

Long-term Plan 2024–34



Respondent No. 96

Response ID 5651298

Date of contribution Apr 14 24 07:57:02 pm

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 Paraparaumu

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 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 the Kapiti community cannot afford a 17% rates increase, this will cripple most families. KCDC need to look at reducing personell levels, reducing spending, especially on consultants and contractors. Using a figure to set rates at 7% of household income is flawed. People are already paying huge amounts of their household income on mortgages and cost of living expenses, so the rates should be decreasing below 5% of household income, not going higher.

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?

Council debt needs to reduce, but not at ratepayers expense. Councils have let this situation get out of

hand far too easily, and now the ratepayers have to bail them out. Council need to find other ways of reducing debt by reducing staff levels and other frivolous spending and operating costs.

**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?

Maybe some of the existing housing needs to be sold to pay for the set up costs and other expenses.

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

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

Again, increases in spending should not be funded through rates increases, especially in the current climate. Families are struggling more than ever with the cost of living. Perhaps big projects need to be delayed or staged further apart to reduce spending costs. I believe council staff numbers can be reduced and contractors should no longer be used. Our council is being fleeced by contractors charging exorbitant prices. We shouldn't be paying Wellington salaries for staff working out here on the coast. All government departments are reducing staffing levels and admin costs, maybe our council need to look at this as well.

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

The burden on ratepayers is already high. A 17% increase should not be an option, expenditure needs to be pared right back and debt needs to be reduced by reducing operating expenditure and personnel levels. There must be a better way to get through these difficult times without driving ratepayers and homeowners into poverty. You run the risk of having no ratepayers in the district because no-one will be able to afford to live here!!