

Make Submission

Event Name	Long term plan 2018-38 consultation
Submission by	<input type="text"/>
Submission ID	18LTP-200
Response Date	21/04/18 7:24 PM
Consultation Point	Tell us what you think about our long term plan (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.2

First and last name	<input type="text"/> WITHHOLD DETAILS.
---------------------	--

Title

Address

Phone

Email

Are you providing feedback	as an individual
----------------------------	------------------

Hearings

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission? Yes

Privacy statement	Please withhold
-------------------	-----------------

Where we're heading (Page 8)

Considering our challenges and constraints, do you think we're focusing on the right 10-year outcomes?

Yes. We also support having increased spending on parks and reserves with fun and safe equipment. We like that climate change is expressly being planned for.

Our financial and infrastructure strategies (Pages 10-13)

The Council plans to pay down debt, reduce borrowings and target infrastructure spending for resilience and growth. What are your views on this approach?

Yes. We support more water tanks on residential properties to reduce council infrastructure

Key decision (Pages 14-17)

Should we change the way we share rates across the district?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option to change the rating system?

Yes - reduce the proportion of fixed-rate charges and introduce a commercially targeted rate (Council's preferred option)

Please tell us why:

We agree with targeting rates, as proposed.

Key decision (Pages 18-20)

What should we do next to address flood risks?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option of a revised 45-year programme?

No - keep the status quo programme

Please tell us why:

We should encourage developers to pay the associated costs of rebuilding in flood prone areas, rather than the ratepayers (or future home owners).

Work on the go (Pages 21-23)

Any comments on the matters below:

(Please tick the check box next to the relevant issue and a comment box will open below. You can comment on as many of these issues as you wish)

Coastal hazards and climate change

Excellent approach.

Housing

While this is a Central Govt role, we should do our part, including keeping elder flats so older people can stay in communities.

Replacing the Paekakariki seawall

We support soft options, rather than a wall.

Paraparaumu and Waikanae town centres

Great idea. Local community hubs are important.

Maclean Park

We should prioritize park spending, not just at Masclean park.

Kapiti Island gateway

Great plan.

Rates for 2018/19 (Pages 24-25)

If the draft long term plan is adopted with all our recommended proposals, a rates increase of 4.7% on average will apply across the district for 2018/19. Do you support this?

Yes

Comments on change to fees and charges:

We should lobby for more realistic Food Act charges - the community fairs should not pay such big fees, especially Te Horo.

Key policies (Pages 27-28)

If you have any views about the **proposed changes to our development contributions policy**, please tell us here:

None.

If you have any views about the **proposed changes to our revenue and financing policy**, please tell us here:

None.

If you have any views about the **proposed changes to our rates remission policy**, please tell us here:

None.

Anything else?

If you have any other feedback about this plan, or the work of the Council please comment here:

Children should be free to swim at swimming pools and we are happy to pay higher rates for it. It will help prevent drownings. Transmission Gully means more focus on growth, so it is a good idea to have sound infrastructure. Rural land must be maintained and protected.

Make Submission

Event Name	Long term plan 2018-38 consultation
Submission ID	18LTP-201
Response Date	21/04/18 7:27 PM
Consultation Point	Tell us what you think about our long term plan (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1
First and last name	Penelope Eames
Title	Ms
Address	13 Titoki Road, Waikanae Beach 5036
Phone	021 321 048
Email	pseeames@gmail.com
Are you providing feedback	as an individual
Hearings	
Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission?	Yes

Where we're heading (Page 8)

Considering our challenges and constraints, do you think we're focusing on the right 10-year outcomes?

No. See the comments throughout this submission. Also there is very little acknowledgement that Kapiti Coast is a creative region and the promotion and development of the Arts, Music and Craft sector needs innovation, money and support by the whole Council.

Our financial and infrastructure strategies (Pages 10-13)

The Council plans to pay down debt, reduce borrowings and target infrastructure spending for resilience and growth. What are your views on this approach?

Yes pay down debt, but not at the expense of basic well-being objectives. Your objectives to do extensive storm water can be staggered over a longer period of time, plus where houses have been built in crazy locations which were flood zones before the building should contribute to most of the storm water system for their area.

Key decision (Pages 14-17)

Should we change the way we share rates across the district?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option to change the rating system?

No - keep the status quo - leave the rating system as it is

Please tell us why:

For the Waikanae Beach area the number of high capital values (CV) have made the whole of Waikanae Beach area more expensive for rates. For the many elderly people in this area the rates increases, in some cases in excess of 21% increases is going to provide significant hardship. Because some houses are valuable that doesn't mean all are. This new system is unfair.

Key decision (Pages 18-20)

What should we do next to address flood risks?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option of a revised 45-year programme?

No - keep the status quo programme

Please tell us why:

Where flood risk is because people have built in flood zones then they should be paying for the expensive upgrades. Hugely expensive houses are still getting consent even when on sand dunes close to the sea. Climate change will hit these beach side houses and yet they are still getting permission from the Council.

Work on the go (Pages 21-23)

Any comments on the matters below:

(Please tick the check box next to the relevant issue and a comment box will open below. You can comment on as many of these issues as you wish)

Paraparaumu and Waikanae town centres

The way KCDC is not supporting Mahara Place is absolutely crazy. The tiny strip of artificial grass is not going to upgrade the town centre. Also if KCDC had done an internet search they would find that parallel parking is actually more dangerous than angle. Opening car doors kill cyclists. With cars backing from angle parking the cyclist is warned by the lights of the car who is backing. The business owners need angle parking and as we have seen in Countdown park and Waikanae Beach, angle parking is great.

Rates for 2018/19 (Pages 24-25)

If the draft long term plan is adopted with all our recommended proposals, a rates increase of 4.7% on average will apply across the district for 2018/19. Do you support this?

No

Comments:

I would support if it is true for everyone. Yes overall 4.7% for Waikanae Beach residents it is 21% . By using the new CV (Capital Value) houses who have increased valuation are being charged these greater amounts. In Auckland when there were huge increases in CV the rates increases were spread over several years. Why can't we do that here.

Comments on change to fees and charges:

The behaviour of inspectors at market is over kill. The markets are remarkable. I visit both Waikanae Market and Paraparaumu markets every Saturday. Busy and shouldn't be charged and they should be able to sell home made food and vegetables. The "grown in our garden for vegetable and fruit stalls" is crazy. Who can grow bananas, but the range must be available so we can buy a full range of fruit and vegetables. Keep the markets local and free. Also trust them.

Key policies (Pages 27-28)

If you have any views about the **proposed changes to our development contributions policy**, please tell us here:

We need develop and in the end these developments will help Kapiti Coast grow and then new houses will pay the extra rates. BUT charging for every single nut and bolt and inspecting dozens and dozens of times at the developers own cost is over kill. Encourage development and don't frustrate them.

If you have any views about the **proposed changes to our revenue and financing policy**, please tell us here:

I agree about maintaining current assets, but I also think we must balance that will well-being of our people with the growth of infrastructure. Borrowing is far too high, but paying it back should be spread over 20 years.

If you have any views about the **proposed changes to our rates remission policy**, please tell us here:

I have already addressed this. Where Capital Values have gone up hugely then the rates increases should be staggered over say 3 years. There is going to be a lot of hardship for single income families, beneficiaries and seniors on fixed incomes.

Anything else?

If you have any other feedback about this plan, or the work of the Council please comment here:

Waikanae Beach are paying a significant increase in rates and some of this extra money should be spent in Waikanae Beach. Waikanae Beach needs a Primary School, a functional community hall and escape routes is evacuation is ever needed. I am a party to another submission and it will be submitted separately.

Make Submission

Event Name	Long term plan 2018-38 consultation
Submission ID	18LTP-202
Response Date	21/04/18 9:03 PM
Consultation Point	Tell us what you think about our long term plan (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1
First and last name	<input type="text"/> WITHHOLD DETAILS
Title	<input type="text"/>
Address	<input type="text"/>
Phone	<input type="text"/>
Email	<input type="text"/>
Are you providing feedback	as an individual
Hearings	
Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission?	No

Privacy statement

Please withhold

Please note that all submissions (including names and contact details) will be made available at Council offices and public libraries. A summary of submissions including the name of the submitter may also be made publicly available and posted on the Kapiti Coast District Council website. Personal information will be used for administration relating to the subject matter of the submissions, including notifying submitters of subsequent steps and decisions. All information will be held by Kapiti Coast District Council, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information. If you do not want your personal information to be published please tick the box below.

Where we're heading (Page 8)

Considering our challenges and constraints, do you think we're focusing on the right 10-year outcomes?

Yes. I appreciate your goal of accessible services.

Our financial and infrastructure strategies (Pages 10-13)

The Council plans to pay down debt, reduce borrowings and target infrastructure spending for resilience and growth. What are your views on this approach?

As long as these fiscal prudencies do not compromise delivery of core services, I'm all for it.

Key decision (Pages 14-17)

Should we change the way we share rates across the district?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option to change the rating system?

Yes - reduce the proportion of fixed-rate charges and introduce a commercially targeted rate (Council's preferred option)

Please tell us why:

I think it's well considered.

Key decision (Pages 18-20)

What should we do next to address flood risks?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option of a revised 45-year programme?

Yes - do the revised 45-year programme (Council's preferred option)

Please tell us why:

It sounds measured.

Work on the go (Pages 21-23)

Any comments on the matters below:

Housing

I agree with the Paekakariki Housing Trust submission that states: Make affordable housing a priority in Kāpiti Coast. Commit the KCDC to the principle that affordable housing is critical to the health and well-being of our community and change the stance of the council to one of finding ways to work together with community housing providers to enable affordable housing. Make priority given to affordable housing a central principle in decisions the council takes on planning and consenting issues and on the allocation of land and other resources held by the council. Work with NZTA and other central government agencies to use land for affordable housing. The council can work to ensure that lands made surplus after the construction of the Kāpiti Expressway and Transmission Gully are disposed of in ways that create assets for the community, protecting the environment and enabling land to be developed for affordable housing. In particular, ensure a comprehensive community-based precinct plan is developed for the Perkins Farm property and adjacent lands currently held by NZTA. This plan should provide for environmental protection and affordable housing and be completed before NZTA disposes of these lands. Land that will become surplus from the highway construction has many values and opportunities for the community of Paekākāriki as well as the wider Kapiti District. Working with

the community on planning and securing the future of this land is required to ensure maximum benefit is obtained by the whole community. Use council-held rights of first refusal for NZTA lands that are appropriate for affordable housing as a means to enable community-led development of that land. This would include such sites as the south end of the 'Tilley triangle' and the former BP station on SH1. Enable affordable housing by reducing or waiving Council fees and levies where appropriate when a residential development includes provision for affordable or social housing, particularly where it is to be purchased by a recognised Community Housing provider. Lease Council social housing and land to local registered community housing providers such as Paekākāriki Housing Trust, Dwell Housing Trust, and iwi providers. Manage social housing locally to strengthen community connections and cohesion. Empower the Paekākāriki Community Board to decide on the allocation of social housing in the village. Of the Kāpiti Coast communities Paekākāriki has the lowest percentage of elderly residents because there is not enough appropriate housing and they are forced to leave the village. This reduces the diversity of the community and cuts people off from connections of long standing. I will add here that we should consider ensuring affordable housing projects are well suited to those they are intended for and that there is provision for accessible housing for disabled persons.

Replacing the Paekakariki seawall

This ties in with your commitment to climate change protection, but I really believe you must consider the needs of the community and tourism when choosing whether or not to keep the beach - above your desire to reduce spending. According to your plan, this wall should be one of the priority commitments of the next 3 years, and with the increase in cyclones and high winds already impacting residents in our village, I strongly feel this should be prioritised.

Kapiti Island gateway

Community-driven process for long-term planning of best use of surplus NZTA land including Perkins Farm. I submit that the Long Term Plan should include support for and resourcing of a community-driven planning process for surplus NZTA land associated with the construction of the Transmission Gully. This includes the area known as Perkins Farm. Land that will become surplus from the highway construction has many values and opportunities for the community of Paekākāriki as well as the wider Kāpiti District. Working with the community on planning and securing the future of this land is required to ensure maximum benefit is obtained by the whole community.

Rates for 2018/19 (Pages 24-25)

If the draft long term plan is adopted with all our recommended proposals, a rates increase of 4.7% on average will apply across the district for 2018/19. Do you support this?

Yes

Anything else?

If you have any other feedback about this plan, or the work of the Council please comment here:

I submit that the council, in keeping with it's priority outcome of accessibility, takes into consideration the needs of disabled persons whenever planning public infrastructure; with a special focus on pedestrian access. I also request that KCDC considers families without personal transport, especially in conjunction with a more sustainable Kapiti. Why is it that a family in Paekakakriki needs to drive for a child to attend school in Raumati? Why is Paraparaumu structured in such a way as to make it dangerous and difficult for non-drivers with children to navigate? When constructing new public service buildings, please consider proximity to public transport. Finally, I submit that the council must prioritise it's residents over and above private companies. KCDC must be able and equipped to challenge, and enforce, designations and bylaws. It's not acceptable that companies (of any size) are able to throw their weight around at the expense of KCDC residents, who apparently do not have the support from their council which they deserve. KiwiRail and the NZTA should not have the ability to use council land as they see fit, nor change zonings or designations at their whim. The KiwiRail/Fulton Hogan deal has impacted my street, my neighbours and my family and I am disgusted that it was allowed to continue, and no future protection is yet in place to ensure that it never happens again.

Make Submission

Event Name	Long term plan 2018-38 consultation
Submission ID	18LTP-203
Response Date	21/04/18 9:20 PM
Consultation Point	Tell us what you think about our long term plan (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1
First and last name	<input type="text"/> WITHHOLD DETAILS
Title	<input type="text"/>
Address	<input type="text"/>
Phone	<input type="text"/>
Email	<input type="text"/>
Are you providing feedback	as an individual
Hearings	
Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission?	Yes

Privacy statement	Please withhold
-------------------	-----------------

Where we're heading (Page 8)

Considering our challenges and constraints, do you think we're focusing on the right 10-year outcomes?

Our rates rises are not sustainable and our capacity to pay is limited. Reduce debt – yes but it needs clear \$ and time-specific targets. The graph looks like a minor adjustment only. Debt should never have been allowed to get so high. Fully fund depreciation – yes but maybe look at a further 2 year extension to reduce the annual burden caused by past mismanagement. Can Council assure us that it will indeed be fully funded and we won't be asked to pay more because of accounting errors or the lack of peer review on estimates, quotes & tenders. Spend less by prioritising – this should always be part of Council's mindset, non-negotiable. I am concerned about the mindset of Wealth distribution by changing rating methods. This is not a council function. I also want to see a priority on infrastructure. Not Social Programs that are nice to haves. Most people have a finite capacity to pay, In the past 3 years we have experienced a 45% increase in Rates and core services such as Water Supply and Rubbish Collection have now been passed directly to ratepayers as an additional cost.. KCDC needs to spend in accordance with limiting cost increases and not with a mindset that says there is an infinite capacity to tax and spend. I want a Council that is mean and lean administratively so all revenues are spent to the benefit of the community.

Our financial and infrastructure strategies (Pages 10-13)

The Council plans to pay down debt, reduce borrowings and target infrastructure spending for resilience and growth. What are your views on this approach?

Page 9 - What do you mean by an effective response to climate change? There is a lot of hype without much in the way of scientific facts, and KCDC has already been caught out by acting in a rash manner. Page 10. Your financial plan needs work. Debt levels are too high now. The interest alone is in the vicinity of \$8 Million per annum. Or the average rates of 2,000 households. I have not spoken to a single person that has a rates increase this year anywhere near the 4.7% average you claim. Most increases are from 9% - 15%. Council needs to drastically reduce spending, reduce the bloated bureaucracy and concentrate on the things that matter such as infrastructure. Page 12: You list supplying clean drinking water as part of the infrastructure strategy yet we are paying separate usage driven water rates that you intend to increase by a further 25% this year. Why is this used as a justification for a general rates increase. It seems like double dipping to me.

Key decision (Pages 14-17)

Should we change the way we share rates across the district?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option to change the rating system?

No - keep the status quo - leave the rating system as it is

Please tell us why:

Setting rates on property values is a farce. The value is an arbitrary figure set by computers or people that have no knowledge of the property or the circumstances of the people living in it. It is not Council's role to redistribute Wealth, which is what you are suggesting. That is a role of Central Government who already tax us in the way of income taxes etc for this. People with higher value homes should not pay more if they are not getting more services. 1. Everyone uses the roads equally it is nonsense to suggest someone should pay more because of a house value. 2. Why are you wasting \$2.7m of ratepayers money on business promotion? Surely that is up to business to do. I say NO I do not want to fund businesses for this. That money would be better off reducing debt, or being spent on infrastructure Page 16: This is all wrong. Values do not indicate increased incomes. Get your head around the fact that people are not a bottomless pit for you to keep taxing

Key decision (Pages 18-20)

What should we do next to address flood risks?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option of a revised 45-year programme?

No - keep the status quo programme

Work on the go (Pages 21-23)

Any comments on the matters below:

(Please tick the check box next to the relevant issue and a comment box will open below. You can comment on as many of these issues as you wish)

Coastal hazards and climate change

You are guessing at what the impacts of climate change will be. Do not put money into something that is only a theory at this stage

Housing

Infrastructure is stretched now. Growth for growth's sake would not be a good thing.

Paraparaumu and Waikanae town centres

Do not waste the money in Waikanae on the old SH1. Leave it alone there is no need to change it. The locals don't want it.

Maclean Park

The pond was a great asset to the park. Leave it alone.

Kapiti Island gateway

We do not need this. There are better things to spend the money on

Rates for 2018/19 (Pages 24-25)

If the draft long term plan is adopted with all our recommended proposals, a rates increase of 4.7% on average will apply across the district for 2018/19. Do you support this?

No

Comments:

The 4.7% average is a nonsense. Most rates are being increased by at least 9%. I disagree with any increase above the rate of inflation.

Make Submission

Consultee	Jayne O'Neill (81808)
Email Address	kowhai53@gmail.com
Company / Organisation	Paekākāriki Orchard and Gardens Inc
Address	103 Tilley Road Paekākāriki 5034
Event Name	Long term plan 2018-38 consultation
Submission by	Paekākāriki Orchard and Gardens Inc (Jayne O'Neill - 81808)
Submission ID	18LTP-204
Response Date	21/04/18 9:32 PM
Consultation Point	Tell us what you think about our long term plan (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.2
First and last name	Jayne O'Neill
Title	Mrs
Address	103 Tilley Road Paekākāriki
Phone	0276307630
Email	kowhai53@gmail.com
Are you providing feedback	on behalf of an organisation
Organisation name	Paekākāriki Orchard and Gardens Inc
Hearings	
Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission?	Yes

Anything else?

If you have any other feedback about this plan, or the work of the Council please comment here:

I make the following submission to the Kāpiti Coast District Council long term plan: Paekākāriki Orchard and Gardens Inc. is an Incorporated Society Our vision is: A strong and independent Paekākāriki Orchard and Gardens Inc. is an Incorporated Society Our vision is: A strong and independent Paekākāriki community through growing organic food together. Enjoyment. Abundance. Learning. Celebrating. We request Council consider providing land for the development of community gardens in Paekākāriki. We presently have a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that recognises the partnership between Kāpiti Coast District Council and Paekākāriki Orchard and Garden Group for the purpose of optimising reserve development for public enjoyment while protecting and restoring the natural environment. This is not a legal contract, but it intends to confirm the partnership by clarifying the commitments, roles and responsibilities of each party. This is located on the Tilley Road Reserve, a small portion of the western bank. Our aim is to support the community building resilience, coming together building connectivity and sharing knowledge amongst the community to grow their own food and provide supplies to be shared in the community. This is a place where our young people can participate and gain knowledge and insights into good food and sustainability This venture supports the visions of the community, providing a natural playground for children and has the potential to be part of the wider Wainui Wildplay initiative. The Grow Paekākāriki Report recognised the benefits of community gardens. Along with a community garden there is the opportunity to develop an edible food forest as part of a neighbourhood park, as opportunities open up for the village and NZTA surplus land becomes available. The aims and vision of Paekākāriki Orchard and Garden would be able to be integrated into other initiatives such as the proposed Paekākāriki Community Led Development initiative. Paekākāriki Orchard and Garden has been active since 2013 and is excited to be finally able to begin actioning its most important aim to develop community gardens. We ask that KCDC supports by building into the long-term plan the provision of land to support this venture in our village. Jayne O'Neill Chair: Paekākāriki Orchard and Garden Inc.

Make Submission

Consultee	Maria McMillan (81809)
Email Address	ljm.mcmillan@gmail.com
Address	105 Tilley Road Paekakariki 5034
Event Name	Long term plan 2018-38 consultation
Submission by	Maria McMillan (81809)
Submission ID	18LTP-205
Response Date	21/04/18 9:36 PM
Consultation Point	Tell us what you think about our long term plan (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.2
First and last name	Maria McMillan
Title	Ms
Address	105 Tilley Road, Paekakariki
Phone	0275114291
Email	ljm.mcmillan@gmail.com
Are you providing feedback	as an individual
Hearings	

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission? No

If you do, we will contact you at the email address or phone number provided above to arrange a time. Hearings will take place during the week of 14 May

Where we're heading (Page 8)

Considering our challenges and constraints, do you think we're focusing on the right 10-year outcomes?

I would like to see Kapiti shift to a more human-centred approach in planning. While supporting economic growth is important there should be a clear benefit to communities not just to businesses.

Key decision (Pages 14-17)

Should we change the way we share rates across the district?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option to change the rating system?

Yes - reduce the proportion of fixed-rate charges and introduce a commercially targeted rate (Council's preferred option)

Work on the go (Pages 21-23)

Any comments on the matters below:

Housing
Replacing the Paekakariki seawall

Housing

Comment

Support the creation of community housing particularly for vulnerable populations.

Replacing the Paekakariki seawall

Comment

Replace the wall with the community's preferred option as quickly as possible. The longer the issue is left the more damaging and non-robust short term solutions like dumping rocks will be used.

Rates for 2018/19 (Pages 24-25)

If the draft long term plan is adopted with all our recommended proposals, a rates increase of 4.7% on average will apply across the district for 2018/19. Do you support this?

Rates comment categorisation

Key policies (Pages 27-28)

If you have any views about the **proposed changes to our rates remission policy**, please tell us here:

I support the changes.

Anything else?

If you have any other feedback about this plan, or the work of the Council please comment here:

I support the KCDC committing to a living wage for all its employees, contractors and that paying the living wage should be a requirement of the companies it gives contracts to. A principle of KCDC is that adequate housing is central to the well-being of the community and a top priority for the Council. I support the development of a comprehensive community-based plan for the Perkins Farm property and adjacent lands currently held by NZTA. KCDC should take over the management and delivery of kerbside rubbish and recycling collection. Multiple trucks going up and down the roads of tiny communities is bad for the environment. The communication sent by these multiple companies is diabolical and confusing. Many residents resort to local facebook groups to try and interpret what is happening. Quite frankly it is a shambles and the Council should take over.

Make Submission

Consultee	<input type="text"/> WITHHOLD
Email Address	<input type="text"/>
Address	<input type="text"/>
	<input type="text"/>
Event Name	Long term plan 2018-38 consultation
Submission by	<input type="text"/>
Submission ID	18LTP-206
Response Date	22/04/18 7:52 AM
Consultation Point	Tell us what you think about our long term plan (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.2
First and last name	<input type="text"/> WITHHOLD
Title	<input type="text"/>
Address	<input type="text"/>
Phone	<input type="text"/>
Email	<input type="text"/>
Are you providing feedback	as an individual
Hearings	
Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission? Yes	
If you do, we will contact you at the email address or phone number provided above to arrange a time. Hearings will take place during the week of 14 May 2018.	
Privacy statement	Please withhold

Work on the go (Pages 21-23)

Any comments on the matters below:

(Please tick the check box next to the relevant issue and a comment box will open below. You can comment on as many of these issues as you wish)

Rates for 2018/19 (Pages 24-25)

If the draft long term plan is adopted with all our recommended proposals, a rates increase of 4.7% on average will apply across the district for 2018/19. Do you support this?

Yes

Comments:

Yes I would support a 4.7% increase, however my increase is 11.25%, in addition that is on a very high property rate, \$6092.00 so the increase is compounded. Council have been promoting fair and equitable rates, also set against a nominal 5% of household income, for my property neither of those apply, even remotely. I have assessed my rates against 34 properties on my road, that average is \$2668.00, Other considerations, 6 properties over 10ha, that average is \$3376.00, and 7 Beach front properties, that average is \$3164.00. So currently my rates as a landowner of a large land holding are not fair and equitable, Councils proposal will compound that situation. I request that such anomalies are addressed.

Make Submission

Consultee	<input type="text"/> WITHHOLD (81811)
Email Address	<input type="text"/>
Address	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
Event Name	Long term plan 2018-38 consultation
Submission by	<input type="text"/>
Submission ID	18LTP-207
Response Date	22/04/18 9:51 AM
Consultation Point	Tell us what you think about our long term plan (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.3
First and last name	<input type="text"/> WITHHOLD
Title	<input type="text"/>
Address	<input type="text"/>
Phone	<input type="text"/>
Email	<input type="text"/>
Are you providing feedback	as an individual
Hearings	
Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission?	No
2018.	
Privacy statement	Please withhold

Where we're heading (Page 8)

Considering our challenges and constraints, do you think we're focusing on the right 10-year outcomes?

Yes

Our financial and infrastructure strategies (Pages 10-13)

The Council plans to pay down debt, reduce borrowings and target infrastructure spending for resilience and growth. What are your views on this approach?

Yes

Strategy classification

Select classification

Key decision (Pages 14-17)

Should we change the way we share rates across the district?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option to change the rating system?

Yes - reduce the proportion of fixed-rate charges and introduce a commercially targeted rate (Council's preferred option)

Please tell us why:

With some reservations. From the point of view of my personal circumstances, your model is faulty

Rating review sub-classification

Land value vs Capital value

Where there was an expressed preference

Key decision (Pages 18-20)

What should we do next to address flood risks?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option of a revised 45-year programme?

Yes - do the revised 45-year programme (Council's preferred option)

Please tell us why:

Can't be left as it is. Doing something is better than doing nothing.

Work on the go (Pages 21-23)

Any comments on the matters below:

(Please tick the check box next to the relevant issue and a comment box will open below. You can comment on as many of these issues as you wish)

Coastal hazards and climate change
Housing

Coastal hazards and climate change

Comment

Urgent attention required in Raumati/Paraparaumu section

Housing

Comment

Require developers to increase number of smaller sections and find ways to use these to increase the number of smaller dwellings.

Rates for 2018/19 (Pages 24-25)

If the draft long term plan is adopted with all our recommended proposals, a rates increase of 4.7% on average will apply across the district for 2018/19. Do you support this?

No

Comments:

View from personal circumstances. My rate increase will be close to 7% and this will make them almost 7% of my income.

