterous. Other Shires have recognised that any changes must not occur unilaterally but can only be considered in a holistic sense across that State. If you are unhappy with the timetable that the State Government is undertaking this review, please take up your grievances with it and not the ordinary rate payers of the Shire you represent.</p> <p>During another year of unprecedented year of Covid-19 induced financial and emotional insecurity it is extraordinary to see our Council seemingly so out of touch with its electors.</p> <p>I would appreciate some acknowledgement that you have both read this email and attached letter.</p>	Noted
116	<p>We think it's discriminatory to change the zoning of our residential property so that you can put the rates up. As noted in your letter dated 23 June, 2021, we will be charged rates equal to a Commercial/Industrial and Intensive Farming block. We do not run a business from our property. All we have is a normal residential block.</p> <p>We have been paying our rates long before any of the latest subdivisions were developed. Obviously the Shire had enough money from our rates to improve the area and create new subdivisions. To say that we have not been pulling our weight as to paying rates is offensive.</p> <p>We would like to point out that on Linton Street North there is no footpath, and no kerbing. Nothing has been done to upkeep this street for years.</p>	Noted for response
117	<p>Correct rates should reflect services that are provided... I get NONE... no fixing roads/streets, no drainage, no verge cleaning... NOTHING!!!</p> <p>No footpath minimal lighting, no parks, no verge or drain maintenance, no scheme water, no gas line only bottles, so please tell me what we are paying for</p>	Noted

No.	Responses regarding Differential Rates	Officer Comment
118	I believe we should be classed as rural, we have no amenities, nothing maintained by the shire (except the front drain cleared maybe every 3 years) but pay GRV the same as residential that have parks, amenities, playgrounds, footpaths etc. We paid for land but are limited to what we can do or build but pay for the whole acreage. I am only asking for everything to be considered in regards to the rate we pay.	Noted
119	We have not lived in oakford they long but our rates are grv improved and everyone else in our street is uv why???? Therefore we are paying \$1000 more per year and are on a smaller block.... I don't understand how this is meant to be more fair it definitely is not.	Noted
120	We do not agree of our rates being increased in such a huge amount. We have not made any changes or made any improvements since it was built in 1983	Noted
121	Q1. Why is the minimum UV Residential and the UV Commercial rate the same? Residential use means no income is generated from the land. Q2. Will Council allocate funds for the basic maintenance service it should provide such as maintenance of Shire land - bridle paths, natural water drainage and lical roads? Q3. Has Council considered public appetite for the proposed sporting complex in recent times.	Noted for response