

KAIKŌURA DISTRICT COUNCIL EXTRAORDINARY MEETING TO HEAR AND DELIBERATE SUBMISSIONS TO THE RATES REVIEW 2023

Date:	Wednesday 08 November 2023
Time	9.00am
Location	TŌTARA ROOM, 96 WEST END, KAIKŌURA

AGENDA

1. Karakia
2. Apologies
3. Declarations of Interest
4. Overview of numbers of submissions Page #
3
- Attachment 1:** Rates Review 2023 – Submission Results Spreadsheet 5
- Attachment 2:** Full submissions received (separate pack)

5. Submitters to be heard:

Time	Name	Submission #	Page #
9:05am	Angela Blunt	4	18
9.15am	Derrick Millton	28	135
9.25am	Kim Swords	37	181
9.35am	Hamish Murray	30	145
9.45am	Chris & Lynn Wilson	43	212
	Chris Wilson – on behalf of ECCO	44	217
9.55am	Lionel Hume – Federated Farmers of NZ	12	59

6. Submitters who chose not to speak *

Hearings end

7. Deliberations
8. Close Extraordinary Meeting

** Note: The following submitters chose not to speak – their full submission is included in Attachment 2.*

Name	Submission #	Page #
Vern Ayson	1	1
Blake Bennett	2	6
Janenne Blackler	3	12
Tom Butters	5	23
Lynette Buurman	6	28
Peter Clayton	7	33
Grant Coulter	8	38
Shane Cross	9	43
Trevor Cummerfield	10	49
Brian Farrant	11	54
Daniel Fleming	13	64
Mark Giles	14	69
Lawrence Gledhill	15	74
Ainslie Green	16	79
Robin Green	17	84
Alan Gulleford	18	89
Ryan Haigh	19	94
Liza Hewison	20	99
Doug Hitchon	21	104
Cheryl and Tim Hodson	22	109
Craig Hutchison	23	110
Bronwyn Lamond	24	115
Joanne Landman	25	120
Dave Margetts	26	125
Rebecca Meikle	27	130
Peter Mitchell	29	140
Russell Nelson	31	151
Noeline Ocarroll	32	156
Justine Schroder	33	161
Hamish & Simpson	34	166
Helene Smith	35	171
Chanel Starkey	36	176
Ginny Thomson	38	186
Paddy and Anna Trolove	39	192
Cushla Twist	40	197
Joe van Rooyen	41	202
Rachel Vaughan	42	207

Report to:	Extraordinary Council Meeting
Date:	8 November 2023
Subject:	Rates Review Hearing of Public Submissions
Prepared by:	S Poulsen, Finance Manager
Input sought from:	D Clibbery - Senior Manager Operations P Kearney - Senior Manager Corporate Services
Authorised by:	W Doughty - Chief Executive

1. PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to summarise the public submissions to the rates review.

Attachments:

- (1) Rates Review 2023 Submission Results Spreadsheet
- (2) Full Submissions Received

2. RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that that this report be received for information.

3. SUMMARY

3.1 The public consultation process

Following eight workshops where the Council debated funding needs for each activity it delivers, the suggestions from the rates review were made publicly available on 18 September, and the submissions period closed on 24 October.

A total of 44 submissions were received, and these are attached verbatim.

3.2 The feedback received

Of the 44 submissions, 6 agreed with all of the proposed changes, 1 disagreed with all of the proposed changes, and the remaining 37 agreed or disagreed with some of the proposed changes.

7 submitters have requested to speak to the Council at the hearing of 8 November 2023.

4. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Regular monitoring and reporting on the Council financials is required as there is a risk that the Council's financial position could deteriorate with an increase in debt levels; lowered credit rating; revenue flows are lower than budgeted, and expenditure is higher than projected.

5. COMMUNITY OUTCOMES SUPPORTED

The work is in support of all community outcomes.



Community

We communicate, engage and inform our community



Development

We promote and support the development of our economy



Environment

We value and protect our environment



Future

We work with our community and our partners to create a better place for future generations



Services

Our services and infrastructure are cost effective, efficient and fit-for-purpose

6. SIGNIFICANCE OF DECISION

This decision is not considered significant in terms of Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.

7. RELEVANT LEGISLATION

The Local Government Act 2002 states that a local authority should ensure prudent stewardship and the efficient and effective use of its resources in the interests of its district or region.

8. COMMUNITY VIEWS

No community views were sought in relation to this report

Summary of Responses		
	44	Submissions received
	6	Agreed with all the proposed changes
	1	Disagreed with all the proposed changes
	37	Disagreed with some or all of the proposed changes
Q. 1		Roading Differential
	11	Agree
	31	Disagree
	26	Comments
Q2		New Roding Uniform Target Rate
	14	Agree
	26	Disagree
	22	Comments
Q3		Increase semi-rural differential
	16	Agree
	23	Disagree
	20	Comments
Q. 4		Increase Accommodation Sector Charge
	21	Agree
	15	Disagree
	13	Comments
Q. 5		The Rural Recycling Rate
	19	Agree
	19	Disagree
	16	Comments
Q. 6		Rubbish_Bin_Charge
	22	Agree
	14	Disagree
	9	Comments
Q.7		A_new_Harbour_Special_Operator_Rate
	26	Agree
	12	Disagree
	11	Comments
Q.8		Changes to how activities are funded
	22	Agree
	16	Disagree
	13	Comments
Q.9		New Definition for Separately Used SUIP Rating Unit
	25	Agree
	10	Disagree
	7	Comments
General comments : 7 submitters		

