

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Ian Wood [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, 6 March 2018 10:35 AM  
**To:** Legislation  
**Cc:** Renata Mlinar  
**Subject:** Local Government review.

Hello,

I have been spending hours reading and going through the pro forma local government consultation and have answered up to section 13 but none of these seem to address the single problem a lot of us are facing with the current local government act as it relates to rating in that, due the unfair, inequitable and inconsistent system of splitting UV & GRV rating principals based on untested interpretations of the level of use of individual properties use, that rating principals should be based solely on zoning.

I draw your attention to the Local Government Operational Guidelines Number 2 - March 2012. Changing Methods of Valuation of Land. Section 1.5 "Principals to observe". These include ***Objectivity, Fairness and Equity, Consistency, Transparency and Administrative efficiency.***

As an example, the current number of rateable properties in the City of Swan for 2017/18 is circa 55,000 so for the rates department to do an objective, fair, equitable, consistent, and transparent assessment on EACH one of the 55,000 properties would result in an unfair burden on the rating department and have a huge negative impact on the Administrative efficiency of the rating department and the city as a whole.

To NOT do this and adopt a broad-brush approach, would be neither objective, fair, equitable or consistent.

All properties in the state have relevant zonings in place and in the name of Administrative Efficiency should be a matter of using those zonings to define the rating methodology. Rural is Rural, Urban is Urban.

I have finalised the review, but unfortunately I don't have the time to complete all the reading and answers.

If the one item of GRV v UV rating could be fixed by using the zoning to define the rating method it would have been worthwhile.

Kind Reagrds  
Ian Wood

[REDACTED]