

#	Summary
1	Oppose - public and Ccl need to be more informed prior to making decisions.
2	Oppose - Ccl should live within its means. Majority of the year a significant percentage of ratepayers are not utilising or wearing out the bulk of the areas you want to improve.
3	Oppose - no confidence in the ESC due to the resolution of the South Coast Regional Sea Level Rise Policy and Framework and the proposed rate increase.
4	Support - provided it is spent on necessary infrastructure improvements and maintenance.
5	Support - understand process and proposal and acknowledges the audit committee involvement.
6	Oppose - already disadvantage here and Ccl making it hard to continue to live in the area. The rate rise is unfair that's going to push working people away and kill the local economy.
7	Oppose - increase doesn't cease in three years but 'goes on indefinitely at a compounding amount'. Queried ratepayers ability to pay increase. Ccl needs to manage affairs more efficiently.
8	Oppose - retain less councillors and use money to fund road infrastructure.
9	Oppose - short fall before the wish list - careful planning and LEP should have delivered improved rates. The process of rate rise is flawed - simple psychology to ask what someone wants without offering the ramifications of their decisions.
10	Oppose - self funded retirees, conscious of pressures on limited finances. Constant increasing costs are cause for concern. Ask to consider some form of concession for genuine low income earners in the review of the Rate and Debtors Hardship policy.
11	Oppose - no increase in pension rebate in last 30 years so Ccl should give some thought of the old age people in the Shire.
12	Oppose.
13	Oppose - petitions, local meetings and survey indicate the variation is not justified or wanted.
14	Oppose - there is no support for proposal - Ccl is already double dipping unit owners.
15	Support - not unreasonable as our rates are below other similar councils and we need funds spent on new facilities to attract tourists as tourism is our number one industry.
16	Oppose - not enough rates spent on promoting Tuross Head.
17	Oppose - will force them to put holiday home on the market and vacate shire.
18	Oppose.
19	Oppose - Moruya expected to pay for infrastructure improvements in the Bay. There is no transport infrastructure to South Head or no bus service. No services will be cut in Moruya as Ccl currently doesn't provide any. Permanent disability pensioner. No increase to rebate for years. Ccl should reduce staff numbers to meet financial criteria and stick to a budget. If rate increase happens expects pensioner discounts to increase by same amount. Ccl is totally out of touch with the community and its true needs.
20	Oppose - pensioners unable to increase their income therefore would have to go without some other form of expenditure to cover rate increase. There should be a lower increase applied to pensioners.
21	Oppose.
22	Oppose - proposal is excessive and unacceptable.
23	Oppose - increase is outrageous. Take proposal to next election for ratepayers to have a say.

#	Summary
24	Oppose - increase seems extraordinary at 4 times the inflation rate and bad timing with Federal Government belt tightening measures. Found that rates have increased 22% in last 5 years and ESC is ranked 71st of 152 NSW ccls. Wanted confirmation of type of SRV ccl is applying for, s508A or s508(2). Response was provided.
25	Oppose - made presentation to ratepayers and Ccl in 2010 - increasing rates without justification in terms of a cost benefit analysis and not demonstrating a significant examination of reducing the cost structure of Ccl activities. Requested an appointment with the General Manager.
26	Requested a copy of the rates and debtors hardship policy and what is the pensioner rebate.
27	Oppose - the proposed increase is an insult.
28	Oppose - the SRV is not justified and Ccl should consider efficiency and divestment measures to live within its means.
29	Oppose - dissatisfaction with current level of service and questioned what will change by charging everyone more money for rates.
30	Oppose - rates already excessive for the amount of service delivered; if managed successfully now it would not need to ask for additional rates; the looming world wide financial crunch should be sending conversation messages to Ccl; overlap of services with the States; back-to-basic motto for Ccl Roads and Rubbish first and foremost and scale down community expectations.
31	Oppose - plus drainage issue that was referred to responsible officer to respond.
32	Oppose - Ccl is not being responsible or listening to the community. Ccl needs to review own infrastructure and running costs, past and outdated community strategic plans, community facilities, playgrounds, pathways and public toilets if they are really needed, social and economic benefits and staffing and wage levels. Ccl doesn't understand and know how many ratepayers will experience hardship. The rate rise is ludicrous that is not sustainable by ratepayers, especially pensioners.
33	Oppose - current expenditure on transport (16.4%) seems to be extremely excessive compared to real council service of sewer 17.7% and waste management 12.8%. Where is the expenditure for the region's largest resource - the beaches? Little attempt at identifying alternate strategies in the Long Term Financial Plan. Live within means. Do not push rates up as the majority of ratepayers are on fixed incomes and will not be able to afford it.
34	Oppose (return letter).
35	Further information was requested and provided to be better informed for the public meetings.
36	Oppose - the proposal is appalling. Identified a number of issues they have with Ccl such as toilet stench at Surfside; beach covered in debris; traffic jams; insufficient parking; need better street lighting; etc.
37	Oppose (return letter).
38	Oppose - increase ludicrous when inflation and average wage increases are less than 3%. Income could come from illegal campers on Corrigans Beach, Caseys Beach and Observation Point.
39	Oppose - self funding pensioner. Unable to find any extra to pay for rates.
40	Oppose - endorse the comments made by the President of the Rosedale Association in previous submission plus sent photos of the condition of Rose Court.

