

Long-term Plan 2024–34



Respondent No. 146

Response ID 5659321

Date of contribution Apr 19 24 09:43:38 am

Personal information

First name Robin

Last name Gunston

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

Please let us know what ward you live in Paraparaumu

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

Are you happy for your name to be published with your feedback: My name can be published with my feedback

Submission

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

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

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

This is the only fair and prudent action for the Council to take now that NZ has been let down by the incoming Government's abandonment of 3 Waters.

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

Option 1: Apply average rates increases of 8% per year from 2025/26 to 2033/34

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

Having to provide for a future unforeseen event is again a most prudent thing to do, given what happened last year in Auckland, Northland and Hawkes Bay.

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

Option 1: Transfer our older persons' housing assets to a new Community Housing Provider

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

Council does not need expertise in this area- Community Housing is an essential part of wellbeing for many older people which the CHP structure is designed to deliver. I do have a reservation that Council give the proposed CHP more autonomy to create its own Deed of Trust, having extensive governance experience I have always found it hard to just take on board something someone else, with little or no skin in the game, has created. There could just be a legal framework supplied by Council but then completed by the Trustees..

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?

It is highly likely that climate action adaptation will grow to be the primary functions of Councils possibly within the term of this LTP, so it is totally logical that this rate be separated out.

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

Development contributions must be totally transparent and take into account the write down cost of new assets over say 50 years within the costings. There should not be any trade offs whereby the Council gets given some perceived additional benefit by a developer which turns out in years to come to be a yoke around the Council's neck.

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

I would like to see KCDC take a lead in more equitable pay across Council with there being a ratio set in Council remuneration policies between the lowest pay rate of an employee and the CEO's totally emolument. International equity research has shown a far more harmonious, productive workforce where this band is narrowed so that everyone feels part of the team. One benefit any KCDC employee gets is to work in a great place, with a friendly supportive community (in general), that is worth an extra pay of about 30% compared with someone having to work in Wellington or the Hutt!!