MESSAGE FROM THE MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT

As foreshadowed at the Local Government NSW Annual Conference, I am delighted to release an Exposure Draft of the Local Government Amendment (Rating) Bill 2020 to implement the NSW Government’s response to IPART’s review of the local government rating system.

The release of this Bill for consultation represents a milestone in the Government’s reform agenda to ensure a fairer and more flexible rating system for councils and ratepayers across NSW.

This consultation guide, Towards a Fairer Rating System, has been released to explain the proposed changes and assist councils and others to provide feedback by the February 5 deadline.

The Government is committed to providing greater flexibility in the current rating system to improve distribution of the rating burden in local communities. This will make rates fairer and help councils cater for population growth and infrastructure costs.

Whilst some will want us to go further, these sensible adjustments to the rating system are the first step to help ensure councils have a stable and reliable revenue base to deliver services for their communities and that ratepayers pay a fairer contribution.

I am now seeking feedback on this Bill from councils, communities and other interested individuals and organisations to help us understand whether we have struck the right balance. Your responses will be carefully reviewed as the final Bill is prepared for introduction to Parliament early next year.

I encourage you to have your say by reading this Consultation Guide, together with the Exposure Draft Bill, and answering the targeted questions, as well as providing any further, general feedback.

Your responses will be carefully reviewed as a final Bill is prepared for introduction. It is important that we hear from councils, communities and as many other interested individuals and organisations as possible.

I look forward to hearing your views.

The Hon. Shelley Hancock MP
Minister for Local Government
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Introduction

At the request of the former NSW Premier, the Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal (IPART) undertook a significant review of the local government rating system in NSW. The purpose of this review was to identify how to improve the equity and efficiency of the rating system, in order to enhance councils’ ability to implement sustainable fiscal policies over the long term.

On 18 June 2020, the Government released its Final Response to IPART’s Final Report. This response acknowledged that local government and the communities they serve need to have a more flexible rating system, whilst ensuring rates are applied fairly and more equitably to local communities. It also committed to reforming the rating system to address issues identified during the review.

To deliver on the Government’s commitments, a Bill has been prepared to seek to amend the Local Government Act 1993 (the Act). Through this Bill, the Government proposes to implement the key reforms from its response in a way that is fair and reasonable for both councils and ratepayers.

To make sure we get the details right, an Exposure Draft of the Bill, together with this consultation guide, Towards a Fairer Rating System, have been released for public consultation. This provides a further opportunity to obtain essential feedback from councils, communities and other interested individuals and organisations until COB 5 February 2021.

The Government will introduce the Bill into Parliament in early 2021. In part, this will enable councils formed in 2016 to take up options provided by greater rating flexibility as they prepare for 1 July 2021.

How to read this paper

The consultation guide has been divided into three sections, beginning with a short section explaining the local government rating system. The following two sections provide an explanation of how the Government is implementing its response to the IPART report through the Exposure Draft Bill and other key rating reforms. The three sections are:

- **Section One** – Understanding local government rating
- **Section Two** – the Exposure Draft Bill, and
- **Section Three** – other key rating reforms.

Sections two and three set out each of the Government’s commitments, including background information, and a summary of how it is proposed to implement that commitment.

How to have your say

First, read the Privacy Notice online or at Appendix A, which explains the personal information being collected through this consultation. To provide feedback, you will need to provide some information about yourself and whether you are responding as an individual or on behalf of an organisation.
Importantly, specific consultation questions are also posed to obtain your feedback on key issues, and you are able to provide general comments if you have other feedback to provide. Feedback can be provided via an online submission form, located on Office of Local Government (OLG) website, www.olg.nsw.gov.au. You do not need to answer every question and can skip to sections of interest.

Alternatively, an identical feedback form is provided at Appendix A to this Consultation Guide. This form allows you to respond to the targeted consultation questions and make any further general comments. You are able to post or email the completed form by COB 5 February 2021 to:

Office of Local Government, NSW Department of Planning, Industry and the Environment
Towards a Fairer Rating System
Locked Bag 3015
Nowra NSW 2541
olg@olg.nsw.gov.au
Executive Summary

The NSW Government is committed to implementing a package of reforms to ensure the rating system is equitable and responsive to changing community needs. This package comprises those recommendations made by IPART in the Final Report on its local government rating system review of that were accepted by the Government in its Final Response.

Most of these reforms require amendments to the Local Government Act 1993, which sets out how councils may levy rates from property owners. Other reforms will be implemented by change to regulations and by issuing new guidance.

Local Government Amendment (Rating) Bill 2020

A Bill to make these amendments has been prepared – the Local Government Amendment (Rating) Bill 2020 (the Bill). If passed by the NSW Parliament, this Bill would:

- allow councils to create more flexible residential, business and farmland rating subcategories to enable them to set fairer rates
- allow councils to create separate rating subcategories for vacant residential, business and mining land to provide additional flexibility for councils to tailor rates for local communities
- remove the rating exemption for land subject to new conservation agreements and allow it to be rated under the new environmental land category
- allow councils to choose whether to exempt certain land from special rates for water and sewerage
- require councils to publicly report the value of any rating exemptions they choose to grant
- limit postponement of rates on rezoned land and let councils decide whether to write off any debts, and
- allow councils to sell properties for unpaid rates after three years rather than five years.

Through the Bill, the Government proposes to implement the key reforms in a way that is fair and reasonable for both councils and ratepayers. An Exposure Draft of this Bill has been released, together with this consultation guide to explain the proposed changes and to seek public feedback.
Other key rating reforms

The rates reform package also includes measures that do not rely on legislative amendments. As part of the Final Response to the IPART rating review, the Government committed to aligning rating income growth with population growth within the rate pegging system. This will help councils provide for growing communities while still protecting residents from sudden, excessive rate rises.

To kick-start this reform, the Minister for Local Government, with the approval of the Premier, has asked IPART to recommend a new rate peg methodology that allows the general income of councils to be varied annually in a way that accounts for population growth. This is consistent with the Productivity Commission’s recommendations on its review of the infrastructure contributions system. The Government will not consider any further changes to the rate peg or allowable income at this time.