#	Summary
41	Oppose - from the financially challenged sector of the community. Struggle to pay rates, petrol and food and services needed. Issues raised include the opening hours of toilets, heating of public halls, towns filling up with huge franchises. We are already penalised in many ways for living in area.
42	Requested clarification on the 8% - does it include the rate peg amount?
43	Oppose - pensioners with a family holiday home in Narooma that is becoming more of a liability than an asset. Rates are cheaper for their Victorian home than their holiday unit. Narooma going backwards receiving due to poor service from Ccl.
44	Oppose - pensioner already struggling to pay the rates. Currently have to rent out her unit as unable to live in it due to neighbourhood issues.
45	Oppose - introduce the Modern Award for all employees in line with real workers. Ratepayers should be given a 6% discount on their rates as the carbon tax was removed. Start reducing staff levels and learn how to manage grants received to avoid amalgamation.
46	Requested a copy of brochure to be sent to mailing address.
47	Oppose - retired ratepayer. People generally always want more but the responsible task is to ascertain the difference between wanting and needing. Increasing the rates by almost 4 times the CPI is not reasonable, not responsible nor sustainable. Want to see evidence of the majority of ratepayers to vote for such an increase.
48	Oppose.
49	Oppose - disappointed with timing of exhibition.
50	Oppose.
51	Oppose.
52	Oppose.
53	Oppose.
54	Oppose - objection to Ccl assuming the majority of ratepayers have no objection to proposed rate variations. A more transparent reason for the variation (possible amalgamation) is required.
55	Oppose.
56	Oppose - current rates are extremely high and an enquiry into management of finances at Ccl is required. Community has a high percent of elderly people and an increase would place considerable hardship on them. Amalgamation is in the best interest of ratepayers.
57	Oppose.
58	Oppose.
59	Oppose.
60	Oppose - proposal is totally inappropriate. Ccl are becoming more prescriptive towards and non responsive to the needs and views of ratepayers.
61	Oppose - not a long term solution and lacks foresight. Possible solution is to seek sponsorship of the various sportsgrounds, playgrounds and tother infrastructure to assist with the shortfall. Another solution is to investigate if some assets owned would be better placed to be sold or outsourced. Concerned of the need to repair the rock wall, i.e. if for safety reason it should be done before the schedule date to avoid being sued.
62	Oppose.
63	Oppose.
64	Oppose.
65	Oppose.
66	Oppose.
67	Oppose.

