

#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
1	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Strongly supportive		Strongly supportive		Strongly supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
2	Ballina	Supportive	As long as the proposed rate levies aren't increased other than what is stated	Supportive		Supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
3	Ballina	Not very supportive	Water quality in the Richmond River is largely influenced by rural runoff and other rural land management issues. Council programs will not contribute significantly to improving water quality. Council should be contributing by providing a strong voice for the community when lobbying the appropriate state and federal elected representatives and responsible departments.	Not at all supportive	Every council/utility/infrastructure manager in Australia is facing funding concerns. Many are meeting this challenge and reducing their charges (water, electricity for example) by finding new and innovative ways of delivering their services. I would urge Ballina Council to seriously consider what benefits could be achieved through amalgamation/s and looking at how the private sector could contribute.	Not very supportive	In a period of low CPI and almost negative wages growth a proposal to increase rates by almost 17% over three years is unacceptable.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
4	Alstonville	Not at all supportive	The project is good but should not be funded from a rate increase, other funds are available. Develop and sell commercial assets is a better source. Holding commercial assets for the benefit of future generations is not necessary as they will have the benefit of the municipal assets being acquired.	Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive	Don't do it, it's wrong, there is too much reliance on property tax. Council rates are already the second highest item of household expenditure ( after house payments ) and many residents simply can't afford any more. Better to fund from sale of non core, non municipal assets ( commercial property ). To hold commercial assets for the benefit of future generations is a fraud on current rate payers.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Multiple categories of properties (eg residential and business)	It's good but you must respect any majority position, otherwise it's a farce.
5	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not very supportive		Not very supportive		Not all all supportive	Stop wasting money and empire building	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
6	Other (eg. rural)	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Strongly supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
7	Ballina	Not at all supportive	Many of the Ballina Islanders are on fixed incomes and struggling to keep up. I am delinquent on my rates by \$100 and doing everything in my power to catch up. I cannot afford one more additional cent to be charged to me.	Not at all supportive	As above. I cannot take blood from a stone. I cannot afford it.	Not all all supportive	Take money from the new cars... whatever you spend it on that is not necessary... and put it into the environment. Don't hit me in my non-existent pocket.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Please consider your lower-income constituency. Stop extravagances, fix what is broken rather than replacing with more expensive things... and stop taking money that I/we just don't have.
8	Ballina	Not very supportive	It's all very well to propose this program but in case you hadn't noticed Ballina is at the end (mouth) of the Richmond river. As such unless the other councils which are also situated along the Richmond and its tributaries upstream from Ballina (Kyogle, Lismore and Richmond Valley) get on board then all that "bad unhealthy water" is still going to come down the river.	Not at all supportive	Fund the asset renewal by selling existing assets such as real estate. DO NOT EXPECT THE RATEPAYERS TO FUND YOUR INEFFICIENCIES.	Not all all supportive	17.6% That's what my rates are going to increase between now and 2020. The annual CPI increases and my salary wont even go close to that. I think that you have a hide to ask for more money from the ratepayers.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Simple don't apply for a rate rise above the rate peg limit then we wouldn't require a consultation process or have thousands spent on marketing/selling the proposals.
9	Ballina	Not at all supportive	Shawn Bay should be a priority to make it deeper and more user friendly due to the ongoing shark problem with our beaches	Not at all supportive	We are already paying some of the highest rates in the shire.	Not very supportive	Rate payers can't afford additional risers in their rates.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
10	Ballina	Supportive		Supportive		Supportive		No (Resident)		
11	Ballina	Not very supportive		Not very supportive		Supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	

#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
12	Alstonville	Not very supportive		Not at all supportive	I wish to register my opposition to rates rises/levies. In Alstonville we are already paying extra rates for swimming pools that we, the elderly, never use. Now we're being asked to pay more for roads which many of us don't use either. Where does it stop? Levies for this, levies for that. We're already paying in excess of \$2000 per annum for modest services which ignore maintaining some of our gutters and unkempt nature strips, leaving it to the residents to clean up.	Not very supportive	I wish to register my opposition to rates rises/levies. In Alstonville we are already paying extra rates for swimming pools that we, the elderly, never use. Now we're being asked to pay more for roads which many of us don't use either. Where does it stop? Levies for this, levies for that. We're already paying in excess of \$2000 per annum for modest services which ignore maintaining some of our gutters and unkempt nature strips, leaving it to the residents to clean up.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	I wish to register my opposition to rates rises/levies. In Alstonville we are already paying extra rates for swimming pools that we, the elderly, never use. Now we're being asked to pay more for roads which many of us don't use either. Where does it stop? Levies for this, levies for that. We're already paying in excess of \$2000 per annum for modest services which ignore maintaining some of our gutters and unkempt nature strips, leaving it to the residents to clean up.
13	Ballina	Strongly supportive	Prospect lakes	Strongly supportive	Build tourist amenities on Lighthouse Hill Picnic & BBQ facilities Tidy up the Kerry Saxby walkway eg clean up the pandanus leaves ( remove every second branch like the Sunshine Coast Council does.	Strongly supportive		No (Resident)		
14	Wollongbar	Not at all supportive	Find out what is causing the problems and stop at the source	Not at all supportive	The council got a rate increase to cover cost of pool repair. This was way back last year. Having collected the money from the rate payers we are told although we were led to believe the problems were urgent but the work has not been started. We seem to forget that any rate increase is going to compound over the years.	Not all all supportive	It would be great if all the old age pensioners could get the same sort of increase to cover what council is trying to get. It would be interesting to learn what the number of pensioners there are in the shire and what effect the proposed increases would have on them	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
15	Other (eg. rural)	Strongly supportive		Strongly supportive		Strongly supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Multiple categories of properties (eg residential and business)	
16	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Somewhat supportive	I am not supportive of any rate increase if it means the closure of the eastern access road at Lake Ainsworth. Ballina Council seems more content in listening to a very noisy 'minority' and this is a typical example. I do not support 'any' rate increase if part of the council's plans include the closure of this road!!!!	Supportive	The cycle way from Ballina to Lennox - along the coast has been an issue for a number of years - promises! Ballina council is one of the least proactive council I've seen - get the job done as the 'majority' of the community want done and stop listening to the noisy minority!	Supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Proposed improvement of th Ballina Pool is a great idea - if a rate increase would give Ballina a 'showpiece' for future generations then great. I am concerned that the project has already been toned down to an 8 lane - not full 10 lane Olympic pool. This council wants our money but has very little insight as to the wishes of the community - will this serves really have any bearing on decision making? Or is it used just to make it look like the Council is interested in community consultation!!!
17	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Strongly supportive		Strongly supportive		Strongly supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	

#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
18	Alstonville	Not at all supportive	Waterways are not Council's responsibility. Many ratepayers do not live anywhere near the waterways and rarely use the waterways yet we are expected to pay. NO!	Not at all supportive	IPART sets limits for a reason. You make a mockery of it by constantly asking for more. Ballina is already one of highest charging councils around. Ratepayers can't afford these constant increases	Not all all supportive	I would be more supportive if we got more for our money. For example, we wanted to dump a fridge about 3 years ago. We were quoted a (high) degassing cost plus an amount per kilo. Lismore had a flat fee of \$40 at that time. Most councils offer at least one kerbside cleanup per year or, alternately, one or two free tip days. We get none! Many councils offer free dumping of bulk green waste. Not only do we have to pay to take it to the top, we then have to pay to buy the mulch created from it. There is not a single complimentary item the council provides. You imposed a permanent increase to cover pool renovations, despite the majority of ratepayers not using the pools. If I read the result correctly, you did this even though the majority of ratepayers were not in favour of that increase. In light of that, why should I have any confidence that you will take any notice of ratepayers this time. I think you're only going through the motions of consultation and will impose this increase anyway. In that case you could have saved the cost of the letters and postage and put that towards asset removal.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
19	Alstonville	Somewhat supportive	Closing the road at Lake Ainsworth will not do anything to healthy waterways for the lake. Please do not spend money on this closure.	Not very supportive		Not very supportive		No (Resident)		
20	Ballina	Not at all supportive		Not very supportive	It would be much better over a longer period of time if asset renewal was done more effectively in the first place so that they would be more enduring. EG if roads were built with better and more substantial structure so that replacement was in 15 years instead of 7 even if it cost more initially.	Not very supportive	Healthy waterways should be funded by state gov, not council. after all the Richmond for example runs through 3 or 4 council areas.	No (Resident)		
21	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive	I understand your job is to get more money for BSC projects, but you must understand how disappointed I am in the council's use of rates paid. The "obvious priority" of the people who ride bicycles was to have the bike path on the eastern side of the coast rode built first (as can be seen by the absence of users on the western side bike path). We are still waiting for the connection to Pat Morten lookout and you want to start new projects? Slippery streets in Ballina. The skatepark in Lennox was finally built and is now used daily by the kids. BSC seems to place "amenity" at the bottom of it's priority list but the people's welfare and enjoyment should be top of the list. Why does the BSC deny it's residents the use of the shire's biggest asset the coastline? FINISH THE COSTAL BIKEPATH before I die....PLEASE!...or at least before my children pass on. As you can tell I'm totally frustrated by your(BSC's) seeming lack of "common sense".	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	

#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
22	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive	Essential services take precedence over additional services. Ratepayers' budgets are stretched thinly now and limit spending to cope. Council should adopt a similar strategy.	Not at all supportive	I ask that Council works within the constraints of its allocated budget, attending to essentials before embarking upon extras. Developer contributions can fund asset renewal and associated works.	Not all all supportive	Ballina Council rates have quadrupled over the last ten to twelve years which causes a strain on the finances of average families. The developer and state government contributions are used in assisting council achieve it's budget. No survey of residents to date has been truly considered: pool improvements, plans for Lennox Community Centre or the siting of Lennox markets. The results of surveys completed re the aforementioned were not reflective of community input. I would hope the comments of ratepayers re this survey, are carefully considered before residents are asked to commit to extra rate rises which many cannot afford.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Residents concerns should be considered as we are the ratepayers and Councillors are our elected representatives.
23	Ballina	Not at all supportive		Not very supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
24	Alstonville	Not very supportive	If Council wants to collect this levy it needs to justify where the expenditure is required. Clearly it appears Council has no priorities of its own. At the very least Council should identify issues or problems at each site and ask the community to rank those. Talking about "Healthy Waterways" in very general terms is misleading and this question asks the community to rank areas without knowing what, if any, problems exist. Community response to these questions cannot be interpreted clearly. As presented, I cannot support this proposal. If I had more specifics I may be more supportive. At present I see this particular program as a means to increasing general revenue overall, not really guaranteeing water quality or catchment health improvement.	Not at all supportive	I am not at all supportive of this proposal as the funds will go to general revenue, an unspecified amount of which may be spent on asset renewal. Council should specify which assets it has prioritised for renewal and place the funds into a tied account. In general revenue they are more likely to be spent on recurrent expenditure items including servicing debt, trips, salaries, directors fees, administration etc. Council has provided no argument for an increase in general revenue expenditure but has estimated the cost of asset renewal. The expenditure of these funds on asset renewal is inferred but not assured and there is no transparency to the management of these extra funds. As such it is most likely they will disappear into the general operating costs of Council, being unaccountable and likely to require further increases in future.	Not all all supportive	Council's fund raising is in excess of inflation. With no real increase in wages likely over the next three years and the likelihood of no growth leading to recession, Council proposes to take a compounding share from the disposable funds available to a family. These funds will need to be highly accountable to ratepayers to justify the decision to fund Council activities ahead of family needs. Council has not provided the argument or the accountability to provide that assurance. Your argument appears to be give us the money and then give us your wish list then leave it all to us. Not good enough by far. Council needs a much stronger business case to justify the need for these rate increases to the community and IPART. Council is not under threat of amalgamation and has been judged a responsible manager in the past. Therefore this rate increase proposal appears to be little more than a try on.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	You need to justify that a family will get very good value for giving you the money; that it will be managed in a highly transparent and accountable manner and that ratepayers will have a say in the projects that are funded. The funds should be leveraged to attract additional monies and they should be held outside the general revenue accounts. Similarly they should be spent on capital expenditure/ asset replacement projects and not on recurrent expenditure items. There should be an annual review of projects funded under this scheme with an audit every three years. If this is not possible, Council needs to identify what other activities these monies will fund once in general revenue and admit this up front in its consultation process. They will need to get community endorsement for this unspecified operational expenditure. Thus far I regard the consultation information as misleading and deceptive.
25	Alstonville	Not very supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
26	Alstonville	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
27	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive	If you clean up the river and estuaries you clean up Shaw's Bay. The biggest problem with the Richmond is the amount of toxic poison sent into the river from farming. The poison put into the river by sugar cane farmers is the major, Fix that and you help to fix the river.	Not at all supportive	For not supporting this section is that council wastes too much rate payers funds. When council work is being carried out there might be 12 councils employees on the job but only 1 or 2 doing any work the rest are just standing around absolutely idol. It is time that council checked on what's being done and the wasted amount of time it takes.	Not all all supportive	The council should sell of property it owns, being a Government statute it should not be in the business of hoarding property which gets run down and then council has to spend millions to bring it back to its best.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	

#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
28	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		No (Resident)		This survey like last years concerning swimming pools is biased it asks what you might consider a priority, then do you support the rate increase. The survey is a waste of time as the council will do what it wants regardless of feedback. The raising of more revenue is a ploy to show the State Government that you have cash, propose how to spend it and avoid being amalgamated with another council which could be a good idea. Everything is a priority but it doesn't mean it can always be afforded. The council needs an independent review into cost savings before increasing the rates without due diligence. Most ratepayers would support that
29	Ballina	Not at all supportive	The people that gain the most are the people with financil gain from any council works and money spent. your company gain financil benifit YOU pay more, eg, all those on the chamber of commerce and farms with run off into our waterways.	Not at all supportive	you want to see what a town should look like, drive out to Goondiwindi and have a wake up call. Driving into Ballina you would never belive this is a coastal town.	Not all all supportive	we have to pay for poor performance,whether we like it or not.Tick the box, you have consulted.	No (Resident)		
30	Ballina	Strongly supportive		Not very supportive	A disporportionate amount of money is spent on improving roads and maintaining playgrounds which are never used. Assets such as trees (urban forest), bushland and rainforest remnants are more important.	Somewhat supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
31	Ballina	Strongly supportive	Health waterways is like investing in the future of the shire. People enjoy living by-visting - health / clean ecosystems Clean up the river and you will grow the shire.	Strongly supportive	Build it and they will come, Its hard to grow the shire without facilities which people use.	Strongly supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
32	Wollongbar	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive	I don't believe Ballina ratepayers should be paying to clean up a river that has been polluted before it even flows thru here. We pay enough in rates now, so if assets need renewing look to reviewing your budget running cost. The pegged increase is enough, no more.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
33	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Strongly supportive		Strongly supportive		Strongly supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
34	Wollongbar	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		No (Resident)		
35	Ballina	Not very supportive		Not very supportive		Not very supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
36	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive	Council needs to prove to ratepayers that they are operating as efficiently as possible as measured by productivity benchmarks from both government and private enterprise. Until this is clearly demonstrated why should we pay more tax that could just be supporting inefficiencies.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
37	Alstonville	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	The council needs to accept the base rate increase is in line with other councils and amend expenditure to meet income.
38	Ballina	Not at all supportive	I would like to know what can be done with the existing funding, including other savings from Council operations.	Not at all supportive	Asset renewal program needs to be determined before committing to additional rate increases. This should be completed from existing funding.	Not all all supportive	Why is the state government interfering with rates. These cost should be contained within Councils budget and operations.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	I'd like to see other options. The arrangement with Oz Fish sounds a little fishy to me.



#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
39	Ballina	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive	Perhaps, like any other enterprise, instead of continually seeking extra revenue by applying increases, look at where savings can be made. It would appear Council is somewhat extravagant when it comes to spending ratepayers funds ...was such a grand and costly Coastguard tower really needed or could they have got by in a much cheaper structure? And the shark net trial that was doomed from the start. Did anyone seek advice from those who actually know and understand the action of waves and the movement of sand at Main Beach ,other than know-it-all academics? But why should I worry ...I'm sure I can just do what Council does and put my hand out and I will get a big fat rise...yeah sure!	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
40	Other (eg. rural)	Strongly supportive		Supportive		Strongly supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Amalgamation would be disastrous. Please prevent us from being subsumed into Lismore's issues.
41	Ballina	Not very supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive	Asking for another increase in rates (in addition to the pool upgrade) is both rude and unfair. Extremely disappointed to receive this mail today!	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
42	Wollongbar	Supportive		Not at all supportive	Council could better fund its programs if there were to be a centralisation of some of the facilities. The proposed skate park at the intersection of Plateau Drive and Riffle Range Road seems to me to be a total useless waste of land, considering that it could have been incorporated into the redevelopment of the Wollongbar sporting fields area. Not to mention being safer for the young people using the skate park.	Not all all supportive		No (Resident)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
43	Wollongbar	Not very supportive		Not very supportive	Council need to ge giving something back eg collection pick up of unwatered goods. This will elevate the existing problem and costly dumping illegally	Not very supportive		No (Resident)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	How much is this consultation process costing . It is not that long ago that we answered a similar survey and the council of the day did not listen to the people then do why now. Another waste of precious funds
44	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Strongly supportive		Somewhat supportive		Somewhat supportive		No (Resident)		
45	Other (eg. rural)	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
46	Alstonville	Supportive	I believe priority should be given to the water ways we people are most likely to swim.	Supportive		Supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
47	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Strongly supportive	Excellent initiative that is needed urgently	Strongly supportive	Happy to support as don't agree with the limitations of rate pegging	Strongly supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Good to have a number of ways to have input
48	Ballina	Somewhat supportive	I sigh at time of writing....., understand it costs money to enjoy amenities in our beautiful shire. It's just that I don't get rises of that % On my fixed income. Hence I am torn, supply and demand. My vote is yes. BUT..... I REALLY would like the ocean pool. At Shelleys Beach....NOT MONEY SPENT dredging Shaws Bay, that's fine for kayaks, paddle boards etc. Ocean pool is for wonderful, fresh, clean, Visual, healthy laps for us older swimmers and retired surfers who are in love with the ocean Still. Please build one.	Somewhat supportive	You're doing a great job in all these areas. I do prefer to stay independent BSC ,but do you think it's only a stop gap? Can't you see it happening into the future? Can't keep raising rates keeping one step in front, or will it only be for the elite.	Somewhat supportive	River is an asset, hence stormwater , tidal flows, run of, etc must all be considered. Population brings pollutants.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Feel as if printing costs could be less, we needed only 1 or other. Either letter OR coloured pamphlet . I read letter. Glanced at pretty coloured graphs.....unnecessary wastage.

#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
49	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		No (Resident)		The rates we pay are already exorbitant compared to some of the richest areas in Sydney, to expect the low socio economic population or in fact anyone to dig deeper for an extra rate increase above the pegged rise I think is atrocious.
50	Ballina	Strongly supportive		Not at all supportive	Ballina needs more in number and diversity of trees and shrubs planted	Not all all supportive	GET YOUR SHIT TOGETHER! We had an SRV 20 years (?) ago and council continues to cater to developers and future residents over current ratepayers by refusing either due to incompetence or corruption to charge developers the appropriate fees AND council refuses to save money in funds to account for depreciation	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
51	Ballina	Strongly supportive		Supportive		Supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
52	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive	It would be great to be able to give extra funding via ratepayer increases, however, I doubt many ratepayers have the financial capacity to pay the extra levy on top of the standard rate peg which is already in today's financial situation regarding pensioners and low income earning already over the top.	Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive	Where does council think people on limited incomes will get the money to pay the extra rates. Pension increases are not keeping pace with general costs of living, these extra rates place people even further behind. I think the standard rate peg is more than reasonable. Maybe council should look at itself and consider how to minimise costs and not waste money ie, duplication of pathways at Skennars Head.	No (Resident)		
53	Alstonville	Strongly supportive		Strongly supportive		Strongly supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
54	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive	My wages do not go up. I can't afford to pay extra in rates. Manage the money more effectively.	Not at all supportive	I can't afford it.	Not all all supportive	Save the money. Council employees earn more money than I do.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Please listen we cant afford to pay more.
55	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Supportive		Supportive		Supportive		No (Resident)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
56	Ballina	Not at all supportive	This proposal is a total waste of ratepayer funds.	Not at all supportive	The councils priority should be to manage its business affairs within its income not looking to burden only ratepayers unfairly.	Not all all supportive	NO SPECIAL RATE VARIATION.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	I understand the proposal. The consultation process is a total sham and will have no effect in curbing councils irrational spending.
57	Ballina	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive	Work should be done by cost cutting, such as less Mayoral meetings/lunches at Ballina Lighthouse Beach Cafe.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Of course, if Council is unwilling to listen to the voice of the majority of ratepayers, then remove them for their incompetence & arrogance. When a similar survey of ratepayers was conducted into raising rates for work on Ballina and Alstonville pools, the overwhelming majority of respondents voted against that proposal, but Council ignored that and went ahead. Council scaremongering about possible forced amalgamations is just that!! The Baird Government has seen the consequences in the Orange By-election. Let's have one good administrator to replace the Councillors!!
58	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive	while understanding the need to improve waterways and services and the ongoing associated costs, myself as a ratepayer struggle with the ever increasing cost of council rates and therefore cannot afford the proposed increases over the next 3 years	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	

#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
59	Ballina	Somewhat supportive	The Richmond River is a system and the water quality issues cannot be addressed by adopting a piecemeal approach. The UNE report shows clearly that the main areas of concern are at the top of the catchment - generally outside of the Ballina Council area. Unless a whole of catchment approach is adopted, what is proposed will not address the real issues.	Not very supportive	Council needs to provide more information on what it is doing to cut its costs. The information provided creates the impression that this is a typical 'tax and spend' philosophy followed by all levels of government. In the real world we have to cut our cloth to fit. I wouldn't regard waiving the Waste Operations Charge as a serious commitment by Council to reduce costs and to be mean and lean. Council needs to demonstrate to us that it is also doing its bit by telling us what efficiencies it has identified to minimise the increase to ratepayers.	Not all all supportive	The mayor's letter states that Council seeking a 'permanent' increase in our general rate income' and then goes on to outline what is proposed for the next 3 financial years. So what is it?	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Call me cynical but I have very little confidence in the process. Council followed the same process with the swimming pool redevelopment project and despite the overwhelming lack of support from ratepayers through such a process Council went ahead anyway. Tax and spend. While I am on that, the Mayor seems reluctant to give us information on the costs. If I want to find out more I need to call Council. Why can't Council tell us? As outlined above I don't think that Council has done enough to explain what it is doing to decrease overall costs and minimise the rate increase.
60	Alstonville	Strongly supportive		Strongly supportive		Strongly supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
61	Ballina	Strongly supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
62	Wollongbar	Strongly supportive	I am strongly supportive if the money is indeed spent on the improvement of the river system, not just to make some cosmetic gestures to appease the public. Fix the black water run off problem, even if this means the farmers have to pay. Dredging is essential to maintain a healthy flow through the system.	Somewhat supportive	If it means better roads and less rubbish going into the sea, it will be supported.	Supportive	I would support this proposal if the money is exclusively used for the purpose nominated, not used on other jaunts.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	First, letter to ratepayers dated 6th Jan 2017 page 4 directs to online survey at ballina.gov.au/srvproposal - this in fact takes user to the shire newsletter with no access to online survey. At least get the right information out there so that ratepayers can contribute.
63	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Somewhat supportive		Somewhat supportive		Somewhat supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
64	Ballina	Not very supportive	It is all very vague. I would be supportive if there was a definite plan. Eg Clean up Shaws Bay. At the moment it all sounds airy fairy.	Not at all supportive	Again give me a definite plan.	Not very supportive	Many people in Ballina are on pensions and fixed incomes. The letter was very confusing and seems to be promising everything but no definite so.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	The letter you sent out was the most confusing thing I have ever read. A simple calculator on line eg rates 2015, rates this year and next would help to calculate the bottom line.
65	Ballina	Supportive	Value for money spent with results	Supportive		Supportive		No (Resident)		
66	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not very supportive		No (Resident)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
67	Ballina	Not at all supportive	Be more economical with your projects. For example, the Lennox Hd Community Centre was budgeted at \$4.5mil and came in around \$10mil. Outside consultants were employed who didn't understand the local conditions. Money flows out of our area when outside consultants and contractors are employed. A better handling of council finances will allow projects to be completed without additional rate levies.	Not at all supportive	See 5. above. Council should use local expertise and not fritter away rates paid to support outside businesses. Local people can be creative, cost effective, bring local knowledge to projects and add their own projects to the local economy if supported. Fiddling with crazy designs never worked and good designs need to come from local ingenuity first principles. Outside people don't care much for our area but are rather motivated by self interest.	Not all all supportive	Council officers should go on a pay freeze. Very few people within the local community earn the same amount of money as the Council officers. The average yearly income of people in the Ballina Shire from recent government figures is about \$38000, below the state average. Why should Council workers get \$150000 or more? Saving money on salaries would permit more of our rates to be used on so called special projects, which in truth are not special but rather ordinary works which should be part of Council's ordinary activities. Waterways should be fixed and footpaths should be created for all streets as a matter of course.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Council often use these types of surveys to justify their opinion and actions. I doubt public opinion in this survey will have any effect whatsoever on the outcome of the rate increases.
68	Other (eg. rural)	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Farmland	
69	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not very supportive	As alluded to in the information provided- this is primarily a state and federal funding issue. I see the local council's role as one of advocacy, not funding.	Somewhat supportive	I feel it is unfair to threaten local councils with amalgamation based on financial stability. If a council is unable to fulfill the needs of its community with average rates, then it needs more support, not less.	Not all all supportive	Perhaps just the Asset Renewal increase. One at time will have less financial impact.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Consultation is adequate.



