### **Rates Review 2023**



We are considering options for making our rating system fairer. We have outlined our suggestions as to how we could do this, and invite you to tell us what you think.

This consultation runs from noon 18th September to noon 24th October 2023

If you run out of time you can save the form as draft and comeback and finish it at any time before noon on 24th October 2023.

Submitter Details	
First Name*	Family Name*
vern	ayson
Organisation Name (optional)	
Contact Details (required)	
In the space below, please provide either:	
<ul><li>Email Address</li><li>Phone Number; or</li><li>Postal Address;</li></ul>	
Contact Phone Number	E-mail Address
Redacted	Redacted
Postal Address	
Redacted	
Are you a ratepayer in the Kaikoura District*	
Yes	○ No
If yes, what is your address?  We need this information to understand how your opinion might be Redacted	affected by whether you live in the urban, semi-rural , or rural area.
2. Submission	
There are nine suggested changes to the rating system that we are	consulting on. More information is available on the KDC website and in

the relevant section of this submission form below.

- 1. A new differential on the Roading Rate
- 2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate
- 3. Increase to the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates
- 4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge
- 5. Rural Recycling Rate
- 6. Removal of Public Rubbish Bin Charge

8. Changes to how some activities are funded	
9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Pa	rt of a Rating Unit (SUIP)
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested changes, yo	ou can tick the appropriate box below, and send us this form.
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested chan	ges, you can tick the appropriate box below, and submit the form.*
I agree with all of the suggested changes	I disagree with all of the suggested changes
If you agree with some of the suggested changes, but not all, plea	ase continue to complete this survey form.
1. A Differential on the Roading Rate	
	Roading Rate, that would mean commercial properties, and properties ost of roading because these properties have a greater impact on the
I agree with this suggested change	○ I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agre	ee or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestion.
Yes	No
0.11	
2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate	
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban are irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggested	ea should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs d to be \$200.00 including GST.
This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural proper	rties will not nay less than this minimum amount towards roading while
	rtionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with
Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roading each other.	rtionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.
Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roading each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate	rtionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with
Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roading each other.	rtionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.
Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roading each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change	rtionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.  Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with  I disagree with this suggested change
Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roading each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree.	rtionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.  Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with  I disagree with this suggested change  ee or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roading each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change	rtionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.  Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with  I disagree with this suggested change
Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roading each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree.	rtionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.  Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with  I disagree with this suggested change  ee or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roading each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree Yes	rtionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.  Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with  I disagree with this suggested change  ee or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No
Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roading each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree Yes	rtionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.  Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with  I disagree with this suggested change  ee or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roading each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree Yes  3. Increase the differential on the Footpath  These three targeted rates currently apply a differential on semi-differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are less	Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with  I disagree with this suggested change  Be or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No  No  Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates  Ni-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed
Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roading each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree Yes  3. Increase the differential on the Footpath  These three targeted rates currently apply a differential on semi-differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are less services. In essence, the Council is suggesting that the current to increase the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the semi-rural from	Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with  I disagree with this suggested change  Be or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No  No  Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates  Ini-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed the rural differential to be standardized at 0.25.
Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roading each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree.  Yes  3. Increase the differential on the Footpath  These three targeted rates currently apply a differential on sem differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are less services. In essence, the Council is suggesting that the current to increase the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and Town Centre Rates	Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with  I disagree with this suggested change  Be or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No  No  Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates  Ini-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed the rural differential to be standardized at 0.25.
Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roading each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree Yes  3. Increase the differential on the Footpath  These three targeted rates currently apply a differential on semi-differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are less services. In essence, the Council is suggesting that the current to increase the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the semi-rural from	Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with  I disagree with this suggested change  Be or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No  No  Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates  Ini-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed the rural differential to be standardized at 0.25.

Would you like to add a comment to explain why you a	agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	No     No
4. Increase the Accommodation Sector C	Charge
	sitors, but doesn't meet the definition of a commercial property (generally ied the Accommodation Sector Charge of \$400.00 including GST per year. The
The Council is suggesting that the Accommodation Sector Chaccommodation providers are contributing a fairer share tow	harge be increased to \$600.00 including GST per year, so these smaller wards Council activities that support tourism.
Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge	
I agree with this suggested change	○ I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you a	ngree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	No
5. The Rural Recycling Rate	
	e, as a fixed dollar amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit, munal collection points - for rural properties only because the collection sites are
The Rural Recycling Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you a	agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	No
6. Damaya tha Dublia Dubbiah Dia Chara	
6. Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charg	,e
this is \$162.46 including GST), which covers 50% of the cost of	charge regardless of the capital value of the property (for the 2023/2024 year of emptying these public rubbish bins, with the balance 50% funded by general or a separate targeted rate for the emptying of public rubbish bins, and that the Charge instead be funded by commercial rates.
Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge	
I agree with this suggested change	○ I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you a	ngree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	No
7 A new Harhour Special Operator Rate	

is suggesting that it is appropriate for the net costs of harbour activities (after all other sources of revenue such as slipway fees, boat parking fees, cruise ship fees, etc), could be covered by a combination of the existing commercial rate and harbour rate (set on differential), plus a proposed new Harbour Special Operator Rate to apply to special operators in proportion to the areas that they each have exclusive use over. Note that the Council is having separate conversations with each of the special operators that we have identified, and that this new rate will be subject to the outcome of those discussions, as well as a legal review. We do, however, still want your feedback on the principles of this suggestion. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate I agree with this suggested change I disagree with this suggested change Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions. Yes No 8. Changes to how some activities should be funded While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested changes is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees. Changes to how some activities should be funded I agree with this suggested change I disagree with this suggested change Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions. Yes No 9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP) We are suggesting a new definition for the SUIP. While the proposed definition is not a significant change, it is helpful for ratepayers and Council staff to have a clear understanding of the definition, so that it is consistently applied. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP) I agree with this suggested change I disagree with this suggested change Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions. O Yes No Do you wish to present your opinion in person to the Council at a Hearing?\* Five minute slots will be allocated to each person who wishes to present their submission in person. Yes No Thank you for taking the time to make this submission.

The Council wishes to make provision in the Revenue and Financing Policy for the ability to levy a Harbour Special Operator rate. The Council

What happens next?

Once we have received feedback (by noon 24 October 2023) we will commence a legal review of the suggested changes, including of the feedback suggestions, and have a hearing for people to present their views to the Council.

# When are the key dates?

Submissions open: 18th September 2023

Submissions close: 24th October 2023

Hearings: 1st - 17th November 2023

Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023

### **Rates Review 2023**



We are considering options for making our rating system fairer. We have outlined our suggestions as to how we could do this, and invite you to tell us what you think.

This consultation runs from noon 18th September to noon 24th October 2023

If you run out of time you can save the form as draft and comeback and finish it at any time before noon on 24th October 2023.

Submitter Details	
First Name*	Family Name*
Blake	Bennett
Organisation Name (optional)	
Contact Details (required)	
Contact Details (required)	
In the space below, please provide either:	
Email Address	
Phone Number; or	
Postal Address;	
Contact Phone Number	E-mail Address
redacted	redacted
Postal Address	
redacted	
Are you a ratepayer in the Kaikoura District*	
Yes	○ No
If yes, what is your address?	
We need this information to understand how your opinion might be at	ffected by whether you live in the urban, semi-rural , or rural area.
redacted	
2. Submission	
There are nine suggested changes to the rating system that we are co	nsulting on. More information is available on the KDC website and in

### In summary the suggested changes cover:

1. A new differential on the Roading Rate

the relevant section of this submission form below.

- 2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate
- 3. Increase to the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates
- 4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge
- 5. Rural Recycling Rate

6. Removal of Public Rubbish Bin Charge 7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate	
<ol> <li>Changes to how some activities are funded</li> <li>A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a</li> </ol>	a Rating Unit (SUIP)
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested changes, you car	
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested changes,	you can tick the appropriate box below, and submit the form.*
I agree with all of the suggested changes	I disagree with some of the suggested changes
If you agree with some of the suggested changes, but not all, please co	ontinue to complete this survey form.
1. A Differential on the Roading Rate	
	ling Rate, that would mean commercial properties, and properties of roading because these properties have a greater impact on the
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestion.
Yes	○ No
Comment about differential on the roading rate	
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here	
The assumption that rural properties contribute to a heavier wear at transportation is misleading and unfair. This notion wrongly general occur in rural settings.	
counterparts. The current proposal essentially punishes rural reside	re and amenities available to rural residents in comparison to our urban ents for using what little infrastructure we have, to access amenities and eave the house - in our small car - once or twice per week to go shopping
The economic impact of the proposed changes also cannot be ignor public services. The rate increase could add an extra financial burder	red. Many rural areas already face challenges such as limited access to n, exacerbating existing inequalities.
2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate	
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area sho irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggested to be	ould contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs be \$200.00 including GST.
at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportion	will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while ate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. e, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with
New Roading Uniform Target Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change

Yes	○ No
Comment about new Roading Uniform	
a regressive approach that disproportiona households have the same impact on road particularly unfair. This added financial bu	stions here  orm Targeted Rate, especially the fixed \$200 charge for properties outside the urban area. This is ely impacts lower-value rural and semi-rural properties. It also fails to consider that not all rural wear and tear. For example, my property sees minimal road usage, making this fixed rate den would significantly affect rural communities, who already face limited public services. We posal and look for more equitable funding mechanisms.
3. Increase the differential or	the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates
differential, and is suggesting that semi-ru services. In essence, the Council is sugges	differential on semi-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the all residents are less than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urbaning that the current differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed 0.5 to 0.75, and for the rural differential to be standardized at 0.25.
Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and T	wn Centre Rates Differential
I agree with this suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested changes
Would you like to add a comment to ex	plain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	○ No
Comment about Footpath & Streetligh	
generalized and doesn't consider individua them especially unjust. What is more, ther	assumption that semi-rural residents are frequent users of these urban services is overly household behaviors. We rarely (if ever) use these services, making an increase in our rates for aren't actually ANY street lights operating in Kekerengu - so why should we be billed for street itials exacerbates the financial pressures on rural and semi-rural communities, who already have
4. Increase the Accommodat	on Sector Charge
	modation for visitors, but doesn't meet the definition of a commercial property (generally sts or less), is levied the Accommodation Sector Charge of \$400.00 including GST per year. The
	odation Sector Charge be increased to \$600.00 including GST per year, so these smaller a fairer share towards Council activities that support tourism.
Increase the Accommodation Sector C	arge
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to ex	plain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	○ No
Comment about the Accommodation Se Add your comments and alternative sugge	

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?

### 5. The Rural Recycling Rate

The Council is suggesting introducing the rural recycling rate, as a fixed dollar amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit, to cover the cost of collecting recyclable material from communal collection points - for rural properties only because the collection sites are in the rural area (Lynton Downs, Clarence and Kekerengu).

# The Rural Recycling Rate I agree with this suggested change I disagree with this suggested change Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions. No

### Comment about the Rural Recycling Rate

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

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.

### 6. Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge

Currently all commercial properties pay a public rubbish bin charge regardless of the capital value of the property (for the 2023/2024 year this is \$162.46 including GST), which covers 50% of the cost of emptying these public rubbish bins, with the balance 50% funded by general rates. The Council is now suggesting that there is no need for a separate targeted rate for the emptying of public rubbish bins, and that the portion of costs currently funded by the Public Rubbish Bin Charge instead be funded by commercial rates.

Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or   Yes	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No

### 7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate

The Council wishes to make provision in the Revenue and Financing Policy for the ability to levy a Harbour Special Operator rate. The Council is suggesting that it is appropriate for the net costs of harbour activities (after all other sources of revenue such as slipway fees, boat parking fees, cruise ship fees, etc.), could be covered by a combination of the existing commercial rate and harbour rate (set on differential), plus a proposed new Harbour Special Operator Rate to apply to special operators in proportion to the areas that they each have exclusive use over.

Note that the Council is having separate conversations with each of the special operators that we have identified, and that this new rate will be subject to the outcome of those discussions, as well as a legal review.

We do, however, still want your feedback on the principles of this suggestion.

A new Harbour Special Operator Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	○ I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree	or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	○ No
8. Changes to how some activities should be	funded
o. Changes to now come detivities should be	Turidou
compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested chan	as debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, ges is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do e Council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.
Changes to how some activities should be funded	
○ I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree	or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	○ No
9. A new definition for the Separately Used or	r Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)
We are suggesting a new definition for the SUIP. While the propose Council staff to have a clear understanding of the definition, so the	ed definition is not a significant change, it is helpful for ratepayers and at it is consistently applied.
A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of	f a Rating Unit (SUIP)
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Tagree with this suggested change	Tulsagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree	or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	○ No
Comment about a new definition for the Separately Used or	Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here	
	clear: they are disproportionately unfair, especially to families like ours
,	to the prohibitive costs at the supermarket and petrol station. We don't nicles are not contributing to heavy road wear. Moreover, our local road is
	ouncil deems it fit to burden us with additional road-related costs?! As if
that weren't enough, we don't even have the basic amenity of rub	bish collection, a service readily available in most developed areas.
If the Council persists in shifting financial burdens onto families lik	ke ours, you're essentially pushing us closer to the edge, amidst already
spiraling living costs. You leave us in an increasingly precarious po	sition with fewer and fewer options to make ends meet. So, to the Council proach, because as it stands, it is patently unfair and unsustainable for
Do you wish to present your opinion in person to the Council	_
Five minute slots will be allocated to each person who wishes to pr	
Yes	No

### What happens next?

Once we have received feedback (by noon 24 October 2023) we will commence a legal review of the suggested changes, including of the feedback suggestions, and have a hearing for people to present their views to the Council.

# When are the key dates?

Submissions open: 18th September 2023

Submissions close: 24th October 2023

Hearings: 1st - 17th November 2023

Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023

### **Rates Review 2023**



We are considering options for making our rating system fairer. We have outlined our suggestions as to how we could do this, and invite you to tell us what you think.

This consultation runs from noon 18th September to noon 24th October 2023

If you run out of time you can save the form as draft and comeback and finish it at any time before noon on 24th October 2023.

Submitter Details	
First Name*	Family Name*
Janenne	Blackler
Organisation Name (optional)	
Contact Details (required)	
In the space below, please provide either:	
<ul><li>Email Address</li><li>Phone Number; or</li><li>Postal Address;</li></ul>	
Contact Phone Number	E-mail Address
Redacted	Redacted
Postal Address	
Redacted	
Are you a ratepayer in the Kaikoura District <sup>2</sup>	*
Yes	○ No
If yes, what is your address?	
We need this information to understand how yo	our opinion might be affected by whether you live in the urban, semi-rural , or rural area.
Redacted	
2. Submission	
There are nine suggested changes to the rating	system that we are consulting on. More information is available on the KDC website and in

There are nine suggested changes to the rating system that we are consulting on. More information is available on the KDC website and in the relevant section of this submission form below.

- 1. A new differential on the Roading Rate
- 2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate
- 3. Increase to the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates
- 4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge
- 5. Rural Recycling Rate
- 6. Removal of Public Rubbish Bin Charge

<ul><li>7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate</li><li>8. Changes to how some activities are funded</li><li>9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a</li></ul>	Rating Unit (SUIP)
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested changes, you can	tick the appropriate box below, and send us this form.
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested changes,	you can tick the appropriate box below, and submit the form.*
I agree with all of the suggested changes	I disagree with all of the suggested changes
If you agree with some of the suggested changes, but not all, please co	ntinue to complete this survey form.
A Differential on the Roading Rate	
	ng Rate, that would mean commercial properties, and properties roading because these properties have a greater impact on the
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestion.
Yes	No
Comment about differential on the roading rate	
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here	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 i	n this setting is a business or a farm, and suggest that if the proposed blive in a rural setting without running a business would be subsidising
2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate	
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area sho irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggested to b  This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural properties of the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportional	ould contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs e \$200.00 including GST.  will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while ate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. , and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with
New Roading Uniform Target Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	○ No
	the roads equally. This is not true. Some people drive to town to go to 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.

### 3. Increase the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates

These three targeted rates currently apply a differential on semi-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are less than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban services. In essence, the Council is suggesting that the current differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed to increase the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the rural differential to be standardized at 0.25.

Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and Town Centre Rates Differ	ential
I agree with this suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested changes
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	○ No
Comment about Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and Town Ce	ntre Rates
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here	
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 that when coming into the township, rural residents use footpaths but they only have the benefit of street lighting if each rural person was to travel to the township at night time. Do you have statistics to support the rural use of urban street lighting?? In the rural areas, the residents survive without street lighting how about turning the street lights down in town to save money as happens with supporting initiatives such as Huttons Shearwater or Night Sky??	
4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge	
Currently, any property that provides accommodation for visitors, but because they can only accommodate 4 guests or less), is levied the Accouncil is suggesting this is too low.	
The Council is suggesting that the Accommodation Sector Charge be increased to \$600.00 including GST per year, so these smaller accommodation providers are contributing a fairer share towards Council activities that support tourism.	
Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	○ No

### **Comment about the Accommodation Sector Charge**

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

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.

### 5. The Rural Recycling Rate

to cover the cost of collecting recyclable material from in the rural area (Lynton Downs, Clarence and Kekeren	communal collection points - for rural properties only because the collection sites are ngu).
The Rural Recycling Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why	you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	○ No
Comment about the Rural Recycling Rate	
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here	
take our recycling all the way to Kekerengu or Clarence of recycling and rubbish for the business operations i.e. The rural sector 5km from the edge of town.  I don't see why we are expected to pay for the cost of receive storing and delivering their own recycling to Innovative areas are already well supported by recycling collection, Reintroducing rural recycling charges for semi-rural propagatility at their doorstep should be directed to those compliances that the cost of Innovative Waste travelling external propagations.	ensively to collect waste of any sort from these areas would far exceed the cost if there le running expenses, land transfer dumping fees etc let the communities who receive r it.
Currently all commercial properties pay a public rubbis this is \$162.46 including GST), which covers 50% of the	sh bin charge regardless of the capital value of the property (for the 2023/2024 year cost of emptying these public rubbish bins, with the balance 50% funded by general leed for a separate targeted rate for the emptying of public rubbish bins, and that the
Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge	
I agree with this suggested change	○ I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why	you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	○ No
Comment about the Public Rubbish Bin Charge Add your comments and alternative suggestions here As any of the remaining public rubbish bins are located is service.	in and around the business sector it is reasonable that the business sector fund this
7. A new Harbour Special Operator R	Rate
The Council wishes to make provision in the Revenue a	and Financing Policy for the ability to levy a Harbour Special Operator rate. The Council

The Council is suggesting introducing the rural recycling rate, as a fixed dollar amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit,

is suggesting that it is appropriate for the net costs of harbour activities (after all other sources of revenue such as slipway fees, boat parking fees, cruise ship fees, etc), could be covered by a combination of the existing commercial rate and harbour rate (set on differential), plus a proposed new Harbour Special Operator Rate to apply to special operators in proportion to the areas that they each have exclusive use over.

Note that the Council is having separate conversations with each of the special operators that we have identified, and that this new rate will be subject to the outcome of those discussions, as well as a legal review. We do, however, still want your feedback on the principles of this suggestion. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate I agree with this suggested change I disagree with this suggested change Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions. O No Comment about a new Harbour Special Operator Rate Add your comments and alternative suggestions here 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 user levy. 8. Changes to how some activities should be funded While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested changes is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees. Changes to how some activities should be funded I agree with this suggested change I disagree with this suggested change Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions. Yes O No Comment about changes to how some activities should be funded Add your comments and alternative suggestions here 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. Hanmer 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 Hanmer ratepayers will be subsiding it. 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. Parking control... is there such a thing in Kaikoura...?? A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)

We are suggesting a new definition for the SUIP. While the proposed definition is not a significant change, it is helpful for ratepayers and Council staff to have a clear understanding of the definition, so that it is consistently applied.

A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)

I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or one of Yes	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Comment about a new definition for the Separately Used or Inh Add your comments and alternative suggestions here	abited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)
Do you wish to present your opinion in person to the Council at a Five minute slots will be allocated to each person who wishes to present	
○ Yes	No
Thank you for taking the ti	me to make this submission.
What happens next?	
Once we have received feedback (by noon 24 October 2023) we will confeedback suggestions, and have a hearing for people to present their vi	
When are the key dates?	
Submissions open: 18th September 2023	
Submissions close: 24th October 2023	
Hearings: 1st - 17th November 2023	
Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023	
Changes take effect: 1st July 2024	

### Rates Review 2023



We are considering options for making our rating system fairer. We have outlined our suggestions as to how we could do this, and invite you to tell us what you think.

This consultation runs from noon 18th September to noon 24th October 2023

If you run out of time you can save the form as draft and comeback and finish it at any time before noon on 24th October 2023.

1. Submitter Details	
First Name* Angela	Family Name*
Aligeia	Dunt
Organisation Name (optional)	
Contact Details (required)	
In the space below, please provide either:	
<ul><li>Email Address</li><li>Phone Number; or</li><li>Postal Address;</li></ul>	
Contact Phone Number	E-mail Address redacted
Postal Address	
Are you a ratepayer in the Kaikoura District*	
Yes	○ No
If yes, what is your address?	
We need this information to understand how your opinion might be aff	fected by whether you live in the urban, semi-rural , or rural area.
redacted	
2. Submission	

There are nine suggested changes to the rating system that we are consulting on. More information is available on the KDC website and in the relevant section of this submission form below.

- 1. A new differential on the Roading Rate
- 2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate
- ${\tt 3.\,Increase\,to\,the\,differential\,on\,the\,Footpath\,\&\,Streetlights,\,Harbour,\,and\,Town\,Centre\,Rates}$
- 4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge
- 5. Rural Recycling Rate
- 6. Removal of Public Rubbish Bin Charge
- 7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate

8. Changes to how some activities are funded 9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Pa	art of a Rating Unit (SUIP)
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested changes, yo	ou can tick the appropriate box below, and send us this form.
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested char	nges, you can tick the appropriate box below, and submit the form.*
I agree with all of the suggested changes	I disagree with some of the suggested changes
If you agree with some of the suggested changes, but not all, ple	ease continue to complete this survey form.
1. A Differential on the Roading Rate	
	Roading Rate, that would mean commercial properties, and properties cost of roading because these properties have a greater impact on the
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agr	ree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestion.
Yes	○ No
Comment about differential on the roading rate	
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here	
Rates increases from 20 / 21 to 24 / 25 with current proposed	d rates review changes.
Rural / Farm : 22.5 % , Urban : 12.5 % , Commercial : 0.6	6%.
The Rural Differential needs to be reduced at least 10 %.  This will drop the average farm increase to 0 % which will still be average Urban decrease of - 4. 2% and Commercial average decreased of the roading differential fo Commercial should be increased at that service that sector and to reduce roading rates for the other.	ecrease of - 5 .7 % . bit more to pay for the vehicles
On farm inflation for this year will be over 16 %, more than do	
I invite Council to consider being fairer than this proposed rate	es review allows.
2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate	
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban are irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggeste	ea should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs d to be \$200.00 including GST.
at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the dispropo	erties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while ortionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. g Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with
New Roading Uniform Target Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agr	ree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	○ No
	19

### 3. Increase the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates

These three targeted rates currently apply a differential on semi-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are less than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban services. In essence, the Council is suggesting that the current differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed to increase the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the rural differential to be standardized at 0.25.

Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and Town Centre Rates Diffe	rential
I agree with this suggested changes	○ I disagree with this suggested changes
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	
4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge	<b>)</b>
Currently, any property that provides accommodation for visitors, but because they can only accommodate 4 guests or less), is levied the A Council is suggesting this is too low.	ut doesn't meet the definition of a commercial property (generally accommodation Sector Charge of \$400.00 including GST per year. The
The Council is suggesting that the Accommodation Sector Charge be accommodation providers are contributing a fairer share towards Co	
Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	No
5. The Rural Recycling Rate	
	red dollar amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit, llection points - for rural properties only because the collection sites are
The Rural Recycling Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	○ No
6. Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge	

Currently all commercial properties pay a public rubbish bin charge regardless of the capital value of the property (for the 2023/2024 year this is \$162.46 including GST), which covers 50% of the cost of emptying these public rubbish bins, with the balance 50% funded by general

portion of costs currently funded by the Public Rubbish Bin Charge in	.,, .
Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	○ No
7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate	
is suggesting that it is appropriate for the net costs of harbour activities, cruise ship fees, etc), could be covered by a combination of the	Policy for the ability to levy a Harbour Special Operator rate. The Council ties (after all other sources of revenue such as slipway fees, boat parking existing commercial rate and harbour rate (set on differential), plus a erators in proportion to the areas that they each have exclusive use over.
Note that the Council is having separate conversations with each of the subject to the outcome of those discussions, as well as a legal rev	the special operators that we have identified, and that this new rate will iew.
We do, however, still want your feedback on the principles of this su	ggestion.
A new Harbour Special Operator Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
W. H W. d	
Yes	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No
	- No
8. Changes to how some activities should be fu	unded
	debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, s is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do ouncil expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.
Changes to how some activities should be funded	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
<ul><li>Yes</li></ul>	○ No
Comment about changes to how some activities should be fur	nded
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here	he hand a constitution
	s huge rates increases when others have little or no increases. We seem to be that farmers can afford it. With the decrease in Dairy payout and families. With the return of increased tourist numbers commercial

# 9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP) We are suggesting a new definition for the SUIP. While the proposed definition is not a significant change, it is helpful for ratepayers and Council staff to have a clear understanding of the definition, so that it is consistently applied. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP) I agree with this suggested change I disagree with this suggested change Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions. Yes O No Do you wish to present your opinion in person to the Council at a Hearing?\* Five minute slots will be allocated to each person who wishes to present their submission in person. O No Yes A Council staff member will contact you to let you know when the hearings will be held, and arrange a time for you to speak. Thank you for taking the time to make this submission. What happens next? Once we have received feedback (by noon 24 October 2023) we will commence a legal review of the suggested changes, including of the feedback suggestions, and have a hearing for people to present their views to the Council. When are the key dates? Submissions open: 18th September 2023 Submissions close: 24th October 2023

Hearings:

1st - 17th November 2023

Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023

### **Rates Review 2023**

Culturalities Detaile



We are considering options for making our rating system fairer. We have outlined our suggestions as to how we could do this, and invite you to tell us what you think.

This consultation runs from noon 18th September to noon 24th October 2023

If you run out of time you can save the form as draft and comeback and finish it at any time before noon on 24th October 2023.

1. Submitter Details	
First Name*	Family Name*
Tom	Butters
Organisation Name (optional)	
Contact Details (required)	
In the space below, please provide either:	
<ul><li>Email Address</li><li>Phone Number; or</li><li>Postal Address;</li></ul>	
Contact Phone Number	E-mail Address
Redacted	Redacted
Postal Address	
Redacted	
Are you a ratepayer in the Kaikoura District*	
Yes	○ No
If yes, what is your address?	
We need this information to understand how your o	pinion might be affected by whether you live in the urban, semi-rural , or rural area.
Redacted	
2. Submission	
There are nine suggested changes to the rating syste	em that we are consulting on. More information is available on the KDC website and in

# In summary the suggested changes cover:

1. A new differential on the Roading Rate

the relevant section of this submission form below.

- 2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate
- 3. Increase to the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates
- 4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge
- 5. Rural Recycling Rate
- 6. Removal of Public Rubbish Bin Charge

7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate	
8. Changes to how some activities are funded	
9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited F	Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested changes,	you can tick the appropriate box below, and send us this form.
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested cha	anges, you can tick the appropriate box below, and submit the form.*
I agree with all of the suggested changes	I disagree with all of the suggested changes
If you agree with some of the suggested changes, but not all, positive of the suggested changes.	ease continue to complete this survey form.
1. A Differential on the Roading Nate	
	e Roading Rate, that would mean commercial properties, and properties cost of roading because these properties have a greater impact on the
I agree with this suggested change	○ I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you ag	ree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestion.
Yes	○ No
<b>3.35</b>	
2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate	
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban a irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggest	rea should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs ed to be \$200.00 including GST.
irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggest  This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural prop at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disprop	_
irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggest This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural prop at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disprop Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roadil each other.	ed to be \$200.00 including GST.  erties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while ortionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.
irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggest This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural prop at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disprop Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roadil each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate	ed to be \$200.00 including GST.  erties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while ortionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.  ng Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with
irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggest This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural prop at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disprop Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roadil each other.	ed to be \$200.00 including GST.  erties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while ortionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.
irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggest This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural prop at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disprop Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roadin each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change	eed to be \$200.00 including GST.  erties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while ortionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. In this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with
irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggest. This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural prop at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disprop Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roadin each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you ag	eed to be \$200.00 including GST.  erties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while ortionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. In the roading rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with the last of last of last of last or last of last or last
irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggest This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural prop at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disprop Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roadin each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change	eed to be \$200.00 including GST.  erties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while ortionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. In this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with
irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggest. This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural prop at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disprop Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roadin each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you ag	eed to be \$200.00 including GST.  erties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while ortionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. In the roading rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with the last of last of last of last or last of last or last
irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggest. This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural prop at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disprop Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roadin each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you ago	eed to be \$200.00 including GST.  erties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while ortionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. In this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with  I disagree with this suggested change  gree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggest. This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural prop at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disprop Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roadin each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you ago	eed to be \$200.00 including GST.  erties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while ortionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. In the roading rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with the last of last of last of last or last of last or last
irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggest. This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural prop at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disprop Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roadin each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you ago Yes  3. Increase the differential on the Footpath  These three targeted rates currently apply a differential on sed differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are less than the same and the suggesting that semi-rural residents are less than the same and the suggesting that semi-rural residents are less than the same and the suggesting that semi-rural residents are less than the same and the suggesting that semi-rural residents are less than the same and the suggesting that semi-rural residents are less than the same and the same and the suggesting that semi-rural residents are less than the same and the same are suggested to the same and the same are suggested to the	eet to be \$200.00 including GST.  erties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while ortionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. In the second of the roading rate, work best in tandem with the large or disagree with this suggested change  gree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No  No  No  No  No  Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates  emi-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the ses than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban at differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed
irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggest. This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural prop at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disprop Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roadin each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you ago Yes  3. Increase the differential on the Footpath  These three targeted rates currently apply a differential on sed differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are lesservices. In essence, the Council is suggesting that the current to increase the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for	erties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while ortionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. In grate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with I disagree with this suggested change  I disagree with this suggested change  I disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No  No  No  Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates  I wini-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the st than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban at differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed rethe rural differential to be standardized at 0.25.
irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggest. This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural prop at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disprop Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roadin each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you age. Yes  3. Increase the differential on the Footpath  These three targeted rates currently apply a differential on sed differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are less services. In essence, the Council is suggesting that the current to increase the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and Town Centre Rate	eet to be \$200.00 including GST.  erties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while ortionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. In the roading rate, work best in tandem with the large with this suggested change gree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No  No  No  Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates  emi-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the sest than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban at differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed or the rural differential to be standardized at 0.25.
irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggest. This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural prop at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disprop Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roadin each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you ago Yes  3. Increase the differential on the Footpath  These three targeted rates currently apply a differential on sed differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are lesservices. In essence, the Council is suggesting that the current to increase the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for	erties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while ortionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. In grate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with I disagree with this suggested change  I disagree with this suggested change  I disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No  No  No  Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates  I wini-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the st than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban at differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed rethe rural differential to be standardized at 0.25.

Would you like to add a comment to explain why you a	gree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	○ No
4. Increase the Accommodation Sector C	harge
	sitors, but doesn't meet the definition of a commercial property (generally ed the Accommodation Sector Charge of \$400.00 including GST per year. The
The Council is suggesting that the Accommodation Sector Chaccommodation providers are contributing a fairer share tow	narge be increased to \$600.00 including GST per year, so these smaller wards Council activities that support tourism.
Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge	
I agree with this suggested change	○ I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you a	gree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	No
5. The Rural Recycling Rate	
	e, as a fixed dollar amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit, nunal collection points - for rural properties only because the collection sites are
The Rural Recycling Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you a	gree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	○ No
6. Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge	e
this is \$162.46 including GST), which covers 50% of the cost of	charge regardless of the capital value of the property (for the 2023/2024 year of emptying these public rubbish bins, with the balance 50% funded by general or a separate targeted rate for the emptying of public rubbish bins, and that the Charge instead be funded by commercial rates.
Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge	
I agree with this suggested change	○ I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you a	gree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	No
7 A new Harhour Special Operator Rate	

is suggesting that it is appropriate for the net costs of harbour activities (after all other sources of revenue such as slipway fees, boat parking fees, cruise ship fees, etc), could be covered by a combination of the existing commercial rate and harbour rate (set on differential), plus a proposed new Harbour Special Operator Rate to apply to special operators in proportion to the areas that they each have exclusive use over. Note that the Council is having separate conversations with each of the special operators that we have identified, and that this new rate will be subject to the outcome of those discussions, as well as a legal review. We do, however, still want your feedback on the principles of this suggestion. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate I agree with this suggested change I disagree with this suggested change Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions. Yes O No 8. Changes to how some activities should be funded While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested changes is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees. Changes to how some activities should be funded I agree with this suggested change I disagree with this suggested change Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions. Yes O No 9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP) We are suggesting a new definition for the SUIP. While the proposed definition is not a significant change, it is helpful for ratepayers and Council staff to have a clear understanding of the definition, so that it is consistently applied. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP) I agree with this suggested change I disagree with this suggested change Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions. O Yes O No Do you wish to present your opinion in person to the Council at a Hearing?\* Five minute slots will be allocated to each person who wishes to present their submission in person. Yes No Thank you for taking the time to make this submission.

The Council wishes to make provision in the Revenue and Financing Policy for the ability to levy a Harbour Special Operator rate. The Council

26

What happens next?

Once we have received feedback (by noon 24 October 2023) we will commence a legal review of the suggested changes, including of the feedback suggestions, and have a hearing for people to present their views to the Council.

# When are the key dates?

Submissions open: 18th September 2023

Submissions close: 24th October 2023

Hearings: 1st - 17th November 2023

Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023

### **Rates Review 2023**



We are considering options for making our rating system fairer. We have outlined our suggestions as to how we could do this, and invite you to tell us what you think.