#	Summary
68	Oppose.
69	Oppose.
70	Oppose - immoral of Ccl to seek such a high rate variation. What improvements can be expected? There appears to be very little that would constitute genuine benefits for the majority of ratepayers in Long Beach area.
71	Oppose - wish they could vote themselves an 8% rise every year for 3 years.
72	Requested a copy of DP and LTFP as unable to download from web.
73	Oppose - concerned about the 'financially responsible' rate rise that represents 3 times the current inflation rate and finds it unfair and extortionate. Acknowledges the reassessment by the valuer general that will have an impact.
74	Oppose.
75	Oppose - detrimental impact on the many elderly people and young families living in Tuross Heads.
76	Oppose.
77	Oppose.
78	Oppose.
79	Oppose.
80	Oppose.
81	Oppose - will be paying more than double the Ccl rates on four properties without being able to recoup such rise from rental income as tenants are battlers.
82	Oppose.
83	Oppose.
84	Oppose.
85	Oppose.
86	Oppose.
87	Oppose.
88	Oppose.
89	Oppose.
90	Oppose.
91	Oppose.
92	Oppose.
93	Oppose.
94	Oppose.
95	Oppose - wasted money on postage of another letter to ratepayers separate from rates notice. Rates are already far too high (\$200 per quarter more than their Glenhaven property in the Hills Shire Council). Council needs to look at the money it spends and cut costs rather than ask more from ratepayers.
96	Oppose.
97	Oppose - disappointed and total disagreement with the proposal. Ccl should follow the successful example set by the Federal Government in addressing financial difficulty by reducing costs through reducing non critical projects and reducing staff numbers.
98	Oppose.
99	Oppose.
100	Oppose.
101	Oppose.
102	Oppose.
103	Oppose.
104	Oppose.
105	Oppose.

#	Summary
106	Oppose - Ccl should work within budget and unable to see value of many of the proposed projects. Perhaps tourists should contribute to the maintenance. Ccl has totally ignored the wishes of the majority of residents - an example of not being financially responsible by wasting money employing consultants and dismissing their findings.
107	Oppose - proposal grossly excessive and will impose severe financial hardship upon ratepayers. Ccl should concentrate on improving its financial management. Ccl has wasted ratepayers funds with excessive administration expenditure on unnecessary and unwanted projects (e.g. letter to all ratepayers separate from rates notices and before annual accounts published, using consultants for survey and the proposed Long Beach toilet construction). SLR has sustainably affected the value of property.
108	Oppose.
109	Oppose.
110	Oppose.
111	Oppose.
112	Oppose.
113	Oppose.
114	Oppose - the proposal fails to consider the capacity of ratepayers to pay such a large increase. There is no information regarding the trend of grants received, growth of the population and no evidence provided on the work Ccl has done to bring community expectations back to more realistic level.
115	Oppose.
116	Oppose.
117	Oppose.
118	Oppose.
119	Oppose.
120	Oppose.
121	Oppose.
122	Oppose - business management has always been about the containment of costs while maintaining services.
123	Oppose.
124	Oppose.
125	Oppose.
126	Oppose.
127	Oppose.
128	Oppose - provide the basics before asking for more money from already cash strapped residents.
129	Oppose - not in support of the compounding effect.
130	Oppose.
131	Oppose.
132	Oppose.
133	Oppose.
134	Oppose.
135	Oppose.
136	Oppose.
137	Oppose.
138	Oppose - without strong community agreement.
139	Oppose.
140	Oppose.

#	Summary
141	Oppose.
142	Oppose.
143	Oppose.
144	Oppose.
145	Oppose.
146	Oppose.
147	Oppose.
148	Oppose.
149	Support - understand the position of council.
150	Oppose - pay heaps already.
151	Oppose.
152	Oppose.
153	Oppose.
154	Oppose.
155	Oppose - to hold a survey and ignore the results is appalling.
156	Oppose.
157	Oppose.
158	Oppose.
159	Oppose - can I wash dishes for the council? Because there is no way I can afford an increase of this magnitude.
160	Oppose - against any rate rise apart from the normal State Government CPI increase.
161	Oppose.
162	Oppose.
163	Oppose.
164	Oppose.
165	Oppose.
166	Oppose.
167	Oppose - rates already higher than comparable properties in other areas. Ccl should live with rates capped at inflation. Since 1998, services have been lost despite significant growth from subdivisions. Already being over-charged due to the 'minimum value' concept.
168	Oppose.
169	Oppose.
170	Oppose.
171	Oppose.
172	Oppose.
173	Oppose.
174	Oppose.
175	Oppose.
176	Oppose.
177	Oppose.
178	Oppose - Ccl needs to cut costs. No reason why anyone would want to pay more than they do at the moment.
179	Oppose.
180	Oppose - just can't afford it. Understand the cost shift from government but if Ccl can't afford to do it, they shouldn't do it. Pushing more people to seek assistance from charities. Ccl needs to look at the expenses for the core work and the way they to do business. If service is to be offered it should be cost recovery. The proposal has little or no support from the community.

