

Long-term Plan 2024–34



Respondent No. 117

Response ID 5652102

Date of contribution Apr 15 24 12:15:15 pm

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 Raumati

Do you want to speak to Council about your submission at our public hearings on 2 May? Yes

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?

The current CAP process has cost ratepayers upwards of \$4million so far with the process only partway finished. This outrageous amount spent on CAP members & expensive consultant reports must stop! Council could have used this money to fund the 3-waters debt.

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?

There are few options outlined in the consultation document to reduce debt apart from putting rates up! This seems very poor business practice and in any other business the CEO would not receive a substantial pay rise as a reward for such poor outcomes. Council must stick to being the provider of key services and

operate far more prudently, for instance, A total review of staff jobs at council would trim a number of salaries which are not providing key services.

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

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

Council needs to trim debt & must stick to core business, they do not need to be social housing providers when this can be carried out by a community housing provider/government.

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?

1. There is no evidence of a 'climate emergency'. This term needs to be removed from KCDC documents unless actual evidence is provided to the ratepayers/residents of Kapiti. of any such 'emergency'. It causes unnecessary & false assumptions about the climate, which is driving an immense amount of anxiety among young people & those residents who have a poor understanding of the drivers of a changing climate. You insist that sea level is rising but again, no evidence of anything significant so please provide evidence this is happening. Kapiti has always had major storms, these are not getting worse as KCDC claims. The region needs good protective barriers for coastal storms & flooding (such as drain improvements etc) which benefit all residents. Stop spending on expensive consultants & reports eg the whole CAP process, which do not add any real value to the assets/properties that need protecting from storm events. We need a pragmatic common sense approach.
2. Reference to hazards on LIMS: what consideration has been allowed for with the potential for a significant drop in property values near the coast, water ways etc as a result of this hazard notice, which will lead to a significant drop in rates for those properties?

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

Enhancing Democracy

I personally have little faith left that KCDC will listen in any meaningful way to residents views that may conflict with the seemingly predetermined outcomes of council planning/policies. Examples include: 1. Voting on the Maori wards where it was unanimously a 'No' from the Kapiti people who voted. Yet Council had the arrogance to take a very small cohort of young people (some as young as 15!) who are not ratepayers or eligible to vote in council elections & in many case have minimal understanding of the complexity of the issue and who will not be paying for extra Maori wards. Councils excuse was that too many of the 'No' voters were over 65 yrs so didnt represent the community! This is undemocratic and a disgrace on the Council.

2. The climate change alarmist narrative the Council is supporting through the CAP process which has resulted in massive costs to residents. Council are not listening to the community who have had to join groups such as CRU (Coastal Ratepayers United) & CALM (Calm Alarmist Law Madness) in order to have their voices heard.

3. The announcement of a 'Climate Emergency' in 2019, which was driven by a group of school students, with no consulting of the wider community, many of whom have a wealth of knowledge to contribute to such a debate. Such a statement should have gone to a referendum before being incorporated into all council operations.

4. The underhanded announcement more recently of a 'non-proliferation of a fossil fuels treaty in Kapiti' agreement, signed only by Cr Handford, again with NO consultation of the wider community. Few residents know about this 'treaty' & how council will interpret & use in planning/policy development eg. will this lead to non-renewal of petrol station contracts/consents?

5. The placing of a hazards notification with reference to Jacobs on all Kapiti LIMS (for coastal erosion & inundation) with no notification or consultation with ratepayers. This is already having a massive impact on insurance costs & ability to sell property in the Kapiti area. Where is the accountability from Council for undertaking such unnoticed actions?

I know I am one of many who are extremely disillusioned & upset with the way KCDC operates in an undemocratic manner, this needs to change radically. We need total transparency, proper consultation & a drastic trimming of staff who do not support such changes.