Long-term Plan 2024–34

Respondent No. 362

Response ID 5678093

Date of contribution Apr 30 24 09:59:29 am

Kāpiti Coast DISTRICT COUNCIL
Me Huri Whakamuri, Ka Titiro Whakamua

Personal information

First name	Ian
Last name	Grice
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

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

As a ratepayer and someone that will be severely affected by the proposed 17% rate increase, my thoughts are this is NOT acceptable.

My household is under extreme financial pressure as is, I have had to cut back on the "nice to haves" like holidays, new appliances etc and then the "I really should haves" but simply cannot afford it, such as insurances, house and car maintenance and even things like dental work. I'm sure if I could nominate my own pay-rise in June of 17% I would easily be able to identify many worthwhile projects to invest that in, sadly this is NOT my reality, 1.5% per year for the past 2 years and looking at this stage like it might be the same this year sadly.

My priorities are living costs, I sincerely hope the council will retain focus on ONLY the "must haves" and reduce focus on the "nice to haves", what I view as meaningless projects, 2 recent examples of which include " Maori wards" representation on the council and district wide speed reductions on streets, council admitted that the majority of feedback received was NOT in favour of separate Maori wards on council and yet decided to proceed with it anyway.

This and the generic speed reduction on roads, tiriti o waitangi and previous climate change obligations are just a few of recent examples of things that have been reprioritised as not important by the new government, so why are they being pursued by KCDC?.

The first 2 are not wanted or needed by ratepayers, the second 2 are at best vague, which I suspect is why they have been reprioritised by central government, yet will cost ratepayers to implement.

Housing for the elderly was mentioned as an issue, my thoughts are that the days of local government supplying housing for the elderly are not a function of a local council, central government and various private operators are providing this service, selling any existing houses to private entities will of course not only return capital to ratepayers but create new ratepayers.

Spending of anticipated 3 waters funding was also mentioned as a liability, I understand spending the kick-start funding provided by the previous government, but why was additional money spent in anticipation of getting a refund, knowing full well that a national election was imminent and the National led coalition were campaigning on eliminating the 3 waters project all together as one of their top priorities, that seems irresponsible.
I perhaps understand council contribution the metlink bus terminal giving that almost a third of kapiti residents commute in to Wellington for work and spending on infrastructure for a new subdivision, but fail to see the value for the majority of ratepayers in subsidising the cycle track over the bridge, funding privately run festivals and funding specific minority racial groups.
Our new government has a mandate to reduce spiraling inflation, one immediately noticeable implementation of this mandate is to reduce wasteful spending in government departments by firstly reducing staff numbers, so a little disappointing to see staff numbers at KCDC being “capped for 3 years” being touted as the only cost saving measure.
You mention building a resilient future for kapiti, consideration should be given for making it sustainable as well, not only is increasing rates by this amount NOT sustainable for most households, it is inflationary and against current government policy
Proposed rates rises for other districts as viewed in the media, will in the most part include councils that supply water and rubbish services as a matter of course, remembering this is obviously not the case in kapiti as these are not supplied when paying annual rates.
Speaking with a councilor regarding proposed rates increases, they stated.
“Even if we do no more than what we have done in the past 12 months, the likely rates increase would be 12%”.
Lets remember how much the district has been affected by roadworks in the past 12 months, there has been huge spending no infrastructure in the past year, consider also that a lot of the disruption has been caused by one off projects such as the metlink bus terminal, water works for the new subdivision on kapiti road and road works affecting traffic through main road and bridge in Waikanae
So actually doing no more than you have in the past 12 months is actually a pretty sensible prospect and of course remembering that undoing the wrongs of the past few terms of councils does not have to be put right in the next 3 years, the problems are not new or unique.
Although still being unfair, a rates increase of the 12% mentioned would be more sustainable to most and still high enough to make the silent protest to central government that we are not able to do all we would like to do for the district as we are definitely working hard on using ratepayers funds for the essentials while seriously reviewing the nice to haves and working hard to actually try and keep the rates increases somewhat under control, who knows, this may even attract more potential ratepayers to consider moving here in the future, boosting ratepayer funds even more as well as doing our bit to curb inflation.
I think you'll find the quoted Shand report from 2007 would have assumed property rates would have included things like getting water from the tap and rubbish/recycling services which of course are not included in rates in the district, so the quoted percentage of household income will be somewhat higher than the 7.5% quoted in the consultation document.
3 waters project : Option 2 debt fund
Council Debt: Option 3 would have the least impact on rates while still achieving the desired outcome of reducing debt
Community housing : None of the listed options, the most sensible solution would be to on-sell the current portfolio for the reasons I have outlined above
Just my thoughts
Thank you for your consideration

Upload any related files

https_s3-ap-so... .pdf_1714435130