

Our Community Plan Submission - Received by Email

Name:	Jim [mailto:F.McQueen@xtra.co.nz]
CC:	RatesInfo; HannW @ccc.govt.nz; MooreG @ccc.govt.nz
Sent:	Sunday, 16 May 2004 10:19 p.m.
Your Submission:	change in rating differential
	<p>Wayne Hann CCC</p> <p>Dear Sir</p> <p>This is a "Submission " Notice, and an "Objection"</p> <p>"Objection" and Notification that i will be placing a late "Submission" on the 2005 Draft Community Plan.</p> <p>Re your letter "Change in Rating Differential"</p> <p>Objection , my property is and always has been rural, I farm sheep and grow nut crops in fact 62 walnut tress and other nut trees, 51 Fruit trees, 10 Olive Trees. Hardly a residential situation considering the size of the property.</p> <p>You saw fit to advise me that my property has been identified as "evidenced where appropriate, by the attached aerial photograph as one of those where, from 1 July 2004, The rating differential will be changed from rural to residential." You further stated that you were not going to (through the council) provide me with any additional services, just that you were going tocharge me more ie rates increase etc etc (Re classified as residential).</p> <p>First, I find your letter obnoxious, condescending and misleading in it's wording</p> <p>Condescending on the part about a "Public consultative process" for a plan that is in the draft stage for 2005, yet, you limit the responce time to one calendar month from April to May 2004. Is this your idea of public consultation?</p> <p>Obnoxious that you should think that an aerial photograph will show you all you need to decide on a properties useage.</p> <p>I consider this most inappropriate not "appropriate" as stated on your letter. Where do you think you are coming from on this issue?</p> <p>Note you are to act in a transparent fair and equitable manner,in this instance, I believe you have not.</p> <p>I believe that this decision by "council" has been ill conceived, misguided and misconstrued as for comprehensive review of its revenue and financing policy, yes, I dare say someone has decided there is an opportunity for revenue gathering to further aid pet projects.</p> <p>I take "council" liberally.</p> <p>Misleading: You add the sentence "Please also note that even though your property may be outside the serviced area for sewerage and /or water this is no longer a valid consideration for attracting a rural differential". Well having never used this as the reason for being a rural property, knowing full well that the above services have never been provided, I find the addition of this sentence misleading.</p>

**Your Submission
(Cont'd):**

In summary, I am very disappointed in my council on these two issues.

1: 2005 Daft Community Plan, how long have you "The Council" been drafting and planning this, and what time did you allocate for rate payer response?

2: Right of objection under section 39 of the government (rating) Act 2002. You decided from an aerial photo that you will rate me differently now and you ask me to respond or object, to something you have changed with no consultation, no communication not even a phone call and definitely no site visit. Your audacity is if nothing else startling.

Yes, I will object very very strongly. I object to my rating differential being changed to residential. I also request from you a copy of your criteria for deciding on who's property is rural, rural residential or other. The one that you apply by your inspector when inspecting to determine the appropriate rating regime.

Thank you in anticipation of your reply

Yours faithfully

Jim Dimoff
20 Selkirk Place
Christchurch 8005

Val Ref:2180057500
RTZ :1005025

p.s I will be forwarding my "SUBMISSION ON THE 2005 DRAFT COMMUNITY PLAN" Separately.