This consultation runs from noon 18th September to noon 24th October 2023

If you run out of time you can save the form as draft and comeback and finish it at any time before noon on 24th October 2023.

# 1. Submitter Details First Name\* Family Name\* Lynette Buurman **Organisation Name (optional)** Dolphin Encounter Partnership Contact Details (required) In the space below, please provide either: Email Address • Phone Number; or Postal Address; **Contact Phone Number** E-mail Address redacted **Postal Address** redacted Are you a ratepayer in the Kaikoura District\* Yes O No If yes, what is your address? We need this information to understand how your opinion might be affected by whether you live in the urban, semi-rural, or rural area. redacted 2. Submission

There are nine suggested changes to the rating system that we are consulting on. More information is available on the KDC website and in the relevant section of this submission form below.

- 1. A new differential on the Roading Rate
- 2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate
- 3. Increase to the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates
- 4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge
- 5. Rural Recycling Rate

<ul><li>6. Removal of Public Rubbish Bin Charge</li><li>7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate</li><li>8. Changes to how some activities are funded</li></ul>	
9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited	Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested changes,	you can tick the appropriate box below, and send us this form.
	anges, you can tick the appropriate box below, and submit the form.*
I agree with all of the suggested changes	I disagree with some of the suggested changes
If you agree with some of the suggested changes, but not all, p	please continue to complete this survey form.
1. A Differential on the Roading Rate	
	e Roading Rate, that would mean commercial properties, and properties cost of roading because these properties have a greater impact on the
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you ag	gree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestion.
○ Yes	○ No
2. A new Booding Uniform Targeted Date	
2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate	
	area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban a irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggest.  This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural propat the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disprop	area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban a irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggest. This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural propat the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disprop Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roadin	area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs ted to be \$200.00 including GST.  perties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while portionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban a irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggest. This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural propat the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disprop Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roadil each other.	area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs ted to be \$200.00 including GST.  perties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while portionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban a irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggest. This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural prop at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disprop Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roadin each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change	area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs ted to be \$200.00 including GST.  perties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while cortionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.  In grate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban a irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggest. This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural propat the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disprop Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roadin each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you ag	area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs ted to be \$200.00 including GST.  Deerties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while contionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. In this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with  O I disagree with this suggested change  Gree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban a irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggest. This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural prop at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disprop Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roadin each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change	area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs ted to be \$200.00 including GST.  perties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while cortionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.  In grate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban a irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggest. This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural propat the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disprop Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roadin each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you as	area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs ted to be \$200.00 including GST.  Deerties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while contionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. In this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with  O I disagree with this suggested change  Gree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban a irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggest. This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural propat the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disprop Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roadin each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you as	area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs ted to be \$200.00 including GST.  Deerties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while contionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. In this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with  O I disagree with this suggested change  Gree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban a irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggest. This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural properties at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproposing that the differential on the Roading each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you ago Yes  3. Increase the differential on the Footpath. These three targeted rates currently apply a differential on sed differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are less than the semi-rural residents are less than the	area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs ted to be \$200.00 including GST.  Describes will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while cortionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. In grate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with  Oracle of disagree with this suggested change  Gree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No  No  A Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates  The emi-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the less than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban and differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban a irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggest. This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural properties at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproperate Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roading each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you ago Yes  3. Increase the differential on the Footpath  These three targeted rates currently apply a differential on sed differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are lesservices. In essence, the Council is suggesting that the currents	area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs ted to be \$200.00 including GST.  Detries will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while contionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. In this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with this suggested change  Gree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  N

Would you like to add a comment to explain why y	ou agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	○ No
4. Increase the Accommodation Sector	or Charge
	For visitors, but doesn't meet the definition of a commercial property (generally is levied the Accommodation Sector Charge of \$400.00 including GST per year. The
The Council is suggesting that the Accommodation Sect accommodation providers are contributing a fairer shall	tor Charge be increased to \$600.00 including GST per year, so these smaller re towards Council activities that support tourism.
Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge	
I agree with this suggested change	○ I disagree with this suggested change
	vou agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	○ No
5. The Rural Recycling Rate	
	g rate, as a fixed dollar amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit, communal collection points - for rural properties only because the collection sites are gu).
The Rural Recycling Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why y	ou agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	No
6. Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Ch	arge
this is \$162.46 including GST), which covers 50% of the	h bin charge regardless of the capital value of the property (for the 2023/2024 year cost of emptying these public rubbish bins, with the balance 50% funded by general eed for a separate targeted rate for the emptying of public rubbish bins, and that the Bin Charge instead be funded by commercial rates.
Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge	
I agree with this suggested change	○ I disagree with this suggested change
We like a Planta and a second as	
	ou agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	○ No
7. A new Harbour Special Operator Ra	ate

is suggesting that it is appropriate for the net costs of harbour activities (after all other sources of revenue such as slipway fees, boat parking fees, cruise ship fees, etc), could be covered by a combination of the existing commercial rate and harbour rate (set on differential), plus a proposed new Harbour Special Operator Rate to apply to special operators in proportion to the areas that they each have exclusive use over. Note that the Council is having separate conversations with each of the special operators that we have identified, and that this new rate will be subject to the outcome of those discussions, as well as a legal review. We do, however, still want your feedback on the principles of this suggestion. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate I disagree with this suggested change I agree with this suggested change Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions. Yes O No Comment about a new Harbour Special Operator Rate Add your comments and alternative suggestions here 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. 8. Changes to how some activities should be funded While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested changes is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees. Changes to how some activities should be funded I agree with this suggested change I disagree with this suggested change Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions. Yes O No A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP) We are suggesting a new definition for the SUIP. While the proposed definition is not a significant change, it is helpful for ratepayers and Council staff to have a clear understanding of the definition, so that it is consistently applied. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP) I agree with this suggested change I disagree with this suggested change Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions. O Yes O No Do you wish to present your opinion in person to the Council at a Hearing?\*

The Council wishes to make provision in the Revenue and Financing Policy for the ability to levy a Harbour Special Operator rate. The Council

Five minute slots will be allocated to	o each person who wishes to	present their submission in person.
--	-----------------------------	-------------------------------------

O Yes

No

# Thank you for taking the time to make this submission.

### What happens next?

Once we have received feedback (by noon 24 October 2023) we will commence a legal review of the suggested changes, including of the feedback suggestions, and have a hearing for people to present their views to the Council.

### When are the key dates?

Submissions open: 18th September 2023

Submissions close: 24th October 2023

Hearings: 1st - 17th November 2023

Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023

### **Rates Review 2023**



We are considering options for making our rating system fairer. We have outlined our suggestions as to how we could do this, and invite you to tell us what you think.

This consultation runs from noon 18th September to noon 24th October 2023

If you run out of time you can save the form as draft and comeback and finish it at any time before noon on 24th October 2023.

Submitter Details	
First Name*	Family Name*
Peter	Clayton
Organisation Name (optional)	
Contact Details (required)	
In the space below, please provide either:	
<ul><li>Email Address</li><li>Phone Number; or</li><li>Postal Address;</li></ul>	
Contact Phone Number	E-mail Address
Redacted	Redacted
Postal Address	
Redacted	
Are you a ratepayer in the Kaikoura District*	
Yes	○ No
If yes, what is your address?	
	our opinion might be affected by whether you live in the urban, semi-rural , or rural area.
Redacted	
2. Submission	
There are nine suggested changes to the rating	system that we are consulting on. More information is available on the KDC website and in

There are nine suggested changes to the rating system that we are consulting on. More information is available on the KDC website and in the relevant section of this submission form below.

- 1. A new differential on the Roading Rate
- 2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate
- 3. Increase to the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates
- 4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge
- 5. Rural Recycling Rate
- 6. Removal of Public Rubbish Bin Charge

<ul><li>7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate</li><li>8. Changes to how some activities are funded</li><li>9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabite</li></ul>	ed Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested change	es, you can tick the appropriate box below, and send us this form.
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested	changes, you can tick the appropriate box below, and submit the form.*
I agree with all of the suggested changes	I disagree with all of the suggested changes
If you agree with some of the suggested changes, but not al	l, please continue to complete this survey form.
1. A Differential on the Roading Rate	
	the Roading Rate, that would mean commercial properties, and properties the cost of roading because these properties have a greater impact on the
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you	agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestion.
○ Yes	○ No
2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Ra	te
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urba irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is sugg	n area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs ested to be \$200.00 including GST.
at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the displ	roperties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while roportionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. ading Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with
New Roading Uniform Target Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you	agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	○ No
Comment about new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate	<b>;</b>
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here	
Many of the semi rual properties have their own driveway government funded.	rs that they maintain themselves before coming onto Statehighway 1 which is
3. Increase the differential on the Footpa	ath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates
These three targeted rates currently apply a differential on semi-rural and rural areas: however, the Council has considered the level of the	

differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are less than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban services. In essence, the Council is suggesting that the current differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed to increase the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the rural differential to be standardized at 0.25. 34

Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and Town Centre Rates Differential		
I agree with this suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested changes	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.		
Yes	○ No	
Comment about Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and Town Ce	ntre Rates	
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here  The comment 'In essence, the Council is suggesting that the current d	lifferential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low' is so far from reality its	
	should be NO increase at all. If anything we should be getting a credit.	
4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge		
Currently, any property that provides accommodation for visitors, but doesn't meet the definition of a commercial property (generally because they can only accommodate 4 guests or less), is levied the Accommodation Sector Charge of \$400.00 including GST per year. The Council is suggesting this is too low.		
The Council is suggesting that the Accommodation Sector Charge be increased to \$600.00 including GST per year, so these smaller accommodation providers are contributing a fairer share towards Council activities that support tourism.		
Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.		
○ Yes	○ No	
5. The Rural Recycling Rate		
The Council is suggesting introducing the rural recycling rate, as a fixed dollar amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit, to cover the cost of collecting recyclable material from communal collection points - for rural properties only because the collection sites are in the rural area (Lynton Downs, Clarence and Kekerengu).		
The Rural Recycling Rate		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.		
○ Yes	○ No	
6. Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge		

Currently all commercial properties pay a public rubbish bin charge regardless of the capital value of the property (for the 2023/2024 year this is \$162.46 including GST), which covers 50% of the cost of emptying these public rubbish bins, with the balance 50% funded by general rates. The Council is now suggesting that there is no need for a separate targeted rate for the emptying of public rubbish bins, and that the portion of costs currently funded by the Public Rubbish Bin Charge instead be funded by commercial rates.

Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
Yes	○ No	
7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate		
The Council wishes to make provision in the Revenue and Financing Policy for the ability to levy a Harbour Special Operator rate. The Council is suggesting that it is appropriate for the net costs of harbour activities (after all other sources of revenue such as slipway fees, boat parking fees, cruise ship fees, etc), could be covered by a combination of the existing commercial rate and harbour rate (set on differential), plus a proposed new Harbour Special Operator Rate to apply to special operators in proportion to the areas that they each have exclusive use over.		
Note that the Council is having separate conversations with each of the special operators that we have identified, and that this new rate will be subject to the outcome of those discussions, as well as a legal review.		
We do, however, still want your feedback on the principles of this suggestion.		
A new Harbour Special Operator Rate		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.		
Yes	○ No	
Comment about a new Harbour Special Operator Rate  Add your comments and alternative suggestions here  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.		
8. Changes to how some activities should be funded		
While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested changes is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.		
Changes to how some activities should be funded		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
-	-	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.		
Yes	○ No	
Comment about changes to how some activities should be funded  Add your comments and alternative suggestions here  Could not find the information so voted against until relevant information is clearly available		

9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)

	ga new definition for the SUIP. While the ve a clear understanding of the definition	proposed definition is not a significant change, it is helpful for ratepayers and n, so that it is consistently applied.
A new definition	for the Separately Used or Inhabited	Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)
I agree with this	suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to	o add a comment to explain why you	agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes		○ No
Comment about	a new definition for the Separately U	sed or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)
Add your comme	ents and alternative suggestions here	
Could not find the	information so voted against until releva	ant information is clearly available
	n extra window for rate payers to provide agement to keep just cutting with off with	e comments for example the Kincaid Water Scheme, we all pay high rates in this late to no notice.
	esent your opinion in person to the C	
	will be allocated to each person who wish	es to present their submission in person.
Yes		No
	Thank you for takin	ng the time to make this submission.
What happens ne	ext?	
	ved feedback (by noon 24 October 2023) ve a hearing for people to present their v	we will commence a legal review of the suggested changes, including of the feedback views to the Council.
When are the key	dates?	
Submissions open:	18th September 2023	
Submissions close:	24th October 2023	
Hearings:	1st - 17th November 2023	
Adopt the changes:	29th November 2023	
Changes take effect	: 1st July 2024	

### **Rates Review 2023**



We are considering options for making our rating system fairer. We have outlined our suggestions as to how we could do this, and invite you to tell us what you think.

This consultation runs from noon 18th September to noon 24th October 2023

If you run out of time you can save the form as draft and comeback and finish it at any time before noon on 24th October 2023.

Submitter Details	
First Name*	Family Name*
Grant	Coulter
Organisation Name (optional)	
Te Moto Moto Holdings ltd	
Contact Details (required)	
In the space below, please provide either:	
Email Address	
Phone Number; or	
Postal Address;	
Contact Phone Number	E-mail Address
021331638	grant.coulter@xtra.co.nz
Postal Address	
redacted	
Are you a ratepayer in the Kaikoura District*	
Yes	○ No
If yes, what is your address?	
We need this information to understand how your opinion might be af	fected by whether you live in the urban, semi-rural , or rural area.
redacted	
2. Submission	

There are nine suggested changes to the rating system that we are consulting on. More information is available on the KDC website and in the relevant section of this submission form below.

In summary the suggested changes cover:

- 1. A new differential on the Roading Rate
- 2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate
- 3. Increase to the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates
- 4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge
- 5. Rural Recycling Rate

6. Removal of Public Rubbish Bin Charge	
7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate	
8. Changes to how some activities are funded	
9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of	f a Rating Unit (SUIP)
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested changes, you ca	an tick the appropriate box below, and send us this form.
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested changes	s, you can tick the appropriate box below, and submit the form.*
I agree with all of the suggested changes	I disagree with all of the suggested changes
If you agree with some of the suggested changes, but not all, please	continue to complete this survey form.
1. A Differential on the Roading Rate	
	ding Rate, that would mean commercial properties, and properties of roading because these properties have a greater impact on the
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree o	or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestion.
Yes	○ No
Comment about differential on the roading rate  Add your comments and alternative suggestions here rural properties shouldn't pay more to say that we should because tractors and cows go on the roads is our road is shingle anyway	s ludicrous
2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate	
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area sl irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggested to	hould contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs be \$200.00 including GST.
at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportion	s will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while nate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. te, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with
New Roading Uniform Target Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	○ I disagree with this suggested change
J	
	or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	No
3. Increase the differential on the Footpath & \$	Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates

These three targeted rates currently apply a differential on semi-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are less than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban 39

to increase the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the ru	ral differential to be standardized at 0.25.
Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and Town Centre Rates Differ	rential
I agree with this suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested changes
	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	No
4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge	
Currently, any property that provides accommodation for visitors, but because they can only accommodate 4 guests or less), is levied the A Council is suggesting this is too low.	it doesn't meet the definition of a commercial property (generally ccommodation Sector Charge of \$400.00 including GST per year. The
The Council is suggesting that the Accommodation Sector Charge be accommodation providers are contributing a fairer share towards Co	
Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	No
5. The Rural Recycling Rate	
	ed dollar amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit, llection points - for rural properties only because the collection sites are
The Rural Recycling Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	○ No
Comment about the Rural Recycling Rate	
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here	
I take all my recycling to the dump, wasn't aware of any collection in O so shouldn't pay anything	aro
6. Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge	
Currently all commercial properties pay a public rubbish bin charge i	regardless of the capital value of the property (for the 2023/2024 year

this is \$162.46 including GST), which covers 50% of the cost of emptying these public rubbish bins, with the balance 50% funded by general rates. The Council is now suggesting that there is no need for a separate targeted rate for the emptying of public rubbish bins, and that the portion of costs currently funded by the Public Rubbish Bin Charge instead be funded by commercial rates.

Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge	
I agree with this suggested change	○ I disagree with this suggested change
	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	No     No     No
7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate	
is suggesting that it is appropriate for the net costs of harbour activi fees, cruise ship fees, etc), could be covered by a combination of the	Policy for the ability to levy a Harbour Special Operator rate. The Council ties (after all other sources of revenue such as slipway fees, boat parking existing commercial rate and harbour rate (set on differential), plus a verators in proportion to the areas that they each have exclusive use over.
Note that the Council is having separate conversations with each of the special operators that we have identified, and that this new rate will be subject to the outcome of those discussions, as well as a legal review.	
We do, however, still want your feedback on the principles of this su	ggestion.
A new Harbour Special Operator Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	No     No     No
8. Changes to how some activities should be for	unded
While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested change	
While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested change	debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, s is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do
While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested change affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the C	debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, s is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do
While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested change affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has compared to rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has compared to how some activities should be funded	debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, s is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.
While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested change affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested change affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested change affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested change affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has compared to rates, for every activity.	debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, s is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.
While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested change affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested change affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested change affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested change affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has compared to rates, for every activity.	debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, s is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.
While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested change affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has compared to rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has compared to how some activities should be funded  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, s is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.  I disagree with this suggested change  disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested change affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has compared to rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has compared to how some activities should be funded  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, s is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.  I disagree with this suggested change  disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No
While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested change affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has compared to rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has compared to how some activities should be funded  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or Yes	debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, is is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.  I disagree with this suggested change  disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No  No  Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)
While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested change affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has compared to rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has been decreased by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has been decreased by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has been decreased by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has been decreased by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has been decreased by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has been decreased by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has been decreased by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has been decreased by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has been decreased by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has been decreased by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has been decreased by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has been decreased by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has been decreased by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has been decreased by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has been decreased by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has been decreased by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has been decreased by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has been decreased by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has been decreased by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has been decreased by either increased by either increasing or decreased by either increased by either incr	debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, is is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.  I disagree with this suggested change  disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No  Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)  definition is not a significant change, it is helpful for ratepayers and it is consistently applied.
While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested change affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has compared to rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has considered a compared to how some activities should be funded  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or Yes  9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Increase the suggesting a new definition for the SUIP. While the proposed	debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, is is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.  I disagree with this suggested change  disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No  Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)  definition is not a significant change, it is helpful for ratepayers and it is consistently applied.

Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.

○ Yes	No	
Do you wish to present your opinion in person to the Council at a Hearing?*  Five minute slots will be allocated to each person who wishes to present their submission in person.		
Yes	No	
	Thank you for taking the time to make this submission.	
What happens ne	xt?	
	ved feedback (by noon 24 October 2023) we will commence a legal review of the suggested changes, including of the ns, and have a hearing for people to present their views to the Council.	
When are the key	dates?	
Submissions open:	18th September 2023	
Submissions close:	24th October 2023	
Hearings:	1st - 17th November 2023	
Adopt the changes:	29th November 2023	
Changes take effect	: 1st July 2024	

### **Rates Review 2023**



We are considering options for making our rating system fairer. We have outlined our suggestions as to how we could do this, and invite you to tell us what you think.

This consultation runs from noon 18th September to noon 24th October 2023

If you run out of time you can save the form as draft and comeback and finish it at any time before noon on 24th October 2023.

Submitter Details	
First Name*	Family Name*
Shane	Cross
Organisation Name (optional)	
Contact Details (required)	
In the space below, please provide either:	
<ul><li>Email Address</li><li>Phone Number; or</li><li>Postal Address;</li></ul>	
Contact Phone Number	E-mail Address
Redacted	Redacted
Postal Address	
Redacted	
Are you a ratepayer in the Kaikoura District*	
Yes	○ No
If yes, what is your address?	
We need this information to understand how your op	pinion might be affected by whether you live in the urban, semi-rural , or rural area.
Redacted	
2. Submission	
There are nine suggested changes to the rating syste	em that we are consulting on. More information is available on the KDC website and in

There are nine suggested changes to the rating system that we are consulting on. More information is available on the KDC website and in the relevant section of this submission form below.

In summary the suggested changes cover:

- 1. A new differential on the Roading Rate
- 2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate
- 3. Increase to the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates
- 4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge
- 5. Rural Recycling Rate
- 6. Removal of Public Rubbish Bin Charge

7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate
8. Changes to how some activities are funded
9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)

If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested changes, you can tick the appropriate box below, and send us this form.

If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested changes, you can tick the appropriate box below, and submit the form.

I agree with all of the suggested changes

I disagree with some of the suggested changes

If you agree with some of the suggested changes, but not all, please continue to complete this survey form.

1. A Differential on the Roading Rate

We are suggesting that there is a new differential on the Roading Rate, that would mean commercial properties, and properties in the rural and semi-rural areas, pay more towards the cost of roading because these properties have a greater impact on the wear and tear of roads.

I agree with this suggested change

#### Comment about differential on the roading rate

Yes

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

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.

Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestion.

O No

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 Comercial operations, it was of the understanding to us this operation was relocating to a Comercial 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 Comercial 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 prodomently Red Swamp road increase the need for road maintenance.

In comparrison our lifestyle block only uses small light vehicles prodomently taking us to and from work the same as school traffic takes the children to and from school to save road wear those children could ride on the busses that passes those cars every day.

Dairy Cow crossing points are also part of Comercial operations.

## 2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate

We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggested to be \$200.00 including GST.

This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural properties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roading Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with each other.

I agree with this suggested change

	plain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	○ No
Comment about new Roading Uniform  Add your comments and alternative sugge	
	eir very low use and minimal effect whilst Comercial operations carrying rocks, heavy machinery ys and grazing, including that heavy traffic. This is more a Comercial Tax.
3. Increase the differential on	the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates
differential, and is suggesting that semi-rur services. In essence, the Council is suggest	a differential on semi-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the al residents are less than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban ing that the current differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed 0.5 to 0.75, and for the rural differential to be standardized at 0.25.
Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and To	own Centre Rates Differential
I agree with this suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested changes
	plain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	○ No
Comment about Footpath & Streetlights Add your comments and alternative sugge We only have the one street light and that is I  4. Increase the Accommodation	estions here s a kilometer down the road, it flashes on and off
4. Increase the Accommodation	on Sector Charge
	nmodation for visitors, but doesn't meet the definition of a commercial property (generally sts or less), is levied the Accommodation Sector Charge of \$400.00 including GST per year. The
	odation Sector Charge be increased to \$600.00 including GST per year, so these smaller a fairer share towards Council activities that support tourism.
Increase the Accommodation Sector Ch	narge
I agree with this suggested change	○ I disagree with this suggested change
Mandalana Blacks add a comment	
	plain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Would you like to add a comment to ex  Yes	plain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
	○ No

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 Comercial type operations.

# 5. The Rural Recycling Rate

The Council is suggesting introducing the rural recycling rate, as a fixed dollar amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit, to cover the cost of collecting recyclable material from communal collection points - for rural properties only because the collection sites are in the rural area (Lynton Downs, Clarence and Kekerengu).

The Rural Recycling Rate		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you	u agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
Yes	○ No	
Comment about the Rural Recycling Rate		
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here		
	n 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. If increasing prices. We shouldn't have to pay an additional fe	his now comes as additional cost in fuel and road user charges due to those ever	
0,		
6. Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Cha	rge	
	bin charge regardless of the capital value of the property (for the 2023/2024 year of emptying these public rubbish bins, with the balance 50% funded by general	
rates. The Council is now suggesting that there is no need for a separate targeted rate for the emptying of public rubbish bins, and that the portion of costs currently funded by the Public Rubbish Bin Charge instead be funded by commercial rates.		
Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge		
I agree with this suggested change	□ I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you	u agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
(ii) Yes	○ No	

#### Comment about the Public Rubbish Bin Charge

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

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.

### 7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate

The Council wishes to make provision in the Revenue and Financing Policy for the ability to levy a Harbour Special Operator rate. The Council is suggesting that it is appropriate for the net costs of harbour activities (after all other sources of revenue such as slipway fees, boat parking fees, cruise ship fees, etc.), could be covered by a combination of the existing commercial rate and harbour rate (set on differential), plus a proposed new Harbour Special Operator Rate to apply to special operators in proportion to the areas that they each have exclusive use over.

Note that the Council is having separate conversations with each of the special operators that we have identified, and that this new rate will be subject to the outcome of those discussions, as well as a legal review.

We do, however, still want your feedback on the principles of this suggestion.

A new Harbour Special Operator Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree	or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	○ No
Comment about a new Harbour Special Operator Rate	
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here	
I may not quite understand this and want to know more, I don't us already contribute to thi s new form of rate charge.	se the public slipway, I would expect my Kaikoura annual boat club subs
8. Changes to how some activities should be	funded
o. Changes to now some activities should be	lulided
compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested change	as debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, ges is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do a Council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.
Changes to how some activities should be funded	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree	or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	○ No
Comment about changes to how some activities should be for Add your comments and alternative suggestions here.  Unsure at this stage, I need to understand this more.	funded
9. A new definition for the Separately Used or	r Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)
We are suggesting a new definition for the SUIP. While the propose Council staff to have a clear understanding of the definition, so the	ed definition is not a significant change, it is helpful for ratepayers and at it is consistently applied.
A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of	f a Rating Unit (SUIP)
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree	or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	○ No
Comment about a new definition for the Separately Used or Add your comments and alternative suggestions here Unsure at this stage, I need to understand this more	Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)
Do you wish to present your opinion in person to the Council	at a Hearing?*
Five minute slots will be allocated to each person who wishes to pr	_
Yes	No

# Thank you for taking the time to make this submission.

#### What happens next?

Once we have received feedback (by noon 24 October 2023) we will commence a legal review of the suggested changes, including of the feedback suggestions, and have a hearing for people to present their views to the Council.

#### When are the key dates?

Submissions open: 18th September 2023

Submissions close: 24th October 2023

Hearings: 1st - 17th November 2023

Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023

Changes take effect: 1st July 2024

### **Rates Review 2023**



We are considering options for making our rating system fairer. We have outlined our suggestions as to how we could do this, and invite you to tell us what you think.

This consultation runs from noon 18th September to noon 24th October 2023

If you run out of time you can save the form as draft and comeback and finish it at any time before noon on 24th October 2023.

1. Submitter Details	
First Name*	Family Name*
Trevor	Cummerfield
Organisation Name (optional)	
Contact Details (required)	
In the space below, please provide either:	
<ul><li>Email Address</li><li>Phone Number; or</li><li>Postal Address;</li></ul>	
Contact Phone Number	E-mail Address
redacted	redacted
Postal Address redacted	
Are you a ratepayer in the Kaikoura District*	
Yes	○ No
If yes, what is your address?	
We need this information to understand how your opinion miglinedacted	ht be affected by whether you live in the urban, semi-rural , or rural area.
2. Submission	
There are nine suggested shapped to the voting sustain that we	are consulting an Mare information is available on the KDC website and in

There are nine suggested changes to the rating system that we are consulting on. More information is available on the KDC website and in the relevant section of this submission form below.

In summary the suggested changes cover:

- 1. A new differential on the Roading Rate
- 2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate
- 3. Increase to the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates
- 4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge
- 5. Rural Recycling Rate
- 6. Removal of Public Rubbish Bin Charge

<ol> <li>Changes to how some activities are funded</li> <li>A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part</li> </ol>	t of a Rating Unit (SUIP)
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested changes, you	ı can tick the appropriate box below, and send us this form.
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested chang	ges, you can tick the appropriate box below, and submit the form.*
I agree with all of the suggested changes	I disagree with all of the suggested changes
If you agree with some of the suggested changes, but not all, pleas	se continue to complete this survey form.
1. A Differential on the Roading Rate	
	oading Rate, that would mean commercial properties, and properties st of roading because these properties have a greater impact on the
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree   Yes	e or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestion.  No
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here Commercial trucks traveling between Picton and Christchurch do residents living rural.  2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate	o a lot more damage to roads than local commercial businesses and
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggested  This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural propert at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproport	a should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs to be \$200.00 including GST.  Cies will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while ionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.  Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with
New Roading Uniform Target Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree	e or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	○ No
Comment about new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate	
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here Commercial trucks traveling between Picton and Christchurch do residents living rural.	o a lot more damage to roads than local commercial businesses and

7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate

# 3. Increase the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates

These three targeted rates currently apply a differential on semi-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are less than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban services. In essence, the Council is suggesting that the current differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed to increase the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the rural differential to be standardized at 0.25.

Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and Town Centre Rates Differen	ential	
I agree with this suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested changes	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or o	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
⊚ Yes	○ No	
Comment about Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and Town Ce	ntre Rates	
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here		
Rural residents very rarely use footpaths in town so why should they	be billed for them.	
4 Inches on the Accommodation Contant Change		
4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge		
Currently, any property that provides accommodation for visitors, but	t doesn't meet the definition of a commercial property (generally	
because they can only accommodate 4 guests or less), is levied the Ac		
Council is suggesting this is too low.		
The Council is suggesting that the Accommodation Sector Charge be i	increased to \$600.00 including GST per year, so these smaller	
accommodation providers are contributing a fairer share towards Cou	uncil activities that support tourism.	
Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Tagree with the suggested change	a disagree with this suggested sharige	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or o	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
● Yes	○ No	
Comment about the Accommodation Sector Charge		
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here	and the unions in Maille was and beautiful built and	
You do not want to drive people from offering accommodation which boosts tourism in Kaikoura and benefits businesses.		
5. The Rural Recycling Rate		
	ed dollar amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit, lection points - for rural properties only because the collection sites are	
in the rural area (Lynton Downs, Clarence and Kekerengu).		
The Pural Proveling Pate		
The Rural Recycling Rate	Olding group with this guarant-duban-	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to surely surely	discourse and let us know if you have an elferment or a constitution of the constituti	
	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
Yes	○ No	

51

Comment about the Rural Recycling Rate		
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here		
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.		
6. Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge		
Currently all commercial properties pay a public rubbish bin charge regardless of the capital value of the property (for the 2023/2024 year this is \$162.46 including GST), which covers 50% of the cost of emptying these public rubbish bins, with the balance 50% funded by general rates. The Council is now suggesting that there is no need for a separate targeted rate for the emptying of public rubbish bins, and that the portion of costs currently funded by the Public Rubbish Bin Charge instead be funded by commercial rates.		
Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.		
○ Yes	No	
7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate		
The Council wishes to make provision in the Revenue and Financing Policy for the ability to levy a Harbour Special Operator rate. The Council is suggesting that it is appropriate for the net costs of harbour activities (after all other sources of revenue such as slipway fees, boat parking fees, cruise ship fees, etc), could be covered by a combination of the existing commercial rate and harbour rate (set on differential), plus a proposed new Harbour Special Operator Rate to apply to special operators in proportion to the areas that they each have exclusive use over.		
Note that the Council is having separate conversations with each of the special operators that we have identified, and that this new rate will be subject to the outcome of those discussions, as well as a legal review.		
We do, however, still want your feedback on the principles of this su	ggestion.	
A new Harbour Special Operator Rate		
I agree with this suggested change	◯ I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.		
○ Yes	No	
8. Changes to how some activities should be funded		
While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested changes is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.		
Changes to how some activities should be founded		
Changes to how some activities should be funded		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	

Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.

O Yes

No52

# 9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)

We are suggesting a new definition for the SUIP. While the proposed definition is not a significant change, it is helpful for ratepayers and

Council staff to ha	ve a clear understanding of the definition, so that i	t is consistently applied.
A new definition	for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a	Rating Unit (SUIP)
I agree with this	suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to	o add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes		◎ No
Do you wish to pro	esent your opinion in person to the Council at	a Hearing?*
Five minute slots will be allocated to each person who wishes to present their submission in person.		
○ Yes		No
Thank you for taking the time to make this submission.		
What happens ne	ext?	
Once we have received feedback (by noon 24 October 2023) we will commence a legal review of the suggested changes, including of the feedback suggestions, and have a hearing for people to present their views to the Council.		
When are the key dates?		
Submissions open:	18th September 2023	
Submissions close:	24th October 2023	
Hearings:	1st - 17th November 2023	
Adopt the changes:	29th November 2023	
Changes take effect	: 1st July 2024	

### **Rates Review 2023**

Culturalities Detaile



We are considering options for making our rating system fairer. We have outlined our suggestions as to how we could do this, and invite you to tell us what you think.

This consultation runs from noon 18th September to noon 24th October 2023

If you run out of time you can save the form as draft and comeback and finish it at any time before noon on 24th October 2023.

1. Submitter Details	
First Name* Brian	Family Name* Farrant
Organisation Name (optional) none	
Contact Details (required)	
In the space below, please provide either:	
<ul><li>Email Address</li><li>Phone Number; or</li><li>Postal Address;</li></ul>	
Contact Phone Number	E-mail Address
Redacted	Redacted
Postal Address	
Redacted	
Are you a ratepayer in the Kaikoura District*	
Yes	○ No
If yes, what is your address?	
We need this information to understand how your opinion might be affected by whether you live in the urban, semi-rural, or rural area.	
Redacted	
2. Submission	

In summary the suggested changes cover:

1. A new differential on the Roading Rate

the relevant section of this submission form below.