In addition, the Government supported IPART’s recommendation that any difference between mining and business rates should primarily reflect differences in the councils’ costs of providing services. This will be implemented through future guidance to the local government sector rather than legislation.

Finally, it is proposed to not progress any change to the residual rating category arrangements, and to limit the requirement for councils to report the value of exemptions to only those they choose to grant each year.

Next steps

The Office of Local Government will receive feedback from councils, local communities and other interested individuals and organisations until COB 5 February 2021.

After making any changes in response to this feedback, the Government will introduce the Bill into the Parliament in early 2021. In part, this will enable councils formed in 2016 to take up opportunities provided by greater rating flexibility as they prepare to harmonise rating structures from 1 July 2021.
Proposed Rating Reforms

Section One – Understanding local government rating

Ordinary and special rates help to fund council services

Local councils provide important services and facilities to communities across NSW. These are as varied as community services, local road construction and maintenance, sporting and recreational facilities, planning, environmental protection and waste recovery and disposal.

The Local Government Act 1993 (the Act) and Local Government (General) Regulation 2005 set out how councils levy rates from property owners (ratepayers).

To pay for services, councils must levy property owners in their area for ordinary rates and may also apply additional special rates in certain circumstances. Some types of properties are wholly or partly exempt from paying rates under the Act. Councils also raise revenue by charging user fees, receiving grants, borrowing or other revenue e.g. from fines, developer contributions and interest.

The rate pegging system restricts councils from increasing their income from rates

Under the Act, the total income that a council can raise from rates each year cannot increase by more than a specific percentage – this is called the ‘rate peg’. The rate peg does not apply to charges for services like waste management, water, sewerage and stormwater.

The Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal (IPART) determines the rate peg that applies to councils’ general income each year. For the 2020/21 financial year IPART set the rate peg at 2.0%.

Councill can apply to IPART for a ‘special variation’ to increase their general income above the rate peg, e.g. to provide further services, replace ageing assets or improve financial sustainability.

Councils can determine which rates apply to different property types in consultation with local communities

The Act enables councils to determine different ordinary rates for residential, business, mining and farmland properties (the four rating categories). Councils can choose how they calculate and distribute rates among the properties in these categories.

Council decides which category each property should be in based on its characteristics and dominant use. Councils can also choose to create certain subcategories within each of these four categories, and to apply different rates to properties in each subcategory.
Councils must undertake rate setting as part of their Integrated Planning and Reporting (IP&R)

Councils must set a Revenue Policy each year as part of their Operational Plan. This sets out the combination of rates, charges, fees and pricing policies that will be applied to fund the services it provides to the community. It also contains a rating structure that determines rates and charges each type of ratepayer will pay, and how they will be calculated. Councils must consult on this structure as part of setting their annual Operational Plan and budget before it is finalised.

Councils can choose to apply rates to unimproved land values in different ways

Rates are calculated on the value of the land only, and do not factor in any improvements, such as buildings. For each rating category or sub-category, rates can be calculated based on:

- the (unimproved) land value of the property times the ad valorem (a rate in the dollar)
- a combination of the land value and a fixed rate per property (base amounts), or
- on the land value, but with each property paying at least a set amount (minimum rates).

The Act applies some restrictions however, for example – councils must calculate residential rates for all properties with a single ‘centre of population’ in the same way.

Land values are determined by the Land and Property Information Division of the Department of Finance and Services on behalf of the NSW Valuer General.
Section Two – the Local Government Amendment (Rating) Bill 2020

1 ALLOWING GRADUAL RATES HARMONISATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IPART recommendation</th>
<th>Key sections of the Act</th>
<th>To come into effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation 13</td>
<td>s.506, s.508</td>
<td>On assent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Government’s commitment

In 2017, the Local Government Act 1993 (the Act) was amended to ‘freeze’ the rates path of new councils created in 2016 for a period of four years. This was to ensure that their ratepayers would pay the same rates as they would have if the council had not merged for this initial period only.

In 2019, the Act was amended so that the Minister could allow councils formed in 2016 a further year to harmonise their rates, until 1 July 2021, to allow an additional year for this process. Ultimately, seventeen of the twenty relevant councils took up this option, so that the rates path freeze will now end for their communities on 30 June 2021.

At the end of the rates path ‘freeze’, each council will need to harmonise to a single rating structure – in practice, this means that all residential ratepayers will pay the same rate in the dollar on their properties unless councils choose to charge different rates for different ‘centres of population’. At present, the Act only permits councils to harmonise rates across their area in a single financial year, being 2021/22.

As part of its response to IPART’s review, the Government agreed to IPART’s recommendation to allow new councils to gradually harmonise rates across their former council areas over time. IPART suggested that rates increases be limited to 10% a year.

The proposal in the Bill

It is proposed that each council formed in 2016 have the option to gradually harmonise new rates for residential and farmland rates from 2021-2022 over four years. Those councils and communities that do not wish to gradually harmonise over the four-year period would still be able to harmonise their rates all at once in 2021-22.

Councils that take up the gradual harmonisation option will need to apply no more than 50% of the total increase in rates at the rating category level over the period, in any one of the four financial years. Importantly, councils that choose to harmonise gradually will be required to set out their intended approach over the full four years in their IP&R documents.

The proposed four-year period is designed to allow for gradual change, while setting a reasonable period to limit how long some ratepayers are subsidising others. It also takes into account both an unusual three-year council term, with elections in 2021 and 2024, as well as the fact that all land is to be revalued before rates are levied for 2023-24.

Rather than setting a maximum percentage increase each year, it is proposed to allow affected councils to set rates each year according to community needs and prevailing economic conditions. This allows councils with different legacy rating structures to harmonise in consultation with their communities according to local circumstances and conditions, under the IP&R framework.
The proposed ‘50% in any one year’ cap will ensure that councils that choose this option take a gradual approach that protects ratepayers against sudden and excessive rate rises in any specific year. This will not, however, preclude rates from increasing due to changes in land valuation, special rates or any special variation.

