



# Water Supply, Sewerage and Trade Waste Pricing Guidelines

December 2002

BLANK

BLANK

BLANK

BLANK

A list of sewer discharge factors (SDFs) is included on page 93 in Appendix D as a guide for LWUs. Where an LWU has more accurate information for specific customers, it should use that information.

#### 4.2.2 Non-residential

Non-Residential sewerage bills should be not less than the residential sewerage bill and should be based on a cost-reflective two-part tariff with an annual access charge and a uniform sewer usage charge/kL. The sewerage access charge should be proportional to the square of the size of the water supply service connection to reflect the load that can be placed on the sewerage system and the sewer usage charge/kL should apply for the estimated volume discharged to the sewerage system.

The volume discharged to the sewerage system can be estimated using the customer's total water consumption multiplied by a sewer discharge factor (see above).

The sewerage bill for a non-residential customer would be:

$$B = SDF \times (AC + C \times UC)$$

|        |     |   |   |
|--------|-----|---|---|
| Where: | B   | = | Annual non-residential sewerage bill (\$)       |
|        | C   | = | Customer's water annual consumption (kL)        |
|        | AC  | = | $\left( AC_{20} \times \frac{D^2}{400} \right)$ |
|        | D   | = | Water supply service connection size (mm)       |
|        | SDF | = | Sewer discharge factor                          |
|        | UC  | = | Sewer usage charge (\$/kL).                     |

As with water supply pricing, the sewer usage charge is a key element in best-practice pricing and should be based on the long-run marginal cost of the business. The sewerage long-run marginal cost can be reasonably estimated as 100% to 150% of the LWU's operating cost/kL<sup>22,23</sup>. As the State-wide median operating cost<sup>22</sup> (OMA) is 82 c/kL, this would indicate a typical sewer usage charge of 82 c/kL to 123 c/kL.

The present sewer usage charges and the operating cost/kL (OMA) for a number of NSW water utilities are shown on page 89 of Appendix C.

<sup>22</sup> 2000/01 NSW Water Supply and Sewerage Performance Comparisons Report (Tables 2, 12), Department of Land Water and Conservation, NSW/Local Government and Shires Associations, NSW

<sup>23</sup> LWUs should carefully estimate their projected future sewerage operating cost/kL along similar lines to that indicated in footnote 11 on page 9 for the projected water supply operating cost/kL.



3. For *large trade waste dischargers* (over about 20kL/d) and dischargers of *industrial waste*, the LWU should levy excess mass charges for all wastes exceeding the concentration of pollutants in domestic sewage (refer to page 36 in section 4.4.2). Excess mass charges which may be levied by LWUs are shown on pages 97 and 98 of Appendix E.

In addition, all LWUs responsible for sewerage should develop by June 2005 a liquid trade waste agreement or a liquid trade waste approval under the Local Government Act 1993 for each trade waste discharger connected to the LWU's sewerage system. The agreement or approval should set out the LWU's requirements for pre-treatment of wastes where appropriate, the conditions of discharge to the LWU's sewerage system, including the maximum concentrations of pollutants and maximum discharge rates in accordance with Schedule A of the *Concurrence Guideline for Liquid Trade Waste Discharges to the Sewerage System*<sup>24</sup> or the LWU's trade waste policy.

## 4.4 Appropriate Tariff Structures

### 4.4.1 Sewerage Pricing Structure

As noted on page 28 in section 4.2.1, IPART has recommended that residential customers pay a uniform sewerage bill per property.

As noted on page 29 in section 4.2.2, non-residential sewerage bills should be based on a two-part tariff with an access charge and a sewer usage charge per kL for the estimated volume discharged to the sewerage system.

As with water supply pricing, the access charge should be proportional to the square of the size of the water supply service connection. This reflects the load that the discharger *may* place on the sewerage system.

$$AC = AC_{20} \times \frac{D^2}{400}$$

Where: AC = Customer's Annual Sewerage Access Charge (\$)  
 AC<sub>20</sub> = Sewerage Access Charge for 20mm diameter water supply connection (\$)  
 D = Diameter of customer's water supply connection (mm)

<sup>24</sup> *Concurrence Guideline for Liquid Trade Waste Discharges to the Sewerage System*, Department of Land and Water and Conservation, 2002

BLANK

BLANK

BLANK

BLANK

**TO THE POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 04 SEPTEMBER 2002**

General Manager  
BATHURST NSW 2795

**1 RATES EQUITY AND VALUATIONS (16.00004-06) - Item prepared by Bob Roach**

**Recommendation:**

**Report:**

Council is in the process of determining an equitable rating structure by examining a range of rating models. Please refer to **attachments 1, 2 and 3** for details.

