



The City of Cape Town July 2006 General Valuation

An audit of & comments on the City of Cape Town's valuation process
in terms of the Municipal Property Rates Act 6 of 2004

Annexure "B"

MINUTES of a meeting of the Far South Peninsula Community Forum
with councillor Ian Neilson and his subsequent written reply, with the
GCTCA's comments thereon.

A. MINUTES OF MEETING of Tuesday 2nd October 2007
in the Fish Hoek Civic Centre council boardroom at 18h00

Present: Cllrs Ian Neilson, Nicki Holderness, Felicity Purchase, Demetri Qually and Simon Liell-Cock (chairperson), Lesley Shackleton, Allen Rose-Innes, Neil Grant, Graham Noble, Doug Tunbridge, Kevin McCarthy, Rory Sales, Steve Perrett and Pat Schultz

Apologies: Kommetjie Ratepayers Association

Welcome and Introduction:

Simon welcomed Cllr Neilson and all present. FSPCF member associations are concerned about the serious problems caused by inaccurate valuations and want to help find a satisfactory way forward. Representatives present were all members of rate payers and other civic organisations in the Far South Peninsula who are members of the FSPCF, which deals with common Far South issues.

All FSPCF associations acknowledge the necessity to cross-subsidise poorer areas in the city. This meeting is not to discuss the problems themselves but to identify steps that can be taken to solve them. However, a summary of problems had been prepared by Lesley and Allen as background to this discussion, and a copy had been e-mailed to Cllr Neilson with the request that he respond later in writing to the points raised.

Cllr Neilson's Address:

The Cllr said he would like to begin with some general background:

Council faced a new set of circumstances with the latest valuation process. These were

- 1) This was a new general valuation
- 2) The implementation of the Municipal Property Rates Act and
- 3) Change to VAT legislation.

The Municipal Property Rates Act 6 of 2004 stipulates that a date for valuations must be determined and implemented within 12 months. In theory this was 2nd July 2006, to be implemented by 2nd July 2007. Effectively, though, due to the draft budget, this period was shortened to 7 months, i.e. end of January 2007. There are 735.000 properties in the City

and a limited number of professional valuers. With these constraints it was not feasible to value properties individually. Therefore a computer-assisted mass appraisal for residential properties was carried out. (Commercial properties were valued according to income). A further complication was Sectional Title properties which added around 200.000 properties to the data base and billing system which was not previously the case when units were not valued separately. There was a major problem getting addresses of owners, for example. Also, an error in the computer coding for Sectional Titles was picked up, although this has now been rectified.

Valuers began by studying maps of the City and tried to find homogenous areas, which they grouped into 12 different zones. These zones were a combination of geographical and price classifications. Judgement errors can and did occur. A separate computer model of each of these 12 areas was drafted: a multilinear regression model using 29 different parameters. The data base began with the 2000 valuation. 50% of properties have been revisited over the last three years.

The parameters are: erf size, size of the ground floor, size of garage, number of bathrooms, etc. Some subjective parameters were also used, e.g. view.

Sales data from the Deeds Office for 40.000 properties across the City were accessed – brought back to the valuation date. The objective was to “fit the model” to the data in each zone. Valuers looked at the “outliers”. It was believed that the extreme variability found was due to inconsistencies in the sales data, and to the volatile property market, i.e. sales values. Cllr Nielsen said that tests done by the International Association of the Assessment of Properties (IAAP) show that we are within the boundaries set by them.

Council acknowledges that accuracy depends on the correct data. There will be errors and these are being addressed. The Act provides a mechanism to deal with errors:

OBJECTIONS AND APPEAL. A valuer follows up objections by visiting the property to re-assess it. If owners are still unhappy after the revised valuation, they may appeal to the Province Appeals Board (this has not been set up yet – but this is up to Province and is in the Minister’s hands).

If the valuation is changed by a margin of more than 10%, the Valuations Board must approve it. However, the new rate will be implemented immediately. 37.000 objections (about 5% of properties) have been received. This is within international norms. Approximately 30% of objections have been attended to and hopefully the balance should be completed by the end of the year. Some letters have been sent out. Valuers had to prioritise, attending to objections received first and those which have increased by more than 20% - which is about 25% of all objections received.

