

Author name: C. Cooper

Date of submission: Friday, 20 December 2013

Submission:

We wish to lodge an objection to the LLS rating system to be imposed upon rural residential holdings who derive no income from their small holdings. We own 2.422 hectares used as garden area thus should incur no base rate; animal health rate; pest animal rate or intensive livestock industries rate. Urban blocks would be just as likely to present problems such as blackberries, rabbits etc as our 2 hectare rural residential block. We already pay rates to our Shire Council thus if an additional cost is levied by LLS, our Shire rates should be reduced accordingly.

As rural dwellers, we see further inequities and anomalies in possible rate leverage to landholders such as:

1. Landholders along major highways being more prone to weed / pest invasion due to transport vehicles spreading weed/pest contamination to their properties. Properties off major thoroughfares are not so open to spread of invasive transported diseases & weeds.
2. Landholders nearest to National Parks being more prone to the exposure of wild dogs and rabbits, whilst properties nearest to urbanised areas incur more problems with "town dogs". Farms/stations far away from either least experience such problems.
3. Clarity of responsibilities or identification of impactor of outbreaks of disease eg bird flu / equine disease. Where they commence is often in question so it would be unfortunate that the receiver pays. These landholders suffer enough grief having to put down precious and prized animals.
4. We question what a landholder is getting in return for this "general rate"? What specifically does this cover apart from supposed education, probably the farmer could educate IPART!

Before making any permanent decisions should not IPART consult with all landholders in excess of 2 hectares for feedback? It is very much *Animal Farm* law with suggestions of pigs in the trough it seems.

Your response to our questions & comments would be much appreciated.