**PRESENT RATING STRUCTURE**

Council's present rating structure is contained within its Revenue Policy and is summarised as follows:

- an Ordinary Rate (Residential; Residential Towns/Villages; Business; or Farmland) on a minimum amount or a rate in the dollar of the land value.
- plus a Sewer Rate levied on all properties connected to the sewer or on properties not connected that are within 75 metres of Council's sewer mains on a minimum amount or a rate in the dollar of the land value.
- plus a Water Availability Charge levied according to the size of the water service or on properties that are within 225 metres of council's water mains,
- plus a user-pays water charging system based on metering of water,
- plus a Domestic Waste Charge levied on all properties to which the service is available, or a Non-Domestic Waste Charge levied on non-residential properties where the service is requested,
- plus a Sewer Charge levied on properties with a connection to Council's sewer system, which is greater than a normal load. E.g. flats, hotels, motels, aged care units, etc,
- and a Charge in lieu of a Sewer rate levied on properties that are exempt from the sewer rate under section 555 of the Local Government Act, 1993.

Council has previously examined models showing the effect of a base rating system compared to the present system. The models presented with this report will also examine the effect of base rating as compared to the present system. However, these new models will include a look at the effect of introducing a sewer annual charge with a base amount for the ordinary rate.

**HOW A BASE AMOUNT SYSTEM WORKS**

A Base Amount System reduces the impact of the land value on the amount of rates paid. The way a base system works is that Council raises a percentage of its income for a particular rate by a base amount. The balance is then raised by applying a rate in the dollar against the land value; in contrast the higher the base amount the lower the rate in the dollar and likewise the less impact the land value changes have on the total amount of rates paid.

## SEWER ANNUAL CHARGE

A sewer annual charge would remove the influence of the land value on sewer rates and would move to a user-pays system for sewer. The reason it is called a user-pays system is that the charge can be related to and is determined by the cost of supplying sewerage services to particular categories of properties. Presently sewer rates are determined by land value.

There are many bodies in NSW responsible for the supply of water and sewerage services including Sydney Water, Hunter Water and many local councils.

Bathurst City Council is one of these and it is grouped with other councils in terms of its socio-economic characteristics and its capacity to deliver a range of services to the community.

A survey of similar councils provided 17 responses as follows:

| Councils  | Rates                     | Water              | Sewer                     | Garbage       |
|---|---------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|---------------|
| <b>Councils using Rate-in-the-Dollar or Base Rating for Sewer</b> |                           |                    |                           |               |
| Armidale Dumaresq   | Base Rating System        | User Pays          | Rate-in-the-dollar System | Annual Charge |
| Bathurst City   | Rate-in-the-dollar System | User Pays          | Rate-in-the-dollar System | Annual Charge |
| Dubbo City  | Rate-in-the-dollar System | User Pays          | Rate-in-the-dollar System | Annual Charge |
| Greater Lithgow City  | Rate-in-the-dollar System | User Pays          | Rate-in-the-dollar System | Annual Charge |
| Griffith City   | Base Rating System        | User Pays          | Rate-in-the-dollar System | Annual Charge |
| Kempsey Shire   | Base Rating System        | Base Rating System | Base Rating System        | Annual Charge |
| Orange City   | Base Rating               | User Pays          | Rate-in-the-dollar        | Annual        |



|  | System                    |           | System        | Charge        |
|--|---------------------------|-----------|---------------|---------------|
| <b>Councils using Flat Charge or Volumetric Charge for Sewer</b> |                           |           |               |               |
| Albury City  | Base Rating System        | User Pays | Volume Charge | Annual Charge |
| Ballina Shire  | Rate-in-the-dollar System | User Pays | Flat Charge   | Annual Charge |
| Bega Valley Shire  | Base Rating System        | User Pays | Flat Charge   | Annual Charge |
| Coffs Harbour City   | Rate-in-the-dollar System | User Pays | Flat Charge   | Annual Charge |
| Deniliquin   | Base Rating System        | User Pays | Flat Charge   | Annual Charge |
| Eurobodalla Shire  | Rate-in-the-dollar System | User Pays | Flat Charge   | Annual Charge |
| Grafton City   | Base Rating System        | User Pays | Flat Charge   | Annual Charge |
| Hastings   | Base Rating System        | User Pays | Flat Charge   | Annual Charge |
| Lismore City   | Base Rating System        | User Pays | Flat Charge   | Annual Charge |
| Singleton Shire  | Base Rating System        | User Pays | Flat Charge   | Annual Charge |

Of the 17 responses, 9 have a flat charge and 1 charges by volume of water discharged into sewer and 6 councils use a rate-in-the dollar system for sewer rating and 1 uses a base rating system.

