

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 *

vern

Family Name *

ayson

Organisation Name (optional)

Contact Details (required)

In the space below, please provide either:

- Email Address
- Phone Number; or
- Postal Address;

Contact Phone Number

Redacted

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 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 Rooding Rate
2. A new Rooding 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 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 Roding Rate

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

- 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 Roding Uniform Targeted Rate

We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roding 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 roding, while at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportionate impact of the roding rate differential on high value properties. Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roding Rate, and this new fixed amount roding rate, work best in tandem with each other.

New Roding 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 & 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

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 Kekepengu).

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

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

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.

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

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 *

Blake

Family Name *

Bennett

Organisation Name (optional)

Contact Details (required)

In the space below, please provide either:

- Email Address
- Phone Number; or
- Postal Address;

Contact Phone Number

redacted

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 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 Rooding Rate
2. A new Rooding 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 Roothing Rate

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

- 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 rooding rate

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

The assumption that rural properties contribute to a heavier wear and tear on roads due to activities like dairy farming and stock transportation is misleading and unfair. This notion wrongly generalizes all rural properties and disregards the diversity of activities that occur in rural settings.

Furthermore, it's important to acknowledge the limited infrastructure and amenities available to rural residents in comparison to our urban counterparts. The current proposal essentially punishes rural residents for using what little infrastructure we have, to access amenities and services which are fewer and farther between for us. (e.g. we only leave the house - in our small car - once or twice per week to go shopping in town via SH1. Other than this, we are home-bound).

The economic impact of the proposed changes also cannot be ignored. Many rural areas already face challenges such as limited access to public services. The rate increase could add an extra financial burden, exacerbating existing inequalities.

2. A new Roothing Uniform Targeted Rate

We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the rooding 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 rooding, while at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportionate impact of the rooding rate differential on high value properties. Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roothing Rate, and this new fixed amount rooding rate, work best in tandem with each other.

New Roothing 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 Rooding Uniform Targeted Rate

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

We strongly object to the new Rooding Uniform Targeted Rate, especially the fixed \$200 charge for properties outside the urban area. This is a regressive approach that disproportionately impacts lower-value rural and semi-rural properties. It also fails to consider that not all rural households have the same impact on road wear and tear. For example, my property sees minimal road usage, making this fixed rate particularly unfair. This added financial burden would significantly affect rural communities, who already face limited public services. We strongly urge the Council to rethink this proposal and look for more equitable funding mechanisms.

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 Centre Rates

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

This is an absurd suggestion! The Council's assumption that semi-rural residents are frequent users of these urban services is overly generalized and doesn't consider individual household behaviors. We rarely (if ever) use these services, making an increase in our rates for them especially unjust. What is more, there aren't actually ANY street lights operating in Kekerengu - so why should we be billed for street lights in Kaikoura!? Increasing these differentials exacerbates the financial pressures on rural and semi-rural communities, who already have limited access to public services.

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

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.

Yes 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 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

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.

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

The common thread running through these proposed changes is clear: they are disproportionately unfair, especially to families like ours living in rural areas. We rarely venture into Kaikoura—mostly due to the prohibitive costs at the supermarket and petrol station. We don't frequent the urban areas, particularly in the evenings, and our vehicles are not contributing to heavy road wear. Moreover, our local road is just a graded gravel lane, devoid of any streetlights, and yet, the Council deems it fit to burden us with additional road-related costs?! As if that weren't enough, we don't even have the basic amenity of rubbish collection, a service readily available in most developed areas.

If the Council persists in shifting financial burdens onto families like ours, you're essentially pushing us closer to the edge, amidst already spiraling living costs. You leave us in an increasingly precarious position with fewer and fewer options to make ends meet. So, to the Council and its proposed rate changes: you might want to rethink your approach, because as it stands, it is patently unfair and unsustainable for many rurality-based residents.

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

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 *

Janenne

Family Name *

Blackler

Organisation Name (optional)

Contact Details (required)

In the space below, please provide either:

- Email Address
- Phone Number; or
- Postal Address;

Contact Phone Number

Redacted

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 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 Rooding Rate
2. A new Rooding 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 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 Roothing Rate

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

- 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 rooding rate

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

The new proposed rooding differential suggests that all people living in the rural areas are businesses or farmers and therefore the use of the roads is affected more by heavy traffic. I disagree that everyone in this setting is a business or a farm, and suggest that if the proposed differential is implemented it would mean that the many people who live in a rural setting without running a business would be subsidising the very people who have the biggest impact on the rooding infrastructure, and those making an income from it. How is that fair...??

2. A new Roothing Uniform Targeted Rate

We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the rooding 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 rooding, while at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportionate impact of the rooding rate differential on high value properties. Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roothing Rate, and this new fixed amount rooding rate, work best in tandem with each other.

New Roothing 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 Roothing Uniform Targeted Rate

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

This proposal is assuming that all people in the rural sector are using the roads equally. This is not true. Some people drive to town to go to work, shop, visit medical centre etc but they do not necessarily have bigger or heavier vehicles when compared with residents in the urban area.

As an example my vehicle (which I don't use everyday) is the same as many residents living in the urban area. I disagree with this proposal because not everyone in the rural area is driving a tractor or a truck or running cattle along the rural roads... this would mean the very businesses operating in the rural sector would be subsidised by rural residential dwellers and is totally unfair. I believe council has all the information on farms and active businesses in the rural sector and should target those high users only.

