

Attachment C

No.	Y/N	Summary
1	N	Pensioner – cites difficulty paying
2	N	Need to get spending in order.
3	N	Asks why survey was sent to all residents. Says council should seek additional funding from the State Government through its collection of stamp duty. Should also cut wages.
4	N	Asks why Yamba rates are higher, who was responsible for the 'deficit' and why all residents were surveyed.
5	N	Council needs to consider the socio-economic standing of residents and not waste money on some infrastructure projects.
6	N	Council should be able to manage with the funds it gets now.
7	N	Welcomes savings initiatives but believes Council should use its funds more like a business would. Says council spending should generate funds. Emailed her submission to all councillors.
8	N	Believes proposal is excessive in low socio economic area. Council should look at property sales to improve financial position
9	N	Increases in the cost of living in other areas would make paying an 8% SRV difficult. Suggests Council should look at a 5% cumulative increase.
10	?	Submission not clear. Does not seem to relate to proposal.
11	N	Does not believe Council should have to comply with State Government-imposed Fit for the Future benchmarks. Prices are crippling families. Rise would hurt small business and tourism.
12	N	Pensioner. Believes proposed 8% increases are too onerous. Says ratepayers have rejected similar applications in the past.
13	N	Financial sustainability needs to be achieved through good management, not hitting ratepayers. If cuts need to be made, so be it.
14	N	Self-funded retirees. Struggling on fixed income. Say tourism promotion and sports amenities should largely be funded by beneficiaries/users.
15	N	Council has other income streams. See it as a cash grab that will hurt pensioners, families and jobs.
16	N	Rates have already increased too much. Voted for councillors who supported rate restraint. Time for a rethink.
17	Y	Supports SRV but has questions about road damage from world rally championships
18	N	Council should do more to support development. Council needs to develop a 'how can I help you' attitude. Cites examples of where he has had problems with council.
19	N	No corresponding increase in pensions. Too much spent on printing and distributing material.
20	N	Pensioner. Would support a 17% rebate on rates for pensioners but without that would not support an SRV.
21	Y	Supports increase, but believes customer service needs to improve. Also feels increases will be greater in Lower River areas but most planned work seems to be dedicated to Grafton.
22	N	Some current councillors were elected on a platform of no rate increases. Cost of living pressures are going up and council is adding to those. Would like Maclean de-amalgamated.
23	N	Council should use more contractors who get things done more efficiently. Should develop a work plan and have it approved by the NSW Government.
24	N/A	Believes wealthy areas should pay more in rates. Uses very little of Council's infrastructure but pays close to the same as high income earners.
25	Y	Would support SRV with corresponding 25% increase in pension rebate. Many pensioners in Clarence would struggle with increases without additional rebate.
26	N	Council is not spending enough to maintain roads. Lives on gravel road that is not graded regularly enough.
27	N	Council should live within its budget. Not enough money spent in Grafton. All funds seem to be spent on the Lower River.
28	N	Feels penalised for living on a canal estate where rates are higher. Would not object if more was done to dredge canals and generally improve conditions in the area.

29	N/A	Council should seek additional rates from premises where businesses are being operated from residential properties. It's unfair on businesses who have to pay commercial rates.
30	N/A	General comment on former staff member, councillors not returning phone calls, Ulmarra pool and road surfacing materials.
31	N	Business owner, cattle producer, owns several parcels of land. Been finding it difficult to make ends meet. Council should find savings, maybe not replace equipment so regularly, cut down on waste.
32	Y	Supports SRV so no amenities are lost. Requested curb and guttering in her street.
33	N	Feels doesn't get anything for rates now. Bins not collected regularly enough. Money wasted buying site for new depot, providing services for Aboriginal communities, cultural centres.
34	N	Full submission = "No 8% SRV".
35	N	Council should make more use of volunteers to save money, use infrastructure in a way to make more money. Alarmed by reports ratepayers can pay more because of a rise in median incomes.