**Consultation question/s**

1. Are you from a local government area newly formed in 2016 that has not yet harmonised rates?
   - Yes
   - No

2. Do you agree with the proposal to enable relevant councils to gradually harmonise rates across their former council areas over four years?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Neutral

**Comment:**
2 ALLOWING COUNCILS TO LEVY SPECIAL RATES FOR JOINTLY FUNDED INFRASTRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IPART recommendation</th>
<th>Key sections of the Act</th>
<th>To come into effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation 8</td>
<td>s.495</td>
<td>By proclamation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Government’s commitment

Under the Act, councils can levy special rates, in addition to ordinary rates, on any subset of rateable land in its area to meet the costs of delivering additional works, services, facilities or activities to ratepayers. This is limited, however, to funding local government functions.

Councils are increasingly entering into arrangements to jointly fund infrastructure projects with the NSW Government and the Australian Government. To generate additional revenue to contribute to these projects, which may be a condition of the project going ahead, councils are applying to IPART for a special variation. This imposes a high regulatory burden that extends timeframes and can deter councils from helping to deliver projects that benefit their local communities.

The Government is committed to establishing an equitable and effective funding framework for infrastructure associated with development, and, ensuring that growing communities have adequate and effective infrastructure needed to support that growth.

The Government therefore supported IPART’s recommendation that councils be able to levy a new type of special rate for new infrastructure, where it is of clear benefit to the community, jointly funded with other levels of government.

The proposal in the Bill

It is proposed to clarify that special rates may be levied to pay for goods, services and infrastructure that are not covered by chapters 5-6 of the Act if the specific purpose of the special rate is to co-fund or contribute to infrastructure or services being jointly provided with another level of government.

Income from this special rate will not form part of a council’s general income under the rate peg and councils will not need to seek IPART’s approval before levying the special rate.

Importantly, councils will be prevented from levying a special rate for costs that are being met by a developer under the infrastructure contributions framework or by another funding arrangement. Special rates must only be used for the purpose for which they are levied.

Before applying this special rate, a council will need to consult its community through IP&R about anticipated benefits of the project and special rate, anticipated total project costs, council’s contribution to those costs, the contributions to be made by others, the total special rate that would be levied, and how, and for what time period, the rates are to be levied.

Councils will also need to provide information in their annual reports on project outcomes, actual costs to council of this project, costs reported by other parties (where available) and the total revenue generated by the special rate. Where this differs from a council’s initial estimates, an explanation is to be provided.

The intention is to create a monitoring and reporting framework that maximises transparency, public accountability and community benefit from these special rates.
Consultation question/s

3. Do you agree with the proposal to allow councils to levy special rates for jointly funded infrastructure?

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Neutral

Comment:
3 INCREASING FLEXIBILITY THROUGH NEW RATING CATEGORIES AND SUBCATEGORIES

3.1 Allowing councils to set different residential rates in contiguous urban areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IPART recommendation</th>
<th>Key sections of the Act</th>
<th>To come into effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations 10-12</td>
<td>ss.529-530</td>
<td>On assent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Government’s commitment**

Currently, the Act prevents councils from applying different residential rates on properties within a single ‘centre of population.’ This is difficult to apply in practice and has effectively prevented councils in urban areas, like Greater Sydney, from setting different rates in different locations across their local government area, as occurs in regional and rural NSW.

Given this, IPART recommended councils be able to set different residential rates in contiguous urban areas, but only where there is on average, different access to, demand for, or cost of, providing services and infrastructure. It proposed that councils use geographic markers to define these areas, including postcodes, suburbs, geographic features (e.g. waterways, bushland) and/or major infrastructure (e.g. arterial roads, railway lines).

Importantly, IPART also recommended that a limit apply so the highest rate structure is no more than 1.5 times the average rate structure across all residential subcategories (i.e. so the maximum difference between the highest and average rates, including *ad valorem* rates and base amounts, is 50%) except any new vacant land subcategory (see 3.4 below). To exceed this limit, councils would need to seek IPART approval.

The Government believes that councils should be able to explore different options to distribute the rating burden more equitably, in consultation with their communities, and supports enabling greater use of differential rating in urban areas. It supported these recommendations ‘in principle’.
The proposal in the Bill

It is proposed to allow councils to create different rating subcategories for residential land in contiguous urban areas, while also continuing existing provisions that allow different residential rates to be set by ‘centre of population’, as used by regional and rural councils.

Under the proposal, a council may only set different residential rates in a contiguous urban area if there is on average, different access to, demand for, or cost of, providing services and infrastructure.

For this purpose, ‘contiguous urban area’ will capture a portion of an area that is urban in nature and comprises residential land where the properties within that area, taken together, are not entirely separated by land that falls within other rating categories.

Further, in these cases, councils will be required to use geographic names published by the Geographical Names Board to objectively define different residential areas to which to apply different residential rates, rather than being enabled to simply draw ‘lines on a map’.

A limit will also apply so the highest rate structure is no more than 1.5 times the average rate structure across all residential subcategories, with the capacity to change this ratio in future by regulation. “Average rate structure” includes ad valorem amounts, minimum rates and/or base amounts, as relevant. To exceed this limit, councils would need to seek the Minister’s approval.

Councills will be required to undertake community consultation under IP&R, in determining residential rating subcategories, setting rates for each subcategory and making any future amendments to these arrangements. Councils will also be required to publish the different rates and their rationale for charging different rates in their Revenue Policy.

The Minister will be able to issue guidelines that must be followed by councils in setting these rates, including how the provisions may be used appropriately by councils.

Consultation question/s

4. Do you agree with the proposal to allow for different residential rates in contiguous urban areas?

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Neutral

Comment:

5. Do you agree with the proposal to limit the highest rate structure across all residential subcategories to no more than 1.5 times the average rate structure?

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Neutral

Comment:
3.2 Creating a new rating category for environmental land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IPART recommendation</th>
<th>Key sections of the Act</th>
<th>To come into effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation 29</td>
<td>s.493, s.514, s.518, s.529</td>
<td>By proclamation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Government’s commitment

Under the Act, before making an ordinary rate, a council must have declared each parcel of rateable land in its area to be within one of four rating categories – farmland, residential, mining or business. If a parcel of land does not fall within the residential, farmland or mining rating categories, it is treated as business land (the residual category).