Questions and Discussion:

Simon stressed that we are asking for equity. Those who have been undervalued will obviously not complain. If every valuation is correct, and more people were paying, everyone would pay less. What happens to people who have been missed?

Cllr Neilson agreed. The Rates Act allows for objections on ANY property, even informal objections. The supplementary valuations have started.

The issue of transparency was discussed. The previous valuation was taken off the website. Cllr Neilson said this was for confidentiality reasons, but properties could still be accessed on erf number or street address. There is now a fee for late objections but this is waived if the objection is successful.

Lesley thought the City should not penalise objectors and rather encourage people to come forward. Cllr Neilson said that they were hoping to have more than one supplementary valuation a year.

The question was asked: “How does the City plan to reach the undervalued property owners?” Response: the City did compare with the previous roll to find undervalued properties. Prior to 2000 valuations were more haphazard and there were 24 different valuation rolls. The Act requires valuations at least every four years. Cllr Nielsen said that the new approach is more professional and the City is building internal capacity and will be training and employing permanent data collectors. The collection of data is to be improved with better connections between Planning and Building Control, for example.

Cllr Neilson was asked if he could let us have access to the 29 parameters and he agreed. Cllr Holderness asked who determined these parameters? The reply was that the City could use any parameters they chose to use. IAAP suggested we modify our parameters in the future.

Allen was still concerned about the inconsistencies - the variations in one street, for instance. He was also worried about the length of time the City was taking to respond to objections.

Ratepayers needed to understand and to perceive some fairness. Better communication was important. Cllr Neilson said the City was communicating through the press and welcomed suggestions. People who were waiting for the outcome of their objections and were experiencing difficulty in paying the new rates must approach their municipal office and pay as much as they can in the meantime. Over-payment will be refunded, with interest.

Graham expressed concern that we had not reached agreement on the way forward. There was widespread belief that the valuations had not been competently carried out, that the models did not work, and that there were far too many errors. Assessments carried out in several different areas indicated clearly that in all of these areas at least 25% of properties had been significantly over-valued. These owners were subsidizing the approximately 50% who had been significantly under-valued. This was patently unfair. The fact that only 20% of over-valued owners had submitted objections was more an indictment of the objection process than a sign of success of the valuation process. It indicated that process had not been conducted with enough transparency. We are prepared to put in our input and expect more from the City, although we do appreciate the difficulties. The same problems apply throughout the City and are not isolated to the Atlantic seaboard. Kevin said there have been corrections in Noordhoek.

Cllr Neilson said the only way we can test the system is via sales data to see how close the model is. He did not think the valuation was a bad one. Cllr Qually confirmed that the appeal process is the only way forward. The levy on late objections is to be clarified and deferred for a little longer. Steve said he did not recall a similar feeling of unfairness in previous valuations. Why hasn't the City looked at the significantly lower and higher cases? Rory said he assumed the process will be refined, particularly if valuations are carried out more frequently.

Cllr Holderness asked whether the parameters used now are the same as those used in the last valuation? There used to be one for the age of the property which has now fallen away. Is there a review of parameters? Who does these and on what basis are they determined? Cllr Neilson says recommendations by the IAAP are used and these will be reviewed for the next valuation. The valuers make the decision. Allen thought that introducing parameters to the market value factor confused the issue. Another point raised was that people on fixed incomes, e.g. the elderly, were now not able to afford their rates.

Cllr Neilson confirmed that there are rebates in place for senior citizens, the handicapped and the indigent (the minimum income is R5.000 per household). The Act, for rating purposes, looks at : Type of property (i.e. approved usage or zoning and actual usage) and Type of owner. For residential property only ONE rate may be used, i.e. 1c in the Rand.

Capping cannot be considered because this would change the cent in the Rand rate. The first R88.000 of a property's value is rebated. (An exception is life rights, e.g. retirement villages – but this is being looked at).

Blocks of flats that are not sectional title are charged commercial rates, when they should be charged residential. There is a 90% rebate for agricultural properties and rural residential may apply for residential rates.

Properties in Noordhoek will be charged commercial/agricultural rates but must apply annually for residential rates. New rebates for the elderly will only be considered in the next financial year. There is a 100% rebate for properties with heritage status. The system is mixed: properties under R88.000 will pay no rates, and R30 for services like refuse and another category where the property may be worth more, e.g. R150.000, but the income is, say R1.750 p.m. in which case the owner may register as an indigent ratepayer.