Additionally, 10 councils use a base rating system for the Ordinary rates.

The Hunter Water System has been used as a guide in building the models presented with this report. The Hunter system uses a flat charge for stand alone dwellings with a 20mm water connection. The Hunter Water Model also charges a Sewer Usage Charge subject to a water discharge factor. This is calculated by discounting the metered water supplied to the property by a percentage (discharge factor). For residential properties it is 50% and for Non-residential properties it is dependant upon the type of business.

## PROPOSED MODEL FOR SEWERAGE CHARGES

The model proposed for Bathurst City Council is a modified version of the Hunter model and Bathurst City Council will not be using water consumption as part of the charging mechanism.

**Sewer Annual Charge:** To calculate each of the individual charges shown in the table below it was necessary to first arrive at a single charge amount based on cost recovery. This amount is \$450.00 and is referred to as the Base Sewer Annual Charge.

The calculations in the Model of Proposed Charges below uses two phrases which need defining:

**Discharge Factor:** A discharge factor is the percentage of water discharged to Councils sewer from the property. E.G. A single dwelling with a lawn and garden will use a percentage of its water consumption on the lawn and garden. The percentage of water discharged into the sewer from dwellings adopted in this model is 75%. However, a business situated on the main street with concrete footpath will discharge all of its water into Councils sewer and the discharge factor adopted in this model is 100%.

**Meter Ratio:** The meter ratio is the area of the water pipe servicing the property compared to a 20mm service. The larger the diameter of the pipe the larger the volume of water that is capable of being supplied to the property over a certain time. This meter ratio has already been used by Council in setting the annual charges for user-pays water.

The model is as follows:

### BASE SEWER ANNUAL CHARGE - \$450

#### Model of Proposed Charges

| Category of Charge        | Water Closets | No. of Assess | \$ Annual Charge | Method of Charge |
|---------------------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|------------------|
| Vacant Land - Residential |               | 465           | 240.00           | Per Assessment   |
| Vacant Land - Business    |               | 129           | 240.00           | Per Assessment   |
| Vacant Land - Farmland    |               | 8             | 240.00           | Per Assessment   |
| Stand Alone Dwellings     |               | 9698          | 340.00           | Per Assessment   |
|                           |               |               |                  |                  |

|  |      |     |           |                  |
|--|------|-----|-----------|------------------|
| Multiple Dwellings - Residential                         | 817  | 211 | 170.00    | Per Water Closet |
| Multiple Dwellings - Business                            | 822  | 71  | 170.00    | Per Water Closet |
| Non-Rateable Assess                                      | 2744 | 179 | 170.00    | Per Water Closet |
| Business - No Water Meters                               |      | 197 | 450.00    | Per Assessment   |
| <b><u>Based on largest Water Service to property</u></b> |      |     |           |                  |
| Small Business (20mm Water Service)                      |      | 280 | 450.00    | Per Assessment   |
| Small Business (25mm Water Service)                      |      | 61  | 450.00    | Per Assessment   |
| Medium Business (32mm Water Service)                     |      | 44  | 1,150.00  | Per Assessment   |
| Medium Business (40mm Water Service)                     |      | 37  | 1,800.00  | Per Assessment   |
| Medium-Large Business (50mm Water Service)               |      | 42  | 2,810.00  | Per Assessment   |
| Large Business (80mm Water Service)                      |      | 7   | 7,200.00  | Per Assessment   |
| Large Business (100mm Water Service)                     |      | 4   | 11,357.64 | Per Assessment   |
| Large Business (150mm Water Service)                     |      | 4   | 25,310.00 | Per Assessment   |

Using the theory that residential properties discharge 75% of their water into the sewer the charge for residential properties is 75% of the Annual charge of \$450.00 rounded up to the nearest ten.