Page #	Name	All_of_change_s_Agree_or_Disagree_Q	New_differential_on_the_Roading_Rate_Q	Differential_Roading_Rate_Comment_Q	Differential_roading_rate_Comment	New_Roading_Uniform_Target_Rate_Q	Comment_Q_New_Uniform_Target_Rate	Comment_about_new_Roading_Uniform_Targeted_Rate	Q_New_Footpath_etc_differential	Comment_Q_Footpaths_and_streetlights	Comment_A_Footpath_and_Streetlights	Increase_the_Accommodation_Sector_Charge_Q	Comment_Q_Accommodation	Comment_A_Accommodation_Sector_Charge	Q_The_Rural_Recycling_Rate	Comment_Q_Rural_Recycling_Rate	Comment_about_the_Rural_Recycling_Rate_A	Council_staff_comment	Rubbish_Bin_Charge_Q	Comment_Q_Public_Rubbish_Bin_Charge	Comment_Public_Rubbish_Bin_Charge_A	A_new_Harbour_Special_Operator_Rate_Q	Comment_Q_New_Harbour_Special_Operator_Rate	Comment_about_a_new_Harbour_Special_Operator_Rate_A	Changes_to_how_activities_are_funded_Q	Comment_Q_how_activities_are_funded	Comment_about_changes_to_how_activities_are_funded_A	New_Definition_of_Separately_Used_SUIP_Rating_Unit_Q	Comment_Q_New_Definition_SUIP	Comment_about_New_Definition_SUIP_A	Other_comments_or_suggestions	Council_officer_comments					
1	Vern Ayson	I agree with all of the suggested changes	I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change				I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change									
6	Blake Bennett	I disagree with some of the suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	The assumption that rural properties contribute to a heavier wear and tear on roads due to activities like dairy farming and stock transportation is misleading and unfair. This notion wrongly generalizes all rural properties and disregards the diversity of activities that occur in rural settings. Furthermore, it's important to acknowledge the limited infrastructure and amenities available to rural residents in comparison to our urban counterparts. The current proposal essentially punishes rural residents for using what little infrastructure we have, to access amenities and services which are fewer and farther between for us. (e.g. we only leave the house - in our small car - once or twice per week to go shopping in town via SH1. Other than this, we are home-bound). The economic impact of the proposed changes also cannot be ignored. Many rural areas already face challenges such as limited access to public services. The rate increase could add an extra financial burden, exacerbating existing inequalities.	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	We strongly object to the new Roding Uniform Targeted Rate, especially the fixed \$200 charge for properties outside the urban area. This is a regressive approach that disproportionately impacts lower-value rural and semi-rural properties. It also fails to consider that not all rural households have the same impact on road wear and tear. For example, my property sees minimal road usage, making this fixed rate particularly unfair. This added financial burden would significantly affect rural communities, who already face limited public services. We strongly urge the Council to rethink this proposal and look for more equitable funding mechanisms.	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	This is an absurd suggestion! The Council's assumption that semi-rural residents are frequent users of these urban services is overly generalized and doesn't consider individual household behaviors. We rarely (if ever) use these services, making an increase in our rates for them especially unjust. What is more, there aren't actually ANY street lights operating in Kekerengu - so why should we be billed for street lights in Kaikoura? Increasing these differentials exacerbates the financial pressures on rural and semi-rural communities, who already have limited access to public services.	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	Is this for real? Comparing small property owners to a medium-value, 12-room motel is comparing apples to oranges. Not every small accommodation provider earns money on a daily basis, and yet the Council is asking them to take on an increased financial burden. Meanwhile, commercial properties get to pay less? This proposal doesn't pass the fairness test, and we vehemently oppose it. Moreover, what exactly does the Council do to promote tourism in Kekerengu that would justify this increase?	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	This proposal is nothing short of ludicrous. The Council wants to charge rural residents for recycling collection, yet we don't even receive basic rubbish collection services. It's nonsensical to ask us to pay for an add-on service when the fundamental service is missing in the first place. Asking rural residents to shoulder this cost while others in the district pay less adds insult to injury. We strongly oppose the reintroduction of the Rural Recycling Rate under these conditions.		I agree with this suggested change	Yes	As any of the remaining public rubbish bins are located in and around the business sector it is reasonable that the business sector fund this service.	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	Commercial operations should pay more than the general public simply because they benefit financially, and these extra costs would become business expenses which can be written off, or offset. User pays is how I see this... I don't have a boat, I don't use the facility at all and there is probably a lot of other residents in a similar situation. I think businesses who use the facilities the most should pay the most, and the public sector who use the facilities should also be expected to pay for the privilege by way of a levy.	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	The pool facility has already been funded by the community for the community. A lot of fund raising has enabled this centre to go ahead. A local business is already funding a substantial amount annually to keep up maintenance, contribute to wages etc. Locals who USE the pool could be given discounted rates but other users should pay more to support the use of the facility. Parking control... is there such a thing in Kaikoura...??	I agree with this suggested change	Yes							The common thread running through these proposed changes is clear: they are disproportionately unfair, especially to families like ours living in rural areas. We rarely venture into Kaikoura—mostly due to the prohibitive costs at the supermarket and petrol station. We don't frequent the urban areas, particularly in the evenings, and our vehicles are not contributing to heavy road wear. Moreover, our local road is just a graded gravel lane, devoid of any streetlights, and yet, the Council deems it	
12	Janette Blackler	I disagree with some of the suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	The new proposed roading differential suggests that all people living in the rural areas are businesses or farmers and therefore the use of the roads is affected more by heavy traffic. I disagree that everyone in this setting is a business or a farm, and suggest that if the proposed differential is implemented it would mean that the many people who live in a rural setting without running a business would be subsidising the very people who have the biggest impact on the roading infrastructure, and those making an income from it. How is that fair...??	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	This proposal is assuming that all people in the rural sector are using the roads equally. This is not true. Some people drive to town to go to work, shop, visit medical centre etc but they do not necessarily have bigger or heavier vehicles when compared with residents in the urban area. As an example my vehicle (which I don't use everyday) is the same as many residents living in the urban area. I disagree with this proposal because not everyone in the rural area is driving a tractor or a truck or running cattle along the rural roads... this would mean the very businesses operating in the rural sector would be subsidised by rural residential dwellers and is totally unfair. I believe council has all the information on farms and active businesses in the rural sector and should target those high users only.	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	On one hand the council newsletter acknowledges the semi-rural resident is "similar to - but less than - those living in the township"... but then goes on to say that the rural resident should pay more... because they use less...???	I agree with this suggested change	Yes	These may be small entities who have accommodation for less than 4 people... but these properties are still gaining financially by selling accommodation. They also have the ability to on-charge a levy to their customers.	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	I don't understand this proposal at all. There are no communal recycling collection points in the rural areas anymore... unless we're expected to take our recycling all the way to Kekerengu or Clarence or Lynton Downs... Innovative Waste go all the way to these locations to collect some recycling and rubbish for the business operations i.e. The Store; Clarence Rafting and the Kekerengu Community Centre but it doesn't service the rural sector 5km from the edge of town. I don't see why we are expected to pay for the cost of recycling collection at all... many people are recycling conscious and will do the right thing by storing and delivering their own recycling to Innovative Waste and incur expenses to do so, but as it stands, the business sector in the rural areas are already well supported by recycling collection, why should the residents have to subsidise businesses...?? Reintroducing rural recycling charges for rural properties simply	I agree with this suggested change	Yes	As any of the remaining public rubbish bins are located in and around the business sector it is reasonable that the business sector fund this service.	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	Commercial operations should pay more than the general public simply because they benefit financially, and these extra costs would become business expenses which can be written off, or offset. User pays is how I see this... I don't have a boat, I don't use the facility at all and there is probably a lot of other residents in a similar situation. I think businesses who use the facilities the most should pay the most, and the public sector who use the facilities should also be expected to pay for the privilege by way of a levy.	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	The pool facility has already been funded by the community for the community. A lot of fund raising has enabled this centre to go ahead. A local business is already funding a substantial amount annually to keep up maintenance, contribute to wages etc. Locals who USE the pool could be given discounted rates but other users should pay more to support the use of the facility. Parking control... is there such a thing in Kaikoura...??	I agree with this suggested change	Yes									
18	Angela Blunt	I disagree with some of the suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	Rates increases from 20 / 21 to 24 / 25 with current proposed rates review changes. Rural / Farm : 22.5% , Urban : 12.5% , Commercial : 0.6% The Rural Differential needs to be reduced at least 10%. This will drop the average farm increase to 0% which will still be much higher than average Urban decrease of - 4.2% and Commercial average decrease of - 5.7%. The roading differential to Commercial should be increased a bit more to pay for the vehicles that service that sector and to reduce roading rates for the other sectors. On farm inflation for this year will be over 16%, more than double the national average. I invite Council to consider being fairer than this proposed rates review allows.																														I wish to make a submission on the current rates review and I wish to be heard on my submission: I continue to be surprised by the Council's willingness to give farmers huge rates increases when others have little or no increases. We seem to be being penalised for being land owners. The assumption seems to be that farmers can afford it. With the decrease in Dairy payout and farm gate prices the rates bill becomes an extra burden for farming families. With the return of increased tourist numbers		
23	Tom Butters	I agree with all of the suggested changes	I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change				I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change									