#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
70	Wollongbar	Not at all supportive	I am already paying higher rates as I have a granny flat with my daughter living in it. Ballina Council are the only one out of 5 that I spoke to who charge extra rates for a granny flat if a family member lives there and you are not making an income from it. My daughter is studying and the extra rates have been a struggle so to add even more would be unfair. I don't understand why you cannot be more amicable like other Councils re granny flats.	Not at all supportive	Sadly the Council is going to do what they want, so my input is probably not going to make any difference.	Not very supportive		No (Resident)		
71	Alstonville	Not at all supportive		Not very supportive		Not very supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	The presentation of details and proposals appear to be consultative but have an underlying sense of inevitability so as a pensioner with no ability to increase my income each year by the now expected increase amounts this variation will be just another attack that eats away at my day to day disposable income.
72	Ballina	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
73	Ballina	Not very supportive		Not very supportive		Not very supportive	I think council should first look at their own expenditure e.g. how necessary is a colour high quality brochure included with the notice. There is no mention of overhaul current council business practices. I have done this several times in the business I have managed for 16 years and always find ways to cut costs. This has resulted in lower overhead costs despite of inflation and sales \$ value reductions while sales volume has increased.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
74	Ballina	Not at all supportive	Due to Council's mismanagement rate payers again suffer.	Not at all supportive	Due to Council's lack of planning, rate payers again suffer.	Not all all supportive	The easy option for Ballina Council is to increase rates, better financial management would resolve this issue.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
75	Ballina	Not at all supportive	The BSC has not demonstrated that it spends money wisely and in respect of the continual use of Woollam Constructions I am a bit mused.	Not at all supportive	I reiterate the BSC is not that good that they need to waste more money rather than spend more wisely	Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	If the BSC was more transparent perhaps seeking additional revenue would be more successful
76	Alstonville	Somewhat supportive		Somewhat supportive		Not very supportive	considering we are a recognised farm and have no access to town water supply, i believe the assumed average water consumption figure used in rates determination is irrelevant. a better suggestion would be to average this cost across places with access to this water supply and not apply it to places without.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	preference to spend increased rates on baiting or trapping program for animals in the area that are contributing to stock losses
77	Ballina	Strongly supportive		Strongly supportive		Strongly supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
78	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive	Would not be needed if Council was more efficient and stuck to its core responsibilities.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Multiple categories of properties (eg residential and business)	
79	Other (eg. rural)	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Farmland	
80	Alstonville	Supportive		Supportive		Supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
81	Ballina	Strongly supportive		Strongly supportive		Strongly supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	

#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
82	Ballina	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
83	Ballina	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
84	Ballina	Strongly supportive		Strongly supportive	Something has to be done about the midge/sandfly problem in Ballina Shire. They are breeding by the thousands and nothing is being done to stop them. They are an issue now, but wait 5 years and we won't have to worry about tourist as they just won't come.	Strongly supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
85	Ballina	Somewhat supportive		Not very supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
86	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Strongly supportive		Strongly supportive		Strongly supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
87	Ballina	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
88	Ballina	Supportive		Supportive		Somewhat supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
89	Ballina	Not at all supportive	Council should have improved our waterways (Shaw's bay, Lake Ainsworth)along time ago with the normal rates people pay.	Not at all supportive	Why hasn't the council been doing this over the last 20-30 years with normal council funding?	Not all all supportive	My pension does not go up at this rate!!	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	I thought we might get a better council from the last election, but no Bozo the Clown is still running things.
90	Ballina	Not at all supportive	The rate payers are already paying enough when council has so much tied up in developments instead of service.	Not very supportive	i would like to see coucil be a council and not a developer , use rate payers money on services	Not all all supportive	As above	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	i can not see the reasoning for the ratepayers to foot the bill for this proposal when anything done here can be negatively effected by those upriver, The money collected would go to general revenue and therefore not be dedicated to waterways (which i believe is a state issue)
91	Wollongbar	Not at all supportive	Council must ensure that revenue is not exceeded or existing revenue generating assets are not sold off.	Not at all supportive	Asset renewal program should have been in place since councils were created. It is good governance and savvy business operations that provides timely, measured and planned improvement to any asset base regardless of any meaningless one line " Fit for Futures programs. It is normally not in the best interest of the residents to chase or comply to these dreams.	Not all all supportive	Councils and governments must live within their revenue base - No wastage , no consultants etc Rates should costed and based on services and performance provided. Reviewed by a independent randomly selected panel of permanent residents. Most business and chambers of Commerce as some Councillors would not be considered independent as these mostly have their own agendas.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	The last survey in respect of the a skate park was generally ignored. However I do respect the people who put themselves out there for the true good of residents such as our Mayor.
92	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Strongly supportive	Ballina was built on the river because people were attracted to it, that attraction may have evolved, but the river is still very attractive to most people- and if we want to keep this town attractive, we need to start with the waterways and keep them healthy. Water = Life; healthy water - healthy life.	Supportive	The evidence of this needs to be made public, updates on the website need to inform the community of how this money is spent - I can see this disappearing into the coffers of the council.	Supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	adding personalised information regarding this with the next rates letter would help clarify the exact increase in actual dollar terms, although this may be too late to implement.
93	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive	The concept of healthier waterways is definatly appealing. My concern is twofold 1. The spend should be a part of existing income streams. We are now being asked to pay more for councils past failings to spend and budget effectively 2. I am not confident that the proposed program is the right way to achieve best impact	Not at all supportive	Again this appears to be the result of councils inability to budget effectively ... There is no guarantee that these additional fund will be spent wisely. Can efficiencies be found within current system to achieve same end?	Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Multiple categories of properties (eg residential and business)	

#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
94	Wollongbar	Not at all supportive	Rates notice is already a strain on the household budget. Whilst I do believe that expenditure is necessary, increasing Rates is an 'easy out' method of funding, and council needs to be more creative in finding ways to fund projects.	Not at all supportive	It is councils responsibility to adequately plan, develop and fund its assets, without burdening the local community financially.	Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
95	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Strongly supportive		Strongly supportive		Strongly supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
96	Ballina	Strongly supportive		Somewhat supportive	Upgrade playgrounds for older age groups. Many playgrounds in urban areas under-utilised - maybe because they are only usable for a very young age group (ie toddler to 8 years). Suggest playgrounds aren't duplicated but provide playgrounds for varying age groups around the shire. Also consider closer consultation with local areas when playgrounds are upgraded- taking into account residential movement ie if local youth in a particular area will age or are families more inclined to more thus keeping younger families in the locale therefore younger facilities required vs installing half basketball courts and climbing apparatus for older kids.	Not very supportive	State and Federal Governments should be held more accountable for waterway, river and coastline health, this shouldn't be left up to local councils. Do Newcastle, Sydney and Wollongong City Councils fund waterway programs?	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Factsheet and letter clear in explaining proposed increases and easy methods to provide feedback.
97	Ballina	Not at all supportive	Funding for this should come from the state government. Why should Ballina shire residents pay for pollution from other councils upstream.	Somewhat supportive	I am not sure why council is asking for 5 years of permanent increases above the pegged rate. Council is defeating the purpose of pegged rates. Look for areas of waste instead - cut costs	Not all all supportive	I am not sure why council is asking for 5 years of permanent increases above the pegged rate. Council is defeating the purpose of pegged rates. Look for areas of waste instead - cut costs	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	The council has not explained WHY the expenditure was not in the council's budgets already. The waterways is not Ballina Shire's problem to solve. It is a NSW EPA problem to solve.
98	Other (eg. rural)	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		No (Resident)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
99	Wardell	Supportive		Supportive		Somewhat supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
100	Ballina	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive	Our rates are already much higher then suburbs in sydney - I feel that the rates are sufficient and need to be better utilised.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
101	Wollongbar	Somewhat supportive		Supportive		Somewhat supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
102	Ballina	Not at all supportive	Why are the rates being increased When one of you own councilors (Jeff Johnson) said at the last election that the council has over \$60mil in savings. Ultimately this is to stop a Council amalgamation and keep your jobs.	Not at all supportive	Out door gyms along the walk way like they have at Surfers but bigger and better. You'll look like you care about the communities health. Plant more trees along the footpaths and nature strip. It will provide cost effective shade in public areas and make the whole town look more expensive. Check out any "leafy" suburb in a major city and you'll see the proof. The greenies will love it because you're planting trees and developers will love it because your gentrifying the area. Which brings me to my next point. If you wanna increased revenue. Lose the all north coast community housing and get more private home owners that's are able to pay any rates at all.	Not all all supportive	Where's the \$60milliom we all heard about	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	

#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
103	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Strongly supportive	I feel strongly that the NSW State Government should be contributing to any works on waterways or coastal areas. I think Council should be lobbying for additional funding and or using this rate based funding to leverage grant funding.	Strongly supportive	I feel that funding of Roads is already well covered. Additional funding should be focused on other areas that are not currently adequately funded such as community buildings Open Spaces and Play Equipment and Sport fields AND facilities. I also think that Community managed buildings such as the Community Halls should receive more funding to assist in their upgrading and maintenance.	Strongly supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	I am happy with the consultation.
104	Ballina	Strongly supportive		Strongly supportive		Strongly supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
105	Ballina	Strongly supportive	There have been many reports written on the poor condition of the Richmond River with clear recommendations on the priorities for action. These priorities need to be followed rather than being influenced by pressure groups. In essence, it is critical that action be taken to avoid/minimize black water events.	Supportive		Strongly supportive	I am in favour of Council amalgamations where efficiencies can be shown to occur. Where a full amalgamation is not required, there must be areas where sharing of assets and services could help constrain costs.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
106	Ballina	Not very supportive	How do you propose to clean up waterways where heavy storms wash chemicals and rubbish down to the coast from miles upstream? Money wont fix the problem in my mind.	Not at all supportive	The latter rises are on top of already highly increased rates as it is. Last year you imposed a levee to repair swimming pools which was to be kept in play anyhow. A one off rate rise in a given year is acceptable but I feel with the council you may still impose another levee within the next 3 years to repair something else such as sewage as an example. all seems a bit duplicitous to me	Somewhat supportive		No (Resident)		I feel the rate increase are a little sharp where the real impact will be felt in 3 years time. To compare rates with other larger towns which obviously require larger budgets is trite to say the least as has no bearing on your proposal. The Ballina Council has always operated efficiently and correctly to my mind but as a pensioner (and although I receive a small concession) I feel this is a huge increase in rates and where it all compounds at the end of 3 years to quiet a large sum.
107	Ballina	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	The rates are already so high that I and most people I know are struggling each year to make the payments. I am a single mother raising two children and the increase would put us under
108	Ballina	Not at all supportive	Ballina are living beyond their means	Not at all supportive	sell some of your property	Not all all supportive	you have been getting money from the previous years	No (Resident)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	no
109	Ballina	Not at all supportive	Healthy waterways programme is not allowing for the natural cleansing of the river. I would not support any cleansing of tge Richmond River or its tributaries.	Not at all supportive	Council is formulating plans without consulting residents and I intend to move out of the Shire after 31 years as a result.	Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
110	Ballina	Somewhat supportive		Somewhat supportive		Somewhat supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
111	Ballina	Not at all supportive	The shire is expanding and the number of rate payers is increasing significantly generating more income from rates. The new residential developments will not need maintenance for years to come as they are all new. There is no need for further increases. The Council needs to prioritise works programs and learn how to spend money wisely instead of opting to just keep increasing rates.	Not at all supportive	Better planning and funds management by the council. Stop treating residents like an endless source of revenue for council's mismanagement.	Not all all supportive	Show the residents that the council can manage fund and projects without unnecessary increases and is worthy of re-election.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	I feel it is a waste of time and a waste of revenue as I don't believe the council really listens to the residents. The council is not fully engaged with the residents who it serves.



#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
112	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	I honestly think that this consultation process is a waste of time. Time after time, year after year it has been noted by many people in this community that this Council has their own agenda and have no intent of listening to their community. If they do receive extra funds I am not confident that these funds will be used where they are supposed to be. Where we are situated we pay very high rates for no extra services or benefits - if anything the roads and services in our direct area are pathetic, why should we pay even more??!?!?
113	Ballina	Strongly supportive	Healthy waterways underpin the well-being of our community and our economy. We must be proactive in working to improve this valuable natural resource bring it up to being one of NSW's healthiest rivers, not unhealthiest.	Strongly supportive		Strongly supportive		No (Resident)		
114	Ballina	Somewhat supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Multiple categories of properties (eg residential and business)	
115	Ballina	Strongly supportive	I have just moved to angels beach , from the gold coast, at first I have to say I thought the rates were rather high , but since arriving and seeing the amount of good work that's being done you have my full support . Keep up the good work.	Strongly supportive		Strongly supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
116	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Strongly supportive		Strongly supportive		Strongly supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
117	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Strongly supportive		Supportive		Strongly supportive		No (Resident)		
118	Alstonville	Not very supportive	Council should focus on engaging with the responsible authorities to do this work and not taking on extra work that will ultimately have little impact	Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		No (Resident)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
119	Ballina	Supportive		Supportive		Supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
120	Ballina	Not very supportive	I live in Ballina now, but when my children were growing up we always came to Shaws Bay Caravan Park. During these years there was a delightful safe, sandy beach in front of the Shaws Bay Hotel. This was a very popular family spot. There were learn to swim classes and many activities, such as paddle boats. I know we can't go back in history, but do we have to sacrifice the whole bay to weeds? I believe a small beach area for families would be an advantage.	Not very supportive		Not very supportive	I acknowledge and appreciate the job council does. The new Marine Rescue tower is a great assess as is the footpath and cycle networks. Everything changes, but it is wise not to throw the baby out with the bathwater. There are thing that I believe are better left as they are. In particular the road on the eastern side of Lake Ainsworth. I can see many disadvantages in closing it and no advantages. It isn't worth getting in extra maoney and spending it, just because you can!	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
121	Ballina	Not very supportive		Not at all supportive		Not very supportive	I believe Council should focus on expenditure reduction in general and the investment mix to allow for additional expenditure on significant projects. Assistance should also be sought from the State Government for the waterways project.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	



#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
122	Ballina	Not at all supportive	Why do you need to raise the rates when you have over 50 million in the bank. How much do you actually need sitting in a bank account and I'm sure you are getting good interest on this money. Leave the rate payers alone.	Not at all supportive			Why do you need to raise the rates when you have over 50 million in the bank. How much do you actually need sitting in a bank account and I'm sure you are getting good interest on this money. Leave the rate payers alone.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Multiple categories of properties (eg residential and business)	Why do you need to raise the rates when you have over 50 million in the bank. How much do you actually need sitting in a bank account and I'm sure you are getting good interest on this money. Leave the rate payers alone. Also as a business owner paying rates I feel I get no value for my money, we get no rubbish removal, we mow our own lawn and pay over \$3,000 a quarter for what? I would love to know how you can justify over 12,000 a year in rates and provide very little in service.
123	Ballina	Not at all supportive	Council already raises a high level of funds from its ratepayers. Council must stop overrating and work within available funds.	Not at all supportive	Council already raises a high level of funds from its ratepayers. Council must stop overrating and work within available funds.	Not all all supportive	Council already raises a high level of funds from its ratepayers. Council must stop overrating and work within available funds.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Council already raises a high level of funds from its ratepayers. Council must stop overrating and work within available funds.
124	Other (eg. rural)	Not at all supportive	As water bodies are not under the direct control of the Council therefore I strongly object to Council raising rates to spend on local waterways. I urge the Council to focus its efforts more on lobbying those authorities that do have responsibility for waterways to undertake improvement activities. This would include seeking OzFish's (and another other relevant organisation) to support Councils efforts.	Not very supportive	There are many retired people in the Ballina Council and any rate increase is a difficult imposition.	Not all all supportive	See comments above re waterways program	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	This is an unusual consultative process - seeking input when people are on holiday or away from the area.
125	Ballina	Strongly supportive	Are the community based organisations like Dune Care and Land Care involved in developing and implementing the plans. If not they should be; also all schools should be aware of the problems and potential fixes.	Somewhat supportive		Supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
126	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive	If council wants to spend more on waterways, it should reduce its cost of administration rather than increase rates. Either that or merge.	Not at all supportive	If council wants to spend more on Asset renewal, it should reduce its cost of administration rather than increase rates. Either that or merge.	Not all all supportive	It is inconceivable that Council is considering this. How about looking at streamline and reducing administration costs instead.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Provide adequate time would be a good start but even that wouldn't really help such a 'grab for cash' from rate payers who are already paying too much.
127	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive	I do not in any way support the healthy waterways program as it the State Government's responsibility and not the ratepayers.	Not at all supportive	I do not support any increase above the 1.5% standard increase as rates already include charges for these works.	Not all all supportive	As stated above I do not support these rate increases	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
128	Ballina	Strongly supportive	Commercial and business interests particularly those with a direct interest in income derived from proximity to the waterways or activities around the waterways should pay a higher proportion of the costs for this Healthy Waterways Program rather than local residents. Such commercial interests could include but not be limited to shops, camping grounds, accommodation providers, hiring companies, restaurants, cafes, clubs, pubs, boat owners, fishermen etc. Businesses could pass these additional costs onto the tourists and short term visitors who use the waterways and benefit primarily from improvements. Alternatively they may contribute additional in kind by donating the availability of machinery, equipment, operators, and materials which can be used for waterways improvement. Many local residents do not necessarily have a direct involvement with the waterways and should not have to pay the same amount for waterways improvements as those who make regular use or them or derive a direct profit from them.	Supportive	Commercial and business interests particularly those with a direct interest in income derived from improved assets or activities around the assets should pay a higher proportion of the costs for this Asset Renewal Program rather than local residents. Such commercial interests could include but not be limited to large commercial enterprises such as Bunnings, Aldi etc, other shops, camping grounds, accommodation providers, hiring companies, restaurants, cafes, clubs, pubs, boat owners, fishermen etc. Businesses could pass these additional costs onto the tourists and short term visitors who use the assets and facilities and benefit primarily from improvements. Alternatively they may contribute additional in kind by donating the availability of machinery, equipment, operators, and materials which can be used for asset improvement. Many local residents do not necessarily have a direct involvement with all the assets and facilities and should not have to pay the same amount for improvements as those who make regular use or them or derive a direct profit from them.	Supportive	See my comments in Q5 & Q8 above	No (Resident)	The consultation process is transparent, comprehensive and thorough. The Council is to be congratulated for the ongoing programs for improvement it has throughout the shire. It is unfortunate for ratepayers in regional NSW that the current State Govt has a narrowly Sydney centric approach to allocation of taxpayer funds and provision/improvement of facilities and we the regional ratepayers must wear the ever increasing cost to maintain and hopefully improve our surrounds and lifestyles.	

#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
129	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive	If Coucil feels it is imperative to implement Healthy Waterways Program do that and leave Lake Ainsworth road area alone, using that funding. Large proportion of community are against the road closure so do not increase our rates explaining you are short of funds when spending our money against our wishes! Absolutely against addictions rate increase.	Not at all supportive	Same answer as above	Not all all supportive	I'm against any additional rate increase	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Multiple categories of properties (eg residential and business)	
130	Ballina	Not at all supportive	I feel that the problem of Richmond River stems further up river and should be addressed by Richmond River Shire Council	Not at all supportive	Why is so much being spent on the pools when there are other matters that require more urgent attention? As per election promises am still waiting for the possibility of free tip days and kerbside pickup once a year. Why did it cost me \$16 to take a small car load of green waste to the tip - where is the FREE dumping of recyclable and green waste.	Not all all supportive	I dont see much return for the rates I already pay to Ballina Shire.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
131	Alstonville	Not very supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
132	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Supportive		Strongly supportive		Strongly supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
133	Wollongbar	Supportive		Supportive		Supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
134	Ballina	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not very supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
135	Other (eg. rural)	Supportive		Supportive		Supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Farmland	
136	Other (eg. rural)	Not at all supportive	councils generally do not spend there money wisely. Quotes etc. for gov work are always extremely high and should be questioned more. If the councillors were paying out of their own pocket, they would not accept most of the quotes that were tendered. There is so much red tape and crap that goes on, it is crazy. A little common sense would go a long way.	Not at all supportive	same as above...	Not all all supportive	same as above. people are struggling enough without the council adding to it. maybe some of the councils employees should take a pay cut or work a little more efficiently. Oh ! how good would that be.....	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Lets see some of the quotes for work being done and look at the hourly rates...
137	Ballina	Not very supportive		Not very supportive	After the second rate road surfacing that was done in the Shaws bay area where we had very smooth surfaces and now we have areas where tar is still being picked up on hot days and the sharp stones are still coming out and ending up on footpaths which create an eye hazard when mowing, and the surface is unstable for the elderly residents in these locations. Would we get Bitupave road surfacing again?	Not very supportive	I feel if this increase came into effect the councillors remuneration should be frozen during this 3 year period to allow all of the funds to be directed to the proposed programs	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
138	Ballina	Strongly supportive		Strongly supportive		Strongly supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	

#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
139	Ballina	Not at all supportive	I do not believe our waterways can be considered unhealthy. I sail on the river regularly, swim in shaws bay and rivers have cyclical cycles and seagrass helps to grow young fish. The river is much healthier than it has ever been. The floodwater effect on the river s common and has been for many years. Ask the Aboriginal elders who will tell you the river has always turned brown long before Macadamias and sugar cane were grown . We have control of Acid Sulphate Soils..( ie stop blaming the sugar cane farmers) . Developers require more management developing more housing estates on low lying land. Dredging the mouth of the rive might be of assistance to the fishing boats to ensure we have an industry here but otherwise I do not agree with spending money on the waterways.	Supportive	Road reconstruction yes , Stormwater drainage is a problem particularly in Ballina - eg the sailing club. It is important to ensure that road reconstruction and stormwater drainage are considered together. People often forget that increasing roads leads to greater runoff . Sports fields and facilities are all excellent and only need maintenance as do community buildings. I love the cycleways and would love to see more of them if I am to pay higher rates.	Somewhat supportive	As mentioned above, Only the Asset Renewal program	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Plenty of chance to consult. Thank you.
140	Ballina	Not at all supportive	We had a rate rise, that the public resoundingly voted against, for the upkeep of the two pools that a minority use. If you want to get this over the line why not reduce the rate back to where it was prior to the above mentioned, add the normal CPI then look at raising from there.	Not very supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Multiple categories of properties (eg residential and business)	
141	Ballina	Not very supportive	Poor prior management or lack of does not warrant a rate rise.	Somewhat supportive	I would be more supportive if efforts went into areas of need rather than areas of higher household income	Not very supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
142	Ballina	Not at all supportive	River management should have been done years ago, now ratepayers have to foot the bill for the miss management..... really	Not very supportive		Not all all supportive		No (Resident)		
143	Ballina	Not at all supportive	The State Government should be sending the EPA on all businesses and farms who allow runoff into the river. I pay GST and PAYG already, so I am not paying another tax/charge for NSW State Government neglect of their responsibilities.	Not at all supportive	Why are you paying 10 Million for another asset (basketball courts at the new high school), if you cant afford the upkeep of our current assets. Cancel the basketball court and you may be able to afford your current repairs and maintenance bills.	Not all all supportive	My husband has not had an increase in salary for 3 years, every year you want to put up the rates. Have you noticed how expensive it is to live in Ballina. You need to manage the council within the regulations and amount of money you receive with the normal standard rate peg increase of 2.5%, it is more than my husband and I will get.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Please stop trying for added increases on our rates. The standard rate peg increase is enough. Ask the NSW State Government to do something about the waterways, continue with the grant submissions, and try to stay on budget. That is why you are elected.
144	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive	The council should look to fund these improvements out of the current collection of rates, bearing in mind the amount of new rate payers in the Lennox Head/Ballina Heights area with the current release of land, or the selling off of some assets that cost rate payers to maintain, or put in paid parking like Byron Bay. There comes a time when the goose who lays the golden eggs nest is empty and that is how I feel being a rate payer in the Ballina Shire. We have no more to give. No increase is acceptable above the Government pegged increases.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	The proposal is perfectly clear.
145	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive	It is challenging for me to pay rates as they are without additional increases	Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive	Please think of those struggling to pay rates at present without these huge rate increases	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Multiple categories of properties (eg residential and business)	
146	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Strongly supportive		No (Resident)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
147	Wollongbar	Supportive	no priorities preference	Supportive	no priorities preference. all important	Supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	

