

Long-term Plan 2024–34

Respondent No. 46

Response ID 5623771

Date of contribution Apr 08 24 01:05:04 pm



Personal information

First name Michael

Last name Warington

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: 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?

Water service to the community is the highest priority for a council. We must pay for good quality services. Debt should be used in proportions that reflect the estimated life of the asset. Properties with water tanks (or septic tank facilities) should be rewarded for their contributions to reducing pressure on the network.

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?

Manage debt to within a credible range that enables gradual repayment throughout the life of an asset (which then needs to be replaced). Contemplate the cost of debt, relative to inflation. When interest rates for debt were below inflation (2021) more use of debt would have been appropriate. With debt costs now

2-3% above inflation debt use should decline.

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?

Council should not be in the business of providing long term private accommodation. Assign a long term management contract to an organisation with community support at its core (such as Salvation Army) then sell the property portfolio to investors who will factor in the costs of such management to the net price they are willing to pay for the asset. Bring the capital back to the council's balance sheet for use in higher priority assets, one's that are essential to the community.

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?

I am tired of new priorities being labeled a 'crisis' or an 'emergency'. Council cannot change the climate. Council can budget for maintenance of damaged property and for policies/strategies to reflect expectations of probable future damage. This does not need to sit under a special label.

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

Stop working to an assumption that property owners (rate payers) have bottomless pockets and endless unused discretionary funds to pay the now unreasonable increases to council rates. Monitor the nominal cost of rates relative to the core community measures of average income and household income to understand the real stress that council places on those people. What facility will council offer rate payers once they reach the point that numbers unable to pay rises beyond the margins? This should be a flag that council is buying more services than its community can afford, need or want.

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

I am fan of user pays for contributing to the costs of many 'premium' assets and services. I don't mind the graduated scales that help those in the community with the least resources. I expect financial penalties for poor form by a person to exceed the cost of policing that poor form so there is an incentive to perform better. Alcohol licensing should be cost neutral; rate payers should NOT subsidise this business sector. Property development related fees etc should exceed the costs for providing the service - this is a profit pursuing sector. Once land is re-zoned for the more profitable use by developers council should introduce higher fees for them not starting with that development - bring financial benefits to the community if the developer doesn't deliver the property benefits.

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

There appear to be no service types that have been identified as no longer being required and thus can be removed from provision and budgeting. It is not credible that 100% of past council strategy for its community has been successful, or an efficient use of resources. This statement goes for central government too. Be strong enough to identify failed past ideas and remove them from the current list of council responsibilities.