

Long-term Plan 2024–34



Respondent No. 180

Response ID 5664881

Date of contribution Apr 22 24 03:25:59 pm

Personal information

First name Beverley

Last name Roser

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?

This situation of ratepayers facing significant increased water rates whichever option is chosen has been created by the Coalition Government's shortsighted and highly political position over co-governance in the Three Waters. Both options are unpalatable but avoiding long-term debt through high borrowing has some merit. Many ratepayers who are already struggling under high cost increase will find this very hard indeed.

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

Option 2: Apply average rates increases of 7% per year from 2025/26 to 2033/34

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?

I am grateful to be paying rates to a council that acknowledges and embraces the need to be involved in providing housing for the elderly.

Option 1 is preferable to keep a greater level of council input. However, income related rent subsidies unfortunately has no commitment from the Coalition Government so would need to be taken into account. Similarly, getting support from Central government for Social Housing may well involve agreeing to funding accommodation in line with MHUD which in other Tier 1 areas (which unfortunately the Kapiti Coast falls into) has seen multi-storey buildings which are not necessarily complimentary to the character and living style of the Kapiti Coast.

https://www.labour.org.nz/news-release_social_housing_off_government_to_do_list

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 support the Council preference indicated for two reasons. 1. Because it focuses properly upon what many of us see as the number one issue facing the globe by establishing a dedicated fund. 2. Because there has been plenty of evidence that the elected councillors have paid attention to and been pro-active in this area (eg coastal sea-wall consultation and action) so there should be a dedicated fund for them to continue this work. They are obviously committed to the cause.

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

I am impressed by the scope of the Rates Remission draft and urge it to be adopted as is. Please keep up the engagement - Everything Kapiti is a great thing on the go already!

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

"We are proposing an Alcohol Licensing Fees Bylaw that will enable us to set our own fees to reduce the expense on ratepayers to around 10 percent. "

I see no justification for ratepayers bearing any expense at all to support the alcohol industry. If it has to be, let it be reduced lower still.