- 2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate
- 3. Increase to the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates
- 4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge
- 5. Rural Recycling Rate

There are nine suggested changes to the rating system that we are consulting on. More information is available on the KDC website and in

<ul><li>7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate</li><li>8. Changes to how some activities are funded</li><li>9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabit</li></ul>	ed Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested chang	es, you can tick the appropriate box below, and send us this form.
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested	changes, you can tick the appropriate box below, and submit the form.*
I agree with all of the suggested changes	I disagree with all of the suggested changes
If you agree with some of the suggested changes, but not al	l, please continue to complete this survey form.
1. A Differential on the Roading Rate	
	the Roading Rate, that would mean commercial properties, and properties the cost of roading because these properties have a greater impact on the
I agree with this suggested change	○ I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you	agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestion.
○ Yes	○ No
2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Ra	te
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urba irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is sugg	on area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs gested to be \$200.00 including GST.
at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disp	roperties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while roportionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. ading Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with
New Roading Uniform Target Rate	
New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
I agree with this suggested change	☐ I disagree with this suggested change  I agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
I agree with this suggested change	
<ul> <li>I agree with this suggested change</li> <li>Would you like to add a comment to explain why you</li> <li>Yes</li> <li>Comment about new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate</li> <li>Add your comments and alternative suggestions here</li> </ul>	u agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No

6. Removal of Public Rubbish Bin Charge

These three targeted rates currently apply a differential on semi-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are less than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban

services. In essence, the Council is suggesting that the current differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed to increase the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the rural differential to be standardized at 0.25.		
Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and Town Centre Rates	s Differential	
I agree with this suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested changes	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you ag	ree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
Yes	○ No	
Comment about Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and To	own Centre Rates	
	% differential on some of the CCC rates for many years, and now we have no over HCC, about 30 years ago, it was 70% to start with and then 80%, and now	
4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Ch	narge	
Currently, any property that provides accommodation for visitors, but doesn't meet the definition of a commercial property (generally because they can only accommodate 4 guests or less), is levied the Accommodation Sector Charge of \$400.00 including GST per year. The Council is suggesting this is too low.		
The Council is suggesting that the Accommodation Sector Charge be increased to \$600.00 including GST per year, so these smaller accommodation providers are contributing a fairer share towards Council activities that support tourism.		
Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you ag	ree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
Yes	○ No	
Comment about the Accommodation Sector Charge		
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here		
A higher levy will potentially shift short term rentals into long term rentals, of which there is a shortage, \$600 is still low.		
5. The Rural Recycling Rate		
The Council is suggesting introducing the rural recycling rate, as a fixed dollar amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit, to cover the cost of collecting recyclable material from communal collection points - for rural properties only because the collection sites are in the rural area (Lynton Downs, Clarence and Kekerengu).		
The Rural Recycling Rate		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you ag	ree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
○ Yes	○ No	

# 6. Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge

Currently all commercial properties pay a public rubbish bin charge regardless of the capital value of the property (for the 2023/2024 year this is \$162.46 including GST), which covers 50% of the cost of emptying these public rubbish bins, with the balance 50% funded by general rates. The Council is now suggesting that there is no need for a separate targeted rate for the emptying of public rubbish bins, and that the portion of costs currently funded by the Public Rubbish Bin Charge instead be funded by commercial rates.

Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge  I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or   Yes	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No	
7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate		
The Council wishes to make provision in the Revenue and Financing Policy for the ability to levy a Harbour Special Operator rate. The Council is suggesting that it is appropriate for the net costs of harbour activities (after all other sources of revenue such as slipway fees, boat parking fees, cruise ship fees, etc), could be covered by a combination of the existing commercial rate and harbour rate (set on differential), plus a proposed new Harbour Special Operator Rate to apply to special operators in proportion to the areas that they each have exclusive use over.		
Note that the Council is having separate conversations with each of the special operators that we have identified, and that this new rate will be subject to the outcome of those discussions, as well as a legal review.		
We do, however, still want your feedback on the principles of this sug	ggestion.	
A new Harbour Special Operator Rate  I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or   Yes	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No	
8. Changes to how some activities should be funded		
While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested changes is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.		
Changes to how some activities should be funded		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or Yes	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No	

We are suggesting a new definition for the SUIP. While the proposed definition is not a significant change, it is helpful for ratepayers and Council staff to have a clear understanding of the definition, so that it is consistently applied.

9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)

A new definition	for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a	Rating Unit (SUIP)
<ul><li>I agree with this</li></ul>	suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to	o add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes		○ No
Do you wish to present your opinion in person to the Council at a Hearing?*		
Five minute slots w	vill be allocated to each person who wishes to prese	ent their submission in person.
○ Yes		⊚ No
	Thank you for taking the t	me to make this submission.
What happens next?		
Once we have received feedback (by noon 24 October 2023) we will commence a legal review of the suggested changes, including of the feedback suggestions, and have a hearing for people to present their views to the Council.		
When are the key dates?		
Submissions open:	18th September 2023	
Submissions close:	24th October 2023	
Hearings:	1st - 17th November 2023	
Adopt the changes:	29th November 2023	
Changes take effect	: 1st July 2024	





# **Federated Farmers of New Zealand**

**Submission to Kaikoura District Council on:** Rates Review 2023

24 October 2023



# **SUBMISSION ON KAIKOURA DISTRICT COUNCIL RATES REVIEW 2023**

To: Kaikoura District Council

Name of submitter: North Canterbury Province, Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Contact person: Dr Lionel Hume

Senior Policy Advisor

Address for service: Federated Farmers of New Zealand

P.O. Box 20448

Bishopdale

Christchurch 8543

Phone: 0800 327 646

Mobile: redacted Email: redacted

.

### SUBMISSION ON KAIKŌURA DISTRICT COUNCIL RATES REVIEW 2023

#### 1. Introduction

- 1.1 North Canterbury Federated Farmers (NCFF) values this opportunity to provide feedback on the Rates Review 2023 proposals.
- 1.2 NCFF has a strong membership base in Kaikōura, and we take every opportunity to engage and maintain a positive relationship with Kaikōura District Council.
- 1.3 The rating policy developed by council is of real importance to the farming community. The use of the elements within it that serve to balance their distribution between rural, commercial, and urban property sectors make a big difference to farms.
- 1.4 It is valuable therefore that Kaikōura District Council's rating system makes use of targeted rates, uniform charges, and differentials to reflect the funding principles of section 101 of the Local Government Act 2002. It is good that this essential framework is retained within the proposals put forward by council.
- 1.5 We generally agree with the principles set out in the Step Two Overall Impact Analysis, particularly that council's role in economic wellbeing and ability to pay is to ensure alternative funding is sourced to defray rates.
- 1.6 This submission addresses proposals relevant to farm ratepayers in the Rates Review 2023 consultation document, prefaced by a brief comment on its transparency.

#### 2. Transparency

- 2.1 Transparency in rating policy is crucial for fostering trust and accountability between a council and its communities. It is good to see it given status in the supporting documentation.
- 2.2 In terms of transparency we found the consultation document, when viewed alongside the Step One: Funding Needs Analysis and Step Two: Overall Impact Analysis, to be of a good standard. Information such as the level of uniform charges relative to other rates and line by line identification of funding methods for each service are valuable to any submitter and can be accessed.

### 3. A differential on the Roading Rate

- 3.1 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.
- 3.2 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.
- 3.3 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.

### 4. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate

- 4.1 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.
- 4.2 The Roading 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.
- 4.3 Submission 1: We do not support the 1.2 roading rate differential for rural and semirural, 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."

Submission 2: 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.

- 5. Increase differentials on Footpaths & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre rates
- 5.1 We accept the small increase in the differentials on rural and semi-rural properties, based on the arguments presented about the distribution of benefits.

### 6. Reintroduce the Rural Recycling Rate

- 6.1 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.
- 6.2 As previously stated, we encourage council to bring a similarly rigorous analysis to services funded by the general rate on CV.

### 7. Harbour Special Operator Rate

- 7.1 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.
- 7.2 Reduced rates on higher value properties, such as farms, for the purposes of managing the harbour would be welcomed.

- 7.3 Submission 3: We support the council further investigating development of a Harbour Special Operator Rate, reducing the cost to ratepayers, especially high value properties and commercial businesses, of managing the harbour.
- 8. Changes to how some activities are funded
- 8.1 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.
- 8.2 Submission 4: We support the changes itemised in the consultation document to airport funding etc.- as proposed.

#### Conclusion

Federated Farmers, North Canterbury, thanks Kaikoura District Council for the opportunity to submit on its Rates Review 2023. We are committed to continuing to work constructively with Council for the betterment of the Kaikoura District.

Federated Farmers wishes to speak in support of its submission.

Karl Dean

North Canterbury Provincial President

Federated Farmers of New Zealand

### **Rates Review 2023**



We are considering options for making our rating system fairer. We have outlined our suggestions as to how we could do this, and invite you to tell us what you think.

This consultation runs from noon 18th September to noon 24th October 2023

If you run out of time you can save the form as draft and comeback and finish it at any time before noon on 24th October 2023.

Submitter Details	
First Name* Daniel	Family Name* Fleming
Organisation Name (optional) Vetcare Kaikoura	
Contact Details (required)	
In the space below, please provide either:	
<ul><li>Email Address</li><li>Phone Number; or</li><li>Postal Address;</li></ul>	
Contact Phone Number	E-mail Address
redacted	redacted
Postal Address redacted	
Are you a ratepayer in the Kaikoura District*	
Yes	○ No
<b>If yes, what is your address?</b> We need this information to understand how your opinion might be affected by whether you live in the urban, semi-rural, or rural area. redacted	
2. Submission	

There are nine suggested changes to the rating system that we are consulting on. More information is available on the KDC website and in the relevant section of this submission form below.

In summary the suggested changes cover:

- 1. A new differential on the Roading Rate
- 2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate
- 3. Increase to the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates

4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge	
<ol><li>Rural Recycling Rate</li><li>Removal of Public Rubbish Bin Charge</li></ol>	
7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate	
8. Changes to how some activities are funded	
9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of	of a Rating Unit (SUIP)
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested changes, you o	an tick the appropriate box below, and send us this form.
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested change	s, you can tick the appropriate box below, and submit the form.*
I agree with all of the suggested changes	I disagree with some of the suggested changes
If you agree with some of the suggested changes, but not all, please	continue to complete this survey form.
1. A Differential on the Roading Rate	
	ading Rate, that would mean commercial properties, and properties of roading because these properties have a greater impact on the
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree	or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestion.
Yes	○ No
Comment about differential on the roading rate	
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here	
	r business should not pay more as the council is collecting money but
drags stones down onto the sealed bit and once every couple of ye	ouncil maintained- in theory, but has never had a grader over it. The traffic ears the brush truck pushes them back up. There is no way we should pay To the best of my knowledge Mill rd was resealed with earthquake money ears
2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate	
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area s irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggested to	should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs to be \$200.00 including GST.
at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportion	es will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while characters of the roading rate differential on high value properties. Interest and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with
New Roading Uniform Target Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree	or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	○ No
Comment about new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate	65

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

in the rural area (Lynton Downs, Clarence and Kekerengu).

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.

## 3. Increase the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates

These three targeted rates currently apply a differential on semi-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are less than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban services. In essence, the Council is suggesting that the current differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed to increase the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the rural differential to be standardized at 0.25.

Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and Town Centre Rates Differential		
I agree with this suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested changes	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
Yes	○ No	
Comment about Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and Town Ce	ntre Rates	
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here	and an effective and Control to Manager to the conference of the control to the c	
This is silly. Where does the 15mins come from- you are 15 mins rom people that go into town to buy things and keep the town moving have		
people that go me to me to buy things and neep the tom morning ha		
4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge		
Currently any property that provides assembled the for visitors by	t descrit most the definition of a commercial preparty (generally	
Currently, any property that provides accommodation for visitors, bu	ccommodation Sector Charge of \$400.00 including GST per year. The	
Council is suggesting this is too low.		
The Council is suggesting that the Accommodation Sector Charge be	increased to \$600.00 including GST per year, so these smaller	
accommodation providers are contributing a fairer share towards Council activities that support tourism.		
Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.		
Yes	○ No	
Comment about the Accommodation Sector Charge		
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here		
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		
5. The Rural Recycling Rate		

66

The Council is suggesting introducing the rural recycling rate, as a fixed dollar amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit, to cover the cost of collecting recyclable material from communal collection points - for rural properties only because the collection sites are

The Rural Recycling Rate		
I agree with this suggested change		
	or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
Yes	○ No	
Comment the set the Burel Beautiful Bate		
Comment about the Rural Recycling Rate  Add your comments and alternative suggestions here		
We recycle our own at work, get no service at either Ocean ridge or N	Aill rd. I have no intention of naving more for a service we don't get	
We recycle our own at work, get no service at eliner occurringe or it	milita. Thave no intention of paying more for a service we don't get.	
6. Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge		
Currently all commercial properties pay a public rubbish bin charge regardless of the capital value of the property (for the 2023/2024 year this is \$162.46 including GST), which covers 50% of the cost of emptying these public rubbish bins, with the balance 50% funded by general rates. The Council is now suggesting that there is no need for a separate targeted rate for the emptying of public rubbish bins, and that the portion of costs currently funded by the Public Rubbish Bin Charge instead be funded by commercial rates.		
Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge		
I agree with this suggested change		
	or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
Yes	○ No	
Comment about the Public Rubbish Bin Charge Add your comments and alternative suggestions here Robbing peter to pay Paul- stupid.		
7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate		
The Council wishes to make provision in the Revenue and Financing Policy for the ability to levy a Harbour Special Operator rate. The Council is suggesting that it is appropriate for the net costs of harbour activities (after all other sources of revenue such as slipway fees, boat parking fees, cruise ship fees, etc), could be covered by a combination of the existing commercial rate and harbour rate (set on differential), plus a proposed new Harbour Special Operator Rate to apply to special operators in proportion to the areas that they each have exclusive use over.		
Note that the Council is having separate conversations with each of the special operators that we have identified, and that this new rate will be subject to the outcome of those discussions, as well as a legal review.		
We do, however, still want your feedback on the principles of this suggestion.		
A new Harbour Special Operator Rate		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
gggs cagc		
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.		
Yes	○ No	
Comment about a new Harbour Special Operator Rate  Add your comments and alternative suggestions here		

I don't know anything about this as it does not affect me but user pays does seem fair.

### 8. Changes to how some activities should be funded

compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested changes is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees. Changes to how some activities should be funded I agree with this suggested change I disagree with this suggested change Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions. No Yes 9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP) We are suggesting a new definition for the SUIP. While the proposed definition is not a significant change, it is helpful for ratepayers and Council staff to have a clear understanding of the definition, so that it is consistently applied. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP) I agree with this suggested change I disagree with this suggested change Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions. Yes No Do you wish to present your opinion in person to the Council at a Hearing?\* Five minute slots will be allocated to each person who wishes to present their submission in person. Yes No Thank you for taking the time to make this submission. What happens next? Once we have received feedback (by noon 24 October 2023) we will commence a legal review of the suggested changes, including of the feedback suggestions, and have a hearing for people to present their views to the Council. When are the key dates? Submissions open: 18th September 2023 Submissions close: 24th October 2023 1st - 17th November 2023 Hearings: Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023 Changes take effect: 1st July 2024

While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources,

### **Rates Review 2023**



We are considering options for making our rating system fairer. We have outlined our suggestions as to how we could do this, and invite you to tell us what you think.

This consultation runs from noon 18th September to noon 24th October 2023

If you run out of time you can save the form as draft and comeback and finish it at any time before noon on 24th October 2023.

1. Submitter Details	
First Name*	Family Name*
Mark	Giles
Organisation Name (optional)	
Contact Details (required)	
In the space below, please provide either:	
<ul><li>Email Address</li><li>Phone Number; or</li><li>Postal Address;</li></ul>	
Contact Phone Number	E-mail Address
Redacted	Redacted
Postal Address Redacted	
Are you a ratepayer in the Kaikoura District*	
Yes	○ No
If yes, what is your address?  We need this information to understand how your of Redacted	opinion might be affected by whether you live in the urban, semi-rural , or rural area.
2. Submission	
There are nine suggested changes to the rating sys the relevant section of this submission form below.	tem that we are consulting on. More information is available on the KDC website and in

# In summary the suggested changes cover:

- 1. A new differential on the Roading Rate
- 2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate
- 3. Increase to the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates
- 4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge
- 5. Rural Recycling Rate
- 6. Removal of Public Rubbish Bin Charge

<ul><li>8. Changes to how some activities are funded</li><li>9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)</li></ul>			
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested changes, you can tick the appropriate box below, and send us this form.			
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested changes,	you can tick the appropriate box below, and submit the form.*		
I agree with all of the suggested changes	I disagree with some of the suggested changes		
If you agree with some of the suggested changes, but not all, please of	ontinue to complete this survey form.		
1. A Differential on the Roading Rate			
	ling Rate, that would mean commercial properties, and properties of roading because these properties have a greater impact on the		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change		
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or   Yes	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestion.		
	roads as we only drive our car to the township for supliesmore so its to insure the roads are covered for repair, the same for private vehicles		
2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate			
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area sh irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggested to be	ould contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs be \$200.00 including GST.		
at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportion	will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while ate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. e, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with		
New Roading Uniform Target Rate			
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change		
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or   Yes	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.		
Comment about new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate  Add your comments and alternative suggestions here  once again double dippingvehicles already pay road tax to repair r	oads		

7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate

# 3. Increase the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates

These three targeted rates currently apply a differential on semi-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are less than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban services. In essence, the Council is suggesting that the current differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed to increase the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the rural differential to be standardized at 0.25.

Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and Town Centre Rates Diff	ferential		
I agree with this suggested changes	○ I disagree with this suggested changes		
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree of	or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.		
Yes	○ No		
4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charg			
4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charg			
Currently, any property that provides accommodation for visitors, but doesn't meet the definition of a commercial property (generally because they can only accommodate 4 guests or less), is levied the Accommodation Sector Charge of \$400.00 including GST per year. The Council is suggesting this is too low.			
The Council is suggesting that the Accommodation Sector Charge be increased to \$600.00 including GST per year, so these smaller accommodation providers are contributing a fairer share towards Council activities that support tourism.			
Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge			
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change		
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.			
○ Yes	○ No		
5 T D 1D 1' D 1			
5. The Rural Recycling Rate			
The Council is suggesting introducing the rural recycling rate, as a fixed dollar amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit, to cover the cost of collecting recyclable material from communal collection points - for rural properties only because the collection sites are in the rural area (Lynton Downs, Clarence and Kekerengu).			
The Rural Recycling Rate			
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change		
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.			
Yes	No		
	⊕o		

# 6. Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge

Currently all commercial properties pay a public rubbish bin charge regardless of the capital value of the property (for the 2023/2024 year this is \$162.46 including GST), which covers 50% of the cost of emptying these public rubbish bins, with the balance 50% funded by general rates. The Council is now suggesting that there is no need for a separate targeted rate for the emptying of public rubbish bins, and that the portion of costs currently funded by the Public Rubbish Bin Charge instead be funded by commercial rates.

Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree of	or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
Yes	○ No	
Comment about the Public Rubbish Bin Charge		
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here		
you have removed most of the rubbish bins anyway. THAY NEED TO	BE REPLACED	
7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate		
is suggesting that it is appropriate for the net costs of harbour active fees, cruise ship fees, etc), could be covered by a combination of the	g Policy for the ability to levy a Harbour Special Operator rate. The Council wities (after all other sources of revenue such as slipway fees, boat parking be existing commercial rate and harbour rate (set on differential), plus a operators in proportion to the areas that they each have exclusive use over.	
Note that the Council is having separate conversations with each of the special operators that we have identified, and that this new rate will be subject to the outcome of those discussions, as well as a legal review.		
We do, however, still want your feedback on the principles of this s	uggestion.	
A new Harbour Special Operator Rate		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
. ag. so man and saggested shange	. alsagiso mai ano saggestes silange	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree o	or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
○ Yes	○ No	
8. Changes to how some activities should be	funded	
While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested changes is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.		
Changes to how some activities should be funded		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree of	or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
Yes	○ No	
Comment about changes to how some activities should be fu	unded	
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here		
If we don't use it why should we pay for it. THE RATES ARE FAR TO H	HIGH AS II IS GRRR	
9 A new definition for the Separately Used or	Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)	

We are suggesting a new definition for the SUIP. While the proposed definition is not a significant change, it is helpful for ratepayers and 72

Council staff to have a clear understanding of the definition, so that it is consistently applied.		
A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.		
○ Yes	○ No	
Do you wish to present your opinion in person to the Coun	oil at a Hearing 2 *	
Five minute slots will be allocated to each person who wishes to		
Yes	No	
0.00		
Thank you for taking the time to make this submission.		
What happens next?		
Once we have received feedback (by noon 24 October 2023) we will commence a legal review of the suggested changes, including of the feedback suggestions, and have a hearing for people to present their views to the Council.		
When are the key dates?		
Submissions open: 18th September 2023		
Submissions close: 24th October 2023		
Hearings: 1st - 17th November 2023		
Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023		
Changes take effect: 1st July 2024		

## **Rates Review 2023**



We are considering options for making our rating system fairer. We have outlined our suggestions as to how we could do this, and invite you to tell us what you think.

This consultation runs from noon 18th September to noon 24th October 2023

If you run out of time you can save the form as draft and comeback and finish it at any time before noon on 24th October 2023.

	Submitter Details	
	First Name* LAWRENCE	Family Name* GLEDHILL
	Organisation Name (optional)	GLEDHILL
	Organisation Name (optional)	
	Contact Details (required)	
	In the space below, please provide either:	
	<ul><li>Email Address</li><li>Phone Number; or</li><li>Postal Address;</li></ul>	
	Contact Phone Number	E-mail Address
	redacted	redacted
	Postal Address	
	redacted	
	Are you a ratepayer in the Kaikoura District*	
		○ No
ı	If yes, what is your address?	
	We need this information to understand how your opinion might be affered acted	ected by whether you live in the urban, semi-rural , or rural area.
	2. Submission	
	There are nine suggested changes to the rating system that we are cons	sulting on. More information is available on the KDC website and in
	2 2 2 200 coste a criscing of a criscing of section that we are con-	zamo and management and management and management and management and management and management and and management and

1. A new differential on the Roading Rate

the relevant section of this submission form below.

2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate

<ul><li>3. Increase to the differential on the Footpath &amp; Streetlights, H</li><li>4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge</li><li>5. Rural Recycling Rate</li></ul>	arbour, and Town Centre Rates
<ol> <li>Removal of Public Rubbish Bin Charge</li> <li>A new Harbour Special Operator Rate</li> </ol>	
8. Changes to how some activities are funded	
9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part o	f a Rating Unit (SUIP)
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested changes, you co	an tick the appropriate box below, and send us this form.
	s, you can tick the appropriate box below, and submit the form.*
I agree with all of the suggested changes	I disagree with some of the suggested changes
If you agree with some of the suggested changes, but not all, please	continue to complete this survey form.
1. A Differential on the Roading Rate	
	oding Rate, that would mean commercial properties, and properties of roading because these properties have a greater impact on the
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree o	or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestion.
Yes	○ No
Comment about differential on the roading rate  Add your comments and alternative suggestions here	
RURAL PROPERTIES USE LESS OF THE ROADS BECAUSE THEY LIVE F	RURALLY AND HAVE FARMS TO RUN AND THE COST OF PETROL. RURAL MER WHO IS GOING TO TOWN TO PICK THINGS UP. FARMERS DO NOT USE
THE ROADS AS MUCH AS RESIDENTIAL. YOU SHOULD BE TARGET PARTICULAR	ING THE ACTUAL TRUCKIES OF THIS WORLDTHEIR COMPANIES IN
A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate	
217 the treating entire hangeted reac	
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area s irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggested to	hould contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs be \$200.00 including GST.
at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportio	s will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while nate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. te, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with
New Roading Uniform Target Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree o	or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	○ No
Comment about new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate	75
	. •

## 3. Increase the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates

These three targeted rates currently apply a differential on semi-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are less than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban services. In essence, the Council is suggesting that the current differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed to increase the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the rural differential to be standardized at 0.25.

Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and Town Centre Rates Differential		
I agree with this suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested changes	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
Yes	No	
Comment about Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and Town Ce	ntre Rates	
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here WRONG THOSE USING OUR FOOTPATHS MORE ARE TOURISTS AND H	OLIDAY MAKEDS NOT THE LOCALS	
WRONG THOSE USING OUR FOOTFATHS MORE ARE TOURISTS AND TH	OLIDAT WAKERS NOT THE EOCALS	
4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge		
Currently, any property that provides accommodation for visitors, but doesn't meet the definition of a commercial property (generally because they can only accommodate 4 guests or less), is levied the Accommodation Sector Charge of \$400.00 including GST per year. The Council is suggesting this is too low.		
The Council is suggesting that the Accommodation Sector Charge be increased to \$600.00 including GST per year, so these smaller accommodation providers are contributing a fairer share towards Council activities that support tourism.		
Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or o	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
Yes	○ No	
Comment about the Accommodation Sector Charge		
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here		
A \$200 INCREASE TO THIS SECTOR IS RIDICULOUS. LEAVE IT AS THE STA	ALUS QUO	
5. The Rural Recycling Rate		
The Council is suggesting introducing the rural recycling rate, as a fixe	ed dollar amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit,	

#### The Rural Recycling Rate

in the rural area (Lynton Downs, Clarence and Kekerengu).

to cover the cost of collecting recyclable material from communal collection points - for rural properties only because the collection sites are

Would you like to add a comment to explain why yo	ou agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	○ No
Comment about the Rural Recycling Rate Add your comments and alternative suggestions here THIS IS NOT A GOOD IDEA. WE ALREADY GET VERY LITTLE	FOR OUR RATES WE PAY IN CLARENCE. LEAVE IT AS IT IS
6. Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Cha	arge
this is \$162.46 including GST), which covers 50% of the c	bin charge regardless of the capital value of the property (for the 2023/2024 year cost of emptying these public rubbish bins, with the balance 50% funded by general ed for a separate targeted rate for the emptying of public rubbish bins, and that the Bin Charge instead be funded by commercial rates.
Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why yo	ou agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	○ No
Comment about the Public Rubbish Bin Charge Add your comments and alternative suggestions here PUBLIC RUBBISH BIN SHOULD BE COVERED BY EVERYONE	: :
7. A new Harbour Special Operator Ra	ate
is suggesting that it is appropriate for the net costs of ha fees, cruise ship fees, etc), could be covered by a combin	Ind Financing Policy for the ability to levy a Harbour Special Operator rate. The Council arbour activities (after all other sources of revenue such as slipway fees, boat parking mation of the existing commercial rate and harbour rate (set on differential), plus a to special operators in proportion to the areas that they each have exclusive use over.
Note that the Council is having separate conversations with each of the special operators that we have identified, and that this new rate will be subject to the outcome of those discussions, as well as a legal review.	
We do, however, still want your feedback on the principl	es of this suggestion.
A new Harbour Special Operator Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why yo	ou agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
8. Changes to how some activities sho	ould be funded

While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested changes is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.

Changes to how some activities should be funded		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions	
	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No	
Yes	∪ NO	
9. A new definition for the Separately Used or I	nhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)	
We are suggesting a new definition for the SUIP. While the proposed definition is not a significant change, it is helpful for ratepayers and Council staff to have a clear understanding of the definition, so that it is consistently applied.		
A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a	Rating Unit (SUIP)	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
○ Yes	◎ No	
Do you wish to present your opinion in person to the Council at	a Hearing?*	
Five minute slots will be allocated to each person who wishes to pres	_	
○ Yes	⊚ No	
Thank you for taking the t	ime to make this submission.	
What happens next?		
Once we have received feedback (by noon 24 October 2023) we will co feedback suggestions, and have a hearing for people to present their v		
When are the key dates?		
Submissions open: 18th September 2023		
Submissions close: 24th October 2023		
Hearings: 1st - 17th November 2023		
Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023		
Changes take effect: 1st July 2024		

## **Rates Review 2023**



We are considering options for making our rating system fairer. We have outlined our suggestions as to how we could do this, and invite you to tell us what you think.

This consultation runs from noon 18th September to noon 24th October 2023

If you run out of time you can save the form as draft and comeback and finish it at any time before noon on 24th October 2023.

1. Submitter Details	
First Name*	Family Name*
ainslie	green
Organisation Name (optional)	
Contact Details (required)	
In the space below, please provide either:	
<ul><li>Email Address</li><li>Phone Number; or</li><li>Postal Address;</li></ul>	
Contact Phone Number	E-mail Address
Redacted	Redacted
Postal Address	
Redacted	
Are you a ratepayer in the Kaikoura District*	
Yes	○ No
If yes, what is your address?	
We need this information to understand how your opinion might be a	ffected by whether you live in the urban, semi-rural , or rural area.
Redacted	
2. Submission	
There are nine suggested changes to the rating system that we are co	onsulting on. More information is available on the KDC website and in

In summary the suggested changes cover:

1. A new differential on the Roading Rate

the relevant section of this submission form below.

- 2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate
- 3. Increase to the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates

<ul><li>4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge</li><li>5. Rural Recycling Rate</li><li>6. Removal of Public Rubbish Bin Charge</li><li>7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate</li></ul>	
<ul><li>8. Changes to how some activities are funded</li><li>9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part</li></ul>	of a Rating Unit (SUIP)
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested changes, you	can tick the appropriate box below, and send us this form.
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested chang	es, you can tick the appropriate box below, and submit the form.*
I agree with all of the suggested changes	I disagree with some of the suggested changes
If you agree with some of the suggested changes, but not all, pleas	e continue to complete this survey form.
1. A Differential on the Roading Rate	
	pading Rate, that would mean commercial properties, and properties st of roading because these properties have a greater impact on the
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree	or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestion.
Yes	○ No
culvert. Much of the traffic up our rural road is from recreational identified our private farm roads as public, therefore creating th	ie tarseal . God forbid they should encounter a wee pothole or a blocked activity ,and latterly, out of the local camping grounds. google maps has e false impression that people can drive up the valley and thru our farm. ifting the cost of roading on to rural people while urban people use roads
2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate	
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggested	should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs to be \$200.00 including GST.
at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproporti	ies will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while ionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with
New Roading Uniform Target Rate	
○ I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree	e or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	○ No
Comment about new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate	
	80

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

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.

## 3. Increase the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates

These three targeted rates currently apply a differential on semi-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are less than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban services. In essence, the Council is suggesting that the current differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed to increase the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the rural differential to be standardized at 0.25.

Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and Town Centre Rates Differential		
I agree with this suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested changes	
W. H		
	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
Yes	○ No	
Comment about Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and Town Co	entre Rates	
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here		
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.	
4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge		
Currently, any property that provides accommodation for visitors, but doesn't meet the definition of a commercial property (generally because they can only accommodate 4 guests or less), is levied the Accommodation Sector Charge of \$400.00 including GST per year. The Council is suggesting this is too low.		
The Council is suggesting that the Accommodation Sector Charge be increased to \$600.00 including GST per year, so these smaller accommodation providers are contributing a fairer share towards Council activities that support tourism.		
Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
Yes	No	
Tes	● NO	
5. The Rural Recycling Rate		
The Council is suggesting introducing the rural recycling rate, as a fixed dollar amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit, to cover the cost of collecting recyclable material from communal collection points - for rural properties only because the collection sites are in the rural area (Lynton Downs, Clarence and Kekerengu).		
The Rural Recycling Rate		
I agree with this suggested change	○ I disagree with this suggested change	

Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
○ Yes	○ No	
6. Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge		
this is \$162.46 including GST), which covers 50% of the cost of empty	regardless of the capital value of the property (for the 2023/2024 year ying these public rubbish bins, with the balance 50% funded by general arate targeted rate for the emptying of public rubbish bins, and that the nstead be funded by commercial rates.	
Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
○ Yes	No     No     No	
7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate		
The Council wishes to make provision in the Revenue and Financing Policy for the ability to levy a Harbour Special Operator rate. The Council is suggesting that it is appropriate for the net costs of harbour activities (after all other sources of revenue such as slipway fees, boat parking fees, cruise ship fees, etc.), could be covered by a combination of the existing commercial rate and harbour rate (set on differential), plus a proposed new Harbour Special Operator Rate to apply to special operators in proportion to the areas that they each have exclusive use over.  Note that the Council is having separate conversations with each of the special operators that we have identified, and that this new rate will be subject to the outcome of those discussions, as well as a legal review.  We do, however, still want your feedback on the principles of this suggestion.		
A new Harbour Special Operator Rate		
I agree with this suggested change	○ I disagree with this suggested change	
	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
○ Yes	No     No     No	
8. Changes to how some activities should be for	unded	
While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested changes is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.		
Changes to how some activities should be funded		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
Yes	No	

# 9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)

We are suggesting a new definition for the SUIP. While the proposed definition is not a significant change, it is helpful for ratepayers and Council staff to have a clear understanding of the definition, so that it is consistently applied.		
Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)		
I disagree with this suggested change		
explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.		
○ No		
Comment about a new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)  Add your comments and alternative suggestions here what is the new definition? clarification required		
in person to the Council at a Hearing?* The person who wishes to present their submission in person.		
No		
Thank you for taking the time to make this submission.		
n 24 October 2023) we will commence a legal review of the suggested changes, including of the g for people to present their views to the Council.		
23		
r 2023		
23		
Changes take effect: 1st July 2024		

## **Rates Review 2023**



We are considering options for making our rating system fairer. We have outlined our suggestions as to how we could do this, and invite you to tell us what you think.

This consultation runs from noon 18th September to noon 24th October 2023

If you run out of time you can save the form as draft and comeback and finish it at any time before noon on 24th October 2023.

Submitter Details	
First Name*	Family Name *
Robin	Green
Organisation Name (optional)	
Contact Details (required)	
In the space below, please provide either:	
<ul><li>Email Address</li><li>Phone Number; or</li><li>Postal Address;</li></ul>	
Contact Phone Number	E-mail Address
redacted	redacted
Postal Address redacted	
Are you a ratepayer in the Kaikoura District*	
Yes	○ No
If yes, what is your address?	
We need this information to understand how your opinion might be a	iffected by whether you live in the urban, semi-rural , or rural area.
800 Kekerengu Valley Road.	
2. Submission	
There are nine suggested changes to the rating system that we are co	onsulting on. More information is available on the KDC website and in

There are nine suggested changes to the rating system that we are consulting on. More information is available on the KDC website and in the relevant section of this submission form below.