There are concerns that these four rating categories are not sufficient to ensure that specific types of land are being rated at an appropriate level. In particular, IPART heard that this has resulted in land that cannot be developed, and therefore not falling within the residential, farmland or mining land categories, being treated as business land. As a result, a higher rate is often levied.

IPART recommended that a new, fifth rating category be created for environmental land to provide for appropriate rating of land that cannot be developed due to geographic or regulatory restrictions. The Government accepted this recommendation ‘in principle’, noting that it closely relates to IPART’s further recommendation (No. 18) in relation to conservation agreements (see further below at 4.1).

The proposal in the Bill

It is proposed to create a new rating category for environmental land, and to define environmental land as that:

1. for which current and future use of the land is constrained as it:
   a) has limited economic value relative to its size and location, or
   b) cannot be developed, or
   c) has low development potential for a business, residential or farming activity, and
2. is subject to geographic restrictions or regulatory restrictions.

It is proposed that, in determining whether land cannot be developed or has low development potential, councils must have regard to factors including the zoning of the land under the EP&A Act and regulations and relevant instruments, and any other matter prescribed by regulation.

It is also proposed that geographic restrictions include, but not be limited to, the presence of significant water areas, mud flats, swamps, marshlands, steep slopes and other terrain on which residential or commercial development is virtually impossible due to physical limitations.

Further, it is proposed that regulatory restrictions be defined as laws or other permanent constraints imposed or agreed to in relation to the land that prevent development. This would include, but not be limited to, restrictions due to the land being subject to an environmental agreement or instrument prescribed by regulation, and being not otherwise exempt from rates.
Where a parcel of land is determined to be mixed use land, like rating of business land, councils will be able to apportion rates based on the portion of the land that falls within each rating category, as currently set out under the Valuation of Land Act 1916. This is currently not provided for under that law. Comment is sought on the manner of determining the apportionment of rates where a parcel of land could properly be categorised as environmental and the remainder could be categorised under one or more other rating category.

It is also proposed that, as for land in other rating categories, councils may create subcategories for environmental land to allow different environmental land rates to be set.

For this purpose, it is proposed that councils be enabled to create different rating subcategories based on whether or not there is a conservation agreement or similar instrument in place, and/or, based on geographic location.

Where a council chooses to rely on geographic location to create subcategories, it will need to define the different residential areas by reference to geographic names published by the Geographical Names Board, rather than by drawing ‘lines on a map’.

Consultation question/s

6. Do you agree with the proposal about how to create a new rating category for environmental land, including how environmental land is proposed to be defined?

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Neutral

Comment:

7. Do you agree that a portion of land that is subject to a conservation agreement or other similar instrument should be categorised by councils according to the proposed definition of environmental land?

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Neutral

Comment:
3.3 Enabling different business rates to be set for industrial land and commercial land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IPART recommendation</th>
<th>Key sections of the Act</th>
<th>To come into effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation 30</td>
<td>s.529</td>
<td>By proclamation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Government’s commitment**

Currently, the Act only allows councils to create different categories of business rates according to whether business land falls within a ‘centre of activity’. This is essentially, therefore, limited to location, rather than the activities taking place on each property. It also means that, where businesses are not clustered together, they are most often only charged a general business rate.

IPART recommended, and the Government supported, changing this so that different rating subcategories can also be created for land where industrial and commercial activities are occurring.

This recognises that land where these activities take place typically have different access to, demand for or cost associated with providing council services and infrastructure. It also recognises that these parcels of land may, or may not, be clustered together within a local government area.

**The proposal in the Bill**

It is proposed that councils be given the option of setting different rates for business land based on whether it is industrial or commercial land. This would apply in addition to maintaining the current option of setting different rates based on whether there is a ‘centre of activity’.

It is proposed that councils that choose to take up this option determine whether business land is industrial or commercial, as necessary, based on whether industrial activities are predominantly taking place. This approach means that property zoning is relevant but not determinative for rating purposes, as intended by IPART, and creates a clear approach for councils and ratepayers that can be updated as necessary over time.

It is further proposed that, if the ‘dominant’ activity conducted on a parcel of land does not fall within a list of industrial activities prescribed in regulations, they may be categorised as commercial. Activities which may be prescribed as industrial include, for example, manufacturing, warehousing, abattoirs and works depots.

**Consultation question/s**

8. Do you agree with the proposal about how to enable different business rates for industrial and commercial land?

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Neutral

**Comment:**
3.4 Enabling different rates for residential, business or mining land that is vacant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IPART recommendation</th>
<th>Key sections of the Act</th>
<th>To come into effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation 31</td>
<td>s.519, s.529</td>
<td>By proclamation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Government’s commitment

Under the Act, before making an ordinary rate, a council must have declared each parcel of rateable land in its area to be within one of four rating categories – farmland, residential, mining or business. As above, it is now proposed to create a fifth rating category for environmental land (see 3.2).

At present, councils must rate a parcel of land as residential, farming or mining land if it determines the land falls within one of those categories whether or not it is vacant. If the land does not clearly fall into one of these categories, council must rate it according to its designated use under an environmental planning instrument or, in the absence of such an instrument, based on the predominant surrounding land.

In either case, councils are not permitted to rate land differently because it is vacant. For example, an empty block of land in a residential estate is charged the same rate as the houses in the estate.

IPART recommended that, after completing the current rating categorisation process for vacant land, councils be able to set a different rate for vacant land to that set for other land in the same rating category for residential, business and mining land.

The Government has accepted this recommendation, which would provide additional flexibility for councils to tailor their rates to the needs of local communities.

The proposal in the Bill

It is proposed to give effect to this reform by allowing councils to create rating subcategories for vacant land within the residential, business or mining land categories. This type of rating subcategory will not be able to be created for environmental or farming land.

In determining whether a parcel of land is vacant, a council will need to have regard to factors including whether the land has a substantial and permanent structure. For this purpose, a building or other structure may be considered substantial and permanent if it is:

- significant in size or value
- not incidental to the purpose of another structure or proposed structure
- not related to, reliant on, or existing to support use or function of a structure, and
- fixed and enduring, rather than built for a temporary purpose.

These proposed factors build on relevant aspects of the approach taken by the Australian Tax Office definition of vacant land for income tax purposes.