The effect of this model on Residential properties is shown in the following table:

**Example 1 - Residential Properties**

**Annual Sewer Charge Stand Alone Dwellings**

| Range of Land Values of Properties | Number of Ratepayers in Category | Actual 2002/03 Sewer | Proposed Sewer Annual | Difference between Actual |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|
|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|

|             |       | Rates  | Charge<br>Single<br>Dwellings<br>based on<br>this<br>example | Sewer Rates<br>& Proposed<br>Sewer<br>Charge |
|-------------|-------|--------|--|--|
| Under 25000 | 779   |        |  |  |
| 25000       | 985   | 338.62 | 340.00   | 1.38   |
| 30000       | 1142  | 338.62 | 340.00   | 1.38   |
| 34000       | 1277  | 338.62 | 340.00   | 1.38   |
| 40000       | 1307  | 338.62 | 340.00   | 1.38   |
| 45000       | 1726  | 338.62 | 340.00   | 1.38   |
| 50000       | 1311  | 338.62 | 340.00   | 1.38   |
| 55000       | 872   | 338.62 | 340.00   | 1.38   |
| 60000       | 477   | 338.62 | 340.00   | 1.38   |
| 65000       | 314   | 411.28 | 340.00   | -71.28                                       |
| 70000       | 146   | 442.91 | 340.00   | -102.91                                      |
| 75000       | 200   | 474.55 | 340.00   | -134.55                                      |
| 80000       | 63    | 506.19 | 340.00   | -166.19                                      |
| 85000       | 85    | 537.82 | 340.00   | -197.82                                      |
| 90000       | 59    | 569.46 | 340.00   | -229.46                                      |
| 95000       | 67    | 601.10 | 340.00   | -261.10                                      |
| 100000      | 47    | 632.73 | 340.00   | -292.73                                      |
| 105000      | 37    | 664.37 | 340.00   | -324.37                                      |
| 110000      | 43    | 696.01 | 340.00   | -356.01                                      |
| 115000      | 24    | 727.64 | 340.00   | -387.64                                      |
| 120000      | 21    | 759.28 | 340.00   | -419.28                                      |
| 125000      | 14    | 790.92 | 340.00   | -450.92                                      |
| Over 125000 | 147   |        |  |  |
|             | 10364 |        |  |  |

Business properties are to be charged differently to residential properties. It is proposed to charge business properties based on the meter ratio plus a discharge factor of 100%. A meter size of 20mm has a ratio of 1 and a meter of 25mm has a ratio of 1.55 etc. However, for simplicity it is proposed to group small businesses with a water service of 20mm or 25mm together.

The table below shows the effect of an annual charge of \$450.00 on small business with a discharge factor of 100%.

**Example 2 - Small Businesses**

**Annual Sewer Charge - Small Businesses**

| Range of Land Values of Properties | Number of Ratepayers in Category | Actual 2002/03 Sewer Rates | Proposed Sewer Annual Charge | Difference between Actual Sewer Rates & Proposed Sewer Charge |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|---|
| 25000                              | 10                               | 338.62                     | 450.00                       | 111.38  |
| 30000                              | 10                               | 338.62                     | 450.00                       | 111.38  |
| 45000                              | 19                               | 338.62                     | 450.00                       | 111.38  |
| 40100                              | 16                               | 338.62                     | 450.00                       | 111.38  |
| 45000                              | 18                               | 338.62                     | 450.00                       | 111.38  |
| 50000                              | 16                               | 338.62                     | 450.00                       | 111.38  |
| 55000                              | 22                               | 338.62                     | 450.00                       | 111.38  |
| 60000                              | 12                               | 338.62                     | 450.00                       | 111.38  |
| 65000                              | 21                               | 411.28                     | 450.00                       | 38.72   |
| 70000                              | 19                               | 442.91                     | 450.00                       | 7.09  |
| 75000                              | 13                               | 474.55                     | 450.00                       | - 24.55   |
| 80000                              | 7                                | 506.19                     | 450.00                       | - 56.19   |
| 85000                              | 14                               | 537.82                     | 450.00                       | - 87.82   |
| 90000                              | 8                                | 569.46                     | 450.00                       | - 119.46  |
| 95200                              | 8                                | 602.36                     | 450.00                       | - 152.36  |
| 100000                             | 5                                | 632.73                     | 450.00                       | - 182.73  |

|        |     |          |        |            |
|--------|-----|----------|--------|------------|
| 105000 | 9   | 664.37   | 450.00 | - 214.37   |
| 110000 | 11  | 696.01   | 450.00 | - 246.01   |
| 115000 | 7   | 727.64   | 450.00 | - 277.64   |
| 120000 | 2   | 759.28   | 450.00 | - 309.28   |
| 125000 | 4   | 790.92   | 450.00 | - 340.92   |
| 150000 | 31  | 949.10   | 450.00 | - 499.10   |
| 175000 | 18  | 1,107.28 | 450.00 | - 657.28   |
| 200000 | 16  | 1,265.47 | 450.00 | - 815.47   |
| 300000 | 20  | 1,898.20 | 450.00 | - 1,448.20 |
| 400000 | 11  | 2,530.94 | 450.00 | - 2,080.94 |
| 520000 | 3   | 3,290.22 | 450.00 | - 2,840.22 |
| 750000 | 4   | 4,732.85 | 450.00 | - 4,282.85 |
|        | 354 |          |        |            |