36	N	Wide ranging. Comment about correspondence not being answered, poor road conditions, desire to secede into former Nymboida Council area, for councillors to vote in support of marriage equality.
37	N	Maclean waterfront getting the attention Grafton waterfront needs. Grafton streets need cleaning. Too many empty shops.
38	N	Beef property on council boundaries. Does not get a lot of services. Council needs to develop a more user pays approach.
39.	N/A	Bureaucracy is not innovative and innovative ideas are needed to reduce costs and increase revenue. Offers suggestions such as removing non core functions of council (reviews of dog ownership regulations cited), fast track innovation.
40	N	Does not believe Council will keep its word about further rate increases in SRV out years. Would like to see de-amalgamation, with upper and lower river councils
41	N	Too much waste (depot, Maclean carpark. No disabled access to Iluka breakwater)
42	N	Not enough consultation. When consultation is done no-one listens.
43	N	Full submission: "I wish to object to the SRV as it is excessive and only shows to prove council inability to manage the finances of the valley."
44	N/A	Would like to see more activities for young people. Pleased with Maclean skate park. Would like to see kids active and not in front of a screen.
45	N	Council needs to improve financial performance. Says recent work on Armidale Road shows how work is not being done well enough.
46	N	Can see 'nothing but pain and problems for the valley' if proposal is adopted.
47	N	Lengthy submission. Cites cost of living pressures on low income earners and difficulty paying; full increase would come into effect when major infrastructure projects are winding down; businesses already suffering; opposes increases in DMU charges, cemetery fees and cuts to tourism budget; council needs to look at size of workforce (has high staffing levels); provides too many cars and mobile phones for staff; needs to work with community to explore ways to grow the economy.
48	N	Rate rise counter productive. Could lead to people not setting up for family in Clarence. Should consider more user-pays arrangements, parking meters, council-owned business. Need to cut costs.
49	N	Council is opting for the easiest fix. All other avenues should be explored.
50	N	Full submission: "I do not support Councils SRV"
51	N	Full submission: "I do not support Councils SRV !"
52	N	Pensioner, would struggle to pay increase and would need to consider selling home. Grafton has higher rates than Sutherland (<i>claim is incorrect. Average residential rate in Grafton is \$1060, in Sutherland Shire it is \$1233</i>)
53	N	Wouldn't be able to buy life-saving medications. People will be forced to sell their homes, live on the streets. Businesses will close.
54	N	"I 100% do not support the rate rise at all"

55	N	Dependent on pension. Already finding it difficult to pay rates and charges. Might have to forego specialist medical treatment.
56	N	Full submission: "I do NOT support Councils proposed SRV!"
57	N	"I do NOT agree with the rate increase"
58	N	Rates already too high. Council needs to start working with its community.
59	N	Retiree. Have high land values. Clarence people cannot afford the rise. Will damage economy. Proposed SRV rise is 'legal theft'.
60	N	Full submission: "I Do NOT Support Councils Proposed SRV"
61	N	Full submission: "I do NOT support councils SRV"
62	N	Council can't run its finances. No amount of extra funds will change that. Lists a number of area where he is disappointed council hasn't made more effort to save money, lift morale.
63	N	Council needs to look elsewhere to save money. Also needs to look at staffing levels. There should be no more internal borrowings from the general fund.
64	N	Second submission from this Yamba resident. Already pay \$8500 for waterfront block. Retired at 60 and the rates burden is affecting health. Questions council's ethics in asking for an increase.
65	N	Full submission: "I do not support your submission to special variation rate rise."
66	N	Councillors should listen to the community.
67	N	Full submission: "I do not support council's SRV"
68	N	Full submission: "I do not support cvc's proposed SRV."
69	N	Full submission: "I do not support the special rate rise "
70	N	Low socio economic area – can't be afforded. Staff members need to be multi-skilled, do more work in-house. Must live within means.
71	N	Pensions won't increase by the amount of the SRV. Should seek compensation from the State Gov't. Could consider increasing the base rate in some areas. Extend user-pays principle.