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 Centre 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 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

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

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

Comment about the Rural Recycling Rate

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

I don't understand this proposal at all. There are no communal recycling collection points in the rural areas anymore... unless we're expected to take our recycling all the way to Kekerengu or Clarence or Lynton Downs... Innovative Waste go all the way to these locations to collect some recycling and rubbish for the business operations i.e. The Store; Clarence Rafting and the Kekerengu Community Centre but it doesn't service the rural sector 5km from the edge of town.

I don't see why we are expected to pay for the cost of recycling collection at all... many people are recycling conscious and will do the right thing by storing and delivering their own recycling to Innovative Waste and incur expenses to do so, but as it stands, the business sector in the rural areas are already well supported by recycling collection, why should the residents have to subsidise businesses...??

Reintroducing rural recycling charges for semi-rural properties simply because Lynton Downs, Clarence and Kekerengu still have a recycling facility at their doorstep should be directed to those communities only.

I suggest that the cost of Innovative Waste travelling extensively to collect waste of any sort from these areas would far exceed the cost if there were semi-rural collection points. Consider wages, vehicle running expenses, land transfer dumping fees etc... let the communities who receive the service who are largely farming communities, pay for it.

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

Comment about the Public Rubbish Bin Charge

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

As any of the remaining public rubbish bins are located in and around the business sector it is reasonable that the business sector fund this service.

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

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

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 subsidizing 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...??

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

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

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

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

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 come back and finish it at any time before noon on 24th October 2023.

1. Submitter Details

First Name *

Angela

Family Name *

Blunt

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?

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 Rooding Rate
2. A new Rooding 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 Roothing Rate

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

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 rooding rate

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

Rates increases from 20 / 21 to 24 / 25 with current proposed rates review changes.

Rural / Farm : 22 .5 % , Urban : 12 .5 % , Commercial : 0 . 6 % .

The Rural Differential needs to be reduced at least 10 % .

This will drop the average farm increase to 0 % which will still be much higher than average Urban decrease of - 4. 2% and Commercial average decrease of - 5 .7 % .

The rooding differential fo Commercial should be increased a bit more to pay for the vehicles that service that sector and to reduce rooding rates for the other sectors.

On farm inflation for this year will be over 16 % , more than double the national average.

I invite Council to consider being fairer than this proposed rates review allows.

2. A new Roothing Uniform Targeted Rate

We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the rooding 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 rooding, while at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportionate impact of the rooding rate differential on high value properties. Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roothing Rate, and this new fixed amount rooding rate, work best in tandem with each other.

New Roothing 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 & 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

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

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 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

Comment about changes to how some activities should be funded

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

I wish to make a submission on the current rates review and I wish to be heard on my submission:

I continue to be surprised by the Council's willingness to give farmers huge rates increases when others have little or no increases. We seem to be being penalised for being land owners. The assumption seems to be that farmers can afford it. With the decrease in Dairy payout and farm gate prices the rates bill becomes an extra burden for farming families. With the return of increased tourist numbers commercial ratepayers should have their rates increased surely!! They seem to be very well looked after always by this Council with continuous rates reductions, understandable during Covid but with the return to pre Covid tourist numbers maybe it's time to have them contribute a little more to the costs that are incurred by the town.

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

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

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 *

Tom

Family Name *

Butters

Organisation Name (optional)

Contact Details (required)

In the space below, please provide either:

- Email Address
- Phone Number; or
- Postal Address;

Contact Phone Number

Redacted

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 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 Rooding Rate
2. A new Rooding 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 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 Roothing Rate

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

- 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 Roothing Uniform Targeted Rate

We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the rooding 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 rooding, while at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportionate impact of the rooding rate differential on high value properties. Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roothing Rate, and this new fixed amount rooding rate, work best in tandem with each other.

New Roothing 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 & 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

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 Kekepengu).

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

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

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.

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

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 *

Lynette

Family Name *

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

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 Rooding Rate
2. A new Rooding 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 Roothing Rate

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

- 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 Roothing Uniform Targeted Rate

We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the rooding 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 rooding, while at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportionate impact of the rooding rate differential on high value properties. Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roothing Rate, and this new fixed amount rooding rate, work best in tandem with each other.

New Roothing 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 & 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

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

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 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 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.

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

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 *

Peter

Family Name *

Clayton

Organisation Name (optional)

Contact Details (required)

In the space below, please provide either:

- Email Address
- Phone Number; or
- Postal Address;

Contact Phone Number

Redacted

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 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 Rooding Rate
2. A new Rooding 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 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 Roothing Rate

We are suggesting that there is a new differential on the Roothing 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 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 Roothing 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 Roothing Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with each other.

New Roothing 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 Roothing Uniform Targeted Rate

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

Many of the semi rural properties have their own driveways that they maintain themselves before coming onto Statehighway 1 which is government funded.

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 Centre Rates

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

The comment 'In essence, the Council is suggesting that the current differential of 0.5 for semi-rural areas is too low' is so far from reality its crazy. Where I live there is not footpaths, not streetlights etc so there should be NO increase at all. If anything we should be getting a credit.

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

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

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)

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 Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

Could not find the information so voted against until relevant information is clearly available

There should be an extra window for rate payers to provide comments for example the Kincaid Water Scheme, we all pay high rates in this area and for management to keep just cutting with off with late to no notice.

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

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 come back and finish it at any time before noon on 24th October 2023.

