

No.	Responses regarding the Draft Rating Strategy
1	You lost in December now you are trying to rip us off in another way like I said YOU DON'T PROVIDE THE SERVICE .
2	Money grab
3	You where told to stop by state government. It not even a shire decision.
4	At face value i do not believe these proposed changes are fair nor equitable.
5	It's about budgeting with what you have , so be it if we have to wait for things to be done , please employ decent contractors , most work is sub standard , I can go on and on , but basically we are not happy with the way you run the shire ,
6	I hope that for once the shire listens to the RATEPAYERS and acts accordingly!
7	I do feel that we all should be paying based on land area, sizing in proportion etc however I disagree with council approaches in times that families were struggling to pay an increase and make ends meet. Council is here to work in the best interest of the rate payer.
8	If the outdated rates are not updated then the only way to be fair and equitable is to make all rates outdated and bankrupt the Shire Council.
9	The size of the property is irrelevant, why do I pay more for my rates for 2 people because I live in a larger block than someone who has several people in the house and therefore requires more support ? it should be one set of rates for each domestic household irrespective of land or house size.
10	I am absolutely appalled that it is proposed that my rates for my vacant 820sqm block of land is proposed to go up by \$455.46 for the FY21/22 year. Well above the 'average' rate increase that you mention. It actually makes me reconsider whether I would like to build my house in SJ or sell the block and build in the Council that is more fair and equitable in their on-costs to the community.
11	Please state on how the council will use this additional rate payer expense on our community
12	If you talk about being fair, please consider all scenarios.... not just the size of peoples land.
13	Nil
14	Please update my letter so I have the correct details
15	It is unfair and wrong that just because i have a larger property i should pay more. The council doesn't know how much debt i am in, or my personel circumstances or earning capacity. I find it disgusting that you assume i have a lot of money so therefore i should pay more. I feel that the council are forcing rural propertys to subsidise residential properties who are provided with a lot more services than are provided fo rural properties. Based on your logic, i should assume that being such a large council then my rates should be a third of what you propose. I find it unfair and disgusting that you want to raise rates, especially during a pandemic just because you can. This is nothing more than a money grab, shame on the council for even proposing this during these times. I now know who i will vote for in the next local council elections.
16	Not a good thing

No.	Responses regarding the Draft Rating Strategy
17	<p>Please see above. It would be ridiculous to make everyone pay the same. If we paid rates on the value of our property it would be a lot less. There has to be another way to make this Fair and Equitable and to stop the Byford Residents from whinging about their Rates and causing a rift between the Byford community and the outer communities such as Serpentine. Not sure how the Shire can do it but increasing our Rates by so much is not going to cause Harmony in the Communities. It will only get worse. In reference to the Letter received and the Draft Rating Strategy. There is not enough explanation as mentioned above. It is misleading and is hard to understand. The bottom line is that SJ Shire want more money (For Byford). This is a very unfair way to go about it.</p>
18	<p>I think the way the Shire has communicated the rate change as a fairness undertaking and painted rural landholders as shafting the urban ones is disgusting. There has no indication that feedback has been taken on board regarding the level of support rural landholders feel they are getting from the Shire. When you have a shire making stupid decisions you have no confidence about giving them more money to spend.</p>
19	<p>This Shire, in comparison to other Shires/Councils is over-charging it's citizens, particularly those in the outer areas</p>
20	<p>I would love to know who values the property and how they decide the amount that each property can pay?</p>
21	<p>Having lived in Malarkey Road for over thirty years have seen no shire IMPROVEMENT to the street Fire control of pony trail twice in the first 15 years First time ended up with fire in the tree tops Next (some seven years later) the shire graded a fire break so I couldn't even mow the neglected land Then the shire laid a very dangerous footpath, a stretch of concrete level with the road and a painted white line on the road edge. No street lights were added, the line wore off within twelve months. It was further six years before the white line was repainted, and again it wore off. Then a couple of years ago the shire put in traffic control section in the street, again poorly constructed and don't achieve the desired outcome. At the same time they put in a kerb the full length of the original Malarkey Road. (a kerb straight out of a third world country) I suspect the rate rise has more to do with the Shire instead of the Developers in the near future having to maintain the public areas in the developments and nothing to do with equitably. Just a money grab. Equitably rates for Equitably Service is fine. but that is never going to happen for the residents of Malarkey Road or other rural properties. Beenyup Brook Why did the Shire allow the developers to divert Beenuyup Brook from its original course? We now only get flow when there is extremely heavy rain Because the developers wanted it to run through their sub division.</p>
22	<p>You are making people move out of the area due to th cost, too many workers in the shire shurley 1 person can do more than one job the shire is very top heavy</p>
23	<p>YOU SHOULD EXPLAIN WHICH PROPERTIES WILL GET A INCREASE, AND WHY ,THEN WE CAN REALLY COMMENT.</p>
24	<p>The shire's draft for rating is not a fair system as it burdens the non business small acreage land owners of the Shire with costs for amenities supplied only to the township of Byford. Little spending has been allocated to improve the infrastructure to the out lying parts of the Shire. I do not believe the Shire is making this a fair system like our councilors say they want. The rate in the dollar the Shire charge is way to high compared to all other Shires.</p>