#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
148	Alstonville	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
149	Ballina	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive	As a young adult (26 y/o) and having just got into the property market and having a young family a rate rise would impact myself and my family heavily. My family loves the Ballina shire and my wife and I were both born and raised in Ballina, Alstonville and Wardell areas and hope to raise our son here as well. We love the area but would hate to see Ballina council go the way of Byron council and make this beautiful place even more unaffordable for young locals. We have struggled to get into the property market in Ballina and now that we have just scraped enough money together to get a mortgage and purchase a very old house in Ballina we will now suffer another knock back and continue the on going struggle of living in the area which we grew up in. I hope that the council can see the issue from a young adults perspective and source money from another avenue so that young families can afford to raise their children here.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
150	Alstonville	Not at all supportive		Not very supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
151	Ballina	Not very supportive	I wholeheartedly support improvements to Shaws Bay which are way, way overdue. What was the point of the study two years ago if nothing is done? I am not very supportive to the funding of projects in Ballina Shire's part of the Richmond River - unless - there are positive financial contributions from Richmond Valley Council, Lismore City Council, Casino Council and Kyogle Shire Council. It would be a complete waste of time and money for BSC to do something and other councils further upstream do nothing. All you have to do to recognise this is wait until we have very wet weather >100 mm in 48 hours and watch what comes downstream over the next month - you can see the topsoil from farmers' paddocks upstream go past North Wall. The Agricultural poisons and fertilisers in this solution can only be imagined. I will only support this program if other councils are encouraged to contribute and be part of it.	Supportive	Maintaining our roads has to be top priority, followed by stormwater drainage which I would rate slightly higher than Community Buildings. Ballina needs a Civic Hall similar to that in Albury and we should aim for no less than that. Open spaces and cycleways have been well catered for in the past.	Somewhat supportive		No (Resident)		I have been a resident in Shaws Bay since 1991 and I am appalled at the lack of action and maintenance that various Councils have shied away from over the years. I will support any program which will improve water quality public amenities and facilities dedicated parking on the western side and beautification. At present it looks like a third world watering hole. The sad thing is that the B ward Councillors sit on their hands and do nothing about it. Plan to fix Shaws Bay now or you won't get my support.
152	Ballina	Supportive		Supportive		Strongly supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
153	Ballina	Strongly supportive		Supportive		Supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
154	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive	As a mother on a single parent pension - I can not agree with a rise (special rate variation) as my pension isn't rising during this time, so it would leave me even shorter than I currently am. I am grateful for the subsidy I currently receive from council though.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	the results of the survey and written submissions need to be clearly explained with statistics (see below) - to show that the council have listened to the community and thus conducted effective community consultation and not just provided the community with information



#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
155	Ballina	Supportive	Keep monitoring, improving and informing rate payers about how crucial our water catchments are for the whole community	Somewhat supportive		Supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	We just move to ballina shire few months ago. We have had conversations we people leaving within other councils and we can tell that ballina's is doing a lot for the improvement and maintenance of its shire public areas. Regarding this consultation, it is clear and well explained and we are supportive of any actions that would make our community a beautiful one to live in even if this means reasonable financial efforts for our future.
156	Ballina	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		No (Resident)		
157	Ballina	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
158	Ballina	Not at all supportive		Not very supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Multiple categories of properties (eg residential and business)	
159	Ballina	Strongly supportive	The river is essential to the life of this community for both locals and tourists. If we want something done then we have to be prepared to pay the price. If we do nothing we will have nothing.	Strongly supportive	If we don't look after what we have then there will be no point to building anything new.	Strongly supportive	I accept the council's advice as the best way forward.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	No
160	Ballina	Strongly supportive	It is clear from assessments of the Richmond River Catchment, viewing the waterways and fish kills that our waterways are in trouble. I feel educating the community on what activities impact the waterways and what they can do to prevent these impacts is key. Having resources to do this is important. We are not going to improve things without the needed resources.	Supportive	Stormwater drainage is important as it links in with the health waterways program. Openspaces, playgrounds, sports fields, footpaths are especially important for the health and well being of our community and bringing visitors to our area.	Somewhat supportive	If it was a choice of one or the other I strongly support the rate increase for the Healthy water ways program.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
161	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive	The health of these waterways should be a State Government responsibility, and hence I cannot support the extra levy to pay for this work	Supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
162	Ballina	Supportive		Supportive	Construct a footpath down Jameson Avenue.	Somewhat supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
163	Ballina	Not at all supportive	why dose it fall on the ratepayers of today to fix a 100years+ of neglect. why dose council seem to think todays ratepayers have a bottomless pit of money.	Not at all supportive	Ballina council increased rates last year to fund maintance to two swimming pools .Also are attempting to fund a rockswimming pool	Not all all supportive	When is ballina council going to anything about the bar that needs dredging having only lived here for 6years council has wasted a lot of its funds on silly things.that are you going to about the flooding because the flood plains have been blocked you always blame somewon else.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	you will do what you want legless of ratepayers
164	Wardell	Somewhat supportive	Concerned that money raised for program will not be targeted to highest benefit and might be squandered in monitoring programs and glossy education brochures rather then concrete actions	Somewhat supportive	Asset renewal should also be targeted to improve infrastructures in areas such as Wardell and surrounds. Concerned that additional rate increase might end up to improve assets in Ballina and Lennox and that rural villages will miss out	Not very supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
165	Other (eg. rural)	Somewhat supportive		Somewhat supportive		Not very supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
166	Ballina	Not at all supportive		Not very supportive	Removing & maintaining weeds & unkempt grass that have taken over walking footpaths in the Cumbalum area in particular, weeds in the rock where the sound barrier wall was built at the back of Cullen Court, Cumbalum that are now growing over rate payers fences.	Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
167	Ballina	Not at all supportive		Not very supportive		Not all all supportive		No (Resident)		



#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
168	Ballina	Supportive	Shaws Bay is ideal for local & visitor recreation however improved tidal flushing is required. Dredging and selected filling of identified foreshore areas could vastly improve the amenity of the Bay. Such a project could very well attract State & Federal contributions. Richmond River is a catchment issues & Ballina is only one entity.	Supportive	Local road safety needs to focus on predictions and speeding drivers. Playground equipment & Sporting facilities can bring a community together. Stormwater management at Shaws bay & other sites is critical. Sediment basins & wetland systems should be the norm.	Supportive	The Community Strategic Plan should be reviewed in light of any rate increase. Local Public meetings can provide targeted actions.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	See above
169	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
170	Ballina	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
171	Ballina	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
172	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive	I can barely afford my mortgage and current rates. The cost of living in Australia is high enough without more stresses added by increased rates. I am currently experiencing a pay freeze at work and the country is pretty much in a recession. I do not think that this is an appropriate time to consider increasing rates any more than is necessary.	Not at all supportive	As above	Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
173	Ballina	Not very supportive		Not at all supportive	Heaven help the pensioners.	Not all all supportive	How do pensioners keep up with rate increases.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Smaller increases are easier to handle. Don't forget we have already been slugged for extra rates to fix the swimming pools.
174	Ballina	Strongly supportive		Strongly supportive		Strongly supportive	No-one is ever happy to pay more but if it means we can maintain and even perhaps improve the beautiful area we live in then I guess it is a price we have to pay. On top of that any improvement will only make it more attractive to tourists which is also good for the local economy	No (Resident)		
175	Alstonville	Strongly supportive	the waterways are a major asset for the future. we need to utilise them both for the community and for economic development (tourism etc)	Strongly supportive	assets must be kept up to date if not the bill occurs later and is often greater. we have a very responsible council and we need to trust them and their officers to make good decisions re assets.	Strongly supportive	the renewal of Ballina has been done tastefully and made it a real contrast to other country towns that are dying well done. we need to keep the momentum going. ballina has escaped the high rise etc problems of other coastal towns through well planned development.	No (Resident)		well done.
176	Ballina	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	I feel the rates we already pay should be used to fund these projects not asking for extra money.
177	Ballina	Strongly supportive	My comment needs to be linked with the asset renewal aspect. The proposal to construct an ocean pool should be abandoned. The capital cost is the thin edge of the wedge. Maintenance costs for ocean pools escalate disproportionately to other areas. Spend the money on Shaws Bay and it is a win win situation.	Strongly supportive	Please see my comment in item 5.	Strongly supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
178	Ballina	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Multiple categories of properties (eg residential and business)	

#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
179	Alstonville	Not at all supportive	Money to leverage the state and fed gov's. You've got to be joking! Should have been done. How many millions have you wasted, even recently. Incompetents! Survey is a joke! Already made up your minds. Questions phrased as if decided and just areas of priority given for opinion. What a pity fit for the future only measured financial viability and not competence and community satisfaction. Not fit/ no worries! We'll just blood suck the stupid ratepayers a bit more.	Not at all supportive	All areas should have been ongoing. Should have been done. You're just going to keep asking for more and pissing it up against a wall.	Not all all supportive	Throughout my life I've had to work within a budget. I didn't expect anyone to hand me more. The more you get the less careful with it you will be. Get a long term forward thinking plan. Get a budget. Stick to it. Cover all areas. The problem with all governments - piecemeal plans to get them to the next election. Think beyond your own self interest. What is best for the next 20 years - not can I get my snout in the trough again in 4 years time.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	You consulted over the pools and took no notice of public opinion. Consultation is a sham!
180	Alstonville	Supportive		Supportive		Supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
181	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Supportive	The agricultural sector also need to be involved to ensure that farm chemicals are managed.	Supportive	If the roads and stormwater is right the rest tends to follow.	Supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
182	Alstonville	Not at all supportive	As a retiree, my fixed income stream for 2017-18 was only increased by 0.6% p.a. And you want to increase rate by up to 8.14% over the next few years, and keep this increase permanently. You just recently pulled of a similar rate increase scam for the swimming pool upgrades, increases never to be reversed. LEARN TO LIVE WITHIN YOUR MEANS LIKE EVERYONE ELSE!!!! Find savings from your already wasteful expenditures and under-worked, inefficiently employed staff. DEFINITELY AGAINST ANY ADDITIONAL RATE INCREASE!!!!	Not at all supportive	As in (5) above	Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
183	Alstonville	Not at all supportive	The waterways are a State government responsibility and should be undertaken by the NSW State government alone. All works put forward in this proposal will be confined within the boundaries of the Ballina Shire but the majority of the waterway extend far beyond these arbitrary boundaries thus rendering any work undertaken by BSC temporary at best and most probably simply futile.	Not at all supportive	This Council has repeatedly gone to the rate payers asking for amounts above and beyond what is the norm for the rest of the State. The role of Council has already extended beyond its initial remit of "roads, rates and rubbish" and the council executive should not be looking to extend its reach any further. Just stick within the boundaries of what you are already struggling to meet and stop with this empire building exercise. If you do wish to raise extra revenue perhaps you should examine the extraordinary amount of expenditure wasted on exorbitant senior management salaries, multiple yearly conference appearances by staff and the liberal handing out of completely unlimited use of luxury council vehicles. The rate payers of Ballina Shire are not a bottomless pit of money for you to continue milking for your pet projects.	Not all all supportive	Your correspondence with the rate payers thus far has been convoluted and intentionally difficult to understand and at no point is it mentioned that all of the rates increases are compounding in nature. To this point, as with your previous rates variations efforts has been deliberately deceptive in nature and fails to explain in plain English the full effects of your proposal.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	The last time BSC applied for a special rates variation over 300 submissions to the negative were received by BSC only to be completely ignored. Is this your intention this time too? The timing of this mail out and consultation process also adds to the impression that BSC has no intention of considering the wishes of the majority of Ballina Shire residents. A vast swathe of residents will be focused on their families during the Summer school holidays and to introduce such a proposal during this time is suspect at best.
184	Ballina	Not at all supportive	For the waterways revenue raising, source the State Government, our local member of parliament belongs to "The Greens". Revenue from fishing licences, boat and trailer registration should be used. Sell council assets to raise funds.	Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive	Sooner rather than later rate increases will be unaffordable to some rate payers. Rate variation happened for the upgrade of Ballina and Alstonville public pools, I don't recall reading any progress reports on this, so where has that funding gone.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Hopefully rate payers will express their displeasure with this council application and the Councillors will listen in stead of just going ahead..
185	Ballina	Supportive	It would be good to have neighbouring councils participate in the river health as some of the run off comes from Lismore council area. Also some land owners such as Macadamia and cane farmers need to change their habits to improve the run off into the river.	Supportive	Whilst I grit my teeth at having to pay extra money in my rates, I understand the need to improve facilities in our beautiful town and how hamstrung local councils are when it comes to revenue raising. I believe local government should grow and state government be abolished.	Strongly supportive	It will be good to see the improvement in our pools at Alstonville and Ballina (even though I am not a user) and once that levy is dropped it should not be a large imposition on the community to have to pay the temporary increase. One would hope that this will not be a regular proposal.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	I hope that there is a balanced view from those who support the proposal as well as those who oppose. Sometimes we only hear from the detractors!

#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
186	Ballina	Supportive		Supportive		Supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
187	Ballina	Supportive	I do think the state govt should be aiding more in floodplain works particularly, climate change is a problems for all. We don't seem to have got much from asset sale of poles except school which was needed anyway.	Strongly supportive	Most important. We should be planning for future and not asking residents to add extra as per pools.	Supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Consultation good Explained well in leaflet.
188	Ballina	Not very supportive	Council and state government should be catching the polluters and making them contribute to help fixing the problem.	Not very supportive		Not very supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
189	Wollongbar	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
190	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
191	Alstonville	Strongly supportive		Strongly supportive		Strongly supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
192	Ballina	Supportive		Supportive		Strongly supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
193	Ballina	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Multiple categories of properties (eg residential and business)	
194	Alstonville	Supportive		Somewhat supportive		Somewhat supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
195	Ballina	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
196	Ballina	Strongly supportive	The poor health of the Richmond River is a big issue that will require very large investment of time, resources and money to improve. I believe this requires State or Federal Govt leadership and should not be the responsibility of Council.	Strongly supportive	Over the past 10 years, I would typically have ranked 'footpath & cycleway network' as the highest priority, but I am very happy that Council has made significant investments in this network over the past couple of years.	Strongly supportive	When I was filling in the ranking questions above (3 and 6), I instinctively started putting my highest priority as #1, until I read the instructions to list the highest priority as #5 and lowest priority as #1.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
197	Alstonville	Not at all supportive	Getting the rate payer to pay for for things outside of the councils control is a big concern for me. Is this just to meet a few Councillors election promises, and keep the green vote happy.	Supportive	We need to maintain the shires assets and what I expect council money to be spent on.	Not all all supportive	No to Healthy water ways. It not councils responsibility....sure can tell there's a lot of new councilors in there. Let the people responsible for the waterways do their job, I'm sure I already pay via my taxes for this. I don't want to pay again.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Multiple categories of properties (eg residential and business)	No to waterways, yes to the other increases
198	Ballina	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	

#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
199	Ballina	Supportive	My husband and I support the extra 1.5% as long as the money is spent on making the waterways healthy and not spent on costly consultations. The Shaws Bay Management Plan 2000 for did not appear to be implemented and the Shaws Bay Management Plan 2016 did not truly address all the issues that were raised at meetings, such as removal of weed and mangroves to create a better tidal flush of the bay. I noted in my submission on the upgrade of Pop Denison Park that upgrading the park next to a bay full of weed and mangroves seems to be a waste of money and time.	Somewhat supportive	I believe the number of stormwater drains emptying into Shaws Bay should be addressed. With all these drains emptying into the Bay how can it possibly remain healthy.	Supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	I am not clear on what Consultation process we are talking about here, I have assumed that the letter to residents on the Special Rate Variation is the consultation and Council is not anticipating further costly external consultancies.
200	Other (eg. rural)	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Multiple categories of properties (eg residential and business)	
201	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not very supportive		Not very supportive	Too often Council seems to spend money on areas that do not require attention and not on those that do. I want to see them spend the money they have wisely before I am prepared to give them more eg the closing off of the road from Lennox Surf Club north beside Lake Ainsworth is a waste and will badly inconvenience rate payers who wish to access the beach!!!!	Not very supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
202	Ballina	Supportive	I would like to see programs around sustainable fishing in and around the Richmond River to create a boost for family recreational fishing.	Somewhat supportive	I would like to see more and improved facilities to access the river for boats, kayaks and canoes.	Somewhat supportive	If the increased rates are approved rate payers will have high expectations on the use of the additional funds. We will expect increased information relating to the expenditure of funds for the communities benefit. We will want to see plans and action occur shortly after approval.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Timing for consultation is quite short. Appears deliberate. I have a cynical perspective to rate rises and so expect that the funds will be used appropriately and as intended in the proposal. i.e. not to prop up other projects or sit in council coffers for a rainy day OR be spent on councilor junkets, conferences, educational trips etc.
203	Ballina	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive	Everybody is against this as most were for the pool levy but you arrogant bastards still went ahead with it. It should have been User pays.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
204	Alstonville	Not very supportive		Not very supportive		Not very supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
205	Ballina	Not at all supportive	Insufficient information about why the state government is not funding this program. Insufficient information about why this is an issue that Ballina ratepayers should fund. The Richmond River traverses many shires and it may appear that Ballina ratepayers are paying for other shires' carelessness on a perpetual basis. Insufficient information about exactly what this program of restoration would look like. Quoting the support of OzFish is disingenuous. Insufficient information about OzFish and its nature as an organisation. As a ratepayer we could support something like the swimming pool redevelopment (even though we don't use them) over a discreet period of time, because of the tangible long term benefit to Ballina Shire residents. This Healthy Waterways project, while presented as environmentally necessary, has far greater questionable elements. Just not enough information or time to consult about it. Definitely not in favour at such short notice.	Not very supportive	The council keeps asking for more money. Times are hard for many people. Coming on top of the swimming pool rate increase this newly proposed increase is most inappropriate. Surely it is an appropriate period of time to manage a budget that falls within the allocated increases.	Not all all supportive	The community consultation has been inappropriately handled. Insufficient time has been allowed for the community to properly understand the proposals and seek clarification. To propose another significant rise in rates and rush consultation is politically bloody minded. We are very disappointed with this approach by a council we have readily supported in the past.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	To send this out in the midst of the summer, Christmas, new year period was very poor. Management. More detailed plans for the Waterway program were absolutely necessary.



#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
206	Other (eg. rural)	Not at all supportive	Shire residents should ALL have water tanks as this will ensure they have "healthy" water without added pollutants like fluoride, chlorine etc! High time everyone took responsibility for their own well being!	Supportive	We would strongly support this program if the Council took accountability to fix the lane ways for which they have abdicated all care even though these lane ways are designated by Crown Dept as Council responsibility.	Not all all supportive	We are somewhat supportive of the "Asset Renewal" Program but do have reservations as we don't want to be in the position of paying increased rates and seeing no real benefits i.e. road improvements and lane way upgrades. We certainly do not wish to see any more sporting fields or community buildings - totally unnecessary especially as the current ones are under used!	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
207	Ballina	Not very supportive	Based on priorities, funding for the Healthy Waterways Program should be sought elsewhere in Council's budget. Taxing the rate payer every time, shows a lack of proper stewardship.	Not very supportive	Based on priorities, funding for the Asset Renewal Program should be sought elsewhere in Council's budget. Taxing the rate payer every time, shows a lack of proper stewardship.	Not very supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Present Council's budget to the public and request feedback that way on how we can cut cost.
208	Ballina	Somewhat supportive	I don't feel that there is a lot Ballina Council will be able to do to significantly affect the health of our waterways. It is a lot bigger than council level, therefore can our rates be better spent?	Supportive		Somewhat supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
209	Ballina	Supportive		Supportive		Supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
210	Ballina	Supportive		Supportive		Supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
211	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Supportive	The Richmond River has been in need of dredging and other care all the 14 years I have lived in shire. Lake Ainsworth is so very important to us as residents of Lennox. I use it all the time and am very much in favour of the parklands project.	Not very supportive	This is a bottomless pit of need in the shire. These assets always need renewal, but we pay 'normal' rates for this purpose.	Somewhat supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Our Council is good at consultation but usually does not act on the results. I understand Councillors have already voted to increase the rates.
212	Ballina	Supportive		Supportive		Strongly supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
213	Ballina	Somewhat supportive	I don't believe that rate rises are the key to funding the waterways program. A major contributor to the poor health of our waterways including Richmond river, emigrant and north creeks is the exponential increase of stormwater and sheetflow run off from over development and inadequate retention and dissipation of runoff during heavy rain events. Example 1 new cumbalum Ballina heights estate flooding and poor drainage and road design. 2 lennox head epiq and pines estates. 3 Ballina waste management facility and stp built in wetland. Stop over development and the health of the rivers and creeks may be saved for future generations.	Not at all supportive	As I understand it civil services do not know where half of there assets actually are. Ballina shire geographical information services department has incomplete and inaccurate information and civil services work off old hand drawn plans. The long term appointment of a few council staff has prevented the move to a digital age. So before rate rises how about looking at improving councils ability internal.	Not all all supportive	No to rate rises	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Not everyone reads advocate, send survey details with peoples rates notice. Where I found the survey article. Provided adequate time for people to make a submission.
214	Ballina	Somewhat supportive		Somewhat supportive		Somewhat supportive	If funds raised are used to provide labour on the ground rather than increase the supervisory and administrative roles which Council seems prone to do then these rate increases could then perhaps be justified. Just to employ more staff in the Council chambers is certainly counter productive and cannot be supported.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Given that Council chose to ignore the results of a previous survey regarding the upgrade of Council pools where the great majority of residents opposed the expenditure and applicable rate increase, one is skeptical that Council will take any notice of the outcome of this survey anyway.
215	Ballina	Not at all supportive	Manage within the existing income	Not at all supportive	Manage within the existing income	Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
216	Wardell	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	



#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
217	Ballina	Strongly supportive	The waterways around Ballina are what makes Ballina so desirable to live in. They are responsible for bringing the tourist influx during the holiday seasons, in turn providing the financial boost to local businesses. Sadly, it only takes a decent rainfall in the catchment areas to turn the sparkling clarity of the water into something resembling a chocolate milkshake. A concentrated effort to educate, assist and if necessary, enforce better management practices along the length of our waterways is vital to the sustained future of Ballina.	Supportive	Ballina once had a worthwhile marina, now sold to developers and converted into residential households. The existing facilities consist of two bucket scoops purporting to be harbours. One is dominated by working vessels, and the other is barely accessible. Meanwhile, Mobbs bay plays host to four or five yachts on a daily basis, and lately the river has seen an influx of moored yachts. The only access these folk have to commercial outlets for provisioning and repair is via the wharf in front of the Riverside apartments, which may be constrained at any time by one or more trawlers lying alongside. Various plans for a greatly improved facility at the Martin Street harbour have been published, but no mention is made of it's priority, or indeed, its eventual construction. Sadly, boaties have a poor opinion of Ballina, either because the bar at the entrance is regarded as one of Australia's worst to enter upon, or because of its minimal (let's face it, zero) facilities for replenishment and maintenance. A genuine marina that caters for both local and visiting boats, with attendant support facilities would induce nautical travellers to spend time and money in Ballina, and provide the ultimate goal of the Ballina community - jobs for our children.	Supportive	While recognising the proposed rate increases have been pared down to a few simple concepts, i.e. two categories (waterways and asset renewal), 2 sets of increases (regular - pegged, plus an additional - council, rate), varied on two occasions (2017/18, then 2018/19), with the later one occurring twice, I suspect much of the community got lost at about the second hurdle. I appreciate the openness of expressing the increases this way, but I think most folk would prefer a flat rate increase each year evened across the 3 years, contributing to the two categories of waterways and asset renewal, with the added benefit that Ballina council remains above the threshold for being an amalgamation candidate.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	The waterways program is easily understood because it is readily observable. The asset renewal program is more vague - it goes on all the time, but the 'sense' of it is not easily appreciated. A short explanation of Ballina's goals would improve residents' understanding of what needs to be done. For example, the CBD, being an island, is subject to flooding (as are other areas). Improved drainage eases the flooding, and reduces the impact on road degradation. Money spent on road maintenance last longer, enabling council to focus on community recreational assets, such as parks and playgrounds, which people can see and appreciate more readily. 'Drains - roads - parks and playgrounds'.
218	Ballina	Not at all supportive	I do NOT agree with this proposal of increasing our rates for healthy waterways program. The rate rise is too extreme and Waterways need to find alternative government funding other than owners of properties that already pay high amounts for council rates.	Not at all supportive	Once again, this above asset renewal related programs are already paid for by owners. Funding from the government should already exist and I oppose the rate rises for this SRV proposal	Not all all supportive	The rate rises are too extreme and as a Ballina Council rate payer for many years, my quarterly rate payments should be sufficient enough, taking into consideration the regular rises that occur regardless of new programs. Ballina Shire is already well looked after by the government and I do not see the improvements as necessary for this dramatic rate rise. The roads are excellent, playgrounds, cycle way, footpaths, stormwater drainage system - all work extremely well as they are.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	This survey is an excellent way for rate payers to provide feedback. I think plenty of notice in writing of potential proposals, and taking the survey feedback as an important measure in rate payers rights and decisions.
219	Alstonville	Supportive		Supportive		Supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
220	Ballina	Not at all supportive	Rate payers of Ballina Shire have had a number of "short term" rate increases to fund other infrastructure projects i.e. public pools. Even when the majority of rate payers voted against this, the rate increases went ahead. I would like to see this "one off period" of rate increases finalised and rates returned to where they should be before considering any further increases. I can only hope that in future the council hear the voices of the local residence and be their voice, instead of pursuing an individual agenda.	Not at all supportive	I strongly oppose these large rate increases. If they go ahead, it will be a heavy financial burden upon ourselves and many others. This is too much too soon, please let the rate payers take a breath from the last series of ongoing rate increases.	Not all all supportive	I believe council should return rates to where they were prior to the previous "one off (3 year rate increase)". This would be ethical to begin with. Then increase rates by the 1.5% per annum only. In response to question 11. I am both a property owner and a local business owner.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Multiple categories of properties (eg residential and business)	Please listen to the rate payers. That is what you have been elected to do.
221	Wollongbar	Not very supportive	I am of the opinion that Ballina Shire Council is a wealthy shire and should budget to undertake this work within their current resources	Not at all supportive	I am of the opinion that Ballina Shire Council should budget to undertake this work within their current resources	Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	I hope the council will take heed of responses and take action in keeping with rate payers wishes
222	Alstonville	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	