1. Submitter Details

First Name *

Grant

Family Name *

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

021331638

E-mail Address

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 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 Rooding Rate
2. A new Rooding 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 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 Roothing Rate

We are suggesting that there is a new differential on the Roothing 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
 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

rural properties shouldn't pay more
to say that we should because tractors and cows go on the roads is ludicrous
our road is shingle anyway

2. A new Roothing 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 Roothing Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with each other.

New Roothing 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 & 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

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

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 Oaro so shouldn't pay anything

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

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.

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

Hearings: 1st - 17th November 2023

Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023

Changes take effect: 1st July 2024

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 *

Shane

Family Name *

Cross

Organisation Name (optional)

Contact Details (required)

In the space below, please provide either:

- Email Address
- Phone Number; or
- Postal Address;

Contact Phone Number

Redacted

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 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 Rooding Rate
2. A new Rooding 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 Roding Rate

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

- 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 roding rate

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.

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 Roding Uniform Targeted Rate

We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roding 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 roding, while at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportionate impact of the roding rate differential on high value properties. Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roding Rate, and this new fixed amount roding rate, work best in tandem with each other.

New Roding 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 Roothing Uniform Targeted Rate

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

That is penalising specific landowners of their very low use and minimal effect whilst Commercial operations carrying rocks, heavy machinery and farming using such roads as access ways and grazing, including that heavy traffic. This is more a Commercial Tax.

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 Centre Rates

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

We only have the one street light and that is a kilometer down the road, it flashes on and off

I

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

Yes all those Bed & Breakfast, Booking.com, Homesteads ect charging for accommodation should contribute to this new rate, these should be registered and fire service should also be aware they are Commercial type operations.

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

Comment about the Rural Recycling Rate

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

Kaikoura District Council those outlying services fall short in our (sub) local area, we lost our Rubbish Collection Station and now need to drive our own rubbish to the new Transfer Station in Kaikoura. This now comes as additional cost in fuel and road user charges due to those ever increasing prices. We shouldn't have to pay an additional fee again.

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

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 use the public slipway, I would expect my Kaikoura annual boat club subs already contribute to this new form of rate charge.

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

Unsure at this stage, I need to understand this more

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

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

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

Unsure at this stage, I need to understand this more

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

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 come back and finish it at any time before noon on 24th October 2023.

1. Submitter Details

First Name *

Trevor

Family Name *

Cummerfield

Organisation Name (optional)

Contact Details (required)

In the space below, please provide either:

- Email Address
- Phone Number; or
- Postal Address;

Contact Phone Number

redacted

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 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 Rooding Rate
2. A new Rooding 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 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 Roothing Rate

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

- 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 rooding rate

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

Commercial trucks traveling between Picton and Christchurch do a lot more damage to roads than local commercial businesses and residents living rural.

2. A new Roothing Uniform Targeted Rate

We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the rooding 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 rooding, while at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportionate impact of the rooding rate differential on high value properties. Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roothing Rate, and this new fixed amount rooding rate, work best in tandem with each other.

New Roothing 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 Roothing Uniform Targeted Rate

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

Commercial trucks traveling between Picton and Christchurch do a lot more damage to roads than local commercial businesses and residents living rural.

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 Centre 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. 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

You do not want to drive people from offering accommodation which boosts tourism in Kaikoura and benefits businesses.

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

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 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.

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

Hearings: 1st - 17th November 2023

Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023

Changes take effect: 1st July 2024

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 come back 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:

- Email Address
- Phone Number; or
- Postal Address;

Contact Phone Number

Redacted

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 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 Rooding Rate
2. A new Rooding 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 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 Roothing Rate

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

- 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 Roothing Uniform Targeted Rate

We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the rooding 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 rooding, while at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportionate impact of the rooding rate differential on high value properties. Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roothing Rate, and this new fixed amount rooding rate, work best in tandem with each other.

New Roothing 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 Roothing Uniform Targeted Rate

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

\$200 is not enough if this is a one off charge. If its on going each year, its still low, depending on how much the differential in question 1, makes up for the shortfall

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 Centre Rates

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

In christchurch , I own a semi rural property and we had an 80% differential on some of the CCC rates for many years, and now we have no differential. The initial differential was set up when CCC took over HCC, about 30 years ago, it was 70% to start with and then 80%, and now 100%. future reviews should consider 100%

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

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 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

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

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.

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 (NCF) values this opportunity to provide feedback on the Rates Review 2023 proposals.
- 1.2 NCF 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 Roding 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 Roding 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 Roding Uniform Targeted Rate will occupy some of the total proportion of rates that are uniform charges, which are limited to 30% of rates revenue. Given council's indication in the Step Two analysis that uniform charges will be 29%+ of total rates it is anticipated that the funding of some services will shift from the Uniform Annual General Charge to the capital value general rate. Considering this, the differential of 0.9 on the general rate for rural and semi-rural properties should be reduced.

4.3 Submission 1: We do not support the 1.2 roading rate differential for rural and semi-rural, however if adopted they must be adopted together with the \$200 district-wide roading uniform charge. As stated by council "... they work best in tandem with each other."

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 NCCFF 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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Karl Dean', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Karl Dean
North Canterbury Provincial President
Federated Farmers of New Zealand

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 *

Daniel

Family Name *

Fleming

Organisation Name (optional)

Vetcare Kaikoura

Contact Details (required)

In the space below, please provide either:

- Email Address
- Phone Number; or
- Postal Address;

Contact Phone Number

redacted

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 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 Rooding Rate
2. A new Rooding 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 Roothing Rate

We are suggesting that there is a new differential on the Roothing 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
 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

Our business is on Sh 1 so the council does nothing about that- our business should not pay more as the council is collecting money but doing no maintenance.

