

Name	Have your say
D & M Sherrin	<p>I think possibly Option 2 appears to be the best option . However there need to be some clarification for properties classed as rural but not involved in primary production. There are a lot in this category in urban and semi urban areas and to be charged the primary production rate is inequitable. Also the inclusion of SES services raises the question as to who uses SES service as opposed to TFS services. My general impression would be that the main users of SES service are urban/semi urban. Do statistics bear this out? If this is the case then should it not be user pays?.Whilst it may seem altruistic to say everyone should pay a equal charge across Tasmania, there seems to be no consideration for those people who settle in inaccessible and remote areas where provision of fire and ses services are cost prohibitive. Why should the rest of Tasmania pay for their lifestyle choices?</p> <p>Further to my earlier email, I have ha time to reflect on the proposed amendment. It has been stated that it is the intention to remove the levy imposed on insurance policies and I am assuming this is in relation to Home and Contents policies. If this is the case the it is neither fair or equitable to transfer the funding of TFS and SES to the land holder. They are bearing the full cost of funding as a consequence of owning property. A renter on the other hand has no contribution to the protection of their property which they are required or is desirable to have as their personal property is not covered under the land holder/landlord insurance cover.</p> <p>How is this equitable and fair? Back to the drawing board</p>