#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
223	Ballina	Not at all supportive	My income has dropped \$8000.00 in the last 12 months. The majority of people are doing it tough at the moment. Council should raise rates when times are good. At the moment everyone has been asked to tighten their belt. This also applies to Council.	Not at all supportive	See comments in 5.	Not all all supportive	See comments in 5.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	See comments in item 5.
224	Ballina	Not at all supportive	The money won't be spent on our waterways the last increase was supposed to be spent on our town pool and how many years ago was that. Not a cent has been spent on the pool except the painting of the water slide. Stop having meetings for no reason and spending our money on stupid consultants.	Not at all supportive	Stop spending money on dumb things like islands on the side of the road that do nothing except take car parks away.	Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	I don't know why the council bothers to ask the community. They will do what they want anyway just like the last rate rise for the pool. Not one person i asked was for the rise but apparently the majority of the people in ballina wanted it bullshit !!!!
225	Alstonville	Strongly supportive	additional priority area would the Richmond Floodplain/catchment generally and that part that falls within Ballina Shire.	Somewhat supportive	Asset Renewal should be part of the council's finance program/ long term budget strategy anyway. I don't exactly agree with the special rate variation when it should be routine to factor renewal into the revenue.	Supportive	Although I am very supportive of the Healthy Waterways suggestion, I don't exactly understand why it has to be just that. There is after all many other worthy biodiversity issues and catchment bushland in need of ratepayers/funding assistance.	No (Resident)		I had to telephone and ask for more information which was not provided in the FAQs. Its impossible to publish an answer to every FAQ but further impact on the implications (or none) of removing the waste operations charge would have helped ratepayers understand that waste services are not being reduced in line with the reduction.
226	Alstonville	Not at all supportive	Disagree with the River Proposal	Somewhat supportive	I object to this 3.4% increase to be continued beyond 2020 without consulting the Ratepayers at this point.	Not all all supportive	As stated by you the council "the water bodies mentioned are not under the direct control of the council". We do not want the council to charge the rate payers for something not under our "control". Nor to "show leadership" where we cannot lead.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Multiple categories of properties (eg residential and business)	We had to read the information twice and make notes of the "variations" to be able to decipher the meaning and values of the Rate increases. There was no mention at all as to the current council expenditure or financial position. There is also some wastage of resources and reasonable cuts that would improve the council's finances that were not suggested.
227	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive	Unconvinced by the need for this.	Not at all supportive	The Council should maintain all it's existing assets within the existing budget by pruning expenditure in other areas.	Not all all supportive	Given the current rate of inflation, the Council should be maintaining the existing assets and doing investigative work to ensure the future of the Shire within the standard rate peg. We need to learn to live within our means.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	In seeking advice from the community through consultation, the Council should follow the advice it receives.
228	Ballina	Not very supportive	I cant see an increase in rates solving a waterways problem. Presumably some rates income in the past has been used to address this issue without a huge success.	Not very supportive	Once again if the previous rates were unable to cope with the demand for asset renewal I cannot see how the problem can now be successfully solved by awarding increases proposed. Sometimes throwing more money at a problem area is not the best solution.	Not very supportive	I found the letter proposing the rate variation somewhat confusing and did not mention alternative measures whether they were considered. My own budget has been reduced as I would think many other pensioners have experienced, expenditure has to be controlled and worthwhile.	No (Resident)		Perhaps it came unannounced and a time when people are holidaying or away, maybe the consultation could have begun earlier and highlighted more detailed proposals rather than sweeping terms such as healthy waterways and asset renewal.
229	Other (eg. rural)	Not at all supportive	Maintenance of waterways should be included in normal council budget. Rate increases should be limited to the IPART Rate peg limit. Waterways maintenance rates should not be separated from residential rates. Inappropriate planting of riparian zones contribute to silting and are a harbour for noxious weeds.	Not at all supportive	Asset renewal should be included in the normal council budget, this is a normal practise of any business. Asset renewal should be included within normal residential rates and should not be separated. Rate increases should be limited to the IPART rate peg limit.	Not all all supportive	Rate increases should be limited to the IPART rate peg limit. Asset renewal and waterways maintenance should be a normal part of the council budget and should not be separated. Ratepayers cannot afford these large yearly increases in rates and it is not sustainable for the rate-paying residents of the shire. Annual increases in cost of living in the shire are far greater than average wage increases and CPI. The council budget should be made public with expenditure in each area made known. Asset renewal should be a normal budgetary measure and expenditure should be limited to allow this. Expenditure should be limited in other non-essential services to allow for asset renewal in the normal budget without having to have separate rate increases.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	The consultation process and feedback should be for rate-paying residents and businesses only. The percentage of residents who are supportive or not of the rate increases should be a percentage of the rate paying population of the shire. Results of the feedback survey should be made publicly available on the council website and a required percentage in support for the increases to proceed made known.

#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
230	Ballina	Not at all supportive	After last year's above average increase for works to the two pool's this above average increase for the next two financial years is ludicrous. There are numerous governments grants available to council to fund these projects and I think council, whilst with good intentions, forgets that working ratepayers just haven't got this 'extra' money they wish to apply for. The rate increase is way above CPI inflation rates so where are taxpayer's mean't to get this money from????????	Not at all supportive	See previous comment box.	Strongly supportive		No (Resident)		
231	Ballina	Not very supportive	It is unclear from the information provided on what and where this revenue would be spend. Reference is made to "improving recreational amenity", a term which does not seem to relate to "healthy waterways". In some cases, restricted public access may be needed to improve a waterway's health. This is not "improving recreational amenity" and I believe the use of this term is misleading. Other concerns relate to "reinstating riverbank vegetation" - no details are provided as to where this will occur and whether it will be restricted only to publicly accessible land. I do not support the increase of rates for the provision of improvements and works on private land that should be borne by the landowner. Similarly with reference to "improving floodplain wetlands" - no details are provided as to how this will be achieved and what effect the additional funding will have on this proposal. Concern is also raised with the fact that the primary waterway (being the Richmond River) has catchment within four other Local Government Areas. This is a bigger picture responsibility that needs to be approached from a catchment wide basis and is essentially a State government responsibility. Local ratepayers should not be unreasonably charged for what is the responsibility of other entities. The "healthy waterways program" may be	Supportive	Generally supportive of increase for asset renewal. Council does a great job with road maintenance, reasonably well with stormwater and footpaths. Community facilities and open spaces are generally poorly maintained or only minimally maintained. Concerned that existing community assets are currently poorly maintained or under maintained to justify renewal. Maintenance, upgrade and or adapting existing assets and facilities may be more financially efficient in the long term than simply throwing away old facilities and renewing them. Recent council projects show a rather laissez faire attitude towards ongoing maintenance and renewal with decisions made in favour of the glitz and glamour of the new without consideration for the ongoing maintenance and useful life of facilities (e.g. Lennox CCC and Ballina SLSC)	Not very supportive	As commented above, is difficult to provide support for the proposals due to ambiguities, lack of information and jurisdictional issues (re healthy waterways) and based on council's recent track record re facilities maintenance	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Thank you for providing multiple options for feedback
232	Ballina	Supportive		Strongly supportive		Supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
233	Wollongbar	Not at all supportive	I think that if Council managed their finances better and adequately planned for the future, there would be no need to continually be asking their ratepayers to cough up and wear the cost.	Not at all supportive	I think that if Council managed their finances better and adequately planned for the future, there would be no need to continually be asking their ratepayers to cough up and wear the cost.	Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
234	Ballina	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	

#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
235	Other (eg. rural)	Not at all supportive	A proposal to improve our waterways is akin to a "motherhood" proposal - i.e., of course it would be supported! The submission from Council falls short, however, in that it provides no information as to the determination of the proposed 1.5% permanent increase. The proposal would be better supported if Council could explain the quantum of funds needed to achieve the stated objectives, whether a 1.5% permanent increase would produce the quantum of funds needed, and how ratepayers in Ballina Shire can be assured that Council's actions will not be compromised by actions/inactions of other authorities, Councils, etc.	Not at all supportive	Council's proposal makes no mention of whether the proposed rate variations have been factored into its Long Term Financial Plan and, if so, how that financial plan would be affected by the success or otherwise of the proposed increases. Accordingly, ratepayers are left in the dark as to where and how the additional funds would be directed, other than the general statements about renewal of core infrastructure assets, etc. Moreover, Council's proposal fails to explain why rate increases are needed when sinking funds should have been developed to provide sources of funds for such asset renewal programmes. A proposal to simply "grab more money from ratepayers" over and above the standard rate pegging limit suggests a large degree of entrenched inefficiencies in the management of the Shire's assets.	Not all all supportive	The Council's proposal is poorly developed and badly explained. Council needs to put its thinking cap on and come up with better reasoned arguments for the proposed increases.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	The proposal document provides no explanation of the relevance of consultation with the community. Effective consultation requires an undertaking from Council at the commencement of the process as to what action Council will commit itself to following the conclusion of the consultation process. The impression left by the document is that the SRVs are a "fait accompli" and that Council is merely "feeding the chooks" by providing this "consultative" document. A more effective consultative document should also include a series of "what ifs" - i.e., Council should explain by reference to its previously developed long term financial plans the impact of achieving the SRVs or otherwise. These scenarios should clearly indicate where the additional funds will be directed, or are planned to be directed.
236	Ballina	Somewhat supportive	I was under the impression that our fishing and boating licence would be used to improve waterways. As well as our taxes. I do not support a permanent increase in rates. Even though your increase is only for 3 years it provides an 11% increase in base rate forever. I feel a levy that is not accumulative would be much fairer and not such a money grab from ratepayers.	Somewhat supportive	As above I feel a levy would be more appropriate. Council efficiency could be another aspect of increasing revenue. How many times do you outdoor staff driving down to Shaw's bay to have a long smoko break !!	Not very supportive		No (Resident)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
237	Other (eg. rural)	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive	Council should concentrate its current revenue on essential services which should be its core business. Spending on facilities or programmes not essential - things that ought to be the state and/or commonwealth government's responsibility should be scaled down or better still scrapped in order to make more of the current revenue available for these identified priorities.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
238	Other (eg. rural)	Not very supportive	Rates have almost doubled since 2010. Now you want to increase rates well above the normal RV (on top of these requests being asked in the past). Why hasn't the constant rises in rates covered what you are suggesting is needed to cover the healthy waterways and asset renewal program?	Not very supportive	Rates have almost doubled since 2010. Now you want to increase rates well above the normal RV (on top of these requests being asked in the past). Why hasn't the constant rises in rates covered what you are suggesting is needed to cover the healthy waterways and asset renewal program?	Not very supportive	It seems convenient to suggest that council is being told by the NSW government to comply with the healthy waterways and asset renewal program and this is why you are requesting an SRV. How about taking some of the responsibility for a lack of foresight and planning to keep ahead within ongoing budgets. I know this is an old cliché, but it doesn't look very good when you have teams of council workers standing around watching one or two other workers do a job until its there turn (better team planning may help resolve some of the shortfalls in the budget by increasing production to wage ratio). However, having said that, you did a great job on the Angels Beach Drive upgrade.	No (Resident)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
239	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive	I don't believe that rate payers should have to fund these initiatives - I would like more information please on other funding options	Not at all supportive	I'm not convinced that we need additional funding for this at the expense of rate payers - rates are high enough and council should be able to do these related works without additional rate increases	Not all all supportive	I think you should cut the suit according to the cloth - sometimes we need to pull out belts in - rate payers don't have unlimited funds and these things are not a priority	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	There should have been an NA or DK option to skip the hypothetical - it is a forced response on a hypothetical that could be interpreted incorrectly in the analysis... I hope it isn't!!!
240	Ballina	Strongly supportive	It is of concern that creeks remain dirty long after the main river is clean water.	Strongly supportive	Just a thought. Why dont we include \$20 per year per household for library facilities. Amazing service. Might motivate those that dont use to do so	Supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Please ensure on our behalf that the extra money is spent well and not wasted. Full transparency of expenditure please



#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
241	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Somewhat supportive		Somewhat supportive		Somewhat supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
242	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
243	Ballina	Not at all supportive	There is no reason this should require a rate increase above the approved rate. This should be. Argued out within normal budgetary limitations	Not at all supportive	This should be part of normal budgetary management and should not warrant sp coal extra budget	Not all all supportive	These measures, as with the pool upgrades should be achieved within normal budget limits	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
244	Ballina	Not very supportive		Not very supportive		Not very supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
245	Ballina	Somewhat supportive	Frankly, healthy waterways in this area should always have been a Council focus. I believe it is the primary reason a majority of tourists visit our area. The recurring incidence of blue green algae found in both Lake Ainsworth and Shaws Bay is a disgrace.	Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive	In my opinion, Council has undertaken to spend money on poorly researched and clearly reactive (Shark attacks) projects, with very minimal results; and are now asking the ratepayers to fund what should have been their core priorities all along. I also believe that this rate rise, akin to the ones levied in Byron Bay, will force some sectors of the community to sell family homes because of their inability to pay such increases. I believe Council needs to be accountable and transparent regarding their spending - including individual Councillor remuneration.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
246	Ballina	Not at all supportive		Not very supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
247	Ballina	Not very supportive	as ballina shire council are the main work force employer ballina council should be doing a lot more in this area as this is the council main tourist draw card and with all water ways A lot of council workers DO NOT do a full days work to warrant their jobs more work should be contracted out to save time at a cost saving to council	Not at all supportive	all councils should be working smarter NOT putting rates up to cover work that is not been done. the states governments program for council to raise rates to cover programs that some do and do not some under council control is not a very smart ideal as people on fixed income have no way to pay for this or any increase	Not all all supportive	think smarter make all council employees do a day work and no council vehicle stay in council yard at end of day	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	the entrance from grafton entrance is not draw card but a good sight for any town that is tourist town but a bloody disgrace that where your income come from stand back and look in your own back yard before you think of rate increase
248	Ballina	Not at all supportive	Will the raised rate money be used for these projects or will it be used for endless expensive consultations to decide how to go about the projects?	Not at all supportive	What are the rates we now pay being used for? I thought they were used for all of the above Questions. I always understood that rates were used for maintenance and additional facilities for the town. New subdivisions generate a large amount of rates --especially high density units so they cannot be blamed for the necessity to raise the rates.	Not all all supportive	Could the council be like pensioners and try to budget carefully with the money they have available to them?	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Will you take any notice of this survey or is it just an opportunity to raise the rates regardless ?
249	Ballina	Not at all supportive	This is the responsibility of the State Government and they have money to pay for this. I am a single mortgagee and rates are already expensive for me.	Somewhat supportive	The fact that much bushland in the area and along most roads leading in to Ballina are infested in weeds and vines is a disgrace. I live adjacent to Mercer Park in East Ballina and have seen it essentially degrade and die a slow death. These bits of non-park reserve/bush need to be kept alive to support ecosystems and wildlife.	Somewhat supportive	Again, the waterways of the Richmond River are a State responsibility, why should we pay even more when they are swimming in money?	No (Resident)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	No thank you.
250	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive	Why is asset renewal not part of normal budgeting?? It is for all ratepayers and business owners in the Shire. It has to be! Why is BSC budgeting so seriously ineffective and inadequate?? eg Did your budgeters think the swimming pools would last forever? Seriously?? We cant afford your inefficiencies!	Not all all supportive	Its a damning indictment of inadequacy. It demonstrates exactly why there is a standard rate peg, and why councils are being amalgamated. If you cant live within your means, then you should be amalgamated!	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	

#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
251	Alstonville	Strongly supportive	It is just so important to get right , a clean healthy river for the future.	Strongly supportive	So important for this shire to make better facilities... for now and the future	Strongly supportive	we need this .... now better than later	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
252	Alstonville	Not very supportive	This should be part of core business, not done as the result of a special rate rise.	Not at all supportive	This should have been done in an ongoing manner as core business of council, otherwise what are they doing???	Not all all supportive	There seems to be endemic corruption in council - court cases being fought as a result of questionable operations. Focus on core business, stop wasting money and get on with the job.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Multiple categories of properties (eg residential and business)	
253	Wardell	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
254	Ballina	Strongly supportive		Somewhat supportive		Supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
255	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive	I would like to see Shaws Bay more accessible for swimming by clearing some parts of weeds etc	Not very supportive		Not all all supportive	I think what we have been doing so far is good. No need for additional infrastructure	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
256	Ballina	Not at all supportive	As the Ballina shire is the last area prior to the Richmond river flowing out to sea I believe all the areas with catchments that eventually flow into the Richmond should commit to cleaning the river system not just Ballina. The federal and state governments should be approached to provide funding to assist with rehabilitation of the whole river system, the cost should not be carried by Ballina shire ratepayers.	Not at all supportive	Instead of looking to ratepayers to provide a larger money pool maybe Ballina council should look internally, as most viable corporations in private industry do on a regular basis, to look at cost savings, restructures, and asset usage it may be surprising what could be found! This would definitely make the Ballina council "Fit for Future" because at the moment from a this ratepayers point of view it is not.	Not all all supportive	Considering the demographic in the Ballina shire it is ludicrous that this council deems it necessary to impose this kind of increase on the local citizens. If the main thing that is of worry is that the shire maybe be required to justify it's financial operations to the state government, I say bring it on. Maybe some of the highly paid people behind the scenes within the council staff would then have to account for the apparent waste which seems so visible to the majority of the residents.	No (Resident)		It would be a major event if you actually took notice of the views of the majority. The Ballina Council is fast becoming know for its track record of completely ignoring the wishes of its ratepayers.
257	Wollongbar	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive	Given the way the Council has shown they spend our rates in the past, I just see this as another money grab by the council. The proposed pool upgrades which the majority of people said 'No' in the questionnaire, but apparently phone surveys voted 'Yes' for to get it over the line, show money that is raised does not get spent on what is promised. The pool upgrade was due to happen 2015/2016 but is still not happening and to add it to the letter of proposal is to add salt to the already opened wound. I find that the amount of rates and pre-development contributions would easily cover this proposal, considering Ballina council is one of the local council's that has many new development sites in the works. I am still yet to see where my large contributions we're spent	Not all all supportive	I believe it should not happen, but will not be suprised if this council will find a shady way to get the money they want, (like some unknown phone survey)	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Don't release a proposal 2 years ago that states rates will return to normal after the 2015/2016 period, and then come up with other ways to increase the rates even more. Will you be returning rates to the normal rates before increase again in the new proposal, or will you increase from the current already increased rates. Looking at your tables shows the rates staying at the already increased price before further increasing
258	Wollongbar	Strongly supportive		Strongly supportive		Strongly supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
259	Other (eg. rural)	Not at all supportive		Not very supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
260	Wollongbar	Not very supportive	Q. What are other councils doing to support healthy waterways. Not much use in undertaking a healthy waterways program if the other local councils are not participating. Where does all the pollution come from up stream. Let's put the horse before the cart	Not very supportive		Not very supportive	No	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
261	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	

#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
262	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not very supportive		Not very supportive		Not very supportive		No (Resident)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
263	Ballina	Not very supportive	It seems the focus will be the Richmond River, which is the responsibility of the NSW Gov. Also only a very small part of the catchment is in Ballina Shire, so money spent will be wasted on not making a real difference.	Not very supportive	For people on fixed incomes, constant rate rises are unsustainable and make living hard. Also real income from wages has not increased while many other costs spiral eg. electricity and petrol. GIVE US A BREAK!!!!	Not all all supportive	Farmland rates are very low, and farms are very successful businesses..... I have yet to see Ballina Shire address costs in any real way. I have lived here 25 years and the only response to need is to put rates up rather than find cost savings. eg 2 Olympic standard pools in a small shire is ridiculous as is duplication of basketball facilities. Way too much emphasis on sport.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	I am concerned that this consultation is a sham, done because it is required by law. I think you don't really care what we say, you will do it anyway.
264	Ballina	Not at all supportive	Stop polluting our waters then you will not have to "clean" them and waste our money	Somewhat supportive	Enough of community buildings and sporting facilities - aren't there enough underused ones already! STOP wasting our money and asking for more to be wasted!	Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
265	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive	Healthy waterways become unhealthy waterways because of upstream impacts. A 1.5% increase in rates across the shire netting ~\$300K will not address the issues. My guess is that it would barely pay the fees for the consultants that tell you what needs doing.	Not at all supportive	The Fit for the Future program is not an excuse to raise rates. It is improper management in the past that has led to Ballina Council to not being Fit for the Future without a substantial increase in rates. Efficiencies and cutbacks are the way to survive if your expenditure exceeds your income - not merely by putting your hand out again and taking it from residents.	Not all all supportive	Your documentation insinuates that Council is entitled to the 1.5% and 2.5% standard rate peg as set by the State Government. This is not the case! You should also be justifying this increase in your documentation and arguments. To ask rate payers for a % increase in rates over and above the % increase that they are seeing in their wages and salaries it totally unacceptable.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	To allow people that do not pay rates to participate in the survey makes the survey a bit pointless.
266	Wollongbar	Not at all supportive		Not very supportive		Not all all supportive	I am an aged pensioner and feel this increase will place too much financial stress on both myself and other low income earners.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
267	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Why is it that we have so many council vehicles just sitting around town surely they could reduce the number and have a pool for work use only. It seems that every pen pusher gets to drive one home just to say I work for the council.
268	Ballina	Not very supportive	All Shires forming part of the Richmond River catchment should be involved in raising revenue that is to be directed to improving the Richmond River and tributaries, not just the Ballina Shire.	Supportive		Not very supportive	See previous comment on Waterways (ie all Shires should be involved, not just Ballina) Support Asset Renewal.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Did not received the mailout; this was shown to me by a neighbour.
269	Ballina	Not at all supportive	If the extra money is being spent on the Richmond River and coastline, I am in g support. Get the cane farmers to stop flushing chemicals into the river for a start ha ha.	Not at all supportive	What are our rates pay for now if not Asset Renewal. Why is the increase needed for works that are done everyday. Cut down the waste and don't raise the rates.	Not very supportive	After locals had to fork out extra money for the upgrade of Ballina and Alstonville Pools which only about 5% use, to ask for such a large increase and then for it to become permanent is pretty tough.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
270	Ballina	Strongly supportive	Fix waterways at the source of the problems up stream Dredge river for safe traffic in all tidal conditions Dredge & enliven Shaws Bay Provide adequate thoroughfare & parking for Lennox Head Restore Ainsworths foreshore & build a wooden walkway along this lake's shoreline	Supportive	Fix the fundamentals first Make healthy cycling easier as a mode of transport Get residents out walking Build exceptional community buildings Enable organised sporting groups to use public facilities	Strongly supportive	We voted for Shire Councilors last year without knowing their:- qualification, management and practical experience community centredness voting and preference deals or alliances history of past council motions and why they had voted in Shire decisions knowledge of the NSW local government act.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	The Advocate should publish Council decisions and who voted for / against proposals.
271	Ballina	Strongly supportive		Strongly supportive		Strongly supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
272	Ballina	Somewhat supportive		Somewhat supportive		Somewhat supportive		No (Resident)		
273	Wollongbar	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive	Stop buying into fear of an amalgamated council. Selfish. Ruin ratepayers finances, so you can keep a job.	Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	School holiday consultation period? Looks dodgy.