- 1. A new differential on the Roading Rate
- 2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate
- 3. Increase to the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates
- 4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge
- 5. Rural Recycling Rate

8. Changes to how some activities are funded	
9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited	d Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested change	s, you can tick the appropriate box below, and send us this form.
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested of	hanges, you can tick the appropriate box below, and submit the form.*
I agree with all of the suggested changes	I disagree with some of the suggested changes
If you agree with some of the suggested changes, but not all,	please continue to complete this survey form.
1. A Differential on the Roading Rate	
	he Roading Rate, that would mean commercial properties, and properties ne cost of roading because these properties have a greater impact on the
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you	agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestion.
Yes	⊚ No
2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate	9
	area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs
irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is sugge	
This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural pro at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the dispro	
This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural proposed at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproposed we are proposing that the differential on the Road each other.	operties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while oportionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.
This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural pro at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the dispro Note we are proposing that the differential on the Road	operties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while oportionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.
This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural proat the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disprovate we are proposing that the differential on the Road each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change	operties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while oportionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. ding Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with
This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural proposed at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the dispression of the Road each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you	operties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while oportionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. ding Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with  I disagree with this suggested change  agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural proat the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disprovate we are proposing that the differential on the Road each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change	operties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while oportionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. ding Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with
This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural proposed at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the dispression of the Road each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you	operties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while oportionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. ding Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with  I disagree with this suggested change  agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural proat the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disprovence we are proposing that the differential on the Road each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you  Yes	operties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while oportionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. ding Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with  I disagree with this suggested change  agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural proat the same time the fixed amount mitigates the dispression of the Road each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you  Yes  These three targeted rates currently apply a differential on differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are	perties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while opportionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. ding Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with  I disagree with this suggested change  agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No  No  No  Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates  semi-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the less than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban rent differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed
This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural proat the same time the fixed amount mitigates the dispression Note we are proposing that the differential on the Road each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you  Yes  3. Increase the differential on the Footpath These three targeted rates currently apply a differential on differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are services. In essence, the Council is suggesting that the currently apply and the currently suggesting that the currently suggesting the currently suggesting t	perties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while opertionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. ding Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with  I disagree with this suggested change  agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No  No  No  Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates  semi-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the less than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban rent differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed for the rural differential to be standardized at 0.25.

would you like to add a comment to explain w	vny you agree or disagree, and let us know it you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	No
4. Increase the Accommodation Se	ector Charge
4. IIICIEase lile Accommodation Se	soloi Olialye
	tion for visitors, but doesn't meet the definition of a commercial property (generally ess), is levied the Accommodation Sector Charge of \$400.00 including GST per year. The
	n Sector Charge be increased to \$600.00 including GST per year, so these smaller r share towards Council activities that support tourism.
Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain w	why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	No
5. The Rural Recycling Rate	
	ycling rate, as a fixed dollar amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit, from communal collection points - for rural properties only because the collection sites are erengu).
The Rural Recycling Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain w	why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	No
6. Remove the Public Rubbish Bin	Charge
this is \$162.46 including GST), which covers 50% of rates. The Council is now suggesting that there is r	ubbish bin charge regardless of the capital value of the property (for the 2023/2024 year f the cost of emptying these public rubbish bins, with the balance 50% funded by general no need for a separate targeted rate for the emptying of public rubbish bins, and that the bbish Bin Charge instead be funded by commercial rates.
Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge	
I agree with this suggested change	○ I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain w	why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	No
7. A new Harbour Special Operato	or Rate

is suggesting that it is appropriate for the net costs of harbour activities (after all other sources of revenue such as slipway fees, boat parking fees, cruise ship fees, etc), could be covered by a combination of the existing commercial rate and harbour rate (set on differential), plus a proposed new Harbour Special Operator Rate to apply to special operators in proportion to the areas that they each have exclusive use over. Note that the Council is having separate conversations with each of the special operators that we have identified, and that this new rate will be subject to the outcome of those discussions, as well as a legal review. We do, however, still want your feedback on the principles of this suggestion. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate I agree with this suggested change I disagree with this suggested change Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions. No Yes Changes to how some activities should be funded While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested changes is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees. Changes to how some activities should be funded I agree with this suggested change I disagree with this suggested change Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions. Yes No 9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP) We are suggesting a new definition for the SUIP. While the proposed definition is not a significant change, it is helpful for ratepayers and Council staff to have a clear understanding of the definition, so that it is consistently applied. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP) I agree with this suggested change I disagree with this suggested change Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions. Yes No Do you wish to present your opinion in person to the Council at a Hearing?\* Five minute slots will be allocated to each person who wishes to present their submission in person. Yes No Thank you for taking the time to make this submission.

The Council wishes to make provision in the Revenue and Financing Policy for the ability to levy a Harbour Special Operator rate. The Council

What happens next?

Once we have received feedback (by noon 24 October 2023) we will commence a legal review of the suggested changes, including of the feedback suggestions, and have a hearing for people to present their views to the Council.

# When are the key dates?

Submissions open: 18th September 2023

Submissions close: 24th October 2023

Hearings: 1st - 17th November 2023

Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023

#### Rates Review 2023



We are considering options for making our rating system fairer. We have outlined our suggestions as to how we could do this, and invite you to tell us what you think.

This consultation runs from noon 18th September to noon 24th October 2023

If you run out of time you can save the form as draft and comeback and finish it at any time before noon on 24th October 2023.

Submitter Details	
First Name*	Family Name*
ALAN	GULLEFORD
Organisation Name (optional)	
Contact Details (required)	
In the space below, please provide either:	
<ul><li>Email Address</li><li>Phone Number; or</li><li>Postal Address;</li></ul>	
Contact Phone Number	E-mail Address
Redacted	Redacted
Postal Address	
Redacted	
Are you a ratepayer in the Kaikoura District*	
Yes	○ No
If yes, what is your address?	
	r opinion might be affected by whether you live in the urban, semi-rural , or rural area.
Redacted	
2. Submission	
There are nine suggested changes to the rating s	vstem that we are consulting on. More information is available on the KDC website and in

1. A new differential on the Roading Rate

the relevant section of this submission form below.

2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate

- 3. Increase to the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates
- 4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge
- 5. Rural Recycling Rate
- 6. Removal of Public Rubbish Bin Charge

<ul><li>7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate</li><li>8. Changes to how some activities are funded</li><li>9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of</li></ul>	a Rating Unit (SUIP)
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested changes, you can	n tick the appropriate box below, and send us this form.
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested changes,	you can tick the appropriate box below, and submit the form.*
I agree with all of the suggested changes	I disagree with all of the suggested changes
If you agree with some of the suggested changes, but not all, please co	ontinue to complete this survey form.
1. A Differential on the Roading Rate	
	ing Rate, that would mean commercial properties, and properties froading because these properties have a greater impact on the
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestion.
○ Yes	○ No
A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate	
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area sh irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggested to b	ould contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs oe \$200.00 including GST.
at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportion	will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while ate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. e, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with
New Roading Uniform Target Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	○ No
3. Increase the differential on the Footpath & S	treetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates
differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are less than	rential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed
Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and Town Centre Rates Diffe	
	rential
I agree with this suggested changes	rential  I disagree with this suggested changes

Would you like to add a comment to explain why you ag	gree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	○ No
4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Ch	narge
	tors, but doesn't meet the definition of a commercial property (generally ed the Accommodation Sector Charge of \$400.00 including GST per year. The
The Council is suggesting that the Accommodation Sector Cha accommodation providers are contributing a fairer share tow	arge be increased to \$600.00 including GST per year, so these smaller rards Council activities that support tourism.
Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge	
I agree with this suggested change	○ I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you ag	gree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	○ No
5. The Rural Recycling Rate	
	as a fixed dollar amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit, unal collection points - for rural properties only because the collection sites are
The Rural Recycling Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	○ I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you ag	gree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	○ No
6. Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge	<del></del>
is \$162.46 including GST), which covers 50% of the cost of em	charge regardless of the capital value of the property (for the 2023/2024 year this aptying these public rubbish bins, with the balance 50% funded by general rates. arate targeted rate for the emptying of public rubbish bins, and that the portion is stead be funded by commercial rates.
Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you ag	gree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	○ No
7 A new Harbour Special Operator Rate	

is suggesting that it is appropriate for the net costs of harbour activities (after all other sources of revenue such as slipway fees, boat parking fees, cruise ship fees, etc), could be covered by a combination of the existing commercial rate and harbour rate (set on differential), plus a proposed new Harbour Special Operator Rate to apply to special operators in proportion to the areas that they each have exclusive use over. Note that the Council is having separate conversations with each of the special operators that we have identified, and that this new rate will be subject to the outcome of those discussions, as well as a legal review. We do, however, still want your feedback on the principles of this suggestion. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate I agree with this suggested change I disagree with this suggested change Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions. Yes O No 8. Changes to how some activities should be funded While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested changes is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees. Changes to how some activities should be funded I agree with this suggested change I disagree with this suggested change Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions. Yes O No 9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP) We are suggesting a new definition for the SUIP. While the proposed definition is not a significant change, it is helpful for ratepayers and Council staff to have a clear understanding of the definition, so that it is consistently applied. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP) I agree with this suggested change I disagree with this suggested change Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions. Yes O No Do you wish to present your opinion in person to the Council at a Hearing?\* Five minute slots will be allocated to each person who wishes to present their submission in person. Yes No Thank you for taking the time to make this submission.

The Council wishes to make provision in the Revenue and Financing Policy for the ability to levy a Harbour Special Operator rate. The Council

What happens next?

Once we have received feedback (by noon 24 October 2023) we will commence a legal review of the suggested changes, including of the feedback suggestions, and have a hearing for people to present their views to the Council.

## When are the key dates?

Submissions open: 18th September 2023

Submissions close: 24th October 2023

Hearings: 1st - 17th November 2023

Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023

#### Rates Review 2023



We are considering options for making our rating system fairer. We have outlined our suggestions as to how we could do this, and invite you to tell us what you think.

This consultation runs from noon 18th September to noon 24th October 2023

If you run out of time you can save the form as draft and comeback and finish it at any time before noon on 24th October 2023.

Submitter Details	
First Name*	Family Name*
Ryan	Haigh
Organisation Name (optional)	
Contact Details (required)	
In the space below, please provide either:	
<ul><li>Email Address</li><li>Phone Number; or</li><li>Postal Address;</li></ul>	
Contact Phone Number redacted	E-mail Address
Postal Address	
Are you a ratepayer in the Kaikoura District	**
Yes	○ No
If yes, what is your address?  We need this information to understand how your address.	your opinion might be affected by whether you live in the urban, semi-rural , or rural area.
2. Submission	
There are nine suggested changes to the rating the relevant section of this submission form h	g system that we are consulting on. More information is available on the KDC website and in

- 1. A new differential on the Roading Rate
- 2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate
- 3. Increase to the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates
- 4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge
- 5. Rural Recycling Rate
- 6. Removal of Public Rubbish Bin Charge
- 7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate

9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a	a Rating Unit (SUIP)
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested changes, you can	tick the appropriate box below, and send us this form.
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested changes,	you can tick the appropriate box below, and submit the form.*
I agree with all of the suggested changes	○ I disagree with all of the suggested changes
If you agree with some of the suggested changes, but not all, please co	ontinue to complete this survey form.
1. A Differential on the Roading Rate	
	ing Rate, that would mean commercial properties, and properties f roading because these properties have a greater impact on the
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestion.
Yes	○ No
Comment about differential on the roading rate  Add your comments and alternative suggestions here  Please explain how rural properties have more impact on roads com  2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate	pared to non rural that spend the day going up and down through town?
irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggested to b  This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural properties of the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportional	ould contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs to \$200.00 including GST.  will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while ate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.  a, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with
New Roading Uniform Target Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or  Yes	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.   No
3. Increase the differential on the Footpath & S	treetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates
These three targeted rates currently apply a differential on semi-rura	al and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the

8. Changes to how some activities are funded

differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are less than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban services. In essence, the Council is suggesting that the current differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed

to increase the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the rural differential to be standardized at 0.25.

Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and Town Centre Rates Diffe	rential
I agree with this suggested changes	○ I disagree with this suggested changes
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	No     No     No
0.11	
4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge	
Currently, any property that provides accommodation for visitors, be because they can only accommodate 4 guests or less), is levied the A Council is suggesting this is too low.	ut doesn't meet the definition of a commercial property (generally Accommodation Sector Charge of \$400.00 including GST per year. The
The Council is suggesting that the Accommodation Sector Charge be accommodation providers are contributing a fairer share towards Co	
Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	No
5. The Rural Recycling Rate	
	ted dollar amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit, ollection points - for rural properties only because the collection sites are
The Rural Recycling Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	No
6. Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge	
is \$162.46 including GST), which covers 50% of the cost of emptying	regardless of the capital value of the property (for the 2023/2024 year this these public rubbish bins, with the balance 50% funded by general rates. argeted rate for the emptying of public rubbish bins, and that the portion be funded by commercial rates.
Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	No     No

## 7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate

The Council wishes to make provision in the Revenue and Financing Policy for the ability to levy a Harbour Special Operator rate. The Council is suggesting that it is appropriate for the net costs of harbour activities (after all other sources of revenue such as slipway fees, boat parking fees, cruise ship fees, etc), could be covered by a combination of the existing commercial rate and harbour rate (set on differential), plus a proposed new Harbour Special Operator Rate to apply to special operators in proportion to the areas that they each have exclusive use over.

Note that the Council is having separate conversations with each of the special operators that we have identified, and that this new rate will be subject to the outcome of those discussions, as well as a legal review.

We do, however, still want your feedback on the principles of this suggestion.

A new Harbour Special Operator Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or  Yes	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
8. Changes to how some activities should be fu	ınded
	debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, s is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do buncil expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.
Changes to how some activities should be funded	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	◎ No
9. A new definition for the Separately Used or I	nhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)
We are suggesting a new definition for the SUIP. While the proposed Council staff to have a clear understanding of the definition, so that i	
A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a	Rating Unit (SUIP)
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
W. H	
Yes	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Tes	No     No
Do you wish to present your opinion in person to the Council at	a Hearing?*
Five minute slots will be allocated to each person who wishes to preson	_
○ Yes	⊚ No

## What happens next?

Once we have received feedback (by noon 24 October 2023) we will commence a legal review of the suggested changes, including of the feedback suggestions, and have a hearing for people to present their views to the Council.

## When are the key dates?

Submissions open: 18th September 2023

Submissions close: 24th October 2023

Hearings: 1st - 17th November 2023

Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023

## **Rates Review 2023**



We are considering options for making our rating system fairer. We have outlined our suggestions as to how we could do this, and invite you to tell us what you think.

This consultation runs from noon 18th September to noon 24th October 2023

If you run out of time you can save the form as draft and comeback and finish it at any time before noon on 24th October 2023.

1. Submitter Details	
First Name*	Family Name*
Liza	Hewison
Organisation Name (optional)	
Contact Details (required)	
In the space below, please provide either:	
<ul><li>Email Address</li><li>Phone Number; or</li><li>Postal Address;</li></ul>	
Contact Phone Number	E-mail Address Redacted
Postal Address	
Redacted	
Are you a ratepayer in the Kaikoura District*	
Yes	○ No
If yes, what is your address?	
We need this information to understand how your opinion might be a Redacted	iffected by whether you live in the urban, semi-rural , or rural area.
2. Submission	

There are nine suggested changes to the rating system that we are consulting on. More information is available on the KDC website and in the relevant section of this submission form below.

- 1. A new differential on the Roading Rate
- 2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate
- 3. Increase to the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates
- 4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge
- 5. Rural Recycling Rate

<ul><li>6. Removal of Public Rubbish Bin Charge</li><li>7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate</li><li>8. Changes to how some activities are funded</li></ul>	
9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited F	Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested changes,	you can tick the appropriate box below, and send us this form.
	anges, you can tick the appropriate box below, and submit the form.*
I agree with all of the suggested changes	I disagree with all of the suggested changes
If you agree with some of the suggested changes, but not all, pl	lease continue to complete this survey form.
1. A Differential on the Roading Rate	
	e Roading Rate, that would mean commercial properties, and properties cost of roading because these properties have a greater impact on the
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you ag	gree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestion.
○ Yes	○ No
2 A new Deading Uniform Targeted Date	
2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate	
	rea should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs ed to be \$200.00 including GST.
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban a irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggest.  This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural prop at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disprop	
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban a irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggest.  This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural prop at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disprop Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roadin	ed to be \$200.00 including GST.  Perties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while ortionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban a irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggest.  This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural prop at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disprop Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roadin each other.	ed to be \$200.00 including GST.  Perties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while ortionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban a irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggest. This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural prop at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disprop Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roadin each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change	eed to be \$200.00 including GST.  Herties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while ortionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. In this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban a irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggest. This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural prop at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disprop Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roadin each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you ag	eed to be \$200.00 including GST.  Perties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while cortionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. In this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with the light of the
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban a irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggest. This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural prop at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disprop Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roadin each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change	eed to be \$200.00 including GST.  Herties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while ortionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. In this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban a irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggest. This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural prop at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disprop Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roadin each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you ago	eed to be \$200.00 including GST.  Perties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while ortionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. In this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with  O I disagree with this suggested change  Pere or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban a irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggest. This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural prop at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disprop Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roadin each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you ago	eed to be \$200.00 including GST.  Perties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while cortionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. In this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with the light of the
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban a irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggest. This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural prop at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disprop Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roadin each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you ago Yes  3. Increase the differential on the Footpath. These three targeted rates currently apply a differential on sed differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are less differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are less	eet to be \$200.00 including GST.  Perties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while cortionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. In the Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with  O I disagree with this suggested change  Pere or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  O No  No  A Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates  Peri-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the ses than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban and differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban a irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggest. This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural prop at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disprop Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roadin each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you ago Yes  3. Increase the differential on the Footpath. These three targeted rates currently apply a differential on sed differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are less services. In essence, the Council is suggesting that the currents.	eet to be \$200.00 including GST.  Perties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while cortionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. In this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with  O I disagree with this suggested change  gree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No  No  A Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates  Peri-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the st than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban at differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed or the rural differential to be standardized at 0.25.

Would you like to add a comment to explain why yo	ou agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	○ No
4. Increase the Accommodation Secto	r Charge
	or visitors, but doesn't meet the definition of a commercial property (generally s levied the Accommodation Sector Charge of \$400.00 including GST per year. The
The Council is suggesting that the Accommodation Sector accommodation providers are contributing a fairer share	or Charge be increased to \$600.00 including GST per year, so these smaller re towards Council activities that support tourism.
Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
	ou agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	○ No
5. The Rural Recycling Rate	
	rate, as a fixed dollar amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit, communal collection points - for rural properties only because the collection sites are tu).
The Rural Recycling Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	○ I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why w	ou agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	No
0.10	
C. Damana tha Dublia Dubbiah Dia Ch	
6. Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Cha	arge
this is \$162.46 including GST), which covers 50% of the c	n bin charge regardless of the capital value of the property (for the 2023/2024 year cost of emptying these public rubbish bins, with the balance 50% funded by general ed for a separate targeted rate for the emptying of public rubbish bins, and that the Bin Charge instead be funded by commercial rates.
Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to evaluin why w	Ou agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an elfernative cuspositions
Yes	ou agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
<u></u>	
7. A new Harbour Special Operator Ra	ate

The Council wishes to make provision in the Revenue and Financing Policy for the ability to levy a Harbour Special Operator rate. The Council is suggesting that it is appropriate for the net costs of harbour activities (after all other sources of revenue such as slipway fees, boat parking fees, cruise ship fees, etc), could be covered by a combination of the existing commercial rate and harbour rate (set on differential), plus a proposed new Harbour Special Operator Rate to apply to special operators in proportion to the areas that they each have exclusive use over. Note that the Council is having separate conversations with each of the special operators that we have identified, and that this new rate will be subject to the outcome of those discussions, as well as a legal review. We do, however, still want your feedback on the principles of this suggestion. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate I agree with this suggested change I disagree with this suggested change Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions. Yes O No Changes to how some activities should be funded While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested changes is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees. Changes to how some activities should be funded I agree with this suggested change I disagree with this suggested change Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions. Yes O No 9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP) We are suggesting a new definition for the SUIP. While the proposed definition is not a significant change, it is helpful for ratepayers and Council staff to have a clear understanding of the definition, so that it is consistently applied. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP) I agree with this suggested change I disagree with this suggested change Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions. Yes O No Do you wish to present your opinion in person to the Council at a Hearing?\* Five minute slots will be allocated to each person who wishes to present their submission in person. Yes No Thank you for taking the time to make this submission.

What happens next?

Once we have received feedback (by noon 24 October 2023) we will commence a legal review of the suggested changes, including of the feedback suggestions, and have a hearing for people to present their views to the Council.

# When are the key dates?

Submissions open: 18th September 2023

Submissions close: 24th October 2023

Hearings: 1st - 17th November 2023

Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023

## **Rates Review 2023**

Culturalities Detaile



We are considering options for making our rating system fairer. We have outlined our suggestions as to how we could do this, and invite you to tell us what you think.

This consultation runs from noon 18th September to noon 24th October 2023

If you run out of time you can save the form as draft and comeback and finish it at any time before noon on 24th October 2023.

1. Submitter Details	
First Name* Doug	Family Name* Hitchon
Organisation Name (optional) na	
Contact Details (required)	
In the space below, please provide either:	
<ul><li>Email Address</li><li>Phone Number; or</li><li>Postal Address;</li></ul>	
Contact Phone Number	E-mail Address
redacted	redacted
Postal Address redacted	
Are you a ratepayer in the Kaikoura District*	
Yes	○ No
If yes, what is your address?  We need this information to understand how your opin redacted	nion might be affected by whether you live in the urban, semi-rural , or rural area.
2. Submission	
There are nine suggested changes to the rating systen the relevant section of this submission form below.	n that we are consulting on. More information is available on the KDC website and in

#### 1. A new differential on the Roading Rate

- 2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate
- 3. Increase to the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates
- 4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge

<ul><li>5. Rural Recycling Rate</li><li>6. Removal of Public Rubbish Bin Charge</li></ul>	
<ul><li>7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate</li><li>8. Changes to how some activities are funded</li></ul>	
A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of the Separately Used Or Inhabited Part Or In	of a Rating Unit (SUIP)
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested changes, you c	an tick the appropriate box below, and send us this form.
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested change	s, you can tick the appropriate box below, and submit the form.*
I agree with all of the suggested changes	I disagree with all of the suggested changes
If you agree with some of the suggested changes, but not all, please	continue to complete this survey form.
1. A Differential on the Roading Rate	
	ading Rate, that would mean commercial properties, and properties of roading because these properties have a greater impact on the
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree	or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestion.
Yes	
9 100	
Comment about differential on the roading rate	
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here	
Our property on SH1 is maintained by Waka Kotahi. Urban and sulfewer.	burban roads have more tonne/miles per person per day load on them, not
2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate	
	should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs to be \$200.00 including GST.
at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportio	es will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while mate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. Ite, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with
New Roading Uniform Target Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree	or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	○ No
Comment about new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate  Add your comments and alternative suggestions here	
Our access road is not maintained by KDC.	

## 3. Increase the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates

These three targeted rates currently apply a differential on semi-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are less than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban services. In essence, the Council is suggesting that the current differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed to increase the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the rural differential to be standardized at 0.25.

Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and Town Centre Rates Differ	rential			
I agree with this suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested changes			
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.			
Yes	No			
les	₩ NO			
4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge				
Currently, any property that provides accommodation for visitors, bu because they can only accommodate 4 guests or less), is levied the A Council is suggesting this is too low.	nt doesn't meet the definition of a commercial property (generally ccommodation Sector Charge of \$400.00 including GST per year. The			
The Council is suggesting that the Accommodation Sector Charge be increased to \$600.00 including GST per year, so these smaller accommodation providers are contributing a fairer share towards Council activities that support tourism.				
Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge				
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change			
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.			
Yes	No			
Comment about the Accommodation Sector Charge				
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here				
More tourists equals more cost for KDC that should be paid for by bus	inesses.			
5. The Rural Recycling Rate				
	ed dollar amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit, llection points - for rural properties only because the collection sites are			
The Rural Recycling Rate				
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change			
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.			
Yes	○ No			

## Comment about the Rural Recycling Rate

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

We carry our recycling to town recycling centre when it has sufficiently accumulated. We should not pay anything for rural recycling.  $\frac{106}{106}$ 

## 6. Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge

Yes

Currently all commercial properties pay a public rubbish bin charge regardless of the capital value of the property (for the 2023/2024 year this is \$162.46 including GST), which covers 50% of the cost of emptying these public rubbish bins, with the balance 50% funded by general rates. The Council is now suggesting that there is no need for a separate targeted rate for the emptying of public rubbish bins, and that the portion of costs currently funded by the Public Rubbish Bin Charge instead be funded by commercial rates.

Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or o	lisagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
○ Yes	No	
7.4		
7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate		
is suggesting that it is appropriate for the net costs of harbour activitie fees, cruise ship fees, etc), could be covered by a combination of the e	olicy for the ability to levy a Harbour Special Operator rate. The Council es (after all other sources of revenue such as slipway fees, boat parking existing commercial rate and harbour rate (set on differential), plus a rators in proportion to the areas that they each have exclusive use over.	
Note that the Council is having separate conversations with each of the be subject to the outcome of those discussions, as well as a legal review.	ne special operators that we have identified, and that this new rate will ew.	
We do, however, still want your feedback on the principles of this sugg	gestion.	
A new Harbour Special Operator Rate		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or c	lisagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
Yes	○ No	
Comment about a new Harbour Special Operator Rate		
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here		
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.		
8. Changes to how some activities should be ful	nded	
	ebated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do uncil expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.	
Changes to how some activities should be funded		
I agree with this suggested change	○ I disagree with this suggested change	
•	-	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or o	lisagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	

No 107

#### Comment about changes to how some activities should be funded

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

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.

## 9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)

We are suggesting a new definition for the SUIP. While the proposed definition is not a significant change, it is helpful for ratepayers and Council staff to have a clear understanding of the definition, so that it is consistently applied.

I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain wh	y you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative sugge	estions.
○ Yes	No	
Do you wish to present your opinion in person to	· ·	

## Five minute slots will be allocated to each person who wishes to present their submission in person.

A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)

Yes No

## Thank you for taking the time to make this submission.

#### What happens next?

Once we have received feedback (by noon 24 October 2023) we will commence a legal review of the suggested changes, including of the feedback suggestions, and have a hearing for people to present their views to the Council.

#### When are the key dates?

Submissions open: 18th September 2023

Submissions close: 24th October 2023

Hearings: 1st - 17th November 2023

Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023

From: redacted

To: Subject: Date:

Attachments:



Please consider the environment before printing this email

From: cheryltim Hodson Redacted

**Sent:** Tuesday, October 24, 2023 4:12 PM

**To:** KDC <kdc@kaikoura.govt.nz> **Subject:** Submissions Rates Review

You don't often get email from Redacted Learn why this is important

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 racecourse in South Bay. If Council think Memorial Gardens and outside the Community Hall should have rubbish facilities, they should be installed near the picnic tables, and beach areas of South Bay as well.

Many of the tourists come to South Bay to walk, fish, boating, go on whale watch or see the dolphins and kayaking. South Bay should have rubbish facilities and be enhanced as well.

Cheryl Hodson

**Rates Review 2023** 



We are considering options for making our rating system fairer. We have outlined our suggestions as to how we could do this, and invite you to tell us what you think.

This consultation runs from noon 18th September to noon 24th October 2023

If you run out of time you can save the form as draft and comeback and finish it at any time before noon on 24th October 2023.

1. Submitter Details	
First Name *	Family Name*
Craig	Hutchison
Organisation Name (optional)	
Contact Details (required)	
In the space below, please provide either:	
<ul><li>Email Address</li><li>Phone Number; or</li><li>Postal Address;</li></ul>	
Contact Phone Number	E-mail Address
Redacted	Redacted
Postal Address Redacted	
Are you a ratepayer in the Kaikoura District*	
Yes	○ No
If yes, what is your address?	
We need this information to understand how your	opinion might be affected by whether you live in the urban, semi-rural , or rural area.
Redacted	
2. Submission	
There are nine suggested changes to the rating sy	stem that we are consulting on. More information is available on the KDC website and in

1. A new differential on the Roading Rate

the relevant section of this submission form below.

In summary the suggested changes cover:

- 2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate
- 3. Increase to the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates
- 4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge
- 5. Rural Recycling Rate

<ul><li>6. Removal of Public Rubbish Bin Charge</li><li>7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate</li><li>8. Changes to how some activities are funded</li></ul>	
9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabite	ed Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested change	es, you can tick the appropriate box below, and send us this form.
	changes, you can tick the appropriate box below, and submit the form.*
I agree with all of the suggested changes	I disagree with all of the suggested changes
If you agree with some of the suggested changes, but not all	l, please continue to complete this survey form.
1. A Differential on the Roading Rate	
	the Roading Rate, that would mean commercial properties, and properties the cost of roading because these properties have a greater impact on the
I agree with this suggested change	○ I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you	agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestion.
○ Yes	○ No
2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Ra	to
2. A new Roading Official Targeted Rai	le
	n area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urba irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is sugg  This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural properties at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the dispression.	n area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urba irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is sugg  This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural properties at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the dispression of the Roam to the Roam that the differential on the Roam to the Roam that the differential on the Roam transfer of the Roam transf	on area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs dested to be \$200.00 including GST.  Troperties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while proportionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urba irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is sugg  This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural properties at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the dispression of the Roal each other.	on area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs dested to be \$200.00 including GST.  Troperties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while proportionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urba irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is sugg. This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural properties at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the dispression of the same time the fixed amount mitigates the dispression of the Road each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change	In area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs dested to be \$200.00 including GST.  Troperties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while proportionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. The adding Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urba irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is sugg. This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural prat the same time the fixed amount mitigates the dispr. Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roa each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you	an area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs dested to be \$200.00 including GST.  Troperties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while roportionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. Adding Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with  I disagree with this suggested change
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urba irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is sugg. This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural properties at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the dispression of the same time the fixed amount mitigates the dispression of the Road each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change	In area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs dested to be \$200.00 including GST.  Troperties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while proportionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. The adding Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urba irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is sugg. This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural prat the same time the fixed amount mitigates the dispr. Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roa each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you	an area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs dested to be \$200.00 including GST.  Troperties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while roportionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. Adding Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with  I disagree with this suggested change
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urba irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is sugg. This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural properties are time the fixed amount mitigates the dispression of the same time the fixed amount mitigates the dispression of the Rose each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you are yes.	an area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs dested to be \$200.00 including GST.  Troperties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while roportionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. Adding Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with  I disagree with this suggested change
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urba irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is sugg. This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural prat the same time the fixed amount mitigates the dispr Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roa each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you Yes  3. Increase the differential on the Footpath of the three targeted rates currently apply a differential or differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are	In area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs tested to be \$200.00 including GST.  Irroperties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while roportionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. ading Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with  I disagree with this suggested change  I agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No  No  Ath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates  In semi-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the less than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban rerent differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urba irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is sugg. This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural properties are time the fixed amount mitigates the dispression of the same time the fixed amount mitigates the dispression of the Rose each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why your Yes  3. Increase the differential on the Footpath of the fixed are services. In essence, the Council is suggesting that the currently apply and the currently suggesting that suggesting the currently suggesting that the currently suggesting that the currently suggesting the currently suggestin	In area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs dested to be \$200.00 including GST.  Irroperties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while roportionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. Adding Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with agree or disagree with this suggested change  If agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No  No  No  No  No  Ath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates  In semi-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the less than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban right for the rural differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed differential to be standardized at 0.25.

Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	○ No
4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge	<del>)</del>
Currently, any property that provides accommodation for visitors, be because they can only accommodate 4 guests or less), is levied the A Council is suggesting this is too low.	ut doesn't meet the definition of a commercial property (generally Accommodation Sector Charge of \$400.00 including GST per year. The
The Council is suggesting that the Accommodation Sector Charge be increased to \$600.00 including GST per year, so these smaller accommodation providers are contributing a fairer share towards Council activities that support tourism.	
Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	○ No
5. The Rural Recycling Rate	
	ked dollar amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit, ollection points - for rural properties only because the collection sites are
The Rural Recycling Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	○ No
6. Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge	
Currently all commercial properties pay a public rubbish bin charge regardless of the capital value of the property (for the 2023/2024 year this is \$162.46 including GST), which covers 50% of the cost of emptying these public rubbish bins, with the balance 50% funded by general rates. The Council is now suggesting that there is no need for a separate targeted rate for the emptying of public rubbish bins, and that the portion of costs currently funded by the Public Rubbish Bin Charge instead be funded by commercial rates.	
Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	○ No
7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate	

The Council wishes to make provision in the Revenue and Financing Policy for the ability to levy a Harbour Special Operator rate. The Council is suggesting that it is appropriate for the net costs of harbour activities (after all other sources of revenue such as slipway fees, boat parking fees, cruise ship fees, etc), could be covered by a combination of the existing commercial rate and harbour rate (set on differential), plus a proposed new Harbour Special Operator Rate to apply to special operators in proportion to the areas that they each have exclusive use over. Note that the Council is having separate conversations with each of the special operators that we have identified, and that this new rate will be subject to the outcome of those discussions, as well as a legal review. We do, however, still want your feedback on the principles of this suggestion. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate I agree with this suggested change I disagree with this suggested change Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions. Yes O No Changes to how some activities should be funded While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested changes is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees. Changes to how some activities should be funded I agree with this suggested change I disagree with this suggested change Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions. Yes O No 9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP) We are suggesting a new definition for the SUIP. While the proposed definition is not a significant change, it is helpful for ratepayers and Council staff to have a clear understanding of the definition, so that it is consistently applied. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP) I agree with this suggested change I disagree with this suggested change Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions. Yes O No Do you wish to present your opinion in person to the Council at a Hearing?\* Five minute slots will be allocated to each person who wishes to present their submission in person. Yes No Thank you for taking the time to make this submission.

What happens next?

Once we have received feedback (by noon 24 October 2023) we will commence a legal review of the suggested changes, including of the feedback suggestions, and have a hearing for people to present their views to the Council.

# When are the key dates?

Submissions open: 18th September 2023

Submissions close: 24th October 2023

Hearings: 1st - 17th November 2023

Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023

Changes take effect: 1st July 2024

## **Rates Review 2023**

Culturalities Detaile



We are considering options for making our rating system fairer. We have outlined our suggestions as to how we could do this, and invite you to tell us what you think.

This consultation runs from noon 18th September to noon 24th October 2023

If you run out of time you can save the form as draft and comeback and finish it at any time before noon on 24th October 2023.