It is also proposed to provide guidance to councils about:

- how councils may determine whether a specific parcel of land is to be treated as vacant land and, where relevant, to which rating category it belongs
- factors councils should take into account in setting the rate to be paid for vacant land, and
- how high or low the rate for vacant land should be relative to the principal rating category.
Consultation question/s

9. Do you agree with the proposal to allow subcategories for vacant land to be created for residential, business and/or mining land, including the proposed factors set out above?

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Neutral

Comment:
3.5 Allowing different farmland rates to also be set based on geographic location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IPART recommendation</th>
<th>Key sections of the Act</th>
<th>To come into effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation 32</td>
<td>s.529</td>
<td>By proclamation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Government’s commitment**

Currently, councils can only sub-categorise farmland according to intensity of land use, ‘irrigability’ of the land or economic factors affecting the land.

Concern has been raised that, while some regional and rural councils are able to rely on these factors, it is inflexible, subjective and difficult to apply in many local government areas in an equitable way. IPART found that the majority of councils with farmland properties do not create subcategories and are applying a single rate even if there are substantial differences in the intensity of farming.

IPART therefore recommended that councils should be able to set different farmland rates based on geographic location. This reflects the view that location-based rating for farmland, like residential and business land, can better reflect access to council infrastructure and services as well as the productivity of land. It suggested that areas may be defined by locality or geographical markers (such as a riverbank or escarpment) or major infrastructure (such as a highway).

The Government supported this recommendation. This will allow councils flexibility to more fairly distribute the rating burden by creating rating subcategories that better reflect productivity, are easier to assess and may be more likely to reflect access to council services by landholders.

**The proposal in the Bill**

It is proposed that councils be given the option of setting different rates for farmland based on geographic location. If this option is chosen, councils will need to:

- create subcategories by reference to the geographic names published by the Geographical Names Board rather than drawing ‘lines on a map’, and
- have regard to certain matters prescribed by regulation in creating subcategories for farmland and determining rates to be levied for each geographic location.
This new option would apply in addition to maintaining the current option of setting different rates based on intensity of land use, ‘irrigability’ or economic factors affecting the land. This approach is intended to minimise disruption for councils in regional and rural NSW with rating structures that rely on the current provisions.

Relevantly, the new approach to creating rating subcategories for farmland may also be utilised by relevant councils to assist with harmonisation, or, to maintain current farmland rating structures across their former council areas, should they choose to do so, in consultation with their communities.

Consultation question/s

10. Do you agree with the proposal to enable councils to also set farmland rates based on geographic location?

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Neutral

Comment:
4 CHANGING SPECIFIC EXEMPTIONS FROM ORDINARY AND SPECIAL RATES

4.1 Removing mandatory rates exemptions for land with new conservation agreements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IPART recommendation</th>
<th>Key sections of the Act</th>
<th>To come into effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation 18</td>
<td>s.529, s.555, s.558</td>
<td>By proclamation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Government’s commitment

Under the Act, land subject to certain conservation agreements is exempt from all rates. This exemption was introduced to provide a financial incentive for landholders to enter into agreements for future conservation which impose costs and reduce the development potential of their land.

Over a period of time, different types of conservation agreements and similar instruments have been created and used to manage potential impacts of proposed developments on native species, cultural heritage or to address other environmental, community or development-based concerns. Some of these arrangements are exempt from rates while others are not.

IPART recommended removing rating exemptions for private land with conservation agreements and that councils rate the land under the new environmental land rating category (see above at 3.2). This reflected the finding that these parcels of land should not always be exempt from rates as owners have exclusive possession, derive private benefits, use services and impose other costs on the council and broader community.

The proposal in the Bill

It is proposed that there no longer be a mandatory rating exemption for private land for which a new conservation agreement is entered into after this reform comes into effect.

Instead, these properties will be categorised for rating purposes by the relevant council and may be rated under the new environmental land rating category. Further, as set out above at 3.2, councils will be permitted to create rating subcategories, and therefore to set different rates for environmental land based on whether or not there is conservation agreement or other instrument prescribed by regulation.

Importantly, to ensure fairness for parties to existing conservation agreements, it is proposed that those lands that currently benefit from this exemption continue to do so. This maintains a significant financial incentive that was taken into account by landholders when deciding whether to enter into an agreement which, in the vast majority of cases, is now binding on themselves and future owners.
Consultation question/s

11. Do you agree with the proposal to remove the requirement for councils to apply a rating exemption for land subject to new conservation agreements?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Neutral

Comment:
4.2 Removing certain mandatory exemptions from special rates for water and sewerage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IPART recommendation</th>
<th>Key sections of the Act</th>
<th>To come into effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation 24</td>
<td>ss.555-558</td>
<td>By proclamation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Government’s commitment

Some councils are responsible for providing water and sewerage services, particularly in regional and rural NSW. To fund these services, in addition to regular service charges, councils may levy special rates as a fee for service, in addition to ordinary rates. These special rates appear on rates notices.

Under the Act, councils are prevented from levying special rates for water and sewerage on the whole, or part, of a range of specific types of property, including:

- Crown land not leased for a private purpose
- land within a National Park, historic site, nature reserve, state game reserve or karst conservation reserve, whether or not the land is affected by a lease, licence, occupancy or use,
- land that is subject to a conservation agreement
- land that is vested in, owned by, held on trust by or leased by the (now) Biodiversity Conservation Trust
- land that is within a special area or controlled area for Sydney Water that is either Crown land or land vested in Sydney Water
- land that is within a special area for Hunter Water that is Crown land or vested in Hunter Water
- land that is vested in or owned by Water NSW that is in, on or over which water supply works are installed
- land that is within a special area for a water supply authority that is Crown land or vested in that authority
- land that belongs to a religious body and is occupied and used in connection with:
  - a church or other building used or occupied for public worship, or
  - a building used or occupied solely as the residence of a minister of religion in connection with any such church or building, or
  - a building used or occupied for the purpose of religious teaching or training, or
  - a building used or occupied solely as the residence of the official head and/or the assistant official head of any religious body in NSW or any diocese in NSW,
- land that belongs to and is occupied and used in connection with a government school, non-government school or certain schools with exemptions under s.78 of the Education Act 1990
- a playground that belongs to and is used in connection with the school, and
- a building occupied as a residence by a teacher, employee or caretaker of the school that belongs to and is used in connection with the school,
- land that is vested in the NSW Aboriginal Land Council (ALC) or a local ALC if it is declared under the Aboriginal Land Rights Act 1983 to be exempt from rates,
- land vested in or owned by Residual Transport Corporation NSW or a public transport agency and in, on or over which rail infrastructure facilities are installed,
• land vested in or owned by Transport Asset Holding Entity of New South Wales and in, on or over which rail infrastructure facilities are installed,
• land that is vested in or owned by Sydney Metro and in, on or over which rail infrastructure facilities are installed, and
• land below the high-water mark used for aquaculture relating to the cultivation of oysters.