#	Summary
181	Oppose.
182	Oppose.
183	Oppose.
184	Oppose.
185	Oppose - do not approve any increase when Ccl workers take Ccl vehicles on camping trips.
186	Oppose.
187	Oppose.
188	Oppose.
189	Oppose - how is raising the rates four times the amount they were raised last year financially responsible?
190	Oppose - making land ownership more expensive will have a negative effect on the future viability of the housing market, affordability and population.
191	Oppose - the increased general combined with all other charges, water, sewerage etc. will be difficult for many ordinary ratepayer to manage.
192	Oppose (return letter).
193	Oppose - if Ccl cannot not manage its commitments then it should look at its own costs.
194	Oppose - we have a budget to pay bills and maintain property and Ccl needs to do the same. It's time Ccl not only listened but acted on the wishes of the ratepayers who pay their salary.
195	Oppose.
196	Oppose - without further consultation.
197	Oppose.
198	Oppose.
199	Oppose.
200	Oppose - ratepayers should be listened to and their views considered. The community remain in the majority on the issue saying NO to the proposal. The compounding impact will have a lifetime impact. Pensioners can not absorb such increases without hardship and economic burden.
201	Oppose.
202	Oppose - unviable for aged pensioners, self funded retirees and young families. Felt disenfranchised after told they were ineligible to participate in survey due to age group they belonged to. Ccl needs to live within means and schedule its works program in accordance with the funds available. Ccl already delivered a blow to the assets of many ratepayers with its extreme climate change policy which has reduced the value of ratepayer's homes.
203	Oppose - rates already abnormally high.
204	Oppose - most of the money proposed is to be spent in the Moruya area which would have no benefit to us. We are asked to foot the bill for kerb and guttering which we have no choice about. Unable to rent property from April till November. Need much better justification before agreeing to proposal as we have no street lights, foot paths or public toilets in our area, no contribution from Council for carers for wife however approve McMansions to be built regardless of opposition.
205	Oppose - unable to afford rates now, totally out of budget.
206	Oppose.
207	Oppose.
208	Oppose.

#	Summary
209	FYI - Oppose - CC letter sent to IPART. The proposal doesn't cease at the end of three years but remains in rate base indefinitely. The Shire has a low socio-economic base compared to other councils, average weekly earnings and disposal incomes below average. The Shire has been promoted as a place to retire and therefore limited employment opportunities. The cost of living in the Shire is relative high and Ccl has increased fees more than CPI on recent years. There are opportunities for Ccl to make real savings and better managed.
210	Conditional support - would support if Potato Point received reticulated sewer system.
211	Oppose - with a budgeting deficit of \$800,000 then result in a \$3.5m surplus, why still insist we need a 26% increase? Land rates are already exorbitantly high. The increase is going to force pensioners out of the Shire.
212	Oppose.
213	Oppose.
214	Oppose - we save to save and go without to plan for the future and put needs in priority.
215	Oppose - pensioners and families unable to make ends meet.
216	Support - Understand the need for more rates however they are pensioners. The increase will be higher than that of a standard one and for the pensioners there will be no catch up in the pension to help them stay in their homes unless the ESC applies for the aberration to be considered by the Federal Government through the Department of Families, Housing and Community Services and Indigenous Affairs
217	Oppose.
218	Oppose - Ccl fails to establish standards for the provision of infrastructure and services; continually fails to meet community expectations and misuses the rates it currently collects with much wastage and use of funds against the advice and wishes of the community; lack of tangible, valuable and meaningful benefits to ratepayer of the proposed projects; many residents who are financially incapable of affording the increase; efficiencies need to be found within Ccl and concerned that only 50% of the proposed SRV will be allocated to clearing the infrastructure backlog.
219	Oppose - not taken into consideration the number of ratepayers who are retirees and will face hardship to meet increase or the number of absentee ratepayers/holiday rental properties who put a drain on Ccl's infrastructure during peak times. The amount proposed is too high and rates from rental properties and absentee owners could help off-set the funding shortfall. Many ratepayers will experience hardship and Ccl members should remember their obligations to residents ratepayers and their elected responsibilities.
220	Oppose - Ccl does not offer value for money to self or community.
221	Oppose - detrimental to low income and aged residents and will force rents up. There is need for more efficient and more professional management of Ccl services.
222	Oppose.
223	2898.15 duplicate
224	Oppose.
225	Oppose - no one supports the proposal, can only hope the State Government don't approve it.

