

# Long-term Plan 2024–34



Respondent No. 167

Response ID 5664017

Date of contribution Apr 22 24 09:21:44 am

## 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?**

While I agree that debt funding is not ideal, the 17% proposed rates increase in this economic climate is just not realistic.

**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?**

More focus should be given to cutting services to reduce debt, rather than increasing rates. Council should be implementing drastic austerity measures and cutting all services except core infrastructure. All sustainability, climate and social spending should be cut entirely and council should only be spending on water, roads, etc. KCDC's only responsibility is to ensure the lowest possible rates increase for ratepayers.

### **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?**

Sell the housing stock on the open market, not to a CHP. KCDC's only responsibility is to ensure the highest possible return to ratepayers. Social housing should be a central government problem.

### **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?**

Climate/sustainability spending outside of core infrastructure work is a "nice to have". End ALL climate/sustainability spending until such time (if ever) council is debt free and giving ratepayers negative rates increases.

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

Rates policy:

End all rates remission and assistance for non council owned land, and only allow rates postponement with a security lodged against the property.

Revenue and finance policy:

Remove all priorities not related to core infrastructure services such as roading/water (e.g. climate strategy, emissions strategy, inclusiveness, increased tourism, etc).

Remove all rates based spending and only fund from fees all spending under the Activity Groups "Services" and "Partnership".

Remove all rates based spending and only fund from fees all spending under the "Sustainability and Resilience" section of the Infrastructure Activity Group.

Remove all rates based spending and only fund from fees all spending under the "Regulatory Services" section of the District Planning Activity Group.

Draft Development and Contributions Policy:

Modify the funding principals so that in excess of 100% is funded by development contributions (e.g. Developers pay all costs and return a profit to council to further reduce debt and rates)

Draft Development Contributions Limited Remission Policy:

Remove limited remission of development contributions other than capping community housing development contributions at the actual costs incurred to council.

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

As per some of my previous comments, council needs to slash all non core infrastructure spending to reduce debt and limit rates increases.