At 7 Ludley drive we have a 50m stretch of unsealed road that is council maintained- in theory, but has never had a grader over it. The traffic drags stones down onto the sealed bit and once every couple of years the brush truck pushes them back up. There is no way we should pay more for roads as the little amount we do have is not maintained. To the best of my knowledge Mill rd was resealed with earthquake money as that was the deal for Nctir. No need to do anything to that for years

2. A new Roothing 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 Roothing Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with each other.

New Roothing 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 Roothing Uniform Targeted Rate

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

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 Centre Rates

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

This is silly. Where does the 15mins come from- you are 15 mins from a streetlight or a footpath- it is of no benefit to you! You mean that people that go into town to buy things and keep the town moving have been underpaying? What a joke,

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

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

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

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 Mill rd. I have 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

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

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

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

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.

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

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 *

Mark

Family Name *

Giles

Organisation Name (optional)

Contact Details (required)

In the space below, please provide either:

- Email Address
- Phone Number; or
- Postal Address;

Contact Phone Number

Redacted

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 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 Rooding Rate
2. A new Rooding 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 Roding Rate

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

- 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 roding rate

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

just because we live semi rural does not mean we are harder on the roads as we only drive our car to the township for suplies....more so its all the trucks that use it and are way heavier and Thay pay road tax to insure the roads are covered for repair, the same for private vehicles so charging us on our rates is double dipping

2. A new Roding Uniform Targeted Rate

We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roding 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 roding, while at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportionate impact of the roding rate differential on high value properties. Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roding Rate, and this new fixed amount roding rate, work best in tandem with each other.

New Roding 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 Roding Uniform Targeted Rate

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

once again double dipping...vehicles already pay road tax to repair roads

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

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

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

you have removed most of the rubbish bins anyway. THAY NEED TO BE REPLACED

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

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

If we don't use it why should we pay for it. THE RATES ARE FAR TO HIGH AS IT 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

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

Hearings: 1st - 17th November 2023

Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023

Changes take effect: 1st July 2024

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 *

LAWRENCE

Family Name *

GLEDHILL

Organisation Name (optional)

Contact Details (required)

In the space below, please provide either:

- Email Address
- Phone Number; or
- Postal Address;

Contact Phone Number

redacted

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 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 Rooding Rate
2. A new Rooding 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 Roothing Rate

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

- 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 rooding rate

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

RURAL PROPERTIES USE LESS OF THE ROADS BECAUSE THEY LIVE RURALLY AND HAVE FARMS TO RUN AND THE COST OF PETROL. RURAL PROPERTIES TALK WITH NEIGHBOURS AND CARPOOL OR GET FARMER WHO IS GOING TO TOWN TO PICK THINGS UP. FARMERS DO NOT USE THE ROADS AS MUCH AS RESIDENTIAL . YOU SHOULD BE TARGETING THE ACTUAL TRUCKIES OF THIS WORLD..THEIR COMPANIES IN PARTICULAR

2. A new Roothing Uniform Targeted Rate

We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the rooding 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 rooding, while at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportionate impact of the rooding rate differential on high value properties. Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roothing Rate, and this new fixed amount rooding rate, work best in tandem with each other.

New Roothing 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 Roothing Uniform Targeted Rate

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

THE COUNCIL SEEM TO BE FINDING ANY WHICH WAY TO OBTAIN \$\$\$ TO FUND A VERY POOR COUCIL. STOP THIS IDIOCY NOW

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 Centre Rates

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

WRONG THOSE USING OUR FOOTPATHS MORE ARE TOURISTS AND HOLIDAY MAKERS NOT THE LOCALS

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

A \$200 INCREASE TO THIS SECTOR IS RIDICULOUS. LEAVE IT AS THE STATUS QUO

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

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 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

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 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

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.

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

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 *

ainslie

Family Name *

green

Organisation Name (optional)

Contact Details (required)

In the space below, please provide either:

- Email Address
- Phone Number; or
- Postal Address;

Contact Phone Number

Redacted

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 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 Rooding Rate
2. A new Rooding 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 Roothing Rate

We are suggesting that there is a new differential on the Roothing 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
 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

residential ratepayers enjoy a much higher standard of roading....ie tarseal . God forbid they should encounter a wee pothole or a blocked culvert. Much of the traffic up our rural road is from recreational activity ,and latterly, out of the local camping grounds. google maps has identified our private farm roads as public , therefore creating the false impression that people can drive up the valley and thru our farm. Why should we pay more rates if this is happening? this is just shifting the cost of roading on to rural people while urban people use roads free

2. A new Roothing 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 Roothing Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with each other.

New Roothing 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 Roothing Uniform Targeted Rate

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

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 Centre 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

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

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

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.

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

what is the new definition? clarification required

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

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 *

Robin

Family Name *

Green

Organisation Name (optional)

Contact Details (required)

In the space below, please provide either:

- Email Address
- Phone Number; or
- Postal Address;

Contact Phone Number

redacted

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 affected 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 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 Rooding Rate
2. A new Rooding 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 Roothing Rate

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

- 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 Roothing Uniform Targeted Rate

We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the rooding 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 rooding, while at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportionate impact of the rooding rate differential on high value properties. Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roothing Rate, and this new fixed amount rooding rate, work best in tandem with each other.