Page #	Name	All_of_change_s_Agree_or_Disagree_Q	New_differential_on_the_Roading_Rate_Q	Differential_Roading_Rate_Comment_Q	Differential_roading_rate_Comment	New_Roading_Uniform_Target_Rate_Q	Comment_Q_New_Uniform_Target_Rate	Comment_about_new_Roading_Uniform_Targeted_Rate	Q_New_Footpath_etc_differential	Comment_Q_Footpaths_and_streetlights	Comment_A_Footpath_and_Streetlights	Increase_the_Accommodation_Sector_Charge_Q	Comment_Q_Accommodation	Comment_A_Accommodation_Sector_Charge	Q_The_Rural_Recycling_Rate	Comment_Q_Rural_Recycling_Rate	Comment_about_the_Rural_Recycling_Rate_A	Council_staff_comment	Rubbish_Bin_Charge_Q	Comment_Q_Public_Rubbish_Bin_Charge	Comment_Public_Rubbish_Bin_Charge_A	A_new_Harbour_Special_Operator_Rate_Q	Comment_Q_New_Harbour_Special_Operator_Rate	Comment_about_a_new_Harbour_Special_Operator_Rate_A	Changes_to_how_activities_are_funded_Q	Comment_Q_how_activities_are_funded	Comment_about_changes_to_how_activities_are_funded_A	New_Definition_of_Separately_Used_SUIP_Rating_Unit_Q	Comment_Q_New_Definition_SUIP	Comment_about_New_Definition_SUIP_A	Other_comments_or_suggestions	Council_officer_comments
28	Lynette Burman	I agree with all of the suggested changes	I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested changes			I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change				I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change	Yes	The Dolphin Encounter Partnership supports the concept of a Special Operators Rate for exclusive use of the area of the South Bay Harbour and sea wall which we currently use. In order to continue to operate safely and efficiently we require the exclusive use of this area to continue and recognise this to be of value to our operation. It ensures loading and unloading of our passengers onto the two largest vessels at the jetty to occur without undue congestion and enables us to offer our guests the best possible experience.	I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change				
33	Peter Clayton	I disagree with some of the suggested changes	I agree with this suggested change			I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	Many of the semi rural properties have their own driveways that they maintain themselves before coming onto Statehighway 1 which is government funded.	I disagree with this suggested changes	Yes	The comment 'In essence, the Council is suggesting that the current differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low' is so far from reality its crazy. Where I live there is not footpaths, not streetlights etc so there should be NO increase at all. If anything we should be getting a credit.	I disagree with this suggested change			I disagree with this suggested change				I disagree with this suggested change			I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	By trying to make the likes of Whale Watch, Dolphin Encounter and commercial fishers pay more is dumb since they had to pay for most of the current structure.	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	Could not find the information so voted against until relevant information is clearly available	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	Could not find the information so voted against until relevant information is clearly available	Kincaid Water Scheme, we all pay high rates in this area and for management to keep just cutting with off with late to no notice.	
38	Grant Coulter	I disagree with some of the suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	rural properties shouldn't pay more. to say that we should because tractors and cows go on the roads is ludicrous. our road is shingle anyway	I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested changes			I agree with this suggested change			I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	I take all my recycling to the dump, wasn't aware of any collection in Oaro so shouldn't pay anything		I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change		Hammer hot pools... people go there in droves and pay exorbitant rates... it is a business and I'm not exactly sure, but I don't think the Hammer ratepayers will be subsidizing it.	I agree with this suggested change				
43	Shane Cross	I disagree with some of the suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	Although our property is considered a Lifestyle block, we are direct neighbours to two Commercial operations on either side. One of these operations has been active for considerable time and the other has become active in the last 6 months. Some time ago the Kaikoura District Council Compliance Officer visited us about the disruptions through daily noise, dust and diesel fumes from one of the Commercial operations, it was of the understanding to us this operation was relocating to a Commercial site in Kaikoura township, but since then the second operation has become considerably more operationally active. I would expect these both should both be contributing to the annual Commercial Rates, given both these operations are likely to be for hire and reward. Their increased road usage and heavy weights carried up and down Schoolhouse road and prodromently Red Swamp road increase the need for road maintenance. In comparison our lifestyle block only uses small light vehicles prodromently taking us to and from work the same as school traffic takes the children to school from school to school.	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	That is penalising specific landowners of their very low use and minimal effect whilst Commercial operations carrying rocks, heavy machinery and farming using such roads as access ways and grazing, including that heavy traffic. This is more a Commercial Tax.	I disagree with this suggested changes	Yes	We only have the one street light and that is a kilometer down the road, it flashes on and off.	I agree with this suggested change	Yes	Yes all those Bed & Breakfast, Booking.com, Homesteads ect charging for accommodation should contribute to this new rate, these should be registered and fire service should also be aware they are Commercial type operations.	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	Kaikoura District Council those outlying services fall short in our (sub) local area, we lost our Rubbish Collection Station and now need to drive our own rubbish to the new Transfer Station in Kaikoura. This now comes as additional cost in fuel and road user charges due to those ever increasing prices. We shouldn't have to pay an additional fee again.		I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	Those businesses draw customers into their shops and provide them with paper and plastic, therefore they should contribute the highest proportion, also when down the beach there's glass and rubbish left behind, should you pick it up and put it in the bin or step over it like it's not there. Introduce a ratepayers discount card and charge those visitors that is paid to Kaikoura District Council through their Rates.	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	I may not quite understand this and want to know more, I don't use the public slipway, I would expect my Kaikoura annual boat club subs already contribute to this new form of rate charge.	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes		I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	Unsure at this stage, I need to understand this more		
49	Trevor Cumerfeld	I disagree with some of the suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	Commercial trucks traveling between Picton and Christchurch do a lot more damage to roads than local commercial businesses and residents living rural.	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	Commercial trucks traveling between Picton and Christchurch do a lot more damage to roads than local commercial businesses and residents living rural.	I disagree with this suggested changes	Yes	Rural residents very rarely use footpaths in town so why should they be billed for them.	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	You do not want to drive people from offering accommodation which boosts tourism in Kaikoura and benefits businesses.	I agree with this suggested change	Yes	Only agree if residents in Lyndon Downs, Clarence and Kekerengu are charged. Rural recycling south of Kaikoura was scrapped some time ago and I guess we are still paying for it in our rates.		I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change		Alcohol licensing... again these are businesses who profit from sales... the general rate payer already contributes if they use the services of each establishment by way of margin on sales of whatever they purchase.	I agree with this suggested change				