1. Submitter Details	
First Name* Bronwyn	Family Name* Lamond
Organisation Name (optional)	
Contact Details (required)	
In the space below, please provide either:	
<ul><li>Email Address</li><li>Phone Number; or</li><li>Postal Address;</li></ul>	
Contact Phone Number	E-mail Address
redacted	redacted
Postal Address redacted	
Are you a ratepayer in the Kaikoura District*	
Yes	○ No
If yes, what is your address?  We need this information to understand how your or redacted	pinion might be affected by whether you live in the urban, semi-rural , or rural area.
2. Submission	
There are nine suggested changes to the rating syste	em that we are consulting on. More information is available on the KDC website and in

# the relevant section of this submission form below.

1. A new differential on the Roading Rate

In summary the suggested changes cover:

- 2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate
- 3. Increase to the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates
- 4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge
- 5. Rural Recycling Rate
- 6. Removal of Public Rubbish Bin Charge

7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate	
8. Changes to how some activities are funded	
9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Par	rt of a Rating Unit (SUIP)
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested changes, yo	u can tick the appropriate box below, and send us this form.
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested chan	ges, you can tick the appropriate box below, and submit the form.*
I agree with all of the suggested changes	I disagree with all of the suggested changes
If you agree with some of the suggested changes, but not all, plea	ase continue to complete this survey form.
A Differential on the Roading Rate	
	Roading Rate, that would mean commercial properties, and properties ost of roading because these properties have a greater impact on the
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agre	ee or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestion.
○ Yes	© No
U les	● NO
2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate	
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban are irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggested	a should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs to be \$200.00 including GST.
irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggested  This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural proper at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the dispropor	
irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggested This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural proper at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the dispropor Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roading each other.	to be \$200.00 including GST.  rties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while tionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.
irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggested This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural proper at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the dispropor Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roading each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate	to be \$200.00 including GST.  Ties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while tionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.  Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with
irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggested This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural proper at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the dispropor Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roading each other.	ties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while tionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.
irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggested. This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural proper at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the dispropor Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roading each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change	to be \$200.00 including GST.  Ties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while tionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.  Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with
irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggested. This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural proper at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the dispropor Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roading each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change	to be \$200.00 including GST.  It is will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while tionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.  Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with
irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggested.  This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural proper at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the dispropor Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roading each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree	It to be \$200.00 including GST.  It ies will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while tionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.  Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with  I disagree with this suggested change
irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggested.  This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural proper at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the dispropor Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roading each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree	It to be \$200.00 including GST.  It ies will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while tionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.  Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with  I disagree with this suggested change  the or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggested. This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural proper at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the dispropor Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roading each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree Yes	It to be \$200.00 including GST.  It ies will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while tionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.  Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with  I disagree with this suggested change  the or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggested. This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural proper at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the dispropor Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roading each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree. Yes  3. Increase the differential on the Footpath of These three targeted rates currently apply a differential on sem differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are less	It to be \$200.00 including GST.  It is will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while tionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.  Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with  I disagree with this suggested change  Be or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No  No  Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates  i-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed
irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggested. This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural proper at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the dispropor Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roading each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree. Yes  3. Increase the differential on the Footpath of the three targeted rates currently apply a differential on sem differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are less services. In essence, the Council is suggesting that the current to increase the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the semi-rural from 0.5 to	to be \$200.00 including GST.  It is will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while tionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.  Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with  I disagree with this suggested change  Be or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No  No  Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates  i-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed the rural differential to be standardized at 0.25.
irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggested. This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural proper at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the dispropor Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roading each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree Yes  3. Increase the differential on the Footpath of Yes  These three targeted rates currently apply a differential on sem differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are less services. In essence, the Council is suggesting that the current to increase the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and Town Centre Rates Incorporate Rate Rates Incorporate Rates Incorporate Rates Incorporate Rates Incorporate Rate Rates Incorporate Rate Rate Rates Incorporate Rate Rates Incorporate Rate Rate Rates Incorporate Rate Rate Rates Incorporate Rate Rate Rate Rate Rate Rate Rate R	ties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while tionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.  Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with  I disagree with this suggested change  or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No  No  Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates  i-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed the rural differential to be standardized at 0.25.
irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggested. This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural proper at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the dispropor Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roading each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree. Yes  3. Increase the differential on the Footpath of the three targeted rates currently apply a differential on sem differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are less services. In essence, the Council is suggesting that the current to increase the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the semi-rural from 0.5 to	to be \$200.00 including GST.  It is will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while tionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.  Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with  I disagree with this suggested change  Be or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No  No  Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates  i-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed the rural differential to be standardized at 0.25.

Would you like to add a comment to explain why you ago	ree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	No
4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Ch	arge
	ors, but doesn't meet the definition of a commercial property (generally d the Accommodation Sector Charge of \$400.00 including GST per year. The
The Council is suggesting that the Accommodation Sector Cha accommodation providers are contributing a fairer share toward	arge be increased to \$600.00 including GST per year, so these smaller ards Council activities that support tourism.
Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge	
I agree with this suggested change	○ I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to sunlain where are	roo or dispared, and let us know if you have an alternative account
Yes	ree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
0 103	© 110
5. The Rural Recycling Rate	
	as a fixed dollar amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit, unal collection points - for rural properties only because the collection sites are
The Rural Recycling Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you are	ree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	No
6. Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge	
this is \$162.46 including GST), which covers 50% of the cost of	harge regardless of the capital value of the property (for the 2023/2024 year emptying these public rubbish bins, with the balance 50% funded by general a separate targeted rate for the emptying of public rubbish bins, and that the narge instead be funded by commercial rates.
Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge	
■ I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
	ree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	No     No     No
7 A new Harhour Special Operator Rate	

is suggesting that it is appropriate for the net costs of harbour activities (after all other sources of revenue such as slipway fees, boat parking fees, cruise ship fees, etc), could be covered by a combination of the existing commercial rate and harbour rate (set on differential), plus a proposed new Harbour Special Operator Rate to apply to special operators in proportion to the areas that they each have exclusive use over. Note that the Council is having separate conversations with each of the special operators that we have identified, and that this new rate will be subject to the outcome of those discussions, as well as a legal review. We do, however, still want your feedback on the principles of this suggestion. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate I agree with this suggested change I disagree with this suggested change Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions. Yes No 8. Changes to how some activities should be funded While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested changes is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees. Changes to how some activities should be funded I agree with this suggested change I disagree with this suggested change Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions. Yes O No 9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP) We are suggesting a new definition for the SUIP. While the proposed definition is not a significant change, it is helpful for ratepayers and Council staff to have a clear understanding of the definition, so that it is consistently applied. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP) I agree with this suggested change I disagree with this suggested change Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions. Yes No Do you wish to present your opinion in person to the Council at a Hearing?\* Five minute slots will be allocated to each person who wishes to present their submission in person. Yes No Thank you for taking the time to make this submission.

The Council wishes to make provision in the Revenue and Financing Policy for the ability to levy a Harbour Special Operator rate. The Council

What happens next?

Once we have received feedback (by noon 24 October 2023) we will commence a legal review of the suggested changes, including of the feedback suggestions, and have a hearing for people to present their views to the Council.

# When are the key dates?

Submissions open: 18th September 2023

Submissions close: 24th October 2023

Hearings: 1st - 17th November 2023

Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023

Changes take effect: 1st July 2024

## **Rates Review 2023**



We are considering options for making our rating system fairer. We have outlined our suggestions as to how we could do this, and invite you to tell us what you think.

This consultation runs from noon 18th September to noon 24th October 2023

If you run out of time you can save the form as draft and comeback and finish it at any time before noon on 24th October 2023.

1. Submitter Details	
First Name*	Family Name*
Joanne	Landman
Organisation Name (optional)	
Glen Alton Homestead	
Contact Details (required)	
In the space below, please provide either:	
Email Address	
Phone Number; or	
<ul> <li>Postal Address;</li> </ul>	
Contact Phone Number	E-mail Address
Redacted	Redacted
Postal Address	
Redacted	
nedacted	
Are you a ratepayer in the Kaikoura District*	
Yes	○ No
<b>163</b>	NO NO
If yes, what is your address?	
We need this information to understand how your opinion might be a	ffected by whether you live in the urban, semi-rural , or rural area.
Redacted	
2. Submission	

1. A new differential on the Roading Rate

the relevant section of this submission form below.

2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate

In summary the suggested changes cover:

- 3. Increase to the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates
- 4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge
- 5. Rural Recycling Rate

There are nine suggested changes to the rating system that we are consulting on. More information is available on the KDC website and in

<ul><li>7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate</li><li>8. Changes to how some activities are funded</li><li>9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited I</li></ul>	Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested changes,	you can tick the appropriate box below, and send us this form.
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested cha	anges, you can tick the appropriate box below, and submit the form.*
I agree with all of the suggested changes	I disagree with some of the suggested changes
If you agree with some of the suggested changes, but not all, p	lease continue to complete this survey form.
1. A Differential on the Roading Rate	
	e Roading Rate, that would mean commercial properties, and properties cost of roading because these properties have a greater impact on the
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you ag	gree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestion.
Yes	○ No
mileage diesel an wear an tear on our vechicles so would opp	
2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate	
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban a irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggest	area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs ted to be \$200.00 including GST.
at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disprop	perties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while portionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. In Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with
New Roading Uniform Target Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you ag	gree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	○ No
Comment about new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate	
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here	
Considering we live up the Waiau Toa which we have to trave	el over a dangerous paper road thru rural property leaving us isolated from the

6. Removal of Public Rubbish Bin Charge

# 3. Increase the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates

These three targeted rates currently apply a differential on semi-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are less than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban services. In essence, the Council is suggesting that the current differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed to increase the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the rural differential to be standardized at 0.25.

	ential
I agree with this suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested changes
Manda van like to add a commont to avalein why you are a	diagrams and let up know if you have an alternative assessed and
Yes	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No
Comment about Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and Town Co	ntre Rates
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here	
Should be included in Town rates only	
4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge	
Currently, any property that provides accommodation for visitors, bu because they can only accommodate 4 guests or less), is levied the A Council is suggesting this is too low.	
The Council is suggesting that the Accommodation Sector Charge be accommodation providers are contributing a fairer share towards Co	
Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge	
I agree with this suggested change	○ I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions
	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or   Yes	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No
○ Yes	
<ul><li>Yes</li><li>5. The Rural Recycling Rate</li><li>The Council is suggesting introducing the rural recycling rate, as a fixe</li></ul>	
<ul> <li>Yes</li> <li>The Rural Recycling Rate</li> <li>The Council is suggesting introducing the rural recycling rate, as a fix to cover the cost of collecting recyclable material from communal collecting recyclable material from communal collecting recyclable material from communal collections.</li> </ul>	No  Indicate the second of the
5. The Rural Recycling Rate  The Council is suggesting introducing the rural recycling rate, as a fixt to cover the cost of collecting recyclable material from communal colin the rural area (Lynton Downs, Clarence and Kekerengu).	No  Indicate the second of the
5. The Rural Recycling Rate  The Council is suggesting introducing the rural recycling rate, as a fixe to cover the cost of collecting recyclable material from communal colin the rural area (Lynton Downs, Clarence and Kekerengu).  The Rural Recycling Rate  I agree with this suggested change	No  Ad dollar amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit, lection points - for rural properties only because the collection sites are  I disagree with this suggested change
5. The Rural Recycling Rate  The Council is suggesting introducing the rural recycling rate, as a fixe to cover the cost of collecting recyclable material from communal colin the rural area (Lynton Downs, Clarence and Kekerengu).  The Rural Recycling Rate  I agree with this suggested change	No  Rd dollar amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit, lection points - for rural properties only because the collection sites are

## Comment about the Rural Recycling Rate

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

Once again this occurs mileage diesel an vechicle maintenance crossing the Wharekiri ford so another cost to the residence

## 6. Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge

Currently all commercial properties pay a public rubbish bin charge regardless of the capital value of the property (for the 2023/2024 year this is \$162.46 including GST), which covers 50% of the cost of emptying these public rubbish bins, with the balance 50% funded by general rates. The Council is now suggesting that there is no need for a separate targeted rate for the emptying of public rubbish bins, and that the portion of costs currently funded by the Public Rubbish Bin Charge instead be funded by commercial rates.

Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate		
is suggesting that it is appropriate for the net costs of harbour activities, cruise ship fees, etc), could be covered by a combination of the	Policy for the ability to levy a Harbour Special Operator rate. The Council ies (after all other sources of revenue such as slipway fees, boat parking existing commercial rate and harbour rate (set on differential), plus a erators in proportion to the areas that they each have exclusive use over.	
Note that the Council is having separate conversations with each of the special operators that we have identified, and that this new rate will be subject to the outcome of those discussions, as well as a legal review.		
We do, however, still want your feedback on the principles of this sug	gestion.	
A new Harbour Special Operator Rate		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
○ Yes	○ No	
8. Changes to how some activities should be fu	nded	
While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested changes is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.		
Changes to how some activities should be funded		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
Yes	○ No	
Comment about changes to how some activities should be fun Add your comments and alternative suggestions here User pays	ded	

## 9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)

We are suggesting a new definition for the SUIP. While the proposed definition is not a significant change, it is helpful for ratepayers and Council staff to have a clear understanding of the definition, so that it is consistently applied. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP) I agree with this suggested change I disagree with this suggested change Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions. O Yes O No Do you wish to present your opinion in person to the Council at a Hearing?\* Five minute slots will be allocated to each person who wishes to present their submission in person. Yes No Thank you for taking the time to make this submission. What happens next? Once we have received feedback (by noon 24 October 2023) we will commence a legal review of the suggested changes, including of the feedback suggestions, and have a hearing for people to present their views to the Council. When are the key dates? Submissions open: 18th September 2023 Submissions close: 24th October 2023 1st - 17th November 2023 Hearings: Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023 Changes take effect: 1st July 2024

## **Rates Review 2023**



We are considering options for making our rating system fairer. We have outlined our suggestions as to how we could do this, and invite you to tell us what you think.

This consultation runs from noon 18th September to noon 24th October 2023

If you run out of time you can save the form as draft and comeback and finish it at any time before noon on 24th October 2023.

1. Submitter Details	
First Name*	Family Name*
Dave	Margetts
Organisation Name (optional)	
Ludstone Farm	
Contact Details (required)	
In the space below, please provide either:	
• Email Address	
<ul><li>Phone Number; or</li><li>Postal Address;</li></ul>	
Contact Phone Number	E-mail Address
	redacted
Postal Address	
redacted	
Are you a ratepayer in the Kaikoura District*	
Yes	○ No
If yes, what is your address?	
	r opinion might be affected by whether you live in the urban, semi-rural , or rural area.
redacted	
2. Submission	
There are nine suggested changes to the rating sy	stem that we are consulting on. More information is available on the KDC website and in

#### 1. A new differential on the Roading Rate

In summary the suggested changes cover:

the relevant section of this submission form below.

- 2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate
- 3. Increase to the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates

Rural Recycling Rate     Removal of Public Rubbish Bin Charge	
7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate	
8. Changes to how some activities are funded	
9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Par	t of a Rating Unit (SUIP)
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested changes, yo	u can tick the appropriate box below, and send us this form.
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested chan	ges, you can tick the appropriate box below, and submit the form.*
I agree with all of the suggested changes	I disagree with all of the suggested changes
If you agree with some of the suggested changes, but not all, plea	se continue to complete this survey form.
1. A Differential on the Roading Rate	
	Roading Rate, that would mean commercial properties, and properties ost of roading because these properties have a greater impact on the
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
	e or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestion.
Yes	○ No
that than vehicles from a single urban dwelling, a farm in area w dwellings and many more vehicle trips than a single farm. The	an section. While a single farm's vehicle use is likely to be harder on roads would be equivalent to several urban streets in size that include multiple urban dwellers roading differentials therefore cumulatively provide way more owever should be on the same or less rating differential as urban dwellers as as roading costs for the same rateable land area.
2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate	
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban are irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggested	a should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs to be \$200.00 including GST.
at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the dispropor	ties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while tionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with
New Roading Uniform Target Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	○ I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agre	e or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	No     No

4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge

# 3. Increase the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates

These three targeted rates currently apply a differential on semi-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are less than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban services. In essence, the Council is suggesting that the current differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed to increase the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the rural differential to be standardized at 0.25.

Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and Town Centre Rates Differential		
I agree with this suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested changes	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree o	r disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
Yes	○ No	
Comment about Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and Town C	Centre Rates	
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here		
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.		
4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge	е	
Currently, any property that provides accommodation for visitors, because they can only accommodate 4 guests or less), is levied the Council is suggesting this is too low.	out doesn't meet the definition of a commercial property (generally Accommodation Sector Charge of \$400.00 including GST per year. The	
The Council is suggesting that the Accommodation Sector Charge be increased to \$600.00 including GST per year, so these smaller accommodation providers are contributing a fairer share towards Council activities that support tourism.		
Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree o	r disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
○ Yes	No	
5. The Rural Recycling Rate		
The Council is suggesting introducing the rural recycling rate, as a fixed dollar amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit, to cover the cost of collecting recyclable material from communal collection points - for rural properties only because the collection sites are in the rural area (Lynton Downs, Clarence and Kekerengu).		
The Rural Recycling Rate		
I agree with this suggested change	○ I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to surely in why your	w dispared and let us know if you have an elformative average.	
Yes	r disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
	$\sim$	

## 6. Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge

Currently all commercial properties pay a public rubbish bin charge regardless of the capital value of the property (for the 2023/2024 year this is \$162.46 including GST), which covers 50% of the cost of emptying these public rubbish bins, with the balance 50% funded by general rates. The Council is now suggesting that there is no need for a separate targeted rate for the emptying of public rubbish bins, and that the portion of costs currently funded by the Public Rubbish Bin Charge instead be funded by commercial rates.

Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
○ Yes	No     No	
7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate		
The Council wishes to make provision in the Devenue and Financing I	Delicutor the ability to low a Harbour Special Operator rate. The Council	
The Council wishes to make provision in the Revenue and Financing Policy for the ability to levy a Harbour Special Operator rate. The Council is suggesting that it is appropriate for the net costs of harbour activities (after all other sources of revenue such as slipway fees, boat parking fees, cruise ship fees, etc), could be covered by a combination of the existing commercial rate and harbour rate (set on differential), plus a proposed new Harbour Special Operator Rate to apply to special operators in proportion to the areas that they each have exclusive use over.		
Note that the Council is having separate conversations with each of the special operators that we have identified, and that this new rate will be subject to the outcome of those discussions, as well as a legal review.		
We do, however, still want your feedback on the principles of this sug	gestion.	
A new Harbour Special Operator Rate		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
○ Yes	No     No     No	
8. Changes to how some activities should be fu	nded	
While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested changes is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.		
Changes to how some activities should be funded		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
Yes	○ No	
Comment about changes to how some activities should be fun	ded	

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

See 3 above. 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.

## 9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)

We are suggesting a new definition for the SUIP. While the proposed definition is not a significant change, it is helpful for ratepayers and Council staff to have a clear understanding of the definition, so that it is consistently applied. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP) I agree with this suggested change I disagree with this suggested change Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions. Yes No Do you wish to present your opinion in person to the Council at a Hearing?\* Five minute slots will be allocated to each person who wishes to present their submission in person. Yes O No A Council staff member will contact you to let you know when the hearings will be held, and arrange a time for you to speak. Thank you for taking the time to make this submission. What happens next? Once we have received feedback (by noon 24 October 2023) we will commence a legal review of the suggested changes, including of the feedback suggestions, and have a hearing for people to present their views to the Council. When are the key dates? Submissions open: 18th September 2023 Submissions close: 24th October 2023 Hearings: 1st - 17th November 2023 Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023

Changes take effect: 1st July 2024

#### **Rates Review 2023**



We are considering options for making our rating system fairer. We have outlined our suggestions as to how we could do this, and invite you to tell us what you think.

This consultation runs from noon 18th September to noon 24th October 2023

If you run out of time you can save the form as draft and comeback and finish it at any time before noon on 24th October 2023.

1. Submitter Details	
First Name* Rebecca	Family Name* Mikels
Organisation Name (optional)	
Contact Details (required)	
In the space below, please provide either:	
<ul><li>Email Address</li><li>Phone Number; or</li><li>Postal Address;</li></ul>	
Contact Phone Number	E-mail Address
Not provided	Redacted
Postal Address Not provided	
Are you a ratepayer in the Kaikoura District*	
Yes	○ No
If yes, what is your address?  We need this information to understand how your opinion might be aff Don't know if this person is a ratepayer as did not say on photos of subr	

## 2. Submission

There are nine suggested changes to the rating system that we are consulting on. More information is available on the KDC website and in the relevant section of this submission form below.

In summary the suggested changes cover:

- 1. A new differential on the Roading Rate
- 2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate
- 3. Increase to the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates
- 4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge
- 5. Rural Recycling Rate
- 6. Removal of Public Rubbish Bin Charge

<ul><li>7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate</li><li>8. Changes to how some activities are funded</li></ul>	
9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part	of a Rating Unit (SUIP)
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested changes, you	can tick the appropriate box below, and send us this form.
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested chang	es, you can tick the appropriate box below, and submit the form.*
I agree with all of the suggested changes	I disagree with some of the suggested changes
If you agree with some of the suggested changes, but not all, pleas	se continue to complete this survey form.
1. A Differential on the Roading Rate	
	pading Rate, that would mean commercial properties, and properties st of roading because these properties have a greater impact on the
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree	e or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestion.
Yes	○ No
Comment about differential on the roading rate	
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here	, machiner, and generally more traffic leaving the commercial site
Example: Harmac concrete should pay a substantial amount bec	machinery and generally more traffic leaving the commercial site.  ause of the heavy machinery used to access the commercial property. And End should not. Why, because most of the businesses do not have a pact on roading is nothing.
2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate	
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggested	should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs to be \$200.00 including GST.
at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproport	ies will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while ionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with
New Roading Uniform Target Rate	
○ I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree	e or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	○ No
Comment about new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate	
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here  They should pay exact if not more than as urban because the roa	ads out rural are build especially for them to access their properties. No
impact/use to urban residents.	The second second area properties. No

## 3. Increase the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates

These three targeted rates currently apply a differential on semi-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are less than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban services. In essence, the Council is suggesting that the current differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed to increase the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the rural differential to be standardized at 0.25.

Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and Town Centre Rates Differe	ential	
I agree with this suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested changes	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or o	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
Yes	○ No	
Comment about Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and Town Ce	ntre Rates	
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here		
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 should 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.		
4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge		
Currently, any property that provides accommodation for visitors, but because they can only accommodate 4 guests or less), is levied the Accouncil is suggesting this is too low.		
The Council is suggesting that the Accommodation Sector Charge be increased to \$600.00 including GST per year, so these smaller accommodation providers are contributing a fairer share towards Council activities that support tourism.		
Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or o	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
Yes	○ No	
Comment about the Accommodation Sector Charge		
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here		
f registered and making money from accommodation. They should pay	exactly what all the motels pay because they offer the same service. Air	

## 5. The Rural Recycling Rate

The Council is suggesting introducing the rural recycling rate, as a fixed dollar amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit, to cover the cost of collecting recyclable material from communal collection points - for rural properties only because the collection sites are in the rural area (Lynton Downs, Clarence and Kekerengu).

bnbs need to stop being given certificates 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.

The Rural Recycling Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree	or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	○ No
6. Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge	
this is \$162.46 including GST), which covers 50% of the cost of em	rge regardless of the capital value of the property (for the 2023/2024 year nptying these public rubbish bins, with the balance 50% funded by general separate targeted rate for the emptying of public rubbish bins, and that the ge instead be funded by commercial rates.
Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge	
I agree with this suggested change	○ I disagree with this suggested change
o . ag. co and caggeorde shange	along. soa. and onggoested straings
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree	or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	○ No
7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate	
is suggesting that it is appropriate for the net costs of harbour ac fees, cruise ship fees, etc), could be covered by a combination of	ing Policy for the ability to levy a Harbour Special Operator rate. The Council ctivities (after all other sources of revenue such as slipway fees, boat parking the existing commercial rate and harbour rate (set on differential), plus a I operators in proportion to the areas that they each have exclusive use over.
Note that the Council is having separate conversations with each be subject to the outcome of those discussions, as well as a legal	of the special operators that we have identified, and that this new rate will review.
We do, however, still want your feedback on the principles of this	s suggestion.
- '	
A new Harbour Special Operator Rate	
	◯ I disagree with this suggested change
I agree with this suggested change	Tulsagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree	e or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	○ No
9.55	0.10
Comment about a new Harbour Special Operator Rate	
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here	
should be solely responsible for funding such activities. Whalewa secured through business practices should be changed at a perce	by should be paying a huge chunk. the boats that are parking at the harbour atch is a "charitable trust" they use the dock for business and funds tat are ent. Like if whale watch have a business revenue of say (example amount) ag revenue (or 25% from each ticket) because 1/4 of their business practice is action 1/2 on the open water
Changes to how some activities should be	e funded

While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, 133

· ·	, ,	es is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do Council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.
Changes to how	some activities should be funded	
I agree with this	suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like t	o add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes		○ No
Comment about	changes to how some activities should be fu	nded
Add your comm	ents and alternative suggestions here	
	e 7 councillors make up the opinion of our resider d to be the voice of residents.	nts. Most are over 50 and their presents are not felt in the community as
9. A new de	finition for the Separately Used or	Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)
	g a new definition for the SUIP. While the proposed ave a clear understanding of the definition, so that	definition is not a significant change, it is helpful for ratepayers and it is consistently applied.
A new definition	for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a	a Rating Unit (SUIP)
I agree with this	suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like t	o add a comment to explain why you agree o	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes		○ No
Do you wish to pr	esent your opinion in person to the Council a	t a Hearing?*
	will be allocated to each person who wishes to pre-	
○ Yes		No     No
	Thank you for taking the	time to make this submission.
What happens no	ext?	
	ved feedback (by noon 24 October 2023) we will cons, and have a hearing for people to present their	ommence a legal review of the suggested changes, including of the views to the Council.
When are the key	y dates?	
Submissions open:	18th September 2023	
Submissions close:	24th October 2023	
Hearings:	1st - 17th November 2023	
Adopt the changes:	29th November 2023	
Changes take effect	:: 1st July 2024	

#### Rates Review 2023



We are considering options for making our rating system fairer. We have outlined our suggestions as to how we could do this, and invite you to tell us what you think.

This consultation runs from noon 18th September to noon 24th October 2023

If you run out of time you can save the form as draft and comeback and finish it at any time before noon on 24th October 2023.

1. Submitter Details	
First Name*	Family Name*
Derrick and Ben	Millton
Organisation Name (optional)	
Contact Details (required)	
In the space below, please provide either:	
Email Address	
Phone Number; or	
Postal Address;	
Contact Phone Number	E-mail Address
	redacted
Postal Address	
Are you a ratepayer in the Kaikoura District*	
Yes	○ No
If yes, what is your address?	
	ght be affected by whether you live in the urban, semi-rural , or rural area.
redacted	6··· • • • · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
2. Submission	

There are nine suggested changes to the rating system that we are consulting on. More information is available on the KDC website and in the relevant section of this submission form below.

In summary the suggested changes cover:

- 1. A new differential on the Roading Rate
- 2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate
- ${\tt 3.\,Increase\,to\,the\,differential\,on\,the\,Footpath\,\&\,Streetlights,\,Harbour,\,and\,Town\,Centre\,Rates}$
- ${\it 4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge}$
- 5. Rural Recycling Rate
- 6. Removal of Public Rubbish Bin Charge
- 7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate

8. Changes to how some activities are funded 9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited P	Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested changes, y	you can tick the appropriate box below, and send us this form.
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested cha	anges, you can tick the appropriate box below, and submit the form.*
I agree with all of the suggested changes	I disagree with some of the suggested changes
If you agree with some of the suggested changes, but not all, pl	ease continue to complete this survey form.
1. A Differential on the Roading Rate	
	Roading Rate, that would mean commercial properties, and properties cost of roading because these properties have a greater impact on the
I agree with this suggested change	○ I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you ag	ree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestion.
○ Yes	○ No
2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate	
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban a irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggest	rea should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs ed to be \$200.00 including GST.
at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disprope	erties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while ortionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.  In Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with
New Roading Uniform Target Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to odd a commont to combin what you	
Yes	ree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
3. Increase the differential on the Footpath	n & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates
differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are les	mi-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the standard that 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban at differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed r the rural differential to be standardized at 0.25.
Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and Town Centre Rates	s Differential
I agree with this suggested changes	○ I disagree with this suggested changes
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you ag	ree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.

○ Yes	○ No
4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charg	ge
	but doesn't meet the definition of a commercial property (generally Accommodation Sector Charge of \$400.00 including GST per year. The
The Council is suggesting that the Accommodation Sector Charge I accommodation providers are contributing a fairer share towards	
Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree of Yes	or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
5. The Rural Recycling Rate	
	fixed dollar amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit, collection points - for rural properties only because the collection sites are
The Rural Recycling Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree o	or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	○ No
6. Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge	
Currently all commercial properties pay a public rubbish bin charge regardless of the capital value of the property (for the 2023/2024 year this is \$162.46 including GST), which covers 50% of the cost of emptying these public rubbish bins, with the balance 50% funded by general rates. The Council is now suggesting that there is no need for a separate targeted rate for the emptying of public rubbish bins, and that the portion of costs currently funded by the Public Rubbish Bin Charge instead be funded by commercial rates.	
Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge	
○ I agree with this suggested change	○ I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree of	or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	○ No
7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate	

The Council wishes to make provision in the Revenue and Financing Policy for the ability to levy a Harbour Special Operator rate. The Council

is suggesting that it is appropriate for the net costs of harbour activities (after all other sources of revenue such as slipway fees, boat parking fees, cruise ship fees, etc), could be covered by a combination of the existing commercial rate and harbour rate (set on differential), plus a proposed new Harbour Special Operator Rate to apply to special operators in proportion to the areas that they each have exclusive use over. Note that the Council is having separate conversations with each of the special operators that we have identified, and that this new rate will be subject to the outcome of those discussions, as well as a legal review. We do, however, still want your feedback on the principles of this suggestion. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate I agree with this suggested change I disagree with this suggested change Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions. Yes O No 8. Changes to how some activities should be funded While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested changes is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees. Changes to how some activities should be funded I agree with this suggested change I disagree with this suggested change Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions. Yes O No A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP) We are suggesting a new definition for the SUIP. While the proposed definition is not a significant change, it is helpful for ratepayers and Council staff to have a clear understanding of the definition, so that it is consistently applied. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP) I agree with this suggested change I disagree with this suggested change Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions. Yes O No Do you wish to present your opinion in person to the Council at a Hearing?\* Five minute slots will be allocated to each person who wishes to present their submission in person. Yes O No A Council staff member will contact you to let you know when the hearings will be held, and arrange a time for you to speak. Thank you for taking the time to make this submission.

What happens next?

Once we have received feedback (by noon 24 October 2023) we will commence a legal review of the suggested changes, including of the feedback suggestions, and have a hearing for people to present their views to the Council.

# When are the key dates?

Submissions open: 18th September 2023

Submissions close: 24th October 2023

Hearings: 1st - 17th November 2023

Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023

Changes take effect: 1st July 2024

the relevant section of this submission form below.

In summary the suggested changes cover:

## **Rates Review 2023**



We are considering options for making our rating system fairer. We have outlined our suggestions as to how we could do this, and invite you to tell us what you think.

This consultation runs from noon 18th September to noon 24th October 2023

If you run out of time you can save the form as draft and comeback and finish it at any time before noon on 24th October 2023.

Submitter Details	
First Name* Peter	Family Name* Mitchell
Organisation Name (optional)	
Contact Details (required)	
In the space below, please provide either:	
<ul><li>Email Address</li><li>Phone Number; or</li><li>Postal Address;</li></ul>	
Contact Phone Number	E-mail Address
	Redacted
Postal Address Redacted	
Are you a ratepayer in the Kaikoura District*	
Yes	○ No
If yes, what is your address?  We need this information to understand how your opinion might be at Redacted	ffected by whether you live in the urban, semi-rural , or rural area.
2. Submission	

140

There are nine suggested changes to the rating system that we are consulting on. More information is available on the KDC website and in

<ol> <li>A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate</li> <li>Increase to the differential on the Footpath &amp; Streetlights</li> <li>Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge</li> <li>Rural Recycling Rate</li> <li>Removal of Public Rubbish Bin Charge</li> <li>A new Harbour Special Operator Rate</li> <li>Changes to how some activities are funded</li> </ol>	s, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates
9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Par	rt of a Rating Unit (SUIP)
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested changes, yo	u can tick the appropriate box below, and send us this form.
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested chan	ges, you can tick the appropriate box below, and submit the form.*
I agree with all of the suggested changes	I disagree with some of the suggested changes
If you agree with some of the suggested changes, but not all, plea	se continue to complete this survey form.
1. A Differential on the Roading Rate	
	Roading Rate, that would mean commercial properties, and properties ost of roading because these properties have a greater impact on the
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agre	ee or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestion.
Yes	No
les	Ŭ NO
Comment about differential on the roading rate	
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here	
I have a ute I pay RUC's. I pay fuel taxes. I have nothing delivered	
I do not have more of an impact on roads than urban dewellers I live 100k's from Blenheim, and 50k's from Kaikoura. I already p poorly maintained I have had 4 broken windscreens in the past	pay a small fortune in roading fees to go about my business. The roads are so
2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate	
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban are irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggested	a should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs to be \$200.00 including GST.
at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the dispropor	ties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while tionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with
New Roading Uniform Target Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agre	ee or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	No

1. A new differential on the Roading Rate

## 3. Increase the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates

These three targeted rates currently apply a differential on semi-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are less than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban services. In essence, the Council is suggesting that the current differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed to increase the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the rural differential to be standardized at 0.25.

Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and Town Centre Rates Differ	ential
I agree with this suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested changes
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	⊚ No
4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge	
Currently, any property that provides accommodation for visitors, but because they can only accommodate 4 guests or less), is levied the Accouncil is suggesting this is too low.	
The Council is suggesting that the Accommodation Sector Charge be accommodation providers are contributing a fairer share towards Cou	
Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	No     No
5. The Rural Recycling Rate	
	ed dollar amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit, lection points - for rural properties only because the collection sites are
The Rural Recycling Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	○ No

# 6. Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge

Currently all commercial properties pay a public rubbish bin charge regardless of the capital value of the property (for the 2023/2024 year this is \$162.46 including GST), which covers 50% of the cost of emptying these public rubbish bins, with the balance 50% funded by general rates. The Council is now suggesting that there is no need for a separate targeted rate for the emptying of public rubbish bins, and that the portion of costs currently funded by the Public Rubbish Bin Charge instead be funded by commercial rates.

Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	⊚ No
7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate	
is suggesting that it is appropriate for the net costs of harbour activities, cruise ship fees, etc), could be covered by a combination of the	Policy for the ability to levy a Harbour Special Operator rate. The Council ies (after all other sources of revenue such as slipway fees, boat parking existing commercial rate and harbour rate (set on differential), plus a erators in proportion to the areas that they each have exclusive use over.
Note that the Council is having separate conversations with each of be subject to the outcome of those discussions, as well as a legal rev	he special operators that we have identified, and that this new rate will iew.
We do, however, still want your feedback on the principles of this su	ggestion.
A new Harbour Special Operator Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	<ul><li>No</li></ul>
8. Changes to how some activities should be fu	ınded
While not a direct change to the rating system itself the Council has	
compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested change	debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do ouncil expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.
compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested change	s is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do
compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested change affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the C	s is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do
compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested change affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the C  Changes to how some activities should be funded  I agree with this suggested change	s is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do ouncil expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.
compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested change affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the C  Changes to how some activities should be funded  I agree with this suggested change	s is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do ouncil expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.
compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested change affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Compared to how some activities should be funded  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	is is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do ouncil expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.  I disagree with this suggested change  disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested change affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Compared to how some activities should be funded  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	is is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do ouncil expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.  I disagree with this suggested change  disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No
compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested change affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Compared to how some activities should be funded  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or Yes	is is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do ouncil expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.  I disagree with this suggested change  disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No  No  No  Mabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)  definition is not a significant change, it is helpful for ratepayers and
compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested change affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Compared to how some activities should be funded  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or Yes  9. A new definition for the Separately Used or I We are suggesting a new definition for the SUIP. While the proposed Council staff to have a clear understanding of the definition, so that	is is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do ouncil expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.  I disagree with this suggested change  disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No  No  No  Addinition is not a significant change, it is helpful for ratepayers and it is consistently applied.
compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested change affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Compared to how some activities should be funded  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or Yes  9. A new definition for the Separately Used or I We are suggesting a new definition for the SUIP. While the proposed	is is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do ouncil expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.  I disagree with this suggested change  disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No  No  No  Addinition is not a significant change, it is helpful for ratepayers and it is consistently applied.

Yes	No	
o you wish to	present your opinion in person to the Council at a Hearing?*	
Five minute slo	ts will be allocated to each person who wishes to present their submission in person.	
) Yes	No	
Thank you for taking the time to make this submission.		
/hat happens	next?	
	ceived feedback (by noon 24 October 2023) we will commence a legal review of the suggested changes, including of the tions, and have a hearing for people to present their views to the Council.	
hen are the	key dates?	
ubmissions ope	n: 18th September 2023	
ubmissions clos	se: 24th October 2023	
earings:	1st - 17th November 2023	
dopt the chang	es: 29th November 2023	
hanges take eff	ect: 1st July 2024	

**Rates Review 2023** 



We are considering options for making our rating system fairer. We have outlined our suggestions as to how we could do this, and invite you to tell us what you think.

This consultation runs from noon 18th September to noon 24th October 2023

If you run out of time you can save the form as draft and comeback and finish it at any time before noon on 24th October 2023.

Submitter Details	
First Name* Hamish	Family Name*  Murray
Organisation Name (optional) Bluff Station Ltd	
Contact Details (required)	
In the space below, please provide either:	
<ul><li>Email Address</li><li>Phone Number; or</li><li>Postal Address;</li></ul>	
Contact Phone Number	E-mail Address
redacted	redacted
Postal Address redacted	
Are you a ratepayer in the Kaikoura District*	
Yes	○ No
If yes, what is your address?  We need this information to understand how your redacted	our opinion might be affected by whether you live in the urban, semi-rural , or rural area.
2. Submission	
There are nine suggested changes to the rating	system that we are consulting on. More information is available on the KDC website and in

1. A new differential on the Roading Rate

In summary the suggested changes cover:

the relevant section of this submission form below.

- 2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate
- 3. Increase to the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates
- 4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge

<ol> <li>Removal of Public Rubbish Bin Charge</li> <li>A new Harbour Special Operator Rate</li> </ol>	
8. Changes to how some activities are funded 9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of	of a Pating Linit (SLIID)
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested changes, you c	an tick the appropriate box below, and send us this form.
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested change	s, you can tick the appropriate box below, and submit the form.*
I agree with all of the suggested changes	I disagree with some of the suggested changes
	30 3
If you agree with some of the suggested changes, but not all, please	continue to complete this survey form.
A Differential on the Roading Rate	
1.71 Billerential on the Heading Hate	
	nding Rate, that would mean commercial properties, and properties of roading because these properties have a greater impact on the
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
	or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestion.
⊚ Yes	○ No
Comment about differential on the roading rate	
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here	
	e more that off set by reductions in differential on others. As pointed out in our commercial and urban ratepayers illustrated by the total increase in n.
A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate	
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area s irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggested to	hould contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs be \$200.00 including GST.
at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportio	is will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while nate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. te, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with
New Roading Uniform Target Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
	or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	○ No
Comment about new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate	
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here	

5. Rural Recycling Rate

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. 146

## 3. Increase the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates

These three targeted rates currently apply a differential on semi-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are less than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban services. In essence, the Council is suggesting that the current differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed to increase the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the rural differential to be standardized at 0.25.

Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and Town Centre Rates Differen	ential
I agree with this suggested changes	○ I disagree with this suggested changes
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or o	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
	○ No
Comment about Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and Town Ce	ntre Rates
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here	issian they are only tiplicating at the edge and do not go for anough to
The following points 3-9 do not go far enough, as in my written submi really have any meaningful impact on keeping out rates at sustainable	
4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge	
Currently, any property that provides accommodation for visitors, but	r doesn't meet the definition of a commercial property (generally
because they can only accommodate 4 guests or less), is levied the Ac	
Council is suggesting this is too low.	
The Council is suggesting that the Accommodation Sector Charge be i	increased to \$600.00 including GST per year, so these smaller
accommodation providers are contributing a fairer share towards Cou	uncil activities that support tourism.
Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or o	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	○ No
5. The Rural Recycling Rate	
	ed dollar amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit, lection points - for rural properties only because the collection sites are
in the rural area (Lynton Downs, Clarence and Kekerengu).	
The Rural Recycling Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
0 - 1-3-1-1 and daggested change	g
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or o	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	○ No

### 6. Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge

Currently all commercial properties pay a public rubbish bin charge regardless of the capital value of the property (for the 2023/2024 year this is \$162.46 including GST), which covers 50% of the cost of emptying these public rubbish bins, with the balance 50% funded by general rates. The Council is now suggesting that there is no need for a separate targeted rate for the emptying of public rubbish bins, and that the portion of costs currently funded by the Public Rubbish Bin Charge instead be funded by commercial rates.

Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or   Yes	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No
7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate	
is suggesting that it is appropriate for the net costs of harbour activi fees, cruise ship fees, etc), could be covered by a combination of the	Policy for the ability to levy a Harbour Special Operator rate. The Council ities (after all other sources of revenue such as slipway fees, boat parking existing commercial rate and harbour rate (set on differential), plus a perators in proportion to the areas that they each have exclusive use over.
Note that the Council is having separate conversations with each of be subject to the outcome of those discussions, as well as a legal rev	the special operators that we have identified, and that this new rate will view.
We do, however, still want your feedback on the principles of this su	ggestion.
A new Harbour Special Operator Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	○ No
8. Changes to how some activities should be for	unded
While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested changes is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.	
Changes to how some activities should be funded	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	○ No

We are suggesting a new definition for the SUIP. While the proposed definition is not a significant change, it is helpful for ratepayers and Council staff to have a clear understanding of the definition, so that it is consistently applied.

9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)

A new definition	for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a	Rating Unit (SUIP)
I agree with this		I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to	o add a comment to explain why you agree or o	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
O Yes		○ No
Do you wish to pr	esent your opinion in person to the Council at	a Haaring?*
-	vill be allocated to each person who wishes to prese	_
Yes	m se dilocated to each person who wishes to preso	○ No
Tes		O NO
A Council staff mem	ber will contact you to let you know when the hear	ings will be held, and arrange a time for you to speak.
Thank you for taking the time to make this submission.		
What happens ne	xt?	
	ved feedback (by noon 24 October 2023) we will corns, and have a hearing for people to present their vi	nmence a legal review of the suggested changes, including of the lews to the Council.
When are the key	dates?	
Submissions open:	18th September 2023	
Submissions close:	24th October 2023	
Hearings:	1st - 17th November 2023	
Adopt the changes:	29th November 2023	
Changes take effect	: 1st July 2024	

#### Submission for the KDC Rates review - Hamish Murray and/on behalf of Bluff Station Ltd

We believe strongly that any rates review further increasing the burden on rural ratepayers is unfair considering the level of service accessed compared with those commercial and urban ratepayers. The current model is unsustainable as previously outlined in past submission by the ECCO group, and the latest review is only a small manipulation of the rating system by the council continuing to be favouring those urban and commercial ratepayers.

It is clear that rural and those with the largest value in terms of landholding contribute most significantly and proportionately to the funding model, with outlying regions being the lowest users in terms of council service. To give some numbers around this our totals rates have increased from \$37,146 including GST in July 2018 to \$49,031 in May 2021 and now \$56,761 in July of 2023. This is a total increase of \$19,615 in 5 years being 53%. I am aware that this is due in significant part to the increase in rateable value, however ours and those values should be increasing inline with all property throughout this district. Any way you look at it this the increases are unsustainable on any business with few or little ways to push back or incorporate that cost.

Of greater concern is that the increase in contribution we have made for the general rate which has been from \$8,824 to \$22,348 an increase of some \$13,524 and 153%. Given our distance and the focus council has on those areas close to and around Kaikoura we feel those Kaikoura residents and businesses are being significantly subsidising by our rural rate payers. In contrast during same 5-year time our contribution to ECAN has gone from \$11304 in 2018 to \$12,700 an increase of only 12.3 % pointing to careful management and modest increases, all generated of the same rateable values.

Kaikoura has 84km of sealed road, 101 km of unsealed, 37 km of footpath (all in the township area) and 43 Bridges. These roads are the most significant value we gain from our rate. In the same last 5-year period our contribution to roading rate has gone from \$6,827 to \$10,158 and increase of \$3,331. I am not opposed to this, especially considering our Kekerengu road is in the best state it has been for 15 years and we really appreciate the recent work. However, this is only an increase of 48% compared with that increase in the general rate of 153% we again feel disappointed at the continual tilting of the model to favour those Urban and Commercial users.

We believe the rating differential on the general rate should be more significant and that the tinkering this time around has not gone far enough. Suggestion of a .7 differential in line with a median around the country would be a start.

I am keen to speak to this submission and hear the council's justification around the acceptability of these recent and proposed changes.

Hamish Murray 23rd October 2023

#### **Rates Review 2023**



We are considering options for making our rating system fairer. We have outlined our suggestions as to how we could do this, and invite you to tell us what you think.

This consultation runs from noon 18th September to noon 24th October 2023

If you run out of time you can save the form as draft and comeback and finish it at any time before noon on 24th October 2023.

1. Submitter Details	
First Name*	Family Name*
Russell	Nelson
Organisation Name (optional)	
R and J Nelson Ltd	
Contact Details (required)	
In the space below, please provide either:	
Email Address	
Phone Number; or	
<ul> <li>Postal Address;</li> </ul>	
Contact Phone Number	E-mail Address
Redacted	Redacted
Postal Address	
Redacted	
Nedacced	
Are you a ratepayer in the Kaikoura District*	
Yes	○ No
e les	) NO
If yes, what is your address?	
We need this information to understand how your opinion might be a	ffected by whether you live in the urban, semi-rural , or rural area.
Redacted	
2. Submission	

1. A new differential on the Roading Rate

In summary the suggested changes cover:

the relevant section of this submission form below.

- 2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate
- 3. Increase to the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates
- 4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge
- 5. Rural Recycling Rate

There are nine suggested changes to the rating system that we are consulting on. More information is available on the KDC website and in

8. Changes to how some activities are funded	
9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited	d Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested change:	s, you can tick the appropriate box below, and send us this form.
	hanges, you can tick the appropriate box below, and submit the form.*
I agree with all of the suggested changes	I disagree with some of the suggested changes
If you agree with some of the suggested changes, but not all,	please continue to complete this survey form.
1. A Differential on the Roading Rate	
	he Roading Rate, that would mean commercial properties, and properties se cost of roading because these properties have a greater impact on the
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you	agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestion.
Yes	No     No
2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate	9
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is sugge	area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs sted to be \$200.00 including GST.
irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is sugge  This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural pro at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the dispro	
irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is sugge This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural pro at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the dispro Note we are proposing that the differential on the Road each other.	sted to be \$200.00 including GST.  Operties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while oportionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.
irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is sugge  This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural pro at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the dispro Note we are proposing that the differential on the Road	sted to be \$200.00 including GST.  Operties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while oportionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.
irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is sugge  This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural pro at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the dispro Note we are proposing that the differential on the Road each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change	operties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while oportionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. ding Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with
irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is sugge  This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural pro at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the dispro Note we are proposing that the differential on the Road each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you a	operties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while oportionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. ding Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with  I disagree with this suggested change
irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is sugge  This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural pro at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the dispro Note we are proposing that the differential on the Road each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change	operties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while oportionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. ding Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with
irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is sugge  This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural pro at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the dispro Note we are proposing that the differential on the Road each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you a	operties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while oportionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. ding Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with  I disagree with this suggested change
irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is sugge  This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural pro at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the dispro Note we are proposing that the differential on the Road each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you a Yes	operties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while oportionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. ding Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with  I disagree with this suggested change
irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is sugge  This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural proportion at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disprovence of the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disprovence of the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disprovence of the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disprovence of the same time time time time time time time ti	perties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while opportionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. ding Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with  I disagree with this suggested change  agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No  No  th & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates  semi-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the less than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban ent differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed
irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is sugge  This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural proportion at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disprovence of the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disprovence of the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disprovence of the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disprovence of the same time time time time time time time ti	perties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while proportionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. ding Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with  I disagree with this suggested change  agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No  No  The Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates  semi-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the less than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban ent differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed for the rural differential to be standardized at 0.25.

Would you like to add a comment to explain why you ag	ree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	○ No
4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Ch	narge
	tors, but doesn't meet the definition of a commercial property (generally ed the Accommodation Sector Charge of \$400.00 including GST per year. The
The Council is suggesting that the Accommodation Sector Chaccommodation providers are contributing a fairer share tow	arge be increased to \$600.00 including GST per year, so these smaller ards Council activities that support tourism.
Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge	
I agree with this suggested change	○ I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you ag	gree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	○ No
Comment about the Accommodation Sector Charge	
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here	
Agree with council.	
	as a fixed dollar amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit,
to cover the cost of collecting recyclable material from comm in the rural area (Lynton Downs, Clarence and Kekerengu).	unal collection points - for rural properties only because the collection sites are
The Rural Recycling Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	○ I disagree with this suggested change
	gree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	○ No
6. Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge	
	the control of the co
this is \$162.46 including GST), which covers 50% of the cost o	charge regardless of the capital value of the property (for the 2023/2024 year femptying these public rubbish bins, with the balance 50% funded by general r a separate targeted rate for the emptying of public rubbish bins, and that the harge instead be funded by commercial rates.
Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
	_
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you ag	gree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.

○ Yes	○ No
7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate	
is suggesting that it is appropriate for the net costs of harbour active fees, cruise ship fees, etc), could be covered by a combination of the	g Policy for the ability to levy a Harbour Special Operator rate. The Council vities (after all other sources of revenue such as slipway fees, boat parking see existing commercial rate and harbour rate (set on differential), plus a operators in proportion to the areas that they each have exclusive use over.
Note that the Council is having separate conversations with each o be subject to the outcome of those discussions, as well as a legal re	f the special operators that we have identified, and that this new rate will eview.
We do, however, still want your feedback on the principles of this s	suggestion.
A new Harbour Special Operator Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree o	or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	○ No
8. Changes to how some activities should be	funded
	is debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, ges is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do Council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.
Changes to how some activities should be funded	
I agree with this suggested change	○ I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree	and let up know if you have an alternative our greations
Yes	or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No
0.00	
9. A new definition for the Separately Used or	Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)
e. 7 then deminion for the department dead of	minusited i air of a realing office (con )
We are suggesting a new definition for the SUIP. While the propose Council staff to have a clear understanding of the definition, so that	d definition is not a significant change, it is helpful for ratepayers and at it is consistently applied.
A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of	a Rating Unit (SUIP)
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree o	or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	○ No
Do you wish to present your opinion in person to the Council a	at a Hearing?*
Five minute slots will be allocated to each person who wishes to pre	esent their submission in person.
Yes	No 154

## Thank you for taking the time to make this submission.

#### What happens next?

Once we have received feedback (by noon 24 October 2023) we will commence a legal review of the suggested changes, including of the feedback suggestions, and have a hearing for people to present their views to the Council.

#### When are the key dates?

Submissions open: 18th September 2023

Submissions close: 24th October 2023

Hearings: 1st - 17th November 2023

Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023

#### **Rates Review 2023**



We are considering options for making our rating system fairer. We have outlined our suggestions as to how we could do this, and invite you to tell us what you think.

This consultation runs from noon 18th September to noon 24th October 2023

If you run out of time you can save the form as draft and comeback and finish it at any time before noon on 24th October 2023.

Submitter Details	
First Name*	Family Name*
Noeline	Ocarroll
Organisation Name (optional)	
Contact Details (required)	
In the space below, please provide either:	
<ul><li>Email Address</li><li>Phone Number; or</li><li>Postal Address;</li></ul>	
Contact Phone Number	E-mail Address
redacted	redacted
Postal Address	
redacted	
Are you a ratepayer in the Kaikoura District*	
Yes	○ No
If yes, what is your address?	
We need this information to understand how your opinion m	night be affected by whether you live in the urban, semi-rural, or rural area.
redacted	
2. Submission	
There are nine suggested changes to the rating system that w	we are consulting on. More information is available on the KDC website and in

# In summary the suggested changes cover:

1. A new differential on the Roading Rate

the relevant section of this submission form below.

- 2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate
- 3. Increase to the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates
- 4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge
- 5. Rural Recycling Rate

<ul><li>7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate</li><li>8. Changes to how some activities are funded</li><li>9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabit</li></ul>	ed Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested chang	es, you can tick the appropriate box below, and send us this form.
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested	changes, you can tick the appropriate box below, and submit the form.*
I agree with all of the suggested changes	I disagree with all of the suggested changes
If you agree with some of the suggested changes, but not al	ll, please continue to complete this survey form.
1. A Differential on the Roading Rate	
	the Roading Rate, that would mean commercial properties, and properties the cost of roading because these properties have a greater impact on the
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you	u agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestion.
○ Yes	No
2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Ra	te
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urba irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is sugg	an area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs gested to be \$200.00 including GST.
irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is sugg This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural p at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disp	<del>-</del>
irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is sugg This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural p at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disp Note we are proposing that the differential on the Ro	rested to be \$200.00 including GST. roperties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while roportionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.
irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is sugged. This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural pat the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disp. Note we are proposing that the differential on the Rose each other.	rested to be \$200.00 including GST. roperties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while roportionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.
irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is sugged. This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural plat the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disp. Note we are proposing that the differential on the Rose each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change	rested to be \$200.00 including GST.  Properties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while roportionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. ading Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with
irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is sugged. This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural pat the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disposite we are proposing that the differential on the Roseach other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change	gested to be \$200.00 including GST.  properties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while roportionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. adding Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with  © I disagree with this suggested change
irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is sugged. This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural pat the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disposite we are proposing that the differential on the Roseach other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you	rested to be \$200.00 including GST.  respecties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while reportionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. ading Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with  I disagree with this suggested change
irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is sugged. This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural pat the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disp. Note we are proposing that the differential on the Rose each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you Yes	rested to be \$200.00 including GST.  respecties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while reportionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. ading Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with  I disagree with this suggested change
irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is sugged. This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural pat the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disp. Note we are proposing that the differential on the Rose each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you Yes  3. Increase the differential on the Footp. These three targeted rates currently apply a differential or differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are	rested to be \$200.00 including GST.  roperties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while roportionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. adding Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with  I disagree with this suggested change  agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No  No  Ath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates  In semi-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the less than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban rrent differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed
irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is sugged. This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural pat the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disp. Note we are proposing that the differential on the Rose each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you Yes  3. Increase the differential on the Footp  These three targeted rates currently apply a differential or differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are services. In essence, the Council is suggesting that the cur	rested to be \$200.00 including GST.  roperties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while roportionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. ading Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with  I disagree with this suggested change  agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No  No  Ath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates  In semi-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the eless than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban rrent differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed d for the rural differential to be standardized at 0.25.

Would you like to add a comment to explain why you a	agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	No
4. Increase the Accommodation Sector C	Charge
	isitors, but doesn't meet the definition of a commercial property (generally vied the Accommodation Sector Charge of \$400.00 including GST per year. The
The Council is suggesting that the Accommodation Sector C accommodation providers are contributing a fairer share to	Charge be increased to \$600.00 including GST per year, so these smaller owards Council activities that support tourism.
Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you a	agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	No
5. The Rural Recycling Rate	
	e, as a fixed dollar amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit, munal collection points - for rural properties only because the collection sites are
The Rural Recycling Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you a	agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	No
6. Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charg	
o. Remove the Fubility Rubbish bill Offarg	<u>,~</u>
is \$162.46 including GST), which covers 50% of the cost of ea	n charge regardless of the capital value of the property (for the 2023/2024 year this imptying these public rubbish bins, with the balance 50% funded by general rates. Exparate targeted rate for the emptying of public rubbish bins, and that the portion instead be funded by commercial rates.
Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you a	agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	No     No
7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate	

is suggesting that it is appropriate for the net costs of harbour activities (after all other sources of revenue such as slipway fees, boat parking fees, cruise ship fees, etc), could be covered by a combination of the existing commercial rate and harbour rate (set on differential), plus a proposed new Harbour Special Operator Rate to apply to special operators in proportion to the areas that they each have exclusive use over. Note that the Council is having separate conversations with each of the special operators that we have identified, and that this new rate will be subject to the outcome of those discussions, as well as a legal review. We do, however, still want your feedback on the principles of this suggestion. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate I agree with this suggested change I disagree with this suggested change Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions. No Yes Changes to how some activities should be funded While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested changes is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees. Changes to how some activities should be funded I agree with this suggested change I disagree with this suggested change Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions. Yes No 9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP) We are suggesting a new definition for the SUIP. While the proposed definition is not a significant change, it is helpful for ratepayers and Council staff to have a clear understanding of the definition, so that it is consistently applied. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP) I agree with this suggested change I disagree with this suggested change Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions. Yes No Do you wish to present your opinion in person to the Council at a Hearing?\* Five minute slots will be allocated to each person who wishes to present their submission in person. Yes No Thank you for taking the time to make this submission.

The Council wishes to make provision in the Revenue and Financing Policy for the ability to levy a Harbour Special Operator rate. The Council

What happens next?

Once we have received feedback (by noon 24 October 2023) we will commence a legal review of the suggested changes, including of the feedback suggestions, and have a hearing for people to present their views to the Council.

## When are the key dates?

Submissions open: 18th September 2023

Submissions close: 24th October 2023

Hearings: 1st - 17th November 2023

Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023

#### Rates Review 2023



We are considering options for making our rating system fairer. We have outlined our suggestions as to how we could do this, and invite you to tell us what you think.

This consultation runs from noon 18th September to noon 24th October 2023

If you run out of time you can save the form as draft and comeback and finish it at any time before noon on 24th October 2023.

1. Submitter Details	
First Name*	Family Name*
Justine	Schroder
Organisation Name (optional)	
Contact Details (required)	
In the space below, please provide either:	
Email Address	
Phone Number; or	
Postal Address;	
Contact Phone Number	E-mail Address
Postal Address	
Are you a ratepayer in the Kaikoura District*	
Yes	○ No
If yes, what is your address?	
We need this information to understand how your opinion might Redacted	be affected by whether you live in the urban, semi-rural , or rural area.
2. Submission	
There are nine suggested changes to the rating system that we ar	e consulting on. More information is available on the KDC website and in

the relevant section of this submission form below.

In summary the suggested changes cover:

- 1. A new differential on the Roading Rate
- 2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate
- 3. Increase to the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates
- 4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge
- 5. Rural Recycling Rate
- 6. Removal of Public Rubbish Bin Charge
- 7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate

<ul><li>8. Changes to how some activities are funded</li><li>9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part o</li></ul>	of a Rating Unit (SUIP)
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested changes, you c	
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested change	s, you can tick the appropriate box below, and submit the form.*
I agree with all of the suggested changes	I disagree with some of the suggested changes
If you agree with some of the suggested changes, but not all, please	continue to complete this survey form.
1. A Differential on the Roading Rate	
	ading Rate, that would mean commercial properties, and properties of roading because these properties have a greater impact on the
I agree with this suggested change	○ I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree	or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestion.
Yes	○ No
Comment about differential on the roading rate	
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here	
Rates increases from 20 / 21 to 24 / 25 with current proposed rat	es 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 m	nuch higher than
average Urban decrease of - 4. 2% and Commercial average decrea	•
The roading differential fo Commercial should be increased a bit m	nore to pay for the vehicles
that service that sector and to reduce roading rates for the other s	
On farm inflation for this year will be over 16 % , more than double	e the national average.
2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate	
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area s irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggested to	should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs be \$200.00 including GST.
at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportio	es will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while mate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. Ite, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with
New Roading Uniform Target Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	○ I disagree with this suggested change
would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree of	or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	○ No

### 3. Increase the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates

These three targeted rates currently apply a differential on semi-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are less than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban services. In essence, the Council is suggesting that the current differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed to increase the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the rural differential to be standardized at 0.25.

Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and Town Centre Rates Differ	rential
I agree with this suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested changes
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	○ No
4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge	
Currently, any property that provides accommodation for visitors, bu because they can only accommodate 4 guests or less), is levied the A Council is suggesting this is too low.	t doesn't meet the definition of a commercial property (generally ccommodation Sector Charge of \$400.00 including GST per year. The
The Council is suggesting that the Accommodation Sector Charge be accommodation providers are contributing a fairer share towards Co	
Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or Yes	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No
<ul><li>Yes</li><li>5. The Rural Recycling Rate</li><li>The Council is suggesting introducing the rural recycling rate, as a fixe</li></ul>	
<ul> <li>Yes</li> <li>The Rural Recycling Rate</li> <li>The Council is suggesting introducing the rural recycling rate, as a fix to cover the cost of collecting recyclable material from communal collections.</li> </ul>	No  No  ed dollar amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit,
5. The Rural Recycling Rate The Council is suggesting introducing the rural recycling rate, as a fixe to cover the cost of collecting recyclable material from communal colin the rural area (Lynton Downs, Clarence and Kekerengu).	No  No  ed dollar amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit,
The Council is suggesting introducing the rural recycling rate, as a fix to cover the cost of collecting recyclable material from communal col in the rural area (Lynton Downs, Clarence and Kekerengu).  The Rural Recycling Rate  I agree with this suggested change	No  ed dollar amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit, election points - for rural properties only because the collection sites are
The Council is suggesting introducing the rural recycling rate, as a fix to cover the cost of collecting recyclable material from communal col in the rural area (Lynton Downs, Clarence and Kekerengu).  The Rural Recycling Rate  I agree with this suggested change	No  Red dollar amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit, election points - for rural properties only because the collection sites are  I disagree with this suggested change
The Council is suggesting introducing the rural recycling rate, as a fix to cover the cost of collecting recyclable material from communal col in the rural area (Lynton Downs, Clarence and Kekerengu).  The Rural Recycling Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	No  ed dollar amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit, lection points - for rural properties only because the collection sites are  I disagree with this suggested change  disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.

## 6. Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge

Currently all commercial properties pay a public rubbish bin charge regardless of the capital value of the property (for the 2023/2024 year this is \$162.46 including GST), which covers 50% of the cost of emptying these public rubbish bins, with the balance 50% funded by general rates. The Council is now suggesting that there is no need for a separate targeted rate for the emptying of public rubbish bins, and that the portion of costs currently funded by the Public Rubbish Bin Charge instead be funded by commercial rates.

Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	○ No
7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate	
is suggesting that it is appropriate for the net costs of harbour activi fees, cruise ship fees, etc), could be covered by a combination of the	Policy for the ability to levy a Harbour Special Operator rate. The Council ties (after all other sources of revenue such as slipway fees, boat parking existing commercial rate and harbour rate (set on differential), plus a perators in proportion to the areas that they each have exclusive use over.
Note that the Council is having separate conversations with each of be subject to the outcome of those discussions, as well as a legal rev	the special operators that we have identified, and that this new rate will view.
We do, however, still want your feedback on the principles of this su	ggestion.
A new Harbour Special Operator Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	○ I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	No
8. Changes to how some activities should be for	unded
While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested change	
While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested change	debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, s is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do
While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested change affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the C	debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, s is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do
While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested change affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has compared to rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has compared to how some activities should be funded	debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, is is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.
While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested change affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has compared to rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has compared to how some activities should be funded  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, is is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.  I disagree with this suggested change
While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested change affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has compared to rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has compared to rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested change of the council has compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested change affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has compared to rates, for every activity.	debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, is is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.
While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested change affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has compared to rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has compared to how some activities should be funded  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, is is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.  I disagree with this suggested change
While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested change affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has compared to rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has compared to how some activities should be funded  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, is is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.  I disagree with this suggested change  disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No
While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested change affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has compared to rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has compared to how some activities should be funded    I agree with this suggested change    Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or   Yes	debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, is is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.  I disagree with this suggested change  disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No  Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)  definition is not a significant change, it is helpful for ratepayers and
While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested change affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested change affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has compared to how some activities should be funded  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or Yes  9. A new definition for the Separately Used or We are suggesting a new definition for the SUIP. While the proposed	debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, is is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.  I disagree with this suggested change  I disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No  Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)  definition is not a significant change, it is helpful for ratepayers and it is consistently applied.
While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested change affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council staff to have a clear understanding of the definition, so that	debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, is is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.  I disagree with this suggested change  I disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No  Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)  definition is not a significant change, it is helpful for ratepayers and it is consistently applied.
While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested change affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has compared to rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has been decreased by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has been decreased by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has been decreased by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has been decreased by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has been decreased by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has been decreased by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has been decreased by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has been decreased by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has been decreased by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has been decreased by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has been decreased by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has been decreased by either increasing the amount that the Council has been decreased by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has been decreased by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has been decreased by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has been decreased by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has been decreased by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has been decreased by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has been decreased by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has been decreased by either increased by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has been decreased by either increased by either increased by either increased by either increased	debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, is is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.  I disagree with this suggested change  disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No  Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)  definition is not a significant change, it is helpful for ratepayers and it is consistently applied.
While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested change affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council has to how some activities should be funded  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or Yes  9. A new definition for the Separately Used or We are suggesting a new definition for the SUIP. While the proposed Council staff to have a clear understanding of the definition, so that  A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a gree with this suggested change	debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, is is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.  I disagree with this suggested change  disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No  Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)  definition is not a significant change, it is helpful for ratepayers and it is consistently applied.

Do you wish to present you	r opinion in person to the Council at a Hearing?*
Five minute slots will be alloc	ated to each person who wishes to present their submission in person.
Yes	○ No
A Council staff member will co	ntact you to let you know when the hearings will be held, and arrange a time for you to speak.
	Thank you for taking the time to make this submission.
What happens next?	
	ck (by noon 24 October 2023) we will commence a legal review of the suggested changes, including of the e a hearing for people to present their views to the Council.
When are the key dates?	
Submissions open: 18th Sept	ember 2023
Submissions close: 24th Octo	ber 2023
Hearings: 1st - 17th	November 2023
Adopt the changes: 29th Nov	ember 2023
Changes take effect: 1st July 2	024

#### **Rates Review 2023**



We are considering options for making our rating system fairer. We have outlined our suggestions as to how we could do this, and invite you to tell us what you think.

This consultation runs from noon 18th September to noon 24th October 2023

If you run out of time you can save the form as draft and comeback and finish it at any time before noon on 24th October 2023.

Submitter Details	
First Name*	Family Name*
Hamish &	Simpson
Organisation Name (optional)	
Contact Details (required)	
In the space below, please provide either:	
<ul><li>Email Address</li><li>Phone Number; or</li><li>Postal Address;</li></ul>	
Contact Phone Number	E-mail Address
redacted	redacted
Postal Address	
redacted	
Are you a ratepayer in the Kaikoura District	*
Yes	○ No
If yes, what is your address?	
We need this information to understand how y	our opinion might be affected by whether you live in the urban, semi-rural , or rural area.
redacted	
2. Submission	
There are nine suggested changes to the ratin	g system that we are consulting on. More information is available on the KDC website and in

There are nine suggested changes to the rating system that we are consulting on. More information is available on the KDC website and in the relevant section of this submission form below.