#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
274	Ballina	Strongly supportive	I think it is very important to improve the health of our waterways. They are an integral part of the Ballina Shire environment and need to be better looked after. The poor rating of the health of the Richmond River is proof that we need to put more money directly into looking after our waterways. I think a large component of this money should be spent on helping farmers better manage run-off from their farms as I believe this is a major cause of the deterioration of the River.	Strongly supportive	I strongly support maintaining and improving the Shire assets and infrastructure. I take pride in where I live and love using the facilities provided by Council such as bike paths, swimming pools, parks, libraries and community centres. If we all chip in a little more I think it can make a big difference to our quality of life within the Shire. It has positive economic benefits too if visitors are attracted to Ballina Shire and dollars spent within the Shire.	Strongly supportive		No (Resident)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	I think that the process has been positive and easy to follow for me. Maybe some reminder ads in the Advocate would help to increase input by ratepayers.
275	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not very supportive		Somewhat supportive		Not very supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Business	
276	Ballina	Not very supportive	Hi - my understanding of River systems is that they generally flow from the mountains to the sea. Guess what! Ballina shire is largely located 'by the sea'(your catchphrase; ie an estuary and coastline waterway. Do what you can for the Shaws Bay etc. As far as the River goes there is no support from me towards a river that flows through two other local govt areas. why not get the same folk opposed to shark nets to protest about the cane farmers and the rest of the agriculture business that create the majority of the river problems. Unless I see a letter from the mayors of Lismore and Richmond River Councils that state they are doing the same thing - ie a systematic approach, then I am respectfully opposed. This is the logical approach.	Supportive	I agree that supporting our community with our rates is the best approach. As opposed to point 4, above, where you hope to slug us for problems that are related to poor management practices in other shires. Storm drainage works need better definition as they can be used to cosmetic up the rich end of town.	Not very supportive	You are brave folk to ask for rate rises in what is tipped as a changing economic outlook with petrol cost hikes and higher inflation over the next 18 months to 2 years. I would recommend doing this type of approach after an election. Actually didn't you just have one?	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	I am pleased that you use a consultation process.
277	Ballina	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
278	Other (eg. rural)	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
279	Ballina	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive	i have a disability and own a very small unit in ballina. already my council rates are excessive for such a small place. it seems ridiculous that i am paying almost the same amount of rates for my small unit that people in byron bay, pay for a whole house.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
280	Other (eg. rural)	Supportive		Supportive		Supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Farmland	
281	Alstonville	Not at all supportive	We don't want to see yet another money grab and do not want to see any such program as this as it is totally unnecessary	Somewhat supportive	If there should be an increase definitely do not need any community or sporting facilities just concentrate on doing your job in maintaining the roads you have neglected!	Not all all supportive	Do not want to see this money grab come into effect	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Farmland	
282	Alstonville	Not at all supportive	Not supportive as don't think this is necessary	Somewhat supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Farmland	



#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
283	Alstonville	Somewhat supportive	Unless the Council can tackle the source of waterway degradation, the proposed program is only a short term cosmetic bandaid fix. The council needs to control development adjacent to rivers and waterways where wetlands are being destroyed. It needs to control runoff and erosion from agricultural land, particularly on the plateau. Macadamia orchards are a major source of soil erosion during periods of intense rainfall. Cultivation of soil (on slopes particularly) adjacent to creeks should be banned. It is my view that the Council has no intention of tackling these latter issues, it is all too hard, and therefore can do little to prevent long term degradation of our waterways.	Not very supportive		Not very supportive	Many people in Ballina Shire receive pensions, either as self funded or as aged pensions. I received a 0.9% increase in pension for 2016, this being deemed as the CPI increase. Many salaried workers would also be receiving minimal increases. Hence very few incomes would be keeping pace with the Rate Peg Limit and to then propose a total increase of around 17.6% (compound rate) would appear excessive.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Farmland	The council needs to provide more specific detail regarding the outcome if the Proposal does not proceed.
284	Ballina	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Business	
285	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive		Somewhat supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
286	Ballina	Not very supportive		Not very supportive		Not very supportive		No (Resident)		
287	Wollongbar	Somewhat supportive	Ballina Shire Council should be working within their means and find other areas where money can be saved for this project.	Not at all supportive	We feel this rate variation will be ongoing for further projects.	Somewhat supportive	We support the Healthy Waterways program but once again object to the rate rise to fund these programs as we already have had one to fund the swimming pools in Alstonville and Ballina.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	irrespective of the Consultation Process which is a formality we feel whatever else that needs to be done in the future will be an ongoing process where the ratepayers will be expected to further contribute to whatever project the Ballina Shire Council decides upon. These rate variations as stated in your letter will be permanent if passed by IPART which no doubt will happen. Surely the elected Ballina Shire Council can find and consider an alternate way of funding these programs instead of extra forced financial payment by the ratepayers..
288	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Strongly supportive		Strongly supportive	Safer roads mean less risk of accidents, less damage to vehicles, quicker trips and give an overall appearance of a Shire being cared for - bit like mowing your lawn and trimming the edges - rather than looking horribly neglected as in some adjoining Shires. They are also indicators of monies being spent responsibly.	Strongly supportive	From my experience in the local area and other Shires I have lived in in recent years, Ballina has demonstrated the most responsible expenditure of its monies and appears to be seen by the next tiers of Government to be acting responsibly and consistently in that we receive special funding for projects (such as Black Spot). If the rate rise means we have a Christmas light display in the pine tree at Ross Park, then go for it! Although a more extensive display for 2017 would be appreciated!	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Consultation opportunities have been excellent from my point of view. Given all other Council areas seem to be touting the same issue, you would have to live under a rock to not know about the proposal
289	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive		Not very supportive		Not very supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
290	Ballina	Not at all supportive	build a quality marina, which in turn would generate more income for other water related projects, and then maybe you could give us rate payers a break. But unfortunately the council is only ever pro-active when it comes to raising our rates, so I think you will be still talking about a marina in 10 years time :(	Not at all supportive	Again had the council general manager been better with the rate payers funds, maybe you would not be asking for extra rate rises year after year	Not all all supportive	If you ask me, its a done deal	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Business	Do a mass letter drop and let the rate payers decide. But then again , the last time you wanted extra funds, you asked for feedback from the rate payers and the overall opinion was NO (swimming pools).....but you ignored the feedback and went ahead with it anyway SO WHY BOTHER ASKING US RATE PAYERS AND VOTERS..... BECAUSE YOU WILL IGNORE US IF THE MAJORITY SAY NO, AND JUST DO IT ANYWAY

#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
291	Alstonville	Not very supportive		Not at all supportive		Not very supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
292	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive	what actually does Healthy Waterways Program mean, i doubt this cash grab will lead to that. Fund the program through existing revenue or apply for grants	Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive	there's been too many, give us a break	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	too short, wrong time of the year,
293	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive	I am one of many that have relocated to the Northern Rivers from Sydney within the last 5 - 10 years and remain shocked at the fact my council rates on the Northern Beaches of Sydney were 40% cheaper than those we currently pay.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	As a council you need to run your business (as much as possible) based on the funds available, we have incurred a rate increase recently to fund the renovation of the local pools and now you expect us to incur a further increase above and beyond what you can apply for in additional funding - joke!!!
294	Ballina	Not at all supportive		Not very supportive		Not very supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	We are already paying for a over priced pool and high rates here are not a cash cow for Ballina council.
295	Ballina	Supportive		Supportive		Supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
296	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
297	Alstonville	Supportive		Not very supportive	I would be OK with a small increase in rates to support the asset renewal but not the amount proposed I feel it will increase rates too much particularly the business rate which will be passed on by the premises owner in the form of increased rents to tennants who will then pass it on as increased prices to their customers - probably not good for a lot of local businesses.If you can fix the stormwater runoff problem this will fix a lot of the water quality problems in Shaw's Bay, the river and Lake Ainsworth.	Not very supportive	See previous comments.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Multiple categories of properties (eg residential and business)	Seperate forums for business owners should be held to address specific business concerns regarding the increase.
298	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive	We are paying far too much as it is. You need more funds, cut admin expenditure.	Not at all supportive	We are paying far too much as it is. You need more funds, cut admin expenditure.	Not all all supportive	We are paying far too much as it is. You need more funds, cut admin expenditure.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	We are paying far too much as it is. You need more funds, cut admin expenditure.
299	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive	Stop exploiting rate payers. Source the funds from state or federal government.	Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
300	Ballina	Somewhat supportive		Supportive		Somewhat supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	No
301	Ballina	Not at all supportive	I think council should look at why we have unhealthy waterways. The waterways have not been monitored, not been a priority for years. Then after years of neglect the state government thinks the best way forward is to pass the buck to the rate payer (as if we are not taxed enough). Then the council uses scare tactics if we dare go against the proposal. I think the state government should be held liable for not taking responsibility. How much more of our hard earned money does the government want to take honestly.	Not at all supportive	The state government needs to take responsibility and come up with fundraising events and maybe some counselors and politicians should loose there extra benefits as they get paid enough anyways	Not all all supportive	Just like when we were asked if we want shark nets and I said NO due to the impacts this will have eg animals getting caught in nets and dying heres another survey that once again will go the way council recommends.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	The consultation favors a rate rise to be paid by the property owner its biased

#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
302	Alstonville	Not at all supportive	The state or federal government should be cleaning the waterways.	Not at all supportive	These improvements should be budgeted within the normal increase of our rates. I think some council members forget the implications financially that these rises have on the average ratepayer.	Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
303	Wollongbar	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Multiple categories of properties (eg residential and business)	
304	Other (eg. rural)	Not at all supportive	You want to improve run off into the Richmond , well stop the bloody farmers pouring their fertilisers into the river instead of slugging the rate payers. We are tired of paying for the select "Sacred cows" how about you take care of the residents for once, not your mates.	Not at all supportive	Stop council waste first and then look at improving the bottom line.	Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
305	Ballina	Strongly supportive	The money should be applied towards on ground actions which result in improvements in water quality such as riparian revegetation, improved drain management, improved swamp management	Strongly supportive		Strongly supportive	Pleased to see the council is finally following the types of funding approaches used elsewhere to successfully restore the health of coastal rivers	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
306	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive	Council need to become more efficient in the way they work, identify and prove to the community that you have looked at your own internal processes with a microscope. I do not believe Council has done this. You have lost a minimum of \$200k per year in income since the exit of LCC from Tuckombil. If LCC were that incompetent in the quarry management at Tuckombil why hasn't Boral chosen to take on the resource considering it is at their doorstep to their AC plant? Instead they are pulling material from Queensland! How about focussing on making this resource appealing to a vendor from the Pacific Hwy upgrades, or mining it yourself to save on our roads material costs? You have a cash cow sitting stagnant and you are attacking the community for higher rates when if you think about it, this rate hike does not need to happen. If Council is serious, they will be investing time into reshaping your processes and assets as efficiently as possible to lessen the already heavily burdened rate payer.	Not at all supportive	See comment in section 5	Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Last consult Council had with the Community regarding a rate increase was for the pool upgrades. There was overwhelming support for this to not happen but Council ignored the Community voice and went through with it anyway?? Please listen this time and go with the majority, whatever that may be.
307	Ballina	Supportive	It is all very well to have a waterways program encompassing the lower richmond river, but what's being done upstream. If the management program is to succeed all councils along the Richmond River need to be involved. Why has the River mouth and lower North Creek not been dredged, surely this would help with river management.	Somewhat supportive	Money needs to be spent on ROADS, FOOTPATHS, WALKWAYS AND STORMWATER DRAINS FIRST. There are alot of areas in the shire that need fixing .	Somewhat supportive	Asset renewal ok , healthy waterways more information on exactly how and where money is to be spent.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
308	Alstonville	Not at all supportive	Surely healthy waterways are the responsibility of our governments state and federal. Pollutants in the Richmond River are not just coming from our shire but up river. Ballina ratepayers shouldn't have to wear the cost of remedial works. Council seems to be placing a lot of importance on a letter from OzFish. They are just another special interest group pushing their own agenda on everybody else. A check of the website shows none of the directors are from the Ballina Shire. If they were serious they would be pushing the government to take responsibility.	Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive	Ratepayers are still reeling from the 7.5% increase for the swimming pools which we had foisted on us even though the majority of ratepayers in the shire would never use the pools and the feedback council received was ignored. The cost of that exercise has increased way above what we were told it was going to be. There are a lot of low income earners, pensioners and self-funded retirees (struggling due to the low interest paid on investments) who are going to find it harder to make ends meet than they already are. Council needs to look at streamlining its own operations first.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Firstly everyone is aware that council has only sought feedback because it is required to do so and has no intention of taking any notice of objections. The only figures quoted in the letter are about the increase in rates - nothing about estimated cost of any of the proposed asset renewal program even voluntary organizations have to submit a budget and state where money raised is to be spent.

#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
309	Alstonville	Not very supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
310	Other (eg. rural)	Not at all supportive	Total waste of OUR money	Somewhat supportive	Only if the roads get fixed no need for any other crap	Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
311	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
312	Alstonville	Not at all supportive	The best support for wetlands is to leave them alone. Apart from routine waterfront maintenance which should be budgeted and paid for from existing council revenue, I do not support any extra fundraising for this purpose.	Not at all supportive	The above questions indicate that council does not have a set plan of where to spend additional revenue - they just want more revenue to spend. this council seems to have an addiction to raising and spending money, which the vast majority of ratepayers can't afford. This is effectively a 10% increase in rates over three years, and therefore ongoing. Ratepayers are already hurting very significantly from every compulsory payment in society increasing at a rate above wage / pension increases. Council must learn to live with within its mean, just like ratepayers have to. Most new roads and footpaths are paid for by developers and local residents, so the largest council commitment is to maintenance - which is clearly budgetable within current rates revenue.	Not all all supportive	I strongly object to any rates increase or new levy. Council needs to take into account the financial stress many of its ratepayers are already suffering. When Council advises the outcome of this process, I challenge you to inform residents how many thousands of dollars were wasted in the production of glossy pamphlets and mailing them out to ratepayers.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	I am quite sceptical as to the timing of this information and survey. To release this over the Christmas holiday period indicates Council are hoping most people will be otherwise distracted at this time of year, resulting in a smaller response from ratepayers.
313	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive	See State Gvt for funds or sell some of Council assets	Not at all supportive	See State Gvt for funds or sell some of Council assets	Not all all supportive	See State Gvt for funds or sell some of Council assets	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	sell some of Council assets
314	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive	No matter how much revenue Ballina Council has at its disposal all would be squandered. The increased monies collected from the growth in rate revenue due to all the new housing hasn't helped and I don't think a licence to print money would be enough either, so why should rate payers have to throw good money after bad?.	Not at all supportive	Continuing from the previous comment, stop wasting ratepayer funded revenue and make wiser investment choices!	Not all all supportive	As previously stated use the revenue you receive more responsibly.	No (Resident)		Bring in a caretaker council until a decent new team can be found.
315	Other (eg. rural)	Not at all supportive	My position is that the current taxes we are paying should be able to cover the expenses required for those works. If there are no federal / state funds available, that should be questioned, not more money taken from taxpayers.	Not at all supportive	My position is that the current taxes we are paying should be able to cover the expenses required for those works. If there are no federal / state funds available, that should be questioned, not more money taken from taxpayers.	Not all all supportive	My position is that the current taxes we are paying should be able to cover the expenses required for those works. If there are no federal / state funds available, that should be questioned, not more money taken from taxpayers.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	I hope the results of the survey have a decisive influence on the final decision - ie if the ratepayers reject the proposed increases they should be scrapped.
316	Ballina	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	rates are rising faster than pay rates you want sustainable housing how is this achievable when this rise would have to be passed on ?
317	Ballina	Not at all supportive	The pollution is coming from up river get the other towns on board to clean up their act first	Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		No (Resident)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Like the last rate rise I could not find anyone who was in support of it. Yet you say it was widely supported so I don't know where you are coming from with your surveys.
318	Other (eg. rural)	Not at all supportive	It is a State and Federal responsibility and we are already paying for it in taxes, where does it stop. Money gets spent in the cities what about us. This is wrong. Council would be better off to lobby State and federal government for the funding. I also think that the Ballina council has put their rates up enough and that this is just another grab for cash. Ballina council needs to look more carefully at their spending and stop robbing Ballina's rate payers	Not at all supportive	It is a State and Federal responsibility and we are already paying for it in taxes, where does it stop. Money gets spent in the cities what about us. This is wrong. Council would be better off to lobby State and federal government for the funding. I also think that the Ballina council has put their rates up enough and that this is just another grab for cash. Ballina council needs to look more carefully at their spending and stop robbing Ballina's rate payers	Not all all supportive	It is a State and Federal responsibility and we are already paying for it in taxes, where does it stop. Money gets spent in the cities what about us. This is wrong. Council would be better off to lobby State and federal government for the funding. I also think that the Ballina council has put their rates up enough and that this is just another grab for cash. Ballina council needs to look more carefully at their spending and stop robbing Ballina's rate payers.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	It is a State and Federal responsibility and we are already paying for it in taxes, where does it stop. Money gets spent in the cities what about us. This is wrong. Council would be better off to lobby State and federal government for the funding. I also think that the Ballina council has put their rates up enough and that this is just another grab for cash. Ballina council needs to look more carefully at their spending and stop robbing Ballina's rate payers



#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
319	Ballina	Strongly supportive		Strongly supportive		Supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
320	Ballina	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Council should be looking at cuts in other areas of expenditure to raise the funds. Commitments are stretched to the limit. Ballina has a high retiree population, how can they find more money to pay excess rates!
321	Other (eg. rural)	Strongly supportive	Funds need to be directed to the whole of the Richmond river under the CZMP not just the Ballina Shire as water flows from the headwaters to exit at Ballina. One dollar from each resident would provide enough funding to combine with other councils which is what Ballina refused to do under the last OEH CZMP application to help fix up the river. Funds need to be ongoing every year & ongoing maintenance must be included.	Not very supportive	I believe most assets are adequately maintained apart from adaption to climate change and sea level rise which requires urgent investigation and investment.	Not very supportive	See previous answers, commitment to healthy waterways needs to be ongoing. Only providing one year of increased funding will result in a complete waste of money as weeds again overtake any riparian plantings and will do nothing to improve water quality flowing down from above Ballina Shire.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Farmland	Some more options would be handy eg, BSC to be involved in ongoing actions to improve water quality under the CZMP for the Richmond River Estuary in cooperations with other councils (RVC, LCC, RCC) at \$1 per resident. That would be supported by the community but I suggest in its current form this proposal will fail to gain community support.
322	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
323	Ballina	Not at all supportive	This is not a Council responsibility. I understand your position on showing leadership, but that leadership should be in the form of actions and pressure on those bodies responsible. LEAVE IT TO THE PEOPLE WHO ARE RESPONSIBLE. Yes, pressure them and maintain momentum, but to slug locals with the cost which should be borne by another body is not on.	Strongly supportive	Excellent idea. We are happy to pay for the things which will benefit us and for which we should be responsible.	Not all all supportive	Separate the issues. Asset Renewal is excellent - waterways is someone else's responsibility. Putting them together risks scaring residents with the size of the increase and therefore both failing.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Business	Excellent and clear communication and plenty of time to respond. Well done.
324	Ballina	Not at all supportive	Live within your means.	Not at all supportive	Live within your means.	Not all all supportive	Live within your means.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Multiple categories of properties (eg residential and business)	Don't do what you normally do and disregard the community feedback. Don't have consultation just so that you can say that you have consulted with the community then do what you like and continue on your inefficient way.
325	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Strongly supportive	We have a responsibility to care for our assets now and for future generations	Strongly supportive	Constant maintenance is better for the community and essential for safety and shire pride	Strongly supportive	A small cost for all with long term benefits for all. Sure I'd rather not have to pay more but it is anecessary cost for the benefit of all in our shire.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	As usual Ballina Shire Council keeps us well informed well done.
326	Ballina	Not very supportive		Not very supportive		Not very supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
327	Ballina	Not at all supportive	I have property that backs onto one of the above water ways and have tried to talk to council with regard to this with no response. The money will go to studies and still have no outcome.	Not very supportive		Not very supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Multiple categories of properties (eg residential and business)	
328	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
329	Ballina	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
330	Ballina	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Business	
331	Alstonville	Not very supportive		Not very supportive	Funding for these projects should have been allocated within the forward planning estimates. Maybe we should have less 'managers' & more ground level staff for general maintenance	Not very supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	

#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
332	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
333	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
334	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive	After a 40% rise several years ago I feel the council should get its act together to finance these projects . I am a pensioner and you must understand my income doesn't rise by more than the cpi so why should yours?	Not at all supportive	the council has wasted millions on projects such as the cycle way though skennars and north ck roads . very few people use it and I know at least one person who has injured themselves on it. the lack of exit roads from pacific pines is shaping up to be a major problem, the council ignored advise from community groups and committees on both these issues . I know because I was on one.	Not all all supportive	I found this survey hard to find. I had to ring council for more directions	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	I have completed submissions and surveys in the past and have never received feed back or acknowledgement.
335	Ballina	Not at all supportive	The waterways are a State matter and have nothing yo do with Council. You should concentrate your scope of responsibility on what you were elected yo do. You must think your constituents are millionaires, when the majority are pensioners. If you seriously believe in paying for the waterways then sell some of your many assets and pay for it yourself and not tax the ratepayers who pay more than enough now for your incompetence.	Not at all supportive	You ruined a perfectly good sports oval out at West Ballina now want more money out of the poor pensioners to cover your blunders.	Not all all supportive	People cant afford your whims. You can't seem to competently complete what you were elected to do, now you want to involve yourself and spend other people's money on areas that are run by the State Govt. I think you people are dissolusioned as to your responsibilities. Get out of running things that dont concern you & try to concentrate on what your elected responsibilities are regarding roads, water & garbage.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Listen to the will of the people for a change. The large majority were against your pool proposal.
336	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive	How about you cut costs elsewhere in your program to pay for this initiative. Every council/government in Australia has bloated overpaid workforces who waste money. I already pay excessive rates well above average for this area. I am about to retire, will I get a discount then? NO!! I wish my pay had gone up as much in the last 10 years as rates have!!	Not at all supportive	See the comments in Question 5.	Not all all supportive	Absolute waste of money.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	At least you have given ratepayers an opportunity to comment This survey is good.
337	Ballina	Not very supportive		Not very supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
338	Alstonville	Not at all supportive	RMS should look after the water ways not the rate payers.. Remove the Barrage at tuckean swamp and let it be tidal. That will stop the acid runoff	Not at all supportive	You now have a lot bigger rate base as I see see it and you cannot make ends meet ??? The state government is always putting extra fees on councils and you should fight back instead of giving up. Stop repairing roads that don't need fixing. Kerr street is a perfect example. Lovely hot mix that you just put top coat on. What a devaluation of a asset. There was nothing wrong with it at the time.	Not all all supportive	Stop wasting money and live within you means every one else has to try to. J.Hockey said the age of entitlement is over. Council should try and do the same.	No (Resident)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Stop hitting the rate payers for all these costs and forget about consultants as the do nothing except to charge you more for nothing.
339	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not very supportive		Not very supportive		Not very supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Feel the rates are high now, and with the amount of development there is at the moment the added income from this should enable council to be able to do the things proposed without the extra increase.