Page #	Name	All_of_change_s_Agree_or_Disagree_Q	New_differential_on_the_Roading_Rate_Q	Differential_Roading_Rate_Comment_Q	Differential_roading_rate_Comment	New_Roading_Uniform_Target_Rate_Q	Comment_Q_New_Uniform_Target_Rate	Comment_about_new_Roading_Uniform_Targeted_Rate	Q_New_Footpath_etc_differential	Comment_Q_Footpaths_and_streetlights	Comment_A_Footpath_and_Streetlights	Increase_the_Accommodation_Sector_Charge_Q	Comment_Q_Accommodation	Comment_A_Accommodation_Sector_Charge	Q_The_Rural_Recycling_Rate	Comment_Q_Rural_Recycling_Rate	Comment_about_the_Rural_Recycling_Rate_A	Council_staff_comment	Rubbish_Bin_Charge_Q	Comment_Q_Public_Rubbish_Bin_Charge	Comment_Public_Rubbish_Bin_Charge_A	A_new_Harbour_Special_Operator_Rate_Q	Comment_Q_New_Harbour_Special_Operator_Rate	Comment_about_a_new_Harbour_Special_Operator_Rate_A	Changes_to_how_activities_are_funded_Q	Comment_Q_how_activities_are_funded	Comment_about_changes_to_how_activities_are_funded_A	New_Definition_of_Separately_Used_SUIP_Rating_Unit_Q	Comment_Q_New_Definition_SUIP	Comment_about_New_Definition_SUIP_A	Other comments or suggestions	Council officer comment			
54	Brian Farrant	I agree with all of the suggested changes	I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change	Yes	\$200 is not enough if this is a one off charge. If its on going each year, its still low, depending on how much the differential in question 1, makes up for the shortfall	I agree with this suggested changes	Yes	In christchurch, I own a semi rural property and we had an 80% differential on some of the CCC rates for many years, and now we have no differential. The initial differential was set up when CCC took over HCC, about 30 years ago, it was 70% to start with and then 80%, and now 100%. Future reviews should consider 100%	I agree with this suggested change	Yes	A higher levy will potentially shift short term rentals into long term rentals, of which there is a shortage, \$600 is still low.	I agree with this suggested change				I agree with this suggested change				I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change						
59	Lionel Hume Federated Farmers	I disagree with some of the suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	It is positive that roading is funded on a targeted rate. This provides clarity as to how the cost of this major service is distributed. We have difficulty accepting the argument that semi-rural and rural properties should pay on a differential of 1.2 on the basis that rural business activity contributes to additional wear and tear on the local road network. Farms already contribute more than most other properties on account of their capital value. It is true that our members are usually situated on the least used roads in most districts, and they need rural roads upgraded and well-maintained. These roads are vital to their ability to access goods and services and deliver their produce across the country, and across the globe, in a timely manner. Of real importance, however, is the fact that the local roading network is the council activity of greatest benefit to farmers, and they already pay a goodly sum on their capital value.	I agree with this suggested change	Yes	NCFF supports the proposed fixed per property uniform rate of \$200. In the context of the proposed 1.2 differential on rural and semi-rural properties this measure serves to somewhat balance the impact on higher value properties. The Roding Uniform Targeted Rate will occupy some of the total proportion of rates that are uniform charges, which are limited to 30% of rates revenue. Given council's indication in the Step Two analysis that uniform charges will be 29%+ of total rates it is anticipated that the funding of some services will shift from the Uniform Annual General Charge to the capital value general rate. Considering this, the differential of 0.9 on the general rate for rural and semi-rural properties should be reduced. We do not support the 1.2 roading rate differential for rural and semi-rural, however if adopted they must be adopted together with the \$200 district-wide roading uniform charge. As stated by council "... they work best in tandem with each other."	I agree with this suggested changes	Yes	We accept the small increase in the differentials on rural and semi-rural properties, based on the arguments presented about the distribution of benefits.				I agree with this suggested change	Yes	We accept the reintroduction of the Rural Recycling Rate as a fixed charge of \$61 on rural properties. This is in keeping with our view that the cost of services should be targeted on the basis of use and benefit from them. As previously stated, we encourage council to bring a similarly rigorous analysis to services funded by the general rate on CV.					I agree with this suggested change	Yes	We support this initiative, with the proposition that 80% of harbour costs be funded through a combination of user pays and this potential special rate. This is in keeping with council's philosophy of using, wherever possible, sources of revenue other than rates. Reduced rates on higher value properties, such as farms, for the purposes of managing the harbour would be welcomed. We support the council further investigating development of a Harbour Special Operator Rate, reducing the cost to	I agree with this suggested change	Yes	NCFF supports the general theme of these changes, which is to increase the proportion of user fees for relevant services where possible and reducing the contribution from rates. We support the changes itemised in the consultation document - to airport funding etc- as proposed.						We ask council to consider lowering the rural and semi-rural general rate differential of 0.9, if the new roading charge means some general services funded by the Uniform Annual General Charge are moved to the general rate.		
