

Long-term Plan 2024–34



Respondent No. 123

Response ID 5654690

Date of contribution Apr 16 24 05:11:52 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? 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 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?

Council debt shouldn't be increased too much and saved for unplanned events

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?

Council needs to be mindful of people's ability to pay their rates and should cut their cloth to enable this

**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?

Housing provision is not core council business and can often be done more efficiently by community trusts

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?

You can still report more transparently against the \$500k budget,

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

Development contributions, it is important that all developments pay something towards the impact on our infrastructure.

Consultation with the community is very important and should not decrease.

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

The proposed alcohol licensing fee increase should be more than proposed, the cost to the ratepayer should be minimal. And it should be targeted as outlined in the document

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

Keep up the good work , invest for the future but be very mindful of the costs to the ratepayers. Maybe the staffing levels could be looked at like central government to make some cost savings