Rates comment categorisation

My urban rates impact

My urban rates impact

Comment

View from personal circumstances. My rate increase will be close to 7% and this will make them almost 7% of my income.

Comments on change to fees and charges:

Local conversations suggest that new fees for small market operators will tend to discourage this activity. If so, this will be a retrograde step for the community.

Key policies (Pages 27-28)

Make Submission

Consultee	<input type="text"/> WITHHOLD (81812)
Email Address	<input type="text"/>
Address	<input type="text"/>
Event Name	Long term plan 2018-38 consultation
Submission by	<input type="text"/>
Submission ID	18LTP-208
Response Date	22/04/18 10:20 AM
Consultation Point	Tell us what you think about our long term plan (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.4
First and last name	<input type="text"/> WITHHOLD
Title	<input type="text"/>
Address	<input type="text"/>
Phone	<input type="text"/>
Email	<input type="text"/>

Are you providing feedback as an individual

Hearings

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission?

If you do, we will contact you at the email address or phone number provided above to arrange a time. Hearings will take place during the week of 14 May

Yes

Where we're heading (Page 8)

Considering our challenges and constraints, do you think we're focusing on the right 10-year outcomes?

Sustainability and lowering the council's carbon footprint has to be a priority.

Strategy classification

Select classification

Key decision (Pages 14-17)

Should we change the way we share rates across the district?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option to change the rating system?

Rating review sub-classification

Land value vs Capital value

Where there was an expressed preference

Key decision (Pages 18-20)

What should we do next to address flood risks?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option of a revised 45-year programme?

Please tell us why:

Wetlands need to be restored in Paekakariki, around the Tilley Rd area, to absorb and filter stormwater.

Work on the go (Pages 21-23)

Any comments on the matters below:

(Please tick the check box next to the relevant issue and a comment box will open below. You can comment on as many of these issues as you wish)

Coastal hazards and climate change
Housing
Replacing the Paekakariki seawall

Coastal hazards and climate change

Comment

Council needs to aim at being carbon neutral to minimise climate change. There is a lack of public understanding about the nature of the coastal issues and the reality facing us- Council could take a good role here in education - this doesn't mean printing things no-one will read, a more creative approach is needed eg events/information on site on beaches

Housing

Comment

Affordable housing is a real issue in Paekākāriki and council needs to address this through supporting social housing. I support the PHT submission. In particular, ensure a comprehensive community-based precinct plan is developed for the Perkins Farm property and adjacent lands currently held by NZTA. This plan should provide for environmental protection and affordable housing and be completed before NZTA disposes of these lands. Land that will become surplus from the highway construction has many values and opportunities for the community of Paekākāriki as well as the wider Kapiti District. Working with the community on planning and securing the future of this land is required to ensure maximum benefit is obtained by the whole community. Use council-held rights of first refusal for NZTA lands that are appropriate for affordable housing as a means to enable community-led development of that land. This would include such sites as the south end of the 'Tilley triangle' and the former BP station on SH1.

Replacing the Paekakariki seawall

Comment

Listen to what the community are saying. A better wall is such a worthwhile investment even if it takes longer to gather the funds for this.

Rates for 2018/19 (Pages 24-25)

If the draft long term plan is adopted with all our recommended proposals, a rates increase of 4.7% on average will apply across the district for 2018/19. Do you support this?

Rates comment categorisation

Key policies (Pages 27-28)

Anything else?

If you have any other feedback about this plan, or the work of the Council please comment here:

Waste minimisation: I support Lyndy McIntyre's submission. – When KCDC handed over waste collection to private providers residents were told that the system of bag collection and recycling would remain, but private providers were the best option, because competition would keep the price down. – This experiment has failed. – Now our council must return to providing kerbside recycling and waste collection services like other councils, including our neighbours Porirua, Hutt City and Wellington and numerous others all over New Zealand. – This is important because it provides an incentive for households to reduce their waste – The current commercial system has no incentive to reduce waste. – This is bad for the environment because waste is a major cause of carbon emissions and there are now up to four different providers, whose trucks are driving around our district, duplicating services. – KCDC has a stated commitment to sustainability and waste minimisation. I want my council to walk the walk, not just talk the talk. Also, Community-driven process for long-term planning of best use of surplus NZTA land including Perkins Farm. I submit that the Long Term Plan should include support for and resourcing of a community-driven planning process for surplus NZTA land associated with the construction of the Transmission Gully Highway. This includes the area known as Perkins Farm. Land that will become surplus from the highway construction has many values and opportunities for the community of Paekākāriki as well as the wider Kāpiti District. Working with the community on planning and securing the future of this land is required to ensure maximum benefit is obtained by the whole community.

Make Submission

Consultee	Sue Stapleton (81814)
Email Address	oropigal49@gmail.com
Address	not known not known not known
Event Name	Long term plan 2018-38 consultation
Submission by	Sue Stapleton (81814)
Submission ID	18LTP-209
Response Date	22/04/18 10:20 AM
Consultation Point	Tell us what you think about our long term plan (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.2
First and last name	Sue Stapleton
Title	Mrs
Phone	0272708322
Email	oropigal49@gmail.com
Are you providing feedback	as an individual

Hearings

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission? Yes

If you do, we will contact you at the email address or phone number provided above to arrange a time. Hearings will take place during the week of 14 May 2018.

Work on the go (Pages 21-23)

Any comments on the matters below:

(Please tick the check box next to the relevant issue and a comment box will open below. You can comment on as many of these issues as you wish)

Coastal hazards and climate change

Comment

The detailed schedule of capital spending, page 5, Coastal Management has the Wharemauku Block Wall, assuming it gets consent, being repaired in 2017/18, yet the construction of a replacement not being started till within 2 months of the expiry of the 7 year resource consent. This is clearly extremely unacceptable to us as landowners of the land on which the wall is built. We object wholeheartedly to the delayed funding timeframes. It is unclear whether the work to obtain resource consents etc is within this construction budget, or elsewhere. We remind the Council that they also need the landowner approval to carry out the works, and to compensate the landowner for works under section 331 of the RMA. We also point out that the Raumati South Wall (which protects The Esplanade), due for works in year 7 through year 10, is also on private land and Council must negotiate with the land owner in regard this wall.

Make Submission

Consultee	<input type="text"/>
Email Address	<input type="text"/>
Address	<input type="text"/>
Event Name	
Submission by	Long term plan 2018-38 consultation
Submission ID	<input type="text"/>
Response Date	18LTP-210
Consultation Point	22/04/18 10:40 AM
	Tell us what you think about our long term plan (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.2
First and last name	<input type="text"/> WITHHOLD
Title	<input type="text"/>
Address	<input type="text"/>
Phone	<input type="text"/>
Email	<input type="text"/>
Are you providing feedback	on behalf of an organisation
Organisation name	Landlink Ltd
Hearings	
Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission? Yes	
If you do, we will contact you at the email address or phone number provided above to arrange a time.	
Please withhold	

Where we're heading (Page 8)

Considering our challenges and constraints, do you think we're focusing on the right 10-year outcomes?

The NPS-UDC 'directs local authorities to provide sufficient development capacity in their resource management plans, supported by infrastructure, to meet demand for housing and business space.' KCDC must provide infrastructure and appropriately zoned land (residential, commercial, industrial) to accommodate growth. It is our opinion that the assessments of growth are too low and available land assessments too high - pressure on housing from Transmission Gully and natural internal migration will exceed the projections and currently zoned land is insufficient to accommodate growth. Fringe expressway land, which is readily able to be serviced, and peri-urban land north of Waikanae should be advanced for development to avoid massive land price increases, affecting the affordability of property in Kapiti. Investment in protecting infrastructure from the effects of climate change and growth is considered to be critical to the District. The effects of a poorly drafted and executed PDP on affordability and land availability cannot be underestimated. Costs for administration of land development continue to rise. As consultants, we respect the intentions of officers to administer development in a responsible manner, and desire decisive and consistent administration. We need to provide strategic development advice in a consistent environment.

Our financial and infrastructure strategies (Pages 10-13)

The Council plans to pay down debt, reduce borrowings and target infrastructure spending for resilience and growth. What are your views on this approach?

Responding to the risk of sea level rise and climate change has been, to date, a reactive and haphazard one. Stronger leadership in risk mitigation (in particular the the public reaction to coastal erosion) must be brought about by better communication and consultation leading to stronger decision making. Strong decisions come from a strong understanding of the issues. Spending on resilience and growth could result in targeted rates. Councils 'latest flood extent' maps overstate the extent of flood risk throughout the District (Im happy to provide more details on this, as we have done to the stormwater team for over 4 years now) and as a result, more homes have restrictions and lower values. Removing this unwarranted restriction will lift land values and result in a higher rates take. This error in flood extent carries a high risk that landowners will take Council to task in the same way that coastal erosion forced a backtracking by Council. Landowners are forced into discretionary activity status applications due to this error, adding to costs and reducing affordability. The flood maps must be amended to show flood extent correctly rather than showing the minimum build levels as flood extent, as they do now.

Select classification

Key decision (Pages 14-17)

Should we change the way we share rates across the district?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option to change the rating system?

Yes - reduce the proportion of fixed-rate charges and introduce a commercially targeted rate (Council's preferred option)

Key decision (Pages 18-20)

What should we do next to address flood risks?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option of a revised 45-year programme?

Yes - do the revised 45-year programme (Council's preferred option)

Please tell us why:

Kapiti is fundamentally a flat plain from hills to the Coast and flood risk is unavoidable. Protection is important for communities which are at risk. It would be irresponsible of Council to neglect at-risk flood prone properties. Property value increases which result from protection do not appear to have been factored in to the rates take to 'part fund' the work.

Work on the go (Pages 21-23)

Any comments on the matters below:

(Please tick the check box next to the relevant issue and a comment box will open below. You can comment on as many of these issues as you wish)

Coastal hazards and climate change

Coastal hazards and climate change

Comment

Proactive sea wall replacement and stormwater asset management (pipes which exit to the sea) and protection should also involve the acquisition of land to ensure that protection is more readily achievable. Local by-laws can ensure that the risk to Council is low in regard adjoining land owner legal threats.

Rates for 2018/19 (Pages 24-25)

If the draft long term plan is adopted with all our recommended proposals, a rates increase of 4.7% on average will apply across the district for 2018/19. Do you support this?

Yes

Rates comment categorisation

Key policies (Pages 27-28)

If you have any views about the **proposed changes to our development contributions policy**, please tell us here:

We are concerned that a transparent and consistent remissions policy has been lacking for many

Stormwater

Flood hazard modelling

Comment

Councils 'latest flood extent' maps overstate the extent of flood risk throughout the District (Im happy to provide more details on this, as we have done to the stormwater team for over 4 years now) and as a result, more homes have restrictions and lower values. Removing this unwarranted restriction will lift land values and result in a higher rates take. This error in flood extent carries a high risk that landowners will take Council to task in the same way that coastal erosion forced a backtracking by Council. Landowners are forced into discretionary activity status applications due to this error, adding to costs and reducing affordability. The flood maps must be amended to show flood extent correctly rather than showing the minimum build levels as flood extent, as they do now.

Make Submission

Consultee	Louise Thornley (81817)
Email Address	louise.thornley@gmail.com
Address	138 Tilley Road Paekākāriki
Event Name	5034
Submission by	Long term plan 2018-38 consultation
Submission ID	Louise Thornley (81817)
Response Date	18LTP-211
Consultation Point	22/04/18 11:05 AM
Status	Tell us what you think about our long term plan (View)
Submission Type	Submitted
Version	Web 0.2
First and last name	Louise Thornley
Title	Ms
Address	138 Tilley Road Paekakariki
Phone	021 0324537
Email	louise.thornley@gmail.com
Are you providing feedback	as an individual

Hearings

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission? No

If you do, we will contact you at the email address or phone number provided above to arrange a time. Hearings will take place during the week of 14 May 2018.

Where we're heading (Page 8)

Considering our challenges and constraints, do you think we're focusing on the right 10-year outcomes?

Broadly yes, although I think the climate change outcome needs to be the top priority in the first three years, alongside the financial outcome. All other spending should take into account climate change. Climate change mitigation and adaptation has the potential to help council save on infrastructure and other costs when considered over the next decade.

Strategy classification

Select classification

Key decision (Pages 14-17)

Should we change the way we share rates across the district?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option to change the rating system?

Yes - reduce the proportion of fixed-rate charges and introduce a commercially targeted rate (Council's preferred option)

Please tell us why:

Currently Paekakariki pays disproportionately high rates due to the use of land value rather than capital value as the basis for rating. This is because we have larger sections (to allow for septic tanks). I therefore support the change to a charge relative to a property's capital value, rather than land value. I believe that the use of land value should be discontinued, and the general rate be charged on capital value instead. ..

Rating review sub-classification

Land Value vs Capital Value

Land value vs Capital value

Where there was an expressed preference

Prefers capital value as basis for rates

Land Value vs Capital Value comment

Comment

Currently Paekakariki pays disproportionately high rates due to the use of land value rather than capital value as the basis for rating. This is because we have larger sections (to allow for septic tanks). I therefore support the change to a charge relative to a property's capital value, rather than land value. I believe that the use of land value should be discontinued, and the general rate be charged on capital value instead. ..

Key decision (Pages 18-20)

What should we do next to address flood risks?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option of a revised 45-year programme?

Yes - do the revised 45-year programme
(Council's preferred option)

Work on the go (Pages 21-23)

Any comments on the matters below:

(Please tick the check box next to the relevant issue and a comment box will open below. You can comment on as many of these issues as you wish)

Coastal hazards and climate change
Housing
Replacing the Paekakariki seawall
Kapiti Island gateway

Coastal hazards and climate change

Comment

I call for the Council to go carbon-neutral by 2025. The plan begins to address some of the issues with adaptation to climate change but fails completely to mention ways we could reduce our emissions of greenhouse gases. The exception is the LED streetlight conversion – it is already in the plan and I support this. There is no acknowledgement of Council's existing carbon reduction target of 80% by 2021-22. Climate change mitigation actions that are not included in the draft plan, and which I think should be added, include: a) Offset Council carbon emissions – preferably with native revegetation in the district at high benefit sites. The plan should mention and budget for planting trees. If trees were planted on three pieces of council land the emissions saved would be significant. b. Further conversion of the council's vehicle fleet to electric vehicles would be another contribution. c. Diversion of all organic material (food and garden waste) to composting rather than letting it be buried and produce methane, a greenhouse gas. This is half our waste. There is no budget for investigating or developing systems for this. d. Continue to support education and home insulation etc. to reduce peak electricity generation carbon emissions from coal/gas e. Consider increasing funds for the restoration of wetlands in the Kapiti Coast region - as a highly cost effective way to improve water quality and reduce emissions, while also improving biodiversity, recreational and landscape values. f. Increase and improve public walkways and cycleways and public transport infrastructure - and promote biking and walking for both commuter and recreational journeys. Promote electric bikes for older people and people with health conditions, and encourage local bike schemes such as the Paekakariki bike library g. Support wind turbines and solar farms where appropriate, and energy efficiency initiatives. I also support these strategies to adapt to climate change, and consider they should be included in the plan: a) Coastal erosion. We must decide how long we will defend against the sea and at what stage we will adopt a policy of managed retreat. Coastal erosion from rising sea levels and tectonic subsidence – managed retreat particularly south of Waikanae. b) Rising sea levels – includes tectonic subsidence 2mm/yr-managed coastal and lowland river/stream retreat – stop new infrastructure investment or development in areas that will inevitably succumb to the Dunedin problem c) Increased rainfall/flooding – managed lowland river/stream retreat – catchment native revegetation – revegetation of steep slopes that threaten infrastructure d) Increased droughts – improved lowland river stream riparian vegetation for shading and evaporation minimisation to protect freshwater ecosystems – catchment native revegetation (particularly in our smaller water supply catchments and those with threatened native fish species)

Housing

Comment

The Council's proposed approach is inadequate. I support the Paekakariki Housing Trust's submission, including these recommendations: 1. Make affordable housing a priority in Kāpiti Coast. Commit the KCDC to the principle that affordable housing is critical to the health and well-being of our community and change the stance of the council to one of finding ways to work together with community housing providers to enable affordable housing. 2. Make priority given to affordable housing a central principle

in decisions the council takes on planning and consenting issues and on the allocation of land and other resources held by the council. 3. Work with NZTA and other central government agencies to use land for affordable housing. The council can work to ensure that lands made surplus after the construction of the Kāpiti Expressway and Transmission Gully are disposed of in ways that create assets for the community, protecting the environment and enabling land to be developed for affordable housing. 4. In particular, ensure a comprehensive community-based precinct plan is developed for the Perkins Farm property and adjacent lands currently held by NZTA. This plan should provide for environmental protection and affordable housing and be completed before NZTA disposes of these lands. Land that will become surplus from the highway construction has many values and opportunities for the community of Paekākāriki as well as the wider Kapiti District. Working with the community on planning and securing the future of this land is required to ensure maximum benefit is obtained by the whole community. 5. Use council-held rights of first refusal for NZTA lands that are appropriate for affordable housing as a means to enable community-led development of that land. This would include such sites as the south end of the 'Tilley triangle' and the former BP station on SH1. 6. Enable affordable housing by reducing or waiving Council fees and levies where appropriate when a residential development includes provision for affordable or social housing, particularly where it is to be purchased by a recognised Community Housing provider. 7. Lease Council social housing and land to local registered community housing providers such as Paekākāriki Housing Trust, Dwell Housing Trust, and iwi providers. 8. Manage social housing locally to strengthen community connections and cohesion. Empower the Paekākāriki Community Board to decide on the allocation of social housing in the village. Of the Kāpiti Coast communities Paekākāriki has the lowest percentage of elderly residents because there is not enough appropriate housing and they are forced to leave the village. This reduces the diversity of the community and cuts people off from connections of long standing.

Replacing the Paekakariki seawall

Comment

I see the seawall as crucial for the whole community, not just beachfront property owners. I used to live on the Parade for four years and have watched the seawall degrade noticeably with more frequent and severe storm damage. I'm concerned that money is currently being wasted on endless repairs. It is of great concern to me that the Paekakariki seawall has recently been put on hold, although funding had been secured. Assurance needs to be given in this plan that the seawall replacement will not be further delayed, and that the funding be well and truly locked in at \$17.7m with the proposed completion date of 2023 also locked in. In light of climate change, and the increasingly frequent and ferocious storms, every possible effort should be made to bring this date forward. Rather than "Work is expected to be completed in 2023" [KCDC] it must be ensured that work is completed by 2023 if not sooner. Final designs should be prepared, and tenders let, well in advance of the next local body election, thus helping ensure compliance with the above. That central government be approached for funding/subsidies as the road and infrastructure are at risk.

Kapiti Island gateway

Comment

I don't think there's enough information on this in the consultation document to be able to give a firm view. I think promoting and encouraging more visitors to visit Kapiti Island is crucial, and probably more important than promoting views of it on the mainland.

Rates for 2018/19 (Pages 24-25)

If the draft long term plan is adopted with all our recommended proposals, a rates increase of 4.7% on average will apply across the district for 2018/19. Do you support this?

Rates comment categorisation

Key policies (Pages 27-28)

Anything else?

If you have any other feedback about this plan, or the work of the Council please comment here:

Future use of the surplus Transmission Gully land across the highway from Paekakariki: (the former Perkins' family farmland): I call for Council to commit to a community-driven process for the long-term planning for the best use of surplus NZTA land including Perkins Farm. This issue is one I feel very strongly about in this consultation. I submit that the Long Term Plan should include support for and resourcing of a community-led planning process for this land. Land that will become surplus from the highway construction has many values and opportunities for the community of Paekākāriki as well as the wider Kāpiti District. Working with the community on planning and securing the future of this land is required to ensure maximum benefit is obtained by the whole community. I agree with other submitters from Paekakariki that there is strong potential for revegetation, wetland and stream restoration, and development of affordable housing, a community-scale wind power project, walking and cycling trails, and community gardens/orchards. Planning needs to start early, and be integrated and well-considered to balance competing impacts of the various proposed uses. I believe it would be in the interests of all Kāpiti communities for the Council to make provision in the Long Term Plan to develop a Precinct Structure Plan for this land. Paekakariki community-led sustainable development process: I agree with Tina Pope's call for the Long Term Plan to include support and resourcing for the Paekākāriki community to run its own projects for sustainable development over the next 3 years. The council – all parts of council – ought to start from a place of "How can we help" – all too often the answer is 'no, you can't do that'. This should become a council value, across council and including the infrastructure team. Waste and recycling: I support Lindy Macintyre's submission on this, including: that private provision of waste and recycling collection has failed. Council must return to providing kerbside recycling and waste collection services like other councils, including our neighbours Porirua, Hutt City and Wellington and numerous others all over New Zealand. This is important because it provides an incentive for households to reduce their waste. The current situation is bad for the environment because waste is a major cause of carbon emissions and there are now up to four different providers, whose trucks are driving around our district, duplicating services. Biodiversity and flood protection Wetlands are a relatively cheap solution to help protect land from flooding, reduce carbon emissions, improve water quality and increase biodiversity. Please commit to supporting the restoration of existing wetlands, and creating new wetlands, especially in Queen Elizabeth Park, new subdivisions, and in the existing farmland owned by NZTA that runs behind Tilley Road, Paekakariki. Wild play area proposal: I strongly support the wild play area proposed by Liana Stupples and Jan Nisbet - as a youth development initiative, as well as connecting people with nature. This would have multiple benefits for wellbeing, recreation, environmental awareness, and tourism. Support for Paekakariki's local economic development post-construction of Transmission Gully In the same way as other Kāpiti township's have received financial and other support following the Expressway construction, I call for Council to ensure that Paekakariki also receives financial support to assist with future economic development in the village.

Make Submission

Consultee	Bill Robertson (81819)
Email Address	angelaandbillr@outlook.co.nz
Company / Organisation	A Safe Kāpiti Trust
Address	2 Belford Court Paraparaumu 5032
Event Name	Long term plan 2018-38 consultation
Submission by	A Safe Kāpiti Trust (Bill Robertson - 81819)
Submission ID	18LTP-212
Response Date	22/04/18 11:52 AM
Consultation Point	Tell us what you think about our long term plan (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.3
Files	Request for stronger commitment to safety
First and last name	Bill Robertson
Title	Mr
Address	2 Belford Court Paraparaumu 5032
Phone	04 902 4779
Email	angelaandbillr@outlook.co.nz
Are you providing feedback	on behalf of an organisation
Organisation name	A Safe Kapiti Trust
Hearings	
Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission?	Yes

Privacy statement

Please note that all submissions (including names and contact details) will be made available at Council offices and public libraries. A summary of submissions including the name of the submitter may also be made publicly available and posted on the Kapiti Coast District Council website. Personal information will be used for administration relating to the subject matter of the submissions, including notifying submitters of subsequent steps and decisions. All information will be held by Kapiti Coast District Council, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information. If you do not want your personal information to be published please tick the box below.

Where we're heading (Page 8)

Considering our challenges and constraints, do you think we're focusing on the right 10-year outcomes?

Basically, yes but with some omissions. See attached document.

You can attach a document with further comments to give all the feedback you want to. Request for stronger commitment to safety



Submission on the KCDC Long Term Plan 2018 – 2038

We do not wish to provide feedback on what is in the plan but rather on what is missing or given scant regard to.

He aha te mea nui o te ao

What is the most important thing in the world?

He tangata, he tangata, he tangata

It is the people, it is the people, it is the people

Maori proverb

The new vision for Kapiti talks of an “aspiration for strong, safe communities” but there is little in this plan that will lead to those outcomes. Yes, it is great that attention is being given to building wide, “safe” footpaths and it is great that ways of making housing more affordable are being considered. However, safe footpaths won’t aid the mobility of those elderly and disabled members of our community already too frightened to use them. Affordable housing is not of much use to the increasing number of women and elderly people for whom the home is the least safe part of their environment.

A Safe Kapiti is not saying these should not be priorities for KCDC nor do we maintain the focus on emergency preparedness and resilience is mis-placed. We strongly maintain, however, that there should be an equally strong focus on the safety of and resilience for our more vulnerable people, to enable them to cope with day-to-day living. That focus is absent in this plan.

The plan notes “Caring for our community and staying connected” as a challenge. It states that *“understanding these challenges helps us to build plans to address them or even turn them into opportunities”*.

Kapiti Neighbourhood Support (NS) has 148 Neighbourhood Support groups reaching 23% of our population. This is the largest percentage of any Neighbourhood Support network in NZ territorial local authorities. Neighbourhood Support NZ is a network of organisations that assists neighbourhoods and communities to:

- Be safer and to reduce crime
- Be prepared for emergencies
- Increase community connectedness and enhance well-being

There are 60 affiliated NS networks operating throughout Aotearoa New Zealand. Between them they provide information, resources and support to 15,000 neighbourhood groups, who in turn connect with 170,000 households nationwide.

NS works closely with NZ Police and Civil Defence, as well as many other community organisations. A Safe Kapiti is the affiliated NS area co-ordinator for Kapiti. It currently receives KCDC financial support of \$15,000 annually to run the programme. The average grant from a Local Authority to NS is \$27,341.

What better investment could there be in “Caring for our community and staying connected”, yet KCDC has chosen to cease funding from 1st July this year. That is disgraceful for a community leader claiming its intention to meet the challenge of “Caring for our community and staying connected”.

ASK NS is extremely relevant to the mix we have in Kapiti with its high proportion of mature residents. The biggest problems facing the older population are feeling safe in their homes and having communication with their community. NS is a vital support for these people.

Feeling safe and looked after is an important outcome that NS achieves, especially for those living on their own as they can feel cut off and lonely. Being part of a group and knowing that someone is close by provides great comfort to those who have NS participation in their street and feedback to date overwhelmingly supports this claim.

In July 2018 Kapiti NS will cease to operate with the absence of a KCDC community contract. Formed in 1994, the Kapiti Coast Safer Community Council (as it was then known) was one of many such Safer Community Councils (or SCC) set up around the country by Central Government's Crime Prevention Unit in partnership with the Kapiti Coast District Council.

In 2014 the Trust made a further change to its name in order to reflect our current service provision (ASK-A Safe Kapiti). This change keeps our historical identity and philosophy around prevention and early intervention and creates our current vision of a safe, crime-free community.

The role of ASK has been to manage, coordinate and encourage the development of new initiatives through the pursuit of the following goals:

- To support and advocate for community initiatives that aim to enhance individual and community safety.
- To reduce youth offending by providing integrated services for young people at risk.
- To support at risk families and reduce family violence.
- To facilitate and/or participate in inter-agency projects and advisory groups which aim to increase community safety and wellbeing.

ASK is seen as a leader in the community in community safety and the wider Social Services field and uses the knowledge and expertise of its members to work very closely and collaboratively with other agencies and voluntary groups. An early intervention approach is adopted in most of our areas of service provision and crime prevention initiatives and this has contributed to our success. An example is the early intervention programme "Am I Ok" that originated and has been facilitated by ASK through Kapiti primary schools. This provides coping strategies for at-risk children.