64	Daniel Fleming	I disagree with some of the suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	Our business is on SH 1 so the council does nothing about that- our business should not pay more as the council is collecting money but doing no maintenance. At 7 Ludley drive we have a 50m stretch of unsealed road that is council maintained- in theory, but has never had a grader over it. The traffic drags stones down onto the sealed bit and once every couple of years the brush truck pushes them back up. There is no way we should pay more for roads as the little amount we do have is not maintained. To the best of my knowledge Mill rd was resealed with earthquake money as that was the deal for Nctir. No need to do anything to that for years	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	Again when there is no benefit or improvement the desire to pay more is not there. I like how you have said the 'initial' fixed amount- we all know what the plan is with that.	I disagree with this suggested changes	Yes	This is silly. Where does the 15mins come from- you are 15 mins from a streetlight or a footpath- it is of no benefit to you! You mean that people that go into town to buy things and keep the town moving have been underpaying? What a joke,	I agree with this suggested change	Yes	All the visitors in our great town get it too easy- Kaikoura is unique and people that visit- note- not residents, should pay more for being here	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	We recycle our own at work, get no service at either Ocean ridge or Mill rd. I have no intention of paying more for a service we don't get.		I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	Robbing peter to pay Paul- stupid.	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	I don't know anything about this as it does not affect me but user pays does seem fair.	I disagree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change							
69	Mark Giles	I disagree with some of the suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	just because we live semi rural does not mean we are harder on the roads as we only drive our car to the township for supplies....more so its all the trucks that use it and are way heavier and they pay road tax to insure the roads are covered for repair, the same for private vehicles so charging us on our rates is double dipping	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	once again double dipping...vehicles already pay road tax to repair roads	I agree with this suggested changes			I disagree with this suggested change	Yes		I agree with this suggested change				I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	you have removed most of the rubbish bins anyway. THEY NEED TO BE REPLACED	I disagree with this suggested change			I disagree with this suggested change	Yes		I agree with this suggested change							
74	LAWRENCE GLEDHILL	I disagree with some of the suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	RURAL PROPERTIES USE LESS OF THE ROADS BECAUSE THEY LIVE RURALLY AND HAVE FARMS TO RUN AND THE COST OF PETROL. RURAL PROPERTIES TALK WITH NEIGHBOURS AND CARPOOL OR GET FARMER WHO IS GOING TO TOWN TO PICK THINGS UP. FARMERS DO NOT USE THE ROADS AS MUCH AS RESIDENTIAL. YOU SHOULD BE TARGETING THE ACTUAL TRUCKIES OF THIS WORLD..THEIR COMPANIES IN PARTICULAR	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	THE COUNCIL SEEM TO BE FINDING ANY WHICH WAY TO OBTAIN \$\$\$ TO FUND A VERY POOR COUNCIL. STOP THIS IDIOCY NOW	I disagree with this suggested changes	Yes	WRONG THOSE USING OUR FOOTPATHS MORE ARE TOURISTS AND HOLIDAY MAKERS NOT THE LOCALS	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	A \$200 INCREASE TO THIS SECTOR IS RIDICULOUS. LEAVE IT AS THE STATUS QUO	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	THIS IS NOT A GOOD IDEA. WE ALREADY GET VERY LITTLE FOR OUR RATES WE PAY IN CLARENCE. LEAVE IT AS IT IS		I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	PUBLIC RUBBISH BIN SHOULD BE COVERED BY EVERYONE	I disagree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change			I disagree with this suggested change							
79	ainslie green	I disagree with some of the suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	residential ratepayers enjoy a much higher standard of roading....ie tarseal. God forbid they should encounter a wee pothole or a blocked culvert. Much of the traffic up our rural road is from recreational activity, and latterly, out of the local camping grounds. google maps has identified our private farm roads as public, therefore creating the false impression that people can drive up the valley and thru our farm. Why should we pay more rates if this is happening? this is just shifting the cost of roading on to rural people while urban people use roads free	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	I would suggest that some high value properties create a lot of traffic and wear and tear on roads...others less so. there are properties facing the state highway who get nothing at all for their roading rates. This new roading rate is just another shift of costs on to rural ratepayers, and once accepted, will be able to be lifted every year at the whim of council.	I disagree with this suggested changes	Yes	semi rural should pay 0.95, rural 0.05. semi rural people use these amenities on a daily or near daily basis whereas rural people maybe once a month. maybe less.	I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change				I agree with this suggested change				I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change			I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	what is the new definition? clarification required				
84	Robin Green	I disagree with some of the suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested change			I disagree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested changes			I disagree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change				I agree with this suggested change				I agree with this suggested change			I disagree with this suggested change									
89	ALAN GULLEFORD	I agree with all of the suggested changes	I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested changes			I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change				I agree with this suggested change				I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change									
94	Ryan Haigh	I disagree with some of the suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	Please explain how rural properties have more impact on roads compared to non rural that spend the day going up and down through town?	I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested changes			I disagree with this suggested change			I disagree with this suggested change				I agree with this suggested change				I disagree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change									