#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
340	Wollongbar	Somewhat supportive	All minor waterways should be part of a monitoring program as the health of these areas impacts on all listed above. Your information spouses looking after our natural infrastructure and making the shire 'Fit for the future'. To achieve this how about introducing a more structured waste program to alleviate the damage done by illegal waste disposal. I would suggest a curb side collection to take place two times a year, and a more affordable green waste disposal fee at the tip. Most residents on the plateau choose to use the facility at Lismore which is far more advanced in its offerings around recyclable goods.	Somewhat supportive	Residents of the shire outside of Ballina understand the importance of tourism to our local economy that Ballina brings in, however how about a more planned program of investment outside of Ballina. For example why can't the cycle path between Wollongbar and Alstonville be extended along Lismore rd to the Tafe? This would then provide a safer passage for people wishing to cycle from Alstonville to the Wollongbar TAFE.	Somewhat supportive	The health of our waterways is of critical importance. I would like to see more regular information circulated with the rates as to what households can do regularly to minimise their impact. In Wollongbar, the stormwater from the new developments feeds into the surrounding waterways, yet I would argue that many residents do not think about the impact of their daily choices.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	The consultation period should have been longer. One month at the beginning of the year is not adequate. Most people need longer to understand the information given and the financial impact on their individual household budgets. This is particularly important given that many are still away in this post Christmas period.
341	Other (eg. rural)	Strongly supportive	Essential to restore the health of the river and essential to lose the unfortunate reputation of the river.	Strongly supportive	The main street is looking wonderful, continue the theme throughout the CBD areas.	Strongly supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
342	Alstonville	Not at all supportive	Rivers cross many shires. the state government is also responsible. I would prefer money spent on an ocean pool thanks.	Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Just the normal rise thanks!
343	Ballina	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive	I am not at all supportive of the rates being increased to fund this I find that its already hard to keep up with payments as it is and i believe the rates were increased before to fund the up grade of the Ballina pool i find this unfair as i do not use the pool and the funding for this should have come out of entry fees from people who use the pool i do not wish for my rates to increase as i am struggling as it is with payments and a increase in rates is going to make me struggle to live financially i don't believe this is fair pressure to put on families	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
344	Ballina	Not at all supportive	Without surrounding councils (Lismore and Richmond River Councils) and government agencies (RMS,DPI etc.)funding the project simultaneously and works programs coordinated why should the rate payers have to pay for everyone else. We already pay a storm water levy and proposed eco barrier levy. Soon we will have a rate increase for everything. At this rate no one could afford to live in Ballina.	Not very supportive	If we keep on adding increases to rates no one could afford to live in Ballina. Thus Ballina would cease to exist.	Not very supportive	Due to lack of maintenance of council's assets over many years it should not be up to ratepayers to pay the full bill.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	These two proposals need to be discussed through the consultation process in more detail as to what we are getting for our money and how it is going to be coordinated with other agencies
345	Ballina	Strongly supportive	Riparian vegetation along many parts of the Richmond River and its tributaries is either severely degraded or completely absent, South Ballina, Pimlico and Wardell provide examples of unchecked weed infestations and severe degradation. This vegetation is a key contributor to river health and the biodiversity the river supports.	Somewhat supportive	Number 4 above is left blank as open spaces and play equipment are two different issues. Inspection of many open spaces in the shire, other than main recreational parks, reveals they are generally neglected, especially in terms of weed control and proper tree management. Examples are the Treelands reserve adjacent to the Ballina Fire Station and the Russelton Estate entrance in Wollongbar where vine weeds are smothering and choking native vegetation. These pockets of remnant vegetation will die without funding for works. Play equipment in many of Ballina's parks, gets used extremely rarely or not at all. \$60,000 to \$80,000 to fit out a park with play equipment that doesnt get used is a waste of money. What about a survey of the residents who live in the vicinity prior to installation? If they dont have kids and dont want play equipment, plant trees or do a community garden instead.	Supportive	I support the rate increase because I think our natural areas and open spaces and reserves are neglected. People judge a town's public amenity on its street trees, open spaces and old and modern buildings, not its kerbs, gutters and car parks.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	The information and data gathered through the consultation process should be assessed by a third party - someone outside of Council. This will decrease subjectivity and bias and ensure transparency. Thank you for the opportunity to contribute.

#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
346	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not very supportive		Somewhat supportive		Not very supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
347	Ballina	Not at all supportive		Somewhat supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
348	Wollongbar	Not at all supportive	stop spending money to please a small vocal minority in the community!	Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
349	Alstonville	Not at all supportive	Impose a bed tax on tourists and a recreational fishing tax as these groups contribute greatly to degradation of waterways.	Not at all supportive	This should already be being done. Worthless cultural programs, newsletter production should be cut. User pays for use of sport grounds and pools.	Not all all supportive	Are you going to try to keep increasing rates until people cannot afford to pay.	No (Resident)		Cut office staff and better supervise outdoor staff as I commonly see staff driving around in council vehicles obviously doing very little.
350	Alstonville	Not at all supportive	This is outside of the councils jurisdiction, and you should be focusing on making a stronger case, and securing state or federal funding instead. I am not against fixing these waterways - but you should not be putting this cost directly onto Ballina Shire residents.	Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		No (Resident)		
351	Other (eg. rural)	Not at all supportive	In the letter sent out it says "the water bodies mentioned are actually not under the direct control of Council" I suggest that the various government departments State and Federal be lobbied for these funds not an increase on our rates for this.	Not at all supportive	A residents we have limited income and council should look at what they are doing from this viewpoint and look to keep the costs down to reasonable amounts.	Not all all supportive	The cost of living continually continues to rise. I am a part age pensioner retiring from my 2 days a week work due to my age. My income is not going to rise each year in line with the proposed changes. I believe the council should operate within the rate pegging set by the state government. Priorities need to be looked at by council and council staff and ways of saving money closely considered again.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
352	Ballina	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
353	Alstonville	Somewhat supportive	Council needs to work with government agencies to ensure our catchments are healthy. Streams are overloaded with sediment from farm runoff during heavy rainfall events. Soil loss from macadamia farms has been measured at over 10 tonnes per hectare per year, and land management practices are not changing rapidly enough.	Not very supportive	It is fine for Council to consider rate increases, but my income does not increase to the same extent on a yearly basis.	Not very supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
354	Ballina	Not at all supportive	Make the landowners who put cattle into graze on the wetlands, which turned this into grass, then when it rains turns the grass into a rotting mass that takes oxygen from the water - get those who used this and benefited financially from it to pay.	Not at all supportive	Cut down on wasted dollars of staff. Sat for an hour the other day to see quite too many staff, chatting and socialising and do NOTHING productive. They would not be still employed by my business doing this on my time.	Not all all supportive	Although interest rates are at an all time low, this is far too big a rate hike for families and pensioners to accept in one hit.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	You waste taxpayers money, selling them ideas then built infrastructure that is inadequate. Why is the Kentwell Centre not a hall that the whole town could use??? Lennox Head and ALstonville have this,, Ballina No, although I know that the new high school is going to have combined education/council recreation courts, but where is the whole town use hall
355	Other (eg. rural)	Not at all supportive	Not council's area of responsibility. Ratepayers cannot afford it.	Not at all supportive	Council should include asset renewal in their normal budget.	Not all all supportive	Increase in Rates and Charges is far more than CPI, pension increase, or wage increase.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Results of consultation should be made public including the method for calculating percentage results. Only respondents to the survey should be included in the calculation. Only ratepayers should be included in survey results as they are stakeholders.
356	Ballina	Not at all supportive	I strongly disagree with spending this kind of money on this project when Council has already mismanaged the pools upgrade project with the blowout of nearly double the original costs.	Not at all supportive	I think Council get enough income from rates and they often sprout how successful the council has invested in commercial real Eastgate across the shire, so if this is so successful and they are fit for the future as they claimed, why are we asked to dig deeper in our pockets again!	Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	



#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
357	Ballina	Not at all supportive	We voted for not updating pools and u didn't listen will u follow peoples wishes? 1 increase is enough	Not at all supportive	No more increases our wages do not go up to cover increases	Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Perhaps if council follows rate payers views
358	Ballina	Not at all supportive	Please focus on just one thing at a time - shark attacks and safety of public swimming and surfing at out local beaches should be the only focus at present.	Not at all supportive	Ballina needs an indoor sports centre (a proper one - not the Lennox Head debacle of only one court that doesn't meet standards). It is the only large town I can think of to not to have one. It is embarrassing that representative sports are played in a school hall for a town this size.	Not all all supportive	Council should be pegged at the standard increase. The rates went up for the pool and that is over. Time to tighten your belts too council and give the ratepayers a rest before raising rates above and beyond again.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Actually listen to the results of the consultation. The past few I have been involved in the community votes against council and council just do as they please anyway. If you keep ignoring the community you represent what is the point of consulting.
359	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive	It is a good idea, but council cannot just keeping rates up to fund future projects. There was a consultation about increasing rates to fund upgrades to our pools, which went ahead despite the majority of people who did the council survey objecting. It is poor government policy to keep increasing taxes to pay for public infrastructure , when will the rate increases stop? Council needs to investigate means of raising revenue without just applying to increase rates. One way to do this would be to stop mailing letters for council bills and information, email like every other business and charge for those who want paper copies, another way is to coordinate road works etc with other councils to cut costs. Let's be imaginative and have positive governance that looks to reducing unnessary spending before increasing rates.	Not at all supportive		Not very supportive	Healthy waterways and asset renewal are both very important items that council needs to address. I fully understand that these cost money but council need some to not just take the easy fix and apply for a rates rise. I have read your information about how Ballina rates are low when compared with other local councils but this has been presented in a way to favour your aragument to increase rates. What other ways of cost savings have council investigated? That needs to be made clear to the public, a rate rise should be the absolute last resort.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
360	Ballina	Not very supportive	It is clear that action is needed to ensure the ongoing health of our waterways, particularly the Richmond River. However, I do not believe that the current proposed actions will effectively address the issues, as they do not ensure that required actions from other shires will occur(where the problem actually begins for our end). Further, I do not believe that Ballina residents should be footing the bill for a problem which is the responsibility of all the involved areas. I would see an environmental levy for ALL the affected areas as a more responsible, fair and effective solution.	Supportive	Ballina has a number of buildings which are utter eyesores and a disgraceful waste of resources. These include the defunct and deteriorating cafe overlooking Shelley Beach, and the Stone Grill restaurant at Shaws Bay. What is going on with these? They have been languishing for years with no sign of any resolution of whatever the problem is. Additionally, there a numerous ugly and poorly maintained motels which create a very unappealing view of our town. We need to be cleaning up the "low life" aspects of Ballina to present the best possible face for our tourism AND to attract younger families to choose to reside here.	Not all all supportive	I would support the asset renewal program but would like to see Council spending its funds doing more to improve business opportunities and attract professional families to Ballina. We are a boring town with some very unappealing areas which seem to be doing nothing to change. As an example, what is on offer for Australia Day? There is a formal event which will be extremely limited as to who it appeals to. Where is the commnity picnic, fireworks, entertainment to attract people to come together and celebrate our country and community? In regards to the waterways, I would support an environmental levy which MUST apply to ALL the shires from where the problems actually stem.	No (Resident)		I think the proposal is well understood. I don't believe this has been a true consultation process as the timing of it is highly questionable (given the length of time which Council has obviously been planning this approach together with the timing of the last council election). My absolute view is that Council has made up its mind a long time ago and is simply going through the "show" of "consultation". Given also the process that occurred when this very same approach was applied to the consideration of how to fund the swimming pools renewal, Council has a history of ignoring the "consultation" and doing what it has already decided anyway. I have no confidence in this process.
361	Alstonville	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		No (Resident)		
362	Ballina	Not at all supportive		Supportive		Not very supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
363	Other (eg. rural)	Not at all supportive	It is not Ballina Council's responsibility to "show leadership" in this. The majority of the Richmond River is within other Council Boundaries, therefore consultation with these Councils needs to occur before a Rate increase.	Not at all supportive	If additional funds are required for asset renewal then the large amounts of Industrial Land owned by Council should be developed and sold at a price reflective of the current economic climate.	Not all all supportive	As the economy is far from strong, it is unreasonable to be considering a rate rise above the rate pegging limit, we suggest that Ballina Council think seriously about tightening their purse strings as the rate payers have had to do.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	

#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
364	Ballina	Not at all supportive	It is the NSW Governments responsibility to keep our water ways clean. If you the council was serious about clean water ways they would not remove rubbish bins near them ie Fishery Ck Boat Ramp. They would also never consider a proposal to build a new service station opposite the old Macdonalds at west ballina.	Not at all supportive	Cleaning the streets.	Not all all supportive	As stated State Government problem.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	You have already made the decision to increase the rates this is just a smoke screen.
365	Other (eg. rural)	Supportive		Supportive		Supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
366	Other (eg. rural)	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Farmland	
367	Ballina	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
368	Ballina	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive	Indoor sports centre needed in the shire	Not all all supportive	Council needs to learn to manage the money they already receive from ratepayers - learn to live within your means as the rest of us have to!!	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
369	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Somewhat supportive	Lennox Head shore line reinforcement from the Boat Channel north to minimise sand dune erosion and damage from ocean level rise and major storms	Somewhat supportive		Somewhat supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
370	Ballina	Supportive	happy for rate increase if spent on waterways be good to see Richmond river bar dredged for safety of boats	Not at all supportive	Council should have been planning these upgrades using existing funds already received from revenue points. These works are not new and if council was more competent at budgeting this large increase on top of government recommendations would not be required.	Not all all supportive	Only the healthy waterways increase should even be considered. see above response	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
371	Ballina	Not at all supportive	I am of the belief this to be a State Government issue.--Public Works Dept, N.S.W. Gov.used to maintain the dredge H.E.Street.(my father was Dock-master at Riley's Hill Dry-dock) which would have been provided for in the State Budget. Why divert that funding elsewhere when it was obvious and logical the river would suffer, as sand-mining then Tourism affected the coastline, as increases in business activities e.g. more intensive farming, more and Heavier haulage vehicles use roads through the area C,mon guys and gals sounds to me like a cop out to screw us down.	Somewhat supportive	As long as logic in the decision process is used, and consideration of those in the community with limited budget parameters are considered wisely.	Somewhat supportive	Is there equality in your rating structure? Please enlighten me to your interpretation of the differences between farmland and a business and rural residential?	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	For those unable to attend your community meetings maybe Councillors might be interested in getting out into the real community. Say do a street every couple of weeks, have a prepared questionnaire of issues that may affect residents. Do one on ones, ask, do door knocks, become pro-active.
372	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive	I believe Ballina Shire Council as enough money and do not need rate increase.	Not at all supportive	I believe Ballina Shire Council as enough money and do not need rate increase.	Not all all supportive	I believe Ballina Shire Council as enough money and do not need rate increase.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
373	Ballina	Not very supportive	Other shire councils need to put money in as well other wise you are wasting our local residents hard earned cash!!!! It must be all the councils whom have a stake in the Richmond River to work together as one .	Not very supportive		Not very supportive		No (Resident)		Far too much money is wasted by council researching and deciding if a particular project is or will go ahead. Invariably if it proceeds the original plans or project are changed which make costs blow out of proportion .

#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
374	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive	I fail to see how the damaged caused by historical events should be borne by those trying to support the current environment/community of the shire. Healthy waterways start a lot higher up the river than the outlet.	Not at all supportive	We are still waiting to see any tangible results from the last set of increases to our rates. A casual observation is that the current duties to be undertaken by the council are not anywhere near being met. Parking continues to go unpoliced, dogs on non dog beaches are not even patrolled let alone being managed. Noise and visitor numbers continue to increase but there is little being done to manage the problems for the permanent population that come with the increase in human traffic.	Not all all supportive	We just spent valuable time and resources going through an election process where all candidates declared no more rate rises yet the first communication we get from the new council is that they want more money to spend. We still have seen no tangible outcome from the current rate rise we are paying for and now you want rate payers to cover even more costs. We still get very little value from the current council programs and those that are put in place are not being policed, monitored or in some cases enacted. Lennox Beach south end continues to be populated by more dogs than ever and never is a patrol seen, other than at the local cafes. Children are now being driven out of the boat channel by the dogs that are allowed to swim there which means very few places for children to swim in safety.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	The data you provide on current rate amounts is misleading at best or completely wrong at worst. We currently pay four times what is quoted in the document as an average so I am curious where this average comes from. I think all rate payers are owed a table showing low, middle and high rate amounts and what the impact will be on each group. To leave a capital city for quality of life only to have the council rates being double what you were paying seems at odds with what the state government expects from the local council. The answer in the documentation around averages is purposely misleading and in fact does not answer the question.
375	Ballina	Not at all supportive	I can't understand why council can't fund the healthy waterways program from the standard rate peg increase. How is the money intended to be spent. I also note with interest that the swimming pool redevelopment (which the majority of residents did not agree with) is planned for the winter period of 2017. We were levied for this redevelopment during the 2015/2016 period, where are the funds that have been collected during that period as no redevelopment has been done yet. Why was it necessary to have these funds collected when no work was planned, I assume the funds have been sitting in your bank account earning interest, would be interested in an explanation.	Not at all supportive	Again a repeat of above why can't council fund these works from the proposed rate peg rise	Not all all supportive	My only comment here would be that I can't help but feel that this survey will go the same way as the last one for the pools redevelopments, as most residents voted against the rise the council then got outside opinion and went ahead with the rate increase, guess it will happen again with this proposal.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
376	Ballina	Supportive	I am some what disappointed that Shaws Bay is constantly ignored. It has the potential to be a great family area with protected water way (surf etc). Considering the issue re share attacks what a great option for families to swim but the facilities are extremely poor.	Supportive	I understand the need to do these upgrades / maintenance - but I am concerned at Councillors ethics. We have just had the Coastal Pathway upgraded but future funding has being diverted. This is despite what we voted for and the community wishes.	Supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Their is minimal explanation of Council efficiencies.
377	Alstonville	Somewhat supportive	Richmond river health is a combined responsibility of Ballina shire and the state government. Many tourists use the river also why not look at a tourist levy instead of hitting the locals all the time	Not very supportive		Not very supportive	the council needs to prioritise which projects give the most community benefit. Healthy waterways project is a 10+ year project so it is a combined state and local gov issue	No (Resident)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
378	Alstonville	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	

#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
379	Ballina	Not at all supportive	I am hoping that many intelligent residents of Ballina are aware that Ballina Shire cannot/should not even attempt to improve the Richmond River as its contamination commences far from the end of the river at Ballina, but by farms and other sources further up the river and in other Council/Shire areas..	Somewhat supportive	This Council and those that existed previously have given approval for the Ballina Heights Estate to expand rapidly with more and more homes and individuals moving to this area. However, these Council has IGNORED NUMEROUS requests, by us the Rate Payers for the extremely important access road, that of Deadmans Creek Drive to be repaired in order that the residents could be able to drive safely in and out of the Estate at all times, even during periods of heavy rain and floods around this area - which unfortunately and most importantly is unavailable right now. 2. We have also requested for many years with great urgency for a road light be installed at the turn into Deadmans Creek Drive from Tamarind Drive. 3. Can the Council explain to the humans who fund this Council, why a large sum of their valuable cash was expended on beautification of the village of Alstonville when we lack urgently required safe access to our homes.	Not all all supportive	This Council is clever in ignoring the wishes of its residents and contributors to its wealth, and has happened on far too many occasions.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	This Council and those to follow are elected by the people in order that they represent its people AND NOT THEMSELVES AND/OR OF ANY MATTER THAT BENEFITS THEMSELVES.
380	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
381	Ballina	Not very supportive	To get the river healthy really needs the councils on the river upstream from Ballina to act. We can only have minimal effect	Supportive		Not very supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
382	Alstonville	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
383	Other (eg. rural)	Not very supportive	what exactly are you proposing a lot more detail is required this is all too vague	Not at all supportive	roads are excellent of the rest I have no involvement as I don't live or go to Ballina so don't see why I need to pay for facilities I never use. There was an increase in rates to upgrade both pools but I've seen no action. Which assets exactly are you talking about, what needs upgrading more detail is required otherwise this is very vague	Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Farmland	
384	Ballina	Not very supportive	The State Govt is spending vast amounts of State revenue in Sydney, on projects with little value to Sydney residents, and no value at all to country dwellers. My suggestion - the Richmond River and tributaries should be the responsibility of State and or Federal Governments, and as such they should be providing all the funding. The rate paying residents of Ballina should not be levied for this project.	Not at all supportive	State and or Federal Governments must take some responsibility for funding of projects outside of Sydney/Melbourne	Not all all supportive		No (Resident)		
385	Ballina	Not at all supportive	What would be the point of wasting money on the mouth of the Richmond River when nothing is being done about upstream.	Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
386	Wollongbar	Not very supportive		Somewhat supportive		Not very supportive	I can understand the Asset Renewal Program request for additional funding, but as far as I can see, there is already a method for collecting funding for waterways. I would query how effectively this funding is being utilised..... often overly high council administrative costs eat into funding meant to be for other areas. Maybe Council should consider streamlining their operations first.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	



#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
387	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Somewhat supportive		Not very supportive	Feel strongly that indoor sports facility to be shared with new high school is not appropriate for community use - issues around usage, access etc mean that sporting opportunities for locals will still take second place to school use, as is currently the issue at Southern Cross and basketball competitions. Lennox Head Community Centre is useless and I cannot understand why Council does not see long term benefits in providing quality indoor sports stadium. Further, council has undertaken such "community consultation" before, and doesn't listen to community responses (ie swimming pools) so do not trust that council will use extra income in manner described in correspondence.	Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
388	Wardell	Not at all supportive	I AM VERY ANGRY. YES I totally support fixing the waterways but WHY has it not been done before this! Get the basics right. So much money is wasted and when it has gone you bump up the rates again! And AGAIN! It will not be possible to even live in this Shire because of the high rates.	Not at all supportive	STILL ANGRY re putting up the rates AGAIN.	Not all all supportive	Trim off the fat. Question EVERY expenditure - is it essential? Is it critical? If not, don't spend it. (That is what people on a tight budget do - when there is no one to ask for handouts). THEN put the savings to the waterways and asset renewal. Raising the rates just pushes people out of the shire except for the wealthy and those that can afford to rent here. Is that what you want???	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
389	Ballina	Not very supportive	Works to improve the health of waterways, especially the richmond river is not the responsibility of rate payers and should be carried out and funded by state and federal government programs	Not very supportive	I strongly believe the construction of the ocean pool at shelly beach should NOT go ahead and this would save funds that could be directed into other necessary public works. I believe ballina already has an adequate ocean bathing area at Shaws Bay and some money could be used to refurbish facilities at this location. The Shelly Beach Pool proposal is highly likely to fail as it is a poor location for this to be built as it will constantly fill with sand which will require expensive maintenance works to remove or it will have to be built up (higher) which will spoil the natural beauty of the location.	Not all all supportive		No (Resident)		
390	Alstonville	Not very supportive	The Richmond River is a State Government responsibility. Given their bad habit of passing as many costs onto BSC as possible , BSC should make a point of demanding the State meets its responsibilities. Ballina picking up the tab for the river only creates another precedent and be assured State will use it to pass on even more costs to BS	Not very supportive		Not all all supportive	Council can manage its costs better , and should.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
391	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive	Cut you're own costs, tighten you're belt, why should the rate payers pay when you're wages bill is over the top. You have far to many managers who are not needed	Not at all supportive	See the answer above. Run the council within its means not it dreams. The are rate payer out here who can't afford to eat 3 times a day and you want to make them pay for a better playing field. Get with the community feeling and it's wishers .	Not all all supportive	See above .	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Yes, why not have a community consultation in the year of the council elections, rather than just when a new council is elected. Councillors should be held accountable as elected persons to ensure the council runs and operates within its financial constraints. If you have not got the correct budget and plans in place it's the councilers amd managers who must take steps to live with in its financial incomes, have a look at wages, over all the operation
392	Ballina	Not very supportive	It should be a co-ordinated approach including the other councils, state & federal governments. A comprehensive plan should be developed by all stake holders & then actioned. Land care should also have a major role. I don't support this rate increase without a detailed & balanced plan.	Not very supportive	I don't get income increases of this magnitude & have to live within my means - the council should do the same. These proposed increases are excessive and unfair especially after the recent rate hike to cover the renovations of the swimming pools.	Not very supportive	A greater effort should be made to improve efficiency and identify where savings can be made.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Following the survey regarding the swimming pools renovations, the council disregarded the view of ratepayers - my understanding is that the majority were not in favour of the rate increase for these projects. Is this likely to be the case again?

