

Long-term Plan 2024–34



Respondent No. 231

Response ID 5672103

Date of contribution Apr 25 24 07:31:13 pm

Personal information

First name Ian and Jean

Last name Gunn

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? Yes

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 2: Fund \$4.7 million shortfall by taking on debt each year.

Would you like to expand on your answer for option 2?

Yes you only give two options. There is a third option. one midway between the two options listed.

The future of three waters is still overmuch up in the air. Large rates rises across nz are likely to force this government to develop a contribution mechanism.

Creating a halfway house for the next three years allows the air to clear creating certainty

Proposal 2: Proactively reduce Council's debt
Which option should we choose? (select one option)

Option 2: Apply average rates increases of 7% per year from 2025/26 to 2033/34

Would you like to expand on your answer for option 2?

again after three years we will have clarity regarding the current recession.

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?

The Council needs to be at the table so any transfer needs to have council involvement.

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?

Capital value is a very crude funding mechanism.

For example council currently collects a flood protection rate for the Waikanae and Otaki rivers using capital value. I have previously requested information from the Council about the split between flood prone land identified in flood plain management plans. This analysis showed that over 80% of the funds for flood protection are derived from non flood prone land. This is grossly inequitable. This imbalance will only increase as the town develops especially with the proposed medium high density building rules. Ratepayers with similar capital value properties in Paekakariki and beside the Waikanae river pay exactly the same rate. This is VERY VERY INEQUITABLE.

if council wishes to use capital value then it could assess that the identified flood prone area contributes say 50% of the required rate with the balance being generated by the non flood prone area. This could be introduced over say a three year period.

As climate change increases a variety of risks across the district a number of variable rates will need to be introduced

The plan highlights the need for transparency. Our suggested funding mechanism fulfils this objective. The current funding mechanism fails to achieve transparency.

therefore despite answering no change we strongly support a change

We note that a report prepared by the previous government on flooding and the ability of the community to fund flood protection identified the KCDC district along with Masterton District as amongst the poorest communities in the country regarding flood protection funding. This reinforces a need for a change.

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

Strongly support the change to funding achieved by the new bylaw.

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

we support the work the Council is undertaking to understand the risks on the coast from climate change. More consultation will be required to convince a significant section of the community that the world is not going to end.

Greater explanation of the Pathways process and outcomes is needed.