No.	Responses regarding the Draft Rating Strategy
25	Disgusting! You were shot down last time, however this time you don't have a looming election and a local candidate who stood up for the residents and plastered it all over the local news. So following the same argument as last time the Pandemic is far from over, people don't know when they are and aren't going to be able to work with the loom of lock downs. And you want to charge more.
26	I was under the notion that this shire was equine based, but the way you are suggesting on rating the small land owners with horses and hobby farms, which is the one of the supposed foundations of this shire, it almost feels that that the shire is wanting to drive the equine community out of the area, by increasing the rates to an unaffordable level!
27	Please re think this idea. I am of the understanding that to grow the area and provide the necessary facilities council needs to have this income. However at the present times with the pandemic no wage increases for many years and the cost of living continuing to increase this should be taken into high consideration. By increasing my rates, as you propose which I consider at the current rate also expensive, will only make for added financial stress to me.
28	I believe that many larger properties that once were used for agriculture or horticulture maintained a rate in line with Primary producers when their properties are no longer used for Primary Production
29	You are being horrendously unfair in targeting long term residents who supported this shire before it developed into what it is. Many people affected by these Des Iwona are elderly or barely making ends meet. And you want them to more more for NO extra services to support people who want dog parks and playgrounds and yoga halls.
30	The Shire is no longer concerned about or represents the needs of rhe residents of Serpentine and Jarrahdale. It appears that they are focused solely on residential suburb if Byford. They are attempting to increase rural rates whilst investing the money in to developing Byford and urbanised areas.
31	I hope we are getting counted as residential and not rural...
32	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.
33	e.g If a property has increased \$100000 over time through improvements and these people have retired or do not have an income this does not reflect their capacity to pay higher rates based on the value of their property. Land owners will agist more animals which will cause more degradation or do other activities to recoup monies to pay their rates or leave, sad indictment of this council
34	It is unfair and seems to target small land owners who have 5 to 10 acres for personal use.
35	I totally object to it. It might show equity in rating (debatable), but is totally inequitable is services provided.

No.	Responses regarding the Draft Rating Strategy
36	<p>Then the Shires Draft Rating plan is not fair!</p> <p>Firstly, why are the Shire's cents in the dollar and minimum rates so high in comparison to some many other local governments? This in itself is not fair and reasonable to all ratepayers within the Shire.</p> <p>Based on what we believe is fair and equitable, the ratings are not fair, the cents in the dollar for small 5 acre landholders has the same minimum value to be paid at \$1700 as a commercial industrial lot that provides larger incomes than rental values for homes. The ratings and costs for services being equal for suburban homes, town hub homes, inner acreage and outskirt acreage lots is not fair as they do not all receive similar infrastructure, maintenance for the infrastructure and services.</p> <p>The shire has strict requirements for acreage landholders regarding maintenance, fire requirements, water collection and useage, yet the shire considers the entire landholding as GRV!! When we can only build on a certain size envelope, and the rest is for the UV useage of stabling and feeding horses and smaller animals and the growing of vegetables and fruit for use.</p> <p>The shire has not taken into account the initial cost outlay for water tanks, water run in and septic tanks nor the ongoing maintenance cost of water run, water tanks, septic tank (replacement or clean out) and other costs associated with the lack of services provided by the shire or the state to these properties, and YET the Shire is wanting to charge on the gross rental value for these homes on properties when the Shire have had minimal outlay for these properties it has been the developers that installed the streets and drains and landholders that install and maintain water services, drains, septic tanks, pumps and crossovers/driveways.</p> <p>The gross rental value for homes on acreage should be decreased because it is only a small section of the population that would be interested in renting at such a location for the opportunity to use UV land within the landholding, as some people wish to embrace the rural lifestyle, however the ability to pay large amounts of rates based on GRV for those that live in these properties is minimal. In comparison to suburban properties only have a large population that would wish to rent such properties, the property is completely serviced by the Shire and state for services and maintenance.</p> <p>It is assumed that acreage landholders have an ability to pay more for rates and should, however it is never taken into account that we pay up to \$10,000 for power and water runs, \$40,000 water tanks, \$15,000 septic tanks, a pump for each item also, then the maintenance and pump replacements every 5 or so years. Every time we turn a tap on, or flush the toilet we use electricity. For fire management some properties use bores and in turn pay the electricity to keep their properties green and fire safe. Most acre properties even have a requirement to have a sandpad for their homes before they are built.</p>