The Model of Proposed Charges shows the charges for medium and larger businesses. Examples of how these charges will affect various business and industries are illustrated with the following examples:

**Example 3 - Specific Examples of the effect on Businesses**

**Effect on Various Businesses of Proposed Annual Sewer Charge**

| Business Name    | Quantity   | Meter Size | Actual 2002/03 Sewer Rates or Charges | Proposed Sewer Annual Charge | Difference     |
|------------------|------------|------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------|
| Chemist Shop     |            | 20mm       | 1,075.65                              | 450.00                       | -625.65 Less   |
| Petrol Station   |            | 25mm       | 1,455.29                              | 450.00                       | -1,005.29 Less |
| Medical Centre   |            | 32mm       | 1,645.00                              | 1,150.00                     | -495.00 Less   |
| Licensed Club    | 32 Toilets | 50mm       | 7,118.26                              | 5,610.00                     | -1,508.26 Less |
| Fast Food Shop   |            | 50mm       | 3,876.00                              | 2,810.00                     | -1,066.00 Less |
| Shopping Complex |            | 80mm       | 8,858.28                              | 7,200.00                     | -1,658.28 Less |

|   |             |       |           |           |                 |
|---|-------------|-------|-----------|-----------|-----------------|
| Large Industrial                        |             | 80mm  | 8,478.64  | 7,200.00  | -1,278.64 Less  |
| Shopping Complex                        |             | 100mm | 31,636.70 | 11,250.00 | -20,386.70 Less |
| Hotel                                   | 31 Toilets  | 25mm  | 3,876.00  | 5,270.00  | 1,394.00 More   |
| Manufacturer in Kelso Industrial        |             | 40mm  | 301.80    | 1,800.00  | 1,498.20 More   |
| Manufacturer in Trade Centre Industrial |             | 40mm  | 759.00    | 1,800.00  | 1,041.00 More   |
| Large Industrial                        |             | 100mm | 2,138.64  | 11,250.00 | 9,111.36 More   |
| Large Industrial                        |             | 100mm | 1,392.00  | 11,250.00 | 9,858.00 More   |
| Large Industrial                        |             | 150mm | 6,827.00  | 25,310.00 | 18,483.00 More  |
| Large Industrial                        |             | 150mm | 5,391.00  | 25,310.00 | 19,919.00 more  |
| Educational Institution                 | 479 toilets | 150mm | 33,994.00 | 81,430.00 | 47,436.00 more  |

### Proposed Model for Ordinary Rates - Base Rating System

| Calculation of Base Amount for Residential Rate |               |        |            |              |               |              |
|---|---------------|--------|------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|
| Land Value                                      | No. of Assess | % Base | Ad Valorem | Base Total   | Ad Val amount | Total Income |
| 465,906,057                                     | 10364         | 10%    | 1.364767   | 706,503.51   | 6,358,531.62  | 7,065,035.13 |
| 465,906,057                                     | 10364         | 25%    | 1.137306   | 1,766,258.78 | 5,298,776.35  | 7,065,035.13 |
| 465,906,057                                     | 10364         | 50%    | 0.758204   | 3,532,517.57 | 3,532,517.57  | 7,065,035.13 |
| Calculation of Base Amount for Business         |               |        |            |              |               |              |

| Rate        |               |        |            |              |               |              |
|-------------|---------------|--------|------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|
| Land Value  | No. of Assess | % Base | Ad Valorem | Base Total   | Ad Val amount | Total Income |
| 126,496,971 | 914           | 10%    | 2.541462   | 357,207.99   | 3,214,871.93  | 3,572,079.92 |
| 126,496,971 | 914           | 25%    | 2.117885   | 893,019.98   | 2,679,059.94  | 3,572,079.92 |
| 126,496,971 | 914           | 50%    | 1.411923   | 1,786,039.96 | 1,786,039.96  | 3,572,079.92 |

A combination of a base amount and a rate-in-the-dollar for both the Residential (Town/Villages) Rate and the Business Rate is proposed as an alternative to the present system.

