

Long-term Plan 2024–34



Respondent No. 30

Response ID 5619285

Date of contribution Apr 05 24 10:47:31 am

Personal information

First name David

Last name Wyatt

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

Please let us know what ward you live in Waikanae

Do you want to speak to Council about your submission at our public hearings on 2 May? Yes

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 2: Fund \$4.7 million shortfall by taking on debt each year.

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

The majority of Rate Payers cannot afford an increase in Rates which is way above CPI and adding to the runaway inflation rate. Either find savings to cover this cost or amortize it over a 10 year period

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?

The majority of Ratepayers cannot afford an increase in Rates which is above CPI and adding to the runaway inflation rate. KCDC should be more prudent in spending Ratepayers money - as an example an under the table decision by KCDC in giving \$1.3million to Air Chathams without consultation or ratepayers approval how many other gifts of ratepayer's money has been misused is unknown. - This is a disgrace

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

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

Surely there must be some value in these ratepayers owned assets - Why are you proposing to transfer them at no cost? - Why is there no consideration to sell them? I'm sure Housing New Zealand would like them on their books!

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?

Option 1 is based on a property value - isn't that discrimination when and IF climate activities (which are just normal water activity) will impact all ratepayers.

All funds must be accounted, tracked and audited, preceded by robust cost analysis, benefit analysis, business case etc

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

Development contributions should cover all the costs, 3 waters, roading, lighting, landscaping that Council pays or the Developer is made 100% for these costs

Put an immediate STOP to using Ratepayers money to fund private businesses (example an under the table decision by KCDC in giving \$1.3million to Air Chathams without consultation or ratepayers approval how many other gifts of ratepayer's money has been misused is unknown) This is a disgrace.

COUNCIL are not SPENDING within Ratepayers means as any responsibly Family would do - Why has no proposal to review the bloated KCDC head count & engagement of Contractors - why are these costs not identified.

Stop further borrowing of funds

Increasing RATES to payback Debt (Borrowings) is ridiculous - This will never address the fundamental of living well beyond KCDC means.

Payment of Debt (borrowings) increase time limit to 2050 so that Ratepayers can see the impact on rate increases.

3 Waters costs has KCDC actually been engaging with Government to establish least interest loans backed by Government and for Councils to pay?

Capital Works - what are the priorities and what can be deferred to fit into Ratepayers affordability - where is KCDC issues/risk analysis to spreading these works over a longer period?

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

Agree User should pay all fees - not the Ratepayer

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

The majority of Ratepayers cannot afford increases beyond CPI. I see no options to lower the level of services for instance what analysis has been done for Libraries to be opened 5 days a week, surely 2 days would be sufficient, reduce the open hours of the swimming pools etc.

Commitment from KCDC that they will never again implement under the table decisions to use Ratepayers money to support private businesses - \$1.3million to Air Chathams without any consultation - This is a disgrace.