72	N	Full submission: "I DO NOT support councils proposed SRV."
73	N	Full submission: "I do not support councils proposed SRV"
74	N	Full submission: "I do not support councils proposed SRV"
75	N	Didn't receive initial material. Questions where average rate figure came from. Depot project and Maclean carpark mismanaged.
76	N	Full submission: "I DO NOT Support Councils proposed Special Rate Variation Application"
77	N	Unaffordable spending on bridges and buildings. Money wasted felling trees. In their 80s. Would have trouble selling home.
78	N	General comment about the administration about the new depot in South Grafton.
79	N	GMs have made poor decisions. Road construction and maintenance history illustrates extra money won't fix the backlog because work will be done poorly. Too much work going to contractors. Contractors not well supervised.
80	N	Full submission: "I DO NOT support councils proposed SRV."
81	N/A	Would like more facilities in some of the smaller villages.
82	N	Full submission: "I do not agree with the application for the SRV"
83	N	Council has more than the state average number of employees. Has issued too many mobiles, cars. Low socio-economic area. Increased fees and charges make use of facilities prohibitive. Too much spent on depot. Had to pay out former GM early. Not doing enough to attract tourists. Shouldn't do internal borrowings.
84	N	Rates have increased but service levels at Minnie Water haven't. Beach access disgraceful.
85	N	Proposed increase is excessive. What will we be paying in four years?
86	N	Cut costs by discontinuing Grafton Regional Gallery and airport. Lower Clarence people don't use these.

87	N	I do not support council's proposed rate rise at all.
88	N	Young person can relocate with job. Rates and services costs are a disincentive to buying and settling in the Clarence.
89	N	Should try to raise extra money by charging more at caravan and camping properties. Would be a big cost impost for many people. Should explore more cost recovery.
90	N	Would have bad impact on personal budget. Council should look at discretionary spending (fleet, wages, asset purchases). Only wants to pay CPI increases.
91	N	Objects to proposed rise
92	N	Rely on aged pension. Would struggle to afford increase.
93	N	Unaffordable. Wrong to ask people to pay more.
94	N	Full submission: "I DO NOT support councils Proposed SRV"
95	N	Full submission: "I DO NOT Support Councils Proposed SRV"
96	N/A	Shouldn't have regional airport. Too many cost overruns. Staff sometimes don't have right equipment for job. Could have an SRV, but only for three years.
97	N	Area has low average wage, high unemployment and large pensioner population. Other costs are rising, making payments difficult.
98	N	Councillors were elected on no SRV basis. Projects need to be assessed more carefully. Pensioners. Rebate would need to be increased if increases come in.
99	N	Greater Maclean Community Action Group. Lengthy submission. Mismanagement. Unaffordable for many. Incompetence since amalgamation. Council can't budget. Done nothing in the past to address deficit. Breach of charter if services are cut.
100	N	Full submission: "I do not support council's proposed SRV."
101	N	Full submission: "I do not support council's application for a special variation"
102	N	Full submission: "I do not support council's proposed SRV"
103	N	Council stuck in last century. Could contract out some seasonal work. Could hire out under-utilised plant, employ engineers on a short-term needs basis.
104	N	Pensioners – worried about being priced out of their home.
105	N	Outlined difficulties faced by self-funded retirees. Provided some suggestions on where savings might be made – no need for the roundabout at the intersection of Yamba and Coldstream streets, reduce the number of book purchases, cut swimming pool hours, beautification of Yamba CBD was not needed, McLachlan Park waste.
106	N	Councillors elected on no SRV platform. Financial position not the fault of ratepayers. Needs to run like a business. Should consider 'selling' some council functions to private enterprise. Some services and staff need to go.
107	N	As above: Councillors elected on no SRV platform. Financial position not the fault of ratepayers. Needs to run like a business. Should consider 'selling' some council functions to private enterprise. Some services and staff need to go.
