

Long-term Plan 2024–34



Respondent No. 250

Response ID 5673568

Date of contribution Apr 26 24 05:28:38 pm

Personal information

First name Anonymous

Last name Anonymous

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

Please let us know what ward you live in Paraparaumu

Do you want to speak to Council about your submission at our public hearings on 2 May? No

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

Submission

Proposal 1: Three waters funding
Which option should we choose? (select one option)

Option 1: Fund \$4.7 million shortfall with an additional 5% rates increase in Year 1.

Would you like to expand on your answer for option 1?

This is an invidious situation, the fault of the current government, who are promising tax cuts while at the same time forcing councils to increase rates.

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

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

Proposal 3: Transfer Council's housing for older people Which option should we choose? (select one option)

Option 3: Older persons' housing continues to be delivered by Council with no option to grow the portfolio

Would you like to expand on your answer for option 3?

I disagree with the wording and premise of this question. I believe a community housing provider is a thinly veiled form of privatisation. Such an organisation will not be owned by, representative of, or accountable to, the wider community. It will turn into a self-serving property investment consortium with a window-dressing of 'affordable' or 'social' housing held in its portfolio. Council should retain public ownership of its housing for the elderly, and in the long term, we can only hope that a more enlightened central government will be elected which doesn't pressure councils into making such decisions, and is committed to actually providing adequate public housing through central government, local government, or both.

New climate action rate

Which option should we choose? (select one option)

Option 1: Introduce a new targeted climate action rate based on a property's capital value rather than the current land-value based general rate

Would you like to expand on your answer for option 1?

I disagree with both these options. What I would like to see happen is the introduction of a gradually increasing targeted rate based on assessment of properties' susceptibility to climate change related damage. So far in Aotearoa we seem to be taking a disorganised and piecemeal approach to dealing with the causes and consequences of climate change. If we continue along this path, we will all pay more, and suffer more damage and distress, in the long run. People who choose to keep living in properties which, for example, are obviously already suffering from coastal erosion, and are at risk from severe storms and sea level rise, should not expect the rest of the community to keep subsidising their sea walls. Either we need to move towards user-pays for these situations, or we need to look at genuine managed retreat from some areas where the costs and side effects of mitigation and defense are too severe.