No.	Responses regarding the Draft Rating Strategy
	<p>These are all costs that suburban residents and the Shire do not realise or consider. If acreage landholders were to tally these initial and ongoing costs just to have a household on a small rural property they would identify that there is not a CAPACITY to pay the cents in the dollar amount, the minimum payment amount of \$1700 nor the GRV for such properties.</p> <p>The cents in the dollar for services is slightly less than commercial, however with the minimum being \$1700 this means nothing.</p> <p>The cents in the dollar has consistently increased every year, to offset the decrease in valuer general values decreased.</p> <p>The cents in the dollar for services continues to increase and is calculated evenly across landholdings, yet 5 acre lots in Oakford get minimal services provided by the council that are included in this cost. Bin service is a seperate cost!</p> <p>So these cents in the dollar costs are for maintenance of roads, kerbs, underground drains, street lighting and electricity, verge mowing, park mowing and maintenance. community centres and townsite hubs maintenance. Of which none of these are applicable to any 5 acre lots in the Oakford are that I am aware of, other than some lighting at main intersections such as Kargotich and Rowley and Kagotich and Thomas (as examples) in comparison to street lighting every 30 metres or so for suburban streets.</p> <p>The cents in the dollar for services also includes the development of community areas, parks and services for the general community, however for those living in the outskirts of the shire of serpentine these services are not local, and in some case are not used at all (in our case) we utilise more services from the City of Armadale and Cockburn than the Shire of Serpentine due to the unsafe roads to get there and the distance (which would add extra cost to our household budget) and therefore are not utilised as much (so this should be equated in a decreased percentage to make it fair)</p> <p>If the rate payer is charged in proportion to the services provided such as street lighting, kerbed or un-kerbed safe roads (and sealed or unsealed), drainage (open) versus underground, pathways, walkways, parks, schools, shops, community centres available within a 1km distance from their address. All of these cost the council for installation (unless it is included in the cost of the development by the developer) and all of these cost the council annually to maintain or provide (aka electricity).</p> <p>As small acre landholders, on the boundary of another council area, we believe if rates were fair and equitable we would be paying less cents in the dollars, the minimum amounts payable would not ALL be the same and certainly not the same as commercial/industrial, the rates would be decreased due to the minimal services and infra installation and maintenance, and the rates would be decreased based on the distance, proximity (useage) to schools, parks, town centre hubs, community developments and such.</p> <p>Certainly, based on the previous rates move in 2020 by the Shire and now this review and consultation, it appears that the Shire is just trying to step its way, one step at a time to what it planned and announced in 2020. This does not seem completely transparent. We are disappointed with this, as, in the few times we have required assistance from the Shire in the past 20 years the staff have been great to deal with. We hope the Shire will consider all of our comments, as we believe that at this stage the Shire and other suburban residents seem to underestimate the set up and ongoing costs associated for us as small rural landowners, and that the proximity to services, use of services and provision of services and infrastructure should be considered in the rates analysis, not just use a simple rating system that works for the computer and the Shire to simplify the work required at rates times, and actually develop a fair and equitable system across all factors.</p>
37	I think this is just another way of S/J Shire just collecting more money for rates even thou we are losing services such as Bulk Rubbish Collection and we allready pay the highest rates in Perth. The Council is out of touch with the people they represent
38	The draft rating strategy appears to be very poorly thought out.

