

Long-term Plan 2024–34



Respondent No. 172

Response ID 5664238

Date of contribution Apr 22 24 11:01:01 am

Personal information

First name Linda

Last name Hill

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: My name can be 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?

We should bite the bullet and do this. This is what we pay rates for. I think my super can take the hit since I no longer have a mortgage, but for others on low or fixed income, rates relief will be important. It should be rates funded rather than debt funded because I agree we'll need to be able to fund the climate disasters and managed retreat that will hit the coast in the future. w

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

Option 1: Apply average rates increases of 8% per year from 2025/26 to 2033/34

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

It's always better to have less debt than more, whatever the interest rate. I strongly agree that in the future we will need the capacity to borrow to fund climate impact repairs and managed retreat etc. The future

has never been more uncertain.

Proposal 3: Transfer Council's housing for older people Which option should we choose? (select one option)

Option 3: Older persons' housing continues to be delivered by Council with no option to grow the portfolio

Would you like to expand on your answer for option 3?

Option 1 and Option 3 - I don't have enough info to decide (yes I looked up CHPs). A new CHP will have no experience track record, KCDC appointments doesn't seem enough. What happens if it manages badly, falls over, or sells the units to some other outfit? 2 depends which CHP you choose, and no control, so not 2.

Ideally I'd have KCDC keep existing older persons' housing and support a new CHP to expand housing, closely controlled by KCDC legal agreements, lease of council land, monitoring etc. Why give away our assets? Isn't it collateral? Couldn't you lease existing housing/land to CHP rather than 'transfer'?

New climate action rate

Which option should we choose? (select one option)

Option 1: Introduce a new targeted climate action rate based on a property's capital value rather than the current land-value based general rate

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

We need to put more effort into and spend money on both emissions reduction and climate change mitigation. A specific rate might help make the issue more real and more transparent for some people. I support LCK's point that a fresh climate rate should fund fresh actions, not just re-labeling various current costs as 'climate action'.

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

Licensing to sell alcohol, together with monitoring and enforcement of the Sale of Liquor Act, should be fully funded by licensees themselves as a cost of business. I support the proposed fee change as far as it goes, but I disagree that ratepayers paying 10% of costs to regulate private businesses is 'only fair'. It is not. KCDC's role in harm minimisation and community consultation exists because central govt has devolved regulation of the sale of a harmful product down to local govt level. All costs of effective regulation should be borne by those granted the privilege of being allowed to sell alcohol. It's a profitable privilege, not a right.