New Roothing 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 & 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

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

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 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.

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

Hearings: 1st - 17th November 2023

Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023

Changes take effect: 1st July 2024

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 *

ALAN

Family Name *

GULLEFORD

Organisation Name (optional)

Contact Details (required)

In the space below, please provide either:

- Email Address
- Phone Number; or
- Postal Address;

Contact Phone Number

Redacted

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 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 Rooding Rate
2. A new Rooding 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 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 Roding Rate

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

- 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 Roding Uniform Targeted Rate

We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roding 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 roding, while at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportionate impact of the roding rate differential on high value properties. Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roding Rate, and this new fixed amount roding rate, work best in tandem with each other.

New Roding 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 & 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

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

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

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.

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

Hearings: 1st - 17th November 2023

Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023

Changes take effect: 1st July 2024

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 *

Ryan

Family Name *

Haigh

Organisation Name (optional)

Contact Details (required)

In the space below, please provide either:

- Email Address
- Phone Number; or
- Postal Address;

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 opinion might be affected by whether you live in the urban, semi-rural, or rural area.

Rural

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 Rooding Rate
2. A new Rooding 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 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 Roothing Rate

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

- 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 rooding rate

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

Please explain how rural properties have more impact on roads compared to non rural that spend the day going up and down through town?

2. A new Roothing Uniform Targeted Rate

We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the rooding 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 rooding, while at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportionate impact of the rooding rate differential on high value properties. Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roothing Rate, and this new fixed amount rooding rate, work best in tandem with each other.

New Roothing 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 & 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

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

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 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.

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

Hearings: 1st - 17th November 2023

Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023

Changes take effect: 1st July 2024

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 *

Liza

Family Name *

Hewison

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

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 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 Roding Rate
2. A new Roding 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 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 Roothing Rate

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

- 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 Roothing Uniform Targeted Rate

We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the rooding 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 rooding, while at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportionate impact of the rooding rate differential on high value properties. Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roothing Rate, and this new fixed amount rooding rate, work best in tandem with each other.

New Roothing 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 & 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

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

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 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.

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

Hearings: 1st - 17th November 2023

Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023

Changes take effect: 1st July 2024

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:

- Email Address
- Phone Number; or
- Postal Address;

Contact Phone Number

redacted

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 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 Rooding Rate
2. A new Rooding 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 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 Roding Rate

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

- 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 roding rate

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

Our property on SH1 is maintained by Waka Kotahi. Urban and suburban roads have more tonne/miles per person per day load on them, not fewer.

2. A new Roding Uniform Targeted Rate

We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roding 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 roding, while at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportionate impact of the roding rate differential on high value properties. Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roding Rate, and this new fixed amount roding rate, work best in tandem with each other.

New Roding 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 Roding 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 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

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

More tourists equals more cost for KDC that should be paid for by businesses.

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

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.

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 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 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

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.

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

Hearings: 1st - 17th November 2023

Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023

Changes take effect: 1st July 2024

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

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 *

Craig

Family Name *

Hutchison

Organisation Name (optional)

Contact Details (required)

In the space below, please provide either:

- Email Address
- Phone Number; or
- Postal Address;

Contact Phone Number

Redacted

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 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 Roding Rate
2. A new Roding 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 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 Roothing Rate

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

- 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 Roothing Uniform Targeted Rate

We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the rooding 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 rooding, while at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportionate impact of the rooding rate differential on high value properties. Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roothing Rate, and this new fixed amount rooding rate, work best in tandem with each other.

New Roothing 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 & 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

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

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 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.

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

Hearings: 1st - 17th November 2023

Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023

Changes take effect: 1st July 2024

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:

- Email Address
- Phone Number; or
- Postal Address;

Contact Phone Number

redacted

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 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 Rooding Rate
2. A new Rooding 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 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 Roding Rate

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

- 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 Roding Uniform Targeted Rate

We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roding 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 roding, while at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportionate impact of the roding rate differential on high value properties. Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roding Rate, and this new fixed amount roding rate, work best in tandem with each other.

New Roding 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 & 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

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 Kekepengu).

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

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

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.

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

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 *

Joanne

Family Name *

Landman

Organisation Name (optional)

Glen Alton Homestead

Contact Details (required)

In the space below, please provide either:

- Email Address
- Phone Number; or
- Postal Address;

Contact Phone Number

Redacted

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 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 Roding Rate
2. A new Roding 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 Roothing Rate

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

- 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 rooding rate

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

As part of the rural sector none of these suggestions affect us except the rural recycling which is a cost to us to travel the distances of mileage diesel an wear an tear on our vehicles so would oppose the increased .

2. A new Roothing Uniform Targeted Rate

We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the rooding 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 rooding, while at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportionate impact of the rooding rate differential on high value properties. Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roothing Rate, and this new fixed amount rooding rate, work best in tandem with each other.

New Roothing 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 Roothing Uniform Targeted Rate

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

Considering we live up the Waiiau Toa which we have to travel over a dangerous paper road thru rural property leaving us isolated from the main road for days with the Wharekiri flooding we would be very unhappy to be paying more in our rates

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 Centre 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, 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

Comment about the Rural Recycling Rate

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

Once again this occurs mileage diesel an vehicle 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.