No.	Responses regarding the Draft Rating Strategy
39	Semi-rural rate payers are extremely low cost residents for SJ Shire. They also have no access to most of the services council provides. It is not fair or equitable to charge higher rates to people with no access to services. If rates are increased to these people, we will demand the same amenities such as footpaths which are a staple in the suburbs but a dream in the semi-rural areas. This rise will create a substantial disgruntled population bent on receiving their share of the councils budget, thus impacting the budgetary issues further.
40	Money grab
41	While this this appears better than last year's Rate Project, it still fails to pick up inequalities in rating. Eg Byford quarries paying less in rates than egg farms(intensive farmland).
42	<p>As I have mentioned before, and repeat: 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>
43	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.
44	Needs further investigation. To be fair and equitable there needs to be maintenance done on footpaths, street lights ,parks public toilets of which we don't see anything done in Serpentine. Not just done around Byford and Whitby. We are part of this shire too. Have been here 45 years and in that time we have seen the Clem Kentish hall built and that's about it. This area most certainly has gone downhill. It looks very run down.
45	The fair and equitable rating needs to show and document allocation of shire resources. If rural properties are paying more then more resources should be allocated to the rural areas. For example to increase rural property value the shire needs to address lack of storm water drainage and allocate resources to maintaining shire owned lands within the rural areas.
46	We feel that the shire is determined to drive out older residents, who's income is now only a pension or at best supplemented with the remains of their retirement savings, which have been cut to almost nothing over the past 18 months. These are often the people most affected as they cannot increase their income. Very cruel.
47	The Rate in the dollar amount for UV Rural Residential is still too high. Our rates are MORE than GRV Residential yet we receive none of the services that they do! Our Verge and drains aren't even maintained by the shire. How is it fair that we, who pay for all our own amenities, should pay more than a GRV Residential property. You have disguised the higher amount by showing a lower Rate in the dollar but the overall payment is still higher.

No.	Responses regarding the Draft Rating Strategy
48	So many people were against this proposal when it was first introduced so maybe the shire needs to listen to its rates payers instead of trying to get money where it can.
49	I feel If the shire go ahead with this rate increase it will cause a huge rift between the shire and it's residence. And if the increase does go ahead then the shire needs to increase what the rural residents get we want verge pickups, tip passes all road verges maintained and all of the roads fixed because they are a death trap.
50	<p>I believe the shire needs to take a step back and actually think carefully about a fair way to implement rates changes. It feels as if the shire is just determined to bring the increases regardless of them being fair, and to make a point to the residents who opposed their proposal back in September 2020.</p> <p>The state government has put a stop to rate increases back in September 2020, and for the shire to still want to go a head with the increases in any way possible, specially during these uncertain times where people are loosing their livelihood and going through a great deal of financial and emotional stress, just shows how out of touch this shire is with it's residents.</p>
51	<p>Please note we are in Cardup but it wasn't recognised in question 4,</p> <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>
52	Come and have a look at our area and see if you think we're being fairly charged. Talk to some of the residents in the area around the trotting track. See how dangerous it is for the children.
53	Why were submission forms not sent to residents with letters, as previously done? Was this a deliberate attempt to hinder the views of older generations as they will be the majority of residents affected by these proposed changes and not have the facilities to complete online submissions?
54	The existing rate system and the proposed system, we will be paying more than the most and taking in to account that their is no street lighting no foot paths and the road is a mess and has been like this for the past 33+ years. We have been discriminated against by having to pay more than our fair share, because the shire decided to develop this area this has driven up the UV value and and therefor increased our rates to an amount that has made it very difficult for us to live on our property and will be faced with almost \$500 per month this is not fair or just for the services being provided by the shire. I believe that some dispensation should be taken in to account to address this inequity.
55	A previous liberal government wanted to change shire boundaries to reflect the lifestyle and activities of the residents, this should be the focus and should be revisited to align the currently affected residents and maybe redraft the boundaries to account for urban and rural residents.
56	I implore you to reject this proposal. If you must, increase everyone's rates by CPI and figure out other ways to balance spending rather than targeting residents in their homes.

