

Long-term Plan 2024–34



Respondent No. 5

Response ID 5609988

Date of contribution Mar 30 24 06:40:28 pm

Personal information

First name Steven

Last name Barry

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

Write organisation name here
Jeses criste, asking for a 17% payrise and youe cant even get a submission form right. I ticked im submitting as an individual and your asking what organization Im from, whn I thick on behalf of an oraganization in Q17 this box goes away.

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

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

This isn't the fault of ratepayers, Kapiti residents already pay for water separately. Previous councils failure to plan and fund resiliently by counting on a not yet passed legislation is your oversight and mismanagement. Counting your chickend before they are hatched shouldn't be funded by ramping rates up during a cost of living crisis.

**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?

Whilst balancing budgets is a laudable aim, front loading rate increases is a poor option. With Kapiti now being appealing as a commuter town to Wellington ramping up rates may discourage further local migration to this area, aiming to make Kapiti an appealing place to live and work, would grow the rate payer base and be a better long term source of revenue.

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

Option 2: Older persons' housing is delivered by an existing Community Housing Provider with less influence from Council

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

Whilst offloading property assets is generally a bad idea, if it includes transfer of liabilities and costs of providing housing for older persons with the possibility of increased funding from other government sources then this seems sensible.

**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?

This is an unclear policy statement, I'm not averse to it being split out of the current rate for transparency reasons but the proposed change seems less a transparency move and more like a backdoor method to introduce an additional rate source and excuse to milk rate payers.

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

Saving costs to ratepayers makes sense, however being anti-business will hurt the district. I note Tuatara brewery has opted to move to Brewtown in the Hutt, KCDC could have worked with them to help develop the business in and around Sheffield Street as the opportunity exists to create a venture similar to Brewtown here. Encouraging some night life attractions would be a great boon to the local economy.

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

17% is a frankly ridiculous, perhaps infrastructure spending and debt repayment could be funded by cutting KCDC fat cat pay rather than just ramping up rates. I understand that the CEO recently had extra \$50,000 per annum on top of his \$300,000 salary agreed. That is absolutely disgusting given the median income in New Zealand is around NZD\$62,000 based on February 2023 data. Handing out pay rises that are on par with a lot of people's annual salaries to a PUBLIC SERVANT earning 5 times the normal person's wage and then demanding more tax is obscene.