In summary the suggested changes cover:

- 1. A new differential on the Roading Rate
- 2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate
- 3. Increase to the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates
- 4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge
- 5. Rural Recycling Rate
- 6. Removal of Public Rubbish Bin Charge

8. Changes to how some activities are funded 9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabit	ted Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested chang	ges, you can tick the appropriate box below, and send us this form.
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested	I changes, you can tick the appropriate box below, and submit the form.*
I agree with all of the suggested changes	I disagree with all of the suggested changes
If you agree with some of the suggested changes, but not a	ıll, please continue to complete this survey form.
1. A Differential on the Roading Rate	
	n the Roading Rate, that would mean commercial properties, and properties the cost of roading because these properties have a greater impact on the
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why yo	u agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestion.
○ Yes	○ No
2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Ra	
we are suggesting that all properties outside the urbairrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is sugg	an area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs gested to be \$200.00 including GST.
at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disp	properties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while proportionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. Pading Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with
New Roading Uniform Target Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why yo	u agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	○ No
Comment about new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate Add your comments and alternative suggestions here A number of large rural properties have a bigger impact of	on road = heavy machinery (tractors, stock trucks) running stock on the roads.
3. Increase the differential on the Footp	oath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates
These three targeted rates currently apply a differential of	on semi-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the

7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate

differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are less than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban services. In essence, the Council is suggesting that the current differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed to increase the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the rural differential to be standardized at 0.25.

Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and Town Centre Rates Diffe	erential
I agree with this suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested changes
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree o	r disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	○ No
4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge	е
Currently, any property that provides accommodation for visitors, because they can only accommodate 4 guests or less), is levied the Council is suggesting this is too low.	ut doesn't meet the definition of a commercial property (generally Accommodation Sector Charge of \$400.00 including GST per year. The
The Council is suggesting that the Accommodation Sector Charge b accommodation providers are contributing a fairer share towards C	
Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree o	r disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	○ No
5. The Rural Recycling Rate	
	xed dollar amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit, ollection points - for rural properties only because the collection sites are
The Rural Recycling Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Model and the food of a comment to combine when the	
Yes	r disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
	_ ne
Comment about the Rural Recycling Rate	
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here	
only if its the rural properties that have access to these points.	
6. Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge	
is \$162.46 including GST), which covers 50% of the cost of emptying	regardless of the capital value of the property (for the 2023/2024 year this these public rubbish bins, with the balance 50% funded by general rates. argeted rate for the emptying of public rubbish bins, and that the portion be funded by commercial rates.
Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change

Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	○ No
7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate	
is suggesting that it is appropriate for the net costs of harbour activities, cruise ship fees, etc), could be covered by a combination of the	Policy for the ability to levy a Harbour Special Operator rate. The Council ities (after all other sources of revenue such as slipway fees, boat parking existing commercial rate and harbour rate (set on differential), plus a perators in proportion to the areas that they each have exclusive use over.
Note that the Council is having separate conversations with each of be subject to the outcome of those discussions, as well as a legal rev	the special operators that we have identified, and that this new rate will view.
We do, however, still want your feedback on the principles of this su	ggestion.
A new Harbour Special Operator Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	r disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	No
8. Changes to how some activities should be for	unded
	debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, as is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do Council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.
Changes to how some activities should be funded	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
	r disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	○ No
9. A new definition for the Separately Used or	Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)
We are suggesting a new definition for the SUIP. While the proposed Council staff to have a clear understanding of the definition, so that	definition is not a significant change, it is helpful for ratepayers and it is consistently applied.
A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a	a Rating Unit (SUIP)
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	○ No

Do you wish to present your opinion in person to the Council at a Hearing?\* 169

Five minute slots will be allocated to each person w	who wishes to present their submission in person.
--	---

O Yes

No

## Thank you for taking the time to make this submission.

#### What happens next?

Once we have received feedback (by noon 24 October 2023) we will commence a legal review of the suggested changes, including of the feedback suggestions, and have a hearing for people to present their views to the Council.

#### When are the key dates?

Submissions open: 18th September 2023

Submissions close: 24th October 2023

Hearings: 1st - 17th November 2023

Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023

#### **Rates Review 2023**



We are considering options for making our rating system fairer. We have outlined our suggestions as to how we could do this, and invite you to tell us what you think.

This consultation runs from noon 18th September to noon 24th October 2023

If you run out of time you can save the form as draft and comeback and finish it at any time before noon on 24th October 2023.

1. Submitter Details	
First Name*	Family Name*
Helene	Smith
Organisation Name (optional)	
Contact Details (required)	
In the space below, please provide either:	
Email Address	
<ul><li>Phone Number; or</li><li>Postal Address;</li></ul>	
- Tostar Address,	
Contact Phone Number	E-mail Address
Redacted	Redacted
Postal Address	
Redacted	
Are you a ratepayer in the Kaikoura District*	
Yes	○ No
If yes, what is your address?	
We need this information to understand how your opinion might be	affected by whether you live in the urban, semi-rural , or rural area.
Redacted	
2. Submission	
There are nine suggested changes to the rating system that we are o	consulting on. More information is available on the KDC website and in
the relevant section of this submission form below.	

- 1. A new differential on the Roading Rate  $\,$
- 2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate

In summary the suggested changes cover:

- 3. Increase to the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates
- 4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge

5. Rural Recycling Rate
6. Removal of Public Ruk
7. A new Harbour Specia
8. Changes to how some
9. A new definition for the
If you agree, or disagree, wit
If you agree, or disagree,
I agree with all of the sugge

- bbish Bin Charge
- al Operator Rate
- e activities are funded
- he Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)

if you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested changes, you can tick the appropriate box below, and send us this form.		
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested changes, y	ou can tick the appropriate box below, and submit the form.*	
I agree with all of the suggested changes	I disagree with all of the suggested changes	
f you agree with some of the suggested changes, but not all, please cor	ntinue to complete this survey form.	
A Differential on the Roading Rate		
We are suggesting that there is a new differential on the Roadir in the rural and semi-rural areas, pay more towards the cost of wear and tear of roads.	ng Rate, that would mean commercial properties, and properties roading because these properties have a greater impact on the	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or o	lisagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestion.	
○ Yes	No	
2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate		
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggested to be \$200.00 including GST.		
This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural properties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roading Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with each other.		
New Roading Uniform Target Rate		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or one of the second of the s	lisagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
3. Increase the differential on the Footpath & St	reetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates	

These three targeted rates currently apply a differential on semi-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are less than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban services. In essence, the Council is suggesting that the current differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed to increase the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the rural differential to be standardized at 0.25.

Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and Town Centre Rates Differential

I agree with this suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested changes	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree of	r disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
Yes	No	
0.00		
4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge	9	
Currently, any property that provides accommodation for visitors, but doesn't meet the definition of a commercial property (generally because they can only accommodate 4 guests or less), is levied the Accommodation Sector Charge of \$400.00 including GST per year. The Council is suggesting this is too low.		
The Council is suggesting that the Accommodation Sector Charge be increased to \$600.00 including GST per year, so these smaller accommodation providers are contributing a fairer share towards Council activities that support tourism.		
Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
	r disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
○ Yes	No     No	
5. The Rural Recycling Rate		
The Council is suggesting introducing the rural recycling rate, as a fixed dollar amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit, to cover the cost of collecting recyclable material from communal collection points - for rural properties only because the collection sites are in the rural area (Lynton Downs, Clarence and Kekerengu).		
The Rural Recycling Rate		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	r disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
○ Yes	No     No	
6. Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge		
Currently all commercial properties pay a public rubbish bin charge regardless of the capital value of the property (for the 2023/2024 year this is \$162.46 including GST), which covers 50% of the cost of emptying these public rubbish bins, with the balance 50% funded by general rates. The Council is now suggesting that there is no need for a separate targeted rate for the emptying of public rubbish bins, and that the portion of costs currently funded by the Public Rubbish Bin Charge instead be funded by commercial rates.		
Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
	r disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
○ Yes	No	

### 7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate

The Council wishes to make provision in the Revenue and Financing Policy for the ability to levy a Harbour Special Operator rate. The Council is suggesting that it is appropriate for the net costs of harbour activities (after all other sources of revenue such as slipway fees, boat parking fees, cruise ship fees, etc.), could be covered by a combination of the existing commercial rate and harbour rate (set on differential), plus a proposed new Harbour Special Operator Rate to apply to special operators in proportion to the areas that they each have exclusive use over.

Note that the Council is having separate conversations with each of the special operators that we have identified, and that this new rate will be subject to the outcome of those discussions, as well as a legal review.

We do, however, still want your feedback on the principles of this suggestion.

A new Harbour Special Operator Rate		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or Yes	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
8. Changes to how some activities should be fu	nded	
While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested changes is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.		
Changes to how some activities should be funded		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.		
○ Yes	No	
9. A new definition for the Separately Used or I	nhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)	
We are suggesting a new definition for the SUIP. While the proposed definition is not a significant change, it is helpful for ratepayers and Council staff to have a clear understanding of the definition, so that it is consistently applied.		
A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
○ Yes	No	
Do you wish to present your opinion in person to the Council at a Hearing?*		
Five minute slots will be allocated to each person who wishes to preson the slots will be allocated to each person who wishes to preson the slots will be allocated to each person who wishes to preson the slots will be allocated to each person who wishes to preson the slots will be allocated to each person who wishes to preson the slots will be allocated to each person who wishes to preson the slots will be allocated to each person who wishes to preson the slots will be allocated to each person who wishes to preson the slots will be allocated to each person who wishes to preson the slots will be allocated to each person who wishes to preson the slots will be allocated to each person who wishes to preson the slots will be allocated to each person who wishes to preson the slots will be allocated to each person to each person the slots will be allocated to each person to each person the slots will be allocated to each person to each perso	No	
_ 100	□ 110	

Thank you for taking the time to make this submission.

#### What happens next?

Once we have received feedback (by noon 24 October 2023) we will commence a legal review of the suggested changes, including of the feedback suggestions, and have a hearing for people to present their views to the Council.

## When are the key dates?

Submissions open: 18th September 2023

Submissions close: 24th October 2023

Hearings: 1st - 17th November 2023

Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023

#### Rates Review 2023



We are considering options for making our rating system fairer. We have outlined our suggestions as to how we could do this, and invite you to tell us what you think.

This consultation runs from noon 18th September to noon 24th October 2023

If you run out of time you can save the form as draft and comeback and finish it at any time before noon on 24th October 2023.

1. Submitter Details	
First Name*	Family Name*
chanel	starkey
Ourseisstian Name (autions)	
Organisation Name (optional)	
Contact Details (required)	
In the space below, please provide either:	
Email Address	
Phone Number; or	
Postal Address;	
Contact Phone Number	E-mail Address
redacted	redacted
Postal Address	
Are you a ratepayer in the Kaikoura District*	
Yes	○ No
If yes, what is your address?	
We need this information to understand how your opinion might be affected by whether you live in the urban, semi-rural, or rural area.	
redacted	
2. Submission	

There are nine suggested changes to the rating system that we are consulting on. More information is available on the KDC website and in the relevant section of this submission form below.

In summary the suggested changes cover:

- 1. A new differential on the Roading Rate
- 2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate
- ${\tt 3.\,Increase\,to\,the\,differential\,on\,the\,Footpath\,\&\,Streetlights,\,Harbour,\,and\,Town\,Centre\,Rates}$
- 4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge
- 5. Rural Recycling Rate
- 6. Removal of Public Rubbish Bin Charge
- 7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate

<ol> <li>Changes to how some activities are funded</li> <li>A new definition for the Separately Used or Inh</li> </ol>	abited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested ch	nanges, you can tick the appropriate box below, and send us this form.
If you suree or dissuree with ALL of the surges	ted changes, you can tick the appropriate box below, and submit the form.*
I agree with all of the suggested changes	I disagree with all of the suggested changes
If you agree with some of the suggested changes, but n	ot all, please continue to complete this survey form.
1. A Differential on the Roading Rate	
	I on the Roading Rate, that would mean commercial properties, and properties ds the cost of roading because these properties have a greater impact on the
I agree with this suggested change	○ I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why	you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestion.
○ Yes	No
irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is some street amount ensures that semi-rural and rur at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the content of the same time the fixed amount mitigates.	urban area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs suggested to be \$200.00 including GST.  Fall properties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while disproportionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.  Roading Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with
New Roading Uniform Target Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	○ I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why	you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	⊚ No
3. Increase the differential on the Foo	otpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates
differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural resident services. In essence, the Council is suggesting that the	ial on semi-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the sare less than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban e current differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed and for the rural differential to be standardized at 0.25.
Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and Town Centr	re Rates Differential
I agree with this suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested changes
Would you like to add a comment to explain why	you agree or di <del>pa</del> gree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.

○ Yes	No     No	
1 Increase the Assertmentation Contar Charge		
4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge		
Currently, any property that provides accommodation for visitors, but doesn't meet the definition of a commercial property (generally because they can only accommodate 4 guests or less), is levied the Accommodation Sector Charge of \$400.00 including GST per year. The Council is suggesting this is too low.		
The Council is suggesting that the Accommodation Sector Charge be increased to \$600.00 including GST per year, so these smaller accommodation providers are contributing a fairer share towards Council activities that support tourism.		
Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge		
I agree with this suggested change	○ I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
○ Yes	<ul><li>No</li></ul>	
5. The Rural Recycling Rate		
The Council is suggesting introducing the rural recycling rate, as a fixed dollar amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit, to cover the cost of collecting recyclable material from communal collection points - for rural properties only because the collection sites are in the rural area (Lynton Downs, Clarence and Kekerengu).		
The Rural Recycling Rate		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
Yes	No	
	3.10	
6. Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge		
Currently all commercial properties pay a public rubbish bin charge regardless of the capital value of the property (for the 2023/2024 year this is \$162.46 including GST), which covers 50% of the cost of emptying these public rubbish bins, with the balance 50% funded by general rates. The Council is now suggesting that there is no need for a separate targeted rate for the emptying of public rubbish bins, and that the portion of costs currently funded by the Public Rubbish Bin Charge instead be funded by commercial rates.		
Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge		
I agree with this suggested change	○ I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.		
Yes	No	
7 A now Harbour Special Operator Date		
7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate		

fees, cruise ship fees, etc), could be covered by a combination of th	ne existing commercial rate and harbour rate (set on differential), plus a operators in proportion to the areas that they each have exclusive use over.	
Note that the Council is having separate conversations with each of the special operators that we have identified, and that this new rate will be subject to the outcome of those discussions, as well as a legal review.		
We do, however, still want your feedback on the principles of this s	uggestion.	
A new Harbour Special Operator Rate		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree of	or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
○ Yes	No     No	
8. Changes to how some activities should be	funded	
While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested changes is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.		
Changes to how some activities should be funded		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree of	or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
○ Yes	⊚ No	
9. A new definition for the Separately Used or	Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)	
We are suggesting a new definition for the SUIP. While the proposed definition is not a significant change, it is helpful for ratepayers and Council staff to have a clear understanding of the definition, so that it is consistently applied.		
A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of	a Rating Unit (SUIP)	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree o	or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
○ Yes	No	
Do you wish to present your opinion in person to the Council at Five minute slots will be allocated to each person who wishes to pre		
Yes	No	
Thank you for taking the	time to make this submission.	

#### What happens next?

Once we have received feedback (by noon 24 October 2023) we will commence a legal review of the suggested changes, including of the feedback suggestions, and have a hearing for people to present their views to the Council.

## When are the key dates?

Submissions open: 18th September 2023

Submissions close: 24th October 2023

Hearings: 1st - 17th November 2023

Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023

### **Rates Review 2023**



We are considering options for making our rating system fairer. We have outlined our suggestions as to how we could do this, and invite you to tell us what you think.

This consultation runs from noon 18th September to noon 24th October 2023

If you run out of time you can save the form as draft and comeback and finish it at any time before noon on 24th October 2023.

1. Submitter Details	
First Name*	Family Name*
Kim R	Swords
Organisation Name (optional)	
Contact Details (required)	
In the space below, please provide either:	
<ul><li>Email Address</li><li>Phone Number; or</li><li>Postal Address;</li></ul>	
Contact Phone Number	E-mail Address
Redacted	Redacted
Postal Address	
Redacted	
Are you a ratepayer in the Kaikoura District*	
Yes	○ No
If yes, what is your address?  We need this information to understand how your of Redacted	pinion might be affected by whether you live in the urban, semi-rural , or rural area.
2. Submission	
There are nine suggested changes to the rating syst	em that we are consulting on. More information is available on the KDC website and in

1. A new differential on the Roading Rate

the relevant section of this submission form below.

2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate

In summary the suggested changes cover:

- 3. Increase to the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates
- 4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge

<ul><li>6. Removal of Public Rubbish Bin Charge</li><li>7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate</li><li>8. Changes to how some activities are funded</li></ul>	
A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited	l Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested changes	s, you can tick the appropriate box below, and send us this form.
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested cl	hanges, you can tick the appropriate box below, and submit the form.*
I agree with all of the suggested changes	I disagree with some of the suggested changes
If you agree with some of the suggested changes, but not all,	please continue to complete this survey form.
1. A Differential on the Roading Rate	
	he Roading Rate, that would mean commercial properties, and properties e cost of roading because these properties have a greater impact on the
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you a	agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestion.
Yes	○ No
Comment about differential on the roading rate  Add your comments and alternative suggestions here  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 aslo paying then it seems yet another burden that cannot be recovered by them.	
2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate	
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggested to be \$200.00 including GST.  This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural properties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.	
Note we are proposing that the differential on the Road each other.	ling Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with
New Roading Uniform Target Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	■ I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you a	agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
3. Increase the differential on the Footpa	th & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates

5. Rural Recycling Rate

	ess than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban ent differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed for the rural differential to be standardized at 0.25.
Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and Town Centre Rate	es Differential
I agree with this suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested changes
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you a	gree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	○ No
Comment about Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and	Town Centre Rates
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here	
This is an additional level of complication that is not required ratepayers.	d but if gone ahead with would appear to favour urban dwellers over rural
4. Increase the Accommodation Sector C	harge
	sitors, but doesn't meet the definition of a commercial property (generally ied the Accommodation Sector Charge of \$400.00 including GST per year. The
The Council is suggesting that the Accommodation Sector Chaccommodation providers are contributing a fairer share tow	narge be increased to \$600.00 including GST per year, so these smaller wards Council activities that support tourism.
Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you a	gree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	○ No
Comment about the Accommodation Sector Charge	
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here	
· ·	t get traffic / revenue from council activities. Consumers expect to pay less for t they would be able to generate this additional cost but would absorb. You would
5. The Rural Recycling Rate	
	e, as a fixed dollar amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit, nunal collection points - for rural properties only because the collection sites are
The Rural Recycling Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you a	gree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Nos	O No

183

These three targeted rates currently apply a differential on semi-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the

#### Comment about the Rural Recycling Rate

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

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?

### 6. Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge

Currently all commercial properties pay a public rubbish bin charge regardless of the capital value of the property (for the 2023/2024 year this is \$162.46 including GST), which covers 50% of the cost of emptying these public rubbish bins, with the balance 50% funded by general rates. The Council is now suggesting that there is no need for a separate targeted rate for the emptying of public rubbish bins, and that the portion of costs currently funded by the Public Rubbish Bin Charge instead be funded by commercial rates.

Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why y	you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	○ No
Comment about the Public Rubbish Bin Charge	
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here	
I can't see a reason for the change? all commercial activit the bins.	ies attract some sort of visitor and therefore should have this targeted cost in emptying
7. A new Harbour Special Operator R	ate
is suggesting that it is appropriate for the net costs of h fees, cruise ship fees, etc), could be covered by a combi	nd Financing Policy for the ability to levy a Harbour Special Operator rate. The Council narbour activities (after all other sources of revenue such as slipway fees, boat parking ination of the existing commercial rate and harbour rate (set on differential), plus a to special operators in proportion to the areas that they each have exclusive use over.
Note that the Council is having separate conversations be subject to the outcome of those discussions, as well	with each of the special operators that we have identified, and that this new rate will as a legal review.
We do, however, still want your feedback on the princip	oles of this suggestion.
A new Harbour Special Operator Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	○ I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why y	ou agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	○ No

compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested changes is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.

While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources,

8. Changes to how some activities should be funded

Changes to how some activities should be funded		
○ I agree with this suggested change		
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.		
Yes No		
Comment about changes to how some activities should be funded		
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here		
Overall raising general rates for the sake of lowering commercial rates would Favour those that can recoup charges but unfairly disadvantage those who cannot.	!	
9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)		
We are suggesting a new definition for the SUIP. While the proposed definition is not a significant change, it is helpful for ratepayers and Council staff to have a clear understanding of the definition, so that it is consistently applied.		
A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)		
○ I agree with this suggested change		
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.		
Comment about a new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)		
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here		
There is too little information on how this would play out to be agreed with.		
Do you wish to present your opinion in person to the Council at a Hearing?*		
Five minute slots will be allocated to each person who wishes to present their submission in person.		
A Council staff member will contact you to let you know when the hearings will be held, and arrange a time for you to speak.		
Thank you for taking the time to make this submission.		
What happens next?		
Once we have received feedback (by noon 24 October 2023) we will commence a legal review of the suggested changes, including of the feedback suggestions, and have a hearing for people to present their views to the Council.		
When are the key dates?		
Submissions open: 18th September 2023		
Submissions close: 24th October 2023		
Hearings: 1st - 17th November 2023		
Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023		

**Rates Review 2023** 



We are considering options for making our rating system fairer. We have outlined our suggestions as to how we could do this, and invite you to tell us what you think.

This consultation runs from noon 18th September to noon 24th October 2023

If you run out of time you can save the form as draft and comeback and finish it at any time before noon on 24th October 2023.

Submitter Details	
First Name*	Family Name*
Ginny	Thomson
Organisation Name (optional)	
Contact Details (required)	
In the space below, please provide either:	
<ul><li>Email Address</li><li>Phone Number; or</li><li>Postal Address;</li></ul>	
Contact Phone Number	E-mail Address
redacted	redacted
Postal Address	
redacted	
Are you a ratepayer in the Kaikoura District*	
Yes	○ No
If yes, what is your address?	
We need this information to understand how your o	pinion might be affected by whether you live in the urban, semi-rural , or rural area.
redacted	
2. Submission	
There are nine suggested changes to the rating syst	em that we are consulting on. More information is available on the KDC website and in

#### 1. A new differential on the Roading Rate

In summary the suggested changes cover:

the relevant section of this submission form below.

- 2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate
- 3. Increase to the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates
- 4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge
- 5. Rural Recycling Rate

7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate     8. Changes to how some activities are funded		
9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited F	Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)	
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested changes,	you can tick the appropriate box below, and send us this form.	
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested cha	anges, you can tick the appropriate box below, and submit the form.*	
I agree with all of the suggested changes	I disagree with all of the suggested changes	
If you agree with some of the suggested changes, but not all, pl	lease continue to complete this survey form.	
1. A Differential on the Roading Rate		
	e Roading Rate, that would mean commercial properties, and properties cost of roading because these properties have a greater impact on the	
I agree with this suggested change	□ I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestion.		
Yes	○ No	
country, the cycle tracks and walks the beach etc. Tourists too end of the day and up go the prices. This council has squand	roads more that urban is ridiculous. Urban people like to go out and enjoy the o and adding more onto commercial businesses adds to the cost of goods at the lered rates on inferior roading contractors that are repairing the repairs again needs to be redone 6 months to a year later then it should not be a costs to	
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban a irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggest	rea should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs ed to be \$200.00 including GST.	
This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural properties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.  Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roading Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with each other.		
New Roading Uniform Target Rate		
I agree with this suggested change	□ I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you ag	gree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
Yes	○ No	
Comment about new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate  Add your comments and alternative suggestions here		

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.

### 3. Increase the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates

These three targeted rates currently apply a differential on semi-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are less than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban services. In essence, the Council is suggesting that the current differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed to increase the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the rural differential to be standardized at 0.25.

to increase the semi-ratal amerendal from 6.5 to 6.75, and for the ra	an amerenda to be standardized at 0.25.	
Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and Town Centre Rates Differ	ential	
I agree with this suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested changes	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
Yes	⊚ No	
4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge		
Currently, any property that provides accommodation for visitors, bu because they can only accommodate 4 guests or less), is levied the Accouncil is suggesting this is too low.	t doesn't meet the definition of a commercial property (generally ccommodation Sector Charge of \$400.00 including GST per year. The	
The Council is suggesting that the Accommodation Sector Charge be increased to \$600.00 including GST per year, so these smaller accommodation providers are contributing a fairer share towards Council activities that support tourism.		
Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
Yes	○ No	
Comment about the Accommodation Sector Charge		
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here		
No opinion as have no idea on this matter		
5. The Rural Recycling Rate		
5. The Kurai Recycling Rate		

The Council is suggesting introducing the rural recycling rate, as a fixed dollar amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit, to cover the cost of collecting recyclable material from communal collection points - for rural properties only because the collection sites are in the rural area (Lynton Downs, Clarence and Kekerengu).

○ I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or   Yes	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No	
Comment about the Rural Recycling Rate  Add your comments and alternative suggestions here  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.	
6. Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge		
Currently all commercial properties pay a public rubbish bin charge regardless of the capital value of the property (for the 2023/2024 year this is \$162.46 including GST), which covers 50% of the cost of emptying these public rubbish bins, with the balance 50% funded by general rates. The Council is now suggesting that there is no need for a separate targeted rate for the emptying of public rubbish bins, and that the portion of costs currently funded by the Public Rubbish Bin Charge instead be funded by commercial rates.		
Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge		
I agree with this suggested change	■ I disagree with this suggested change	
Would any like to add a comment to make a whole and		
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No	
o res	○ NO	
Comment about the Public Rubbish Bin Charge		
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here		
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.		
7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate		
is suggesting that it is appropriate for the net costs of harbour activities, cruise ship fees, etc), could be covered by a combination of the	Policy for the ability to levy a Harbour Special Operator rate. The Council ties (after all other sources of revenue such as slipway fees, boat parking existing commercial rate and harbour rate (set on differential), plus a erators in proportion to the areas that they each have exclusive use over.	
Note that the Council is having separate conversations with each of the special operators that we have identified, and that this new rate will be subject to the outcome of those discussions, as well as a legal review.		
We do, however, still want your feedback on the principles of this su	ggestion.	
A new Harbour Special Operator Rate		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
Yes	○ No	
Comment about a new Harbour Special Operator Rate		

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

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)

### 8. Changes to how some activities should be funded

While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested changes is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.

Changes to how some activities should be funded		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
Yes	○ No	
Comment about changes to how some activities should be funded		
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here	also well a south and a second a second and a second a second and a second a second and a second a second a second a second a second and a second a second a second a second and a second a	
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 wi		
this and leaving their waste behind. I say heavy fines for freedom car		
	e over the stop bank. One less job in council would pay for a person to	
	facilities and dumping their rubbish on the tracks. A much better way to	
	ve money a good look at who works at the council and what their job is annot keep upping the rates and not making sure your house is clean.	
Every year the rates go up again and again so in my opinion now is the		
9. A new definition for the Separately Used or I	nhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)	
We are suggesting a new definition for the SUIP. While the proposed definition is not a significant change, it is helpful for ratepayers and		
Council staff to have a clear understanding of the definition, so that it	: is consistently applied.	
A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a	Rating Unit (SUIP)	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.		
Yes	○ No	
Comment about a new definition for the Separately Used or Inf	nabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)	
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here		
Not sure about this one and what it means		
Do you wish to present your opinion in person to the Council at	a Hearing?*	
Five minute slots will be allocated to each person who wishes to prese	ent their submission in person.	
Yes	No	

# Thank you for taking the time to make this submission.

#### What happens next?

Once we have received feedback (by noon 24 October 2023) we will commence a legal review of the suggested changes, including of the feedback suggestions, and have a hearing for people to present their views to the Council.

#### When are the key dates?

Submissions open: 18th September 2023

Submissions close: 24th October 2023

Hearings: 1st - 17th November 2023

Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023

### **Rates Review 2023**



We are considering options for making our rating system fairer. We have outlined our suggestions as to how we could do this, and invite you to tell us what you think.

This consultation runs from noon 18th September to noon 24th October 2023

If you run out of time you can save the form as draft and comeback and finish it at any time before noon on 24th October 2023.

Submitter Details	
First Name*	Family Name*
Paddy and Anna	Trolove
Organisation Name (optional)	
Contact Details (required)	
In the space below, please provide either:	
<ul><li>Email Address</li><li>Phone Number; or</li><li>Postal Address;</li></ul>	
Contact Phone Number	E-mail Address
Redacted	Redacted
Postal Address	
Redacted	
Are you a ratepayer in the Kaikoura District*	
Yes	○ No
If yes, what is your address?	
We need this information to understand how your opinion Redacted	might be affected by whether you live in the urban, semi-rural , or rural area.
2. Submission	
There are nine suggested changes to the rating system that the relevant section of this submission form below.	at we are consulting on. More information is available on the KDC website and in

# In summary the suggested changes cover:

- 1. A new differential on the Roading Rate
- 2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate
- 3. Increase to the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates
- 4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge

<ol> <li>Removal of Public Rubbish Bin Charge</li> <li>A new Harbour Special Operator Rate</li> </ol>	
8. Changes to how some activities are funded	
9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a	a Rating Unit (SUIP)
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested changes, you can	tick the appropriate box below, and send us this form.
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested changes,	you can tick the appropriate box below, and submit the form.*
I agree with all of the suggested changes	I disagree with some of the suggested changes
If you agree with some of the suggested changes, but not all, please co	ontinue to complete this survey form.
1. A Differential on the Roading Rate	
	ing Rate, that would mean commercial properties, and properties f roading because these properties have a greater impact on the
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestion.
Yes	○ No
Comment about differential on the roading rate  Add your comments and alternative suggestions here  Everyone uses and benefits from roads where ever they are. imposs	ible to differentiate who is or isn't using the road
2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate	
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area sho irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggested to b	ould contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs e \$200.00 including GST.
at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportional	will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while ate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.  , and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with
New Roading Uniform Target Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	○ No
Comment about new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate Add your comments and alternative suggestions here Urban people use roads too!	

5. Rural Recycling Rate

### 3. Increase the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates

These three targeted rates currently apply a differential on semi-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are less than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban services. In essence, the Council is suggesting that the current differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed to increase the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the rural differential to be standardized at 0.25.

Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and Town Centre Rates Differe	
I agree with this suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested changes
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or c	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	○ No
Comment about Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and Town Cell Add your comments and alternative suggestions here Seems to be a theme to load more onto rural rate payers	ntre Rates
4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge	
Currently, any property that provides accommodation for visitors, but because they can only accommodate 4 guests or less), is levied the Accouncil is suggesting this is too low.	
The Council is suggesting that the Accommodation Sector Charge be i accommodation providers are contributing a fairer share towards Cou	
Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge	
I agree with this suggested change	○ I disagree with this suggested change
	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No
○ Yes	No
5. The Rural Recycling Rate	
The Council is suggesting introducing the rural recycling rate, as a fixe to cover the cost of collecting recyclable material from communal coll in the rural area (Lynton Downs, Clarence and Kekerengu).	d dollar amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit, ection points - for rural properties only because the collection sites are
The Rural Recycling Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	■ I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or comments of explain why you agree or companies and explain why you agree or comments of explain why you agree or companies	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No
⊜ 165	₩ NO
Commont about the Pural Proveling Pate	

#### Comment about the Rural Recycling Rate

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

Just a new charge that was not there before on rural rate payers

### 6. Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge

Currently all commercial properties pay a public rubbish bin charge regardless of the capital value of the property (for the 2023/2024 year this is \$162.46 including GST), which covers 50% of the cost of emptying these public rubbish bins, with the balance 50% funded by general rates. The Council is now suggesting that there is no need for a separate targeted rate for the emptying of public rubbish bins, and that the portion of costs currently funded by the Public Rubbish Bin Charge instead be funded by commercial rates.

Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge	
I agree with this suggested change	■ I disagree with this suggested change
	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	○ No
Comment about the Public Rubbish Bin Charge  Add your comments and alternative suggestions here	
	s charge should be shared as it is currently with general and commercial
7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate	
The Council wicker to make provision in the Povenue and Financing	Policy for the ability to levy a Harbour Special Operator rate. The Council
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ties (after all other sources of revenue such as slipway fees, boat parking
	existing commercial rate and harbour rate (set on differential), plus a
proposed new Harbour Special Operator Rate to apply to special op	erators in proportion to the areas that they each have exclusive use over.
_ ·	the special operators that we have identified, and that this new rate will
be subject to the outcome of those discussions, as well as a legal rev	iew.
We do, however, still want your feedback on the principles of this su	ggestion.
A new Harbour Special Operator Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	● No
8. Changes to how some activities should be fu	unded
3	
While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has	debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, s is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do
	Council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.
Changes to how some activities should be funded	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
-	-
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	○ No

# Comment about changes to how some activities should be funded Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

Sounds like this would give the council to change rates as they suited, without consulting the rate payers, which i do not agree with

### 9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)

We are suggesting a new definition for the SUIP. While the proposed definition is not a significant change, it is helpful for ratepayers and Council staff to have a clear understanding of the definition, so that it is consistently applied.

	A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a F	Rating Unit (SUIP)
	O I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
	Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or d	lisagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
	⊚ Yes	○ No
	Comment about a new definition for the Separately Used or Inh.  Add your comments and alternative suggestions here  The new definition has not been stated, so we cannot agree or disagree.	
	Do you wish to present your opinion in person to the Council at a	ı Hearing?*
	Five minute slots will be allocated to each person who wishes to prese	nt their submission in person.
(	Yes	⊚ No

### Thank you for taking the time to make this submission.

#### What happens next?

Once we have received feedback (by noon 24 October 2023) we will commence a legal review of the suggested changes, including of the feedback suggestions, and have a hearing for people to present their views to the Council.

#### When are the key dates?

Submissions open: 18th September 2023

Submissions close: 24th October 2023

Hearings: 1st - 17th November 2023

Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023

### **Rates Review 2023**



We are considering options for making our rating system fairer. We have outlined our suggestions as to how we could do this, and invite you to tell us what you think.

This consultation runs from noon 18th September to noon 24th October 2023

If you run out of time you can save the form as draft and comeback and finish it at any time before noon on 24th October 2023.

