

Submission of Norris Everton. Greytown 16/04/2025

In relation to Question 3. How should we define Separately Used or Inhabitable Parts (SUIPs)
My belief is that SUIP's not be target rated with uniform charges as they already exist in the one flat rate per rating unit.

We are informed from the SWDC publications provided to me...

Council applies some uniform charges; Annual General... Roothing... Water supply... Wastewater to each SUIP rather than charging one flat rate per 'rating unit' (the entire property)

Also.

This reflects the fact that properties with multiple uses 'typically' have more impact on council services such as water and roading networks than single use properties.

Did the Strategy Working Committee (SWC) carry out research to ensure this assumption was correct.... that in 'most cases' (typically) this was the situation?

Did the SWC responsible for introducing this new fee ensure accuracy and fairness for all... in terms of services provided.

The SWC logic is flawed. Eg

How is the belief SUIPs have an extra impact on services reconciled against the rating units that take in 'boarders' or have large numbers of occupants.

How can the council recommend a change (Question 4) to drop the current targeted rate of Refuse and Recycling charge to each SUIP when in Question 3 they plan to continue targeting SUIP's albeit with a clearer definition. Should policy not be consistent.

The adoption of 'Capital Value' for value-based rating purposes also captures the value of any SUIP and is therefore currently rated

The targeted rating of SUIP's is a penalty and does little in resolving the current housing crisis.

It is a retrospective fee (ex post facto' introduced after the fact) in that ratepayers who have invested in additional accommodation based on existing fees... may not have done so.

Ends;