We have been providing leadership and advice for place-based crime prevention programmes and implementing initiatives to increase community safety. There are significant issues facing our community and as a result of the economic environment these issues have increased and become more complex to manage. Family violence and youth offending, predominantly fuelled by alcohol and drugs, are of high concern to both the Police and the public. Today ASK is using its very experienced and qualified personnel to deal with more intense cases where individuals and families/whanau have high and complex needs. This service is at risk with the elimination of council funding

ASK provides strategic direction and interacts with key stakeholders and agencies in Kapiti through networking, meetings and focus groups. Participation in these fora by most agencies in Kapiti ensures a coordinated and united response to relevant issues and that we collectively meet the ever-growing needs of the community.

ASK has established strong networks with other service providers on the Kapiti Coast. These include the Ministry Oranga Tamariki (MOT), local schools, college counsellors, RTLB's, Iwi and Police. We continually foster interagency support and collaboration across agencies in supporting families. An ASK Social Worker continues in his role as Chairperson of the MOT Care and Protection Panel. As such we can contact the MOT Paraparaumu Site Manager directly, to liaise on any concerns with our families or in the community generally. This year he also attended a hui at the local Whakarongotai Marae where a delivery model for Maori was explained and gaps in services to Maori discussed.

The Strengthening Families programme is governed by the needs that each family identifies. A combination of services is then provided for them. This is one of the most effective programmes we deliver. It provides parents with parenting advice, strategies and ongoing support. This is best delivered within an integrated process involving other services including those assisting the client's school (e.g. RTLB), dealing with mental health issues e.g. Child, Adult Mental Health Service (CAMHS) and care and protection issues (MVCOT).

The Strengthening Families programme is one of several helping to improve coping strategies and reduce family and community violence. Another of these strategies is the Champions of Kapiti project. In August 2017, the Champions of Kapiti met with the Mayor to talk about their role, discuss family violence and seek support from him and the council for the project.

The champions, focusing on Paraparaumu initially, are a group of everyday people who have volunteered their time to spread the message that all forms of family violence are not OK and that help is available.

The campaign relies on all sectors of the community, support services and the local council, getting behind the project, promoting the champions and supporting the messages:

- * Family violence does happen in Kapiti.
- * All forms of family violence/harm is not acceptable - physical, psychological, economic.
- * It is OK to ask for help.
- * Help is available.
- * Talk to our champions.

The Mayor responded by saying "*the statistics on reports to police, made from our communities, indicates domestic violence is high if not the highest. This is a concern, especially where children are involved or are witnesses to acts of violence within their families*". He said he was honoured to join the seven Champions of Kapiti to highlight the message that family violence is not OK. "*These are people from all walks of life who have put their hands up to be the go-to people in our communities ready and able to support to anyone who may have concerns regarding family violence. I congratulate A Safe Kapiti for this innovative idea*".

This is another ASK project that relies on community funding to provide sufficient resources to train and continue to support the Champions in their quest to make Kapiti violence free. This project has already made excellent progress but without collaborative support could consequently be in danger of disappearing.

ASK has a strong and enduring relationship with Police and the Kapiti Coast District Council and we have continued to operate together in partnership on crime prevention issues and projects within the community. ASK has built a reputable profile that has increased over the years. Our funding streams however, like those of many other community organisations, have decreased.

ASK's services complement each other. One service cannot survive without the others working in collaboration. ASK has built its profile under such a holistic approach.

For ASK to continue to operate beyond July 2018 it needs financial support to provide Neighbourhood Support and the other valuable and expected social and community services providing safer communities. All face extinction without continued funding.

A Safe Kapiti is aware that KCDC must live within its means. It is also aware that failure to invest in people results in the higher costs associated with crime, poor health, vandalism and damage to public property. We are not saying that investment in programmes provided through A Safe Kapiti will solve all the district's social problems any more than re-sealing all Kapiti roads will ensure safer roads, but it will assist, and at a much lower cost.

Letters of Support will be made available from Government and non-government agencies and groups in support of our Submission.

Make Submission

Consultee	<input type="text"/> WITHHOLD
Address	<input type="text"/>
Event Name	Long term plan 2018-38 consultation
Submission by	<input type="text"/>
Submission ID	18LTP-213
Response Date	22/04/18 12:05 PM
Consultation Point	Tell us what you think about our long term plan (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.3
First and last name	<input type="text"/>
Title	<input type="text"/>
Address	<input type="text"/>
Phone	<input type="text"/>
Email	<input type="text"/>
Are you providing feedback	as an individual
Hearings	
Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission? No	
If you do, we will contact you at the email address or phone number provided above to arrange a time. Hearings will take place during the week of 14 May 2018.	
Privacy statement	Please withhold

Strategy classification

Select classification

Key decision (Pages 14-17)

Should we change the way we share rates across the district?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option to change the rating system?

Yes - reduce the proportion of fixed-rate charges and introduce a commercially targeted rate (Council's preferred option)

Please tell us why:

I agree in principal with the proposed restructure of the rates system BUT it doesn't take into account the stress on those with a fixed income. Just because you live in a supposedly higher value house doesn't mean you can afford a huge rates increase. It is not a natural consequence.

Rating review sub-classification

Land value vs Capital value

Where there was an expressed preference

Key decision (Pages 18-20)

What should we do next to address flood risks?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option of a revised 45-year programme?

Work on the go (Pages 21-23)

Any comments on the matters below:

(Please tick the check box next to the relevant issue and a comment box will open below. You can comment on as many of these issues as you wish)

Coastal hazards and climate change
Housing
Replacing the Paekakariki seawall
Paraparaumu and Waikanae town centres
Maclean Park
Kapiti Island gateway

Coastal hazards and climate change

Comment

priority

Housing**Comment**

priority

Replacing the Paekakariki seawall**Comment**

priority

Paraparaumu and Waikanae town centres**Comment**

nice but not essential

Maclean Park**Comment**

nice but not essential

Kapiti Island gateway**Comment**

nice but not essential

Rates for 2018/19 (Pages 24-25)

If the draft long term plan is adopted with all our recommended proposals, a rates increase of 4.7% on average will apply across the district for 2018/19. Do you support this?

No

Comments:

That's the average, not the reality for a lot of us.

Rates comment categorisation

Average rates increase affordability

Average rates affordability**Comment**

That's the average, not the reality for a lot of us.

Make Submission

Event Name	Long term plan 2018-38 consultation
Submission ID	18LTP-214
Response Date	22/04/18 12:38 PM
Consultation Point	Tell us what you think about our long term plan (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.2

Title Anonymous

Are you providing feedback as an individual

Hearings

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission?

If you do, we will contact you at the email address or phone number provided above to arrange a time. Hearings will take place during the week of 14 May 2018. No

Privacy statement Please withhold

Where we're heading (Page 8)

Considering our challenges and constraints, do you think we're focusing on the right 10-year outcomes?

Yes

Our financial and infrastructure strategies (Pages 10-13)

The Council plans to pay down debt, reduce borrowings and target infrastructure spending for resilience and growth. What are your views on this approach?

Good approach

Select classification

Key decision (Pages 14-17)

Should we change the way we share rates across the district?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option to change the rating system?

Rating review sub-classification

Land value vs Capital value

Where there was an expressed preference

Key decision (Pages 18-20)

What should we do next to address flood risks?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option of a revised 45-year programme?

Yes - do the revised 45-year programme (Council's preferred option)

Work on the go (Pages 21-23)

Any comments on the matters below:

(Please tick the check box next to the relevant issue and a comment box will open below. You can comment on as many of these issues as you wish)

Rates for 2018/19 (Pages 24-25)

If the draft long term plan is adopted with all our recommended proposals, a rates increase of 4.7% on average will apply across the district for 2018/19. Do you support this?

Yes

Rates comment categorisation

Comments on change to fees and charges:

The charges for market stall holders selling food will have a very negative affect on the weekend Markets around Kapiti. The cost will be prohibitive for many and the Markets will become glorified jumble / car boot sale. The vibrant Waikanae market on a Saturday morning was a real draw card when we decided to move into the area. I totally agree with the need for stalls to be registered and Food Safety Plans.

Key policies (Pages 27-28)

Anything else?

If you have any other feedback about this plan, or the work of the Council please comment here:

'Being part of a community means being able to participate – to feel connected to others, join in and access services. In our district people aged over 60 outnumber those aged 20–49. This means that a high proportion of our population are retired, and may have reduced opportunities for, and greater barriers to, participation' I cannot see from this plan how this challenge is being addressed. Increased age brings an increased the risk of Dementia. Social isolation is a major risk for this demographic. Increase awareness and a reduction of stigma for this condition is the only way these people can be supported to remain connected to their community. Although physical frailty is a significant barrier for older people to remain connected to their community, the lack of understanding, by the wider population, to the challenges of people with dementia and their supporters can only be addressed by education. Collaboration between some of the youth funded organisations and agencies supporting people with dementia could be promoted and Council supported awareness programmes could go a long way to supporting this vulnerable, and ever increasing proportion of the Kapiti population.

Make Submission

Consultee	<input type="text"/> WITHHOLD (81820)
Email Address	<input type="text"/>
Address	<input type="text"/>
Event Name	Long term plan 2018-38 consultation
Submission by	<input type="text"/>
Submission ID	18LTP-215
Response Date	22/04/18 2:41 PM
Consultation Point	Tell us what you think about our long term plan (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.3
First and last name	<input type="text"/> WITHHOLD
Title	<input type="text"/>
Address	<input type="text"/>
Phone	<input type="text"/>
Email	<input type="text"/>
Are you providing feedback	as an Individual
Hearings	
Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission?	
If you do, we will contact you at the email address or phone number provided above to arrange a time. Hearings will take place during the week of 14 May 2018.	No
Privacy statement	Please withhold

Where we're heading (Page 8)

Considering our challenges and constraints, do you think we're focusing on the right 10-year outcomes?

I agree that we should reduce borrowing as much as possible, I can't think of a reason you wouldn't do this. Seeking to fully fund the depreciation in five years, rather than a longer period, obviously leads to higher rate rises in the short term, at a time when wage income rises have been and continue to be very low. Given that the under funding is the result of previous, poor council decisions I don't think that the burden of catching up should be placed on the ratepayers. I am not sure why a target of five years is necessary, why not 10? 20?

Strategy classification

Select classification

Key decision (Pages 14-17)

Should we change the way we share rates across the district?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option to change the rating system?

No - keep the status quo - leave the rating system as it is

Please tell us why:

The proposal to change the split between fixed and apportioned charges will increase the rates burden on those with higher valued properties while reducing the burden on those with lower valued properties. The council has said that this will benefit ~70% of properties, therefore hitting ~30% negatively. The large number of 'Baby Boomers' in the area with large, half-empty houses who are in this ~30% but also eligible for a rebate will further concentrate the negative effects even more on middle class families. This can certainly be classed as a 'wealth tax' and indeed the council has stated its reasoning is that those who can pay more should. While I may agree with the general sentiment, and feel that wealth taxes should be the way forward for national as well as local tax collecting I think that you need to have fewer exemptions and a far better 'linkage' to justify and gather support for such a change. The current proposal to link roading charges to property value is nonsensical; the two are totally unrelated. Under the proposal a large house with a single car will pay more towards roading than a small house with 3 cars, I don't see how this can be justified. If you want to change the roading charges to an apportioned charge then do it based on car ownership or value—at least that's closer to being relevant. Further to this the link to the capital value of a property as the scale which should be used to assess the amount of a apportioned charge is crude, and I don't believe it accurately reflects the ability to pay. Capital values in the area can now be realistically described as out-of-control. Wages have not risen by the same percentage as capital values and it's the income that pays the rates, not the 'non-money' of the capital increase. When I bought my property it was valued at ~\$500K, it's now 'worth' ~\$650K according to Q.V., a rise of 30%. My income, and therefore my ability to pay, has not risen by anything like that amount. My rates are slated to rise 10% based on this re-evaluation. My income has not risen by 10% either. Commercially targeted rate: I agree with this proposal and would even increase it from the \$0.5m stated, however I note that you have tied this change to the residential changes. This deliberate tying together of the two changes shows a lack of flexibility, and perhaps a lack of serious intent on making a meaningful change.

Rating review sub-classification

Fixed charges
Commercial rate

Fixed charge comment

Comment

The current proposal to link roading charges to property value is nonsensical; the two are totally unrelated. Under the proposal a large house with a single car will pay more towards roading than a small house with 3 cars, I don't see how this can be justified. If you want to change the roading charges to an apportioned charge then do it based on car ownership or value—at least that's closer to being relevant. Further to this the link to the capital value of a property as the scale which should be used to assess the amount of a apportioned charge is crude, and I don't believe it accurately reflects the ability to pay. Capital values in the area can now be realistically described as out-of-control. Wages have not risen by the same percentage as capital values and it's the income that pays the rates, not the 'non-money' of the capital increase. When I bought my property it was valued at ~\$500K, it's now 'worth' ~\$650K according to Q.V., a rise of 30%. My income, and therefore my ability to pay, has not risen by anything like that amount. My rates are slated to rise 10% based on this re-evaluation. My income has not risen by 10% either.

Fixed charge response

Submission response

I agree with this proposal and would even increase it from the \$0.5m stated, however I note that you have tied this change to the residential changes. This deliberate tying together of the two changes shows a lack of flexibility, and perhaps a lack of serious intent on making a meaningful change.

Land value vs Capital value

Where there was an expressed preference

Key decision (Pages 18-20)

What should we do next to address flood risks?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option of a revised 45-year programme?

No - keep the status quo programme

Please tell us why:

I think it's a shame that these climate risks have been known about and ignored by successive governments and councils for years and now that we are getting to the sharp end the ratepayers are expected to step up and pay for what almost amounts to emergency measures. However this is a better example where we should have apportioned charges. Perhaps in areas where section flooding is a risk storm water charges could be based on section size (if connected to the storm water system). The section size would seem to be related to the amount of storm water 'produced', perhaps also tied to the total roof area of a property. I would propose that the storm water replacement programme should be further broken down and charges split between fixed for general upgrades and apportioned for section flooding projects. Until then I think we should continue with the current programme as accelerating the 60-year plan to 45 years is yet more increases on all ratepayers.

Work on the go (Pages 21-23)

Any comments on the matters below:

(Please tick the check box next to the relevant issue and a comment box will open below. You can comment on as many of these issues as you wish)

Replacing the Paekakariki seawall

Replacing the Paekakariki seawall
Maclean Park

Are:

Response type

Comment

Climate change: council should be addressing a long-term managed retreat from the beach area.
Council should not be spending ratepayers money shoring up private beach-front property values with multi-million dollar seawalls

Maclean Park

Comment

I thought the 'consultation' on Maclean Park was flawed as the options offered were all big changes and high cost. The area might need a refresh, but not a total revamp, especially if spending is tight as council seem to be hinting at. However, the status quo with modest upgrades was not given as an option thus restricting the conversation around the park and shutting out valid public opinions.

Rates for 2018/19 (Pages 24-25)

If the draft long term plan is adopted with all our recommended proposals, a rates increase of 4.7% on average will apply across the district for 2018/19. Do you support this?

No

Rates comment categorisation

Comments on change to fees and charges:

Swimming pool charges: I support the introduction of a student swimming pool entry fee, and would hope that the 10c increase in the normal entry fee (to which I do not object) is used to fund this. Animal management: I own neither a dog or a cat but it seems that cat owners don't have the same responsibilities as dog owners. Will you consider a micro chipping requirement for cats?

Key policies (Pages 27-28)

Anything else?

If you have any other feedback about this plan, or the work of the Council please comment here:

I read that all these increases are essentially to cover the bad decisions made by previous councils? Where's the responsibility? I would hope that if these proposals go through then those councillors who back them will have the guts to stand up and say so, especially come the next local elections.

Make Submission

Event Name Long term plan 2018-38 consultation
Submission ID 18LTP-216
Response Date 22/04/18 2:50 PM
Consultation Point Tell us what you think about our long term plan
([View](#))
Status Submitted
Submission Type Web
Version 0.3

First and last name

WITHHOLD

Title

Address

Phone

Email

Are you providing feedback

as an individual

Hearings

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission? No

If you do, we will contact you at the email address or phone number provided above to arrange a time. Hearings will take place during the week of 14 May 2018.

Privacy statement

Please withhold

Where we're heading (Page 8)

Considering our challenges and constraints, do you think we're focusing on the right 10-year outcomes?

We need to focus on the sustainability/ infrastructure and realise the focus of Kapiti may change from a retirement community to a commuter town.

Our financial and infrastructure strategies (Pages 10-13)

The Council plans to pay down debt, reduce borrowings and target infrastructure spending for resilience and growth. What are your views on this approach?

This should be the focus but being mindful of cost of living increase without increase in income.

Strategy classification

Select classification

Key decision (Pages 14-17)

Should we change the way we share rates across the district?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option to change the rating system?

No - keep the status quo - leave the rating system as it is

Please tell us why:

you haven't got the plan right

Rating review sub-classification

Land value vs Capital value

Where there was an expressed preference

Key decision (Pages 18-20)

What should we do next to address flood risks?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option of a revised 45-year programme?

Yes - do the revised 45-year programme (Council's preferred option)

Work on the go (Pages 21-23)

Any comments on the matters below:

(Please tick the check box next to the relevant issue and a comment box will open below. You can comment on as many of these issues as you wish)

Housing
Paraparaumu and Waikanae town centres
Macleay Park
Kapiti Island gateway

Housing

Comment

Issues with accessibility to good housing.. There should be housing plan to support low income families.
There needs to be a focus on sustainability

Paraparaumu and Waikanae town centres**Comment**

This will come if when infrastructure is sorted and we attract commuter families and business.

Maclean Park**Comment**

Waste of money and resources

Kapiti Island gateway**Comment**

waste of time and resources. Unlikely to attract more tourists (or enough to make a difference and recoup investment)

Rates for 2018/19 (Pages 24-25)

If the draft long term plan is adopted with all our recommended proposals, a rates increase of 4.7% on average will apply across the district for 2018/19. Do you support this?

No

Rates comment categorisation**Comments on change to fees and charges:**

you are loosing the essence of New Zealand and Kapiti. It will have a negative impact on the market and it should be sustained at its present location and format in order to maintain the beach as a prime destination for locals and tourists.

Key policies (Pages 27-28)

Make Submission

Consultee Rebecca Thomson (81822)
Email Address ripekathomson@gmail.com
Address 47 Ocean Road
 Paekākāriki
 5034
Event Name Long term plan 2018-38 consultation
Submission by Rebecca Thomson (81822)
Submission ID 18LTP-217
Response Date 22/04/18 3:46 PM
Consultation Point Tell us what you think about our long term plan ([View](#))
Status Submitted
Submission Type Web
Version 0.2
First and last name Rebecca Thomson & Richard Ward
Title
Address 47 Ocean Road, Paekākāriki
Phone 0274348244
Email ripekathomson@gmail.com
Are you providing feedback as an individual

Hearings

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission? No

If you do, we will contact you at the email address
 or phone number provided above to arrange a time.
 Hearings will take place during the week of 14 May
 2018.

Privacy statement

Where we're heading (Page 8)

Considering our challenges and constraints, do you think we're focusing on the right 10-year outcomes?

In part, please see specific comment below.

Our financial and infrastructure strategies (Pages 10-13)

The Council plans to pay down debt, reduce borrowings and target infrastructure spending for resilience and growth. What are your views on this approach?

We agree with the reduction in debt approach, reduced borrowings and targeted infrastructure spending.

Strategy classification

Select classification

Key decision (Pages 14-17)

Should we change the way we share rates across the district?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option to change the rating system?

Please tell us why:

We believe that the rating model should be changed to Capital Value and that differential rating be implemented. A scaled differential rating would increase the rate-take from businesses over a threshold and reduce the burden on home owners. We further consider there be no implementation of differential rating for roading. Commercial targeted rate The targeted rate of \$0.5m will be cancelled out by the 55% reduction in rate take from commercial ratepayers. The commercial businesses need to be paying a more equitable [for the community] amount of the rate burden. Thereby removing the increasing burden from home owners. KCDC has already greatly increased its rates revenue with the recent revaluation of property. The burden of these rate increases falls predominantly, and unfairly, on the homeowners. Some of these home owners have lived many decades in one house in areas once seen as undesirable [i.e. beachfront] only to find in their retirement that these areas are now desirable, and the rates are now untenable. This is forcing some elderly out of their long-term homes. KCDC states that rates are held at no more than 5% of a household income, this is patently untrue.

Rating review sub-classification

Fixed charges
Commercial rate

Fixed charge comment

Comment

We believe that the rating model should be changed to Capital Value and that differential rating be implemented. A scaled differential rating would increase the rate-take from businesses over a threshold and reduce the burden on home owners. We further consider there be no implementation of differential rating for roading.

Commercial rate comment

Comment

The targeted rate of \$0.5m will be cancelled out by the 55% reduction in rate take from commercial ratepayers. The commercial businesses need to be paying a more equitable [for the community] amount of the rate burden. Thereby removing the increasing burden from home owners.

Where there was an expressed preference

Key decision (Pages 18-20)

What should we do next to address flood risks?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option of a revised 45-year programme?

Yes - do the revised 45-year programme (Council's preferred option)

Work on the go (Pages 21-23)

Any comments on the matters below:

(Please tick the check box next to the relevant issue and a comment box will open below. You can comment on as many of these issues as you wish)

Coastal hazards and climate change
Housing
Replacing the Paekakariki seawall
Paraparaumu and Waikanae town centres

Coastal hazards and climate change

Comment

KCDC to be more pro-active in all aspects of remediation of climate change. Plan for the district to be carbon neutral as per the Paris Agreement. KCDC to set an example by changing all their vehicles to electric or hybrid. Encourage car-charge suppliers to install car and bike chargers in Paraparaumu. Work with GWRC for improved train and bus services and encourage use of trains and buses with more price incentives/subsidies. Encourage more bike use with more bike stands and better safety in areas such as shopping centres and malls. Encourage, through the planning and permitting process, the installation of solar panels and water tanks on all new housing. Also, enable retrofitting with minimal permit costs. This could be extended to bulk buy savings on solar panels, a similar model to the water tanks that the Council sells. Permitting costs, and slow processing, must not be a barrier to green initiatives. Support wind turbines and solar farms where appropriate, and energy efficiency initiatives.

Housing

Comment

We strongly support the submission made by the Paekākāriki Housing Trust and urge KCDC to actively engage with our community to address village housing needs. Surplus NZTA Land including Perkins' Farm and Tilley Road Triangle On completion of Transmission Gully Motorway there will be much surplus land. A program of acquisition of this land put in place now would eventually benefit the whole community with the many possible uses. This land has many values, and opportunities, for the community of Paekākāriki as well as the wider Kāpiti District. Working with the community on planning and securing the future of this land is required to ensure maximum benefit is obtained by the whole community. On land adjacent to Paekakariki north we would envisage areas with mixed housing where the land is suitable. Housing for first home owners etc, and some smaller houses intermingled for elderly, thus freeing up larger family houses within the community. We see this as a diverse mix of housing, not just a community of clones. New build, kitset and re-located. Other uses; wetlands, walkways and cycleways, recreational, tourism, wind turbines, solar panels, reedbed sewage system, re-forestation with native plants, community garden and play area, bird corridors and more. This is an opportunity not to be lost.

Replacing the Paekakariki seawall

Comment

Paekākāriki seawall has recently been put on hold, although funding had been secured. Assurance needs to be given that the seawall replacement will not be further delayed, and that the funding be well and truly locked in at \$17.7m with the proposed completion date of 2023 also locked in. In light of climate change, and the increasingly frequent and ferocious storms, every possible effort should be made to bring this date forward. Rather than "Work is expected to be completed in 2023" [KCDC] it must be ensured that work is completed by 2023 if not sooner. That final designs be prepared, and tenders let, well in advance of the next local body election, thus helping ensure compliance with the above. That central government be approached for funding/subsidies as the road and infrastructure are at risk. Money is currently being wasted on endless repairs. The beachfront and seawall are amenities for the whole community, not just beachfront owners.

Paraparaumu and Waikanae town centres

Comment

Paekākāriki should be included in the LTP town centres review. Paekākāriki urgently needs parking, roading and speed limit reviews for the whole township. Parking has recently become more and more congested. The old garage site on SH1 lends its self to creation of commuter parking, along with weekend parking for those accessing popular tracks. This will become more viable when SH1 is revoked and there is less traffic on the main road. We'd like to see greater consideration given to traffic calming measures, safer intersections, increased parking options for commuters and more bike racks throughout Paekākāriki.

Rates for 2018/19 (Pages 24-25)

If the draft long term plan is adopted with all our recommended proposals, a rates increase of 4.7% on average will apply across the district for 2018/19. Do you support this?

Comments:

See comments on rates specifically.

Rates comment categorisation

Key policies (Pages 27-28)

Anything else?

If you have any other feedback about this plan, or the work of the Council please comment here:

We want a return to council-provided kerbside recycling and waste collection service and we'd like to see the collection and disposal of waste incentivised to enable a greater level of waste reduction across the district. Christchurch provides a useful exemplar for this. When KCDC handed over waste collection to private providers residents were told that the system of bag collection and recycling would remain, but private providers were the best option, because competition would keep the price down. However, this has not been the case, particularly for low waste producers such as ourselves. KCDC must return to providing kerbside recycling and waste collection services like other councils, including our neighbours Porirua, Hutt City and Wellington and numerous others all over New Zealand. This is important because it provides an incentive for households to reduce their waste. The current commercial system has no incentive to reduce waste. This is bad for the environment because waste is a major cause of carbon emissions and there are now up to four different providers, whose trucks are driving around our district, duplicating services.

Make Submission

Consultee	Rod Walker (81824)
Address	3 Petrel Close Paraparaumu 5032
Event Name	Long term plan 2018-38 consultation
Submission by	Rod Walker (81824)
Submission ID	18LTP-218
Response Date	22/04/18 5:19 PM
Consultation Point	Tell us what you think about our long term plan (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.2
First and last name	Rod Walker
Title	Mr
Address	3 Petrel Close, Paraparaumu
Phone	0274444772
Email	rod.walker@xtra.co.nz

Are you providing feedback

Hearings

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission?

If you do, we will contact you at the email address or phone number provided above to arrange a time. Hearings will take place during the week of 14 May 2018.

Privacy statement

Where we're heading (Page 8)

Considering our challenges and constraints, do you think we're focusing on the right 10-year outcomes?

Partly, while I accept the council has many challenges I believe the current levels of rate rises are not sustainable for many residents, especially when you consider the rates increases and add the cost of water and rubbish collection.

Our financial and infrastructure strategies (Pages 10-13)

The Council plans to pay down debt, reduce borrowings and target infrastructure spending for resilience and growth. What are your views on this approach?

Overall these are the correct targets. I think a real focus on targeting the correct infrastructure improvements and making sure that you get the best value for the dollars spent.

Key decision (Pages 14-17)

Should we change the way we share rates across the district?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option to change the rating system?

No - keep the status quo - leave the rating system as it is

Please tell us why:

I fail to understand the rationale for changing the fixed roading rates to a capital property value apportioned charge. Most households use vehicles and the roads in a similar manner. Why, because a person has a higher value property should they pay more rates for the roads. Kapiti has a high proportion of older people and many have a higher value property asset but don't have a high income. This change will increase the stress and pressure on many people. Why?? I think it should be left as a fixed charge. Commercially targeted rates. Not sure, it is easy for me to say yes but I think the commercial community should be listened to closely on this issue.

Rating review sub-classification

Land value vs Capital value

Where there was an expressed preference

Key decision (Pages 18-20)

What should we do next to address flood risks?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option of a revised 45-year programme?

Yes - do the revised 45-year programme
(Council's preferred option)

Please tell us why:

Yes, I agree to an extent. I think council also needs to consider some recompense for households that are being forced (by District Plan) to manage their properties stormwater on site by either water tanks, attenuation water tanks or soakpits. Should there not be some rates reduction for these properties versus the properties that just put all their stormwater into the council system.

Work on the go (Pages 21-23)

Any comments on the matters below:

(Please tick the check box next to the relevant issue and a comment box will open below. You can comment on as many of these issues as you wish)

Coastal hazards and climate change

Coastal hazards and climate change

Comment

While I accept this is a hugely emotive issue for councils and ratepayers, many residents seem to think this is just a council issue. It cant be, property owners must have skin in the game as different scenarios occur. eg, some sea walls, some managed retreat, etc. The next 50 years is going to create huge challenges for councils and ratepayers and I suspect we will all be broke if we try to hold the sea where it currently is.

Rates for 2018/19 (Pages 24-25)

If the draft long term plan is adopted with all our recommended proposals, a rates increase of 4.7% on average will apply across the district for 2018/19. Do you support this?

No

Comments:

While I dont have such a problem with the 4.7% this year, it seems to be averaging about 4% over the next 8 years. This is not sustainable for many residents, especially when the current and projected inflation rates and wage increases are likely to be well below this

Make Submission

Consultee	Sue Lusk (73715)
Email Address	SueLusk@outlook.com
Company / Organisation	Destination Waikanae
Address	Not known Not known Not known
Event Name	Long term plan 2018-38 consultation
Submission by	Destination Waikanae (Sue Lusk - 73715)
Submission ID	18LTP-219
Response Date	22/04/18 5:36 PM
Consultation Point	Tell us what you think about our long term plan (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.2
Files	DW LTP submission 2018-2035
First and last name	Sue Lusk
Title	Mrs
Address	70 Huia Street Waikanae
Phone	049041779
Email	suelusk@outlook.com
Are you providing feedback	on behalf of an organisation
Organisation name	Destination Waikanae
Hearings	
Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission?	Yes

Privacy statement

Please note that all submissions (including names and contact details) will be made available at Council offices and public libraries. A summary of submissions including the name of the submitter may also be made publicly available and posted on the Kapiti Coast District Council website. Personal information will be used for administration relating to the subject matter of the submissions, including notifying submitters of subsequent steps and decisions. All information will be held by Kapiti Coast District Council, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information. If you do not want your personal information to be published please tick the box below.

Our financial and infrastructure strategies (Pages 10-13)

The Council plans to pay down debt, reduce borrowings and target infrastructure spending for resilience and growth. What are your views on this approach?

Yes, you have to do this - and enable residents to achieve more themselves through ease of regulations so that they are not always coming to you for help.

Strategy classification

Select classification

Key decision (Pages 14-17)

Should we change the way we share rates across the district?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option to change the rating system?

Rating review sub-classification

Land value vs Capital value

Where there was an expressed preference

Key decision (Pages 18-20)

What should we do next to address flood risks?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option of a revised 45-year programme?

Work on the go (Pages 21-23)

Any comments on the matters below:

(Please tick the check box next to the relevant issue and a comment box will open below. You can comment on as many of these issues as you wish)

Rates for 2018/19 (Pages 24-25)

If the draft long term plan is adopted with all our recommended proposals, a rates increase of 4.7% on average will apply across the district for 2018/19. Do you support this?

Rates comment categorisation

Comments on change to fees and charges:

I am shocked by the scale of fees for market stall holders. The markets are a hugely important community space, especially for our elderly residents, and may well die with too much compliance pressure, monetary or otherwise, imposed on them.

Key policies (Pages 27-28)

Anything else?

If you have any other feedback about this plan, or the work of the Council please comment here:

Destination Signage submission attached herewith. Second crossing for Waikanae East attached herewith.

Need more space

You can send us extra pages if there isn't enough space on this form to say everything you want to tell us. Please make sure you put your name and contact details on each sheet you send us.

Note: Attachments are limited to 10mb

You can attach a document with further comments to give all the feedback you want to. DW LTP submission 2018-2035

DESTINATION SIGNAGE

The Visitor Attraction Plan 2015-2018 describes KCDC as the "Promoter of Visitor Attractions – promoting destination marketing that boosts tourism services and promotes existing events and attractions".

Destination attractions in Kapiti are still, a year after the opening of the expressway and presentations to KCDC, being impacted by a lack of destination signage from one end of the district to the other. A quote from out-of-town visitors looking for Southwards Car Museum (a world-class attraction): "Do you realise we have spent over an hour wandering around Paraparaumu and Waikanae looking for Southwards? We got off the expressway, got lost, googled you and finally found you – the signage is terrible" – In fact the signage at the start and finish of the expressway for Southwards is good, but in between there is no indication of the towns you have to go through and the distances.

Reikorangi Farm Park: "We have had friends get lost and never manage to find us".

Nga Manu Nature Reserve: "We are happy with the increase in cyclists coming down the cycle track but would appreciate the road signage being more informative with distances"

These are key attractions for Kapiti and if we are to maximise Kapiti's appeal to visitors, we have to improve these deficiencies quickly.

And Waikanae Town Centre - people even in Paraparaumu still don't know that Mahara Place exists (the retailers there frequently tell me their new customers are surprised to hear where they are) -

It makes no sense that KCDC should be pouring so much money into revitalising both Paraparaumu and Waikanae town centres, without maximising the promotion of these town centres wherever it can as quickly as it can.

I don't think Kapiti-wide destination marketing and signage are specifically discussed in the LTP 2018-2038. The expressway opened in February 2017 and it is clear that there are simple deficiencies that should be rectified as soon as possible. Destination Waikanae is happy to contribute to this in any way we can, financial or otherwise.

<https://www.kapiticoast.govt.nz/contentassets/2adf8c8204b94af582989e1e1315abe1/visitor-attraction-plan-2016.pdf>

SECOND CROSSING FOR WAIKANA E

This needs to be in the LTP. KCDC has allowed at least three large developments in Waikanae East and the Elizabeth Street crossing will reach crisis point within the LTP planning period. KCDC can't continue to allow for development without having a plan for a second crossing.

The "Kapiti Estate" subdivision is an ideal location that should be investigated immediately, with the developer creating a road from Huia Street down to the railway line.

The connection to Hadfield Road is the other most likely alternative.

Make Submission

Consultee

Address

Event Name

Long term plan 2018-38 consultation

Submission by

Submission ID

18LTP-220

Response Date

22/04/18 6:00 PM

Consultation Point

Tell us what you think about our long term plan
([View](#))

Status

Submitted

Submission Type

Web

Version

0.2

First and last name

WITHHOLD

Title

Address

Phone

Email

Are you providing feedback

as an individual

Hearings

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission? Yes

If you do, we will contact you at the email address
or phone number provided above to arrange a time.
Hearings will take place during the week of 14 May
2018.

Privacy statement

Please withhold

Please note that all submissions (including names and contact details) will be made available at Council offices and public libraries. A summary of submissions including the name of the submitter may also be made publicly available and posted on the Kapiti Coast District Council website. Personal information will be used for administration relating to the subject matter of the submissions, including notifying submitters of subsequent steps and decisions. All information will be held by Kapiti Coast District Council, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information. If you do not want your personal information to be published please tick the box below.

Strategy classification

Select classification

Key decision (Pages 14-17)

Should we change the way we share rates across the district?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option to change the rating system?

Rating review sub-classification

Land value vs Capital value

Where there was an expressed preference

Key decision (Pages 18-20)

What should we do next to address flood risks?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option of a revised 45-year programme?

Yes - do the revised 45-year programme
(Council's preferred option)

Please tell us why:

Climate change, new roading, adverse weather effects can mean that flooding can occur in areas not previously considered risky. The plan needs to be more flexible to reflect what is actually occurring at any given time.

Work on the go (Pages 21-23)

Any comments on the matters below:

(Please tick the check box next to the relevant issue and a comment box will open below. You can comment on as many of these issues as you wish)

Coastal hazards and climate change

Coastal hazards and climate change

Comment

Massive concern for our coastal areas. The stormwater outlets at the beach are no longer sufficient to deal with flooding and high tides at the same time. We need to ensure the stormwater infrastructure leading into the lower lying areas of Tutere St Waikanae Beach, and leading to the beach can handle larger volume. Any potential future commercial builds in these areas, and in all Waikanae residential

areas should be governed by the same guidelines as new residential builds by having to have run off sump pits and NOT be allowed to put additional pressure to already at capacity stormwater pipes.

Rates for 2018/19 (Pages 24-25)

If the draft long term plan is adopted with all our recommended proposals, a rates increase of 4.7% on average will apply across the district for 2018/19. Do you support this?

No

Comments:

Waikanae Beach proposed increases are WELL above the area average. We will be subsidising the whole region, and I doubt we will be given the reflective percentage of additional resource. Waikanae Beach has already become very busy with the expressway off ramp resulting in Waikanae Beach becoming the easiest to access beach area on the whole Kapiti Coast for travellers, and more full time residents are living here. I hope that if this increase goes ahead that we can expect to be better resourced whilst keeping in with the wishes of residents and our Waikanae Beach values as outlined in the Waikanae Beach futures brochure, and recent character assessment commissioned by KCDC by ensuring adequate signage, parks maintenance, river maintenance, dune maintenance, emergency preparedness focus, toilets, rubbish bins, campervan parking restrictions and a view to future proofing our area as it continues to grow.

Rates comment categorisation

Key policies (Pages 27-28)

Anything else?

If you have any other feedback about this plan, or the work of the Council please comment here:

1. Community Emergency planning introduced into the long term plan. I consider it extremely important to see greater emphasis and commitment placed prioritising and supporting the residents of Waikanae to ensure a high level of emergency preparedness. Recent changes to the way that the Wellington regional emergency management office (WREMO) operate within communities, and with the move away from the way that Civil Defense operations have been previously viewed in a community, has lead to WREMO asking for greater involvement, and leadership from the community to establish grass roots community preparedness. We ask for documentation of commitment by KCDC to support the work currently done by WREMO and local community groups such as the Waikanae community emergency response planning team (WCERPT), and provide guidance to channels of expertise available to advance initiatives to educate the community and raise awareness of potential risk, and minimise hazards and challenges unique to our community in an emergency. The WCERPT are committed to working alongside WREMO to plan and activate emergency hub exercises at the two designated Community Hubs, and other sub hubs as necessary (e.g. at Waikanae Beach), to update community emergency asset lists, to document useful information such as generator and water tank locations and skilled personal available in Waikanae, to work with WREMO, KCDC and the Waikanae Community board to plan, and create logical, safe and accessible emergency evacuation routes for all members of our community. The complex variety of waterways, and access ways in Waikanae, along with the mobility challenges a lot of our residents have provide for the need to plan evacuation routes and create solutions. Waikanae Beach is becoming extremely busy with more people choosing to reside full time in Waikanae and more people visiting Waikanae Beach and staying short term. We have the added challenge of providing information and support to many of our residents that work out of the region during business hours and associated commutes. We need to ensure messages of emergency preparedness, what people should do, where they should go and where to find information when we experience flooding and adverse weather, as well as earthquakes, tsunami risk, fire and a variety of other emergency situations are accessible to all. The work done on emergency preparedness in Waikanae is considered by WREMO to be leading the way in establishing a community driven model, and we endeavor to operate as a benchmark that provides useful information, and experience for other areas on the Kapiti coast such as Te Horo and Otaki. 2. Te Reo on all of our signage I would like to see all of our area signage reflect English and Maori language.

Make Submission

Consultee	<input type="text"/>
Address	<input type="text"/>
Event Name	Long term plan 2018-38 consultation
Submission by	<input type="text"/>
Submission ID	18LTP-221
Response Date	22/04/18 6:10 PM
Consultation Point	Tell us what you think about our long term plan (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.2
First and last name	<input type="text"/> WITHHOLD
Title	<input type="text"/>
Address	<input type="text"/>
Phone	<input type="text"/>
Email	<input type="text"/>
Are you providing feedback	as an individual
Hearings	
Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission? No	
If you do, we will contact you at the email address or phone number provided above to arrange a time. Hearings will take place during the week of 14 May 2018.	
Privacy statement	Please withhold

Please note that all submissions (including names and contact details) will be made available at Council offices and public libraries. A summary of submissions including the name of the submitter may also be made publicly available and posted on the Kapiti Coast District Council website. Personal information will be used for administration relating to the subject matter of the submissions, including notifying submitters of subsequent steps and decisions. All information will be held by Kapiti Coast District Council, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information. If you do not want your personal information to be published please tick the box below.

Key decision (Pages 14-17)

Should we change the way we share rates across the district?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option to change the rating system?

No - keep the status quo - leave the rating system as it is

Rating review sub-classification

Land value vs Capital value

Where there was an expressed preference

Key decision (Pages 18-20)

What should we do next to address flood risks?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option of a revised 45-year programme?

No - keep the status quo programme

Please tell us why:

Re districtwide roading charge I interpret this change as: • instead of sharing the roading contributions charge evenly over all ratepayer properties to one where higher capital value properties will proportionally pay more than lower value properties. In our case our property has a capital value of \$1,170,000 which is roughly double the value of the average home. I therefore interpret this suggested plan change will mean we will pay double in dollar terms than the average property. This being the case we totally object to this change, the is not "equitable" as the document states it is effectively a property wealth tax and is "inequitable" you are suggesting higher value properties pay more - why? In our case the letter sent to us states our roading charge shares is \$235 and if this is double the average you are suggesting we pay \$117 over the average, again why? We already pay over \$5000 in rates significantly more than the average and there are only 2 of us living in the property and our roading use is minimal. On top of that each time rates increase by a % we pay more than the average in dollar terms and the gap in dollar terms increases to grow, by example a 4% increase in \$5000 = \$200 where a 4% increase in \$3000 is only \$120. Proportionally each increase we pay more in dollar terms, in this example \$80. We are tired of the attitude and thinking that higher value properties should pay more. If the above example is correct this year increase for us means we pay circa \$200 more than the average (\$80 + \$117). That is not fair or sharing or equitable. We accept paying an equal share we don't accept and object to paying more.

Work on the go (Pages 21-23)

Any comments on the matters below:

(Please tick the check box next to the relevant issue and a comment box will open below. You can comment on as many of these issues as you wish)

Rates for 2018/19 (Pages 24-25)

If the draft long term plan is adopted with all our recommended proposals, a rates increase of 4.7% on average will apply across the district for 2018/19. Do you support this?

No

Comments:

This is higher than inflation and the council needs to structure its organsaiton and spending to keep increases in line with inflation. Unnecessary expenditure should be eliminated.

Make Submission

Event Name	Long term plan 2018-38 consultation
Submission by	Kapiti Table Tennis Club (Mr Peter Jones - 81509)
Submission ID	18LTP-222
Response Date	22/04/18 6:25 PM
Consultation Point	Tell us what you think about our long term plan (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1

First and last name	Peter Jones
Title	Mr
Address	18 Groves Road Raumati Beach 5032

Phone	04 902 0607
Email	peter@ourbeach.nz
Are you providing feedback	as an individual

Hearings

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission?	Yes
--	-----

Key decision (Pages 14-17)

Should we change the way we share rates across the district?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option to change the rating system?

Yes - reduce the proportion of fixed-rate charges and introduce a commercially targeted rate (Council's preferred option)

Please tell us why:

Our residential rates are too expensive. For way too long the residential ratepayers have been subsidizing the commercial sectors in Kapiti. It is time the commercial sectors started paying their way, as they do in most other districts in NZ. While I have agreed with the council introducing a commercially targeted rate, I don't think the way KCDC has proposed to implement this for the 2018/19 rating year is the right way. On calculating my rates I discover that my residential rates will go up, not down, for this commercially targeted rate. It appears that KCDC is just pretending to target the commercial sector, while applying another residential rate increase. The two increases added together makes for an "over 9%" increase in our case. I guess it is better publicity to only have a "4.7%" increase. I believe that Kapiti should introduce a proper Capital Value rating system, or if not stick to a Land Value system. Having a 50/50 system is just playing with figures. We the ratepayers need a system that is fair and consistent. We don't need need a system that is constantly being juggled to hide rates increases.

Work on the go (Pages 21-23)

Any comments on the matters below:

Coastal hazards and climate change

Council should lead the way, and be proactive with organizing a solution for protecting our waterfront properties, both public and private. The private property owners could be charged a special rate to pay for their share. Or they could pay a capital contribution. It should be KCDC's responsibility to plan and implement a fair strategy to protect all our assets. Individual protection should be to a plan set up by KCDC, so that everyone can proceed in harmony with each other. The present adversarial approach to development and protection is wrong. The council is in the best position to find a permanent solution.

Kapiti Island gateway

Please keep all Kapiti Island activity where it is now. ie in Paraparaumu, near the boating club and Maclean Park. I would not want to see the proposed Kapiti Island Marine Reserve Education facility set up in the old swimming pool building in Raumati Beach. It should be positioned near or in the new "Gateway" in Paraparaumu.

Rates for 2018/19 (Pages 24-25)

If the draft long term plan is adopted with all our recommended proposals, a rates increase of 4.7% on average will apply across the district for 2018/19. Do you support this?

No

Comments:

See my submission re rating system above. If only it was just a 4.7% increase.

Make Submission

Event Name	Long term plan 2018-38 consultation
Submission by	Gordon Cameron (81827)
Submission ID	18LTP-223
Response Date	22/04/18 7:10 PM
Consultation Point	Tell us what you think about our long term plan (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.2

First and last name	Gordon Cameron
Title	Mr
Address	15 Alexander Road Raumati Beach Paraparaumu 5032
Phone	0223255493
Email	gkcameron@xtra.co.nz
Are you providing feedback	as an individual
Hearings	
Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission?	No

Where we're heading (Page 8)

Considering our challenges and constraints, do you think we're focusing on the right 10-year outcomes?

Yes. I would add "improving information" - Council gathers, interprets and reports using heaps of information, and we would benefit from even better management and access to this. e.g It is still not easy to search through Council papers on the website to find specific topics of interest. Kapiti will always have an audience of engaged and thinking people to be fed with relevant data.

Our financial and infrastructure strategies (Pages 10-13)

The Council plans to pay down debt, reduce borrowings and target infrastructure spending for resilience and growth. What are your views on this approach?

Let's do this.

Key decision (Pages 14-17)

Should we change the way we share rates across the district?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option to change the rating system?

Yes - reduce the proportion of fixed-rate charges and introduce a commercially targeted rate (Council's preferred option)

Please tell us why:

I agree with the proposals. Although we will pay more rates now, having a family home, this means in the future when we downsize we will be paying less. I agree with a commercially targeted rate. Commercial operators are able to claim rates as a tax deduction so they are financially advantaged. There will be issues around determining what is commercial, and in principle a residential rental property should be included as commercial. This will be easier to determine than the home based business. I also note that the government's tax review includes land tax (excluding residential land) as a possible future revenue stream; so if these ideas proceed there will ideally be a co-ordinated approach and data sharing.

Key decision (Pages 18-20)

What should we do next to address flood risks?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option of a revised 45-year programme?

No - keep the status quo programme

Please tell us why:

Stormwater continues to be the big risk to our district. I appreciate the work Council has done and plans to do here, however would like to see property owners accept the risks to their property and mitigate (where possible) themselves. Values for properties subject to inundation should reflect this, and lead over time to managed retreat in some cases. We regularly have flood events, however these fortunately recede in a short time. We are yet to see the impacts of the expressway in big floods.

Rates for 2018/19 (Pages 24-25)

If the draft long term plan is adopted with all our recommended proposals, a rates increase of 4.7% on average will apply across the district for 2018/19. Do you support this?

Yes

Comments on change to fees and charges:

Good luck !

Anything else?

If you have any other feedback about this plan, or the work of the Council please comment here:

Social investment - the Council proposes to reallocate its external social investment funding, to achieve improved social goals than current delivery. Although I am associated with several groups that may now miss out on funding; I agree with the direction. Kapiti has a vast number of community groups, and I would hope to see some collaboration and rationalisation of these, to achieve their goals more efficiently. I specifically write in support of the Kapiti Community Centre, who offer a growing range of activities to the community, and I would be like to see something similar develop in Waikanae.

Make Submission

Event Name	Long term plan 2018-38 consultation
Submission by	<input type="text"/>
Submission ID	18LTP-224
Response Date	22/04/18 8:25 PM
Consultation Point	Tell us what you think about our long term plan (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.2

First and last name	<input type="text"/> WITHHOLD DETAILS
---------------------	---------------------------------------

Title

Address

Phone

Email

Are you providing feedback	as an individual
----------------------------	------------------

Hearings

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission? No

Privacy statement

Please withhold

Where we're heading (Page 8)

Considering our challenges and constraints, do you think we're focusing on the right 10-year outcomes?

Yes, as long as Council keep listening to the people/ratepayers and acting on their submissions to council and heeding advice from outside professionals it appears as though council could be heading in the right directions. There are always other problems cropping up admittedly which upset the best laid plans but that is something that has to be dealt with as time goes on. We shall see.

Our financial and infrastructure strategies (Pages 10-13)

The Council plans to pay down debt, reduce borrowings and target infrastructure spending for resilience and growth. What are your views on this approach?

Paying down debt is essential. It's a pity the debt got to where it is before being acted on. Your headline on page 10 is right on. LIVE WITHIN YOUR MEANS COUNCIL. Everyone else has to. Council go on about achieving a balance and it sounds good but I do not believe it will happen going on past performance. Rates are not being kept to proposed figures. It all looks good on paper with all the right intentions. Hopefully the plan can be adhered to and it all works out.

Key decision (Pages 14-17)

Should we change the way we share rates across the district?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option to change the rating system?

No - keep the status quo - leave the rating system as it is

Yes - reduce the proportion of fixed-rate charges and introduce a commercially targeted rate (Council's preferred option)

Please tell us why:

I certainly will. Dealing with fixed charge roading rate first. Why should I, living on an extremely busy road used by everybody in Paraparaumu and others including council heavy vehicles and all vehicles going to the landfill pay a charge set according to my property's capital value which has just increased by 50% and the rates that have gone up by 7.9%. It would NOT alleviate affordability on my fixed income (pension). That means that I would be paying a disproportionate roading rate. GET REAL COUNCIL. Reducing the level of fixed charges in our rates will NOT alleviate the affordability problem in our district. You should be talking about lower incomes WITH higher rates and what council could do about that. Unless council can come up with better ideas then I will not agree to your new proposal. I do not believe that rising property values do not affect the total amount of rates that council collect. Why else these complicated proposals being put forward. Would not keeping the status quo spread the rates equally across the whole district. Every ratepayer shares equally. The bottom line is why should those with higher valued property's pay more for fixed charges. As you can see I have ticked both no and yes for this section as it is only the road charge idea that I really object to. Totally unfair in my view. All vehicles should pay a toll for using Arawhata Road and all main streets in the district as far as I am concerned. LOL

Key decision (Pages 18-20)

What should we do next to address flood risks?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option of a revised 45-year programme?

Yes - do the revised 45-year programme
(Council's preferred option)

Please tell us why:

Knowing only the bare bones of the entire council plans I can only agree with what I see in the consultation document. GO FOR IT. These plans seem to have been well thought out and priorities put in place. Lets hope that we do not get to many extremes in weather patterns in the meantime. Mother nature can be very fickle as we all know.

Work on the go (Pages 21-23)

Any comments on the matters below:

Coastal hazards and climate change

I agree with the envisaged proposal.

Replacing the Paekakariki seawall

Needs to be done. A pity it is taking so long.

Maclean Park

I do not really think that the council have heard (maybe listened) to the people on this matter. Having read a lot of the letters in the local papers I do not think the council have heard what the majority of people would like encompassed in this area. Maybe the pond would cost a lot to repair but a water feature would be an attraction. I don't think enough thought and planning has gone into this area. Or council do not want to.

Rates for 2018/19 (Pages 24-25)

If the draft long term plan is adopted with all our recommended proposals, a rates increase of 4.7% on average will apply across the district for 2018/19. Do you support this?

Yes

Comments:

Yes, in Principal only. If the plans could be adhered to. The idea is very good BUT. If my rates for 2018/19 have risen 7.9% and the average rate figure is 4.7% then there must be a lot of ratepayers with rate increases of less than 4.7%. I find it extremely hard to believe that the average is 4.7%. In the examples of rates impacts for Paraparaumu/Raumati on page 25 my property valuation comes between property 1 and property 2 and yet council are grabbing a rating over Property 2's rate. My property's value is NOT the same as property 2. I suppose council accountants as all accountants can make figures do anything. Really confusing to the ordinary bloke. Something like this makes one wary of the whole consultation process and the figures presented. Council would have some explanation I am sure.

Comments on change to fees and charges:

Council costs have to be recovered so fees and charges have to be increased to recover these costs. User pays.

Key policies (Pages 27-28)

If you have any views about the **proposed changes to our development contributions policy**, please tell us here:

A lot of information in the document that means nothing to the ordinary ratepayer. I thought council would make it a lot clearer what the policy and terms mean. (HUE for gods sake) Come down to earth council. Be kind to us mere mortals.

If you have any views about the **proposed changes to our revenue and financing policy**, please tell us here:

Should not the fee for building consents be funded by the person requesting the consent (private) or have I got the wrong understanding of page 28.

Anything else?

If you have any other feedback about this plan, or the work of the Council please comment here:

Yes. After reading the Kapiti News today the 18th of April I did not realise the extent of the hypocrisy of the council. Front page news. Loss of funds to Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB) from KCDC with a picture of his lordship the mayor with a smile on his face cutting the ribbon to declare CAB's new premises open. Not even a hint of embarrassment from him. Just an explanation of why their funding was cut. CAB who help people on all sorts of problems should not have their funding cut. Council may be trying to fund them some other way and so they should. Okay, funds should be contested to a degree but we are talking here only about \$14000 I understand from the article. CAB are probably doing a lot of work that Council would otherwise be having to help folk with. Come on KCDC, help CAB. In the same issue of Kapiti News I read the Mayor's column and am no wiser about the whole situation than I was beforehand. I am sure the mayor did not write those columns. Put together by the accountant or somebody in a higher position. I am no less concerned about the way the situation will turn out in future. KCDC will do what they want anyway. Its just going to cost rate payers more and more. Ratepayers are treated as Cash Cows who have to pay up regardless. Wellington Regional Council are just as bad. No concern for the ratepayer. Going by the feedback I am receiving both verbally and in the papers council could very well be facing a backlash in the near future. My feeling is that this being so close to the 1st July KCDC have everything in place for all the changes envisaged and the only reason for asking for submissions is because council are required to by law. Probably a complete waste of effort and time for ratepayers to prepare these submissions as council have already made up their minds.

Make Submission

Event Name	Long term plan 2018-38 consultation
Submission by	Jayne O'Neill (81828)
Submission ID	18LTP-225
Response Date	22/04/18 8:50 PM
Consultation Point	Tell us what you think about our long term plan (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.2

First and last name	Jayne O'Neill
---------------------	---------------

Title	Mrs
-------	-----

Address	103 Tilley Road Paekākāriki
---------	-----------------------------

Phone	0276307630
-------	------------

Email	kowhai53@gmail.com
-------	--------------------

Are you providing feedback	as an individual
----------------------------	------------------

Hearings

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission?	Yes
--	-----

Anything else?

If you have any other feedback about this plan, or the work of the Council please comment here:

NZTA will soon begin the process of moving on the land it does not require for the completion of Transmission Gully. For Paekākāriki this opens the door to numerous possible changes in our village, some positive and some with the potential to have negative impacts. There's already numerous groups with ideas and plans vying for approval in the village, with some of these already seeking support externally from the public and political backing before the community has engaged in full robust consultation that may see such plans as a windfarm part of Paekākāriki's future. I understand the district plan classifies the local land (Perkins Farm) as Rural Hills and Dunes. Under this classification Wainui Stream catchment and our surrounding natural landscapes would be protected from substantial subdivisional development. I ask that the District Plan be upheld as it is. I support the future possibility of some limited new sustainable and affordable housing within the village ensuring our mana whenua can afford to stay in their village and renters can live in the village affordably and with security of tenure. Housing options in the village also need to ensure there is warm, modern accommodation to meet the needs of elderly people who wish to down size and remain in the village, keeping them close to amenities. I fully support submissions that request and support our local community to consult fully in an open and transparent manner so we all consider the long-term vision for our village before making decision about this land. My concern for our region is that we have the opportunity for the beauty and ecology benefits of this land being lost as projects are pushed through without the fuller considerations occurring due to inadequate consultation and incomplete information shared with the community. The hills of Perkins farm were recently publicly described as 'ratshit', of no value. I found this disturbing and lacked insight into their true value to our district. We live in a time where sustainability in its many forms is highly valued and opportunities to take action are encouraged. Paekākāriki is a community that values initiatives that support our community to be more sustainable. It is concerning that some proposals will impact significantly on the outstanding natural features, Bird life, special amenity landscape and other areas of high natural character. The hills and valleys of Perkins farm have immense potential to be regenerated, supporting the return of our bird life which is already occurring with the great work of Nga Uruora. By preserving this land we have the opportunity to regenerate the native forest and develop bikeways and walking tracks for the next generation. There is a concern that in the passion for action our important ecological regeneration and our outstanding landscape may be lost locally and a great loss for the region. I ask KCDC to consider the opportunity to preserve the outstanding natural landscape in the district known as Perkins Farm. To use wise guardianship and wisdom as they consider each request. I ask KCDC take up the guardianship role for joining the Akatarawas across Mt Wainui to Perkins Farm and on to Paekākāriki, our scarp to Pukerua Bay, and QE Regional Park. As a District Park it would be a haven for NZ native birds that would allow for the return of the kakariki and many other native birds so that Paekakariki would be seen as No.1 in environmental awareness and living with nature. Paekakariki defines the southern entrance to Kapiti district and would be the jewel in the crown of a bold framing of our districts natural landscape.

Make Submission

Event Name	Long term plan 2018-38 consultation
Submission by	Stacey Gasson (81829)
Submission ID	18LTP-226
Response Date	22/04/18 9:09 PM
Consultation Point	Tell us what you think about our long term plan (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.2
Files	LTP2038 - Stacey Gasson

First and last name	Stacey Gasson
Title	Ms
Address	11 Haumia St, Paekakariki
Phone	292 8828
Email	gassonstacey@gmail.com
Are you providing feedback	as an individual

Hearings

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission? No

Anything else?

If you have any other feedback about this plan, or the work of the Council please comment here:

[See attached submission on multiple topics]

Submission on Kāpiti Coast District Council Long Term Plan

Name: Stacey Gasson

Address: 11 Haumia St, Paekākāriki 5034

Phone: 292 8828

E-mail: gassonstacey@gmail.com

I am providing feedback as an individual. I do not want to speak to Council about my submission

I note my submission (including name and contact details) will be made available publicly.

I make the following submission to the Kāpiti Coast District Council Long Term Plan:

Traffic:

I support the creation of traffic calming measures for Ames St. I appreciate there are currently speed bumps but vehicles still come through too quickly. Ames Street is also affected by a large volume of people parking to use Te Araroa Trail. Directing people to park at the railway station in the weekend is useful, but it would be excellent if parking could be created at the old service station too. The walk from here to the start of the trail is clear and not far.

Also, while it's not exactly a traffic issue, motorbikes and quad bikes on the beach are not uncommon (usually on the weekend and in the the late afternoon). These often lack license plates so it's difficult to know what to do. Given that people aren't expecting them to be there however and they tend to be going quite quickly, they pose a real hazard to dogs and children.

Housing:

I support the submission made by the *Paekākāriki Housing Trust*. Their assertion on the inadequacy of affordable housing in the district is spot on, and the actions they propose would make a real difference. Specifically:

1. The next 12 months should hold more than “talking to the community and our partners about how best to manage our existing stock of older person flats”. The Council should make affordable housing a priority in Kāpiti. The housing provided by Council for older people is important and done really well. However, housing pressures are affecting other groups in our community too, particularly families with children. Rising rents are becoming increasingly unaffordable for parents working in the service industry, which provides a large proportion of employment in Kāpiti.

I would like to see the Council commit to the principle that affordable housing is critical to the health and well-being of our community and actively seek ways to work with community housing providers to increase both the stock of affordable housing and the demographic groups it benefits.

2. The availability of affordable housing should therefore be a central consideration in decisions the Council makes on planning and consent issues and on the allocation of land and other resources held by the Council.
3. The Council should work with NZTA and other central government agencies to identify land suitable for affordable housing. The Council can work to ensure that land made surplus after the construction of the Expressway and Transmission Gully are disposed of in ways that create assets for the community, protecting the environment and enabling the development of affordable housing.
4. In particular, Council should work to ensure a comprehensive community-based precinct plan is developed for the Perkins Farm property and adjacent lands currently held by NZTA. This plan should provide for environmental protection and affordable housing and be completed before NZTA disposes of these lands. Land that will become surplus from the highway construction has many values and opportunities for the community of Paekākāriki as well as the wider Kāpiti District. Working with the community to plan for and secure the future of this land is required to ensure maximum benefit is obtained by the whole community.
5. Use Council-held rights of first refusal with regard to NZTA lands that are appropriate for affordable housing as a means to enable community-led development of that land. This would include sites such as the south end of the 'Tilley triangle'.
6. Enable and encourage affordable housing by reducing or waiving Council fees and levies where appropriate when a residential development includes provision for affordable or social housing, particularly where it is to be purchased by a recognised Community Housing provider.
7. Lease Council social housing and land to local registered community housing providers such as Paekākāriki Housing Trust, Dwell Housing Trust, and iwi providers.
8. Manage social housing locally to strengthen community connections and cohesion. Empower the Paekākāriki Community Board to decide on the allocation of social housing in the village. Of the Kāpiti Coast communities, Paekākāriki has the lowest percentage of elderly residents because there is not enough appropriate housing and they are forced to leave the village. This reduces the diversity of the community and severs long-standing social connections.

Waste and recycling services:

The current waste collection system has failed with regard to waste reduction and this needs to be rectified. I understand Council has contracts in place, but these have expiry dates and Council should be planning now how to address the issues.

Specifically, when Council handed over waste collection to private providers residents were told that the system of bag collection and recycling would remain, but private providers were the best option because competition would keep the price down. We are now losing the option of bag collection and told to choose who we wish to receive a large waste bin from.

With flat fees in place, rather than a fee per bag, this system offers no incentive for waste reduction; the large bin also encourages people to fill it as they understand that they are paying

for it either way. This is bad for the environment because waste is a major source of methane emissions, and there are now up to four different providers driving around our district, duplicating services and emitting carbon dioxide and air pollutants.

The Council has a stated commitment to sustainability and waste minimisation. This situation can be resolved by returning to council-provided kerbside recycling and waste collection services like other councils, including our neighbours, Porirua, Hutt City and Wellington and numerous others all over New Zealand.

Council also needs to looking into ways that a greenwaste service can be provided to further reduce waste to landfill and methane emissions. The compost produced would be welcomed by groups and individuals throughout the district seeking to establish gardens on sandy soil and reduce their water use by building the structure of that soil.

Rates:

The Council needs to look again at changing the rating model to one based on Capital Value. Paekākāriki has larger sections (to allow for septic tanks) and often has older homes, so pays disproportionately high rates due to the use of land value rather than capital value as the basis for rating.

Given the Council's acknowledgment that they want a fairer rating system, one which uses the capital value of a property as a proxy for ability to pay, it is inconsistent to continue to use a land-value based approach rather than a capital value system. In the rating system review background information, in support of improving fairness and appropriateness and ability to pay, the Shand report is quoted indicating that there is a strong link between property values and household incomes - the Council should therefore move to using property (capital) values rather than land values.

In addition to it being unfair from this perspective, it is also unfair in that according to the consultation document many of the increasing costs relate to the construction of new services to account for population growth. New subdivisions tend to have much lower land values compared to capital values, partly as a result of them tending to be smaller sections and partly because the houses are new and undepreciated. This means that existing properties pay disproportionately more.

Biodiversity:

In considering the future of the NZTA land known as the 'Tilley Triangle', the restoration of natural wetlands on low-lying areas must be provided for. This land is unsuitable for development and could serve no better purpose than being returned to the ecosystem it once supported. Wetlands provide crucial habitat for many of New Zealand's threatened species, valuable ecosystem services and flood protection, and are sadly one of our most endangered ecosystems due to pressures from farming and urban development.

Climate change:

As a member of Low Carbon Kāpiti, I strongly support their submission. Specifically, we are calling on Council to go carbon neutral by 2025, and the actions we outline can enable this:

1. In the section *Where we are heading?*, you list 'An effective response to climate change' as the last of five. We would like it first so that, in thinking about infrastructure and money, climate change becomes an integral part of every decision.
2. A section on *Significant Assumptions and Risks* should be included and, like Greater Wellington does, state that the main effects of climate change will be more frequent and increasing severe storm events with rain and westerly winds.
3. The plan begins to address some of the issues with adaptation to climate change but fails completely to mention ways we could reduce our emissions of greenhouse gases. The exception is the LED streetlight conversion – it is already in the plan, it will reduce emissions and we support it. There is no acknowledgment of Council's existing carbon reduction target of 80% by 2021-22.
4. Mitigation issues that are left out include:
 - a. Offsetting Council carbon emissions – preferably with native re-vegetation in the district at high benefit sites. The plan should mention, and budget for, planting trees. If trees were planted on three pieces of Council land the emissions saved would be significant.
 - b. Further conversion of the council's vehicle fleet to electric vehicles would be another contribution.
 - c. Heat pumps at Ōtaki and Waikanae pools. Heating renewals are planning in the next six years but these must not be natural gas boilers. Ōtaki Pool should also have a ventilation heat recovery system installed.
 - d. Diversion of all organic material (food and garden waste) to composting rather than letting it be buried and produce methane, a greenhouse gas. This is half our waste. There is no budget for investigating or developing systems for this.
 - e. Continue to support education and home insulation etc. to reduce peak electricity generation carbon emissions from coal/gas
 - f. More solar panels at the sewage treatment plant and possibly introduce them at the water treatment plant
 - g. Improve public walkways and cycleways and public transport infrastructure
5. Adaptation:
 - a. The stormwater upgrade issue is partly an issue relating to adaptation to climate change. The Council knows it must be upgraded and earlier dismissed the chance to spend just 25 years upgrading it, but chose the 45 year timeframe because of its self-imposed constraints on Council debt. The only other option is no good – to do nothing. Submitters should know this is a major part of the rates bill.
 - b. Road maintenance: certain roads, mainly rural, are vulnerable to frequent storm events causing slips.
 - c. Coastal erosion: we must decide how long we will defend against the sea and at what stage we will adopt a policy of managed retreat (particularly south of Waikanae).
 - d. Rising sea levels are compounded by the effect of tectonic subsidence of 2mm/yr. A plan for managed coastal and lowland river/stream retreat is needed and should include stopping new infrastructure investment or development in areas that will inevitably

succumb to the Dunedin problem.

e. Increased rainfall/flooding raises multiple issues which must be acted on, including the need for managed lowland river/stream retreat, catchment native re-vegetation, and re-vegetation of steep slopes that threaten infrastructure and contribute to stream flows/contamination through erosion.

f. Increased droughts – improved lowland river and stream riparian vegetation for shading and evaporation minimisation to protect freshwater ecosystems; native re-vegetation of catchments (particularly in our smaller water supply catchments and those with threatened native fish species).

Perkins Farm land:

I ask that the Long Term Plan include support for and resourcing of a community driven planning process for surplus NZTA land associated with the construction of the Transmission Gully Highway. This includes the area known as Perkins Farm.

Land that will become surplus from the highway construction has many values and opportunities for the community of Paekākāriki as well as the wider Kāpiti District. Working with the community on planning and securing the future of this land is required to ensure maximum benefit is obtained by the whole community.

Nearly all of this Motorway will lie outside the Kāpiti District, but the point where it enters the District will become a quite dramatic Gateway. Resource consents for the use of the land around this gateway will be determined by the Kāpiti Coast District Council, and it would be prudent for the Council to begin considering now how it would wish to see that gateway developed -- in the best interests of the communities of the District and the region.

Most of the land is now owned by NZTA who will at some unknown point in the next three years decide to sell some 350 hectares of the former Perkins Farm and some associated blocks. This land includes a number of important features:

- a landscape deemed 'outstanding' in the Kāpiti District Plan, and 'of regional significance' in the Greater Wellington Council statement;
- some steep country subject to erosion and landslips that have in the past closed rail and road links;
- part of a re-vegetation project aimed at bringing back kākāriki - and the dawn chorus;
- areas subject to flooding that could be restored as wetlands to reduce risks;
- streams to be rejuvenated for indigenous fish;
- some land suitable for housing;
- a suitable site for a wind farm;
- scope for walkways and cycle trails; and
- areas suitable for community gardens and orchards.

Some of these opportunities are obvious - but defining the boundaries around them will demand care. Some are competing uses that will need to be considered in the context of varied regional and local priorities.

The possibility of the Kāpiti Council buying the land has been raised, but at present there is insufficient funding for this in the Strategic Land Purchase Fund and the Council might not want to retain ownership of the whole block. In any case, the process for disposal of Crown Lands is not likely to give priority to the Council. What the Council does have, however, is the responsibility for determining acceptable changes in the use of the land through its resource consent process.

There are strong arguments for beginning the consideration of competing land uses now. NZTA might trigger the sale process at any time. Indeed, its intermediaries may already be talking to potential buyers, and it has already taken steps towards selling off some separate blocks nearby. Clarification of the Council's views on competing uses for the land can exert significant influence on the sale process and price.

Beginning the process of clarifying community interests now is likely to yield better results for Kāpiti than waiting for the process to be triggered and shaped by the preconceptions of a new owner. Land uses will change. Council will have to deal with applications for resource consent for these changes. Preparing a statement of community interests in the best use of this land now, before the process of disposal starts, will ensure that potential buyers are fully aware of them from the beginning. Waiting until a new owner has spent money on the land, prepared its own vision for its use, and paid experts to prepare a formal resource consent application, would ensure that the new owner's preferences will shape and drive what could be a contentious and expensive consent process. The purchase price, the consent process, and the outcome can all be influenced by first setting out the interests of the communities of Kāpiti.

The Council has a mechanism, a Precinct Structure Plan, which it has used before for considering land use changes on significant blocks of land. I submit that it would be in the interests of all of the communities in Kāpiti for the Council to make provision in the Long Term Plan to develop a Precinct Structure Plan for the land around the Northern end of the Transmission Gully Motorway, principally the former Perkins Farm.

Streams quality:

The water quality of many of our local streams is inadequate. With regard to the Wainui Stream in particular, flowing through a park, as it does, people should be able to assume that the water will be safe for children and dogs. This is not the case, as Council are well aware, and something must be done to protect this better. Things have improved since the stock were taken off the Perkins farm, but riparian planting is still lacking many sections. This enables sediment to enter the stream at many points, causing the stream bed to rise noticeably over the years. The lack of shade also affects water temperature, making it an uncomfortable home for the native and threatened fish species currently found there.

Flooding:

As we have seen, all but the southern end of the 'Tilley Triangle' is prone to flooding. This land must be protected – and wetland restoration would do this well. The situation would be greatly assisted if the man-made dog-leg in the Wainui stream behind the houses were remedied. When the stream is flowing high, this corner is eroded and water encouraged to spill out of the channel.

Impact of Transmission Gully:

Council are supporting Paraparaumu and Waikanae and have spent considerable money on Otaki township. Paekākāriki will be greatly affected by Transmission Gully. We too should be supported.

Town centre:

Paekākāriki should be included in the LTP town centres review. Paekākāriki urgently needs a parking, roading, and speed limit review for the whole township. Parking has recently become more and more congested. The old garage site on SH1 lends its self to creation of commuter parking, along with weekend parking for walkers etc. This will become more viable when SH1 is revoked and there is less traffic on the main road.

Council as a Living Wage employer:

A growing number of local authorities around Aotearoa are adopting the NZ Living Wage rate as the minimum rate paid to workers. Council workers work for me. I value the work they do. I would be proud to be able to say that our council workforce is paid a wage that enables them to live in dignity and participate in society. I want my council to support the principle of the Living Wage and include a plan to implement the Living Wage in the Long Term Plan.

Make Submission

Event Name	Long term plan 2018-38 consultation Geoffrey
Submission by	Osgood (81831)
Submission ID	18LTP-227
Response Date	22/04/18 9:40 PM
Consultation Point	Tell us what you think about our long term plan (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.2

First and last name	Geoffrey Osgood
---------------------	-----------------

Title	Mr
-------	----

Address	Winston St Crofton Downs Wellington
---------	-------------------------------------

Phone	027 234 8633
-------	--------------

Email	gosgood4@gmail.com
-------	--------------------

Are you providing feedback	as an individual
----------------------------	------------------

Hearings

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission?	No
--	----

Where we're heading (Page 8)

Considering our challenges and constraints, do you think we're focusing on the right 10-year outcomes?

Yes. Of the 5 primary outcomes, an improved financial position, infrastructure investment and an effective response to coming climate change are essential for safe and continuing life for citizens.

Our financial and infrastructure strategies (Pages 10-13)

The Council plans to pay down debt, reduce borrowings and target infrastructure spending for resilience and growth. What are your views on this approach?

Agree.

Key decision (Pages 14-17)

Should we change the way we share rates across the district?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option to change the rating system?

Yes - reduce the proportion of fixed-rate charges and introduce a commercially targeted rate (Council's preferred option)

Please tell us why:

This is a shift to 'user pays'. Commercial operations earning income are better placed to contribute than those on fixed incomes.

Key decision (Pages 18-20)

What should we do next to address flood risks?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option of a revised 45-year programme?

Yes - do the revised 45-year programme (Council's preferred option)

Please tell us why:

Stormwater management is a vital core Council function for a district comprising a coastal plain backed by mostly short steep catchments.

Rates for 2018/19 (Pages 24-25)

If the draft long term plan is adopted with all our recommended proposals, a rates increase of 4.7% on average will apply across the district for 2018/19. Do you support this?

Yes

Anything else?

If you have any other feedback about this plan, or the work of the Council please comment here:

SOLID WASTE As part of the second tier outcome of sustainable practice, greatly improved waste minimisation should be possible by residents and business. If contracted private business is unable and/or unwilling to offer services and flexibility to enable waste reduction and landfill diversion then waste management should be a Council function. It should be obvious that dumping waste in holes is not a sustainable practice. **BIODIVERSITY** A vital part of improved district biodiversity is predator animal control. This is already undertaken on private land, urban and rural, by residents on their own initiative. Most of these projects are self funded or funded outside of District Council resources. However, past and present Biodiversity and Sustainable Communities staff have been of great help in advice, coordination and networking. I suggest Council continue with these roles and be open to having resident's groups conduct predator control on Council land where such control by staff is not possible.

Make Submission

Event Name Long term plan 2018-38 consultation
Submission by Mr Martin Manning (65009)
Submission ID 18LTP-228
Response Date 22/04/18 10:30 PM
Consultation Point Tell us what you think about our long term plan
[\(View\)](#)
Status Submitted
Submission Type Web
Version 0.3
Files KCDC needs to consider what is sustainable

First and last name Martin Manning

Title Dr

Address 14 Fairway Oaks Drive Waikanae 5036

Phone 04 293 8457

Email martin.r.manning@gmail.com

Are you providing feedback as an individual

Hearings

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission? No

Where we're heading (Page 8)

Considering our challenges and constraints, do you think we're focusing on the right 10-year outcomes?

In principle, yes. In practice, it is not at all clear yet.

Our financial and infrastructure strategies (Pages 10-13)

The Council plans to pay down debt, reduce borrowings and target infrastructure spending for resilience and growth. What are your views on this approach?

As covered in more detail in my attached comments, reduction of debt and bringing asset depreciation into the council budget can be done in ways that avoid major year to year changes in rates.

Key decision (Pages 14-17)

Should we change the way we share rates across the district?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option to change the rating system?

No - keep the status quo - leave the rating system as it is

Please tell us why:

As covered in my attached comments the system for levying rates may need to change but the current proposal is extremely unfair to people who have fixed incomes. It is also much worse than the equivalent of rating systems used in each of the other three countries I have worked in.

Key decision (Pages 18-20)

What should we do next to address flood risks?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option of a revised 45-year programme?

Yes - do the revised 45-year programme (Council's preferred option)

Please tell us why:

In general the 45-yr programme is reasonable. But there still has to become a much clearer approach to the changes in risks that are being caused by sea level rise and the implications that this has for the usable lifetime of any coastal asset on land less than 5m above current sea level.

Rates for 2018/19 (Pages 24-25)

If the draft long term plan is adopted with all our recommended proposals, a rates increase of 4.7% on average will apply across the district for 2018/19. Do you support this?

No

Comments:

See attached comments.

Key policies (Pages 27-28)

If you have any views about the **proposed changes to our rates remission policy**, please tell us here:

See attached comments.

You can attach a document with further comments to give all the feedback you want to. KCDC needs to consider what is sustainable

KCDC needs to consider what is sustainable

1. Year to year variations in the council's rates are the opposite of long term planning

Sustainability requires prudent forms of long term planning that take a carefully balanced approach between short term and long-term issues. In contrast to this, the graph at the top of page 11 of the consultation document "Building a Stronger Kapiti together" shows that while there is a long-term average for rates increases of about 2.5%/yr the current approach is to have rates increases jumping around wildly from year to year, from more than 5% to practically zero.

This shows a complete lack of long-term planning that should be used to buffer the costs to ratepayers. For example, the current approach is completely out of line with those used in all major financial management organisations such as banks, insurance and re-insurance companies.

More specifically, a key part of this fiasco is the aim to now fully fund depreciation from council income. But this is primarily a change in the accounting process, so why does it have to be met in five years? Why not fifteen years? Better still, why not have this become a way of setting constant rates increases as the long-term average. That would mean depreciation becomes covered by 2029 and rates exceeding expenditure in years after that would mean that additional savings were made to reduce current loans even more than currently proposed.

2. Sustainability requires increasing efficiency

The figure at the bottom of page 12 has operating costs for infrastructure rising rapidly after 2025. The latter part of this 30-year perspective deals with a major pipe renewal that should be planned carefully. But the first 20 years are said to have a population growth of "almost" 4,000 households (so ~16%) whereas the growth in infrastructure operating costs over this period is put at more than 60%. Why? And why is it not explained anywhere?

At present it implies that the plan envisages a significant drop in efficiency of the current infrastructure, despite an increasing amount of asset renewal also occurring over the 20-year period. Why is KCDC actually planning to go backwards in efficiency, when a proper deployment of the new technologies that are becoming available for infrastructure is known to be able to cover increases in diversity and demand while total costs only increase by about the same rate as inflation.

Home owners and business owners are having to operate that way, why wont the council?

3. The proposed rates increase is obviously inequitable

There are several reasons why the council's position on changing the way in which different services are charged to ratepayers is not equitable. Two of the more obvious ones are:

Switching \$7.6 million of road charges to being apportioned on the basis of ratepayers' property capital values rather than being fixed is completely different to a user pays approach. Frankly, I think that the council staff who put this argument together should be made to pass a stage I economics exam before we trust them anymore. The proposal is actually the opposite of what economic analyses keep showing about all of the implicit side benefits that come from a well-balanced user-pays approach.

Furthermore, the Local Government Act 2002 sets out why councils should levy rates primarily on the basis that the benefit received is more important than the ability to pay. That then relates to the central government role being to consider lower income earners via the tax system or, in the specific case of local government rates, as is done by the Dept of Internal Affairs Rates Rebate Act 1973.

Having lived and worked in four countries I can say that the New Zealand situation is quite different to other forms of local tax systems such as transfer of tax income from central to local government in the UK, or the major role of state and city taxes in the USA. Here the New Zealand government has actually devolved some responsibilities to local government and so far no steps have been taken to transfer their tax income to cover this as is being done in other countries (e.g. see: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/444993/2904001_LGF_web_accessible_v0_2_final.pdf for UK)

The current legislative framework means that council is constrained to only consider: flat charges, ones related to land value or ones related to capital value. On that basis, LGNZ should probably raise the issues of dealing with equity across ratepayers with central government in ways that could lead to improvements in the Local Government Rating Act.

But in the meantime, it is not at all equitable to suddenly charge a significant cross-section of ratepayers for services that others use very much more than they do. This applies particularly to those who are retired and so no longer use the council's roads nearly as much as those who commute every day.

A second concern is that statements about 'affordability' made on page 14 demonstrate the complete lack of attention that the council has paid to this issue. For example, the 5% of household income threshold did not start with a 'Shand report' in 2007 (for which no reference is given). It is actually built into government legislation called the Rates Rebate Act 1973. Does the council not know this?

More significantly, the government rebate for local government rates that are high relative to ratepayers income is still locked into the context of 1973 and so is limited to \$605 per annum. That shows the very large increase in rates that has occurred since the Act was passed by government so that it is now becoming a generic problem rather than one applying to a very limited number of ratepayers. Again, this is a point that the council should raise with central government, probably via LGNZ.

4. The council's approach to setting rates has now become completely unsustainable

The council's current approach to financial management has now become totally unsustainable because rates are increasing much faster than average or median salary increases. And for those of us who are relying on past investments, living on pensions, or on superannuation tied to the consumer price index, or other benefits, our incomes are also increasing by a lot less than the average salaries.

Page 25 of the consultation document makes it clear that Waikanae would face the largest rates increases, but it uses figures that are much less than we are now hearing from others. In our case the increase would be more than ten times the most comparable value given on that page, and more than eight times what the council imply with their statement on page 16 that 21,000 residential properties will pay an additional \$1M.

This clearly shows that the council is trying to hide the seriousness of the issue.

E.g, our KCDC rates went up by 6.6% in 2017 and it is now proposed to raise them by another 14.2% this year. The GWRC component on top of this went up by 5.4% in 2017 and that is now going up another 13.9%. Over the same years our retirement income went up by 1.5% in 2017 and by 2.2% this year.

Or to put it another way, the proposal is that our rates should now jump from being 3.9% of our income to 4.4% and that implies we would go over the 5% level in another couple of years.

5. Conclusion

If the council refuses to back down from its proposed major structural change to the KCDC rating system then this issue will probably go the same way as the council's very poorly considered approach to LIM reports on coastal properties over 2012 – 2013 that led to court action. That sloppy way of addressing the issue just led to a backdown by the council that has now made it even harder to address what will actually become a growing problem of coastal erosion.

Imposing a major structural change in the way that rates are levied on a wide range of property owners in Kapiti should not be done without looking at the options in a much more open way. These should be consistent with economic analyses of the benefits of user-pays approaches and should address the very obvious inequities in the current proposal that have been mentioned above.

Personally, I feel very strongly about the quality of local governance that is being raised by this issue. And this is to the extent that I will never again vote for any of the current councillors who does not clearly oppose this proposed major shift towards rates becoming much more based on capital values, with its major implications for retired rate payers.

Martin Manning
14 Fairway Oaks Drive

Make Submission

Event Name	Long term plan 2018-38 consultation
Submission by	Miss Diane Connal (59472)
Submission ID	18LTP-229
Response Date	22/04/18 11:20 PM
Consultation Point	Tell us what you think about our long term plan (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.3

First and last name	Diane Connal
Title	Miss

Address	1a Field Way Waikanae Beach
----------------	-----------------------------

Phone	0211810453
--------------	------------

Email	dconnal@gmail.com
--------------	-------------------

Are you providing feedback	as an individual
-----------------------------------	------------------

Hearings

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission?	No
--	----

Where we're heading (Page 8)

Considering our challenges and constraints, do you think we're focusing on the right 10-year outcomes?

I think there is too much flowery talk and not much substance. I don't understand what the fresh approach is. You say you are caring for the environment but you ignore our shorelines. . Not for profits are in chaos with the changes to their funding.

Our financial and infrastructure strategies (Pages 10-13)

The Council plans to pay down debt, reduce borrowings and target infrastructure spending for resilience and growth. What are your views on this approach?

My rates are going up more than 5.5 percent. We get a lot less of essential services than we used to. We now pay for rubbish collection and water. I'm getting priced out of my home. You waste money on consultants and cut our services.

Key decision (Pages 14-17)

Should we change the way we share rates across the district?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option to change the rating system?

Please tell us why:

My rates are going up more than 5.5 percent. The amount we pay to Greater Wellington Regional Council is excessive. You say you are making changes but there is not a lot of detail there. I'm still being rated out. Why does the value of my house reflect in my rates? I get nothing from the council because of this. I don't trust your stats on the decrease that could happen. Hard to believe.

Key decision (Pages 18-20)

What should we do next to address flood risks?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option of a revised 45-year programme?

Please tell us why:

The maintenance on drains and storm waters is random at best. I often see the council checking drains only after it has been raining heavily. Surely it would be better to check regularly before the rain. Why have you stopped cutting the Waikanae river? It is causing erosion.

Work on the go (Pages 21-23)

Any comments on the matters below:

Paraparaumu and Waikanae town centres

I feel that the Council needs to commit to the plan to upgrade Mahara Gallery and Waikanae Library. Also the Waikanane Beach community has done a lot of work producing a draft plan for our unique beachside township and it is not the same as Waikanae town. We want the points that came out of it actioned and not side lined by the Waikanae Board. We dont need to buy the old beach Bowling Club. We have a hall that we love and we have a plan and vision for our community that we want listened to .

Kapiti Island gateway

Don't block the beautiful beach view or build anything on the beach. We certainly don't need any of that ugly Fred Flinstone outdoor furniture that you have used in your document.

Rates for 2018/19 (Pages 24-25)

If the draft long term plan is adopted with all our recommended proposals, a rates increase of 4.7% on average will apply across the district for 2018/19. Do you support this?

No

Comments on change to fees and charges:

It's hard to tell what the changes are from what you say. Dont understand what you mean by swimming admin charges. Will it cost more? Just say so. and No, it shouldnt.

Anything else?

If you have any other feedback about this plan, or the work of the Council please comment here:

There is nothing in your plan about Arts and Culture at all. It's an important part of our community and it is ignored . The not for profit contestable funding is messy and unfair to many of the charities in our community. Who is the Impact church who are getting so much of the funding?

Make Submission

Consultee	Mr Robert Kieboom (65126)
Address	35 Rimu Road Raumati Beach 5032
Event Name	Long term plan 2018-38 consultation
Submission by	Mr Robert Kieboom (65126)
Submission ID	18LTP-230
Response Date	22/04/18 11:21 PM
Consultation Point	Tell us what you think about our long term plan (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.4
First and last name	Robert Kieboom
Title	Dr
Address	35 Rimu Road Raumati Beach Kapiti 5032
Phone	04 2972677
Email	kieboom@xtra.co.nz
Are you providing feedback	as an individual
Hearings	
Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission?	Yes

Key decision (Pages 14-17)

Should we change the way we share rates across the district?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option to change the rating system?

No - keep the status quo - leave the rating system as it is

Please tell us why:

1. Should we change the way we share rates across the district? No – keep the status quo. . The rationale for changing the way rates are distributed across the district is to make it fairer and more affordable. Affordable for whom? By making rates more affordable for some there is the opposite effect of making them less affordable for others. . Changing the fixed-charge roading rate to an apportioned charge is both unfair and a rather random approach to solving affordability issues. There are some huge assumptions in this policy. There is the assumption owners of higher value properties have a greater ability to pay. But they are already paying more. Council always refers to 'low and fixed' income people struggling. Most people are on fixed incomes – wage and salary workers can't go and ask for a pay rise simply because their rates have gone up - so this argument doesn't really wash. Why should a couple in a higher value house, who run one car to and from the shops a few times a week, pay more for roads in Kapiti than another property that may have more occupants and two or three cars that are regularly on the roads? Everyone faces uncertainty these days about future employment prospects and some people facing higher rates under this policy may also be struggling – they may be facing redundancy, they may be a sole income earner, they may be asset rich on paper but cash poor. . Taking water charges out of general rates a few years ago and introducing a user pays element was completely fair – those who use more water pay more for it. But this proposed change appears to be a randomly applied social policy – and one has to ask if this is really council's role? We would prefer to see a more robust rates remission policy that helps those who can prove they need assistance rather than the proposed change. . In addition, the letters communicating the proposed changes were rather disingenuous. Publicly council has been talking about average rates increases of 4.7% but letters to property owners only outlined their weekly increase – ours was \$9.62. The council that claims it is 'open for business' left it up to property owners to work out their rates percentage increase – and ours was a whopping 10.3 percent. A more cynical person would think council was trying to make property owners think their increase was 'only around the price of a cup of coffee' a week and not bother to figure out their percentage increase – which may have been well above the 4.7% average and inflation. (Please note this submission does not address the commercial element of the proposed change to rating system as I am not directly affected and have not done enough research into the idea to make an informed comment.)

Key decision (Pages 18-20)

What should we do next to address flood risks?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option of a revised 45-year programme?

Yes - do the revised 45-year programme (Council's preferred option)

Please tell us why:

Storm water is obviously a big issue for the region and in many areas has been exacerbated since the expressway was built. We agree that (at the least) the revised 45-year programme should happen.

Make Submission

Event Name	Long term plan 2018-38 consultation
Submission by	Mrs Rachel Mackay (81839)
Submission ID	18LTP-231
Response Date	23/04/18 12:26 AM
Consultation Point	Tell us what you think about our long term plan (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.4
First and last name	Rachel Mackay
Title	Mrs
Address	14 Gavin Rd, Raumati Beach, Kapiti Coast 5032
Phone	049701374
Email	nzmackays@gmail.com
Are you providing feedback	as an individual

Hearings

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission? No

Where we're heading (Page 8)

Considering our challenges and constraints, do you think we're focusing on the right 10-year outcomes?

I would like to see annual targets (SMART goals), which are monitored and reported quarterly across the key deliverables.

Our financial and infrastructure strategies (Pages 10-13)

The Council plans to pay down debt, reduce borrowings and target infrastructure spending for resilience and growth. What are your views on this approach?

Agree this is sensible approach, though it appears little thought has been given to the likelihood of significant population increase 2020+ due to completion of Transmission Gully and increasing house prices in Wellington. I didn't read the plan in detail so may have missed this.

Key decision (Pages 14-17)

Should we change the way we share rates across the district?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option to change the rating system?

Yes - reduce the proportion of fixed-rate charges and introduce a commercially targeted rate (Council's preferred option)

Rates for 2018/19 (Pages 24-25)

If the draft long term plan is adopted with all our recommended proposals, a rates increase of 4.7% on average will apply across the district for 2018/19. Do you support this?

Yes

Make Submission

Event Name	Long term plan 2018-38 consultation
Submission by	Mr Peter Moyes (81840)
Submission ID	18LTP-232
Response Date	23/04/18 7:59 AM
Consultation Point	Tell us what you think about our long term plan (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.4

First and last name	Peter Moyes
Title	Mr
Address	84 The Parade
Phone	02102671226
Email	pedrosfish@gmail.com
Are you providing feedback	as an individual

Hearings

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission? Yes

Privacy statement

Where we're heading (Page 8)

Considering our challenges and constraints, do you think we're focusing on the right 10-year outcomes?

If this council saves money you will only find new ways to spend the savings. The failed 50 year coastal erosion line and Sea wall proposal must have cost a lot of money. Better due diligence on large scale project is required so wasting more money does not happen. Community satisfaction, I know no one who has a good word to say about this council so I don't know how you can say this is maintained. Vision for Kapiti, reduce rates will have more impact than anything else.

Our financial and infrastructure strategies (Pages 10-13)

The Council plans to pay down debt, reduce borrowings and target infrastructure spending for resilience and growth. What are your views on this approach?

Paying down debt is a good idea, have you looked within the council itself to see how this can be done, instead of cutting down on people/ customer services, maybe reduce the employment overheads. The common answer is increasing rates, these are increasing faster than wage increases. You are going to force people out of the area who cannot pay the increased, already large rates.

Key decision (Pages 14-17)

Should we change the way we share rates across the district?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option to change the rating system?

No - keep the status quo - leave the rating system as it is

Please tell us why:

You are proposing to 'tax' people who have houses of larger capital values, this is wrong and simply a money making exercise. I already pay heavier council rates for living on the Parade, you are now talking about increasing these further to pay for roads. Everyone uses the same roads, this is completely wrong 2.7 million on economic development activities, how exactly are you going to attract and promote business with escalating rates??

Key decision (Pages 18-20)

What should we do next to address flood risks?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option of a revised 45-year programme?

No - keep the status quo programme

Please tell us why:

Keep the status quo and concentrate on the sea wall project, if this fails the cost implication will be far greater than the storm water one

Work on the go (Pages 21-23)

Any comments on the matters below:

Coastal hazards and climate change

We all know these issues, its a world wide issue, why are we wasting more money on this.

Replacing the Paekakariki seawall

If this wall fails then the costs will be endless, it was supposed to start this year and now we are saying 2023. Are the rates going to increase fr this in a couple of years

Macleay Park

This is already well used, money should go elsewhere

Kapiti Island gateway

This is underused as it way to expensive to go there

Rates for 2018/19 (Pages 24-25)

If the draft long term plan is adopted with all our recommended proposals, a rates increase of 4.7% on average will apply across the district for 2018/19. Do you support this?

No

Comments:

Definitely not, rates are increasing in an exponential rate, wages are not. You will force people away from the area. I know people who have moved away for that reason. I pay 4000 for rates a year and I have septic tanks, explain that one!

Make Submission

Event Name	Long term plan 2018-38 consultation
Submission by	<input type="text"/>
Submission ID	18LTP-233
Response Date	23/04/18 9:15 AM
Consultation Point	Tell us what you think about our long term plan (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.2

First and last name	<input type="text"/> WITHHOLD
---------------------	-------------------------------

Title	<input type="text"/>
-------	----------------------

Address	<input type="text"/>
---------	----------------------

Phone	<input type="text"/>
-------	----------------------

Email	<input type="text"/>
-------	----------------------

Are you providing feedback	as an individual
----------------------------	------------------

Hearings

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission? ☐ No

Privacy statement

Please withhold

Where we're heading (Page 8)

Considering our challenges and constraints, do you think we're focusing on the right 10-year outcomes?

Generally to 10-year outcome is satisfactory. However, aiming for an improved financial position is a fine idea but when there is urgent work needed to be done then funding must be found to carry that work out as soon as possible.

Our financial and infrastructure strategies (Pages 10-13)

The Council plans to pay down debt, reduce borrowings and target infrastructure spending for resilience and growth. What are your views on this approach?

As above - Aiming for an improved financial position is a fine idea but when there is urgent work needed to be done then funding must be found to carry that work out as soon as possible. Flooding of private homes through poorly working storm water drains is a major concern for all the affected property owners. The replacement of stormwater drains needs to be sped up.

Key decision (Pages 14-17)

Should we change the way we share rates across the district?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option to change the rating system?

Yes - reduce the proportion of fixed-rate charges and introduce a commercially targeted rate (Council's preferred option)

Please tell us why:

Commercial businesses should pay their own way. I do have a concern though that properties with a higher capital value will be charged more through this option - these households might be contributing more to the economy than homes in the lower brackets and any additional charges can cause some dissatisfaction.

Key decision (Pages 18-20)

What should we do next to address flood risks?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option of a revised 45-year programme?

Yes - do the revised 45-year programme (Council's preferred option)

Please tell us why:

Speeding up the process of replacing storm water drains is of priority interest for us personally - I would suggest that where a specific problem has been identified then that should have a priority focus i.e. a tree bole has blocked the stormwater drain at Nathan Avenue and this problem has been temporarily addressed to supposedly prevent flooding from occurring in the near future. I have been told that this drain is due for replacement in 12 years - in my opinion the temporary work will not keep this area flood free for the next 12 years and that not dealing with the problem now is negligent.

Work on the go (Pages 21-23)

Any comments on the matters below:

Coastal hazards and climate change

Ensuring storm water drains are properly managed should be a priority.

Paraparaumu and Waikanae town centres

A sensible approach to making SH1 into a local road must be taken - any suggestion of multiple names and a drop in road speed is not needed.

Maclean Park

Do it once and do it right.

Kapiti Island gateway

A major asset of the Paraparaumu (Kapiti) beaches are that they are natural and family friendly. Adding a structure to the beach would in my opinion be a major mistake - the area is beautiful already.

Rates for 2018/19 (Pages 24-25)

If the draft long term plan is adopted with all our recommended proposals, a rates increase of 4.7% on average will apply across the district for 2018/19. Do you support this?

Yes

Comments:

With reluctance yes. Financial pressures can become more burdensome as living expenses (including rates) increase. Incomes have not increased by 4.7%.

Comments on change to fees and charges:

No comment

Key policies (Pages 27-28)

If you have any views about the **proposed changes to our development contributions policy**, please tell us here:

I don't know about Housing for Older persons - making rental levels more equitable sounds very attractive for this cohort of the community.

Make Submission

Event Name	Long term plan 2018-38 consultation
Submission by	<input type="text"/>
Submission ID	18LTP-234
Response Date	23/04/18 9:36 AM
Consultation Point	Tell us what you think about our long term plan (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.2

First and last name

Title

Address

Phone

Email

Are you providing feedback

as an individual

Hearings

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission?

No

Privacy statement

Please withhold

Key decision (Pages 14-17)

Should we change the way we share rates across the district?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option to change the rating system?

Yes - reduce the proportion of fixed-rate charges and introduce a commercially targeted rate (Council's preferred option)

Please tell us why:

I'm sure lots of research has gone into this change and wouldn't want the time and effort spent to come up with a new plan wasted.

Key decision (Pages 18-20)

What should we do next to address flood risks?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option of a revised 45-year programme?

Yes - do the revised 45-year programme (Council's preferred option)

Please tell us why:

The council needs to prepare for climate change / increased flood risks

Work on the go (Pages 21-23)

Any comments on the matters below:

Coastal hazards and climate change

The council needs to prepare for climate change, however those who have bought & enjoyed the expensive seafront properties need to do their own part. It should not be up to everyone else to protect at any cost their luxury living.

Housing

There needs to be affordable housing to support the coast. But also mandatory testing for mold, drugs and other indicators that the tenants are undesirable for the area.

Replacing the Paekakariki seawall

This needs to be done properly so we don't have an extra expense to fix later

Paraparaumu and Waikanae town centres

The town centre of Paraparaumu is nicely maintained, keep this up. This is one of the reasons we moved to this location.

Kapiti Island gateway

We are looking forward to visit and use this

Rates for 2018/19 (Pages 24-25)

If the draft long term plan is adopted with all our recommended proposals, a rates increase of 4.7% on average will apply across the district for 2018/19. Do you support this?

Yes

Comments:

My only concerns are where frequency is reduced, if the street cleaning is reduced from 4 to 3 times a year. Are you going to engage schools or the community to get the message out to "keep your street clean". I have gone around my streets drains and collected the mulch for my plants, this helps keep the drains clear and helps prevent flooding. The more the community can do for itself should be promoted more.

Make Submission

Event Name	Long term plan 2018-38 consultation
Submission by	Mr Kerry Walker (81842)
Submission ID	18LTP-235
Response Date	23/04/18 9:51 AM
Consultation Point	Tell us what you think about our long term plan (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.2

First and last name	Kerry Walker
Title	Mr
Address	120 Te Horo Beach Road R. D. 1 OTAKI 5581
Phone	0274838577
Email	ak.farm@xtra.co.nz
Are you providing feedback	as an individual
Hearings	
Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission?	Yes

Where we're heading (Page 8)

Considering our challenges and constraints, do you think we're focusing on the right 10-year outcomes?

Yes, Constraint must be applied to ever increasing rate rises

Our financial and infrastructure strategies (Pages 10-13)

The Council plans to pay down debt, reduce borrowings and target infrastructure spending for resilience and growth. What are your views on this approach?

The right approach

Key decision (Pages 14-17)

Should we change the way we share rates across the district?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option to change the rating system?

No - keep the status quo - leave the rating system as it is

Please tell us why:

There is an equity problem with reducing the proportion of fixed rate charges especially with regard to roading and especially in the rural area. This area gets a smaller benefit per rate dollar (no footpaths, street lighting etc) but pays a much larger proportion. For example my individual rates under the council preferred option will increase by 20% almost entirely due to the change away from using fixed rate charges and the impact this has on the way the roading impost is applied. This makes a mockery of the average 4.7% increase touted.

Key decision (Pages 18-20)

What should we do next to address flood risks?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option of a revised 45-year programme?

No - keep the status quo programme

Rates for 2018/19 (Pages 24-25)

If the draft long term plan is adopted with all our recommended proposals, a rates increase of 4.7% on average will apply across the district for 2018/19. Do you support this?

No

Comments:

The draft plan needs amending back to status quo

Make Submission

Event Name Long term plan 2018-38 consultation
Submission by Low Carbon Kapiti (Ms Deirdre Kent - 80672)
Submission ID 18LTP-236
Response Date 23/04/18 10:54 AM
Consultation Point Tell us what you think about our long term plan
[\(View\)](#)
Status Submitted
Submission Type Web
Version 0.1
Files KCDC carbon neutrality formula

First and last name Deirdre Kent
Title Ms
Address 7a Fleetwood Grove Waikanae 503
Phone 021 728 852
Email deirdre.kent@gmail.com
Are you providing feedback on behalf of an organisation
Organisation name Low Carbon Kāpiti

Hearings

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission? Yes

Where we're heading (Page 8)

Considering our challenges and constraints, do you think we're focusing on the right 10-year outcomes?

We welcome the inclusion of climate change in your priorities, but it is the last of five. Climate change is an existential threat to human societies, including our own. Therefore we would like it first so that in thinking about infrastructure and money climate change becomes an integral part of every other decision. Having a liveable climate is the precondition for achieving anything else. Furthermore, the approach described that ties council's actions strongly to following central government's lead overlooks council's own ability to provide leadership in this area.

Our financial and infrastructure strategies (Pages 10-13)

The Council plans to pay down debt, reduce borrowings and target infrastructure spending for resilience and growth. What are your views on this approach?

As yet our organisation has no policy on this. However we are aware of the demands on council's spending and that they will increase as adaptation to climate change starts to make demands. Our view is that reducing emissions of greenhouse gases (mitigation) should be a primary consideration in prioritising spending, as it can bring significant additional benefits (for example reductions in operating costs), it is prudent for avoiding higher future costs as the drive to decarbonise the economy increases, it contributes indirectly to reducing costs for adapting to climate change impacts and it provides important community leadership.

Key decision (Pages 14-17)

Should we change the way we share rates across the district?

Please tell us why:

No policy on this.

Key decision (Pages 18-20)

What should we do next to address flood risks?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option of a revised 45-year programme?

Yes - do the revised 45-year programme (Council's preferred option)

Please tell us why:

Of course we would rather see this completed earlier and as time proceeds this may become obvious. There will be more frequent storms and increasingly severe storms in future. To save money and be wise we urge working with nature on this topic – for example allowing the natural flow of streams and rivers and opening them up if they are covered.

Work on the go (Pages 21-23)

Any comments on the matters below:

Coastal hazards and climate change

We are glad to see this topic included and applaud council for addressing it. However this is just a start. There will be so many choices to make as to the spending priority. It will be tempting to spend millions on adaptation to climate change while spending very little on mitigation e.g. renewable energy, tree planting, composting. For instance a composting plant for the district will probably cost about the same as a seawall. We need to decide how long we are going to fight the sea and at what stage we will choose managed retreat instead. If we continue to minimise spending on preventing emissions to pay for adaptation, it is like curing obesity by expanding your belt.

Replacing the Paekakariki seawall

We do not oppose this project but wonder how long it will last and whether council will choose to rebuild it. Clearly it is not affordable or sustainable to build more and continuously rebuild seawalls along our coast as our primary response to rising seas.

Rates for 2018/19 (Pages 24-25)

If the draft long term plan is adopted with all our recommended proposals, a rates increase of 4.7% on average will apply across the district for 2018/19. Do you support this?

Comments:

We do not have a policy on this.

Comments on change to fees and charges:

No policy.

Key policies (Pages 27-28)

If you have any views about the **proposed changes to our development contributions policy**, please tell us here:

No policy.

If you have any views about the **proposed changes to our revenue and financing policy**, please tell us here:

No policy.

If you have any views about the **proposed changes to our rates remission policy**, please tell us here:

No policy as yet though we have contemplated rates remission for those who send less waste to landfill if it can't be done by other means.

Anything else?

If you have any other feedback about this plan, or the work of the Council please comment here:

We see in the draft activity chapters that Council intends to continue the deployment of LED streetlights through an enhanced renewal program. We strongly support this. However, there is no further discussion of how council is going to achieve its target of a 80% reduction in its corporate carbon footprint by 2021-22, or what it intends to do about its emissions beyond this. We advocate that Council sets the goal of becoming 'carbon neutral' (that is, having net-zero emissions) by 2025. A formula for achieving this is attached.

1. A section on Significant Assumptions and Risks should be included and, like Greater Wellington does, state that the main effects of climate change will be more frequent and increasing severe storm events with rain and westerly winds.

2. Mitigation issues that are left out include:

a. Offset Council carbon emissions – preferably with native revegetation in the district at high benefit sites. The plan should mention and budget for planting trees. If trees were planted on three pieces of council land the emissions saved would be significant. The council has a discussion paper and information on the potential of its land for carbon sequestration.

b. Further conversion of the council's vehicle fleet to electric vehicles would be another contribution. We note that Greater Wellington Regional Council has an EV first policy for fleet purchases and has 8 EVs. The other councils in the region do not have such a policy and they have at most 2 EVs (most one or none). We recommend council adopts an EV policy modeled on Greater Wellington's.

c. Heat pumps at Ōtaki and Waikanae pools. We see in the draft activity plans heating plant renewals are planned in the next six years but these must not be natural gas boilers - heat pumps are the low-carbon option. Ōtaki Pool should also have a ventilation heat recovery system installed as the draft activity plan indicates. Council has reports from Enercon and Pioneer Energy for Waikanae and Ōtaki Pools respectively that discuss these topics. For Waikanae, heat pump heating has the highest net present value of all options, meaning its impact on rates over its lifecycle would be lowest. An electrical upgrade of the supply to the site is required to accommodate a heat pump sized for primary heating. At present the supply is barely adequate for the site's existing needs. It is suggested the electrical upgrade (costing approximately \$100K by Electra's estimate) is carried out in advance of the heating replacement to spread out the costs of the project. Regarding Ōtaki Pool, heat pumps are the best way to achieve heat recovery from ventilation. By specifying the largest possible heat pumps for this, they can be used for primary heating and gas heating can be reduced to a minimal back-up/top-up role. Such an arrangement is the same as what is used at the Coastlands Aquatic Centre.

d. Diversion of all organic material (food and garden waste) to composting rather than letting it be buried and produce methane, a greenhouse gas. This is half our waste. There is no budget that we see in the draft plan for investigating or developing systems for this. We recommend the council do this, not least because a change to the present arrangement of sending sewage sludge to Silverstream landfill could see council's emissions rise significantly.

e. Continue to support education and home insulation etc. to reduce peak electricity generation carbon emissions from coal/gas.

f. More solar panels at the sewage treatment plants and possibly introduce them at the water treatment plant

g. Improve public walkways and cycleways and public transport infrastructure - we support the continuation of this work particularly to connect to town centres.

3. Further thoughts on the balance between adaptation and mitigation include

a. Road maintenance. Certain roads mainly rural are vulnerable to frequent storm events causing slips. Once again at some stage council will have to choose between spending money fixing vulnerable roads and mitigation.

b. Coastal erosion. We must decide how long we will defend against the sea and at what stage we will adopt a policy of managed retreat from rising sea levels and tectonic subsidence, particularly south of Waikanae. Council needs to avoid new infrastructure investment or development in low lying areas that will inevitably succumb to issues such as those seen in South Dunedin.

d. Increased rainfall/flooding – managed lowland river/stream retreat, catchment native revegetation, particularly of steep slopes that threaten infrastructure.

e. Increased droughts – improved lowland river stream riparian vegetation for shading and evaporation minimisation to protect freshwater ecosystems – catchment native revegetation (particularly in our smaller water supply catchments and those with threatened native fish species)

Need more space

You can attach a document with further comments to give all the feedback you want to.

KCDC carbon neutrality formula
KCDC carbon neutrality formula

Formula for Council to meet its 80% corporate greenhouse gas emissions reduction target.
(all emissions figures are per year)

Council emissions 2016-17	3,112 tonnes CO ₂ e
Annual emissions consistent with 2021-22 target	2,500 tonnes CO ₂ e
Additional reductions to find	612 tonnes CO₂e

1 Complete LED streetlights programme - high priority for 2018-21 LTP.
Reduction potential (all lights) ~ **230 tonnes CO₂e**

2 Renewable heating (heat pumps) at Ōtaki and Waikanae Pool

Waikanae Pool ~ **110 tonnes CO₂e**

Ōtaki Pool ~ **180 tonnes CO₂e**

Recommend consideration of these in 2018-21 to help reach target. Otherwise, when existing boilers need replaced. Waikanae Pool's boiler is the older of the two.

3 Electric vehicle first policy (ala GWRC) - can be implemented immediately

Reductions of complete conversion of fleet to EV:

Petrol vehicles (light fleet) ~ **73 tonnes CO₂e**

Diesel (heavy fleet incl vans) ~ **286 tonnes CO₂e**

Complete conversion of fleet may not be practical by 2021-22, but significant progress could be made e.g. 25-50% conversion

25% fleet conversion ~ **90 tonnes CO₂e**

50% fleet conversion ~ **180 tonnes CO₂e**

4 Carbon forests on council land - high priority for 2018-21 LTP

Plant forests and put into the government Permanent Forest Sinks Initiative. Some existing forest owned by council is already eligible. 'Retire' the credits generated through the scheme to offset other council emissions.

5.6 Ha immediately South of Waikanae WTP – Eucalyptus. ~ **95 tonnes CO₂e**

5.2 Ha immediately adjacent to the above – plant natives ~ **34 tonnes CO₂e**

17.5 Ha Maungakotukutuku dam land – plant natives ~ **113 tonnes CO₂e**

Combined effect of four measures when all implemented: **1125 tonnes CO₂e, enough to meet the emissions reduction target with a significant contingency.**

Other complementary/substitute measures to consider:

- Energy efficiency improvements in buildings and at treatment plants
- Solar electric panels (PV) on buildings and at treatment plants
- Establishing other areas of forest, e.g. in water supply catchments
- Seek lower-emissions disposal routes for solid waste. (These emissions are strongly influenced by which landfill the waste goes to).
- e-Bikes for staff travel

Council will also benefit from national efforts to achieve the target of 100% renewable electricity by 2025. Emissions from electricity use would reduce to close to zero if this target is achieved.

Achieving full carbon neutrality by 2025

With 100% renewable electricity, taking actions 1-4 described above and continuing conversion of the vehicle fleet to 100% electric, the council's emissions would be approximately 980 tonnes CO₂e, 92% below baseline. Carbon neutrality could be achieved by further offsetting (e.g. with forests) of these remaining emissions and (optionally), reducing waste emissions by using an in-vessel anaerobic digestion process to compost sewage sludge.

Make Submission

Event Name	Long term plan 2018-38 consultation	
Submission ID	18LTP-237	
Response Date	23/04/18 11:14 AM	
Consultation Point	Tell us what you think about our long term plan (View)	
Status	Submitted	
Submission Type	Web	
Version	0.2	
First and last name	Sarah Biddiscombe	
Title	Mrs	
Address	Well-Able, 110 Rimu Road, Paraparaumu, 5254	
Phone	042982914	
Email	sarah@diec.org.nz	
Are you providing feedback	on behalf of an organisation	
Organisation name	Well-Able	
Hearings		
Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission?	Yes	

Anything else?

If you have any other feedback about this plan, or the work of the Council please comment here:

Well-Able (Kapiti Disability Centre) wish to submit the following proposal to Council for consultation alongside the Long Term Plan.

The words 'elderly' and 'disabled' when they apply to people, denote a minefield of 'less than' that disregards capacity, ability, potential and individualism and instead prioritizes brokenness and lack. Data from the 2013 Census showed that 24% of the New Zealand population identified as having a disability. Over 60% of those over 65 had at least one disability and most had multiple disabilities.

Ageing was the given cause for the majority of the disabilities stated. Add these statistics to the projection that by 2050 there will be more people over 65 years than those under 14 years and the urgent necessity to recreate our communities and make them both more accessible and inclusive is very apparent.

Disability prevents people from fully participating in many aspects of their communities; by making our communities accessible, we not only make them elder-friendly, but inclusive for everyone. In order for us all to be able to 'age in place' in the future we must look at the barriers that currently exist that prevent people from being able to do this and systematically remove them.

Not only are our older citizens coping with ageing and multiple disabilities but also with a community that is often not friendly to their needs. There is a definitive lack of awareness around what ageing means to the individual and the difficulties it presents to those journeying through it.

Within our health and social services, people with disabilities and older people are constructed as two distinct client groups, yet they rarely are. Older people accrue disabilities as they age and younger people with disabilities, age. When it comes to making our communities more accessible and inclusive they must be considered together and not siloed apart from each other. As the WHO - Global Age-friendly Cities: A Guide states "Because active ageing is a lifelong process, an age-friendly city is not just "elderly friendly". Barrier-free buildings and streets enhance the mobility and independence of people with disabilities, young as well as old"

In 2001 the New Zealand Government adopted a New Zealand Disability Strategy to guide government action and to promote a more inclusive society. Whilst there is no legal requirement for local authorities to give effect to the New Zealand Disability Strategy, the Strategy does acknowledge that local authorities have a significant impact on the lives of disabled and older people by the decisions they make. It is for that reason that Kapiti Coast District Council need to develop a Disability and Age-friendly Strategy for our District.

Disabled people have the same basic rights and freedoms belonging to all people - to be treated fairly and equally, with respect and dignity. This is clarified in the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (Disability Convention) which guides governments on how to remove barriers and make sure disabled people have "full and equal enjoyment of all human rights and fundamental freedoms".

The New Zealand Government (along with the governments of many other countries) has agreed to follow the Disability Convention.

Therefore as a local governing body, we feel that KCDC have a part to play in upholding the rights of disabled people in our community.

A disability and age-friendly strategy should be developed collaboratively with a wide range of individuals, groups and organisations in the local disability and aged sector, including individuals whom have extensive experience of disability. We value and consider this input essential to the development, implementation and monitoring of a robust strategy to ensure it is relevant and will make a meaningful difference for disabled and older persons in the Kapiti District.

Make Submission

Event Name	Long term plan 2018-38 consultation
Submission by	Ric Cullinae (81844)
Submission ID	18LTP-238
Response Date	23/04/18 11:23 AM
Consultation Point	Tell us what you think about our long term plan (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.3

First and last name	Ric Cullinane
Title	Mr
Address	62A The Parade Paekakariki
Phone	0274775042
Email	ric.cullinane@walkingaccess.govt.nz
Are you providing feedback	as an individual
Hearings	
Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission?	No

Work on the go (Pages 21-23)

Any comments on the matters below:

Replacing the Paekakariki seawall

Kapiti Coast District Council
Long Term Plan Submission
23 April 2018

I would like to make a submission on the following points.

Paekakariki Seawall

A high quality process to develop a design for the structure of this seawall was run by the Paekakariki Community and KCDC between 2013 and 2016. This resulted in resource consent being obtained in 2016 for a design that is supported by the community. It is essential that the Long Term Plan provide funding and support for the construction of a seawall, as consented. The LTP must:

1. Provide ongoing support of a collaborative process with the Paekakariki community over 2018 – 2019 to complete final detailed design that delivers a seawall replacement supported by the community. As outlined in previous community consultation and discussions with council, this final design process must continue to address:

- Foot / walking access is facilitated across the seawall and along the beach at a range of tides
- The beach environment for recreation and quiet enjoyment is retained and enhanced
- Vegetation and natural values are maintained and enhanced
- Protection of roadway assets
- Cultural importance of the beach and community connection to it.

2. Examine opportunities to integrate road narrowing and traffic calming along The Parade with the seawall project. This approach can support the practical construction of the seawall, improve safety, and make the Parade a more pedestrian and cycle focused space that will benefit the whole community.

3. Ensure letting of contracts for seawall construction in 2019, as agreed with the Paekakariki community to allow construction to be completed between 2019 and 2021.

4. Ensure that an open and collaborative process between KCDC and the Paekakariki community is supported during the construction process. This includes working with the community on decisions on timing of operations, communication and other practical matters of concern to the community during construction.

Make Submission

Event Name	Long term plan 2018-38 consultation
Submission by	Sue Hurst (81848)
Submission ID	18LTP-239
Response Date	23/04/18 11:30 AM
Consultation Point	Tell us what you think about our long term plan (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.2

First and last name	Sue Hurst
Title	Mrs
Address	31 Aperahama Street Paekakariki
Phone	04 905 8273
Email	suehurst31@gmail.com

Key decision (Pages 14-17)

Should we change the way we share rates across the district?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option to change the rating system?

Yes - reduce the proportion of fixed-rate charges and introduce a commercially targeted rate (Council's preferred option)

Anything else?

If you have any other feedback about this plan, or the work of the Council please comment here:

Town Centres

Paekakariki should be included in the LTP town centres review. Paekakariki urgently needs a parking, roading and speed limit review for the whole township. Parking has recently become more and more congested.

The old garage site on SH1 lends its self to creation of commuter parking, along with weekend parking for walkers etc. This will become more viable when SH1 is revoked and there is less traffic on the main road.

I envisage traffic lights, at the intersection and a pedestrian crossing to the parking area.

Traffic calming on The Parade.

A reduced speed limit within the township.

Surplus NZTA Land including Perkins' Farm

On completion of Transmission Gully Motorway there will be much surplus land. A program of acquisition of this land put in place now would eventually benefit the whole community with the many possible uses.

This land has many values, and opportunities, for the community of Paekakariki as well as the wider Kapiti District. Working with the community on planning and securing the future of this land is required to ensure maximum benefit is obtained by the whole community.

On land adjacent to Paekakariki north I would envisage areas with mixed housing where the land is suitable. Housing for first home owners etc, and some smaller houses intermingled for elderly, thus freeing up larger family houses within the community. I would see this as a diverse mix of housing, not just a community of clones. New build, kitset and re-located. Other uses; wetlands, walkways and cycleways, recreational, tourism, wind turbines, solar panels, reedbed sewage system, re-forestation with native plants, community garden and play area, bird corridors and more.

This is an opportunity not to be lost.

Support wind turbines and solar farms where appropriate, and energy efficiency initiatives.

When KCDC handed over waste collection to private providers residents were told that the system of bag collection and recycling would remain, but private providers were the best option, because competition would keep the price down.

- This experiment has failed.
- Now our council must return to providing kerbside recycling and waste collection services like other councils, including our neighbours Porirua, Hutt City and Wellington and numerous others all over New Zealand.
- This is important because it provides an incentive for households to reduce their waste
- The current commercial system has no incentive to reduce waste.
- This is bad for the environment because waste is a major cause of carbon emissions and there are now up to four different providers, whose trucks are driving around our district, duplicating services.
- KCDC has a stated commitment to sustainability and waste minimisation. I want my council to walk the walk, not just talk the talk.

I would like to see work put into creating a green belt/public park/botanical garden for the area, maybe using some of the transit land that has become available and also the land around the library. This needs to happen now so that our grandchildren can enjoy the benefits - see Wellington town belt - New Plymouth Pukekura park as examples

Make Submission

Event Name	Long term plan 2018-38 consultation
Submission by	Mr David Yockney (81514)
Submission ID	18LTP-240
Response Date	23/04/18 11:51 AM
Consultation Point	Tell us what you think about our long term plan (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1

First and last name	David Yockney
---------------------	---------------

Title	Mr
-------	----

Address	3 Kawau Grove, Waikanae Beach Waikanae 5036
---------	---

Phone	022 469 9058
-------	--------------

Email	davidyockney@gmail.com
-------	------------------------

Are you providing feedback	as an individual
----------------------------	------------------

Hearings

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission?	No
--	----

Where we're heading (Page 8)

Considering our challenges and constraints, do you think we're focusing on the right 10-year outcomes?

Sounds good, but will need to be turned into a reality that works - that will be the hard part.

Our financial and infrastructure strategies (Pages 10-13)

The Council plans to pay down debt, reduce borrowings and target infrastructure spending for resilience and growth. What are your views on this approach?

This seems sensible. Hopefully, it can be achieved, but it will be difficult. There is a never ending need for more and more money to pay improvements to life in Kapiti. Inevitably choices will have to be made and people will have different opinions on what the priorities should be. Also, rates need to be kept affordable - this is extremely important.

Key decision (Pages 14-17)

Should we change the way we share rates across the district?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option to change the rating system?

Please tell us why:

I am not sure on this one, but I have the strong suspicion that the new system will increase my rates.

Key decision (Pages 18-20)

What should we do next to address flood risks?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option of a revised 45-year programme?

Yes - do the revised 45-year programme
(Council's preferred option)

Please tell us why:

We can expect sea levels to rise significantly over the next 100 years. Kapiti is particularly exposed to this issue and therefore we need to start acting urgently on it.

Work on the go (Pages 21-23)

Any comments on the matters below:

Coastal hazards and climate change

Good, but does not go far enough. In the long-term plan, there are references to climate change causing an increased risk of sea level rise, more frequent storms, flooding, landslides, coastal erosion and so on. There are also some details on how this should be dealt with (Paekakariki seawall, storm-water infrastructure). However, I would like to see detailed planning on how KCDC intends to tackle the major reason that these are an issue, namely carbon emissions. As we are all aware, a low carbon future is essential for the well-being of humanity. If disaster is to be averted, we need to make changes in the way we do things at all levels - individually, locally, nationally and internationally. KCDC is not exempt. The long-term plan is Kapiti Coast's chance to state how it will achieve a reduction in its carbon output. At the moment I feel it is far too short on specifics and it will be far too easy to sweep this issue under the carpet. Therefore, I support calls for KCDC to make a clear commitment to becoming carbon neutral by 2025 and to state how this will be achieved in the long-term plan. There are many steps that can be taken. Streetlights can be totally converted to LED technology, efficiency of buildings and treatment plants can be improved, the use of fossil fuels in running the KCDC vehicle fleet and swimming pools can be phased out, more trees can be planted, better public transportation developed, and an effective waste disposal system implemented. I would also like to see a clear plan on how Kapiti could be made bicycle friendly. I feel that bicycles will have a significant role to play in the future. EVs are an important step in the right direction, but an often-forgotten issue is the amount of carbon that is created in their production. Bicycles, on the other hand, have a much lower carbon footprint all round and so all steps possible should be taken to encourage their use. I see no reason that Kapiti should not become like Copenhagen, where there are 454 kilometres of cycle tracks, 37% of people commute to work or school by bike and there are more bikes than people. Building a bike culture will help reduce emissions. Kapiti could aim to become the biking capital of New Zealand, just as Copenhagen is the "First Bike City in the World". Cycle trails have brought \$20 million in economic benefits to Otago. Why should Kapiti miss out on this sort of business? To help achieve this, we need a network of cycleways that will make it possible to get to all parts of Kapiti safely by bike. When building new roading infrastructure, cycle tracks should be included automatically. At the moment, it seems they are an optional extra that are only included if enough people make enough noise. However, I feel that cycle tracks should be included as of right, just as footpaths are. Also, more bike stands would be very useful in shopping areas such as Coastlands and Waikanae town centre.

Paraparaumu and Waikanae town centres

In relation to the upgrade of the old main road at Waikanae town, I support the decision made by KCDC to go with option one (cycleways) rather than option two (10 extra carparks). Businesses were upset by this decision as they felt it would mean fewer customers. I don't agree with this view. Both options would bring improvements, but I feel option one is preferable as it is a win/win situation with both motorists and cyclists making gains. Also, it is a safety issue, as was noted by some councilors. Making Waikanae town centre viable for business is a totally different issue that will not be easily solved. Unfortunately, neither ten extra carparks nor the cycleways will sort out the problems that the businesses face. If only it was that easy!

Kapiti Island gateway

Some of the designs recently on display at Coastlands looked interesting. This will be a great step forward in making Kapiti an interesting place to visit.

Rates for 2018/19 (Pages 24-25)

If the draft long term plan is adopted with all our recommended proposals, a rates increase of 4.7% on average will apply across the district for 2018/19. Do you support this?

Comments:

I support a 4.7% rates increase. I do not support an 11% increase in rates. Unfortunately, in my case, the increase is over 11%. I was shocked by this, especially as I am on a fixed income. Also, I now have to pay much more for rubbish disposal. I used to use the yellow rubbish bags which cost me about \$30 a year. If I want to have a front door rubbish disposal service I will now have to pay \$180 plus. I see rubbish disposal as one of the core services a council should provide so if I include rubbish disposal, my rates increase this year will be close to 17%.

Make Submission

Event Name	Long term plan 2018-38 consultation
Submission ID	18LTP-241
Response Date	23/04/18 12:02 PM
Consultation Point	Tell us what you think about our long term plan (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1
First and last name	<input type="text"/> WITHHOLD DETAILS
Title	<input type="text"/>
Address	<input type="text"/>
Email	<input type="text"/>
Are you providing feedback	as an individual
Hearings	
Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission?	No

Privacy statement Please withhold

Housing

Dear People, Firstly, thank you for the work that you do. However please read below and really consider what is being said. If housing on the coast, and in fact anywhere, continues to remain unaffordable, community life - with the subsequent loss of social resilience of this country - is being consistently undermined. Tennants are continually at the mercy of landlords and families often end up shifting annually. The disruption to friendships, supportive reciprocal neighbourly relationships and schooling helps to create an underclass. Diversity is strength both ecologically, economically and socially. Please think about the communities on whose behalf you work and serve. Make affordable housing a priority in Kāpiti Coast. Commit the KCDC to the principle that affordable housing is critical to the health and well-being of our community and change the stance of the council to one of finding ways to work together with community housing providers to enable affordable housing. Make priority given to affordable housing a central principle in decisions the council takes on planning and consenting issues and on the allocation of land and other resources held by the council. Work with NZTA and other central government agencies to use land for affordable housing. The council can work to ensure that lands made surplus after the construction of the Kāpiti Expressway and Transmission Gully are disposed of in ways that create assets for the community, protecting the environment and enabling land to be developed for affordable housing. In particular, ensure a comprehensive community-based precinct plan is developed for the Perkins Farm property and adjacent lands currently held by NZTA. This plan should provide for environmental protection and affordable housing and be completed before NZTA disposes of these lands. Land that will become surplus from the highway construction has many values and opportunities for the community of Paekākāriki as well as the wider Kapiti District. Working with the community on planning and securing the future of this land is required to ensure maximum benefit is obtained by the whole community. Use council-held rights of first refusal for NZTA lands that are appropriate for affordable housing as a means to enable community-led development of that land. This would include such sites as the south end of the 'Tilley triangle' and the former BP station on SH1. Enable affordable housing by reducing or waiving Council fees and levies where appropriate when a residential development includes provision for affordable or social housing, particularly where it is to be purchased by a recognised Community Housing provider. Lease Council social housing and land to local registered community housing providers such as Paekākāriki Housing Trust, Dwell Housing Trust, and iwi providers. Manage social housing locally to strengthen community connections and cohesion. Empower the Paekākāriki Community Board to decide on the allocation of social housing in the village. Of the Kāpiti Coast communities Paekākāriki has the lowest percentage of elderly residents because there is not enough appropriate housing and they are forced to leave the village. This reduces the diversity of the community and cuts people off from connections of long standing. Thank you for reading. Nga mihi,

Make Submission

Event Name	Long term plan 2018-38 consultation
Submission ID	18LTP-242
Response Date	23/04/18 12:07 PM
Consultation Point	Tell us what you think about our long term plan (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1
Files	LTP submission 2018
First and last name	<input type="text"/>
Title	<input type="text"/>
Address	<input type="text"/>
Phone	<input type="text"/>
Email	<input type="text"/>
Are you providing feedback	on behalf of an organisation
Organisation name	Kāpiti Coast Older Persons' Council
Hearings	
Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission?	Yes
Privacy statement	Please withhold

Where we're heading (Page 8)

Considering our challenges and constraints, do you think we're focusing on the right 10-year outcomes?

See attached file

Our financial and infrastructure strategies (Pages 10-13)

The Council plans to pay down debt, reduce borrowings and target infrastructure spending for resilience and growth. What are your views on this approach?

See attached file

Key decision (Pages 14-17)

Should we change the way we share rates across the district?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option to change the rating system?

Yes - reduce the proportion of fixed-rate charges and introduce a commercially targeted rate (Council's preferred option)

Please tell us why:

See attached file

Key decision (Pages 18-20)

What should we do next to address flood risks?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option of a revised 45-year programme?

Yes - do the revised 45-year programme (Council's preferred option)

Please tell us why:

See attached file

Rates for 2018/19 (Pages 24-25)

If the draft long term plan is adopted with all our recommended proposals, a rates increase of 4.7% on average will apply across the district for 2018/19. Do you support this?

Comments:

See attached file

Comments on change to fees and charges:

See attached file

Key policies (Pages 27-28)

If you have any views about the **proposed changes to our development contributions policy**, please tell us here:

See attached file

If you have any views about the **proposed changes to our revenue and financing policy**, please tell us here:

See attached file

If you have any views about the **proposed changes to our rates remission policy**, please tell us here:

See attached file

Anything else?

If you have any other feedback about this plan, or the work of the Council please comment here:

See attached file



The Kāpiti Coast Older Persons' Council appreciates this opportunity to contribute to the discussion of how we take our district into the future.

Rates

The Kāpiti Coast Older Persons' Council is in favour of the distribution of rates charges being as fair and equitable as is possible:

- supports the proposed change of the fixed-charge roading rate to an apportioned charge, and
- supports the establishment of a commercial targeted rate.

The Kāpiti Coast Older Persons' Council recognises these first steps towards a more equitable rating regime, but submits that more is required. The impact of the recent rise in house valuations by Valuation NZ will be felt keenly by people on fixed incomes. Residents aged over 65, those on sickness and supported living benefits will struggle to meet the inevitable increase in rates. In previous discussions on the subject, it appears that members of Council are aware of this impact but to date have failed to satisfactorily address it. Therefore the Kāpiti Coast Older Persons' Council wishes to submit on one measure to cushion the impact for the more vulnerable in our community.

Rates postponement

Current provisions for rates postponement are draconian and fit well within an 18th century model of social welfare which relied on charity for the disadvantaged with criteria restricted to the "deserving poor". Residents must demonstrate they are struggling financially and obtain proof of this from an outside agency. They must also advise their bank or mortgage, limiting their ability to apply for mortgage assistance in the future. These measures are demeaning and we consider them unnecessary.

When the prospect of a commercially based rates postponement similar to that offered by Auckland City council was proposed at OPC, it was rejected by councilors present because of its impact on Council debt. However, as the Mayor

has pointed out in a recent media releases, Council assets are considerable, with totals for New Zealand in the region of \$120 billion, whereas residents on fixed incomes have little or no safety net. The end result for this sector is that they go without food, health care, or other essentials in order to pay the rates. Participation in civic events, including elections, is reduced along with ability to participate in social, economic, cultural and spiritual aspects of the community. We all pay for this in the end with increased health expenditure.

A more equitable solution would be for council to dispose of some of its assets, consider reducing expenditure on parks and reserves, or reductions in size, to allow for a deferment in rates to occur. The Auckland rates postponement scheme is not onerous. All that is required is;

- That the postponed rates do not exceed 80% of available equity in the property;
- Postponed rates are registered as a statutory land charge on the property title;
- House insurance and liability (bank) statements are required; and
- The postponed rates are due if the property is sold, on death of the resident, or if the resident ceases to use the property as a residence.

Along with several other routine requirements, the policy is essentially a commercial transaction where the residences personal circumstances are not relevant. Given that the bulk of people applying for rates postponement are aged 65 and over, the debt would be a medium-term arrangement. Given average life expectancy of approximately 78 for males and 83 for females, the maximum term is likely to be in the region of 18 years and would generate some income from interest charged.

It is recommended that Council investigate the possibility of disposing of some of its assets to free up a sum of money to be allocated toward rates postponement for those that apply. A straightforward commercial transaction similar to the Auckland City council should be implemented.

Housing for Older Persons

The Kāpiti Coast Older Persons' Council request clarification on how reducing the current five rental categories to two rental levels makes the housing services for older persons more equitable across the district, especially for those tenants coping with a "larger than usual rent increase". The OPC also note with concern that the proposed annual increase in rentals of up to \$12 per week is similar to recent increases in NZ super payments, so tenants will struggle coping with other cost increases if all their increased income goes to hous-

ing. The Kāpiti Coast Older Persons' Council requests that cases be handled in an individual and compassionate fashion.

Storm water

Given the improved understanding of climate change and the coastal nature of our district the Kāpiti Coast Older Persons' Council considers it essential that this work is given a high priority, and it supports the "Prioritised Programme" on P 20 of the booklet "Building a Stronger Kapiti Together".

The Kāpiti Coast Older Persons' Council submits that the Kāpiti Coast District Council needs to address the issue of adequate storm water systems in Kapiti with urgency. Extreme weather events are becoming more commonplace and MfE has advised that western areas of the North Island are likely to experience increased rainfall and potential flooding as the effects of climate change unfold.

Twice in the past three months, parts of Paraparaumu have been flooded, with residents forced from their houses. The levels of rain were not regarded as particularly excessive by today's standards, and it is apparent that the storm water system is inadequate to deal with bursts of heavy rain.

Council infrastructure services manager Sean Mallon has advised "the district's ageing storm water infrastructure needed work for which there was no quick fix" However he also stated that recent flooding was due in part to blockages in storm water drains from tree roots and other waste matter which is amenable to immediate work. Mr Mallon has also advised that \$200M has been set aside in the long term plan to address the issue.

This expenditure needs to be district wide and encompass low lying areas in Waikanae and Raumati. Furthermore, work to remove blockages from drains should begin immediately. Storm water management is part of Council's core business and should be accorded top priority in council works.

The storm water system in Nathan Avenue and surrounding streets is particularly deficient and immediate work is required. Residents in the Nathan Avenue area could be forgiven for thinking Council viewed their situation with indifference as, once again in March this year, they waded knee deep through muddy water and sewerage to escape their homes. Between February 21 and March 18 this year, when floods occurred, no action was taken to clear blocked drains. Residents houses were then flooded for a second time.

Therefore, the Kāpiti Coast Older Persons' Council urges the KCDC to expedite the spending programme for the work on the KenaKena Catchment.

Flooding in this area affects at least 20-40 homes many of them occupied by

older residents who are being regularly flooded.

The Council has allocated seven million dollars for this project and given it priority in line with their established principle that flooded homes be given first priority. We welcome this principle but it is the time line period that is worrying. It would be preferably if the work was carried out in years 1,2,3,4, and we urge this on Councillors. The LTP suggests that the planned work will be carried out over years 1,2,3,5,6,7,8,11. This is far too long for a number of reasons including the relative value of the project and the potential for deterioration of assets.

The lengthy time line will cause worry and stress and affect the health of elderly residents whose homes tend to be affected the hardest. The stress level is more damaging on their health when the rain comes as they fear another regular flood. The existing storm water pipes also appear to be undersized for a one in ten-year flood which they were supposed to support.

More responsiveness is needed from Council in these events and communication is needed with residents so that they are informed what measures will be taken to improve the storm water management. It is recommended that Council advise residents what action will be taken to future proof the district for climate change. Immediate works should be undertaken to alleviate the pressure on storm water systems in the Nathan Avenue area and in neighboring parts of Paraparumu. In addition, the council should be well informed of the risks posed to low lying areas of Raumati and Waikanae from increased rainfall and extreme weather events. Ongoing work should be scheduled to alleviate these risks.

The KCOPC also questions why the “Managed Retreat” of vulnerable areas is not mentioned in the proposals, and asks if this is still part of KCDC strategic planning.

The Paekākāriki seawall replacement project is relevant in this context. It appears that the “agreed design for a concrete and timber wall” is more expensive than the original, and is likely to set a more expensive precedent for similar works along our coast as other communities face the consequences of climate change. The Kāpiti Coast Older Persons’ Council is not aware of any of the “significant community consultation” for the Paekākāriki seawall replacement project being conducted outside Paekākāriki, however the cost of the project will be carried by the whole district.

The Kāpiti Coast Older Persons’ Council raises the question that if seawall projects protect both private and public land, should the beneficiaries of those projects carry more of the costs through a targeted rate?

Town Centre Upgrades

The Kāpiti Coast Older Persons' Council remains skeptical of major "Town Centre Upgrades" – for reasons we have stated in the past and still seem to be relevant.

Age Friendly

Age Friendly Kāpiti will be making a separate submission, which of course the KCOPC supports as the age friendly effort is a very important part of our work programme. However the Older Persons' Council wishes to emphasise an aspect of the age friendly submission that we believe should be part of the everyday work and culture of the KCDC: the New Zealand Standard NZS 4121 2001 - *Design for Access and Mobility – Buildings and Associated facilities*.

The Kāpiti Coast Older Persons' Council submits that this New Zealand Standard needs to be used as a standard guideline when granting building, parking and related permits in Kapiti.

Thank you for considering this submission. The Kāpiti Coast Older Persons' Council wishes to speak in support of it.

Make Submission

Event Name	Long term plan 2018-38 consultation
Submission ID	18LTP-243
Response Date	23/04/18 12:46 PM
Consultation Point	Tell us what you think about our long term plan (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1
First and last name	Robert Bunch
Title	Mr
Address	23 Weggery Drive Waikanae 5036
Phone	049042038
Email	thebunches@hotmail.com
Are you providing feedback	as an individual
Hearings	
Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission?	Yes

Where we're heading (Page 8)

Considering our challenges and constraints, do you think we're focusing on the right 10-year outcomes?

The headings in the consultation document affirm the direction, but the means of getting there need amendments, particularly with regards to a) fully fund depreciation with five years b) rates and their composition.

Our financial and infrastructure strategies (Pages 10-13)

The Council plans to pay down debt, reduce borrowings and target infrastructure spending for resilience and growth. What are your views on this approach?

These are good concepts which I support, but there are aspects of the means and the timeframes which I do not support.

Key decision (Pages 14-17)

Should we change the way we share rates across the district?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option to change the rating system?

No - keep the status quo - leave the rating system as it is

Please tell us why:

The Council's preferred option is part of a concept of moving to a more balanced approach to rates composition based on a roughly equal proportion of fixed charges, capital value and land value. There is no realistic basis to this concept - it is purely a theoretical one, not supported by facts. By the Council's own comparison with other councils in its publication, 'About your rates', (see chart) there is no council that has a rates composition comprising such a concept. As the Council itself states they all have different proportions based on what they determine to be fair and affordable for its ratepayers. None of them have a rates composition such as the one envisioned by the Council. If equal splits were fair and affordable, why haven't any of the councils the Council compares itself to have its rates on that basis? It is apparent that fairness and affordability and a roughly equal split of charges are not that compatible. On the specific proposal to change fixed-charge roading rate to an apportioned charge, again, there is no logical rationale for this other than the doctrinal adherence to the overall rates concept. It also opens the door to apportioning costs to where they occur within the district, e.g replacing the Paekakariki seawall. Roading costs are not variable according to where they occur within the district. The costs incurred by the Council are the same wherever they occur. It is more equitable to apportion costs equally across all ratepayers rather than charging according to capital value. To do otherwise makes such a change basically a wealth tax. This is inequitable in a district where a large proportion of ratepayers, the retired, may be asset rich but income poor.

Key decision (Pages 18-20)

What should we do next to address flood risks?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option of a revised 45-year programme?

No - keep the status quo programme

Please tell us why:

Given the level of debt that the Council intends to reduce and the intent to fully fund depreciation within five years, it is too ambitious to reduce the timeframe for the stormwater management programme as well. If the Council wishes to pursue its preferred option, then amendments need to be made to either a) the timeframe to reduce debt b) the timeframe to fully fund depreciation c) the timeframe for both of the above. While climate change is occurring, no one can accurately predict what the impact will be on the district. Yes, there have been severe weather events since 2015, but the 2017/18 summer season has seen Hawkes' Bay weather come to the Kapiti coast. And may it long continue!

Work on the go (Pages 21-23)

Any comments on the matters below:

Coastal hazards and climate change

I support the intent and direction of the Council's programme.

Housing

I support the intent and direction of the Council's programme

Replacing the Paekakariki seawall

I support the Council's programme to replace the Paekakariki seawall. Even though the benefit applies specifically to Paekakariki, the Paekakariki community is part of our district and the cost should be shared equally amongst ratepayers.

Paraparaumu and Waikanae town centres

I support the Council's programme of reducing the overall budget and spreading the programme over a longer timeframe. The advent of the Expressway has and will see substantial changes to the way that people shop and travel within the district.

Maclean Park

I question the need to change Maclean Park, particularly the removal of the pond which has been a fabulous attraction for families for many years, especially those with young children. It is already "a welcoming place for people to play, relax, and enjoy, while also enhancing the natural environment of the park". I don't see the need for the changes proposed - can someone please explain what an 'older person's playground' is and looks like?

Kapiti Island gateway

I also question the Council's proposal to get involved with a Kapiti Island gateway. There are too many variables about the costs and benefits that are outside of the Council's control and influence, particularly the primary role of the Department of Conservation and the duopoly of access to and from the island. If the Council is intent on investigating a role for itself in this possible programme, I expect it to come back to the Kapiti community for consideration and support before any commitment is made.

Rates for 2018/19 (Pages 24-25)

If the draft long term plan is adopted with all our recommended proposals, a rates increase of 4.7% on average will apply across the district for 2018/19. Do you support this?

Yes

No

Comments:

Yes, I do support a rates increase of 4.7%, but make that apply to all rates rather than the average as it is equitable to all ratepayers. I object strongly to the way that the average has been arrived at in the apportionment to applying the increase to ratepayers because it is inequitable. The Mayor, in the Kapiti News of 18 April 2018, said that the Council's aim is "to use the rating tools to create a system that's equitable for the majority of ratepayers". According to the Concise Oxford Dictionary, 'equitable' means "just, fair". If the proposal is not equitable to all ratepayers, then, by definition, the proposal is not fair or even-handed. The Council has a legal obligation to be fair in its policies and operations. The proposed rates increase is not equitable and the basis on which the Council has developed its proposal is fundamentally wrong. From the reactions to the proposed rates increase on the Neighbourly website, it is apparent that the district communities of Waikanae, Waikanae rural, Waikanae Beach, Paraparaumu, Paraparaumu Beach, Raumati Beach, and Raumati South, have found their rates increases to be substantially more than the 4.7 per cent average, ranging from 8 per cent to over 15 per cent (my own rates increase of 11.8 per cent is more than 2 and 1/2 times the average of 4.7 per cent). These proposed rates increases are in direct contradiction with the Council's own statement on its website that "typically, where a property's revaluation exceeds the average revaluation increase in an area, the property will have a slightly higher rates increase than the average. Conversely, a property that has a revaluation below the average revaluation increase for that area will have a slightly lower rates increase than the average." In the Kapiti News article, the Mayor also said, 'you don't have to be a rocket scientist to see that for every dollar that goes down for some ratepayers an equal amount goes up for others'. However, information on the average rates increases for individual Kapiti communities is non-existent. The Council has not provided such a comparison, unlike the information on the changes in land values arising from the 2017 revaluation exercise. Given that the size of the pie has not increased (\$74.8m) and that much, if not most of the Kapiti communities have seen a substantial increase in proposed rates, it calls into question the basis of the rates increases. What communities or commercial/industrial/rural sectors saw a proposed rates increase of either below or around the average of 4.7% or a proposed rates decrease? The way that the rates increase is proposed does not pass the smell test. Also, proposed rates increases for much of the Kapiti communities ranging from 8 per cent to 15 per cent make a mockery of the Council's own key financial targets and limits of between 2.9 per cent and 5.5 per cent per year. This leaves very little trust in the Council's statement that there will be only a 4.8 per cent increase in rates over the next two financial years.

Comments on change to fees and charges:

As long as the new fees under the Food Act 2014 do not damage initiatives such as the Waikanae and Paraparaumu Beach Saturday markets, I support the proposed changes.

Key policies (Pages 27-28)

If you have any views about the **proposed changes to our revenue and financing policy**, please tell us here:

In the consultation document section on fees and charges, the Council proposes to increase fees ranging from 10 cents to 50 cents per entry into Council swimming pools. Under the revenue and financing policy, the Council is proposing to increase the private portion of swimming pool funding to 30%. However, in its document on funding and revenue policy the Council states that there already is 30% private portion swimming pool funding. So I don't understand whether the proposed increase in fees is more than the 30% or not and what the Council means by increasing the private portion of swimming pool funding if it is already 30%.

Anything else?

If you have any other feedback about this plan, or the work of the Council please comment here:

In 2014/15, my rates, which included water and rubbish collection - core Council functions - amounted to \$2,195. In 2017/18 my rates, which no longer include these 2 Council core functions, amounted to \$2601, a 19% increase over a period of 3 years. With the addition of water rates, the increase has been 42%. The proposed rates of \$2911 for 2018/19, if implemented, will see my rates increase by 33% over a period of 4 years. With the addition of water rates, the increase will be 56%. My wife and I are retirees, on fixed income from the Government, and this rampant rise in our rates is unsustainable in anyone's book.

Make Submission

Event Name	Long term plan 2018-38 consultation
Submission ID	18LTP-244
Response Date	23/04/18 12:48 PM
Consultation Point	Tell us what you think about our long term plan (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1
First and last name	Sam Buchanan
Title	Mr
Address	52 Tilley Road Paekakariki 5034
Phone	02040160107
Email	quackysam@hotmail.com
Are you providing feedback	as an individual
Hearings	
Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission?	Yes

Where we're heading (Page 8)

Considering our challenges and constraints, do you think we're focusing on the right 10-year outcomes?

Probably not.

Our financial and infrastructure strategies (Pages 10-13)

The Council plans to pay down debt, reduce borrowings and target infrastructure spending for resilience and growth. What are your views on this approach?

Paying down debt is fine, infrastructural spending is a matter of what is selected.

Key decision (Pages 14-17)

Should we change the way we share rates across the district?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option to change the rating system?

Yes - reduce the proportion of fixed-rate charges and introduce a commercially targeted rate (Council's preferred option)

Please tell us why:

Move to a charge based of capital value rather than land value. Return to a fixed water rate.

Key decision (Pages 18-20)

What should we do next to address flood risks?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option of a revised 45-year programme?

Please tell us why:

Purchase the NZTA owned paddock immediately to the east of the north end houses on Tilley Road, Paekakariki for flood control purposes, returning the stream to a natural meandering path across this paddock, with associated wetland, thus providing capacity to hold water, and directing away from houses. At the same time creating an environmental and recreational asset.

Work on the go (Pages 21-23)

Any comments on the matters below:

Housing

Facilitate social housing with other agencies such as iwi. Consider NZTA land between Tilley Road and the current SH1 for this purpose.

Replacing the Paekakariki seawall

Lock-in future funding for this project to be carried out as soon as possible in line with the design created by the Community Design Group. In the meantime, carry out repairs to the existing wall only when absolutely necessary, using timber. Curtail the dumping of rip rap on the beach which is impacting on the community's major recreational and visitor asset.

Paraparaumu and Waikanae town centres

Take note of previous improvements to town centres, and accept that the KCDC, like other councils, has no ability to improve town centres, especially when they are as ugly as hell in the first place. Stop wasting money on minor improvements to street furniture and paving which has no impact whatsoever on the attractiveness of towns, or on spending patterns.

Rates for 2018/19 (Pages 24-25)

If the draft long term plan is adopted with all our recommended proposals, a rates increase of 4.7% on average will apply across the district for 2018/19. Do you support this?

No

Comments:

As above, look to a capital value rating system.

Anything else?

If you have any other feedback about this plan, or the work of the Council please comment here:

Policy making Support community-led policies by making increased funds available at a community level. Give weight in decision-making to projects which are initiated by community groups and supported by Community Boards. Support the community-led wind farm project in Paekakariki. Reduce spending on grass mowing and minor improvements to pavements and the like. Especially in Paekakariki where we are quite happy to be a bit scruffy. In the case of mown grass areas, consider replacing grass with native shrubs to provide habitat and lower maintenance costs. Work with community groups to provide labour for plantings. Bring back a council-owned rubbish and recycling service which incentivises recycling and rubbish reduction. Make this a monopoly to stop duplication of services and the consequent environmental impacts. Undertake a survey of Kapiti's visitor attractions, and support those which actually attract large numbers of visitors, rather than glamorous projects such as the Kapiti Island 'gateway' project which is unlikely to draw a single extra visitor. Publicise family attractions such as the Raumati Marine Gardens area which is already successful in bringing in visitors. Review the effectiveness of currently funded promotional organisations with a view to reducing their funding. Support community-led projects in this area instead. Scrap the visitor information on the KCDC website, as the whole site is a hopeless mess and trying to use it to attract visitors is a waste of time. Support facilitation training to allow community groups to more effectively reach decisions and contribute to the well-being of the Kapiti Coast, as well as to provide good feedback to council. Support a community garden and orchard space in the north of Paekakariki by ensuring long-term rights to use current unused land is agreed. Don't have anything else to do with this project as we know what we are doing. Reduce bureaucratic burden on small businesses as much as possible, including supporting the liquor licensing of small bars and cafes, rather than encouraging patrons to attend large 'booze barn' pubs. Note that St Peter's Hall in Paekakariki is the Kapiti Coast's premier live music venue and provide appropriate support.

Make Submission

Event Name	Long term plan 2018-38 consultation
Submission ID	18LTP-245
Response Date	23/04/18 1:10 PM
Consultation Point	Tell us what you think about our long term plan (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1
First and last name	<input type="text"/> WITHHOLD DETAILS
Title	<input type="text"/>
Address	<input type="text"/>
Phone	<input type="text"/>
Email	<input type="text"/>
Are you providing feedback	as an individual
Hearings	
Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission?	No

Privacy statement

Please withhold

Housing

I would like the Kāpiti Coast District Council's long term housing plan to change. I endorse the Paekākāriki Housing Trust's submission that include the following eight housing actions to be included in the long term plan and taken up by the council in 2018. Make affordable housing a priority in Kāpiti Coast. Commit the KCDC to the principle that affordable housing is critical to the health and well-being of our community and change the stance of the council to one of finding ways to work together with community housing providers to enable affordable housing. Make priority given to affordable housing a central principle in decisions the council takes on planning and consenting issues and on the allocation of land and other resources held by the council. Work with NZTA and other central government agencies to use land for affordable housing. The council can work to ensure that lands made surplus after the construction of the Kāpiti Expressway and Transmission Gully are disposed of in ways that create assets for the community, protecting the environment and enabling land to be developed for affordable housing. In particular, ensure a comprehensive community-based precinct plan is developed for the Perkins Farm property and adjacent lands currently held by NZTA. This plan should provide for environmental protection and affordable housing and be completed before NZTA disposes of these lands. Land that will become surplus from the highway construction has many values and opportunities for the community of Paekākāriki as well as the wider Kapiti District. Working with the community on planning and securing the future of this land is required to ensure maximum benefit is obtained by the whole community. Use council-held rights of first refusal for NZTA lands that are appropriate for affordable housing as a means to enable community-led development of that land. This would include such sites as the south end of the 'Tilley triangle' and the former BP station on SH1. Enable affordable housing by reducing or waiving Council fees and levies where appropriate when a residential development includes provision for affordable or social housing, particularly where it is to be purchased by a recognised Community Housing provider. Lease Council social housing and land to local registered community housing providers such as Paekākāriki Housing Trust, Dwell Housing Trust, and iwi providers. Manage social housing locally to strengthen community connections and cohesion. Empower the Paekākāriki Community Board to decide on the allocation of social housing in the village. Of the Kāpiti Coast communities Paekākāriki has the lowest percentage of elderly residents because there is not enough appropriate housing and they are forced to leave the village. This reduces the diversity of the community and cuts people off from connections of long standing.

Make Submission

Event Name	Long term plan 2018-38 consultation
Submission ID	18LTP-246
Response Date	23/04/18 1:38 PM
Consultation Point	Tell us what you think about our long term plan (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1
First and last name	Barbara Macdonald
Title	Mrs
Address	16 Tangahoe St, Paekakariki
Phone	0210542796
Email	beamacdee@gmail.com
Are you providing feedback	as an individual

Hearings

Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission? No

Anything else?

If you have any other feedback about this plan, or the work of the Council please comment here:

The rubbish and recycling system used by the council does not meet councils sustainability goals: - Large wheelie bins and monthly collection fees do not encourage reduction of waste - Three or more contractors collecting in the same area is inefficient increasing the cost of collection and using more fuel - The wheelie bins blow over leaving rubbish and recycling littering the streets I would prefer a single bag system collected by one contractor. In addition I would prefer rubbish collection to be part of rates as some people struggle to pay the fees monthly

Make Submission

Event Name	Long term plan 2018-38 consultation
Submission ID	18LTP-247
Response Date	23/04/18 1:39 PM
Consultation Point	Tell us what you think about our long term plan (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1
First and last name	janet bayly
Title	Ms
Address	99 Seaview Rd, Paraparaumu
Phone	027 213 9692
Email	janetbayly1@gmail.com
Are you providing feedback	on behalf of an organisation
Organisation name	Mahara Gallery
Hearings	
Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission?	Yes

Where we're heading (Page 8)

Considering our challenges and constraints, do you think we're focusing on the right 10-year outcomes?

These long term 10 year goals seem rather vague beyond year 3, a focus on people and community values should not be lost within tight economic management; growing a distinct district identity is a good goal which needs strongly supporting environmental sustainability should be a higher priority; once council has officially 'consulted' it needs to keep to communication going with affected communities, and to follow through in a meaningful way that indicates it has really 'listened'

Our financial and infrastructure strategies (Pages 10-13)

The Council plans to pay down debt, reduce borrowings and target infrastructure spending for resilience and growth. What are your views on this approach?

Making people and communities more sustainable and caring is as important as infrastructure in the long run

Key decision (Pages 14-17)

Should we change the way we share rates across the district?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option to change the rating system?

Yes - reduce the proportion of fixed-rate charges and introduce a commercially targeted rate (Council's preferred option)

Key decision (Pages 18-20)

What should we do next to address flood risks?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option of a revised 45-year programme?

Yes - do the revised 45-year programme (Council's preferred option)

Work on the go (Pages 21-23)

Paraparaumu and Waikanae town centres

I write in support of the contribution that Mahara Gallery makes as the district's public gallery to making the Kapiti Coast a vibrant, diverse and thriving place to live, work and play; and supporting the development of a distinct district identity. Mahara Gallery creates a stronger, more resilient and more connected community. We actively support a focus on both local and global environmental issues through various projects which support creative thinking, personal engagement and individual empowerment. National and international research shows that a very high proportion of New Zealanders of all ages value and engage with arts and culture in a whole range of ways. Research also indicates that this engagement enhances individual resilience, mental and physical wellbeing, and connectedness to the community. Mahara Gallery has a core support base of regular visitors from the significant retired community of Kapiti. We offer them many opportunities throughout the year for stimulation and social contact, which reduce isolation, boredom and loneliness. At the other end of the scale, very young visitors come with their classes then return bringing their families and grandparents to share their sense of discovery and confidence in the cultural space. Access to the gallery and its wide range of programmes is free. We also engage with various groups across the community in partnerships which extend our activities beyond the limits of our current physical building. Our free public programmes, which attracted nearly 4,000 people in the last financial year, and our 20+ exhibitions annually are not passive or elitist experiences. They offer high levels of interaction and participation to diverse communities and audiences both within and beyond Kapiti. Mahara Gallery also has great potential to support council's economic development strategy through cultural tourism. It has already attracted further arts businesses to Waikanae village and shares complementary audiences with nearby Shoreline Cinema and visitors to the library and marae. These visitors then also support other local businesses in the village such as cafes, bakeries, bars and specialist boutiques, alongside the 60% of our visitors who come from outside Kapiti, including 22% who are international tourists. We could attract more from the busy cruise ship market, for example, by being included in Council's visitor attraction programme, publicity and promotion, and tourism development.

SOME OF THE ARTS & CULTURAL EXPERIENCES PRESENTED IN, AROUND OR BY MAHARA GALLERY IN PAST 21 MONTHS

Kapahaka (primary school & senior kaumatua) Lion dancing Fan dancing Dragon dancing Zen dance film 3D printed sculpture collage mixed media assemblage mosaic woodwork bronze recycled textiles + workshops puppet shows story-telling te reo classes experiences at Nga Manu Nature Reserve live music concrete art glass art photography drawing ceramics embroidery & embroidered jeans for teens workshop weaving carving poetry + book launches support for church group fundraiser Rap writing & performing Chinese lanterns + workshops stencil art kites interviews conceptual art social practice art artist-in-residence + talks + walks painting sculpture textiles historical shows and heritage themes Eco art (100+ kids) + awards tapa cloth printed Maori kites discussions about public art calligraphy & Chinese brush painting + workshops Nga Manu environmental art project (+book & film launch) NZ Writers week event, NZ Festival INTERNATIONAL PROJECTS Jui Pin Chang, international artist residency from Taiwan, in partnership with Whitireia, Nga Manu & Tutere Gallery Stories from Vanuatu about women dealing with climate change Michel Tuffery won the prestigious international Saatchi Schools Art Award 2017 while showing at Mahara, with his award-winning work painted on the Mahara front window Children of Illam, school in India started by a NZ writer PARTNERSHIPS Nga Manu Nature Reserve & Philipp Family Foundation Te Atiawa ki Whakarongotai National Services Te Paerangi Kapiti Coast District Libraries Council's Green Team Guardians of Kapiti Marine Trust UN Women Asian Events Trust NZ Chinese Culture and Arts Assn NZ Festival 2018 Field Collection Trust and Avenal McKinnon MEMBERSHIPS Museums Aotearoa Discover Kapiti Heritage Group Destination Waikanae

SOME RECENT STATISTICS 12,500+ visitors (2016-17 year; 14,000+ to date this financial year) 3,972 attended 59 free public events (2016-2017) Showed 300+ local artists (2016-2017) 40+ class visits (current financial year)

Rates for 2018/19 (Pages 24-25)

If the draft long term plan is adopted with all our recommended proposals, a rates increase of 4.7% on average will apply across the district for 2018/19. Do you support this?

Yes

Make Submission

Event Name	Long term plan 2018-38 consultation
Submission ID	18LTP-248
Response Date	23/04/18 1:41 PM
Consultation Point	Tell us what you think about our long term plan (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1
First and last name	<input type="text"/> WITHHOLD DETAILS
Title	<input type="text"/>
Address	<input type="text"/>
Phone	<input type="text"/>
Email	<input type="text"/>
Are you providing feedback	as an individual
Hearings	
Do you want to speak to the Council about your submission?	No

Privacy statement ☐ Please withhold

Key decision (Pages 18-20)

What should we do next to address flood risks?

Do you agree with the Council's preferred option of a revised 45-year programme?

No - keep the status quo programme

Please tell us why:

This isn't an issue that can be deferred or lengthened. There are many subdivisions currently being built and developed that are adding to existing flood issues. Our biggest concern is the fact that the effluent treated by the council is released into Mazengarb stream/drain. In flooding events this has the potential to inundate private properties and public areas where uninformed public could be affected (notably Mazengarb park areas, walk areas between here and Paraparaumu college). Before we found out that this is where Council disposes of the whole area's effluent, our own children for years played in this area in light flood times on skim boards, canoes etc and never was there been warning signs that indicating this. Many people take pūha from the stream edges. Flooding and appropriate short term plan/actions of these waters are of vital importance to the district health across all ages and should be of priority to this Council.



18LTP-249
WITHHOLD

15 April 2018

Kapiti Coast District Council
175 Rimu Road
Paraparaumu 5032

Dear Sir / Madam

I refer to your generic ratepayer letter received 29 March 2018.

Generally, I have a concern with the value of rates that I have been paying considering I am in a rural property with no council services.

I also have a number of concerns with the rates as explained in your letter:

1. Change in the way KCDC share rates across the district (\$62.16)

How is this calculated? My property's capital value is \$710,000 and land value of \$490,000. Other properties have higher capital value do not have the same increase in the way your share rates.

2. KCDC's proposed rates increase (\$165.61 – average 4.7% of capital value)

I see little value for money in the proposed increase. This is above inflation (1.6% Jan 2018). The additional work that KCDC want to cover seems from the "Building a stronger Kapiti together" booklet, to be based on roading and storm water flood risks. Neither of these relate to my property given there is no drains or footpaths. For the sizeable increase that KCDC proposes, I would expect to have more detail behind why this is so high.

I set out below some key concerns:

- I do not see why we should contribute to any form of flood protection. Those affected should pay more for where they are, also have flood insurance. Council also to up their game with storm water cleaning the blocked drains etc.
- Properties built on coastal sand dunes should be left to wash into the sea. If these property owners want protection, they should talk to their insurers.
- Town centre improvements is a waste of money. The town centres will be what they will be – no one in the council of overpaid consultants have any ability to make any difference to the present situation.

- No rate payer funded public art of any form. If a so called artist thinks their art is so wonderful they should pay for all costs or form a group of people to pay for it out of their own pockets.
- The funding for roads should be left as is. Rural rate payers pay for too much for urban roads, that they will never use
- The Aquatic Centre should be sold as soon as possible, before the next million dollar costly repairs at the expense of the rate payers where no profit is handed back to the council.

I look forward to hearing from you with respect to the above.

Kind regards

