Long-term Plan 2024–34

Respondent No. 176

Response ID 5664452

Date of contribution Apr 22 24 12:07:58 pm

Kāpiti Coast DISTRICT COUNCIL
Me Huri Whakamuri, Ka Titiro Whakamua

Personal information

First name	Anonymous
Last name	Anonymous
I'm providing a submission (choose one):	as an individual
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:	I do not want my name 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?

I am concerned that there is an 'all or nothing' approach to these decisions. On one hand, the council appears to prefer burdening current rates payers with the debt responsibility that has accumulated (at the 'benefit') of previous rate payers, and at the benefit of reducing pressure on future generations. On the other hand, increasing debt is only prolonging/deferring the pain and should be avoided.

I would prefer council focusing on maintaining a stable level of debt, rather than specifically increasing or decreasing it. Current economic conditions (out of anybody's control) are not conducive to reducing debt - this should have been the focus during better economic conditions over the past ten years, where council presumably benefited significantly by rising asset prices.

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?

Council currently has a very short term view on the level of debt that the council should have. Current debt has not been built up over a period of ten years, therefore why should it's repayment strategy be limited to such a period? Council appear to be hyper focused on maximizing the reduction to this debt, rather than achieving a stable debt level (or consistent level of reduction) that is fair to current and future rate payers.

As usual the default solution is to pass on cost to the rate payer, rather than looking at maximizing efficiency within council or capitalizing on the increase in value of council assets.

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?

Council analysis seems flawed - how can establishing a new CHP deliver the same financial outcome as transferring to an existing CHP, where a new CHP will attract significant setup costs and associated ongoing running costs (and council overhead)? An existing CHP would fundamentally be a more efficient operating model. Concerns around reduced service levels appear unfounded given that there is a well established regulatory framework governing these providers. Surely any concerns (around a shift from a focus on elderly to a more community based focus) could be mitigated with specific negotiated conditions with the transfer?

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?

Council have not provided enough information to understand what impact this change would have on individual rate payers, therefore I am strongly of the opinion that no change should be made to the current methodology. Climate Action activities should now be considered an standard part of a councils responsibilities and therefore should be treated no differently to all other council costs collected via rates based on LV's.

If council with to increase transparency, then the same 'targeting' of rates should be extended across all council services. Council is also more than capable of tracking the revenue for, and expenditure on, Climate Change Activities, under the current methodology, if they really wish to do so, without introducing a targeted rate.

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

Many of these changes are complex with high administration costs

Part 3 - Optional Rates postponement
Appears to be a targeted rate relief open to anyone over the age of 65 regardless of their financial situation. Strongly object on the grounds that this will likely reduce rate recovery, placing burden once again on the younger generation. Recovery cannot be guaranteed, and costly and complex to administer and manage.

Part 8 - Rates relief for separately habitable units
Complex, high administration cost, and impossible to monitor compliance with the conditions (particularly

around the 'non commercial' use). Strongly object to the change