

# Long-term Plan 2024–34

Respondent No. 364

Response ID 5678107

Date of contribution Apr 30 24 10:06:11 am



## Personal information

First name Isabelle

Last name Maloret

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

**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 would only support Option 1 if the spending was for operational use and the increase is reversed in the following year. I would also only support if the total rate increase is reduced by other means and would not result in a 17% rate increase. Rates affordability is a major factor for residents and I believe Council need to do more to take this into account.

**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?**

although I support Option 2 to make no change to how we allocate funding I do not support the premise of a "Climate Emergency" which underpins much of the Councils climate change activities. See note at the end of this submission

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

### Enhancing Democracy

I do not believe Council has been acting in a democratic way in regards to the Maori Wards and the Non-proliferation fossil fuels treaty.

I have attended Community Board meetings around the district over the past 8 months or so and have found them to be very regimented with all but one providing any sense of true community engagement. I have also found members of some of the Board's to be rude and discriminatory towards those who share a different view to them which seems to be an acceptable practice from some senior Council members and staff.

I believe the council has become very disjointed from their community and appear to be afraid of any meaningful discussion/debate. Everything is controlled by Council – this is very evident with the Takutai Kapiti/CAP process over the past year. One of the main mandates for the Panel was community engagement and this has been sorely lacking. Even members of the Panel have expressed concern and frustration over this.

### ☒ Councils Influence and Input into Coastal Adaptation

Council has already spent in the region of \$4-\$5 million on the Takutai Kapiti project. The outcome of this will be “recommendations” from the Coastal Adaptation Panel on preferred pathways, optional thresholds for adaptation planning and recommendations on the District Plan Change. This was touted as a “community led” initiative but the majority of the ratepayers in Kapiti had little to no understanding of it until recently.

The Council, in the 12th hour, has sent letters to all ratepayers explaining the project, the panel's role and given some opportunity for the community to provide their feedback and preferences. The letter gives people the choice of doing an online survey and/or attending a drop in session. These letters were sent out very late and most people would have missed the opportunity to attend a drop in session, even if they were able to attend there were very limited time options. The letter also refers to the district plan change and has given a link to the Takutai Kapiti documents page – but when going there it is unclear as to which document they refer to. The whole Takutai Kapiti/CAP process has been anything but engaging with the community. There has been very little opportunity to meet and discuss and ask questions outside of a very controlled and contrived environment. A big part of CAP's mandate was community engagement but it appears they did not have a budget for this. Surely this is incongruent with their stated mandate – how can this be?

As a ratepayer I am appalled at this. It has not only been totally undemocratic but a very large amount of money has been spent on a process that is apparently “only the start” and could be another 2-3 years before it is complete. There has been no indication as to how much more this is going to cost the ratepayer.

I am not against planning for maintaining our coastline/ waterways and planning for the future if it is done using a more realistic model.

### ☒ Climate “Emergency”

This seems to underpin most of the risk, adaptation and fearmongering which in turn is the basis for focus and expenditure on “predictions” and “modelling”. I do not think the community has had proper consultation.

Council's climate emergency stance also comes with a high \$ cost and is hurting us as a community. We should be focussing on real things and not planning for something that may or may not happen.

We are told time and time again that the science is settled around the climate emergency. This is absolute nonsense, and no independent scientist should ever agree that it is settled. Even the CAP scientist stated that “we don't know what will happen in the future”.

I also have concerns that a climate activist is a big driving force within the council and there seems to be a lack of willingness to look at alternative information/data/science. I would like to see the Council take a more balanced approach to both the Coastal Adaption and Climate Emergency strategies which affects our social and economic future, including the Long Term Plan.

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

Response to proposal 2: I DO NOT SUPPORT any of these options.

Comment: I DO NOT support the excessively high rates increases in order to reduce debt. Debt reduction can be achieved in other areas without putting the full burden on ratepayers.

With regards to reducing debt to respond to natural disasters – it should not be the responsibility of

KCDC to respond to a natural disaster - we have the EQC and Insurance Companies and personal responsibility. Placing people in financial hardship now by increasing rates for something in the future that may or may not happen is irresponsible

Response to proposal 3: I do not think there has been enough information provided around these options therefore I cannot make a selection for any of the proposed options.

**Upload any related files**

 [https\\_s3-ap-so...\\_pdf\\_1714435540](https_s3-ap-so..._pdf_1714435540)