

**Submission  
No 82**

## **INQUIRY INTO LAND VALUATION SYSTEM**

**Name:** Mr Col Coupland

**Date Received:** 8/03/2013

8<sup>th</sup> March 2013

The Chairman

Joint Standing Committee on the Office of the Valuer General

### **INQUIRY INTO LAND VALUATION SYSTEM**

Thank you for the opportunity of submitting a submission to the Standing Parliamentary Committee which is looking into the way Land Valuations are carried out and the difficulty in appealing these values for the everyday person.

To give you some of my history, I reside at [REDACTED] Forestville and I have lived here since 1968. My wife Carmel Coupland nee Heeger won the block of land via a crown ballot in the first half of 1966 and we commenced building July 1967 and moved in in January 1968.

The original subdivision has our land as [REDACTED] in [REDACTED]

Our penultimate valuation was received in 2009 as at 1<sup>st</sup> July for the amount of \$610,000. This was a 20.8% increase from the previous valuation in 2006 which I believe was \$505,000. I submitted an objection in April 2010 and extrapolated a realistic value of my property as \$520,000, based on a number of different things some of which were as follows;

The graphs printed on the official Newsletter from the NSW Valuer General January 2010 showed a dead flat rate of increases in all areas and the average price for Sydney and Newcastle was between \$200,000 and \$380,000 even though the house values fell from mid 2007. The exception to these figures was Sydney East, which takes in Rose Bay, Woollahra etc.

Then, looking at the General Valuation Sales Report which was sent to us by the Land and Property Information Division (of course no form number) was printed out on the 3<sup>rd</sup> March and states in paragraph one; 'this report lists the property sales for you location that were considered when determining land values in your area...!!!'

On this list was the house directly opposite our block, [REDACTED] and it had an adjusted Land Value of \$500,000. (They valued the house at \$120,000 out of the sale price of \$620,000) Where can you buy a three bedroom house, rumpus room, double carport on the high side of the road with extensive bushland views and views of the city skyline for this sort of price? This block was part of the same subdivision and was valued by the Lands Department as being of greater worth than our block because of the view, even though it was slightly smaller. We however, have a 8 foot wide drainage easement 150 foot long ( 108 M<sup>2</sup>) which we could not build over. So our area is really only 771 M<sup>2</sup> compared to No12's area 809M<sup>2</sup>

Now we come to the appeal findings.

An inspection was carried out by [REDACTED] on the 27<sup>th</sup> May 2010 and the valuers name is [REDACTED] and his registration number is [REDACTED]. Their report is dated 28<sup>th</sup>. NOTE the valuer is hired by the Land Valuation Department and is paid by them. This surely would always be considered to be a conflict of interest if [REDACTED] want any future work passed their way.

This report includes a number (3) photographs of my land and focuses (1) on the front yard with wide stencilled concrete driveway, manicured lawns and edges, trees etc and then (2) photographs of my pool area with extensive luxury paving, lights, shrubs and gardens, black aluminium fencing etc.

Imagine my surprise when their report (see page 8) only focussed on the luxury improvements I installed myself, including carting around by barrow many, many loads of soil, laying good quality turf again all manicured. I thought that the land value was unimproved capital value, and should not include improvements carried out over many many years. (i.e Freehold value of the land excluding any structural improvements – see Page 5 second last paragraph.)

Next part of the report dealt with the house directly opposite which had sold for \$620,000 and the land was said to be valued at \$500,000. On page 8 of [REDACTED] report at the top of the page they discuss the house as follows; 'Single storey elevated brick and tile dwelling c1950's with front patio...heavily filtered (tree) water glimpses and bush outlook from the dwelling which at the time of sale was in 'need of repair'. No mention of the views to the city.

Again imagine my surprise. The building was actually built in 1967 (or maybe even 1968.) The land was not gazetted until 1966. AND no mention was made of the outstanding view across to the city. AND I was penalised for maintaining my house in good condition. Very, very sloppy research. When I rang to proceed further I was told that I would have to pay to go to court and when I did the sums, it was going to cost more to continue than I could possibly save.

Finally I did a little bit of maths homework this week to include our 2012 Land Valuation of \$640,000, which has just arrived in the mail.

If you take the original land value of \$4,400 in 1966, you would need to accrue interest at just over 11% each and every year for the 47 years to reach the new \$640,000. I really wish I could get this rate of return on my allocated pensions and investments.

Thank you for taking the time to read this. I sincerely hope you can find a way for The Land Valuation System to gain some sort of creditability because from the above you can see that they have a long was to go

Col Coupland

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]



Unimproved block in March 1967