#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
393	Ballina	Not at all supportive	Local waterways should be the priority. Richmond river is worthy but only in demonstrated financial conjunction with other stakeholders (all the way to Qld border) both local and state governments.	Not at all supportive	None of the current Councillors were elected on a rate rise platform.(NO MANDATE) Proposed asset renewal program favours business over private ratepayers - increase business rate or parking fees. Councils amalgamation threat, such as it was, is no longer valid. Since the Orange bi-election and the election of Premier Berjiklian, the shift in politics ins NSW means any fears of forced council amalgamations are unfounded. Council should explore other Grant sources more diligently. Explore ways to increase revenue from holiday letting businesses (airbnb and the like) before the Office of State Revenue beats you to it.	Not all all supportive	This is not a special variation, this is a permanent increase, as printed in your own newsletter .	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	This isn't consultation, this is presented as a fait accompli, one of the main drivers of which is no longer valid with changes to state government (refer to comments at 8. above).
394	Wollongbar	Not at all supportive	I don't have the luxury of putting my hand deep into other peoples pockets to balance my budget. Councils should learn to live within their means.	Not at all supportive	I do not trust councils or governments. Remember the 3 x 3 cent fuel tax implemented in 1989. We are still paying it as it was eventually absorbed into the general excise, and we now pay GST on it!	Not all all supportive	Federal and state governments should be funding the environment, as we already pay excessive taxation. They have money for polities perks etc!	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
395	Ballina	Not very supportive	Why is this special rate increase to be a burden on Ballina Shire ratepayers only, if that is indeed so? The rubbish and pollution isn't just from Ballina but from other Council areas, e.g. Lismore and Casino. If they allow runoff which contains pollutants into the river proper, shouldn't THEY have to pay to fix it too? It seems somewhat unfair that we Ballina ratepayers have to shoulder the cost. And in regard to Shaws Bay, it has been allowed to deteriorate when once it was the picture postcard swimming spot. If it was improved, maybe people could swim there more often instead of swimming with sharks. (I also hope the "broken glass" deposited in Lake Ainsworth by drunken louts on Australia Day is properly removed so that it is safe for people to venture into the water.)	Not very supportive	With the change of leadership in NSW Government, who says that Council amalgamations will have similar priority? There are so many protests taking place, why is it assumed that we should be "fit for the future" or else? Ballina Council has traditionally made a lot of money from land development. Why are we so afraid of continuing to stand on our own two feet and standing up to intimidation and Government threats? You say in your letter to ratepayers that amalgamation remains a "possible option". So what, so is death! Sure roads and other facilities need repair and renewal BUT we don't have to have the latest and the best do we? I draw your attention to an article in today's (31/1) Sydney Morning Herald about an amalgamated Sydney Council which turns out to have new ownership of a pile of ramshackle vehicles - every one of them needing replacement at an estimated cost of \$7million! Mirrors falling off, no back seat, no windscreens, no air-conditioning (removed to save repairs) and up to 400,000 kms on the speedo! I haven't noticed Ballina Council vehicles in this state any time recently. We are in an excellent financial position and we should be managing our money so that these special rate variations are necessary far less often. Borrowed money is very cheap at the	Not all all supportive	I know I am wasting my time even in making a comment as I objected to the SRV for the swimming pool upgrades and that achieved nothing either. However, what annoys me about this is the compounding affect of each percentage increase. There are thousands of ratepaying former part-pensioners whose income has either been totally cancelled or radically reduced. They are in the position of facing continuing living increases while having far less to live on. You need to consider people on fixed or lowering incomes. You collect rates - do the best you can with them and cut your suit to fit the cloth. Some of us struggle to pay the rates as they are now. Why burden us with more, especially if special interest groups with lots of lobbying money behind them demand unaffordable wishlists? If they want pristine rivers and top grade roads, let them find the money to get what they want or ask local (useless) politicians to earn their position and associated perks and actually ask the Government to increase grants to regional councils for special needs? They readily ask for our votes but what do they do to deserve them? Ask for help and don't take refusals lying down. You represent us - who are ignored because we are only the little people who don't seem to matter any more.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	The tables provided are somewhat confusing as they are based on the assumption that the ratepayer already accepts that the "standard rate peg increase" is perfectly alright! From my reading of your letter, we are getting \$73 taken off the rates but this will be swallowed up in spades by the compounded rate increases, if approved. Not much of a bargain to me. If the supermarket gave me \$73 off my groceries this week but charged me hundreds of dollars more over three years, I wouldn't be too happy. Would you? And why does the rates increase need to be "permanent"? Why can't it be removed, if approved, after the set period? You do not explain this.
396	Other (eg. rural)	Somewhat supportive		Somewhat supportive		Somewhat supportive	The proposal is sound for the two programs council are suggesting. I would like to see more information on what other options were reviewed prior to going to the ratepayers. I understand the response required by the State Government's program. Having said this I do not understand why we are not "fit for the future". What has caused us to need to increase the rates to be "fit"? I am supportive of maintaining infrastructure and assets as well as looking at rejuvenating the waterways. As mentioned, I would like an understanding of the overall reasoning rather than what appears to be convenience in response to the State government.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	I think the consultation process has been fair. However, it has been difficult to attend a meeting due to the school holidays and the meetings being held very quickly over a week (or so).

#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
397	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
398	Other (eg. rural)	Not at all supportive	The Richmond River improvement should be the responsibility of the State Government as it is a resource that covers areas which are not the sole responsibility of Ballina Council and it's ratepayers.	Not very supportive	It is becoming increasingly difficult for pensioners and self funded retirees to continue to absorb increased rates at a time when interest rates on money are very low, and recent changes to asset tests have taken over 50% of part pension payments. Council should consider divesting itself of some assets to raise revenue.	Not all all supportive	Again comments are related to the affordability of low income groups and pensioners who cannot continue to bear these increases and maintain a reasonable life style. Consideration should be given to means testing these proposed increases.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	The consultation process, including the details of proposed rate increases, was well documented and allowed for adequate public response.
399	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive	Not supportive of yet another rate increase over the standard rate peg after only the most recent increases in 15/16 and 17 to fund the local pools. Many of the newly elective council members were quite specific in that they would not vote for any further increases yet another possible SRV is already being proposed. Being a newer member of the community (approx 4 years in region) my current rates are more than 25% higher than what I was paying in Sydney's eastern suburbs where my land value was higher and services better.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	With all the new housing developments in area, won't this significantly increase councils revenue. I believe council should manage the budget better instead if continually requesting rate increases.
400	Ballina	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive	My wife & I are on a fixed income (pension) and would find any increase difficult.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
401	Ballina	Not at all supportive	This should be done as a matter of course.	Not at all supportive	This should be done as a matter of course.	Not all all supportive	The rates in Ballina Shire are now the highest (pro rata) I have ever paid, including when living in Brisbane. We are self funded retirees and struggling to pay the current rates, as we get no discount at all and our income has, in fact, decreased. An increase will mean real hardship for us and many others in the same category. I have been paying ever increasing rates at this address for approx 6 years and have seen no increase in services in that time. We want/expect basic services and local maintenance.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	If you indeed do consult with rate payers, kindly put this type of proposal before voters prior to the council elections so that we know just what to expect of you.
402	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Supportive	Waterways can be improved by fixing/installing stormwater drains and the accompanying guttering . Currently these are sadly missing in one of the older parts of Lennox Head ie the area from Pacific parade to Gibbons st. also the lanes are a disgrace wth nowhere for the water to flow. The tree root of a Mortensen bay fig has raised a large hump and broken through the sealed surface in f Lems lane .My support is contingent on fixing this problem. Young children are in danger of being run over in Gibbon st,particularly on the eastern side as cars park at various angels and drivers cannot see children when they suddenly appear from behind a car	Supportive		Strongly supportive	By implementing dual occupancy in Lennox Head you have increased your rate income without fixing the stormwater and guttering issues on Stewart, Gibbon ,the cross sits and the lanes	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	

#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
403	Other (eg. rural)	Somewhat supportive	In your proposal you mention that you are looking at floodplain management but it is not listed in Q3. For me this is a high priority. The drains in the floodplain have not been attended to for many years. I would like to see a complete clean up of the drains so that the water can get away more easily than it does. Many outcrops of reeds and poor grades in the drains prevent the water from flowing in the correct direction. This causes the water to back up and flood properties for several days instead of the release of the water on the low tide as it always did in the past. This refers to the flood mitigation program that used to take place. I would like the council to consider these facts, make observations and take photos of the drains in order to get a complete picture of water flow through floodplains. Finally, your letter says "The water bodies mentioned are actually not under the direct control of Council". Perhaps, the 'Healthy Waterways Program' should not be a priority of the Council. Maybe give ratepayers some relief and only raise the rates to cover the 'asset renewal' program.	Somewhat supportive	Although the healthy waterways is an attractive program, I feel that the Council should only consider 1 program. The asset renewal program seems the most logical program to support.	Not very supportive	In my opinion only some rate payers get to take advantage of your reduction in charges. Some rate payers in rural areas pay for septic systems to be monitored 4 times a year at a rate of \$150 per time. This is an extra charge placed on the home owner for doing their part to improve the health of our waterways, doesn't seem fair to me. Also the rural community provides their own tanks and depends on the weather to get their water supply again no cost to the council. What can council do for rural rate payers in this situation to offset your increases? I would like the council to look into these matters before making their final decision. A lower increase for rural properties may make a difference to those already battling world market fluctuations, weather changes and limited income. Again, I reiterate that 1 program, the Asset Renewal Program, with a rate rise is enough for residents to undertake. Again I quote from your words, "The water bodies mentioned are actually not under the direct control of Council".	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Farmland	To improve the consultation process I would like to see a more detailed plan of exactly what is involved in each area of the proposal eg Healthy Waterways - Shaws Bay. This tells me nothing about the exact plans to improve the area. Also a balance sheet of how exactly these funds are going to be used. Be transparent, show that the residents can trust you with the funds they are supplying. Support your residents and they will support you.
404	Other (eg. rural)	Not at all supportive	We have been going through a period of time where wage growth has not kept pace with inflation and until this changes the council should not be more pressure on already financially stressed households.	Not at all supportive	We have been going through a period of time where wage growth has not kept pace with inflation and until this changes the council should not be more pressure on already financially stressed households.	Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
405	Wollongbar	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
406	Ballina	Not at all supportive	It is not reasonable to ask Ballina residents to pay to fix problems not of their making and possibly outside of their local government area.	Not at all supportive	The standard 1.5% rate peg should be accepted by council and extra money sourced through federal and state grants and improved council management. If pensioners received a 5.9% increase, that would be something else!	Not all all supportive	There is too much wastage by local council(s) eg road resealing where it is not needed. residents deserve better council management - bottomless money bags.	No (Resident)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
407	Ballina	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Somewhat supportive		No (Resident)		
408	Ballina	Not at all supportive	The Richmond runs past Kyogle and past Lismore and is a state responsibility. If you want money to do the governments work apply for a grant.	Not at all supportive	The council should take some responsibility for raising and using some of its own assets like rental income, airport etc. When you have green councils you have broke councils.	Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
409	Ballina	Not at all supportive	Many of my friends who are pensioners in a similar financial situation to myself (battling to pay my rates each Quarter plus other necessary Bills) feel the same as I do. That council should rely on Government Grants to fix the waterways it is also unfair that ordinary ratepayers bear the brunt of the proposed, while investor renters should pick up some of rate increases by raising rents and paying resultant receipts as a special rate on these properties.	Not at all supportive	Drainage should be paid by developers. Sporting fields seem to be adequate. footpaths are in reasonable condition. Playground equipment replaced as needed. road reconstruction from grants. community buildings built on merit such as the long awaited basketball courts. open spaces restricted to reasonable size not created and mowed for nothing other than the look (Headlands)	Not all all supportive	You can't get blood out of a stone but you can force the poorer out their homes and Ballina.	No (Resident)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	As the current Mayor stated on election day said you can't peg rates they will always go up. Have a good look at current council expenditure that there is no waste !!!!!
410	Ballina	Not at all supportive		Not very supportive		Not very supportive		No (Resident)		



#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
411	Ballina	Supportive	The Council is to be commended for its initiative to promote the management of our waterways, water bodies and coastline to improve their important social, economic, cultural and environmental values. The challenge is to ensure our neighbouring councils also meet their obligations in relation to the health of the Richmond River.	Supportive	Greater resource commitment to recognise the importance and value of "the spit" area and around the southern parts of Kingsford Smith Reserve.	Supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	The Council's community consultation/engagement process in relation to this matter has been comprehensive, with good access to all relevant information.
412	Ballina	Not at all supportive	Should this be not a State Govt responsible (See J Moyle letter to editor in the Advocate 1 Feb 2017)	Not at all supportive	Asset Renewal should be incorporated into Annual operating and capital budgets not as an excuse to continually increase rates as per the blatant disregard of ratepayers wishes when the so called Swimming Pool rate increase was imposed on us.	Not all all supportive	My Rates package has increased from \$1211 for 2006/7 to \$2548 for 2016/17. Over 100%. This is totally unacceptable in this era of low inflation. Is this due to a growing Shire which should naturally bring more revenue or mismanagement of ratepayers funds and contributions from State/Federal Governments ?	No (Resident)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	SEE QUESTION 10 Ballina Shire Council inherited healthy assets and infrastructure and is in a relatively sound financial position and should not need to try and impose these proposed and past extraordinary rate increases put forward by management. Councillors need to reign in and control management current budgets to achieve growth and not push for these over the top rate increases.
413	Ballina	Not at all supportive	We already pay high rates, and will highly effect those of us on pensions	Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
414	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
415	Other (eg. rural)	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive	If the State or Federal governments are placing additional burden on Council then Council should push back or simply advise that additional burdens are unable to be met. Governments at all levels need to recognize that we are in a low inflation, low wage growth, low business profit margin environment and that such rate rises are usually passed on in the form of rent increases. Council has continued to raise it's rates year on year throughout this period yet the ability of ratepayers to bear this burden is never assessed. It appears that the only item factored in to the equation is meeting Council's needs for greater revenue. I have a strong stake in Council achieving the lofty goals to be funded by these proposals through a number of businesses which would benefit as well as the personal benefit we would receive through environmental improvements. That does not equate to an ability to pay for them.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
416	Ballina	Not at all supportive	This should come out of already raised rates. Unfortunately mismanagement and I	Somewhat supportive	Again, going above the pegged rate seems greedy and unfair to make residents suffer. A lot of families live in the area and adding more pressure is pushing them out as well. Lower the rate in line with NSW pegged amount and keep standard flow - as we are having a boom with building and people moving to the area, I am sure that rate revenue is at an all time high regardless.	Somewhat supportive	Different rating structure - lower the amounts and be more pro active as oppose to throwing money to people who sit in office buildings coming up with ideas - give it to the people who work in the environment, who know the issues and understand the solutions better.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	After a rate increase for the pool - i believe it is very hard to then hit us residents again. As a pool goer i am looking forward to the improvements but am concerned of the swimming rates - as if they go up AGAIN like this year - my family wont be able to utilise the improvements. The richmond river does need improving but this needs to be supported by neighbouring councils - as its a flow on affect. We can just fix it at the river mouth.

#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
417	Wollongbar	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Multiple categories of properties (eg residential and business)	The information provided in the mailout to ratepayers was very comprehensive. I don't believe that either the Council is doing enough to reduce expenses, or communicating to ratepayers as to how they are reducing expenses. Expense reduction is certainly the preference over a SRV increase. The one expense reduction that has been identified by BSC is the removal of the Waste Operations Charge, yet there was no information about what the impact of this will be and/or how this was a justifiable charge previously if it's removal will have zero impact. Ratepayers need to see better management of existing rates by BSC before we will support any proposal for a SRV increase.
418	Other (eg. rural)	Not at all supportive	If this is deemed so important why has Council not trimmed its spending back in other areas such as the Ballina Library, building of bike tracks that have little use, building of so called Community Buildings etc. If Council always stuck the basics of why it exists, sewer, water, roads, drains they would not constantly be attempting to force higher costs onto Rate Payers.	Not at all supportive	It appears Council staff, the Mayor and Councillors are more interested in keeping their jobs and preventing amalgamation than any genuine intent to assist the community. After Council ineptitude and negligence to date that I have had the misfortune of witnessing first hand, amalgamation would be the preferable option and perhaps the Ballina Community would then have some chance of Council services being delivered in a professional manner.	Not all all supportive	If Council can't afford its wish list then it should cut back expenditure in other areas. It is called fiscal restraint. Not expect time and time again to put a greater burden on rate payers who in most instances are not in the position to afford more and more demands of Council. Perhaps Council could hold an election to see how many Rate Payers would be in favour of Council Amalgamation, the bringing in of an Administrator and the replacement of Senior Staff who act in their own self interest.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Business	Like always Council is only going through this process to pretend they are listening to the Community. I have lost all respect and trust in this Council through its actions and payback mentality that my business has endured at the hands of Senior Staff who regardless of their misconduct can never be held to account or sacked. The elected Councillors and Mayor from my experience just want to feel important and perhaps get themselves elected into parliament in order to move up the food chain.
419	Ballina	Not at all supportive	Rock pool at Shelley beach	Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
420	Other (eg. rural)	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive	because I live out of town I rarely benefit from any of the assets town rate payers use. My only services are garbage collection and roadside slashing which has been reduced. The tractor operators are not allowed to move to your boundy anymore. Our rural roads are a disgrace. I pay more rates than the townies who get all the benefits and council would like to charge me more. Get real Ballina Shire Council.	Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Farmland	
421	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
422	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
423	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Supportive	Difficult to prioritise as I don't know enough about current state of each waterway but support in general that these need to be looked after.	Strongly supportive		Strongly supportive	Seems a fair increase	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
424	Alstonville	Not at all supportive	The Richmond River is the responsibility of State Government	Not at all supportive	I have been watching in disbelief at the work being carried out on Gap Road opposite the Boral entrance to the Quarry. It has now been over two months to relay larger pipes under the road and widen the crossing. I hate to think at what cost!!!!!! If this is the 'new order' for asset renewal then I want no part of it.	Not all all supportive	Please refer to my written submission.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
425	Ballina	Strongly supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	

#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
426	Ballina	Supportive		Supportive		Supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
427	Ballina	Strongly supportive	It is my belief that ALL waterways should have a mandatory buffer zone between the waters edge and any structural development (buildings etc) of at least 30 - 50 metres. This area should be available for public use and also help to protect the riverbank.	Strongly supportive		Strongly supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
428	Other (eg. rural)	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
429	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not very supportive	I ATTENDED THE COUNCIL MEETING & WHILST THE TUCKEAN SWAMP IS A GOOD START THERE IS MUCH WE SHOULD DO WITHIN BALLINA SHIRE ITSELF FIRST. THE INITIAL FUNDING FOR THE TUCKEAN SWAMP HAS MOSTLY BEEN RAISED SO ANY RATE INCREASE ON TOP OF THE 1.5% STANDARD RATE PEG INCREASE SHOULD START IN 2018/19 & AS IT IS ONGOING SHOULD BE LESS THAN 1.5% SO THAT RATEPAYERS CAN AFFORD IT OVER TIME.	Not very supportive	Q 6. (PRIORITY 3) PROVISION OF ADDITIONAL PARKING IN CLOSE PROXIMITY TO THE LENNOX HEAD CULTURAL & COMMUNITY CENTRE. Q 7. ANY EXTRA RATE INCREASE SHOULD BE NO MORE THAN THE 1.5% & 2.5% SET BY THE STATE GOVERNMENT AS IT IS ALSO ONGOING. THIS AGAIN WOULD TAKE SOME PRESSURE OFF RATEPAYERS AS NO DOUBT THERE WILL BE ONGOING PROPOSALS FOR EXTRA RATE INCREASES & THEIR CUMULATIVE AFFECT IS A FINANCIAL BURDEN.	Not very supportive	BALLINA SHIRE COUNCIL HAS ACQUIRED & MANANAGED IT'S ASSETS WELL OVER TIME BUT IN MY OPINION SHOULD AT THS TIME CONSIDER PROVIDING SOME RELIEF TO RATEPAYERS RATHER THAN AIMING TO BE THE BEST RUN COUNCIL ON THE NORTH COAST. I THINK WE ARE FIT FOR THE FUTURE BUT DO NOT NEED TO BE OVER-FIT.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	I THOUGHT THE COUNCIL'S PRESENTATION WAS WELL DONE. THE GENERAL MANAGER IS ALWAYS WELL PREPARED & DOES A GOOD JOB.
430	Ballina	Not at all supportive	We are a young family with a mortgage and are already very tight financially given the high cost of living in this area.	Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive	I am supportive of what the programs are trying to achieve but not for the increase in rates for residents. the cost is high enough already and council should be looking at alternatives to fund these programs.	No (Resident)		
431	Ballina	Supportive		Somewhat supportive		Supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Multiple categories of properties (eg residential and business)	
432	Ballina	Strongly supportive	Would like to see more info on what exactly is included in this Program and ensure that future funds are not progressively diverted into other areas. There is also value in addressing water quality issues emanating from other parts of the Richmond River upstream of Ballina Shire, as we are the 'sump' for the rest of the catchment.	Not very supportive	Existing asset management appears to be progressing well under current budgets with new footpaths/cycleways, reasonable roads, good sports fields etc. Need to examine the cost/benefit of upgrading assets increasingly under threat of sea level rise (i.e stormwater and sewerage systems on Ballina Island)	Not very supportive	I personally don't think we need any extra revenue for asset mgt. as things appear to be managed well. However, our natural waterways are in dire need of some extra TLC and are a significant investment in the future 'liveability' and provide a huge potential tourism magnet for Ballina Shire.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
433	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Somewhat supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive	I'm already paying more than my brother who lives in the northern suburbs of Sydney, yet get fewer services. No more rate rises. It's financially unmanageable in an area where it's hard to find well paying jobs.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
434	Other (eg. rural)	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Strongly supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
435	Ballina	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Strongly supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
436	Wollongbar	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	

#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
437	Ballina	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive	I think the council is so greedy you need to spend the money you get from Rate payers and stop taking from us all the time what happened to rate payers getting a few free garbage drops a year you carnet even give that or even look after the nature strips were doing some of your work and you just keep taking and doing what you like any way. Who makes these laws up any way. common day thief's	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
438	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive	Bigger pensioner rebates. How do you expect low income earners and pensioners to pay the same rates as high income earners. Even someone on \$50000.00 per year compared to \$120000 or above.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
439	Ballina	Strongly supportive		Strongly supportive		Strongly supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
440	Ballina	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
441	Alstonville	Not at all supportive	The cost blow out on upgrading the chlorinated and heated swimming pools from a previous unpopular recent srv, the pollution of our waterways by the introduction of toxic fluoride compounds shows that the current Ballina council is not	Not at all supportive	Wage increases, inflation etc are low, Ballina council recently had a srv for the pools ( assets )which is now a cost blow out. Council needs to better manage their budget like the rest of us.	Not all all supportive	No srv. Stop polluting waterways and save money by ceasing fluoridation. Save money and less harm to environment by not heating the outdoor pools. I support having healthy waterways but not by an srv to council but by council being more responsible with it's existing budget and assets	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	The broad scope of the healthy waterways program and that it goes beyond the council range and ability needs to be addressed first instead of increasing rates again. Is the council aware that it contributes to polluting the waterways by fluoridation, and t
442	Alstonville	Not at all supportive	Why should we suffer for past mismanagement in other shires? This should be state or federally funded.	Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		No (Resident)		
443	Ballina	Somewhat supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
444	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not very supportive	In respect to the Healthy Waterways Program, we're happy to have a slight rate increase on top of the standard peg rate, but what you're suggesting is too much.	Not very supportive	In respect to the Asset Renewal Program, we're happy to have a slight rate increase on top of the standard peg rate, but what you're suggesting is way too much.	Not very supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	As social media is so widely used and is a way of communicating to a wide audience, I'd be interested to know if this Rate Information and Survey was shared through a Ballina Council Facebook Page? If not, it should have been.
445	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
446	Ballina	Somewhat supportive		Somewhat supportive	public toilets	Somewhat supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
447	Ballina	Not at all supportive	We cannot stop what happens further up the river that is not in our shire	Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Multiple categories of properties (eg residential and business)	PLEASE DO NOT INCREASE OUR RATES, IT IS A STRUGGLE ALREADY
448	Ballina	Not at all supportive	In 28 years of my residence in Ballina Shire, I have always been told by Council officers that no money was available for Coastal beaches. However grants have always been available and many Councils have availed themselves of these. I feel that BSC has not availed itself of available funds. Therefore I do not support the proposed rate rises.	Not at all supportive	No mention is made of bridges. They need regular maintenance as all other assets do. This does not appear to have been seen as a necessity in the past, so assets have been allowed to deteriorate. Ratepayers should not have to bear the brunt of this policy.	Not all all supportive	My rates are already over \$3000 per annum and I am on a pension. Council appears to have a commercial building construction policy which has been to the detriment of maintenance of its stormwater dispersal, roads and footpaths, waste removal etc. Perhaps it is time for Council to review its policies and consider where savings could be made.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	



#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
449	Ballina	Not very supportive	Tourism being our major industry-----Shaws Bay ' Lake Ainsworth, Richmond River. are our jewels in the crown & should be treated as such. A positive , scientific approach should be paramount in restoring these areas to there previous glory, before they sink in their own mire	Not very supportive		Not very supportive		No (Resident)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
450	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
451	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Somewhat supportive		Somewhat supportive		Supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
452	Alstonville	Not very supportive	Healthy waterways in our shire needs a regional approach rather than the bandaid contribution that the council could provide with the proposed \$300,000.	Not very supportive	It is of concern that that asset renewal has suddenly become a concern i.e. not been adequately factored into the budget previously. All areas mentioned in question 6 are important and should be maintained in an on-going basis.	Not very supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	I attempted to be part of the consultation process and undertook a previous on-line survey and subsequently a phone survey. I found the phone survey was unmanageable in terms of its length and thus the volume of content. For example, questions were asked so that respondents could give ratings for the importance of areas and then later questions were asked to elicit ratings in relation to whether council spent enough money on those areas. To answer such questions one would have needed to know the council budgets over the years to make an informed response. A written questionnaire would have given respondents time to think through responses. It felt as though the survey was conducted merely for the council to be able to tick the box 'We have consulted with the community'. This has not given me any confidence in this consultation process and its outcome. This view seems to be supported by the belief that a majority of the rate payers voted for no rate increase in the past but this was ignored by the council. Similarly it is of concern that council should have contemplated the location of the skate park outside the under construction sports complex in Alstonville/Wollongbar. This has now lead to council funds being spent on further investigations. It is also disappointing that some C Ward councillors
453	Alstonville	Not at all supportive		Not very supportive		Strongly supportive	The council applying for these things is great, the rates increase is absurd. Its way above what any over agency can get away with and charge. If you increase the rates more than the cost of living do you think people will be able to afford it? Of course not.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
454	Ballina	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
455	Other (eg. rural)	Not at all supportive	If the shire's human population is growing at the national average of 1.4%, then the whole environment will be trashed, including the waterways. As this region will be the fastest growing region in Australia, our population will most probably double by 2050 (2% growth rate). What pressure is being applied to state and federal governments, to slow population growth?	Not at all supportive		Somewhat supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Unless governments in Australia realise that endless growth is an impossibility in a finite system (Australia/the planet), our communities will continue to fall short of a sustainable future, no matter how much the governments want to raise taxes to try and make it possible.

