

Long-term Plan 2024–34



Respondent No. 316

Response ID 5676058

Date of contribution Apr 28 24 09:40:36 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 Waikanae

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 1: Fund \$4.7 million shortfall with an additional 5% rates increase in Year 1.

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

You guys really messed up by falling for the whole Three Water proposal. Who did you think would fund anything 'water-based', at the end of the day? It was NEVER going to be a simple transfer of the asset to the govt, and a magic fairy would appear and fix everything at ZERO cost to KCDC ratepayers. You spent the blackmail payment given by the previous Govt to get their proposal over the line, and now we're in a shocking position.

Whichever member of the backroom staff pushed for this, and all the councillors who went along with the shiny prize, without using any critical thinking skills to ask the vital questions, needs to seriously question whether they are the best role.

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?

We should never have been allowed to get to the place we now are in. Shame on all of you (past and present) who have got us here, with reckless overspending and vanity projects. Wasting time and money on inane ideologies (ill-informed green policies and giving the votes to children) needs to stop.

Whilst I agree a 7% av increase makes better long-term sense, I need that extra 1% to live! To provide food and housing for my children and me. I need that NOW! You need to make sure you have trimmed the fat (ie reduce staff and payroll, put unessential projects on the back-burner, go through budgets with a fine tooth comb) before you commit us to that extra 1%.

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?

The figures are similar to Option 1. I'm not sure I've seen any reason what benefit there would be to have influence from KCDC. Choose a good CHP and stop being involved, as you've not proven you have the professional, empathetic or financial references to be involved in older person care.

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?

Stop it with the green washing initiatives.

It is a scam. Al Gore has been a champion for the green scam for years. He has claimed rising sea levels will wipe us out. Yet he has a beachfront holiday home.

Sophie Handford has strong green beliefs. She believes rising sea levels will wipe us out. Yet she pushed for the Te Uruhi centre, which would be right on the beachfront. She also owns a \$800k townhouse which falls within the zone the Coast Zone the council is currently claiming will need to be evacuated from.

STOP this nonsense now. It is a rort and something we can neither afford, nor should be believing.

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

1. Rates remission

Rates remission on Maori land should be stopped. As Council facilities are still used, and we live in user-pays system, it is unfair and racist to implement this. To claim there is "no person or occupier gaining an economic or financial benefit from the land" is a nonsense. No postponement under Part 2. It's land. It will increase in value and will still be utilising services provided by council. I don't pay my rates to subsidise others who have a greater capacity than I to pay.

The text for the remission scheme could've done with an overview. At this stage of the game, it's too late to understand all the policies. I don't mind subsidising the elderly, but would question any one else applying for relief.

2. Revenue and Finances

The material you have provided is wordy and excessive. I imagine this is by intent. Something is clearly wrong: you have too many expenses and a lack of income to pay for all these projects. The ratepayer is

not a bottomless pit to draw from.

I'd like to see a basic one-page spreadsheet showing money in, money out. I'm yet to see this.

Now is the time to ONLY spend on necessities. For the moment, until debt is reduced and the economy improves, NO MORE 'WANTS'. No more parks. No more galleries. Cut all spending back to the minimum. We can't afford it. It's simple!

3. Development contributions

These are too low and need raising ASAP. I cannot believe the 4 Kapiti Road townhouse development only charged approx \$13k/house as development contribution! The apartments sold for approx \$800k each. That's only 1.6% per house. The developers must be laughing at you, and us ratepayers.

This piddly amount doesn't even cover the cost to join the existing infrastructure. There has been no allowance in their plans (and I include Trieste Way, and the proposed Ian Cassells development on Kapiti Road, here) for the stress on other facilities such as doctors, schools and college.

I strongly believe we need proper housing for the growing numbers, but not at the expense these developments put us under.

These small-box housings are aesthetically unappealing. The demand they will place on our already-overstretched services will cost us more. But the developers won't care, as they sit in their mansions outside Kapiti.

Building here is a desirable option. It must come at a price that doesn't mean existing ratepayers are put under considerable financial strain.

The developer's contribution MUST be increased.

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

No time to address this.

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

No more frivolous spending.
No more vanity projects.

Just the basics for the next five years. No more new parks. No new community centres.

Find some way to bring income to the area. Community gardens. Get Mahara Place fully tenanted and vibrant.

Get rid of the green ideologies. NOW!