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

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

User pays

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

Hearings: 1st - 17th November 2023

Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023

Changes take effect: 1st July 2024

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 *

Dave

Family Name *

Margetts

Organisation Name (optional)

Ludstone Farm

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

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 Rooding Rate
2. A new Rooding 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 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 Roding Rate

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

- 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 roding rate

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

Rural properties are mostly farms and much larger than an urban section. While a single farm's vehicle use is likely to be harder on roads than than vehicles from a single urban dwelling, a farm in area would be equivalent to several urban streets in size that include multiple dwellings and many more vehicle trips than a single farm. The urban dwellers roding differentials therefore cumulatively provide way more more rates than one farm for a similar land area. The farmer however should be on the same or less rating differential as urban dwellers as urban dwellers collectively can better afford to cover the districts roding costs for the same rateable land area.

2. A new Roding Uniform Targeted Rate

We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roding 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 roding, while at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportionate impact of the roding rate differential on high value properties. Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roding Rate, and this new fixed amount roding rate, work best in tandem with each other.

New Roding 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 & 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 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

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

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

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

Comment about changes to how some activities should be funded

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 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

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:

- Email Address
- Phone Number; or
- Postal Address;

Contact Phone Number

Not provided

E-mail Address

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 affected by whether you live in the urban, semi-rural, or rural area.

Don't know if this person is a ratepayer as did not say on photos of submission form sent in.

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 Rooding Rate
2. A new Rooding 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 Roothing Rate

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

- 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 rooding rate

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

I agree to commercial properties paying more if they have heavy machinery and generally more traffic leaving the commercial site. Example: Harmac concrete should pay a substantial amount because of the heavy machinery used to access the commercial property. And rural road around. Where as a commercial retail space on West End should not. Why, because most of the businesses do not have a parking/car entry onto their commercial space therefore the impact on rooding is nothing.

2. A new Roothing Uniform Targeted Rate

We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the rooding 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 rooding, while at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportionate impact of the rooding rate differential on high value properties. Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roothing Rate, and this new fixed amount rooding rate, work best in tandem with each other.

New Roothing 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 Roothing Uniform Targeted Rate

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

They should pay exact if not more than as urban because the roads out rural are build especially for them to access their properties. No impact/use to urban residents.

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 Centre 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 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

If registered and making money from accommodation. They should pay exactly what all the motels pay because they offer the same service. Air bnbs need to stop being given 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.

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

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

No

Comment about a new Harbour Special Operator Rate

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

Considering that Whalewatch has their own docking harbour they should be paying a huge chunk. the boats that are parking at the harbour should be solely responsible for funding such activities. Whalewatch is a "charitable trust" they use the dock for business and funds that are secured through business practices should be changed at a percent. Like if whale watch have a business revenue of say (example amount) \$100,000 they should be charged 25% of the businesses incoming revenue (or 25% from each ticket) because 1/4 of their business practice is using the harbour to leave and enter. 1/4 onsite at Whaleway station 1/2 on the open water

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

Since when did the 7 councillors make up the opinion of our residents. Most are over 50 and their presents are not felt in the community as they are supposed to be the voice of residents.

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

Hearings: 1st - 17th November 2023

Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023

Changes take effect: 1st July 2024

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 *

Derrick and Ben

Family Name *

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?

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 Rooding Rate
2. A new Rooding 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 Roothing Rate

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

- 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 Roothing Uniform Targeted Rate

We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the rooding 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 rooding, while at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportionate impact of the rooding rate differential on high value properties. Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roothing Rate, and this new fixed amount rooding rate, work best in tandem with each other.

New Roothing 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 & 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

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

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

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.

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

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

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 *

Peter

Family Name *

Mitchell

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

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 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 Roothing Rate
2. A new Roothing 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 Roothing Rate

We are suggesting that there is a new differential on the Roothing 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
 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

I have a ute I pay RUC's. I pay fuel taxes. I have nothing delivered to me except mail.

I do not have more of an impact on roads than urban dwellers.

I live 100k's from Blenheim, and 50k's from Kaikoura. I already pay a small fortune in roading fees to go about my business. The roads are so poorly maintained I have had 4 broken windscreens in the past 2 years from debris thrown up from other vehicles.

2. A new Roothing 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 Roothing Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with each other.

New Roothing 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 & 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

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

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 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.

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

Hearings: 1st - 17th November 2023

Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023

Changes take effect: 1st July 2024

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 *

Hamish

Family Name *

Murray

Organisation Name (optional)

Bluff Station Ltd

Contact Details (required)

In the space below, please provide either:

- Email Address
- Phone Number; or
- Postal Address;

Contact Phone Number

redacted

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 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 Rooding Rate
2. A new Rooding 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 Roothing Rate

We are suggesting that there is a new differential on the Roothing 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 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

Any changes that go towards increasing our rural rates, need to be more that off set by reductions in differential on others. As pointed out in my written submission our Rural Ratepayers continue to subsidize our commercial and urban ratepayers illustrated by the total increase in rates and ability of access those furthest away have to access them.

2. A new Roothing 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 Roothing Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with each other.

New Roothing 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 Roothing Uniform Targeted Rate

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

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.

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 Centre Rates

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

The following points 3-9 do not go far enough, as in my written submission they are only tinkering at the edge and do not go far enough to really have any meaningful impact on keeping out rates at sustainable levels and increases.

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

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

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.