Graham suggested the City appoint a select group jointly with ratepayer associations, provide them with the data for all properties in the City plus the previous and current valuation rolls, and ask them to submit objections for all properties significantly over- or under-valued. All upper and lower outliers and including "finger error" inconsistencies must be revalued and the models revalued with these properties included. Those present would be prepared to be part of this group.

Cllr Neilson replied that Section 44 of the Act stipulates that data may not be disclosed to any unqualified person. The City would have to appoint the members of this group for this task.

Discussion followed on the slow response to objections and the fact that the City is only 1/3rd of the way through these. People should be advised every 2 months or so that the process is ongoing, that they will be attended to.

Previously one could check data to see how a property was rated. Cllr Neilson said Council could provide this information, if approached.

In conclusion, Cllr Neilson agreed to the following:

1. Obtain confirmation that the closing date for objections would be deferred indefinitely.

2. Provide advice to objectors equivalent to that provided by the information offices held open during March.
3. Approach Council regarding the waiving/deferment of fees for late objections.
4. Provide the 29 parameters and the criteria used to apply values within each.
5. Provide a copy of the full audit.
6. Investigate changing the criteria for awarding rates rebates, to allow more people to qualify.
7. Investigate having old-age homes and retirement villages pay rates on the residential rather than commercial scales.
8. Investigate having let flats pay rates on the residential rather than commercial scales.
9. Investigate allowing heritage residential properties a rebate.
10. Investigate adding the age of the building as a parameter in the valuation model.
11. Send out more informative and user-friendly public communications on property owners' rights and options with regard to objections.
12. Investigate having a full re-valuation done for each sold property considered during the modelling as an "outlier" and initially discarded for purpose of the modelling, and then running the models again with these properties included.
13. Discuss with valuers refining the accuracy of the modelling exercise with a view to the next valuation being more correct.
14. Investigate the possibility of the City appointing a small group of ratepayers' representatives to a Review Group to be given access to the data used in the valuation modelling, the Group to be asked to review all valuations and submit objections for all properties considered for any reason to have been valued wrongly or to have been valued too high or too low.
15. Accept suggestions in writing but he could not guarantee that these would be acted on – affordability is the constraint.
16. Study the summary drawn up by Lesley and Allen and respond in writing within two weeks from today.

The meeting closed, with thanks to Cllr Neilson for his time and input.

B. Councillor Ian Neilson's written reply to the foregoing meeting and the GCTCA's comments added thereto.

From: "Ian Neilson" Ian.Neilson@capetown.gov.za

Date: 07 November 2007 12:31:36 PM

To: "Simon Liell-Cock" fspcf@artefact.co.za

Subject: Response to the Far South Peninsula Community Forum

I respond to issues raised by the Far South Peninsula Community Forum concerning GV 2006 in their document "Statement of Concerns", using the same numbering as in that document.

1. Procedural Issues

1.1 Accuracy

(a) Please see the enclosed report drafted by the City Valuer in this regard. The audit report from IPTI is also attached (*See Annexure "A"*).

(b) The methodology used for Section Title Units differed from that used for Single Residential Units. An explanation of the "Apportionment" method is enclosed. This was the first time that the city valued ST units separately, as previously the entire scheme was valued as a whole.

Errors in computer coding as well as interpretation of information from the Deeds Office led to errors in a portion of the schemes. Once this problem was identified the City moved quickly to correct the problem and revalue the Sectional Title units. Errors of this nature are regrettable,

but were attended to openly. The cause of the problem did not occur in the valuation of other property types.

GCTCA: No comment

(c) If there is any significant under-valuation of any commercial properties, we would like for these to be identified, so that they can be investigated.

GCTCA: The undervaluation was identified by IPTI. How can an ordinary ratepayer help here? Should the City not identify these? Certainly the Owners are not going to necessarily co-operate here!

The City is currently reviewing all non-residential property values in GV2006. Part of this exercise is to compare GV2000 values and GV2006 values. Any significant under valuations will form the basis of the next supplementary valuation scheduled for January 2008.

GCTCA: This is unacceptable because it assumes that the GV 2000 figures were correct and also that no improvements were made between 2000 and 2006.

