

Long-term Plan 2024–34



Respondent No. 35

Response ID 5621019

Date of contribution Apr 06 24 10:05:07 am

Personal information

First name

Nick

Last name

Brunsdon

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.

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?

As noted in the consultation document, lower debt places us in a stronger position for recovery from natural disasters. As a community we are vulnerable to significant natural disasters from earthquakes to coastal flooding. Looking at recent natural disasters in New Zealand, from the Christchurch earthquakes through to Cyclone Gabrielle, shows that council finances can be stretched for decades (and generations) after a major natural disaster. Central government has been reducing its role in helping communities recover from natural disasters as the frequency and severity of events increases - as a tangible example, seeing how stretched the NLTF has been after Cyclone Gabrielle. In summary, we are likely to be increasingly 'on our own' when it comes to funding our future natural disaster recovery, and having

sufficient debt headroom now is crucial to ensure our children and grandchildren aren't forced to pay for the recovery from our next natural disaster.

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?

I appreciate that a new council-influenced CHP would have greater focus on Kapiti, but it seems that option would have inefficiencies given its modest scale compared to many other CHPs, which would ultimately limit the pace and extent to which it can renew and expand Kapiti housing stock. My preference is to sell to an existing CHP with a requirement to ensure no net reduction in the Kapiti based stock. Either way, a CHP is needed as it's clear as it's not affordable for ratepayers to fund the necessary renewals.

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?

A capital-value based rate for climate action better reflects the value of the assets being protected, so should better align the incidence of costs and benefits.
I'm not convinced by the transparency argument as clarity on what rates are spent on can be achieved in other ways, without changing how rates are calculated.

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

Development Contributions Policy: Point 138 on Page 25 - this references Stats NZ, but I think this is incorrect - it should reference the Sense Partners projections referred to elsewhere in the policy. Stats NZ doesn't produce projections of employment.