Under the Act, councils are also able, but not required, to choose to exempt other types of land from these types of special rates – this includes, for example, public reserves, hospitals and charities.

IPART found that it may not be appropriate for some parcels of land that fall within the above list to be exempt from paying special rates for water and sewerage as they would receive these services for free with significant private benefit. Instead, IPART recommended that the Government allow councils discretion to choose whether to exempt these properties from special rates. The Government accepted this recommendation.

It is understood, however, that in practice very few councils in regional and rural NSW levy special rates for water and sewerage, as compared to annual or service charges.

The proposal in the Bill

It is proposed that councils be able to choose whether to exempt those properties listed above from special rates, noting that these special rates are unlikely to be applied.

Importantly, it is intended that the Government provide guidance to any councils levying special rates about how best to exercise their discretion in relation to whether to continue to exempt specific types of land that were previously required to be exempt from these special rates. This guidance may specify relevant factors to consider, for example, the type of land, the land’s permitted use, the land’s actual use/s and access to relevant council infrastructure and services.

Consultation question/s

12. Do you agree with the proposal to remove certain mandatory exemptions from special rates for water and sewerage?

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Neutral

Comment:
5 IMPROVING PUBLIC CONFIDENCE IN THE RATING SYSTEM

5.1 Narrow scope to postpone rates and let councils choose whether to write them off

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IPART recommendation</th>
<th>Key sections of the Act</th>
<th>To come into effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation 40</td>
<td>s.585, s.595</td>
<td>By proclamation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Government’s commitment

Under the Act, a ratepayer is able to postpone paying higher rates if their land is rezoned, the rates payable increase after rezoning and the ratepayer does not intend to redevelop the land according to the new land uses that are permitted under the new zoning. Further, councils are required to write-off any rates and accrued interest postponed under this process after five years.

This postponement option allows people to retain properties with higher permitted uses without paying higher council rates. It is available to land consisting of a single dwelling house or rural land zoned to allow subdivision and applies to both ordinary and special rates.

IPART found that the cost to councils of administering postponement arrangements is high and is inconsistent with the taxation principles of simplicity, efficiency and equity. In particular, the postponement option:

- does not acknowledge the wealth gained in land value from rezoning
- does not recognise that the increased rates are a small proportion of the increased value of the land asset, and
- acts as a disincentive to develop land and does not promote growth and urban renewal.

IPART therefore recommended that the option to postpone rates in these circumstances should be removed, and that councils no longer be required to write-off postponed rates after five years. This would not affect the continuing ability for ratepayers to apply for rates relief on hardship grounds. The Government accepted this recommendation.

The proposal in the Bill

It is proposed to provide appropriate limits on the postponement of rates. These include:

- limiting who can postpone rates to those ratepayers that would face substantial hardship as a result of paying the higher rates attributable to rezoning
- restricting the amount of rates that can be postponed under the postponement of rates provisions to the difference between the rate applied under the former zoning, and the amount that will apply under the new zoning, and
- removing the requirement for councils to write-off postponed rates after five years, while still giving them flexibility to do so in appropriate circumstances.

The Government understands that, if the provisions in relation to the postponement of rates were simply removed, ratepayers may face significant rate increases and, if unable to pay, may need to sell their properties.

These proposals are designed to limit the potential significant financial impact for some owners of properties when they face a zoning change in relation to their land. The proposals also acknowledge potential hardship for some of these ratepayers, particularly owner occupiers of residential or rural residential land already facing financial stress.

Importantly, to ensure fairness, it is proposed that those ratepayers that currently benefit from such an arrangement, or have applied to do so, continue to do so under the current provision after the reform comes into effect.
The Government believes that these proposals will create a fairer rates postponement framework that enables ratepayers needing to postpone rates for legitimate reasons to do so, while enabling councils to collect much needed rates to meet the cost of services provided to that land, and to lessen the burden on other ratepayers.

### Consultation question/s

13. Do you agree with the proposal to restrict who can seek postponement of rates?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
   - [ ] Neutral

Comment:

14. Do you agree with the proposal to remove the requirement to write off rates debts?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
   - [ ] Neutral

Comment:
5.2 Allow councils to sell properties for unpaid rates after three years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IPART recommendation</th>
<th>Key sections of the Act</th>
<th>To come into effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation 36</td>
<td>s.713</td>
<td>On assent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Government’s commitment

Under the Act, a council may seek to sell a property that is not vacant to recover the cost of rates and charges, including interest, that remain unpaid after five years in certain circumstances. Specific provisions set out when properties may be sold and the process that must be followed by councils.

IPART recommended that the period of time after which these properties may be sold should be reduced from five years to three years. The Government accepted this recommendation, which is designed to improve the simplicity of the rating system, bring NSW in line with other States, and is likely to reduce costs and delays currently experienced by councils in recovering outstanding rates.

The proposal in the Bill

It is proposed that councils be permitted to seek to sell properties that are not vacant for unpaid rates and charges after 3 years rather than 5 years.

This would apply from the date of commencement of the provision and would not apply in respect of properties for which a ratepayer already owes unpaid rates and/or charges to council at that time.

Importantly, the COVID-19 Legislative Amendment (Emergency Measures-Miscellaneous) Act No.2 2020 currently operates to prevent councils from commencing legal action to recover rates and charges for six months unless certain specific matters have been considered.

