

Long-term Plan 2024–34



Respondent No. 330

Response ID 5676856

Date of contribution Apr 29 24 01:20:03 pm

Personal information

First name Joanna

Last name Poole

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

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

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?

1. it is premature to introduce a new targeted climate action rate until a proposed plan on how this targeted rate would be used is put to ratepayers.
2. I am not confident that a targeted rate will be ring-fenced.

Recommend read full submission

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

Rates remission: Council most definitely needs to review rate payer affordability and therefore it rates remission policy to include a broader sector of ratepayers who are eligible for rates remission. To do this, it should use The Treasury's affordability estimates, which are more accurate than Berl's affordability estimates.

Revenue and finance: Council should use best-practice values provided by The Treasury in developing revenue and finance policies.

Development contributions: Development contributions should be differentiated between green-field and

brown-field contribution rates. Developers absolutely need to take more responsibility for the cost of providing services to new properties, rather than the Council.

Significance and engagement: Multiple concerns re consultation deadlines, and notes the submission form limited submitter ability to expand on their answers.

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

'Fees and charges: Fees and charges should be limited to real cost increases.

Enhancing democracy: Provide a broader and more complete set of options in the Council's consultation processes; improving the format of its consultation submission forms to allow for explanation by submitters whether they agree or not with Council-provided options; not indicating a preference for any option in its consultation submission process/forms.

- we take the process seriously. It would be beneficial for all (ratepayers and the Council) if consultation and submission documents and processes took this into account.

Proposed alcohol licensing bylaw: Please make it more difficult to acquire /renew an alcohol licence. The Council often brings to the fore of discussions and goals its social obligations'.

The social fabric of the Kapiti Coast District could well be improved by limiting availability of alcohol.

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

Response for proposal 1: I do not support either option provided (increase rates or increase debt). The Council has overlooked an obvious third option - that of reducing expenditure. Individual New Zealanders are having to cut their cloth/tighten their belts during these difficult financial times, Central Government is taking decisive action by asking Government agencies/departments to reduce expenditure by 6.5% - why then is the Kapiti Coast District Council also not showing financial prudence by reducing expenditure? I would like to have seen Council provide a third option - that of cutting back Council expenditure by at least 6.5%. This I would support.

Response for proposal 2: I do not support any of the three options provided (increase average rates by 8%, 7% or 6% per year from 2025/26 to 2033/34).

By increasing average rates "to build a resilient future" the Council demonstrates a Council that is out of touch with the financial circumstances of its ratepayers and shows a cavalier attitude towards its ratepayers. The three options provided by the Council neglect to take into account the affordability of this Council mandated 'resilient future' by its ratepayers.

Once again, the Council has overlooked a fourth option - that of reducing Council expenditure.

It is an erroneous Council assumption that each household in the Kapiti Coast District has an income of at least \$101,362 just because this is apparently the 'median' income of the district, and that household income will increase by 3% per year. My household has no income and is surviving financially by living off/eating into capital. I imagine there are a large number of households in the same, if not a more precarious financial situation.

What is the point of "building a resilient future" if Kapiti Coast District ratepayers and residents can no longer afford to live here through Council increasing rates to an unaffordable level?!

I do not support any of the three options provided by Council. I would like to have seen Council provide a third option - that of cutting back Council expenditure by at least 6.5%. This I would support.

Response to proposal 3: I do support the Council discontinuing delivering Older persons' housing but, valued at over \$21 million on Council's books, Council ought to provide as much value as it can for its ratepayers by selling these assets to a third-party rather than giving away ('transferring') the assets to a new provider - even if at a discount.

I do not support the Council transferring housing assets to a new community housing provider (CHP). Council's argument that it would "have more influence and say on how fund and assets are used" if it were to transfer housing assets to a new CHP, as stated in its 'Consultation document', overlooks the value and experience that an existing CHP would bring to the portfolio. Presumably, the existing CHP would select tenants who met certain criteria (e.g. can pay the rent) and this would not discriminate against the 'sectors of the community' living in Kapiti any more than it would in any other region.

Yes, it beggars belief that during this period of financial austerity facing many New Zealanders including residents within the Kapiti Coast District, the Council is focussed on increasing rates.

The Council's proposed rates increases are unaffordable to many people in our District. What is the point of having a 'resilient Kapiti' if we ratepayers can no longer afford to live here.

Not only are the proposed rates increases unaffordable, but the figures cited by the Council in its LTP 2024-34 consultation and submission documents are factually inaccurate. Rates will increase by 19.4% in Year 1- not 17%, and in the following years by 8%- not 7%. In calculating the rates increases, the Council has used gross figures not net figures. For example, the Council has included rates remissions and rates on Council-owned properties, whereas these should have been deducted from the gross figures before calculating the percentages. (The net figures show what actual cash is available to the Council to pay for services and capital works.)

The rates increases that the Council is proposing means that rates would have doubled in 8 years.

Until such a time as the economy is really growing and incomes are really growing, the Council needs to pull its head in and do as other organisations, companies, government agencies and individuals are doing - downsizing and/or reducing expenditure. People are financially hurting! The Council needs to make some hard decisions about what services and work the Council (ratepayers) can afford and what we can't afford and make reductions in expenditure wherever it can. Spend on 'must have' services and capital works, not 'nice to have'!

I propose that the Council amend the LTP 2024-34 to as follows:

1. Set the 'Net' Rate increase in Year 1 to 12.56%; the following Year 2 at 2.01%; Year 3 at 5.68%; Year 4 at 6.53%.
2. Fully fund all depreciation from Year 1.
3. Retain the budgets for the following Activity Areas: Water management, Access and Transport, Wastewater management, Stormwater Management.
4. Reduce the spending in each of the other Activity Areas in Year 1 by 6.5%, and from Year 2 onwards increase each area by 3%.

Please note, as a rate payer, I take the process of making a submission seriously. The time and effort involved in making a submission to initiatives such as the Council's LTP 2024-34 is substantial. It would be beneficial for all (ratepayers and the Council) if at the planning stage of consultation, this is taken into account so that ratepayers can make the call on options rather than the Council. Providing limited options for consultation (e.g. as in this LTP consultation - only options for increasing rates but not reducing expenditure in certain activity areas), does ratepayers a disservice.

Upload any related files

60%
66

https_s3-ap-so... .pdf_1714360766