

Long-term Plan 2024–34



Respondent No. 194

Response ID 5666640

Date of contribution Apr 23 24 11:59:29 am

Personal information

First name Anonymous

Last name Anonymous

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: I do not want my name published with my feedback

Submission

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

Option 2: Older persons' housing is delivered by an existing Community Housing Provider with less influence from Council

New climate action rate
Which option should we choose? (select one option)

Option 2: Make no change to how we allocate funding our climate change activities

Would you like to expand on your answer for option 2?

This is a bad idea for the following reasons.

1. It incentivises climate actions that require spending when other actions may have greater benefit, eg changes to the building code, reducing the fleet of vehicles, discouraging use of the airport.
2. In the long run it may lead to higher rates. It is likely that candidates for election may campaign on a promise to increase the climate rate.
3. Targeted rates may be useful for specific projects, but they need to be time limited. They are removed when the project is completed.

4. Currently rates are made up of components for specific purposes. This is confusing to ratepayers like myself who simply don't care. I expect council to carry out its core functions including climate action and set an overall rate to finance these.

5. The proposal to base the climate rate on capital value will mean that new houses will be unfairly rated. Newer houses are likely to have a higher capital value, but are also likely to be more environmentally friendly with double glazing, better insulation, water tanks and the like. Charging more environmentally friendly house owners more is unfair and not sensible.