#	Summary
226	Oppose - cc letter sent to Andrew Constance. Original email sent to Lindsay Brown who replied. Pays residential rates on land that's been frozen by the Government. Ccl should cut back on spending and govern within its means as the economy is still on the decline. Ccl does nothing except charge >\$100 for septic tank inspections. No one supports the large increase and are not happy with the Councillors. This rate rise would be disastrous for many living in Narooma.
227	Oppose - all have to live within means including government. Any additional rates will have a heavy impact on household budgets.
228	Oppose.
229	Oppose.
230	Oppose - disability pensioner who finds the proposal frightening. No costings provided on brochure and conflicting information about available funds. Ccl needs to look at internal structure and introducing pay parking in all towns not just the Bay.
231	Oppose.
232	Oppose - appalled by the inconsistencies regarding financial information.
233	Oppose.
234	Oppose - unnecessary and represents a money grab brought about inefficiency and misuse of resources.
235	Oppose.
236	Oppose - already struggling to pay rates. Water rates are one of the highest in the State. Significant drain on the ratepayers. Businesses are already struggling, there is no development of any significance planned in area therefore no employment. Meanwhile surrounding Shires are going ahead in leaps and bounds. If Ccl encouraged development and building they would receive more funds through developer contributions.
237	Oppose - the proposed projects listed should have costings to demonstrate why the enormous increase is needed. Ccl was negligent not advertising the public meetings in the pamphlets - was done to minimise public scrutiny. The 19 December letter was unsigned therefore how can ratepayers believe the contents?
238	Oppose - the neglect of Coila Lake is an absolute disgrace.
239	Oppose - aged pensioners. Thought the new blood would represent the thoughts and wishes of the people of the Shire. Councillors need to think about the people who put you there not just yourselves. (2nd letter original 147.15)
240	Oppose - business and growth are in stagnation. If we pass the costs on we become uncompetitive and when we absorb the costs our standard of living decreases. Had to reduce shop rent to more than half what it was 12 years ago. Ccl should tighten its belt and rid itself of non essential services - e.g. day care, holiday care, town beautification, visitors centres that run at a \$600,000 loss.
241	Oppose - the additional infrastructure is a 'wish list' and would add considerably over time to the Ccl's infrastructure maintenance costs, and thereby continuing to require additional rates. Largest employer in shire intending to maintain abnormally high staffing levels. ESC has not managed its income to best practice. Staffing is top heavy. Could the \$50 million invested help alleviate some of the problems? Wasted money on many items (e.g. GM payout, alternative by-pass road, excessive legal expenses for legal opinions and unwinnable litigation). Rates risen every year, since 2008 overall rates increased by approx. 21% and water usage charge 79%. Retirees unable to afford continuing increases of 8% annually. Ccl should manage budget within current CPI.