108	N	Pensioner. Rates already cost him a full month of income. Other living costs going up. Becoming difficult to exist.
109	N	Too much waste. Rise would put people on the streets.
110	N	Pensioner. Difficulty meeting costs. Other cost of living increases put pressure on budget.
111	N	General fund shortfall due to incompetence. Not ratepayers fault. Owns a house in Angourie and another in Yamba. Rates becoming too difficult to pay. Council should sell the regional gallery.
112	N/A	Pensioner rebate should be proportional to rates as flat rebate advantages some pensioners more than others.
113	N	Standard of living is falling. Current one-off rise hit hard. Can't put more pressure on vulnerable communities. Responsibility lies with council to fix its finances.
114	Y	Failing to upgrade facilities is a downward spiral. Community has lost too much through government cutbacks. Council needs to do jobs properly, once. Cost overruns need to be avoided.

115	N	Full submission: "I Do Not Support Councils Application for a Special Rate Variation"
116	N	Better services and cheaper rates were promised with forced amalgamation. Financial position not ratepayers fault. Had 12 years to fix problems but has poor management. Community consultation not genuine. Should ask State Govt for financial assistance. Council projects go over budget.
117	N	Full submission: "I do not support council's proposed SRV"
118	N	Second Greater Maclean Community Action Group submission. Forced amalgamation did not bring promised benefits. Management incompetent – cost blow-outs. Judicial inquiry into council is needed. Financial position is no fault of ratepayers. Amalgamation was a bungle. State Govt might need to assume financial responsibility.
119	N	Full submission: "I do not support councils proposed SRV"
120	N	"I do not support the SRV at all"
121	N	Low socio-economic area. Highly taxed. Services provided don't represent value. Too many staff. Spending is out of control. Not enough planning for infrastructure projects (depot). Ratepayers shouldn't have to pay for amalgamation experiment. Airport costs ratepayers more than \$1million annually, gallery \$600,000. Time for an administrator.
122	N	Big impact on low income earners. Should consider divesting some services to not for profits and focusing on roads, rubbish, water/sewerage services
123	N	Not happy with overspending on projects – depot, McLachlan Park. Concerned about impact on low-income earners.
124	N	Cost of living already too high. Unaffordable for many low income earners.
125	N	Identical to GCMA2 submission. Forced amalgamation did not bring promised benefits. Management incompetent – cost blow-outs. Judicial inquiry into council is needed. Financial position is no fault of ratepayers. Amalgamation was a bungle. State Govt might need to assume financial responsibility.
126	N	"I Do NOT Support Councils Proposed SRV"
127	N	"I Do NOT Support Councils Proposed SRV"
128	N	"Let it be known that I do not support councils proposed SRV"
129	N	Council spent like drunken sailors. Needs to tighten its belt. For house and farm rates will be close to \$1000 a month.
130	N	"I wish to register my OBJECTION to another SRV rate rise."
131	N	"I do not support Councils proposed SRV rate rise. I do not believe council has yet shown any real major commitment to cost saving and managing rate payer money."
132	N	"I Do NOT Support Councils Proposed SRV"
133	N	"This is to advise we do not support the srv"
134	N	Promised amalgamation savings did not eventuate. Too much spent on consultants and councillor 'junkets'. Depot costs. Shouldn't have to pay for bad management.
135	N	Can't manage budgets – depot, McLachlan Park. Cost of airport, consultants, fleet not touched while community facilities are downgraded. Not enough set aside for asset depreciation. Will impact on low-income earners heavily. Management got us in this mess. Maclean Shire was always in the black. Needs professional management, direction and guidance.
136	N	"Against rate rise"
137	N	Not affordable. Councillors campaigned on no SRV. SRVs are for special purposes, not permanent increases. Council not being run to expectations. DPOP is appalling and misrepresents community's ability to pay. Council can't be trusted. Councillors and department managers need to be replaced.
138	N	40% increase over five years is too much. Not justified. Will impact heavily on pensioners and low income earners.