However, when it was found that the total value of commercial/industrial properties had sunk from 21% to 16% of the total city valuation, Council adjusted the residential rebate from 30% to 46% to ensure that the commercial/ industrial sector paid the same proportion of the total rates income.

GCTCA: On what basis is the ratio of residential rates to commercial & industrial rates established? That is, why 46% and not 60%, for example?

(d) Council's policy with regard to small holdings did not change. All small holdings pay commercial rates by default, and have to apply annually for the relevant rebate if they are farmed or used solely for residential purposes. With respect to the Noordhoek small holdings, some official in the previous South Peninsula Municipality irregularly changed the coding for these properties to residential some years back, so that they would not have to make the annual application for the rebate. This fact was unknown when the new valuation was implemented with the correct coding and it was assumed that Noordhoek small holding owners knew that they had to make such annual application. (This requirement for an annual application will be reconsidered when we revise the rates policy for the next financial year).

GCTCA: This seems to have put the onus to discover and complain about the problem on the Ratepayers and not the City. Why can the annual application not be abolished immediately to avoid the unnecessary confusion which resulted from this City admitted mistake ?

(e) Council's policy with regard to retirement villages did not change. They are specifically excluded from the definition of "residential property" for purposes of rates. However, if they are owned by an NPO or CBO they may apply for a 100% rates rebate. (This definition will also be revisited next year).

GCTCA: Can the Councillor explain this exclusion, please. Again this appears to be a CITY mistake / lack of proper definition which should be rectified immediately.

1.2 Transparency

(a) A list of the parameters used in the Single Residential CAMA models is as follows:

Discrete Variables

Quality
Condition
Traffic
View
Security
Topography
Building style
Number of storeys

Exterior wall type
 Roofing, common walls
 Neighbourhood adjustment

Continuous Variable

Number of bedrooms

Number of bathroom fixtures

Extents of: erf, main floor, upper floor, basement, attic, laundry, office/shop, room, servant's quarters, carport, garage, pergola, covered stoep, covered area, pool

(For calibration purposes the time period between the property sale and the valuation date was a further variable).

I do not agree that it is essential for owners to know this list if they intend to object.

GCTCA: The GCTCA cannot accept this dismissive statement as Cllr. Neilson appears to be unable to understand the argument being put forward by the GCTCA.

In preparation of an objection they will likely use a much shorter list of parameters which would be adequate for them to make their case. These are found on the objection forms.

GCTCA: The only comparative statistics which objectors could use were size of erf, size of house, sales price and sales date.

Except for size, most of these parameters may not have a significant effect in value determination.

GCTCA: If this is true then why has the CITY used the "list" at all?

(b) Only a few of the discrete parameters are subjective and we are looking at ways to ensure a more consistent approach to them in future valuations, such as for example ensuring that in any one area they are evaluated by the same person or redefining modelling neighbourhoods with similar property attributes.

GCTCA: Yet the subjective parameters are where the big mistakes are made. One fundamental question which Cllr Neilson will not answer is what "accuracy" is acceptable to the City. Is it a 5% COD or is it the less stringent average of 12.5% COD which the IAAO allow. The next question is whether the Valuer can achieve this goal. This question must be answered before the valuation starts. If for any reason the accuracy is in doubt then the City must say what alternative method it will use.

(c) It was impossible for Council to announce the rate-in-the-rand at the time that the valuation was released, as it had yet to complete drafting its budget and model the significant changes that were required in terms of the Municipal Property Rates Act that was being implemented for the first time. I do not agree that this disabled people from deciding whether to object to their valuation or not.

GCTCA: The GCTCA begs to strongly differ.

The only consideration for an objection is whether the valuation reflected the market value of the property on the valuation date, or not.

GCTCA: NOTE THIS ADMISSION WELL. A revaluation cannot be accurately or fairly achieved if the valuers and the objectors are reading off different criteria pages.

The impact on rates is irrelevant in this regard, even if this is the actual concern of owners.

GCTCA: (To someone whose rates payments have increased by over 200% it certainly is !)

It is regrettable that our highly qualified attempts to provide information on the average increase to the Total Municipal Account (not rates alone) of 15% led to a simplified interpretation

GCTCA: Please explain the "simplified interpretation" and please justify with arithmetical proof, the average 15% increase" announced by the Executive Mayor when this is not the case unless proved otherwise.

