

Long-term Plan 2024–34



Respondent No. 95

Response ID 5650999

Date of contribution Apr 14 24 04:21:15 pm

Personal information

First name John

Last name Mitchell

I'm providing a submission (choose one):
 as an individual

Please let us know what ward you live in
 Raumati

Do you want to speak to Council about your submission at our public hearings on 2 May?
 No

Are you happy for your name to be published with your feedback:
 My name can be published with my feedback

Submission

Proposal 1: Three waters funding
Which option should we choose? (select one option)

Option 1: Fund \$4.7 million shortfall with an additional 5% rates increase in Year 1.

Would you like to expand on your answer for option 1?

If the shortfall would have been included in the LTP without the previous Governments 3 Waters changes then it needs to be included now. However the entire planned spending needs to be revisited because a rates increase of 17% is not affordable for most ratepayers at any time let alone the current economic environment.

Proposal 2: Proactively reduce Council's debt
Which option should we choose? (select one option)

Option 3: Apply average rates increases of 6% per year from 2025/26 to 2033/34

Would you like to expand on your answer for option 3?

Debt related to capital expenditure should only be repaid from the annual depreciation cash surplus available. Unfunded depreciation should be caught up over the remaining life of the relevant assets. Any

debt taken on to cover revenue shortfalls in prior years should be progressively repaid from surpluses over a number of years. The growth in the rating base from residential and commercial property growth should allow this.

**Proposal 3: Transfer Council's housing for older people
Which option should we choose? (select one option)**

Option 1: Transfer our older persons' housing assets to a new Community Housing Provider

Would you like to expand on your answer for option 1?

Rates should not be used to fund social housing at a token or comprehensive level.

New climate action rate

Which option should we choose? (select one option)

Option 1: Introduce a new targeted climate action rate based on a property's capital value rather than the current land-value based general rate

Would you like to expand on your answer for option 1?

I am not sure fairness is impacted either way. Transparency would be better with the change.

If you have any views on these policies, please comment here:

It would help to have a summary of the changes as there is too much detail to reasonably consider.

If you have any views on these other items, please comment here:

The fees and charges regime has gone beyond the point that would allow a reasoned response. It would require an unbiased professional to determine if they delivered any value and I am guessing that is not the point.

Is there anything else you'd like to tell us about this LTP?

While it may be a useful Council planning process and ticks off the legislative responsibilities it is of limited value for ratepayers. Neither individual nor community group submissions are likely to change the plan in any significant way.