#	Summary
242	Oppose - the economic climate and financial position of the majority of ratepayers do not allow them to contribute an extra 26% without considerable hardship. Ccl's \$3.5m 2013-14 surplus shows Ccl is capable of operating at the present level of funding, there are staffing cuts and efficiencies to be made, 66% oppose rise, must operate within their means and Ccl must prioritise services to fit budget and Ccl would generate more funds if it stopped adopting extreme policies (SLR & LEP).
243	Oppose.
244	Oppose.
245	Oppose - has there been an independent audit carried to support the current budget position or an efficiency study undertaken to confirm the current arrangements for delivering the works? Ccl should look at amalgamation.
246	Oppose - money could have been saved throughout the LEP. Have no choice than to accept increase however this will take place at the same time as Ccl withdraw all the staff engaged with the undermining activities to improve the financial situation of Ccl.
247	Oppose - not what the people want. The level of service provided leaves a lot to be desired - be appreciated if jobs were done correctly the first time instead of needing to be redone at greater expense.
248	Oppose - Ccl is going against the wishes of the majority of ratepayers/residents and the 26% will be unaffordable for most.
249	Oppose - Ccl has not adequately investigated cost savings, in particular amalgamations and joint organisations.
250	Oppose.
251	Oppose - retirees who want to stay in own house however rate rise may force them to sell in a decrease market due to Ccl policy.
252	Oppose.
253	Oppose.
254	Oppose - expect Ccl to live within means as everyone else does. The consultations were restricted and the silent majority have yet to be questioned.
255	Oppose - perplexed to the amount of increase seeing that rates in the Tuross area are already high compared to other districts. If the increase was going to fund necessary works within the Tuross area itself, potential to justify the additional expense. Some people are concerned that they may not be able to manage the additional cost and are considering selling and moving elsewhere. In these tough times of economic tightening, a 26% increase is seriously going to impact the community, particularly the retired members. Some more serious economic management within the Ccl should be adopted.
256	Oppose - council is not in desperate need for money since posting a surplus last year. Council is squandering money everywhere and putting stairs and new playground which are not needed or called for. There was a gross wastage of concrete and labour in the concrete jungle council has created at the roundabout in Narooma. Council seems to have money for advertising rate rise but does not advise non-residents about significant proposals such as gun sales in a public building nor did they listen to the local community. Council needs to budget and spend according to its current income.
257	Oppose - author of the Tuross Giant and attached the special SRV edition of the Tuross Giant publication that contains number of questions and statements.

#	Summary
258	Oppose - the 'silent majority' should not automatically be considered in favour of the SRV as most people consider a submission is futile because Ccl will go ahead with it regardless of ratepayer's opinions. The imposition of the SRV on Tuross ratepayers will not benefit our local area to a great degree, emphasis must be placed on improving productivity of the Ccl workforce due to a large portion of expenditure relating to employee costs, and not confident that paying additional rates will solve all the problems.
259	Oppose - Such an increase indicates that Ccl has been mismanaging funds for a long period. Overstaffing is the principal reason that Ccl has to keep asking for increases over the CPI. Residents would find paying existing rates difficult and it is grossly unfair for Ccl to expect pensioners and self-funded retirees to suffer even further hardship. Batemans Bay residents under-represented on Ccl - would provide the majority of the rates however only have two votes in Ccl resulting in Batemans Bay ratepayers funnelled to the benefit of other areas such as Tuross. Suspect most of the problems comes from the negative and obstructionist approach Ccl has taken to developers over the years. Amalgamation with Shoalhaven is a good fit.
260	Oppose - personally distributed the anti SRV petition in the Moruya CBD and attended community information public meetings. Hard to envisage a more rejected proposal. Ccl resorted to extremely misleading and deceptive conduct to fudge less damning numbers. Early media releases and survey mislead the community of the cumulative total of rate rise. Lodged a formal code of conduct.
261	Oppose - 26% over 3 years is a substantial real increase in rates that will inevitably be lock in. The savings identified have not been quantified nor compared in dollar or percentage terms. Need to analyse user chargers with regard to service costs and policy objectives to identify funding increases. Possible support of a lower level rise, i.e. 8% over rate peg instead of the 16%.
262	Oppose - Ccl has failed to outline the new infrastructure projects which the rates will fund. Rates are very high and the parks, roads and pathways are of a very satisfactory standard as they are. Ccl has not been living within their means and wanting to shift responsibility to the ratepayers.
263	Oppose - everyone is against the SRV. Run Ccl more efficiently.
264	Oppose - local businesses stand to be double hit as they own both residential and business premises. Money is tight with many businesses trading on the edge. See no economic benefit to Tuross Head businesses.
265	Oppose - Ccl should live within its own means, apply for support from Federal and State government. Already pay high rates for very little.
266	Oppose - proposal appears unjustifiable in terms of the demography of Eurobodalla (e.g. employment, occupations, household types, weekly gross incomes, housing tenure). Questions to magnitude of rates increase is warranted for the nature of the proposed works. Alternate revenues streams has not been adequately analysed.
267	Oppose - ratepayers already pay fair share with rates increasing 100% in last nine years, the 2013-17 DP doesn't include critical infrastructure and places too much emphasis on tourist and is not evenly distributed throughout the Shire.
268	Oppose.
269	Oppose - ESC do not represent ratepayers, nor do ratepayers get value for money for what the already pay.