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

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

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

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 *

Russell

Family Name *

Nelson

Organisation Name (optional)

R and J Nelson Ltd

Contact Details (required)

In the space below, please provide either:

- Email Address
- Phone Number; or
- Postal Address;

Contact Phone Number

Redacted

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 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 Rooding Rate
2. A new Rooding 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 Roothing Rate

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

- 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 Roothing Uniform Targeted Rate

We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the rooding 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 rooding, while at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportionate impact of the rooding rate differential on high value properties. Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roothing Rate, and this new fixed amount rooding rate, work best in tandem with each other.

New Roothing 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 & 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

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

Agree with council.

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

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

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.

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

Hearings: 1st - 17th November 2023

Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023

Changes take effect: 1st July 2024

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 come back and finish it at any time before noon on 24th October 2023.

1. Submitter Details

First Name *

Noeline

Family Name *

Ocarroll

Organisation Name (optional)

Contact Details (required)

In the space below, please provide either:

- Email Address
- Phone Number; or
- Postal Address;

Contact Phone Number

redacted

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 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 Roding Rate
2. A new Roding 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 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 Roothing Rate

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

- 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 Roothing Uniform Targeted Rate

We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the rooding 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 rooding, while at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportionate impact of the rooding rate differential on high value properties. Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roothing Rate, and this new fixed amount rooding rate, work best in tandem with each other.

New Roothing 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 & 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

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

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 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.

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

Hearings: 1st - 17th November 2023

Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023

Changes take effect: 1st July 2024

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 *

Justine

Family Name *

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 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 Rooding Rate
2. A new Rooding 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 Roothing Rate

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

- 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 rooding rate

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

Rates increases from 20 / 21 to 24 / 25 with current proposed rates review changes.

Rural / Farm : 22 .5 % , Urban : 12 .5 % , Commercial : 0 . 6 % .

The Rural Differential needs to be reduced at least 10 % .

This will drop the average farm increase to 0 % which will still be much higher than average Urban decrease of - 4. 2% and Commercial average decrease of - 5 .7 % .

The rooding differential fo Commercial should be increased a bit more to pay for the vehicles that service that sector and to reduce rooding rates for the other sectors.

On farm inflation for this year will be over 16 % , more than double the national average.

2. A new Roothing Uniform Targeted Rate

We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the rooding 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 rooding, while at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportionate impact of the rooding rate differential on high value properties. Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roothing Rate, and this new fixed amount rooding rate, work best in tandem with each other.

New Roothing 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 & 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

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

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

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.

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

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

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 come back and finish it at any time before noon on 24th October 2023.

1. Submitter Details

First Name *

Hamish &

Family Name *

Simpson

Organisation Name (optional)

Contact Details (required)

In the space below, please provide either:

- Email Address
- Phone Number; or
- Postal Address;

Contact Phone Number

redacted

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 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 Rooding Rate
2. A new Rooding 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 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 Roding Rate

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

- 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 Roding Uniform Targeted Rate

We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roding 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 roding, while at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportionate impact of the roding rate differential on high value properties. Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roding Rate, and this new fixed amount roding rate, work best in tandem with each other.

New Roding 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 Roding Uniform Targeted Rate

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

A number of large rural properties have a bigger impact on road = heavy machinery (tractors, stock trucks) running stock on the roads.

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

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

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

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

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.

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

Hearings: 1st - 17th November 2023

Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023

Changes take effect: 1st July 2024

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 *

Helene

Family Name *

Smith

Organisation Name (optional)

Contact Details (required)

In the space below, please provide either:

- Email Address
- Phone Number; or
- Postal Address;

Contact Phone Number

Redacted

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 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 Rooding Rate
2. A new Rooding 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 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 Roothing Rate

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

- 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 Roothing Uniform Targeted Rate

We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the rooding 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 rooding, while at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportionate impact of the rooding rate differential on high value properties. Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roothing Rate, and this new fixed amount rooding rate, work best in tandem with each other.

New Roothing 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 & 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

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

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 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.

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

Hearings: 1st - 17th November 2023

Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023

Changes take effect: 1st July 2024

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 *

chanel

Family Name *

starkey

Organisation Name (optional)

Contact Details (required)

In the space below, please provide either:

- Email Address
- Phone Number; or
- Postal Address;

Contact Phone Number

redacted

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 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 Rooding Rate
2. A new Rooding 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 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 Roothing Rate

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

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 Roothing Uniform Targeted Rate

We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the rooding 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 rooding, while at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportionate impact of the rooding rate differential on high value properties. Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roothing Rate, and this new fixed amount rooding rate, work best in tandem with each other.

New Roothing 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 & 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

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

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 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.

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

Hearings: 1st - 17th November 2023

Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023

Changes take effect: 1st July 2024

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 *

Kim R

Family Name *

Swords

Organisation Name (optional)

Contact Details (required)

In the space below, please provide either:

- Email Address
- Phone Number; or
- Postal Address;

Contact Phone Number

Redacted

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 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 Rooding Rate
2. A new Rooding 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 Roothing Rate

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

- 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 rooding 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 Roothing Uniform Targeted Rate

We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the rooding 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 rooding, while at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportionate impact of the rooding rate differential on high value properties. Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roothing Rate, and this new fixed amount rooding rate, work best in tandem with each other.

New Roothing 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 & 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 Centre Rates

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

This is an additional level of complication that is not required but if gone ahead with would appear to favour urban dwellers over rural ratepayers.