Page #	Name	All_of_changes_Agree_or_Disagree_Q	New_differential_on_the_Roading_Rate_Q	Differential_Roading_Rate_Comment_Q	Differential_roading_rate_Comment	New_Roading_Uniform_Target_Rate_Q	Comment_Q_New_Uniform_Target_Rate	Comment_about_new_Roading_Uniform_Targeted_Rate	Q_New_Footpath_etc_differential	Comment_Q_Footpaths_and_streetlights	Comment_A_Footpath_and_Streetlights	Increase_the_Accommodation_Sector_Charge_Q	Comment_Q_Accommodation	Comment_A_Accommodation_Sector_Charge	Q_The_Rural_Recycling_Rate	Comment_Q_Rural_Recycling_Rate	Comment_about_the_Rural_Recycling_Rate_A	Council_staff_comment	Rubbish_Bin_Charge_Q	Comment_Q_Public_Rubbish_Bin_Charge	Comment_Public_Rubbish_Bin_Charge_A	A_new_Harbour_Special_Operator_Rate_Q	Comment_Q_New_Harbour_Special_Operator_Rate	Comment_about_a_new_Harbour_Special_Operator_Rate_A	Changes_to_how_activities_are_funded_Q	Comment_Q_how_activities_are_funded	Comment_about_how_activities_are_funded_A	New_Definition_of_Separately_Used_SUIP_Rating_Unit_Q	Comment_Q_New_Definition_SUIP	Comment_about_New_Definition_SUIP_A	Other comments or suggestions	Council officer comment						
99	Liza Hewison	I disagree with some of the suggested changes	I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change				I disagree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change										
104	Doug Hitchon	I disagree with some of the suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	Our property on SH1 is maintained by Waka Kotahi. Urban and suburban roads have more tonne/miles per person per day load on them, not fewer.	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	Our access road is not maintained by KDC.	I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change	Yes	More tourists equals more cost for KDC that should be paid for by businesses.	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	We carry our recycling to town recycling centre when it has sufficiently accumulated. We should not pay anything for rural recycling.		I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change	Yes	Business should not be subsidised for any impact on the environment or community. The true cost of a business should be apparent in its charges to customers.	I agree with this suggested change	Yes	Business should not be subsidised for any impact on the environment or community. The true cost of a business should be apparent in its charges to customers. Users or developers should pay true costs of their activities.	I agree with this suggested change										
109	Cheryl and Tim Hodson	I disagree with some of the suggested changes																															If the sole purpose of the rates review is to implement a rating system that is fairer for all ratepayers, then ratepayers living in South Bay should have a substantial decrease in our rates. There has been a substantial increase of ratepayer money and Government grants been spent along the Esplanade all the way to the seal colony and back the other way along Beach Road. There are several rubbish/recycling units been installed all over that side of Kaikoura, but not one installed in South Bay Reserve, the beach area or opposite the					
110	Craig Hutchison	I agree with all of the suggested changes	I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change				I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change										
115	Bronwyn Lamond	I disagree with some of the suggested changes	I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change			I disagree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change				I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change						I agree with this suggested change										
120	Joanne Landman	I disagree with some of the suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	As part of the rural sector none of these suggestions affect us except the rural recycling which is a cost to us to travel the distances of mileage diesel an wear on our vehicles so would oppose the increased .	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	Considering we live up the Waiau Toa which we have to travel over a dangerous paper road thru rural property leaving us isolated from the main road for days with the Wharekiri flooding we would be very unhappy to be paying more in our rates	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	Should be included in Town rates only	I agree with this suggested change			I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	Once again this occurs mileage diesel an vehcile maintenance crossing the Wharekiri ford so another cost to the residence		I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change	Yes	User pays	I agree with this suggested change										
125	Dave Margetts	I disagree with some of the suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	Rural properties are mostly farms and much larger than an urban section. While a single farm's vehicle use is likely to be harder on roads than vehicles from a single urban dwelling, a farm in area would be equivalent to several urban streets in size that include multiple dwellings and many more vehicle trips than a single farm. The urban dwellers roading differentials therefore cumulatively provide way more more rates than one farm for a similar land area. The farmer however should be on the same or less rating differential as urban dwellers as urban dwellers collectively can better afford to cover the districts roading costs for the same rateable land area.	I agree with this suggested change			I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	Our semi-rural farm on the edge of town is high value because the Council in the late 1990s changed part of the farm to residential zoning without consulting us. As a result, we have for years been paying high rates (approx \$12k/year) for very little amenity. To further penalise us with an increased differential for urban services that we use less than urban dwellers, will continue the unfairness built into our rates.	I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change					I agree with this suggested change				I agree with this suggested change			I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	The proposed rates increase of over 4% for our semi-rural property is disproportionate and unfair when considering the disproportionately high rates we currently pay due to unfair residential zoning component that we get no benefit for.	I agree with this suggested change								
130	Rebecca Meikle	I disagree with some of the suggested changes	I agree with this suggested change	Yes	I agree to commercial properties paying more if they have heavy machinery and generally more traffic leaving the commercial site. Example: Harmac concrete should pay a substantial amount because of the heavy machinery used to access the commercial property. And rural road around. Where as a commercial retail space on West End should not. Why, because most of the businesses do not have a parking/car entry onto their commercial space therefore the impact on roading is nothing.	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	They should pay exact if not more than as urban because the roads out rural are build especially for them to access their properties. No impact/use to urban residents.	I agree with this suggested change	Yes	Considering everyone in the Kaikoura district has to use the urban services based on how isolated we are. Semi rural, farm are still based in Kaikoura therefore should pay the same. All the farmers/rural residents come to town for everything, to do the same thing and they have even used more council resources to come into urban area. As for the harbour charge that should solely be paid by all the commercial boats that use the marina they make money from using the harbour where as the average joe blow is there for a hobby or past time.	I agree with this suggested change	Yes	If registered and making money from accommodation. They should pay exactly what all the motels pay because they offer the same service. Air bnbs need to stop being given certifi cates to operate as this is what is killing our town. There are no rentals because of how easy it is to start a bnb. Therefore we end up like Hanmer and be completely tourist not somewhere you can live.						I agree with this suggested change	Yes	Considering that Whalewatch has their own docking harbour they should be paying a huge chunk. The boats that are parking at the harbour should be solely responsible for funding such activities. Whalewatch is a "charitable trust" they use the dock for business and funds that are secured through business practices should be charged at a percent. Like if whale watch have a business revenue of say (example amount) \$100,000 they should be charged 25% of the businesses incoming revenue (or 25% from each ticket)	I disagree with this suggested change															Since when did the 7 councillors make up the opinion of our residents. Most are over 50 and their presents are not felt in the community as they are supposed to be the voice of residents.
135	Derrick and Ben Milton	I disagree with all of the suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested change			I disagree with this suggested change			I disagree with this suggested change			I disagree with this suggested change			I disagree with this suggested change				I disagree with this suggested change			I disagree with this suggested change			I disagree with this suggested change			I disagree with this suggested change										

