

This is addressed to The Premier, the Hon. Christopher John Minns, and Carmel Donnelly PSM Chair IPART.NSW.

Dear Premier & IPART chair.

Regarding "the Review of the financial modelling of Councils".

Last year in my residences rate notice, from Clarence Valley Shire, I was charged an extra 51% on my general rates, which equated to around an extra \$600.(I couldn't afford that unexpected rise!)

When I questioned this with council staff and Councillors I met a blank wall with no rights of appeal or any appeal process, I contacted a lot of authorities, IPART, ARIC, ACCC, FAIR TRADING, and the Department of Local Government NSW. They all told me there was nothing they could do and all advised me to go back to my Councillors. My councillors were hopeless and really didn't understand how the rate calculations were made, yet they voted on these outrageous increases in certain areas of the shire. I classed this process calculated by the council staff and Manager, as DISCRIMINATION without any equality for the same services that all residences in the Clarence shire receive.

This is because the general rate calculations are archaic, and based on the Unimproved Land Value (ULV) of the properties set by the Valuer General, mainly for the purpose of LAND TAX. So to ease the burden on rate rises on the inflated ULV in these days, they can use a varying differential rate calculation, to ease a big increase in the general rates, caused by the rising ULV's, by using different differential rate calculations; such as 0.32661 c/\$, which they did in some areas and 0.16281 c/\$ and in other areas. In some areas in the shire the rates only went up \$20, but others like mine went up \$600. But this method creates discrimination against residential ratepayers who all get the same services.

When in fact in a fair system, we should all be paying the same, not more or less because of the ULV. Just because some persons property has increased in value these days charging more for the same service is discrimination. Or does that mean to this NSW government and councils, that the person with a higher value properly has more funds, sorry that's not the case, or should we sell it to please the silly unequal and unfair calculations of our rates ???

Now here is an example of a fair and simple system of calculating a rate which does not discriminate between residential rate payers.

eg..... for the Clarence valley shire,  
( with data from their budget records)

Total amount of residences/resident properties in shire= 25,749, total value in residential rates in the budget papers gathered was= \$35,931,863, now dividing the total res/res properties into that= \$1395 general rates each. How simple and fair is that ! Yet our Councils and NSW government choose a system that DISCRIMINATES..... Why ????

Yours Terence Hudson