The qualifications which we made that a 15% TMA increase was relevant to properties of average value increase and average consumption patterns were lost in the process.

GCTCA: Please explain this – what qualifications ?

1.3 Process

(a) The SIGMA CAMA system was purchased in 2000. However the modelling approach and methodology was different at the time. There are shortcomings to the use of any CAMA system. However, with 735.000 properties to be valued, a legislatively short period in which to do the valuation and a severe shortage of valuers in South Africa makes it impractical to carry out the valuation without the use of a CAMA system.

GCTCA: No one disputes this but Ratepayers are adamant that rigorous accuracy standards are kept. Can the City guarantee that it will achieve the required accuracy and if not why not? It seems that the Johannesburg Council has succeeded in issuing its provisional first valuation roll (for more properties) by November 2007 for an April 2008 objection deadline date which is far more user-friendly than the City's original effort of issuing the same in February 2007 for March 2007. The argument of a "legislatively short period is simply not valid".

The shortcomings can be ameliorated by careful selection of the parameters used and the accurate grouping of similar economic areas into separate computer models. Twelve models were used in Cape Town for GV 2006 (as discussed in the attached report). The Sigma system is used in a number of international areas, such as the State of New York.

GCTCA: Ditto

(b) We note the deficiencies which were raised in the IPTI audit and will address them in future general valuations. These deficiencies are however not fatal to the overall suitability of the valuation result.

GCTCA: The GCTCA cannot accept this. The least stringent IPTI standard averages 12.5% but the City equivalent is 25%. Is this "suitable?"

2. Equity and hardship

The interpretation of "Equitable Treatment" is somewhat subjective. The whole rationale of property rates is based on the value of the property, not the income of the owner or their otherwise ability to pay.

GCTCA: This is a controversial and lazy reply. It summarises the whole weakness of this rating system and for the City to simply accept this without any protest is not considered by the GCTCA to be in any manner fair and equitable to ratepayers. All houses generate rents and must be able to pay rates out of these rents. It is inequitable if some houses pay out a higher

proportion of their rent as rates than others. [What would happen if Trevor Manuel's profits tax was set at a higher percent for some assets than others?] This is an issue over which the City has a firm Constitutional discretion as sec 151 to 153:-

Chapter 7

Local Government

Status of municipalities

151 (3) A municipality has the right to govern, on its own initiative, the local government affairs of its community, subject to national and provincial legislation, as provided for in the Constitution.

...(4) The national or a provincial government may not compromise or impede a municipality's ability or right to exercise its powers or perform its functions..

Objects of local government

152. (1) The objects of local government are:

...to promote social and economic development...;

2) A municipality must strive, within its financial and administrative capacity, to achieve the objects set out in subsection (1).

Developmental duties of municipalities

153. A municipality must -

structure and manage its administration, and budgeting and planning processes to give priority to the basic needs of the community, and to promote the social and economic development of the community; and participate in national and provincial development programmes.

GCTCA: Also, as the Solomon report shows there is no equity in 50% of the properties being undervalued properties and which have to be subsidised by others.

The owner's use of Council services is also not a basic consideration in this concept. Cape Town has removed as much as practically possible of the private services (electricity, water, sanitation, refuse removal) from being rates-funded, and charges them on a consumption basis. All the public services must be paid for from rates income.

GCTCA: These public services as well as those provided by the Province and the State are benefits which accrue equally to all ratepayers in like geographical areas and are reflected in the vacant land price.

We have sought to use the rebate system provided in the MPRA to provide relief to the more vulnerable members of our city, especially as we have recognised that a person's property value is only very roughly related to their income. This is most acute amongst pensioners who live on a declining income while their property values continue to increase. We have in the past two years increased the qualifying household income (for the rebates) from R2200 in 2005/6 to R3.000 in 2006/7 to R5.000 in R2007/8, ie more than doubling the amount in two years.

GCTCA: The GCTCA contends that this level of rebate is still far too low and a large percentage of the population are consequently left stranded in a cash flow problem situation.

It is my belief that we should continue to increase this amount further in future years. (Yes – dramatically!) We have to however take it in a stepwise fashion, as we do not have a priori data that tells us how many applications we will receive at what property values, in order for us to accurately predict the impact of income forgone.

(a) The calculation of the "deduction" for the R88 000 value reduction does not take account of the fact that if the R88 000 was increased to a higher number, the cents-in-the-rand would have to be increased to compensate for the lost income.