Page #	Name	All_of_change_s_Agree_or_Disagree_Q	New_differential_on_the_Roading_Rate_Q	Differential_Roading_Rate_Comment_Q	Differential_roading_rate_Comment	New_Roading_Uniform_Target_Rate_Q	Comment_Q_New_Uniform_Target_Rate	Comment_about_new_Roading_Uniform_Targeted_Rate	Q_New_Footpath_etc_differential	Comment_Q_Footpaths_and_streetlights	Comment_A_Footpath_and_Streetlights	Increase_the_Accommodation_Sector_Charge_Q	Comment_Q_Accommodation	Comment_A_Accommodation_Sector_Charge	Q_The_Rural_Recycling_Rate	Comment_Q_Rural_Recycling_Rate	Comment_about_the_Rural_Recycling_Rate_A	Council staff comment	Rubbish_Bin_Charge_Q	Comment_Q_Public_Rubbish_Bin_Charge	Comment_Public_Rubbish_Bin_Charge_A	A_new_Harbour_Special_Operator_Rate_Q	Comment_Q_New_Harbour_Special_Operator_Rate	Comment_about_a_new_Harbour_Special_Operator_Rate_A	Changes_to_how_activities_are_funded_Q	Comment_Q_how_activities_are_funded	Comment_about_how_activities_are_funded_A	New_Definition_of_Separately_Usual_Rating_Unit_Q	Comment_Q_New_Definition_SUIP	Comment_about_New_Definition_SUIP_A	Other comments or suggestions	Council officer comment				
140	Peter Mitchell	I disagree with some of the suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	I have a ute I pay RUC's. I pay fuel taxes. I have nothing delivered to me except mail. I do not have more of an impact on roads than urban dwellers. I live 100k's from Blenheim, and 50k's from Kalkoura. I already pay a small fortune in roading fees to go about my business. The roads are so poorly maintained I have had 4 broken windscreens in the past 2 years from debris thrown up from other vehicles.	I disagree with this suggested change			I disagree with this suggested change			I disagree with this suggested change			I disagree with this suggested change				I disagree with this suggested change			I disagree with this suggested change			I disagree with this suggested change			I disagree with this suggested change								
145	Hamish Murray	I disagree with some of the suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	Any changes that go towards increasing our rural rates, need to be more that off set by reductions in differential on others. As pointed out in my written submission our Rural Ratepayers continue to subsidize our commercial and urban ratepayers illustrated by the total increase in rates and ability of access those furthest away have to access them.	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	Again, I am not opposed to increase differential of roading, but it must be balanced with reduction in the General rate differential as continuing to rate our rural rates in favor of urban and commercial users is not fair.		Yes	The following points 3-9 do not go far enough, as in my written submission they are only tinkering at the edge and do not go far enough to really have any meaningful impact on keeping out rates at sustainable levels and increases.																									
151	Russell Nelson	I disagree with some of the suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change	Yes	Agree with council.	I agree with this suggested change				I disagree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change								
156	Noeline Ocarroll	I disagree with some of the suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested change			I disagree with this suggested change			I disagree with this suggested change			I disagree with this suggested change			I disagree with this suggested change				I agree with this suggested change			I disagree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change								
161	Justine Schroder	I disagree with some of the suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	Rates increases from 20 / 21 to 24 / 25 with current proposed rates review changes. Rural / Farm : 22.5% , Urban : 12.5% , Commercial : 0.6% The Rural Differential needs to be reduced at least 10%. This will drop the average farm increase to 0% which will still be much higher than average Urban decrease of -4.2% and Commercial average decrease of -5.7%. The roading differential fo Commercial should be increased a bit more to pay for the vehicles that service that sector and to reduce roading rates for the other sectors. On farm inflation for this year will be over 16%, more than double the national average.																															
166	Hamish & Simpson	I disagree with some of the suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested change			I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	A number of large rural properties have a bigger impact on road = heavy machinery (tractors, stock trucks) running stock on the roads.	I agree with this suggested change			I disagree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change	Yes	only if its the rural properties that have access to these points.		I disagree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change								
171	Helene Smith	I disagree with some of the suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested change			I disagree with this suggested change			I disagree with this suggested change			I disagree with this suggested change			I disagree with this suggested change				I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change								
176	chanel starkey	I disagree with some of the suggested changes	I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change			I disagree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change				I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change			I disagree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change								
181	Kim R Swords	I disagree with some of the suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	I can't see the logic in making rural and semirural road users pay more? We all use the roads in the region and therefore a differential rating system seems flawed. I don't see that my impact on the road is any greater than someone living in a rural area. If as differential is to be made for commercial operators using trucks or higher volume then that could be targeted however unless commercial operations in urban areas are also paying then it seems yet another burden that cannot be recovered by them.	I disagree with this suggested change			I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	This is an additional level of complication that is not required but if gone ahead with would appear to favour urban dwellers over rural ratepayers.	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	Rural accommodation suppliers I know of in rural areas do not get traffic / revenue from council activities. Consumers expect to pay less for accommodation in rural areas and therefore very unlikely that they would be able to generate this additional cost but would absorb. You would therefore be punishing this sector unnecessarily.	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	I don't see the logic here - I already have the added burden of disposing of general waste that is not collected - in yet urban ratepayers receive regular collection from their household. I have to drive to a collection point. How is an additional charge equitable?		I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	I can't see a reason for the change? all commercial activities attract some sort of visitor and therefore should have this targeted cost in emptying the bins.	I agree with this suggested change			I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	Overall raising general rates for the sake of lowering commercial rates would favour those that can recoup charges but unfairly disadvantage those who cannot.	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	There is too little information on how this would play out to be agreed with.						
186	Ginny Thomson	I disagree with some of the suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	I find the fact that this council thinks rural properties use the roads more that urban is ridiculous. Urban people like to go out and enjoy the country, the cycle tracks and walks the beach etc. Tourists too and adding more onto commercial businesses adds to the cost of goods at the end of the day and up go the prices. This council has squandered rates on inferior roading contractors that are repairing the repairs again and again. Surely if a contractor does a substandard job that needs to be redone 6 months to a year later then it should not be a costs to ratepayers but to that contractor.	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	Again this is nuts as it creates a them and us division and why do you think that rural properties should pay more for roading? Have you analysed who owns the cars that use a road and you just know that they are rural?? Urban residents use the roads all over the district just as much as rural and yet rural people do not use the footpaths and areas of town as much. I suggest a rate that is the same over the whole community is a far more sensible approach to this complication and mess of an idea. Lets charge the rural people more seems to be a theme here. I would like to know who had this idea and why as a council you are considering it. As a rate payer I think you are getting more than enough rates for this town and since I have lived here rate have almost doubled. All the rural residents get for their rates are roads and you want to charge more. No curbside recycling, no rubbish collection and we pay for our water. Just what do we get out of our rates? I will tell you that it seems like very little for rural people and I know there are a lot of people that are not happy with your proposals but whether or not they bother to fill in this form I have no idea.	I disagree with this suggested change			I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	No opinion as have no idea on this matter	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	Once again here you go wanting more dollars from rural people who get far less in the way of bang for their buck in the rates.	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	Again all you do is push up prices and add on another charge to struggling businesses who in turn up their prices and so it goes on. IN GENERAL: Start some in house council pruning and try and live within the rates you are getting. We all have to try and live within our present means but you just up the rates. I for one have had enough and think that it is far too easy to up the rates and come up with crazy schemes to charge rural people more. You work for us and we voted you in and honestly I wonder why as I cannot see much commonsense in your proposals.	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	You should not charge locals more but have a marina fee for all those tourists and private boaties not paying slipway fees. Why should Jo average be allowed to launch his boat for nothing using the slipway when you want to put other operators charges up. (That is if I have read this new change correctly)	I agree with this suggested change	Yes	I think this council should look at getting money out of user pays and also really cracking down on freedom campers who park up in their vans without toilets and leave disgusting calling cards all over the bike tracks and around the surf beaches etc. I have seen many vans with stickers for self contained on the back window with NO toilet no fresh water and they keep getting away with this and leaving their waste behind. I say heavy fines for freedom camping without facilities on board. Heavy fines for littering - our bills	I agree with this suggested change	Yes	Not sure about this one and what it means							

