

Long-term Plan 2024–34



Respondent No. 302

Response ID 5675886

Date of contribution Apr 28 24 07:20:17 pm

Personal information

First name Michelle

Last name Lewis

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

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?

The current economic climate does not support high rates increases. In 3 years time a further review could take place to ask the same question. Households currently DO NOT have capacity to take on 5% increase in rates.

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?

I do not want any of these options but there is no tick box for that. Why is that ? My preference would be no rates increase to pay off debt. Council should not be spending money it does not have operationally. It is poor management to debt fund to the level that KCDC has done to date.

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 suggest increase the rent for older persons so that the gap reduces overtime. The situation is no different to that which many households find themselves in. Therefore passing the issue to a separate entity does not address the societal issue. The issue that MUST be addressed is making costs of repair affordable within budget. If revenue needs to increase to meet costs then it must increase. That's just good business.

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?

You have not consulted, to the best of my knowledge on the ratepayers desire for this initiative. Stick to core infrastructure services.

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

I do not support the new bylaw. When bylaws have been asked to be addressed as the community is not adhering to them Senior Managers have over the last triennium said it's "too hard " to enforce. This means that for bylaws they are costly and wasteful use of council staff time and ratepayers resources. There should be a reduction in bylaws

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

It is impossible to comment as there is no comparative data. Therefore I do not support these changes as I am not able to assess what they are and if they are reasonable. The way the information is presented to the public is not helpful for meaningful consultation. It needs to be bottom up, not top down consultation. In terms of enhancing democracy, KCD C needs to use feedback from social media in all forms to improve how it responds to the community. It currently is reliant on process rather than a pragmatic, sense based approach.

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

This is the worst consultation document I have ever seen in my 17 years on the coast. It does not provide sufficient detail for meaningful consultation on the matters of importance to the local community. No where is there the opportunity to talk about parks and reserves, walking tracks, beach access costs, road costs and road safety especially on Te Moana Road, that needs urgent attention to reduce speeds. The inclusion of so many other policies with no reference / baseline to compare with is poor practice. This feels like a legislated tick box exercise and not a meaningful discussion with the community you represent. I am left more disillusioned with this council than I was before reading this consultation material. I'm left speechless at the poor quality of information provided to the public.