This temporary measure was put in place to help households that are under significant pressure to remain sustainable during the COVID19 pandemic and as steps towards economic recovery begin. It is therefore not intended to commence these new provisions while this temporary measure remains in place.

Consultation question/s

15. Do you agree with the proposal to enable councils to sell properties for unpaid rates after 3 years?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Neutral

Comment:
Section Three – Other rating reforms

1 ALLOWING COUNCILS’ GENERAL INCOME TO RISE IN LINE WITH POPULATION GROWTH

The Government’s commitment

The Minister, under the Act, may specify the percentage by which councils’ general income may be varied for a specific year – the ‘rate peg’. IPART performs this function under delegation.

IPART has traditionally calculated the Rate Peg by reference to the Local Government Cost Index (LGCI) and improvements in productivity (a productivity factor). The LGCI measures price changes for operational inputs—including labour—used by an average council over the previous year. This overall approach to calculating the rate peg has been in place since 2010.

IPART does not take into account, directly or indirectly, the differing impacts of population growth between councils in setting the rate peg. Instead, the current methodology implicitly assumes that the cost of serving each ratepayer will be, on average, the same, or that a special rate may be levied in areas where serving groups of ratepayers involve higher and special costs. Alternatively, councils may apply to IPART for a Special Rate Variation to levy rates above the rate peg.

While this rate peg model means that council areas with higher populations can levy a greater number of ratepayers and, therefore, will have higher revenue, it is not able to take into account that certain types of residents associated with population growth (such as young families) increase demand for services more than the same number of residents in an established area, and that councils often face these costs before the future ratepayers can begin to pay for them.

The Government has committed to allowing councils to align their income with population growth. This will be achieved by adjusting how the rate peg is calculated. This will help to ensure that adequate local infrastructure and services are provided in local government areas with growing populations.

How this reform will be delivered

The Minister for Local Government, with the approval of the Premier, has asked IPART to deliver a report recommending a rate peg methodology that allows the general income of councils to be varied annually in a way that accounts for population growth. Terms of Reference have already been provided to IPART for this review, which is expected to be completed within nine months.

The Terms of Reference for IPART’s review clarify that the methodology proposed by IPART should not negatively impact the income growth that councils with stable or declining populations would have achieved under a rate peg calculated using the LGCI and productivity factor. They also state that the Government will not consider further change to the rate peg or maximum allowable income at this time.

In undertaking the review, IPART has been asked to have regard to matters including:

• the Government’s commitment to protecting ratepayers from sudden or excessive rate rises, while improving the financial sustainability of local government
• ensuring the rate peg model can be understood by councils and the communities they serve
• the differing needs and circumstances of councils and communities in metropolitan, regional, and rural areas of the State, and
• any other matter it considers relevant.

To ensure that this reform may be given effect as simply and clearly as possible, the Bill puts beyond debt that more than one rate peg can be applied to the local government sector, if required.
2 ENCOURAGING COUNCILS TO LEVY RATES ON MINING LAND TO REFLECT ADDITIONAL COSTS

The Government’s commitment

Under the Act, before levying an ordinary rate, a council must have declared each parcel of rateable land in its area to be within one of four rating categories – farmland, residential, mining or business. The council then determines what rate to levy for land that falls in each of these categories.

IPART analysed the rates applied by councils to mining land and found that they varied widely. Further, IPART found that the different rates that applied to land within this category was unlikely to reflect differences in costs of providing council services to these types of properties. Rather, it appeared that some councils may be setting rates based primarily on ‘capacity to pay’ principles.

In principle, IPART recommended that mining rates should be set, relative to rates for business land, primarily to reflect differences in the cost of providing council infrastructure and services to these properties. The Government accepted this recommendation.

How this reform will be delivered

This reform will be implemented through guidance rather than seeking to amend the Act through the Bill. This will provide maximum flexibility to make adjustments in future and to cater to the different circumstances of local councils and communities across NSW.

Guidance will be issued to specify that councils should set mining rates, relative to rates for business land, primarily to reflect differences in the cost of providing council infrastructure and services. Further, if a council does apply a higher rate to mining land than business land in a specific financial year, that council should explain, as part of its Revenue Policy:

- how the rate has been set and why, and
- any additional costs in providing services to mining properties.

Consultation question/s

16. Do you agree with the proposal to implement this reform through guidance?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Neutral

Comment:
3 RETAINING THE RATING CATEGORY FOR BUSINESS AS THE ‘RESIDUAL’ RATING CATEGORY

The Government’s commitment

Under the Act, before making an ordinary rate, a council must have declared each parcel of rateable land in its area to be within one of four rating categories – farmland, residential, mining or business. If a parcel of land does not fall within the residential, farmland or mining rating categories, it is treated as business land (the residual category).

IPART noted that using the rating category for business as the residual category may, in some areas, lead to certain properties being more highly rated than is equitable. It therefore recommended that councils should have flexibility to choose a different ‘residual’ category based on the profile of local properties. The Government supported this recommendation.

How this reform will be delivered

Following further consultation and consideration of how each reform of rating categories and subcategories may be implemented by councils, this reform will not be progressed at this time. There is a real risk that allowing alternative residual categories could result in perverse outcomes, inconsistency and uncertainty for councils and ratepayers, particularly given the complexities of categorising and subcategorising land for rating purposes.

Consultation question/s

17. Do you agree with the proposal to retain the business land rating category as the residual category?

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Neutral

Comment:
4 REQUIRING COUNCILS TO REPORT THE VALUE OF EXEMPTIONS THEY GRANT EACH YEAR

The Government’s commitment

IPART has identified that councils, generally, do not have a strong indication of the ‘cost’ of exemptions because they do not affect council’s total general income, which is limited by the rate peg. As such, the cost of the exemption is effectively made up for by other ratepayers.

As rates are a tax, this should be as transparent a process as possible so that all parties involved can understand the costs and benefits of providing for exemptions.

With that in mind, IPART recommended that councils publish the estimated value of rating exemptions within their local government area in their annual reports or other information made available to the public. The Government accepted this recommendation, which is designed to improve consistency between councils as well as improving transparency of the rating system for ratepayers.

How this reform will be delivered

It is understood that most councils do not have ready access to information on the value of all exemptions and that obtaining this information would impose a significant additional burden, particularly where that would require additional land valuations at council expense.

