

Author name: Name suppressed

Date of submission: Sunday, 17 November 2024

Your submission for this review:

1. Do you consider the Valuer Generals pricing proposal represents good value? Why/why not? No. The Valuer General (VG) is proposing to increase the local governments cost share by 0.8%, from 30.5% to 31.3%. This includes a price increase for the Coastal valuation zone of 38%, from \$7.80 to \$10.80 per property. For Nambucca Valley Council specifically, this will result in a \$30,000 yearly increase which directly effects our ability to provide community services. In 2019/20 Council paid \$61,000 for valuation services which increased to \$77,000 in 2024/25, an increase of 26.23%. Over this same period Councils total permissible income only increased by 18.00%. This increase disparity has already resulted in impacts to service levels. It is unlikely that Councils total permissible income growth will double over the next 6 year, from 18% to 36%, which means the cost increase disparity will only continue to rise, further hindering Councils ability to provide community services. 2. Has there been any material change to the land valuation process that has impacted the cost of undertaking valuations (e.g. contract costs) Council does not have the extensive knowledge or experience of the land valuation process required to comment. 3. How might the Valuer Generals costs of providing land valuation services change over the next 6 years, considering the impact of digital technology, AI and innovation? Council does not have the extensive knowledge or experience of the land valuation process required to comment. 4. How should the Valuer Generals costs be allocated between users of valuation services? Council agrees that costs should be allocated based on their contribution to the cost of the service. Given that valuation services are used for taxation purposes it may be appropriate to distribute costs based on the clients income from this service. Users who are currently not allocated a cost share should be paying for this service. State government can provide grant funding for these departments where required. 5. What is the impact on councils of the Valuer Generals proposed price increases? As outlined in question 1 the Valuer Generals pricing increases has been out pacing Councils permissible income due to the difference in CPI and the rate peg. Based on the figures supplied by the VGs Office this appears unlikely to change in the future. This increase has resulted in Council having less funds available year to year to provide expected community services. 6. Should the current four pricing zones be retained or is there a more appropriate pricing model for land valuation services such as a single price? In an ideal world pricing would be dependent on the cost of providing the service to each individual Council. The current method of four zones works on a basic acknowledgement of land differences and similarities between metro and rural councils. Consideration should be given to the number of properties within each LGA to determine if further categorisation is achievable. As an example, Nambucca Valley Council is within the North Coast contract area and is charged the same price as Clarence Valley, Coffs Harbour, Mid-Coast, Port Macquarie-Hastings and Tweed. Each of these Councils consist of 3-5 times the number of properties which would require a more substantial valuation workload. 7. If a price increase is necessary, should it be implemented in the first year, or gradually over a few years? Any price increase should be introduced gradually over the 6-year period, allowing Councils permissible income to increase as well. A price spike in one year may substantially impact Councils ability to meet service levels in that year and proceeding years. Whereas a gradual increase, while Councils income is also increasing, should limit this impact. 8. What potential impacts does the bringing in-house of mass valuations by the Valuer General have on the long-term viability of the valuation market participants and the level of competition in the valuation market? Council does not have the extensive knowledge or experience of the land valuation process required to comment. 9. Is the quality of service provided by the Valuer General meeting expectations? The Valuer General has been the monopoly valuation service supplier of Nambucca Valley Council since the 1960s. While service levels are sufficient for Council to operate, a monopoly service limits innovation. Council does not have an deep understanding of the valuation process, however, it is unknown what services and system improvements could be achieved with market competition. 10. If you have been involved with the Valuer Generals land valuation dispute process, what has been your experience? N/A 11. Are there any other matters you would like us to consider as part of our review of the Valuer Generals Monopoly Services? N/A