Submitter Details	
First Name*	Family Name*
cushla	Twist
Organisation Name (optional)	
Contact Details (required)	
In the space below, please provide either:	
<ul><li>Email Address</li><li>Phone Number; or</li><li>Postal Address;</li></ul>	
Contact Phone Number	E-mail Address
redacted	redacted
Postal Address	
redacted	
Are you a ratepayer in the Kaikoura District	*
Yes	○ No
If yes, what is your address?	
We need this information to understand how y	our opinion might be affected by whether you live in the urban, semi-rural, or rural area.
redacted	
2. Submission	
There are nine suggested changes to the ratio	g system that we are consulting on. More information is available on the KDC website and in

There are nine suggested changes to the rating system that we are consulting on. More information is available on the KDC website and in the relevant section of this submission form below.

In summary the suggested changes cover:

- 1. A new differential on the Roading Rate
- 2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate
- 3. Increase to the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates
- 4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge
- 5. Rural Recycling Rate
- 6. Removal of Public Rubbish Bin Charge

8. Changes to how some activities are funded 9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a	Rating Unit (SUIP)
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested changes, you can	tick the appropriate box below, and send us this form.
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested changes, y	ou can tick the appropriate box below, and submit the form.*
I agree with all of the suggested changes	I disagree with all of the suggested changes
f you agree with some of the suggested changes, but not all, please cor	ntinue to complete this survey form.
1. A Differential on the Roading Rate	
We are suggesting that there is a new differential on the Roadir in the rural and semi-rural areas, pay more towards the cost of wear and tear of roads.	ng Rate, that would mean commercial properties, and properties roading because these properties have a greater impact on the
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or one of the Yes	lisagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestion.
Comment about differential on the roading rate  Add your comments and alternative suggestions here  How does properties in Goose bay have a higher wear and tear when are not there. Even when there was a full camping ground at Goose because of the comment of the	there is only 30 houses and 6 months of the year 70% of the residents bay we still did not receive road maintenance.
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area shown irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggested to be	_
at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportional	rill not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while the impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with
New Roading Uniform Target Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or one of the Yes	lisagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No
Comment about new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate  Add your comments and alternative suggestions here  If we paid this yearly amount would KDC guarantee that we would get had no improvements or regular maintenance in Goose bay	the road maintenance/improvements that we need , so far we have

7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate

### 3. Increase the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates

These three targeted rates currently apply a differential on semi-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are less than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban services. In essence, the Council is suggesting that the current differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed to increase the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the rural differential to be standardized at 0.25.

Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and Town Centre Rates Differe	ential
I agree with this suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested changes
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or one Yes	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No
Comment about Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and Town Ce Add your comments and alternative suggestions here we can not even get a street light on the corner of makura rd and mod	
4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge	
Currently, any property that provides accommodation for visitors, but because they can only accommodate 4 guests or less), is levied the Accouncil is suggesting this is too low.	
The Council is suggesting that the Accommodation Sector Charge be i accommodation providers are contributing a fairer share towards Cou	
Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or o	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	No  No
5. The Rural Recycling Rate	
	d dollar amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit, ection points - for rural properties only because the collection sites are
The Rural Recycling Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or one Yes	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.  No

### Comment about the Rural Recycling Rate

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

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
we had a perfectly good recycling service in goose day 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.

Currently all commercial properties pay a public rubbish bin charge regardless of the capital value of the property (for the 2023/2024 year this is \$162.46 including GST), which covers 50% of the cost of emptying these public rubbish bins, with the balance 50% funded by general rates. The Council is now suggesting that there is no need for a separate targeted rate for the emptying of public rubbish bins, and that the portion of costs currently funded by the Public Rubbish Bin Charge instead be funded by commercial rates.

Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	No     No     No
7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate	
is suggesting that it is appropriate for the net costs of harbour activit fees, cruise ship fees, etc), could be covered by a combination of the	Policy for the ability to levy a Harbour Special Operator rate. The Council ties (after all other sources of revenue such as slipway fees, boat parking existing commercial rate and harbour rate (set on differential), plus a erators in proportion to the areas that they each have exclusive use over.
Note that the Council is having separate conversations with each of the subject to the outcome of those discussions, as well as a legal rev	the special operators that we have identified, and that this new rate will iew.
We do, however, still want your feedback on the principles of this su	ggestion.
A new Harbour Special Operator Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	No
Comment about a new Harbour Special Operator Rate	
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here	
the commercial companies using these services should have to pay a	accordingly
8. Changes to how some activities should be fu	ınded
	debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, s is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do ouncil expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.
Changes to how some activities should be funded	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change

○ Yes	No	
9. A new definition for	e Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)	
	for the SUIP. While the proposed definition is not a significant change, it is helpful for ratepayers and tanding of the definition, so that it is consistently applied.	
A new definition for the Separ	ely Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)	
I agree with this suggested cha	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comn	nt to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
○ Yes	No	
Five minute slots will be allocated  Yes	on in person to the Council at a Hearing?*  each person who wishes to present their submission in person.  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  N	
What happens next?		
	noon 24 October 2023) we will commence a legal review of the suggested changes, including of the feedback eople to present their views to the Council.	
When are the key dates?		
Submissions open: 18th Septem	2023	
Submissions close: 24th October	23	
Hearings: 1st - 17th No	nber 2023	
Adopt the changes: 29th Noveml	2023	
Changes take effect: 1st July 2024		

**Rates Review 2023** 

Culturalities Detaile



We are considering options for making our rating system fairer. We have outlined our suggestions as to how we could do this, and invite you to tell us what you think.

This consultation runs from noon 18th September to noon 24th October 2023

If you run out of time you can save the form as draft and comeback and finish it at any time before noon on 24th October 2023.

1. Submitter Details	
First Name* Joe	Family Name* van Rooyen
Organisation Name (optional)	
Contact Details (required)	
In the space below, please provide either:	
<ul><li>Email Address</li><li>Phone Number; or</li><li>Postal Address;</li></ul>	
Contact Phone Number	E-mail Address
Redacted	Redacted
Postal Address	
Redacted	
Are you a ratepayer in the Kaikoura District*	
Yes	○ No
If yes, what is your address?	
We need this information to understand how your opinion might be af	fected by whether you live in the urban, semi-rural , or rural area.
Redacted	
2. Submission	

the relevant section of this submission form below.

In summary the suggested changes cover:

There are nine suggested changes to the rating system that we are consulting on. More information is available on the KDC website and in

1. A new differential on the Roading Rate	
2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate	
3. Increase to the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights,	, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates
<ol> <li>Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge</li> <li>Rural Recycling Rate</li> </ol>	
6. Removal of Public Rubbish Bin Charge	
7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate	
8. Changes to how some activities are funded	
9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Par	t of a Rating Unit (SUIP)
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested changes, you	u can tick the appropriate box below, and send us this form.
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested chang	ges, you can tick the appropriate box below, and submit the form.*
I agree with all of the suggested changes	I disagree with some of the suggested changes
If you agree with some of the suggested changes, but not all, pleas	se continue to complete this survey form.
1. A Differential on the Roading Rate	
	oading Rate, that would mean commercial properties, and properties st of roading because these properties have a greater impact on the
I agree with this suggested change	■ I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree	e or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestion.
	e or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestion.
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree  Yes	e or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestion.  No
Yes	
<ul><li>Yes</li><li>Comment about differential on the roading rate</li></ul>	
<ul> <li>Yes</li> <li>Comment about differential on the roading rate</li> <li>Add your comments and alternative suggestions here</li> </ul>	○ No
<ul> <li>Yes</li> <li>Comment about differential on the roading rate</li> <li>Add your comments and alternative suggestions here</li> </ul>	○ No  • Council must provide a reasonable standard of roading.,i.e. all busy rural
<ul> <li>Yes</li> <li>Comment about differential on the roading rate</li> <li>Add your comments and alternative suggestions here</li> <li>Before a new differential on the roading rate is implemented the</li> </ul>	○ No  • Council must provide a reasonable standard of roading.,i.e. all busy rural
<ul> <li>Yes</li> <li>Comment about differential on the roading rate</li> <li>Add your comments and alternative suggestions here</li> <li>Before a new differential on the roading rate is implemented the roads with in 15km of the town are upgraded and tarsealed to p</li> <li>A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate</li> </ul>	No  Re Council must provide a reasonable standard of roading.,i.e. all busy rural provide a reasonable, safe standard of roading.  Re Should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs
Comment about differential on the roading rate  Add your comments and alternative suggestions here  Before a new differential on the roading rate is implemented the roads with in 15km of the town are upgraded and tarsealed to p  2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate  We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggested.  This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural propert at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproport	No  Re Council must provide a reasonable standard of roading.,i.e. all busy rural provide a reasonable, safe standard of roading.  Re Should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs
Comment about differential on the roading rate  Add your comments and alternative suggestions here  Before a new differential on the roading rate is implemented the roads with in 15km of the town are upgraded and tarsealed to p  2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate  We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggested  This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural propert at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproport Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roading	e Council must provide a reasonable standard of roading.,i.e. all busy rural provide a reasonable, safe standard of roading.  a should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs to be \$200.00 including GST.  ties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while tionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.
Comment about differential on the roading rate  Add your comments and alternative suggestions here  Before a new differential on the roading rate is implemented the roads with in 15km of the town are upgraded and tarsealed to p  2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate  We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban are irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggested  This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural propert at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproport Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roading leach other.	e Council must provide a reasonable standard of roading.,i.e. all busy rural provide a reasonable, safe standard of roading.  a should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs to be \$200.00 including GST.  ties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while tionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.
Comment about differential on the roading rate  Add your comments and alternative suggestions here Before a new differential on the roading rate is implemented the roads with in 15km of the town are upgraded and tarsealed to p  2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate  We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggested  This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural propert at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproport Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roading each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change	e Council must provide a reasonable standard of roading.,i.e. all busy rural provide a reasonable, safe standard of roading.  a should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs to be \$200.00 including GST.  ties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while tionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.  Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with
Comment about differential on the roading rate  Add your comments and alternative suggestions here Before a new differential on the roading rate is implemented the roads with in 15km of the town are upgraded and tarsealed to p  2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate  We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggested  This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural propert at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproport Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roading each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change	e Council must provide a reasonable standard of roading.,i.e. all busy rural provide a reasonable, safe standard of roading.  a should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs to be \$200.00 including GST.  ties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while tionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.  Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with
Comment about differential on the roading rate  Add your comments and alternative suggestions here Before a new differential on the roading rate is implemented the roads with in 15km of the town are upgraded and tarsealed to p  2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate  We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggested. This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural propert at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproport Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roading each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree.	© No  e Council must provide a reasonable standard of roading.,i.e. all busy rural provide a reasonable, safe standard of roading.  a should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs to be \$200.00 including GST.  ties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while tionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.  Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with  © I disagree with this suggested change  e or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Comment about differential on the roading rate  Add your comments and alternative suggestions here Before a new differential on the roading rate is implemented the roads with in 15km of the town are upgraded and tarsealed to p  2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate  We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggested. This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural propert at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproport Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roading each other.  New Roading Uniform Target Rate  I agree with this suggested change  Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree.	© No  e Council must provide a reasonable standard of roading.,i.e. all busy rural provide a reasonable, safe standard of roading.  a should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs to be \$200.00 including GST.  ties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while tionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.  Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with  © I disagree with this suggested change  e or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here see above			
3. Increase the differential on the Footpath	n & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates		
These three targeted rates currently apply a differential on semi-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are less than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban services. In essence, the Council is suggesting that the current differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed to increase the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the rural differential to be standardized at 0.25.			
Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and Town Centre Rate	s Differential		
I agree with this suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested changes		
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you as	gree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.		
Yes	No		
Comment about Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and T	own Centre Rates		
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here			
Identifying all residents living within 15 minutes from the tow These residents fall under two completely separate categorie Owners of lifestyle blocks, unless retired are likely to work in			
	footpaths, street lights etc. so must remain at a 0.5 differential or lower.		
4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Ch	narge		
Currently, any property that provides accommodation for visitors, but doesn't meet the definition of a commercial property (generally because they can only accommodate 4 guests or less), is levied the Accommodation Sector Charge of \$400.00 including GST per year. The Council is suggesting this is too low.			
The Council is suggesting that the Accommodation Sector Charge be increased to \$600.00 including GST per year, so these smaller accommodation providers are contributing a fairer share towards Council activities that support tourism.			
Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge			
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change		
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you ag	gree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.		
○ Yes	○ No		
5. The Rural Recycling Rate			
The Council is suggesting introducing the rural recycling rate.	as a fixed dollar amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit,		

The Council is suggesting introducing the rural recycling rate, as a fixed dollar amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit, to cover the cost of collecting recyclable material from communal collection points - for rural properties only because the collection sites are in the rural area (Lynton Downs, Clarence and Kekerengu).

The Rural Recycling Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	

I disagree with this suggested change

Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree	or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	○ No
6. Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge	
this is \$162.46 including GST), which covers 50% of the cost of em	ge regardless of the capital value of the property (for the 2023/2024 year ptying these public rubbish bins, with the balance 50% funded by general eparate targeted rate for the emptying of public rubbish bins, and that the e instead be funded by commercial rates.
Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
	or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	○ No
7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate	
is suggesting that it is appropriate for the net costs of harbour act fees, cruise ship fees, etc), could be covered by a combination of the proposed new Harbour Special Operator Rate to apply to special	ng Policy for the ability to levy a Harbour Special Operator rate. The Council ivities (after all other sources of revenue such as slipway fees, boat parking the existing commercial rate and harbour rate (set on differential), plus a operators in proportion to the areas that they each have exclusive use over.  of the special operators that we have identified, and that this new rate will review.
We do, however, still want your feedback on the principles of this	
we do, nowever, still want your recuback off the principles of this	Suggestion.
A new Harbour Special Operator Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	◯ I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree	or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	○ No
8. Changes to how some activities should be	funded
compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested chan	as debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, ges is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do e Council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.
Changes to how some activities should be funded	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
	or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
○ Yes	○ No

# 9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP) We are suggesting a new definition for the SUIP. While the proposed definition is not a significant change, it is helpful for ratepayers and Council staff to have a clear understanding of the definition, so that it is consistently applied. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP) I agree with this suggested change I disagree with this suggested change Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions. Yes O No Do you wish to present your opinion in person to the Council at a Hearing?\* Five minute slots will be allocated to each person who wishes to present their submission in person. Yes No Thank you for taking the time to make this submission. What happens next? Once we have received feedback (by noon 24 October 2023) we will commence a legal review of the suggested changes, including of the feedback suggestions, and have a hearing for people to present their views to the Council. When are the key dates? Submissions open: 18th September 2023 Submissions close: 24th October 2023 1st - 17th November 2023 Hearings: Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023

### **Rates Review 2023**

Culturalities Detaile



We are considering options for making our rating system fairer. We have outlined our suggestions as to how we could do this, and invite you to tell us what you think.

This consultation runs from noon 18th September to noon 24th October 2023

If you run out of time you can save the form as draft and comeback and finish it at any time before noon on 24th October 2023.

1. Submitter Details	
First Name* Rachel	Family Name * Vaughan
Organisation Name (optional)	
Contact Details (required)	
In the space below, please provide either:	
<ul><li>Email Address</li><li>Phone Number; or</li><li>Postal Address;</li></ul>	
Contact Phone Number	E-mail Address
redacted	redacted
Postal Address redacted	
Are you a ratepayer in the Kaikoura District*	○ No
<b></b>	3.10
If yes, what is your address?  We need this information to understand how your opinion might be a redacted	affected by whether you live in the urban, semi-rural , or rural area.
2. Submission	
There are nine suggested changes to the rating system that we are c	onsulting on. More information is available on the KDC website and in

1. A new differential on the Roading Rate

In summary the suggested changes cover:

the relevant section of this submission form below.

2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate

<ul><li>3. Increase to the differential on the Footpath &amp; Streetlights, H</li><li>4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge</li><li>5. Rural Recycling Rate</li><li>6. Removal of Public Rubbish Bin Charge</li></ul>	arbour, and Town Centre Rates
<ul><li>7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate</li><li>8. Changes to how some activities are funded</li><li>9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part o</li></ul>	of a Rating Unit (SUIP)
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested changes, you co	an tick the appropriate box below, and send us this form.
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested changes	s, you can tick the appropriate box below, and submit the form.*
I agree with all of the suggested changes	I disagree with all of the suggested changes
If you agree with some of the suggested changes, but not all, please	continue to complete this survey form.
1. A Differential on the Roading Rate	
	nding Rate, that would mean commercial properties, and properties of roading because these properties have a greater impact on the
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree of	or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestion.
Yes	○ No
Comment about differential on the roading rate	
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here	
No proof has been presented that shows the suggested land uses home and do few trips each week. More research is required to ma	have a higher impact on roads. Many rural or lifestyle residents work from ake a fair determination.
2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate	
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area s irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggested to	hould contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs be \$200.00 including GST.
at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportio	s will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while nate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. te, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with
New Roading Uniform Target Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree o	or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	○ No
Comment about new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate  Add your comments and alternative suggestions here	
As above	208
	208

# 3. Increase the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates

These three targeted rates currently apply a differential on semi-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are less than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban services. In essence, the Council is suggesting that the current differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed to increase the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the rural differential to be standardized at 0.25.

Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and Town Centre Rates Differ	rential		
I agree with this suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested changes		
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.			
Yes	○ No		
	entre Rates services at a level that makes the differential fair. Council does not have		
enough data to determine this.			
4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge	<del>}</del>		
Currently, any property that provides accommodation for visitors, but because they can only accommodate 4 guests or less), is levied the A Council is suggesting this is too low.	ut doesn't meet the definition of a commercial property (generally accommodation Sector Charge of \$400.00 including GST per year. The		
The Council is suggesting that the Accommodation Sector Charge be accommodation providers are contributing a fairer share towards Co			
Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge			
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change		
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.		
○ Yes	○ No		
5. The Rural Recycling Rate			
	ed dollar amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit, llection points - for rural properties only because the collection sites are		
The Rural Recycling Rate			
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change		
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.		
○ Yes	○ No		

6	Remove	the	Public	Ruhhish	Rin	Charge
v.		LIIC	I UDIIC	LIGIDADI		Onaluc

Currently all commercial properties pay a public rubbish bin charge regardless of the capital value of the property (for the 2023/2024 year this is \$162.46 including GST), which covers 50% of the cost of emptying these public rubbish bins, with the balance 50% funded by general rates. The Council is now suggesting that there is no need for a separate targeted rate for the emptying of public rubbish bins, and that the portion of costs currently funded by the Public Rubbish Bin Charge instead be funded by commercial rates.

Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or o	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	○ No
7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate	
is suggesting that it is appropriate for the net costs of harbour activitie fees, cruise ship fees, etc), could be covered by a combination of the expression of the expressio	olicy for the ability to levy a Harbour Special Operator rate. The Council es (after all other sources of revenue such as slipway fees, boat parking existing commercial rate and harbour rate (set on differential), plus a prators in proportion to the areas that they each have exclusive use over.
Note that the Council is having separate conversations with each of the be subject to the outcome of those discussions, as well as a legal review.	ne special operators that we have identified, and that this new rate will ew.
We do, however, still want your feedback on the principles of this sugg	gestion.
A new Harbour Special Operator Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or o	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	○ No
Comment about a new Harbour Special Operator Rate	
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here	
I don't have enough information to agree or disagree	
8. Changes to how some activities should be full	nded
	lebated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do buncil expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.
Changes to how some activities should be funded	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or o	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
⊚ Yes	○ No

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here I don't have enough information to agree or disagree

### 9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)

We are suggesting a new definition for the SUIP. While the proposed definition is not a significant change, it is helpful for ratepayers and Council staff to have a clear understanding of the definition, so that it is consistently applied.

I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or o	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.

#### Do you wish to present your opinion in person to the Council at a Hearing?\*

A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)

 $\label{thm:condition} \text{Five minute slots will be allocated to each person who wishes to present their submission in person. }$ 

Yes	<ul><li>No</li></ul>

### Thank you for taking the time to make this submission.

O No

#### What happens next?

Yes

Once we have received feedback (by noon 24 October 2023) we will commence a legal review of the suggested changes, including of the feedback suggestions, and have a hearing for people to present their views to the Council.

#### When are the key dates?

Submissions open: 18th September 2023

Submissions close: 24th October 2023

Hearings: 1st - 17th November 2023

Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023

### **Rates Review 2023**



We are considering options for making our rating system fairer. We have outlined our suggestions as to how we could do this, and invite you to tell us what you think.

This consultation runs from noon 18th September to noon 24th October 2023

If you run out of time you can save the form as draft and comeback and finish it at any time before noon on 24th October 2023.

1. Submitter Details	
First Name*	Family Name*
Lynne and Chris	Wilson
Organisation Name (optional)	
Contact Details (required)	
In the space below, please provide either:	
<ul><li>Email Address</li><li>Phone Number; or</li><li>Postal Address;</li></ul>	
Contact Phone Number	E-mail Address
redacted	redacted
Postal Address	
redacted	
Are you a ratepayer in the Kaikoura District*	
Yes	○ No
If yes, what is your address?	
We need this information to understand how your	opinion might be affected by whether you live in the urban, semi-rural, or rural area.
redacted	
2. Submission	
There are nine suggested changes to the rating sys	stem that we are consulting on. More information is available on the KDC website and in

There are nine suggested changes to the rating system that we are consulting on. More information is available on the KDC website and in the relevant section of this submission form below.

In summary the suggested changes cover:

- 1. A new differential on the Roading Rate
- 2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate
- 3. Increase to the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates
- 4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge
- 5. Rural Recycling Rate
- 6. Removal of Public Rubbish Bin Charge

<ul><li>7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate</li><li>8. Changes to how some activities are funded</li><li>9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of</li></ul>	a Rating Unit (SUIP)
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested changes, you can	n tick the appropriate box below, and send us this form.
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested changes,	you can tick the appropriate box below, and submit the form.*
I agree with all of the suggested changes	I disagree with some of the suggested changes
If you agree with some of the suggested changes, but not all, please of	ontinue to complete this survey form.
A Differential on the Roading Rate	
	ing Rate, that would mean commercial properties, and properties froading because these properties have a greater impact on the
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestion.
<ul><li>Yes</li></ul>	○ No
form of transport benefits from roading wherever they travel. To sug	ved given that every ratepayer, whether urban or rural who uses any ggest travel is restricted to the relatively immediate vicinity of any group e be they locals, visitors or tourists. Refer also summary submission from
2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate	
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area sh irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggested to be	ould contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs be \$200.00 including GST.
at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportion	will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while ate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties. e, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with
New Roading Uniform Target Rate	
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.
Yes	○ No
Comment about new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate Add your comments and alternative suggestions here Refer comments above	

### 3. Increase the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates

These three targeted rates currently apply a differential on semi-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are less than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban services. In essence, the Council is suggesting that the current differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed to increase the semi-rural differential from 0.5 to 0.75, and for the rural differential to be standardized at 0.25.

Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and Town Centre Rates Differ	rential	
I agree with this suggested changes	I disagree with this suggested changes	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or   Yes	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
Comment about Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and Town Ce Add your comments and alternative suggestions here Another manipilation of rates to favour urban ratepayers - refer to the		
4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge		
Currently, any property that provides accommodation for visitors, but doesn't meet the definition of a commercial property (generally because they can only accommodate 4 guests or less), is levied the Accommodation Sector Charge of \$400.00 including GST per year. The Council is suggesting this is too low.		
The Council is suggesting that the Accommodation Sector Charge be increased to \$600.00 including GST per year, so these smaller accommodation providers are contributing a fairer share towards Council activities that support tourism.		
Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
Yes	○ No	
Comment about the Accommodation Sector Charge  Add your comments and alternative suggestions here  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.		
5. The Rural Recycling Rate		
The Council is suggesting introducing the rural recycling rate, as a fixed dollar amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit, to cover the cost of collecting recyclable material from communal collection points - for rural properties only because the collection sites are in the rural area (Lynton Downs, Clarence and Kekerengu).		
The Rural Recycling Rate		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	

Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions. 214

Yes	○ No	
Comment about the Rural Recycling Rate		
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here		
If the total cost of the service was deemed too low to warrant a seperate 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.		
6. Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge		
Currently all commercial properties pay a public rubbish bin charge regardless of the capital value of the property (for the 2023/2024 year this is \$162.46 including GST), which covers 50% of the cost of emptying these public rubbish bins, with the balance 50% funded by general rates. The Council is now suggesting that there is no need for a separate targeted rate for the emptying of public rubbish bins, and that the portion of costs currently funded by the Public Rubbish Bin Charge instead be funded by commercial rates.		
Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agre	ee or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
Yes	○ No	
Comment about the Public Rubbish Bin Charge		
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here		
All commercial activities attract visitors so the existing charges a	re more equitable	
7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate		
The Council wishes to make provision in the Revenue and Financing Policy for the ability to levy a Harbour Special Operator rate. The Council is suggesting that it is appropriate for the net costs of harbour activities (after all other sources of revenue such as slipway fees, boat parking fees, cruise ship fees, etc), could be covered by a combination of the existing commercial rate and harbour rate (set on differential), plus a proposed new Harbour Special Operator Rate to apply to special operators in proportion to the areas that they each have exclusive use over.		
Note that the Council is having separate conversations with each of the special operators that we have identified, and that this new rate will be subject to the outcome of those discussions, as well as a legal review.		
We do, however, still want your feedback on the principles of this suggestion.		
A many Hawharin Special Operator Bata		
A new Harbour Special Operator Rate	Oldingers with this suggested shares	
I agree with this suggested change	○ I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree	ee or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
○ Yes	○ No	
8 Changes to how some activities should h	ne funded	
c. changes to now come donvince should be		
8. Changes to how some activities should be	pe funded	

While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested changes is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees.

Changes to how some activities should be funded			
○ I agree with this suggested change			
Marild you like to add a comment to symbol or why you are an discourse, and let us know if you have an alternative symbol.	.tiono		
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative sugges  No	tions.		
Tes No			
Comment about changes to how some activities should be funded			
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here			
Any of the changes which result in reducing the commercial rate by increasing the gereneral rate should be reconsidered.			
9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)			
We are suggesting a new definition for the SUIP. While the proposed definition is not a significant change, it is helpful for ratepayers and Council staff to have a clear understanding of the definition, so that it is consistently applied.			
A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)			
○ I agree with this suggested change			
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.			
Comment about a new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)			
Add your comments and alternative suggestions here			
The implications of the new definition have not been clarified or quantified			
Do you wish to present your opinion in person to the Council at a Hearing?*			
Five minute slots will be allocated to each person who wishes to present their submission in person.   No			
e les			
A Council staff member will contact you to let you know when the hearings will be held, and arrange a time for you to speak.			
Thank you for taking the time to make this submission.			
What happens next?			
Once we have received feedback (by noon 24 October 2023) we will commence a legal review of the suggested changes, including of the feedback suggestions, and have a hearing for people to present their views to the Council.			
When are the key dates?			
Submissions open: 18th September 2023			
Submissions close: 24th October 2023			
Submissions close: 24th October 2023  Hearings: 1st - 17th November 2023			

Rates Review 2023



We are considering options for making our rating system fairer. We have outlined our suggestions as to how we could do this, and invite you to tell us what you think.

This consultation runs from noon 18th September to noon 24th October 2023

If you run out of time you can save the form as draft and comeback and finish it at any time before noon on 24th October 2023.

Submitter Details	
First Name*	Family Name*
Chris	Wilson - ECCO
Organisation Name (optional) East Coast Community Organisation (Ecco)	
Contact Details (required)	
In the space below, please provide either:	
<ul><li>Email Address</li><li>Phone Number; or</li><li>Postal Address;</li></ul>	
Contact Phone Number	E-mail Address
Redacted	Redacted
Postal Address	
Are you a ratepayer in the Kaikoura District*	
● Yes	○ No
If yes, what is your address?  We need this information to understand how your opinion might be affected by whether you live in the urban, semi-rural, or rural area.	
2. Submission	

### In summary the suggested changes cover:

1. A new differential on the Roading Rate

the relevant section of this submission form below.

- 2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate
- 3. Increase to the differential on the Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates
- ${\it 4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge}$
- 5. Rural Recycling Rate
- 6. Removal of Public Rubbish Bin Charge
- 7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate

There are nine suggested changes to the rating system that we are consulting on. More information is available on the KDC website and in

8. Changes to how some activities are funded 9. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited F	Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)	
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested changes, y	you can tick the appropriate box below, and send us this form.	
If you agree, or disagree, with ALL of the suggested cha	anges, you can tick the appropriate box below, and submit the form.*	
I agree with all of the suggested changes		
If you agree with some of the suggested changes, but not all, pl	ease continue to complete this survey form.	
1. A Differential on the Roading Rate		
	e Roading Rate, that would mean commercial properties, and properties cost of roading because these properties have a greater impact on the	
I agree with this suggested change	O I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestion.		
○ Yes	○ No	
2. A new Roading Uniform Targeted Rate		
We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roading costs irrespective of size or value. The fixed amount is suggested to be \$200.00 including GST.		
This fixed amount ensures that semi-rural and rural properties will not pay less than this minimum amount towards roading, while at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportionate impact of the roading rate differential on high value properties.  Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roading Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with each other.		
New Roading Uniform Target Rate		
I agree with this suggested change	○ I disagree with this suggested change	
Wastelland the Anadel and an arms of Anadel and a second		
Yes	ree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
3. Increase the differential on the Footpath	n & Streetlights, Harbour, and Town Centre Rates	
differential, and is suggesting that semi-rural residents are les	emi-rural and rural areas; however, the Council has considered the level of the set than 15 minutes from the township and are regular users of these urban at differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low. The differential is proposed r the rural differential to be standardized at 0.25.	
Footpath & Streetlights, Harbour and Town Centre Rate	s Differential	
I agree with this suggested changes	○ I disagree with this suggested changes	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you ac	ree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	

○ Yes	○ No	
4. Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge	9	
Currently, any property that provides accommodation for visitors, but doesn't meet the definition of a commercial property (generally because they can only accommodate 4 guests or less), is levied the Accommodation Sector Charge of \$400.00 including GST per year. The Council is suggesting this is too low.		
The Council is suggesting that the Accommodation Sector Charge be increased to \$600.00 including GST per year, so these smaller accommodation providers are contributing a fairer share towards Council activities that support tourism.		
Increase the Accommodation Sector Charge		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	r disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
○ Yes	○ No	
5. The Rural Recycling Rate		
5. The Raral Recycling Rate		
The Council is suggesting introducing the rural recycling rate, as a fixed dollar amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit, to cover the cost of collecting recyclable material from communal collection points - for rural properties only because the collection sites are in the rural area (Lynton Downs, Clarence and Kekerengu).		
The Rural Recycling Rate		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or	r disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.	
Yes	○ No	
6. Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge		
Currently all commercial properties pay a public rubbish bin charge regardless of the capital value of the property (for the 2023/2024 year this is \$162.46 including GST), which covers 50% of the cost of emptying these public rubbish bins, with the balance 50% funded by general rates. The Council is now suggesting that there is no need for a separate targeted rate for the emptying of public rubbish bins, and that the portion of costs currently funded by the Public Rubbish Bin Charge instead be funded by commercial rates.		
Remove the Public Rubbish Bin Charge		
I agree with this suggested change	I disagree with this suggested change	
Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions.		
○ Yes	○ No	
7. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate		

The Council wishes to make provision in the Revenue and Financing Policy for the ability to levy a Harbour Special Operator rate. The Council

is suggesting that it is appropriate for the net costs of harbour activities (after all other sources of revenue such as slipway fees, boat parking fees, cruise ship fees, etc), could be covered by a combination of the existing commercial rate and harbour rate (set on differential), plus a proposed new Harbour Special Operator Rate to apply to special operators in proportion to the areas that they each have exclusive use over. Note that the Council is having separate conversations with each of the special operators that we have identified, and that this new rate will be subject to the outcome of those discussions, as well as a legal review. We do, however, still want your feedback on the principles of this suggestion. A new Harbour Special Operator Rate I agree with this suggested change I disagree with this suggested change Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions. Yes O No 8. Changes to how some activities should be funded While not a direct change to the rating system itself, the Council has debated the proportion of user pays and other funding sources, compared to rates, for every activity. The table of suggested changes is provided on our website. The outcome of the suggested changes do affect rates by either increasing or decreasing the amount that the Council expects to fund via rates versus other revenue such as user fees. Changes to how some activities should be funded I agree with this suggested change I disagree with this suggested change Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions. Yes O No A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP) We are suggesting a new definition for the SUIP. While the proposed definition is not a significant change, it is helpful for ratepayers and Council staff to have a clear understanding of the definition, so that it is consistently applied. A new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP) I agree with this suggested change I disagree with this suggested change Would you like to add a comment to explain why you agree or disagree, and let us know if you have an alternative suggestions. Yes O No Do you wish to present your opinion in person to the Council at a Hearing?\* Five minute slots will be allocated to each person who wishes to present their submission in person. Yes O No A Council staff member will contact you to let you know when the hearings will be held, and arrange a time for you to speak. Thank you for taking the time to make this submission.

What happens next?

Once we have received feedback (by noon 24 October 2023) we will commence a legal review of the suggested changes, including of the feedback suggestions, and have a hearing for people to present their views to the Council.

# When are the key dates?

Submissions open: 18th September 2023

Submissions close: 24th October 2023

Hearings: 1st - 17th November 2023

Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023

#### **Submission on KDC Rates Review 2023**

#### From East Coast Community Organisation (Ecco)

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 residential)

In our submission on the last long-term plan (2021-31) we made the point that the pattern of rates changes pointed to "management" of the rating system by Council to favour the Commercial sector of their rate-payer base with Farmers bearing the largest overall increases despite being the lowest users of Council service. This is now a clear pattern which has been broadened to penalise all rural ratepayers both residential and farming (who now all face increases) in favour of the urban ones (who all benefit from rate reductions).

Making the rates burden more equitable for rural ratepayers could and should be managed in a more equitable fashion by better use of rating differentials on the general rate, in particular by improving the differential for rural ratepayers from .9 to be more in line with the national average of .7 (Ref Insight Economics Report on "Analysis of the Current and Past Use of Council Rating Tools in New Zealand") but the Council is clearly reluctant to do this, which again seems to point to unduly penalising ratepayers in favour of urban and commercial.

The rate increases being proposed for rural will further burden our rural community who have no opportunity to recover this additional cost in their prices to customers and consumers.

#### For Ecco

Chris Wilson Secretary

23 October 2023