No.	Responses regarding the Draft Rating Strategy
57	<p>I live on 5 acres that is currently under water due to the lack of drainage in our area. I have recently been told that I can no longer subdivide my property (even though had pre approval 5yrs ago) due to being close to a water catchment area and not having the required setbacks (100m) to apply again. Now i would love to know what my rental return would be on a property underwater at the moment and this should be what it's judged on (If that's what it's based on) Also now that I can not subdivide, my property isn't worth what it should be (if I was able to subdivide) due to your lack of drainage and maintenance in the area.</p>
58	<p>It is totally unfair. The shire should be charging a lot less. The rate in the dollar is 0.10. Other shires/councils charge a LOT LOWER, some 0.04 cents in the dollar and get many more services and maintenance. Lower the rate in the dollar by at least 75%. That will be a start. As mentioned earlier, 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. It seems the focus of the shire is on Byford, but our shire is much bigger than that and mostly rural. We need a fair and equitable system, but the shire don't know how to provide this.</p>
59	<p>The GRV rates are way to high compared to other shires. Other shires charge fair and equitable commercial rates. Other shires also charge a special levy for parkland. It is not up to me to pay for the failing of the shire when it came to developer contribution collection. If my rates are to be increased I expect to see some improvement in my area to the shires infrastructure or lack thereof. I suspect the windfall will be spent in Byford. That doesn't seem fair and equitable to me. To say Byford is in mortgage stress is ridiculous. Is the shire assuming that those on property are wealthy? I do agree that some properties in the Byford vicinity need to be reassessed as they are the beneficiaries of the facilities in Byford and the urban crawl not me.</p>
60	<p>We are very concerned about the lack of transparency surrounding the move from Rural to Rural Residential, and what plans the Shire has for the future in terms of moving all rural properties to a GRV status. This will result in a massive increase in rates and cause far more hardship than the current proposal. I would ask that Council is more open about its plans in this regard.</p>
61	<p>Leave rates as is and stop trying to gain more money - rates in your shire are already too high and you don't do any maintenance within our estate.</p>
62	<p>During the last round of "discussions" about a possible rates increase, my wife was bullied online by a councillor who advised her "this will get in". The Shire's current push to increase rates may happen without their willingness to hear ratepayers voices, but it must happen within legislation and currently this notice has not been issued correctly. Increasing rural rates is simply a disgusting cash grab which will hurt so many people who has been long standing members of this community. It is unnecessary and enhances the extremely poor view this community has of the current Shire Council.</p>
63	<p>I admit there is no answer that will be correct as far as rating fairness goes. Taking aim at Semi Rural properties asking them to pay more at the same time as reducing Residential properties is also unfair. Maybe keeping rate rises to inflation levels would make it more palatable.</p>
64	<p>I am also not impressed with the shire taking away our verge pick up.</p>
65	<p>Your money hungry! We have the fastest growing shire yet your rates are raised every year and more than other shires! You have less facilities to offer than Armadale council and their rates are lower and they offer rubbish passes and COVID discount on their rates! You took our passes and now road side collection away from us but want to charge more in rates ? How do YOU JUSTIFY THIS????</p>
66	<p>The good I found in your strategy is the comparison you did with the closest share (Armadale). I hope to keep it competitive to other shires.</p>

No.	Responses regarding the Draft Rating Strategy
67	I know a lot of people living on acreage that do an enormous amount of work maintaining trails, the 70 acres, keeping their properties tidy, abiding by council rules in terms of fire requirements and it feels like this is not appreciated by the council. I think the change is poorly thought out and am unhappy about the change.
68	Rate Equity doesn't just mean same rate on value of property and if passed we will seek deductions on rates based on level of service. eg gravel roads, no footpaths, street lighting or public facilities. Council can't have it all there way all the time and my legal advice does say Equity will work both ways if approved.
69	<p>....'Reflecting their capacity to pay'?</p> <p>What does this mean? If I cry poor, can I opt to pay less?</p> <p>Does it mean that because I own a larger property, I can obviously afford to pay more?</p> <p>Who makes that decision? how?</p>
70	<p>Disagree with the proposed increase to Rural Residential, the rural residents do not utilise services to a greater extent than other residents, they do have larger verge areas to maintain, their roads are not as well maintained. 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> <p>These people are not earning money from their properties and have not changed their use of the property, increases revenue should be coming from new development, a well managed shire should be balancing increased expenses with increased growth.</p>
71	The land rating value should not be subject to "the more land you have the more you should pay" if that land is native bush land that cannot be developed or used for commercial purposes.
72	The land rating value should not be subject to "the more land you have the more you should pay" if that land is native bush land that cannot be developed or used for commercial purposes. I do not believe the proposed strategy is a fair and equitable rating strategy.
73	We do not support the rating strategy at all. It is not fair and equitable to charge the Ratepayers who will be changed to Rural residential an extra 5%-25% given we get NO services from the Council at all. We would also like to mention that we thought we had 21 days to lodge a submission. We did not receive your letter until the end of June.
74	<p>We fail to understand how the SJ Shire considers increasing the annual rates of 3,011 ratepayers to carry the financial burden of 12,395 others fair and equitable.</p> <p>If the aim of the shire is to address funding requirements in an equitable way then they should consider sharing the load over a majority or rate payers and not a minority.</p> <p>An increase in commercial rates where applicable only and leave the rest of us alone.</p>
75	please do not increase rates 2021 we are all still in a covid situation
76	<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>
77	All rates should be reviewed, we are rural but pay GRV improved. We should be paying rural rates not residential.
78	Why are bigger property's cheaper

No.	Responses regarding the Draft Rating Strategy
79	If valuations go down so should the rates