

# Long-term Plan 2024–34



Respondent No. 156

Response ID 5663359

Date of contribution Apr 21 24 02:30:10 pm

## Personal information

First name Wynn

Last name Ingram

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 1: Fund \$4.7 million shortfall with an additional 5% rates increase in Year 1.

**Would you like to expand on your answer for option 1?**

I have no issue with council managing its debt down. However, I fail to see why this requires such a massive increase in rates in 24/25 when two consecutive years of 12% would achieve the same end. I also fail to see why this debt reduction strategy is being adopted at this point in time, in advance of the government's announcement of it 3 waters alternative. Surely that policy will have a material bearing on management and financing of 3 waters infrastructure.

**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?**

Even at 6% this is far too aggressive. It will see rates grow by 63% over 5 years in 2024 \$. This will

translate into something more like 100% in dollars of the day! This is unaffordable for many ratepayers. The 7% rates/income ratio adopted by council is totally inappropriate for a community with a high proportion of fixed income ratepayers, who can only dream of seeing annual increases of 3% in their income! The debt that the council is now saddled with years arose out of years of management and governance incompetence on the council's part. Fix it by all means, but not in 10 years. I recommend also that council look for more other more enduring means of reducing and controlling its debt and cost structures, rather than routinely all on ratepayers to bail it out. For example would an overture to Horowhenua DC (arguably more effectively run based on its indebtedness) to amalgamate operations and rationalise on staff, hence overheads be out of the question?

**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

**New climate action rate  
Which option should we choose? (select one option)**

Option 1: Introduce a new targeted climate action rate based on a property's capital value rather than the current land-value based general rate

**Would you like to expand on your answer for option 1?**

This sensible provided that it is backed by sensible policies to ensure that the ring fenced funds are appropriately spent. For example it beggars belief that the council still consents residential building on beach front properties in Waikanae - when sea level rises in excess of 1m are a very real prospect in the foreseeable. Spending climate action rate funds on adaptation of the residences constructed as a result of this short sighted policy would be totally inappropriate.

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

I have already made a submission on alcohol licensing fees.

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

This plan is very much business as usual with the debt reduction overlay thrown in. I feel we have a right to expect something which will, over time, result in a step change improvement in KCDC's performance and effectiveness.