GCTCA: Can you illustrate this? This shortfall will be off set by the rates recoverable from the

rating of previously undervalued properties in supplementary valuations. The impact of this value reduction is variable relative to the property value. The higher the deduction is made, the more the rates burden to be pushed onto higher value properties.

3. Legal concerns

(a) We believe that our process in approval of the rates policy and bylaw is sound, and will defend any attempt to have it challenged in court.

GCTCA: Nevertheless there are those who think that the rates policy is inequitable.

We believe that those objecting to our process are confusing issues.

GCTCA: What is meant here? Please elaborate. Be aware that the bylaw was illegally passed before the deadline date for public comment had occurred and should not happen again, regardless of the recent Court decision in this matter).

b) The Valuation Appeal Board is appointed by the Province, not the city. We have done all in our power to assist the Province in this process, and it is now in their hands to implement. We do not agree with the contention that “commenced without delay” requires the board to be in place at the end of the objection period. An objection goes to the City Valuer, not the Board. The owner can appeal to the Board if he/she is unhappy with the City Valuer’s determination on the objection. Thus the Board only has to be in place once the Valuer has dealt with the objection.

GCTCA: It is now more than nine months since the extended closing date for objections. Why has the process taken so long and why is the Board not yet appointed. In the meantime, ratepayers are paying rates on the higher City’s valuations without being given an opportunity to have their objections heard by the Board. There must be no manner by means of which any Municipality can be able to influence or interfere with the timeous appointment of a Valuations Appeal Board.

4. The way forward

Council is currently beginning the process of review of the rates policy and draft rates structure and rebates for the next financial year. I will ensure that reconsideration is given to a range of issues that include the senior citizen rebate, the treatment of retirement complexes and villages, and the necessity for certain owners to re-apply annually for rebates.

GCTCA: What about the above issues and the contents of this whole GCTCA Audit? When can the issues therein be addressed?

The impact of any changes will be assessed for their affordability to both owners and the city. I see nothing in the draft bill before parliament that would allow for a capping of rates increases on the implementation of a General Valuation.

GCTCA: The GCTCA is applying to the Minister to announce a cap on rates annual increases at a percentage still to be decided.

However, as the GV 2006 will still be used for at least the next two years, significant shifts in rates incidence will not reoccur during this period and rates increases will be the same across all properties in the same category.

I am happy to be transparent and provide information around the CAMA process. It is however a complex subject and is difficult to disseminate meaningfully to a wide audience.

GCTCA: The GCTCA has requested a workshop for many months and awaits a response from the City.

The opportunity to object to valuations is never completely closed off, and the city has been open to ongoing reviews where real problems are identified. We have recently completed the first Supplementary Valuation on the GV 2006 and will be carrying out more SVs every year. This provides opportunities for review, including, but not limited to, areas and individual properties where it is evident that there are significant under-valuations.

GCTCA: But the under valuations are endemic; you cannot say ratepayers must sniff them all out. It is up to the City to correct every one on its own initiative and not simply to react to the incorrect ones highlighted in a continuing dribble of objections. What have the results of the Bo Kaap and Llandudno revaluations of the revaluations shown ?

I thank the Ratepayers Associations of the Far South for their positive and open interaction on this matter, and we are more than willing to continue such interaction.

(GCTCA note: The RAFS group are members of the GCTCA and will be conducting their future dealings in respect of rates through the GCTCA). It looks forward to the City's written answers to this document and subsequent meetings to discuss this whole rates issue.)

Regards

Ian Neilson

Mayoral Committee member for Finance
City of Cape Town
Cell 083 306 6730
(+27 21 400 1306
7 +27 21 400 336

ian.neilson@capetown.gov.za

PLEASE REFER TO THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING ABOVE AND REPORT ON ANY ITEMS NOT COVERED BY YOUR LETTER.

Philip Bam
Greater Cape Town Civic Alliance



The City of Cape Town July 2006 General Valuation

An audit of & comments on the City of Cape Town's valuation process
in terms of the Municipal Property Rates Act 6 of 2004

Annexure "D"

The GCTCA's origin, background, mission statement and list of
current members

1. Background

The GCTCA was started in 2005 to co-ordinate the ratepayer's response to Draft 2 of the City's Integrated Zoning Scheme (IZS). It was revived in May 2007 to prepare for Draft 3 and has begun to be involved in the City's Integrated Development Programme, other planning projects and, as this document shows, the problem of valuations and rates, as well as crime, housing and public participation, amongst other issues of common interest.