The use of base amounts, was determined by its proponents to be a more equitable system because it:

1. gave council an opportunity to charge each property owner a base amount that reflected the similar use of council resources (such as the library, pool parks etc); and then
2. to levy an ad valorem rate to reflect the value council adds to their property by the provision of water, sewer, footpaths kerb & guttering, neighbourhood shops, bus routes etc and zoning.
3. Reduced the effect of the land value on the rate levy and of course the effect of the any revaluation on the change in rate levy as between ratepayers.

**However**, a base amount system flattens the rate and so increases the amount currently paid by those on low rates and decreases the amount of those currently on high rates. This means that the introduction of a Base Rating System should be phased in over a number of years to reduce the negative impact of the change to those currently on lower rates.

A model of the effect of the introduction of a 10% Base amount for the Residential Rate is shown below:

| Range of Land Values of Properties | Number of Ratepayers in Category | Actual 2002/03 Residential Rate levy | Proposed 10% Residential Base Levy | Difference between Actual Residential Rate Levy & Proposed Residential |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
|                                    |                                  |                                      |                                    |  |



|             |       |          |          | Base Levy |
|-------------|-------|----------|----------|-----------|
| Under 25000 | 779   |          |          |           |
| 25000       | 985   | 378.34   | 409.36   | 31.02     |
| 30000       | 1142  | 454.01   | 477.60   | 23.59     |
| 34000       | 1277  | 514.55   | 532.19   | 17.64     |
| 40000       | 1307  | 605.35   | 614.08   | 8.73      |
| 45000       | 1726  | 681.02   | 682.31   | 1.29      |
| 50000       | 1311  | 756.69   | 750.55   | -6.14     |
| 55000       | 872   | 832.36   | 818.79   | -13.57    |
| 60000       | 477   | 908.03   | 887.03   | -21.00    |
| 65000       | 314   | 983.70   | 955.27   | -28.43    |
| 70000       | 146   | 1,059.36 | 1,023.51 | -35.85    |
| 75000       | 200   | 1,135.03 | 1,091.74 | -43.29    |
| 80000       | 63    | 1,210.70 | 1,159.98 | -50.72    |
| 85000       | 85    | 1,286.37 | 1,228.22 | -58.15    |
| 90000       | 59    | 1,362.04 | 1,296.46 | -65.58    |
| 95000       | 67    | 1,437.71 | 1,364.70 | -73.01    |
| 100000      | 47    | 1,513.38 | 1,432.94 | -80.44    |
| 105000      | 37    | 1,589.05 | 1,501.17 | -87.88    |
| 110000      | 43    | 1,664.72 | 1,569.41 | -95.31    |
| 115000      | 24    | 1,740.38 | 1,637.65 | -102.73   |
| 120000      | 21    | 1,816.05 | 1,705.89 | -110.16   |
| 125000      | 14    | 1,891.72 | 1,774.13 | -117.59   |
| Over 125000 | 147   |          |          |           |
|             | 10364 |          |          |           |

Tables showing the effect of a 25% base charge and a 50% base charge are attached to this report and numbered attachment 1 and attachment 2 respectively.

## **VALUATIONS**

Valuations are supplied to council by Land & Property Information. Land & Property Information obtain the values from valuers who are contracted to provide the values.

All NSW councils are now provided with values by contracted valuers. However, the State Valuation Office tenders for contracts alongside private valuers. The tenders are decided by the Department of Public Works and are on a 3 year cycle. Rating practitioners have been invited to sit on the tender evaluation panel; a move which may give councils more influence in the selection of the successful tenderer.

In assessing values, valuers take into consideration an analysis of recent sales and apply that information to an historical data base of the land. All land is inspected at least once. New subdivisions are inspected before they are valued. Theoretically, therefore, any inherent features and detriments in the land are taken into account by the valuer when determining the land value. While Council's staff are not valuers and are only able to check for inconsistencies in values within streets and localities it is the practice that should such inconsistencies be found, Land & Property Information is routinely informed.

## **ROLE OF LAND AND PROPERTY INFORMATION (FORMERLY VALUER-GENERALS DEPT.)**

The main role of the Valuer-General is to supply land values to the State Government for land tax purposes and to supply land values to local Councils for local taxes (rates).

Land and Property Information is the umbrella under which the former Valuer-General's Department now exists. One of its roles is to oversee the contract valuers that supply values to Land and Property Information for distribution to the State Government and local Councils.

A revaluation of the City is made every 4 years. Bathurst City Council is due to receive a General Revaluation this year to be effective from 1/7/2003. Supplementary valuation lists are supplied every month to update changes necessary because of subdivisions, sales of parts of rateable properties, objections to valuations and correction of errors. These supplementary valuations may require a rate account to be relieved in the current year or may be effective from the next year.

