

**To whom this may concern. 25/02/2026**

**Submission to the draft SSL Accommodation Levy Bill. Opposition intended. Tim Parsons, Hamilton.**

My name is Tim Parsons from "Curringa Farm" in Hamilton, central Tasmania. My parents began farmstay accommodation in 1984, now referred to as "Agritourism." 42 years later, we own and manage 9 on farm accommodation cottages that do not neatly fall into the "In House" Bed and Breakfast category. We are a Farmstay Category that is a unique accommodation sector. We offer complimentary continental breakfast supplies and charge for additional "full" provision to cook themselves. Already we fall outside the simple definition of B&B. The same as many other rural accommodation providers in Tasmania.

Our business has been recognised and awarded locally, nationally and globally as an exemplary Agritourism and Farmstay operation.

I write on behalf of all rural, regional farm-based accommodation in Tasmania, with support from Agritourism operators and bodies in Queensland, NSW and WA, to oppose the notion of introducing the SSL levy in Tasmania. My Immediate network of approximately 40 Tasmanian Agritourism Operators disagrees and rejects the notion of this proposed levy. Business names can be supplied.

It is complicated, unworkable and biased towards regional operators. It is being opposed by TICT, RTO's and accommodation operators alike. It has no alignment with the T21 Visitor economy strategy. It is a feeble effort to gouge 11 million dollars from the visitor economy that will place an unnecessary administrative burden on rural and regional businesses who are not responsible for the urban housing crisis and are not displacing rentable houses from the system. It does not make allowances for strategies and actions identified in the recently released 2025 Tasmanian Agritourism Regulatory Review Report.

I understand most bona fide urban operators will be exempt. Hotels Motels, Caravan Parks, Genuine Bed and Breakfast establishments with guests staying "in house".

**HOWEVER** Agritourism, occurring on a registered farm that engages in primary production, by the nature of its various offerings, be they, *self-contained, glamping, campsite, B&B, in house, seasonal, ancillary accommodation, separate dwellings, combination of the above, long term, short stay, employee or family member accommodation*, is not a defined accommodation sector and MAY fall into the taxable levy criteria. This is the point we raise and need addressing.

Rural accommodation providers should not be responsible for making up the government's shortfall in addressing the housing crisis created by Air B&B operators in the cities. The economic and social benefits of rural and regional tourism are huge. This bill will only deflate the current support and momentum for generating agritourism products that educate and create awareness of food and fibre production whilst sustaining farming businesses through generational transition, diversification and basic farm viability.

The National Strategic definition states: **"Agritourism is a form of experiential travel that links individuals with agricultural products or produce. This experience is provided directly on farmland, offering visitors an authentic 'on-farm' engagement."**

**and**

**To be acknowledged as Agritourism, an experience must be delivered on farm and include one or both of engagement with people and product.**

Affected operators will be required to account for and remit the 5% levy, as well as manage administrative arrangements with OTAs that collect payments from customers on behalf of the operators. A totally unproductive and unworkable situation.

Government anticipates that consumers will pay the extra 5%. The reality is that businesses will have to load rates or absorb an income loss, to compensate regardless of who collects the levy. If rates are loaded to compensate, they MAY be deemed as the increased booking fee and as such, increase the booking levy on the selling rate as well. There is no way a TAX should be placed on consumers for some accommodation types and not others and the government will face a severe backlash if some operators are forced to collect the tax and not others.

I refer to the recently released [2025 Tasmanian Agritourism Regulatory Review Report](https://www.stategrowth.tas.gov.au/resources/agritourism) <https://www.stategrowth.tas.gov.au/resources/agritourism> and note of the 6 key issues identified around accessible information, complexities, inconsistencies in interpretation, struggle for coal face experiences, the 6<sup>th</sup> issue states that “**REGULATION IS NOT ALWAYS FIT FOR PURPOSE**”. Key recommendations state. #1 Make sure the regulatory environment is fit for purpose. And #4 Increase the capacity of regulators and experts to better assess proposals.

It includes the statement “The potential approvals required for agritourism businesses are managed by up to 12 different regulators, meaning lots of different contact points for proponents.” This bill will only add another layer of complexity to regional tourism businesses.

One must assume that bona fide Agritourism Operators **MUST** be regarded as a credible and accepted form of Tourism Hospitality accommodation and as such be exempt from the SSL proposal.

**I ask :-**

**That the Tasmanian Government and Treasury abandons the Short Stay Accommodation Levy in its current unworkable form.**

**That the Tasmanian Government and Treasury include and document the exemption of bona fide Agritourism Accommodation properties from the Short Stay Levy Bill if it proceeds.**

**That the Tasmanian Government and Treasury remove, recompense or simplify the onus on accommodation providers to manage and collect the levy on behalf of the Government.**

Thankyou for your consideration in this matter.

Yours sincerely

Tim Parsons *on behalf of 45 Tasmanian Agritourism Operators.*  
Curringa Farm.  
Hamilton, TASMANIA.

[REDACTED]