2. Mission Statement

The GCTCA is a network of Ratepayers' and Civic Associations representing diverse communities all over Cape Town. Its overall purpose is to strengthen the efforts of those member associations in order to improve the lives of people in their different areas. It distributes useful information and shares available knowledge, experience and expertise. Where issues arise that are too big for the individual Associations, it is able to join forces for the benefit of all ratepayers. The GCTCA is registered with the City.

3. Executive Committee

Chairperson: Philip Bam (Lotus River Ottery Grassy Park Residents' Association)
Tel 021 705 3753 / 083 658 3885 Email: philip@lofob.org.za

Vice Chairperson and Communications Officer: Graham Noble (Scarborough Ratepayers' & Residents' Association) Tel 021 780 1949 / 082 852 2030 Email: noblescarbs@gmail.com

Secretary: Fozea Fryddie (Newfields Ratepayers' Association)
Tel 021 6919550 / 082 895 5911 Email: fryzea@telkomsa.net

Treasurer: John Gray (De Waterkant Civic Association)
Tel 021 419 2329 / 082 490 4641 Email: gjohn@yebo.co.za

Selick Dawood (Athlone Crawford Civic Association)
Tel 021 696 6103 / 078 102 3450 Email: dawoods@rghs.wcape.schools.za

Joan Heming (Constantia Property Owners' Association)
Tel 021 794 5903 / 083 300-1574 Email: joan.hemming@telkomsa.net

Ismael Jefferies (Ottery Ratepayers' Association)
Tel 021 703 4635 / 083 324 1374 Email: Ismail.Jefferies@eskom.co.za

Donald Jethro (Retreat/Steenberg Civic Association)
Tel 021 701 1553 / 084 738 3807 Email: jethrod@absamail.co.za

Patrick Labrosse (City Bowl Ratepayers' & Residents' Association)
Tel 021 461 9098 / 082 574 0817 Email: paperkey@telkomsa.net

Yaseen Meyer (Pelican Park Ratepayers' & Residents' Association)
Tel 073 150 6417 Fax 021 396 1135

Roy Nagan (Atlantis Residents' Association)
Tel 021 572 2725 / 073 990 0892 Email: roynagan@telkomsa.net

Harold Oliver (Helderberg Residents' Association)
Tel 021 851 4310 / 082 375 5036 Email: haro@icon.co.za

John Powell (Camps Bay Ratepayers' & Residents' Association)
Tel 021 851 4310 / 082 556 3086 Email: poweltalk@icon.co.za

Rob Rainers (Zeekoevlei Civic Association)
Tel 072 890 4297 Fax 021 705 2993

Lester September (Lansdowne Civic Association)
Tel 021 761 5964 / 082 519 5888 Email: laca@webmail.co.za

Len Swimmer (Residents' Association of Hout Bay)
Tel 021 790 0268 / 082 452 1799 Email: swimmer@telkomsa.net

Azeem Whalele (Walmer Estate Civic Association)
Tel 021 799 6223 / 084 798 8116 Email: paed@corpdial.co.za

CeeJay Williams (Westridge Residents' Association)
Tel 021 374 4485 / 083 726 0377 Fax 021-374 4485