## **POSTPONED RATES**

The Local Government provides for a ratepayer to apply for a postponement of part of the rates on land which is used only as the site of a house or rural land but, because of its zoning or permitted use, is valued for rating purposes in a way that reflects its permitted use rather than its actual use. Postponed rates is a way of

decreasing the amount of rates payable and is used by about 175 ratepayers in Bathurst City's area. The procedure is that the ratepayer firstly applies to the Rates Section by completing a simple form. The form is then referred to Council's Planning Department for verification that the property has a higher use. If the application is verified by Planning it is then referred to Land and Property Information for a determination of a value that can be attributed to the difference between the actual use and the higher use. Following the return of the value to Council the land is relieved for the current year or prepared for levy for the next year as a postponed rate account.

The amount that is postponed is held for five years and attracts interest as if it were arrears but at the end of five years the first year plus interest on that first year is written-off. This continues each year thereafter until the use of the property changes at which time all of the postponed rates not written-off are payable.

Faint, illegible text at the top of the page, possibly bleed-through from the reverse side.

Second block of faint, illegible text.

**POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING TO THE COUNCIL MEETING**  
**HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 18 SEPTEMBER 2002**

General Manager  
BATHURST NSW 2795

**1 REPORT OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON**  
**WEDNESDAY 4 SEPTEMBER 2002 (11.00005)**

**Recommendation:** That the report of the Policy Committee Meeting held on Wednesday 4 September, 2002 be adopted.

**Report: REPORT OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 4**  
**SEPTEMBER 2002**

**PRESENT:** Crs Macintosh (Chair), Haysom, Hosemans, Knowles, Nightingale, Schofield, Stapleton, Tudor, Wardman, Welsh.

General Manager, Director of Corporate Services, City Engineer, City Treasurer, Director Planning & Development, Manager Administration, Administration Officer, Water Waste Engineer, Administration Engineer.

**APOLOGIES:** Crs Crisp, Spring

**YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS:**

1. **APOLOGIES (11.00003)** - A **MOTION** was **MOVED** by Cr Tudor and **SECONDED** by Cr Hosemans.

**RESOLVED** that the apologies received from Crs Crisp and Spring be received and leave of absence granted.

2. **PREVIOUS REPORT (11.00002)** - A **MOTION** was **MOVED** by Cr Tudor and **SECONDED** by Cr Hosemans.

**RESOLVED** that the report of the Policy Committee Meeting held on 7 August 2002 be noted.

3. **DECLARATION OF INTEREST (11.00002)** - A **MOTION** was **MOVED** by Cr Tudor and **SECONDED** by Cr Hosemans.

**RESOLVED** that the information be noted.

**GENERAL MANAGER'S REPORT**

4. **TELEVISION AND FILM PRODUCTION SHOOTS (11.00006)** - A **MOTION**

was **MOVED** by Cr Hosemans and **SECONDED** by Cr Tudor

**RESOLVED** that:

- (a) The "Television and Film Production Shoots - Policy and Guidelines" be adopted.
- (b) The fee waiver continue until 30 June 2004.

**5. NATIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR WOMEN IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT (18.00008) - A MOTION was MOVED by Cr Tudor and SECONDED by Cr Knowles**

**RESOLVED** that Crs Knowles, Schofield, Spring, Stapleton and Tudor be appointed as delegates to the Working Party to address the issues raised in the National Framework for Women in Local Government.

A **MOTION** was **MOVED** by Cr Haysom and **SECONDED** by Cr Schofield

**RESOLVED** that Cr Stapleton be nominated as Council's delegate to attend the Women Moving Forward in Local Government Seminar on 27 September 2002.

**GENERAL BUSINESS**

**6. WHITE ROCK ROAD DEVELOPMENT (20.00077) - Cr Knowles asked will Council be involved in the approval of the process of the White Rock Road development.**

The **Director of Planning & Development** advised that the Development Control Plan will come to the next meeting of Council.

**7. ALL SAINTS CATHEDRAL DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION (DA2003/0005) - Cr Knowles asked if the request by All Saints Cathedral to refund the Development Application and Construction Certificate Application fees will come back to Council for reconsideration.**

The **General Manager** advised that Council has already refused the request and is unable to reconsider.

**8. BOUNDARY ROAD (25.00061) - Cr Welsh expressed concern at the blind spot when turning into the cul-de-sac (Gleneagles Close) on Boundary Road. He requested that the situation be looked into.**

The **City Engineer** advised that the matter will be referred to the Traffic Committee.