Page #	Name	All_of_change_s_Agree_or_Disagree_Q	New_differential_on_the_Roading_Rate_Q	Differential_Roading_Rate_Comment_Q	Differential_roading_rate_Comment	New_Roading_Uniform_Target_Rate_Q	Comment_Q_New_Uniform_Target_Rate	Comment_about_new_Roading_Uniform_Targeted_Rate	Q_New_Footpath_etc_differential	Comment_Q_Footpaths_and_streetlights	Comment_A_Footpath_and_Streetlights	Increase_the_Accommodation_Sector_Charge_Q	Comment_Q_Accommodation	Comment_A_Accommodation_Sector_Charge	Q_The_Rural_Recycling_Rate	Comment_Q_Rural_Recycling_Rate	Comment_about_the_Rural_Recycling_Rate_A	Council staff comment	Rubbish_Bin_Charge_Q	Comment_Q_Public_Rubbish_Bin_Charge	Comment_Public_Rubbish_Bin_Charge_A	A_new_Harbour_Special_Operator_Rate_Q	Comment_Q_New_Harbour_Special_Operator_Rate	Comment_about_a_new_Harbour_Special_Operator_Rate_A	Changes_to_how_activities_are_funded_Q	Comment_Q_how_activities_are_funded	Comment_about_changes_to_how_activities_are_funded_A	New_Definition_of_Separately_Used_SUIP_Rating_Unit_Q	Comment_Q_New_Definition_SUIP	Comment_about_New_Definition_SUIP_A	Other comments or suggestions	Council officer comment		
192	Paddy and Anna Trolove	I disagree with some of the suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	Everyone uses and benefits from roads where ever they are. impossible to differentiate who is or isn't using the road	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	Urban people use roads too!	I disagree with this suggested changes	Yes	Seems to be a theme to load more onto rural rate payers				I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	Just a new charge that was not there before on rural rate payers		I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	It is for the general public benefit that rubbish bins are emptied. This charge should be shared as it is currently with general and commercial	I agree with this suggested change			I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	Sounds like this would give the council to change rates as they suited, without consulting the rate payers, which i do not agree with	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	The new definition has not been stated, so we cannot agree or disagree				
197	cushla Twist	I disagree with some of the suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	How does properties in Goose bay have a higher wear and tear when there is only 30 houses and 6 months of the year 70% of the residents are not there. Even when there was a full camping ground at Goose bay we still did not receive road maintenance.	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	If we paid this yearly amount would KDC guarantee that we would get the road maintenance/improvements that we need, so far we have had no improvements or regular maintenance in Goose bay	I disagree with this suggested changes	Yes	we can not even get a street light on the corner of makura rd and moana rd	I disagree with this suggested change			I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	we had a perfectly good recycling service in Goose bay which cost us \$98.00 per year. When the council took that away from us I contacted the council to discuss options ie pay more per year for the service or have a drop point for Goose bay, but KDC would not engage.		I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change	Yes	the commercial companies using these services should have to pay accordingly	I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change						
202	Joe van Rooyen	I disagree with some of the suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	Before a new differential on the roading rate is implemented the Council must provide a reasonable standard of roading, i.e. all busy rural roads with in 15km of the town are upgraded and tarsealed to provide a reasonable, safe standard of roading.	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	see above	I disagree with this suggested changes	Yes	Identifying all residents living within 15 minutes from the township is a nonsense and must be amended to provide a fair rating system. These residents fall under two completely separate categories, lifestyle blocks and farms. Owners of lifestyle blocks, unless retired are likely to work in the township so could attract a 0.75 differential. Owners of farms on the other hand have minimal benefit of footpaths, street lights etc. so must remain at a 0.5 differential or lower.	I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change				I agree with this suggested change	Yes		I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change						
207	Rachel Vaughan	I disagree with some of the suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	No proof has been presented that shows the suggested land uses have a higher impact on roads. Many rural or lifestyle residents work from home and do few trips each week. More research is required to make a fair determination.	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	As above	I disagree with this suggested changes	Yes	My information is required to determine if semi-rural residents use services at a level that makes the differential fair. Council does not have enough data to determine this.	I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change				I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	I don't have enough information to agree or disagree	I disagree with this suggested change			I agree with this suggested change						
212	Lynne and Chris Wilson	I disagree with some of the suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	The concept of setting differentials on roading is fundamentally flawed given that every ratepayer, whether urban or rural who uses any form of transport benefits from roading wherever they travel. To suggest travel is restricted to the relatively immediate vicinity of any group of ratepayers is ludicrous. Roads are roads and available to everyone be they locals, visitors or tourists. Refer also summary submission from Ecco on manipulation of rates.	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	Refer comments above	I disagree with this suggested changes	Yes	Another manipulation of rates to favour urban ratepayers - refer to the summary submission by Ecco	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	Another deliberate attempt to penalise one ratepayer base to favour another. Many smaller providers gain little or no benefit from Council tourism promotion - especially those in rural areas, whereas the larger providers do gain benefit; and to have their contributions reduce is again a rather blatant manipulation to favour the larger commercial providers.	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	If the total cost of the service was deemed too low to warrant a separate charge then it should still be so given there are only three pick-up sites. Furthermore this is the only waste service provided in these areas leaving locals no option but to deal with their own general waste. Yet another example of moving the rates burden away from urban onto rural ratepayers.		I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	All commercial activities attract visitors so the existing charges are more equitable	I agree with this suggested change			I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	Any of the changes which result in reducing the commercial rate by increasing the general rate should be reconsidered.	I disagree with this suggested change	Yes	The implications of the new definition have not been clarified or quantified				
217	Chris Wilson - ECCO	I disagree with some of the suggested changes																															Overall, we remain of the view that a Council and Rate Payer base the size of Kaikoura, which comprises a community of only 3500 residents and 470 businesses, and a rateable base of 3200 properties is not financially sustainable over the long term. This Rates Review does nothing to alleviate these concerns and is simply a rather obvious manipulation of the rating system by the council to further increase the burden of rates onto the rural community in favour of the urban ratepayers (both commercial and	