

Long-term Plan 2024–34



Respondent No. 327

Response ID 5676783

Date of contribution Apr 29 24 12:44:35 pm

Personal information

First name Quentin

Last name Poole

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?
Yes

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

Submission

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?

There is no need as costing can be easily identified through accounting practice and unique codes. A new targeted rate would need to be FULLY consulted upon so input and output are fully understood by the ratepayers of Kapiti. Check the requirements of the Ratings Act.

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

Rates remission should be considered a social policy of central government responsibility with reimbursement – not Local Govt. Cease all rates remissions.
Revenue and finance should be using 'best practice' values from Treasury, Reserve Bank and IRD to determine assumptions rather than figures from Beryl.
Development contributions should be split into green-field and brown-field rates. All development contributions shall recover the full cost of joining the existing infrastructure.

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

Fees and rates increases should be held as close as possible to real cost increases after efficiency audits. Enhancing democracy should allow for timing of events for as many stakeholders as possible and should allow as much engagement as possible, eg questions allowed in chat in TEAMS.

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

Response for Proposal 1: Neither option. Re-check all assumptions for the 3 waters activity areas. I understand some mistakes have been made in the operating and capital funding sheets for each. Once these are corrected, I am willing for these 3x Activity Areas to be included in the LTP.

Response for proposal 2: None of the options above. The percentage figure shown above relate to the "gross rates" whilst the figure that the ratepayer actually pays – "Net Rates" or the actual rates paid by ratepayers is understated by an order of a figure greater than 1+% higher than shown. As the budget is in such a state, debt repayment can only be undertaken after structural changes are made to the budget.

Response for Proposal 3: None of the above. Option 1 provides more choice to start from scratch without past encombrances, but I do not agree to transfer \$21+m of ratepayers equity as a gift to a third-party. The land and buildings must be sold – even at a discounted rate – to the third party.

These rates increases are unaffordable/unacceptable to many in the Kapiti community. We understand instructions to staff were to create a LTP around – "Growth, Balance, No cut in services, Climate Change'. The current Government has had no concerns of seeking Government departments to reduce expenditure by 6.5 percent. Why was this discipline not shown here? Ratepayers should have also been offered cuts in services as options to assess. Line by line budget items should have been considered for need not want. This exercise should still be carried out.

Upload any related files

