

# Long-term Plan 2024–34



Respondent No. 61

Response ID 5628457

Date of contribution Apr 10 24 09:39:54 am

## Personal information

First name Ewen

Last name Ritchie

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

Please let us know what ward you live in Waikanae

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 2: Fund \$4.7 million shortfall by taking on debt each year.

**Would you like to expand on your answer for option 2?**

KCDC must operate in a no frills manner. Focus on the basics. The new Govt will move to assist local bodies in their 3 waters. Having water meters puts KCDC to the head of 3 waters actions. Im not happy with having to pay in my taxes for others to catch up so what Labour proposed was not the right solution. Borrow now. Invest money only in things that if left unattended will end up costing much more in the future. KCDC

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

Option 3: Apply average rates increases of 6% per year from 2025/26 to 2033/34

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

Rates and insurance are becoming prohibitively expensive for those living beyond full time work. I will be

applying for rates reduction this year for the first time as we struggle to live. I am reducing insurance cover to what we can afford. Reducing debt is the correct solution but putting this into a timeframe of austerity is the wrong solution.

**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?**

KCDC should not be in the housing business. Leave that to central Govt.

**New climate action rate**

**Which option should we choose? (select one option)**

Option 2: Make no change to how we allocate funding our climate change activities

**Would you like to expand on your answer for option 2?**

KCDC should not be considering any further investments into impacts of climate change. It has been vastly over dramatised. All the doomsday targets people have prophesied have come to nothing and there are many examples. Methane is created by agriculture and the Paris Climate Accord says take no actions that impact food production. Co2 is not the enemy as is claimed to be. NZ is a dot on the world for climate change. We should not be pouring money into it especially in these constrained times. Planting of more native trees should be the focus and this is already happening.

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

I never understand why Council call for submissions. I believe Council already knows what it wants to do and ignores any submissions that do not match Council views. It would be much simpler and more honest for Council to say this is what we want to do. This is why. These are the costs and the this is the return. Like the new Govt is doing make long term plans not 3 years but 20 years. Refine plans as they progress. Set goals. Set targets. Make targets SMART - Specific Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Timebound. Give Departments and then staff KPI's directly related to achievement of goals. If a role doesn't contribute to a goal question whether the role is actually required. If it's not a statutory obligation the role should probably not exist. Report regularly to ratepayers on progress to targets. Councils including KCDC do not seem to be razor sharp with clarity of roles and expectations. There is a need to operate much more efficiently.

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

as above

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

as above