3. Associations with full membership (January 2008)

Athlone Crawford Civic Association
Atlantis Inwonersvereniging
Barbarossa Residents' Group
Belvedere / Greater Lynfrae Ratepayers and Tenants Association Bergvliet / Meadowridge Residents' Association
Bishopscourt Residents' Association
Bishopscourt Village Residents' Association
Bloubergstrand Residents' Association
Brackenfell Ratepayers Association
Brooklyn, Rugby & Ysterplaat Residents Association
Cafda Residents Association
Camps Bay Ratepayers & Residents Association
City Bowl Ratepayers & Residents Association
Constantia Hills Residents Association
Constantia Property Owners Association
D'urbanvale Residents Forum
De Waterkant - Bo Kaap Civic Alliance
De Waterkant Residents Association
Durbanville Community Forum
Edgemead Residents' Association
Elsiesrivier Gemeenskapsforum
Fairways Residents' Civic Association
Far South Peninsula Community Forum
Ferness Estate Residents Association
Fernwood Residents Association
Fish Hoek Valley Ratepayers & Residents Association
Friends of the Liesbeek
Friends of the Simon's Town Coastline
Friends of the Tygerberg Hills
Glencairn Action Group
Gordon's Bay Ratepayers Association
Green Point Residents & Ratepayers Association
Hanover Park Civic Association
Harfield Village Association
Helderberg Residents' Action Association
Hout Bay & Llandudno Heritage Trust
Imhoff's Gift Homeowners Association
Kalk Bay / St James Residents & Ratepayers Association
Kenridge The Hills Ratepayers Association
Kommetjie Environmental Awareness Group
Kommetjie Ratepayers & Residents Association
Kuilsvier Residents Association
Labiance Residents Forum
Langevlei Civic & Ratepayers Association
Llandudno Civic Association
Lotus River Ottery Grassy Park Residents Association
Matroosfontein Civic Association
Melkbosstrand Residents Association
Milkwood Place Residents Association
Milnerton Ridge Residents Association
Misty Cliffs Village Association

Monte Vista Ratepayers' Association
 Mouille Point Residents & Ratepayers' Association
 Muizenberg Historical Conservation Society
 Muizenberg/Lakeside Residents' Association
 Newfields Ratepayers Association
 Noordhoek Environment Action Group
 Ottery Ratepayers Association
 Pelican Park Ratepayers & Residents Association
 Pinelands Ratepayers & Residents Association
 Princess Vlei Civic Association
 Residents' Association of Hout Bay
 Retreat/Steenberg Civic Association
 Rondebosch Rosebank Residents and Business Association
 Rosebank & Mowbray Civic Association
 Rosendal Owners Association
 Ruyterwacht Action Group
 Sasmeer & Ardleigh Park Ratepayers' Association
 Scarborough Ratepayers & Residents Association
 Sea Point Fresnaye Bantry Bay Residents & Ratepayers Association
 Sectional Title Association (Strand)
 Sectional Title Association of Somerset West
 Simon's Town Civic Association
 Sir Lowry's Pass Mission Grounds Ratepayers Association
 Stellenberg Ratepayers Association
 Sybrand Park Civic Association
 Table View Ratepayers Association Tokai Residents' Association Upper Trovato Residents Association
 Zeekoevlei Civic Association

Membership being finalised

Belgravia Civic Association
 Belhar Civic Association
 Belthorn & Crawford Civic
 Bo-Kaap Civic Association
 Bothasig Residents Association
 Durbanville Environmental Forum
 Durbanville Heritage Society
 Friends of Rondebosch Common
 Gabriel Road Residents & Traders Association
 Gleemore Civic Association
 Kenilworth Ratepayers Association
 Lansdowne Civic Association
 Maitland Garden Village Residents Association
 Masiphumelele Development Forum
 (Masiphumelele) Ubuhlanti Cultural Centre
 Newlands Residents Association
 Noordhoek Conservancy
 Observatory Civic Association
 Ocean View Civic Association
 Ocean View Neighbourhood Development Forum
 Pelican Heights Civic Association
 Plumstead Civic Ratepayers Association
 Red Hill Development Forum
 Retreat Ratepayers & Residents Association
 Seaview Ratepayers Association
 Smitswinkel Bay Residents Association & Water Syndicate
 Southfork Ratepayers Association
 Summer Greens Residents Association
 Sunnydale Ratepayers Association
 Sunset Beach Homeowners Association
 Tygerberg Hills Residents Association
 Uitsig Community Development Forum
 Upper Woodstock Residents Association
 Valhalla Park Civic Association - United Front
 Walmer Estate Civic Association
 Westlake Development Forum
 Westridge Residents Association
 Wynberg Civic Association
 (Zeekoevlei) Friends of the Vleis Group



The City of Cape Town July 2006 General Valuation

An audit of & comments on the City of Cape Town's valuation process
in terms of the Municipal Property Rates Act 6 of 2004

Annexure "C"

Graphic illustration
of the ratio of actual sales prices to the City's revaluations
for all properties in the Unicity during July 2006.

Full details of every property valuation / sale and location
from which this graph has been derived is available on request