**9. CHARLES STURT UNIVERSITY - HUMAN MOVEMENT STUDIES UNIT**

**(18.00051) - Cr Schofield** advised that the University have made a submission for a grant from Department of Sport & Recreation for an Athletics Track. The University seeks Council support for this application.

A **MOTION** was **MOVED** by Cr Schofield and **SECONDED** by Cr Tudor

**RESOLVED** that Council support the University's application to the Department of Sport & Recreation for an Athletics Track.

- 10. CORNER BOUNDARY ROAD AND ORANGE ROAD (25.00061) - Cr Wardman** expressed his concern at the sight distance at this intersection due to crest. Cr Wardman request that Council approach the Road Traffic Authority.

The **City Engineer** advised that he would write to the Road Traffic Authority.

- 11. STEWART STREET, EVANS PLAINS (25.00052) - Cr Wardman** advised he has seen surveyors out at this location and queried what works are occurring there.

The **City Engineer** advised he would investigate the matter.

- 12. SERVICE CLUBS (20.00020) - Cr Wardman** suggested that when Service Clubs represent the City overseas they need to have something like a Bathurst Flag for presentation. Cr Wardman asked whether a report on costs and sizing for this could be prepared.

- 13. PUBLIC LECTURE (CSU) (18.00051) - The Mayor** advised that CSU students would be holding a Public Lecture titled "The Student Practitioner: Origin of a species" of Wednesday 25 September 2002 at 6.00pm in the Council Meeting Room.

## **DISCUSSION FORUM**

- 14. RATES EQUITY AND VALUATIONS (16.00004-6)**

The **Mayor** and the **City Treasurer** gave an introduction on the existing fee and rating systems in place. The Proposed base rate models examined are 10%, 25% and 50%, with the balance of the rates coming from ad valorem charges. A Land Value of approximately \$45,000 is the point where the existing and base rate systems result in the general rate remaining the same. Council looked at the possibility of a base/user pays model for sewerage to lessen the effect of property valuations. A good example of this system is that adopted by the Hunter Water Board.

**Alf Goodlet** - asked if Council looked at timespans for introduction of the base rate.

The **City Treasurer** advised that this would likely be phased in, but Council would need to consider this prior to adoption.

**Cr Wardman** - expressed concern that Central Business District will benefit from this scheme. People bought in lower value areas to get lower rates. Concern value changes over recent years is drastically varying this. **User pays** often reduces commercial rates and those who can claim a tax deduction, but someone else has to **pay** for this reduction.

**Cr Haysom** - advised that this exercise is looking at residential rates, not commercial rates. There is concern by older people that they are being rated out of their houses. This is reflective of the system in Australia.

**David Morris** - ask in relation to the **user pays sewer** system, what is proposed for locations with multiple properties.

The **City Treasurer** advised that the modelling process would need to look further at various systems. No recommendation has been made at this stage.

**Alf Goodlet** - stated that he understands this is a difficult issue and need to break cycle where rates are tied to the valuation of land. If we leave this for another 10-20 years then the people in the outer fringe areas will find themselves in the same situation of those in the centre of town.

**Cr Knowles** - expressed concern at possible increases of **sewer** charges to businesses under **user pays** as may effect viability of some businesses.

**Helen Wilson** - Asked what place in Bathurst has nearly 500 toilets.

The **General Manager** advised Charles Sturt University has.

**John Humphries** - stated that placing a charge on size of meter is **iniquitous** as fire hose reel system may force businesses to put in a larger meter. Small businesses alone could have charges increased by over \$2,000.

**David Morris** - If the load on sewerage system is closely linked to water consumption, perhaps look at linking **sewer** charge to the water charge.

The **City Treasurer** advised that Council looked at it, but not the preferred model due to inherent problems in the system.

**Ken North** - asked has Council got faith in the Valuer General's Department to give Council an appropriate valuation. Council needs to represent its ratepayers against the Valuer General.

**Peter Cole** - advised that he has put extensions onto house across road from Fengore Plant Hire and rates went up \$70 this year. Need to remove effects of major fluctuations. We now have **user pays water**, possibly **user pays sewer**, next will be **user pays garbage**. He asked not to implement this. Do not charge CPI on **sewer** or



water.

**David Morris** - asked if Council could get valuations before appeal process concludes.

The **General Manager** advised we will get them before closure, people can come in and check variation caused on current years rates.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 6.55pm.

