

# Long-term Plan 2024–34



Respondent No. 255

Response ID 5674535

Date of contribution Apr 27 24 10:35:45 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? Yes

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

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

Where is the option to choose the LOWER rates increase of 12%? Ratepayers cannot afford a HUGE increase in year one. The cost needs to be levelled out over the years. Blaming the \$4.7 million deficit on 3 waters is crazy. You spent money you didn't have, in the hope that Labour would win the election, and 3 waters would proceed. You lost that gamble, so you had to borrow the money, and now you want ratepayers to pay for it.

**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 huge 221m debit run up by previous councils is a disgrace. You run up debt then expect ratepayers to

repay it.

**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

**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:**

Not enough to cap staffing, You need to follow the Govt's lead and reduce staffing costs by up to 6.5%-  
reduce hours of service, avoid CONSULTANCIES etc.

Reduce amounts of grants handed out to community groups.

Cut back on all non-essential capital expenditure (for a 5 year period) T No additional increase to rates!

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

Increase revenue by increasing specific charges.

USER PAYS rather than blanket provision via rates. It won't be popular but at least then people aren't  
charged for services they neither want nor use.

Increase fines HUGEKY for infringements (late payments, dogs, noise, parking etc)- this might also help  
better compliance.

YES to alcohol Licensing Fees Bylaw that will enable you to set your own fees to reduce the expense on  
ratepayers to around 10 percent.

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

1.17% increase is an average., I find my rates would increase by 27.5%!! This is unfair, and unmanageable  
for superannuitants on fixed incomes who got 4% increase this year.

You carefully avoid giving us the option of the lower limit increase of 12%. This is what I want to vote for  
but it is not given on your form (on purpose I suspect!)

2. ESSENTIALS ONLY for now. NO MORE VANITY PROJECTS and ABANDON ANY REMAINING ONES..

E.g Forget the ridiculous proposal to create 7 Maori names for 7 sections of OLD SH1 which most people  
don't need or understand.

Why are new KORA/SCHOOL signs being erected? These were supposed to be erected ONLY IF AND  
WHEN the old ones were no longer serviceable. Typical indulgent spending by a council more obsessed  
with Maori language than concerned for its ratepayers.

Why did Council recently buy the property opposite the station, when it's not designated for any particular  
immediate and essential use? It may be used for future arts and cultural purposes. What does that mean?

This is another example of waste and nice to haves. How much did this purchase cost? What is the  
interest rate on borrowing? What is the impact on rates? Why did Council buy it when a developer could  
have built high intensity residential, commercial, retail, in line with development close to the town centre  
and transport hub?

These are just examples and I'm sure there are many more. REVIISIT your LTP and act responsibly