#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
456	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive	Ballina Shire is located on the bottom part of the mouth of the Richmond River and most of the pollution in it comes from the upper parts in Lismore and Richmond Valley Shires. If Lismore and Richmond Valley Councils are not going to contribute to the cleanup of the Richmond River so as to significantly improve its health, then there is little point in Ballina Shire continually wasting ratepayers money on a futile program to improve the health of the Richmond River and its tributaries.	Not at all supportive	OUR assets such as roads, stormwater and drainage maintenance are an important part of the council's renewal program but there is no justification of the council having submitted a proposal to the state government to increase the general rate income above the allowable standard rate pegging limit for the next three financial years. I know that it will be unwelcome news to this corrupt council but rate peg limit annual increases should strictly mean a limit, is a limit, is a limit and not a greedy invitation to annually seek selfish Special Rate Variations above the standard rate pegging limit set by the state government each year.	Not all all supportive	Same overall comments in respect to the proposed special rate variation as made in the individual Healthy Waterways Program and Asset Renewal Program above.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Remarkable as it may sound to this council, if not stating an obvious tautology, the only way the community consultation process can possibly be improved is by this corrupt council conducting a consultation process which actually consults with the community and complies with the wishes of the community/ratepayers. The council should do what all ratepayers are forced to do and that is live within your annual budget and if you do not have sufficient funds for asset renewal programs and healthy waterways programs, then so be it and postpone them until you do have sufficient funds. After all, you can not argue against the fact that Ballina Council has not done anything to address the pollution of the Richmond River in the many decades that this problem has existed. As well, the council has only recently attempted to address some of the problems associated with roads and stormwater and drainage. When you consider that Ballina Council is one of the wealthiest assets based councils in this state, it has no logical or factual reasons to seek a permanent increase in its general rate income above the standard rate pegging limit set by the state government each year. To make it absolutely clear, the only reason this corrupt council even bothers with the masquerade of conducting a community consultation process is
457	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not very supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
458	Ballina	Not at all supportive	It starts at the top of river at kyogle not the bottom	Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
459	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Somewhat supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
460	Ballina	Not at all supportive	Ballina residents should not be forking out MORE money for this	Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
461	Ballina	Not at all supportive	I think this is important work but I do not think a high rate rise is the way.	Not at all supportive	This is a very high rate rise and not justified at all!	Not all all supportive	This is a ridiculous rate rise and not looking after the people of the Ballina shore this is far to high a rise to expect people to pay .	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Possible lower rate rise for the most important aspects also you are a profitable council already are these extremely high rate rises really needed
462	Ballina	Not at all supportive	Council CANNOT keep stinging the locals constantly with an EXTRA rate increase every time. Just because you live in the local area DOES NOT mean you can cope with these constant extra rate increases. My husband (and I'm sure many others) has NOT had a pay rise in 5 years, and we are a SINGLE income family. Sell off some of your assets and get the money that way. You are constantly blowing the budget for large expense items ( 2 pools & the coast Guard Tower), you can't even get that right!	Not at all supportive	I CANNOT NOT AFFORD IT year after year, I have had to cut back on other expenses to be able to pay extra rates. My daughter is missing out because of crap like this.	Not all all supportive	Go hit the rich people in the area, not battlers & pensioners that make up half of your population!	No (Resident)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
463	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		No (Resident)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	

#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
464	Ballina	Not at all supportive		Not very supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
465	Alstonville	Not at all supportive	The main problem with the lack of oxygen in the water after significant rainfall at Lower Tuckean comes from the excessive amount of undergrowth from Parks and Wildlife reserve. If there is any money spent on this project it should be forthcoming from Parks and Wildlife and not Ballina Rate payers. In my opinion the majority of black water comes from the build up of foliage and this problem should be addressed by Parks and Wildlife.	Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
466	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive	Council continues to increase rates and then add extra increases such as these above when they actually want to do something instead of using the budget money they have An example is the swimming pool levy increase Ballina Council is a development council with many commercial sites and land holding making plenty of money. they don't need to be putting so much pressure on commercial activities in the shire such as increasing rates in this way	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Multiple categories of properties (eg residential and business)	We filled in the feedback form last time and frankly I don't believe you take any notice. we had valid arguments with commercial properties thus businesses in the shire being affected every time you gouge some more when you don't need to
467	Other (eg. rural)	Not at all supportive	Strongly object to representative of Oz Fish, a private national organization not in any way related to Council, attempting to influence all 4 official Council Rate Payers Consultation meetings by utilizing considerable meeting times that should have been exclusively available for ratepayers to raise their massive concerns as to the huge future financial burden of these proposed ongoing permanent cumulative special rate increases.	Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive	The State Govt. carefully and deliberately establishes an appropriate limit to Council Rate percentage increases each year, based on official Cost of Living (Inflation) figures. Most rural ratepayers (such as us), are struggling to even keep abreast of this current low inflation rate By means of these continual ongoing, permanent special rate increase requests, Council is effectively utilizing a slight of hand statistical confusion to dupe ratepayers into accepting (or, rather, not refusing to allow) this distortion of the rate base upon which all future rate charges will be levied.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Prior to any of the Public Meetings, each and every ratepayer should be provided with an accurate estimate, based on his official property U.C.V., of the immediate and future effects of the various options being proposed:- from the application of the State peg limit (based on the official cost of living figures) to the various alternative additional increases being proposed by Council. Together with this personal advice, written response mail facilities should be provided (not by restricted, limited, skewed and expensive independent surveys) to encourage each and every ratepayer to respond accordingly, fully aware and cognisant of the implications and likely effects on his future Rate Bills.
468	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive	This should be a joint effort by all interested parties along the Richmond river. It is ridiculous to think you can fix an ecosystem by identifying one issue and location.	Not at all supportive	Indoor sports complex	Not all all supportive	You already have the funds and if you don't there is monumental mismanagement going on in council. Over 120% increase in rates in 10 years along with developers donations and increase in housing developments have more than covered any planned works in the Shire. Again if the money is not there where is it. Also why do we continually pay for special increases on the expiry of the old so called increases.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	No just don't do it.
469	Ballina	Strongly supportive		Supportive		Strongly supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Business	

#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
470	Ballina	Not at all supportive	I do not support any EXTRA rise on our rates. Where does council think we will get the money from, over and above the current rises? I can't go to my boss and say "give me a raise to pay for council rate rises". But council has standard increases already applied which we have to find money for, and now you ask for more!!!! It's not on. No No No. Learn to live within councils means, and prioritise your own expenses, rather than just sucking it out of the rate payers.	Not at all supportive	As I said above, I do not support any EXTRA rise on our rates. Where does council actually think we will get the money from? We can't simply go to the bank and say "put our interest rates up". I can't go to my boss and say "give me a raise". But council has standard increases already applied which we have to find money for, and now you ask for more!!!! It's not on. No No No. Learn to live within councils means, and prioritise your own expenses, rather than just sucking it out of the rate payers.	Not all all supportive	Manage your money better.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Multiple categories of properties (eg residential and business)	Don't go begging for yet more money. Use the current existing rate rises or change council priorities and works program.
471	Other (eg. rural)	Supportive	Wouldn't it need to involve all councils cleaning up the river along its entire length? Not just us at the mouth of it.	Supportive	Ballina desperately needs an entertainment centre. We have a local orchestra but the only place large enough and acoustically good enough for a concert/plays/musicals/theatre is in either Lismore or Byron. Sports centres cannot double as places of theatre entertainment. An entertainment centre would attract outside performers and visitors would come to hear them - and there are a significant number of Ballina residents who appreciate live entertainment - the orchestra has many subscribers from Ballina and beyond and our concerts have been sold out in the past. If only we could perform in Ballina.	Somewhat supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Farmland	
472	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
473	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive	Existing rates are sufficient to budget council amenities and environment. We don't have a Gold Coast population to support Gold Coast type developments.	Not at all supportive	Existing rates provide for road construction and maintenance. Live within your means - like your ratepayers have to.	Not all all supportive	Stop wasting ratepayers money on extravagant projects. Use existing funding to prioritise council works.	No (Resident)		Stop wasting money printing flyers and mailing them out - use council funds for their intended use, and you won't need extra money. Check with your finance dept to see how many of your ratepayers are already struggling with rate payments. An extra 10% in rates will crush some people - especially the many on fixed and low incomes.
474	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive	Sand mining in the Ross lane swamplands should not be allowed as it will release acid sulphates into the North Creek and Richmond River, causing fish and plant die off.	Not at all supportive	Ballina shire Council is the wealthiest on the North Coast. Use your assets to pay for the works needed and don't waste money on Covered pools that are seriously not needed and are privately provided already at Ballina and Ross Lane. Rate rises will badly effect the elderly and low income families who cannot afford the already exhorbitant rates. Personally I have been paying rates in the shire for 25years and still have no road guttering or storm water on Gibbon St, while large amounts of rate payers money are wasted on extravagent community centres etc. Ballina Shire council is reaping in 3x the rates of 30 years ago with all the strata developement on what were single house blocks. Enough waste, start spending our money where it is needed and stop forcing people to sell out of their communities with rate rises. A new road from a Ross Lane/ Byron Rd roundabout to the western side of Lake Ainsworth and the Sport and rec, Camp Drew etc is urgently needed and would be supported by the Jali and state government with grants to assist in building it. This would eliviate pressure on the current unsuitable access roads around the Lake	Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Listen to peoples comments. Do not ignore them and go ahead with your proposal despite the publics opinion. Use councils huge assets for the prpose they were accumulated for and build a stronger shire without punishing those who can least afford it.



#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
475	Ballina	Supportive		Not at all supportive	There were no specific details of the projects for which this PERMANENT increase in rates is required. If additional funds are required for specific projects, why not seek the community's opinion for a temporary increase to cover them?	Not all all supportive	The Special Rate Variation documents do not mention the Council's past achievements or future plans for making savings. All organisations have opportunities to make savings and reduce costs they pass on to customers. What is Ballina Council doing in that respect?	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
476	Ballina	Not very supportive		Not very supportive		Not very supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
477	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive	Richmond River travels through several other sires and is affected long before it reaches Ballina. The NSW government should lead the action needed to improve the Richmond Waterway	Not very supportive	At best a one-off levy could be used to update the assets Ordinary rates should be used to maintain assets after renewal	Not all all supportive	The imposition of a cumulative rate rise is a spurious way to deal with specific problems. A one year rise to work on the problems may be acceptable but the permanent rise is not.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
478	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Supportive		Supportive	Footpaths needed on Montwood Drive Kids Park to accommodate for older kids in Lennox and Montwood Drive Health Fitness/gym equipment stations would be great in Lennox to assist with personal health and fitness	Somewhat supportive	It's great Council is planning ahead this way but the budget pressure on individual households and families is high. Our wages/salaries are not increasing in line with inflation each year, we are already paying a permanent increase for the improvements to Alstonville and Ballina Swimming Pools and then this on top makes cashflow tight.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	More info on eg storm water drainage and situation of as hard to put where priority should be when we don't know current situation with regards to those subjects ie are they old, do we need more, do they fail etc.
479	Ballina	Strongly supportive	Help our economy-Dredge nth creek and the Richmond River-not just the boatharbour.Tourism and waterways are the towns lifeblood.	Strongly supportive		Strongly supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
480	Ballina	Strongly supportive	North Creek is my biggest concern. I have seen this beautiful waterway become significantly sludged up with mud and the actual Creek becoming smaller and smaller! Im not a boaty - but it appears to be almost impossible for boat to safely navigate the Creek now! The rate at which the Creek is narrowing is rapid! We wont have a "Ballina Island" for much longer if we don't act quickly. The sand build up is so significant!	Somewhat supportive		Somewhat supportive	I feel that our rate at the present and income from Council owned properties should be spent on Asset Renewal Program. I am concerned about a "Healthy Waterways Program" - and would be happy to increase rates to assist this - although feel that State and Federal involvement is imperative to contribute to these costs.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
481	Wardell	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
482	Other (eg. rural)	Not at all supportive	I think it is a good idea but the cost should be shared by all residents as a tax , or from fishing licenses ,whereby everyone contributes fairly . other councils should be involved as well . we need a system like queensland has for the reef recovery with subsidies for farmers to reduce nutrient runoff	Not at all supportive	Rural areas need more priority for road quality and maintenance of the road verge .I think this work could be done more efficiently	Not all all supportive	People who have dual occupancy /workers cottage /granny flat or any extra dwelling approved or not should pay extra rates . I believe double as these places put twice as much pressure on existing resources and i would also include businesses that operate in rural areas legally or otherwise should be looked at and made conform or close.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Farmland	I really feel there are some residents who are freeloading on genuine rate payers who are the backbone of our community and i realise that expenses are increasing and we do need to do something about the state of the river but i also feel everyone in the community needs to contribute
483	Alstonville	Not at all supportive	It needs to be a whole catchment initiative otherwise it will be a waste of money.	Not at all supportive	Council should not be increasing rates above the normal percentage increases. Council needs to budget like the rest of society. Any council with foresight would set funds aside for future major works. There is no guarantee that from 2020/21 onwards normal rate increases would be applied	Not all all supportive	Council should not be comparing itself to Lismore and Byron, both of which have a history of extremely poor management, but with the best achieving councils in the state.(This is akin to ranking students in a class based on the results of the worst student - a definite NO! NO!)Council is in the present sound financial position due to the prudent decisions made by previous councillors.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	If revenue is so tight, council needs to develop a scale of preferences and work through them as funds become available. The rate increases are unjustified in the present economic climate. The present council is composed of too many councillors who are trying to outbid one another on ways of spending money rather than spending it wisely.

#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
484	Ballina	Not very supportive	Given that the community has been asked to rank the 'improving our waterways' indicates that the rate increase will proceed and the survey is just a cover process. Having said that, community swimming and fishing facilities do fall under the Council category public recreation and such improvement projects need to be prioritised within the Strategic Plan along with other activities. Grants are available for well prepared submissions. Health of river is significantly impacted by other Council regions what contributions are they making and that by State Govt. Local Govt needs to 'stand-up' and put pressure on State Govt to accept responsibility rather than them passing the 'buck'.	Not very supportive	Better prioritising of available funds through improved strategic and management practices	Not very supportive	Again, has Council preempted its decision by seeking a ranking for asset renewal works. Yes every so often Councils do have to seek a special one-off rate increase to undertake certain functions. But this suggestion of three consecutive compounding rate increases is underhanded when explained as 'assist Council in complying with State Govt's Fit for the Future Program' and wanting more money to 'undertake additional asset renewal. Council has a Strategic Plan for the future and Operational Plan does this mean poor prioritising or poor decisions are being made by management and Council or is it the threat of the amalgamation. Ballina and Tintembar Councils amalgamated some time ago, similarly Lismore, Gundurimba and Terania Councils for the benefit of their communities. Maybe its time to introduce the concept of Regional Councils, What percentage has the rate base increased this aspect needs reviewing	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	no
485	Ballina	Not at all supportive	Council should first develop a plan to show how the money would be used. What has happened with the CZMP? I suspect not a lot - there has certainly been no public feedback. Shaws Bay & Lake Ainsworth plans will have insignificant effect on quality of water in Richmond River. I personally don't wish to contribute any more rate money, besides Richmond River funding is primarily a State responsibility. What have they contributed?	Not at all supportive	Council's current programs are working very well within the projected budgets and that's a credit to all involved, and the FFTF programs targets are currently able to be maintained without a special rate variation. So keep working hard and don't take the "easy way out" by increasing rates that many (particularly on fixed incomes) just cannot afford.	Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
486	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive	The pollution of the Richmond River starts way upstream as seen with the large fish kill from a flood. Education for farmers and the public on the pesticides and pollutants that end up in the river. Lake Ainsworth-filtering melaleucas gone for housing; used to open to sea in storms for occasional flushing. Its condition will only get worse.	Not at all supportive	Stop wasting money on badly designed Gold Coast style buildings like the LH Community Centre and the new LH surf club.	Not all all supportive	We have already had a rate rise to renew the 2 pools which I never use. Bad management by BSC in not accumulating funds for these in the last 20 years.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
487	Other (eg. rural)	Strongly supportive		Strongly supportive		Strongly supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
488	Ballina	Not very supportive		Not very supportive		Not very supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
489	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive	requiring more money now means your forward planning with regular preventive maintenance programs were not carried out or were not in place initially. If regular programmed maintenance is carried out gluts and backlogs do not occur. Who ever is your maintenance manager needs an overall look out.	No (Resident)		Overview your maintenance programs. Treat your Council as a business we ratepayers are your "shareholders" treat us as such.
490	Ballina	Not at all supportive	We have just been hit with a rate increase to fund swimming pool upgrades in Ballina and Alstonville, which is not used by all ratepayers. No more increases.	Not at all supportive	This should be sourced from other ways other than ratepayers.	Not all all supportive	Already paying an increase for the upgrades of the swimming pools. This should have been funded by user pays, not all ratepayers. Now you are proposing to increase again. No more slugging ratepayers.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Unfair to put these increases on ratepayers. There are so many users in the shire that will not be penalised but are users. You are penalising the ratepayers as easy targets. There needs to be other ways found to subsidise this.

#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
491	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not very supportive		Not at all supportive		Not very supportive	This is the second application for a special levy in 2 years. The Ballina Shire Council should realise that ratepayers are living in a low inflation, low wage growth and difficult fixed income environment. We are not able to finance endless rate increases.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	You could take notice of the responses to your surveys. In the case of the last special levy proposal the majority of responses were against the rise. Yet it went ahead. Rubber stamped by IPAC against the wishes of ratepayers.
492	Other (eg. rural)	Not very supportive		Not very supportive		Supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
493	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive	We are at the very end of the river. The problems with the river (acid sulfate, runoff and silting) stem from inappropriate land use and practice by landholders in the upstream shires. This is a task for State and Federal governments. Any work in this part of the river would be useless without a total approach. If any additional costs in this shire are to be incurred it should be funded by the business community and chamber of commerce who profit directly from the river.	Not at all supportive	Council has numerous property investments and over the years has continued to make such investments sometimes with detrimental results to the bottom line. Property speculation is not the proper business of council. These assets should be overtime liquidated and revenue used to fund the above programs which are indeed the proper business of council. These assets have not contributed to the betterment of the shire or financial security demonstrated by the fact that year after year we see applications for further rate rises.	Not all all supportive	My rates have increased by a factor of three over the past 20 years. Each year we see application for special rate variations above inflation. This new application will see a further 17% going forward. Council (elected and professional staff) do not seem to understand that many shire rate payers are either retired on a pension superannuated or self funded. These groups has no opportunity to increase their income over general cost of living (approx 2%) Quite simply your continued grab for revenue is causing hardship, fear of being priced out of the family home and anger. Enough is enough! Do we really need a salt water pool and renovations on existing pools as well a gilt clad cycle ways?. Perhaps it is time to introduce differential rating based on income and increase rates for business in the CBD. We have frankly had enough of every year being confronted with one off special rate increases - we haven't seen the last "one off variation" completed yet	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	It seems that this consultation is just a sop or poor excuse to justify a decision that has already been made. It is highly unlikely that the substantially newly elected council has had time to read and understand all of the issues involved or to consider the implications before voting for this increase. My best guess is that it was presented and endorsed by professional staff to an uninformed elected council. The people say NO resoundingly, listen and carry out rate payers wished by not proceeding.
494	Ballina	Not at all supportive	This rate rise is not necessary to maintain our waterways. Existing rates should be used and prioritised according to Council staff assessment - not according to a popular vote based on which area has the highest population.	Not at all supportive	Live within the income stream of existing rates. Don't opt for gold plated solutions to make councillors look good, when most residents have bronze plated incomes.	Not all all supportive	A 10% increase in rates over 3 years and continuing beyond that places undue pressure on the budgets of families and pensioners. Live within your means, and peg rates rises to CPI as intended. Fixed living costs such as rates, medical cover, insurance, car registration, electricity etc are all going up faster than wage growth and fixed incomes - BACK OFF !!!!! stop wating money on surveys like this and you won't need more money.	No (Resident)		Cynically, I note the information for this survey was posted out during the Christmas period - no doubt hoping people would be distracted and not respond. Sorry to dissappoint.
495	Ballina	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	
496	Other (eg. rural)	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	council already waste way to much money on proposals that only benefit a few in the community (eg. heated swimming pools)... over 85% of the community voted AGAINST this proposal. TOTAL WASTE OF MONEY ... The average working family is struggling to keep a roof over their head, wages are at an all time low with costs of living at an all time high .. We do not have spare money to donate to council to be wasted by incompetent public servants and self-serving, would-be politicians.
497	Other (eg. rural)	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive		Not all all supportive		Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	

#	Q2 - Residence	Q4 - Waterways	Q5 - Waterways Comment	Q7 - Asset	Q8 - Asset Comment	Q9 - Both	Q10 - Comment on Proposed SRV	Q11 - Ratepayer	Q12 - Type	Q13 - Other Feedback
498	Other (eg. rural)	Somewhat supportive	The health of our waterways is strongly linked to agricultural pursuits with run off, silt and agricultural chemicals entering the river systems. Land owners whose properties drain to the river could be encouraged to use the Contour Farming practices used on the Western Plains. The western farmers cut contour banks into the land to prevent run off to the rivers. This would alleviate the problem of the river silting. Silting costs the council and then ratepayers to remove the silt and clean up the river. Good educational practices such as contouring may alleviate the problem this could save money! Shaws Bay and Lake Ainsworth could be great tourism assets if cleaned, landscaped and the amenities upgraded. We could take a leaf out of the Gold Coast councils provision of BBQ's in areas supplied with hot and cold running water and pleasant places to sit and enjoy the scenery. Our beaches do not have any decent amenities.	Somewhat supportive	Rural roads in this shire are terrible and need major upgrades Ballina desperately needs a Community Centre that may be used for many community projects. As a Rotarian we struggle to find venues for events and functions. A community centre would be a way of raising money by council.	Somewhat supportive	I believe the increases the council proposes are too high. This shire has a large percentage of pensioners, self funded retirees and low income families all struggling on tight budgets. Such an increase may cause some hardship in the community. The increase could be reduced to say 3.0% and 4.0% for subsequent years. This is approximately midway between the standard and the proposed changes which may be well received by the community.	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Please hold some forums and talk to the community. Not everyone has access to a computer and the Internet and the IT services are very patchy
499	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive		Not at all supportive	Ocean swim pool and indoor pool	Not all all supportive	Reduce staff, increase costs generated from housing estates to cover the increases needed	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Majority of rate payers do not agree with increase What is point of consultation if people do not want rate increase
500	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not at all supportive	I voted for a councillor that promised not to support src as council had sufficient funds & assets. I supported the last svr but don't not support this or constant svr's	Not at all supportive	I voted at the council election for a councillor that said he would not support SVR's as council had sufficient funds & assets	Not all all supportive	I will not vote for any councillor or mayor again that supports this unaffordable increase	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	Sneaky large SVR's after elections will not be forgotten next election
501	Lennox Head / Skennars Head	Not very supportive	would be supportive if lake road left open sad so very sad	Somewhat supportive	would support ocean pool	Somewhat supportive	happy for infrastructure and rates to reflect this but council needs to listen to the community which has not done with the lake road	Yes (Property or business owner - Individually or in joint ownership)	Residential (urban or rural residential property or both)	