Long-term Plan 2024–34

Respondent No. 365

Response ID 5678114

Date of contribution Apr 30 24 10:10:55 am

Kāpiti Coast DISTRICT COUNCIL
Me Huri Whakamuri, Ka Titiro Whakamua

Personal information

First name	Anonymous
Last name	Anonymous
I'm providing a submission (choose one):	as an individual
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

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

Proposed alcohol licensing fees bylaw . The general hospitality sector has been significantly disadvantaged during the COVID era and are still in recovery mode. Given the current cost of living crisis, it would be imprudent, at this stage, to raise licensing fees. At this stage, we want local businesses to succeed and thrive and not be impeded by more compliance costs.

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

Response to proposal 1: PROPOSAL 1 - Options to tackle the funding shortfall to deliver three water services
The proposed 17% rates increase during this current cost of living crisis is a kick in the guts for many Kapiti rate payers.
Although council has had to make some hard calls on getting operating costs down, so that the impact on rates is as low as possible, this proposed 17% rates increase for year 1 is not good enough for me and for many others. As far as I am concerned, the 4.7 million operating cost shortfall for three waters services is a capital cost, no more special than the remaining net debt of 221 million (as 31 Dec 2023) and should be spread over the useful life of the project. This is far more equitable than expecting one group of ratepayers to fund council spending all at once in year 1.
I refer to the Shand report, published in 2007, which established a rates affordability benchmark of no more than 5% of household income.
In conclusion, out of option 1 or 2, I choose none. As stated above, rates affordability should be kept within the 5% Shand report benchmark.
Response to proposal 2: Proposal 2 - Proactively reduce council's debt

The wording on this proposal is misleading. What KCDC means is “proactively maintain council’s debt”. The graph on page 16 clearly demonstrates that the 10 year plan will keep our debt at more or less the same amount as it will be in 2024/2025, which at that time will be at $250 million, to $271 million in 2033/2034.
This all seems acceptable in the Long-Term Plan and I quote from page 16: “ by reducing net debt to approximately $271 million by 30 June 2034, this will provide significant new debt capacity to respond to unplanned shock events, enable our infrastructure strategy, and affordably respond to growth and/or enrichment opportunities across the district for our community”.
This shows a council more concerned at their borrowing capacity than actually getting the debt down and/or to eliminate it completely. This is unacceptable.
Tough decisions were made to provide the Kapiti community with the current long term plan and this was outlined on page 5 of the LTP. I am asking for more tough decisions to be made so that the council’s debt is proactively reduced and not maintained.
A change of direction is needed as I believe we have lost the focus of core services and have expanded in areas of health, social, education, culture and climate. Given the cost of living crisis and KCDC’s alarming debt level, any activities in these areas should not be funded by ratepayers. We have to focus entirely on core & essential services such as water, wastewater, stormwater, roading, essential buildings, parks, swimming pools & libraries.
In conclusion, out of option 1, 2 or 3, I choose none. We need to get back to the core basic services. Rates should be kept within the 5% Shand report benchmark .

Response to Proposal 3 - Providing more sustainable council housing for our older people
Although it is clear that the council housing for older persons is no longer affordable or sustainable in the short/medium and long term, the selling of these assets are not formulated in the 3 proposals offered in the LTP. Housing should not be part of the council’s core services. Council involvement in the provision of housing should be limited to consents and infrastructure. I suggest the sale of these assets as one of the methods to reduce the current debt.
In conclusion, out of option 1, 2 or 3, I choose none. I choose the selling of these assets.
Climate action rate. We are in a current cost of living crisis, which I rate much higher than the council’s climate emergency and the long list of activities associated with the carbon emission reduction targets. I have lived on the Kapiti Coast since the early 90’s, and I don’t understand why a climate emergency has been declared by KCDC. (?) Enough is enough as there is an urgent need to scale down costs and reduce /eliminate debt. I don’t support a new climate action rate. My rates should fund core services only: water, wastewater, stormwater, roading, essential buildings, parks, swimming pools & libraries. In conclusion, out of option 1 or 2, I choose none. We have strayed too far from core services.

Upload any related files

https_s3-ap-so... .pdf_1714435827