

From: [Inquiry into the Retirement Housing Sector POV eSubmission Form](#)
To: [LSIC](#)
Subject: New Submission to Inquiry into the Retirement Housing Sector
Date: Wednesday, 29 June 2016 10:56:38 PM

Inquiry Name: Inquiry into the Retirement Housing Sector

Iris Forte
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

SUBMISSION CONTENT:

--

I am a resident living in a retirement village and I wish to bring to your attention the inequitable rating system used by various councils across the Melbourne metropolitan area. Some councils such as Frankston, Seaford and, Manningham all apply a 25% discount to retirement village rates. However Manningham only apply it to one village which presented their case to council by a sworn valuer.

I draw your attention to the Valuation of Land Act 1960 Section 5a, local government Act Section 171(1)(b), and State Concessions Act 2004 (Part1, Section 4(1).

The valuation of Land Act states and I quote, (The purpose of rating properties is to provide an EQUITABLE means of apportioning revenue raising, so councils can fulfil their obligations to the community they represent). Unquote.

As retirement villages are considered to be on private property the councils are relieved of the obligation to provide the following services.

1. Roads within the village are maintained and repaired at a cost to the village residents. These roads are not only used by residents of the village but by service vehicles, visitors and some quite general traffic.
2. Footpaths are maintained and repaired at a cost to the village residents as are the kerbs and gutters.
3. Drainage, provision and maintenance or replacement, is at a cost to the village residents.
4. All street lighting is provided, maintained and operated at a cost to the village residents.
5. Other facilities provided by the association in respect of recreation, open air and parking facilities, swimming pool, medical centre, and library are also costs to the village residents.

The above services are provided to other home owners in the Municipality, who have larger houses and properties, yet they only pay similar rates to those living in Retirement Villages. The area of a retirement village unit is one quarter of a normal house block. The amount of revenue raised by council from retirement village residents is six times more than that raised from normal home owners

whose properties cover a similar area.

This revenue is raised from a large group of citizens, whose only income is the age pension.

Residents of retirement villages across the State believe that there is an anomaly here in that they are not getting a fair go.

From these examples, it is clear that there is no uniform approach to the problem of residents in retirement villages paying rates for council services they do not receive.

I respectfully request the Government to address the problem of retirement village council rates and, recommend that you urgently consider the introduction of a uniform, state-wide discount on rates for retirement villages.

I would also like the government to look into why a corporate can take advantage of the pensioner rebate which amounts to thousands of dollars each year.

The problem with the retirement industry is there is no one identity that residents, who are normally on limited financial means, can address these blatant and discriminating tactics to without engaging expensive lawyers.

With a projected aging community there is an urgent need to have a Commissioner or preferably an Ombudsman to adjudicate on these and other industry matters.

--

File1:

File2:

File3: