

Long-term Plan 2024–34



Respondent No. 244

Response ID 5672980

Date of contribution Apr 26 24 11:48:36 am

Personal information

First name Anonymous

Last name Anonymous

I'm providing a submission (choose one): as an individual

Please let us know what ward you live in Waikanae

Are you happy for your name to be published with your feedback: I do not want my name published with my feedback

Submission

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

The proposals are simply a cost plus approach which lead to unsustainable and unsatisfactory levels of rate increases. Council should at the least meet their own target of affordability, and desirably do better. Why should Council assume they need a greater percentage of household incomes - inherently meaning other ratepayer priorities must receive less! Lower rate levels are necessary which means greater efficiency and reducing service levels and project work. Proposals should not assume that forced rate increases of several times the rate of inflation are satisfactory.

A good starting point would be to defer the Ihakara - Kapiti Rd link

Proposal 1 needs to recognise that further policy information will be developed over the next year or so. The preferred option of a Year 1 rate increase is unclear. Is this a permanent increase or just in year 1? Option 2 is preferred until greater clarity emerges.

Proposal 2 is woolly thinking. Whilst reducing debt is desirable, there is no certainty that greater levels of borrowing will be required, or that any such borrowing will address essential activities. If and when such future debt funded work is essential, it should be seen in the context of the then existing works of Council. Providing headroom simply encourages spending by future Councils! I do not support debt reduction through current rate increases to allow future generations to expend further.

Proposal 3 indicates narrow thinking. Housing is not a primary Council responsibility. Government has this responsibility and Council should not attempt to compete. The housing asset has a value that Council should not simply transfer to others. Option 3 is preferred. Growth in the portfolio can never keep up with demand. If tenants cannot access Government subsidies they, not Council, should manage their issue.

A targeted Climate Action rate.? As an additional rate it is not supported. What added rate level, what are

the targets? Clearly the proposal needs more information.

No issue with collating existing spending and identifying the quantifies benefits (in context of overall Kapiti Coast position). If such information is available a better discussion could be had on further spending)or less!).