

Long-term Plan 2024–34



Respondent No. 55

Response ID 5625729

Date of contribution Apr 09 24 10:13:35 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 Waikanae

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 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?

Why are rates paying for three waters shortfall of \$4.7 million? Isn't that what we pay separate water rates for? If not, what do we pay separate water rates for? If you increase the rates to cover the debt (\$4.7 million shortfall), doesn't it follow that the rates go down by that 5% the following year, because the debt will have been paid.

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

Option 1: Apply average rates increases of 8% per year from 2025/26 to 2033/34

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

Option 2 isn't reducing debt, \$221M to \$271M over 10 years is not a reduction. Option 1 is the only one that actually reduces the debt. How is an existing debt of \$221 million, 'reduced' to \$271 million after 10

years of paying back? Why do we keep borrowing money anyway, what capital works is this paying for? Stop spending money on unnecessary projects – Waikanae bridge cycle lane, the upgrade to the Waikanae Art Gallery, speed bumps that are actually too wide to be a bump in the middle of roads, meet your neighbour funded BBQ's. If we can't afford something then we shouldn't do it, too many 'vanity' projects are being introduced.

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?

If you sell off the elderly housing, why isn't the impact on rates a reduction rather than maintaining an increase of 7%. There isn't an annual 7% increase in salaries, or benefits so how are people expected to pay this?

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

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

Rates have already increased based on RV, so doesn't that mean they have already gone up more than the advertised 17%. Also, why are rates based on capital value of property - we use the same facilities irrespective of market value of a house, so it shouldn't matter. The street I live on doesn't have a footpath, the drains don't work, yet RV for the house, that I maintain and improve has increased, hardly seems fair.

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

Major Infrastructure Projects – page 23. Why is Waikanae River recharge bore in there twice with 2 different figures?