Given this, it is proposed that councils include in their annual report an estimate of the value of those exemptions granted as a result of a decision of that council. This estimate need only be made by applying a simple, prescribed methodology based on information on each parcel of land that is available to council at the time of its decision to grant the rating exemption.

As those matters that must be included in a council’s annual report may be prescribed by regulation, this reform does not feature in a provision of the Bill.

Consultation question/s

Do you agree with the proposal that councils report on the value of exemptions they choose to grant through their annual reports?

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Neutral

Comment:
Glossary & Abbreviations

The Act  Local Government Act 1993
OLG  Office of Local Government
Regulation  Local Government (General) Regulation 2005
DPIE  NSW Department of Planning, Industry and Environment
IPART  Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal
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Privacy Notice
When you give us your feedback, the Office of Local Government (OLG) in the NSW Department of Planning, Industry and Environment (DPIE) will collect some personal information about you, including:

- your name
- your email address
- the name of your organisation (if provided), and
- any personal information you decide to put in additional ‘general comments’ fields.

All feedback received through this consultation process may be made publicly available. Please do not include any personal information in your feedback that you do not want published.

This information is being collected by OLG as part of the Towards a Fairer Rating System consultation to help the Government develop a final Bill to amend the Local Government Act 1993 and supporting regulations, as necessary. As part of that process, we may need to share your information with people outside OLG, including other public authorities and government agencies. We may also use your email address to notify you about further feedback opportunities or the outcome of consultation.

You should also be aware there may be circumstances when OLG is required by law to release information (for example, in accordance with the requirements of the Government Information (Public Access) Act 2009. There is also a Privacy Policy located on OLG’s website that explains how some data is automatically collected (such as your internet protocol (IP) address) whenever you visit OLG’s website. The link to that policy is https://www.olg.nsw.gov.au/about-us/privacy-policy/

Submitting this completed feedback form
Please print your completed form and mail or email by COB 5 February 2021 to:
About you

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>PLEASE SELECT ALL APPLICABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council – Metropolitan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council – Metropolitan Fringe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council – Regional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council – Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council – Large Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector organisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratepayer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW State agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FEEDBACK FORM – Towards a Fairer Rating System

Section Two – Local Government Amendment (Rating) Bill 2020

1. Allowing gradual rates harmonisation

Q.1. Are you from a local government area newly formed in 2016 that has not yet harmonised rates?

A.1. □ Yes
     □ No

Q.2. Do you agree with the proposal to enable new councils to gradually harmonise rates across former council areas over four years?

A.2. □ Yes
     □ No
     □ Neutral

Comment:
### 2. Allowing councils to levy special rates for jointly funded infrastructure

**Q.3.** Do you agree with the proposal in relation to levying special rates for jointly funded infrastructure?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.3.</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:**

### 3. Increasing flexibility through new rating categories and subcategories

#### 3.1 Allowing councils to set different residential rates in contiguous urban areas

**Q.4.** Do you agree with the proposal to allow for different residential rates in contiguous urban areas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.4.</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:**

**Q.5.** Do you agree with the proposal to limit the highest rate structure across all residential subcategories to no more than 1.5 times the average rate structure?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.5.</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:**

### 3.2 Creating a new rating category for environmental land

**Q.6.** Do you agree with the proposal about how to create a new rating category for environmental land, including how environmental land is proposed to be defined?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.6.</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:**
### Q.7.
Do you agree that a portion of land that is subject to a conservation agreement or other similar instrument should be categorised by councils according to the proposed definition of *environmental land*?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Comment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### A.7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Comment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 3.3 Enabling different business rates to be set for industrial land and commercial land

### Q.8.
Do you agree with the proposal about how to enable different rates for industrial and commercial land?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Comment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### A.8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Comment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 3.4 Enabling different rates for residential, business or mining land that is vacant

### Q.9.
Do you agree with the proposal to allow subcategories for vacant land to be created for residential, business and/or mining land, including the proposed factors set out above?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Comment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### A.9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Comment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### 3.5 Enabling different rates for residential, business or mining land that is vacant

**Q.10.** Do you agree with the proposal to enable councils to also set farmland rates based on geographical location?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Neutral

**Comment:**

### 4 Changing specific exemptions from ordinary and special rates

#### 4.1 Removing mandatory rates exemptions for land with new conservation agreements

**Q.11.** Do you agree with the proposal to remove the requirement for councils to apply a rating exemption for land subject to new conservation agreements?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Neutral

**Comment:**

#### 4.2 Removing certain mandatory exemptions from special rates for water and sewerage

**Q.12.** Do you agree with the proposal to remove certain mandatory exemptions from special rates for water and sewerage?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Neutral

**Comment:**

---

**TOWARDS A FAIRER RATING SYSTEM**
### 5 Improving public confidence in the rating system

#### 5.1 Narrow scope to postpone rates and let councils choose whether to write them off

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.13.</th>
<th>Do you agree with the proposal to restrict who can seek postponement of rates?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A.13. | □ Yes  
|       | □ No   
|       | □ Neutral  
|       | **Comment:** |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.14.</th>
<th>Do you agree with the proposal to remove the requirement to write off rates debts?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A.14. | □ Yes  
|       | □ No   
|       | □ Neutral  
|       | **Comment:** |

#### 5.2 Allow councils to sell properties for unpaid rates after three years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.15.</th>
<th>Do you agree with the proposal to enable councils to sell properties for unpaid rates after 3 years?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A.15. | □ Yes  
|       | □ No   
|       | □ Neutral  
|       | **Comment:** |
# Section Three – Other rating reforms

## 2 Encouraging councils to levy rates on mining land to reflect additional costs

**Q.16.** Do you agree with the proposal to implement this reform through guidance?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.16.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:**

## 3 Retaining the rating category for business as the ‘residual’ rating category

**Q.17.** Do you agree with the proposal to retain the business land rating category as the residual category?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.17.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:**

## 4 Requiring councils to report the value of exemptions they grant each year

**Q.18.** Do you agree with the proposal that councils report on the value of exemptions they choose to grant through their annual reports?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.18.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:**

---

**General Comments**