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

Rural accommodation suppliers I know of in rural areas do not get traffic / revenue from council activities. Consumers expect to pay less for accommodation in rural areas and therefore very unlikely that they would be able to generate this additional cost but would absorb. You would therefore be punishing this sector unnecessarily.

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

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 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 activities attract some sort of visitor and therefore should have this targeted cost in emptying the bins.

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

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

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

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 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.

Yes

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

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 *

Ginny

Family Name *

Thomson

Organisation Name (optional)

Contact Details (required)

In the space below, please provide either:

- Email Address
- Phone Number; or
- Postal Address;

Contact Phone Number

redacted

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 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 Rooding Rate
2. A new Rooding 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 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 Roding Rate

We are suggesting that there is a new differential on the Roding 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 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

I find the fact that this council thinks rural properties use the roads more than urban is ridiculous. Urban people like to go out and enjoy the country, the cycle tracks and walks the beach etc. Tourists too and adding more onto commercial businesses adds to the cost of goods at the end of the day and up go the prices. This council has squandered rates on inferior roading contractors that are repairing the repairs again and again. Surely if a contractor does a substandard job that needs to be redone 6 months to a year later then it should not be a cost to ratepayers but to that contractor.

2. A new Roding 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 Roding Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with each other.

New Roding 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 Roding 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.

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

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

No opinion as have no idea on this matter

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).

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

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 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

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

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

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

I think this council should look at getting money out of user pays and also really cracking down on freedom campers who park up in their vans without toilets and leave disgusting calling cards all over the bike tracks and around the surf beaches etc. I have seen many vans with stickers for self contained on the back window with NO toilet no fresh water and they keep getting away with this and leaving their waste behind. I say heavy fines for freedom camping without facilities on board. Heavy fines for littering - our bike and walk tracks are littered with rubbish - people dumping their waste over the stop bank. One less job in council would pay for a person to drive around all over the town watching for people camping without facilities and dumping their rubbish on the tracks. A much better way to spend our money that just up the rates for rural people. I think to save money a good look at who works at the council and what their job is and is it necessary? If you need more money start in house but you cannot 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 time to have a good look at everything

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

Comment about a new definition for the Separately Used or Inhabited 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 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

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 *

Paddy and Anna

Family Name *

Trolove

Organisation Name (optional)

Contact Details (required)

In the space below, please provide either:

- Email Address
- Phone Number; or
- Postal Address;

Contact Phone Number

Redacted

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 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 Rooding Rate
2. A new Rooding 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 Roding Rate

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

- 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 roding rate

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

Everyone uses and benefits from roads where ever they are. impossible to differentiate who is or isn't using the road

2. A new Roding Uniform Targeted Rate

We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roding 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 roding, while at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportionate impact of the roding rate differential on high value properties. Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roding Rate, and this new fixed amount roding rate, work best in tandem with each other.

New Roding 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 Roding Uniform Targeted Rate

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

Urban people use roads too!

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 Centre Rates

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

Seems to be a theme to load more onto rural rate payers

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

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

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

It is for the general publics benefit that rubbish bins are emptied. This charge should be shared as it is currently with general and commercial

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

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

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 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 Inhabited Part of a Rating Unit (SUIP)

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 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

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 come back and finish it at any time before noon on 24th October 2023.

1. Submitter Details

First Name *

cushla

Family Name *

Twist

Organisation Name (optional)

Contact Details (required)

In the space below, please provide either:

- Email Address
- Phone Number; or
- Postal Address;

Contact Phone Number

redacted

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 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 Rooding Rate
2. A new Rooding 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 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 Roding Rate

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

- 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 roding rate

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

How does properties in Goose bay have a higher wear and tear when there is only 30 houses and 6 months of the year 70% of the residents are not there. Even when there was a full camping ground at Goose bay we still did not receive road maintenance.

2. A new Roding Uniform Targeted Rate

We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the roding 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 roding, while at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportionate impact of the roding rate differential on high value properties. Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roding Rate, and this new fixed amount roding rate, work best in tandem with each other.

New Roding 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 Roding Uniform Targeted Rate

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

If we paid this yearly amount would KDC guarantee that we would get the road maintenance/improvements that we need , so far we have had no improvements or regular maintenance in Goose bay

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 Centre Rates

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

we can not even get a street light on the corner of makura rd and moana rd

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

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 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.

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 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 accordingly

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.

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

Hearings: 1st - 17th November 2023

Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023

Changes take effect: 1st July 2024

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:

- Email Address
- Phone Number; or
- Postal Address;

Contact Phone Number

Redacted

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 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 Roothing Rate
2. A new Roothing 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 Roothing Rate

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

- 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 rooding rate

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

Before a new differential on the rooding rate is implemented the Council must provide a reasonable standard of rooding.,i.e. all busy rural roads with in 15km of the town are upgraded and tarsealed to provide a reasonable, safe standard of rooding.

2. A new Roothing Uniform Targeted Rate

We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the rooding 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 rooding, while at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportionate impact of the rooding rate differential on high value properties. Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roothing Rate, and this new fixed amount rooding rate, work best in tandem with each other.

New Roothing 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 Roothing Uniform Targeted Rate

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here
see 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 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 Centre Rates

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

Identifying all residents living within 15 minutes from the township is a nonsense and must be amended to provide a fair rating system. These residents fall under two completely separate categories, lifestyle blocks and farms. Owners of lifestyle blocks, unless retired are likely to work in the township so could attract a 0.75 differential. Owners of farms on the other hand have minimal benefit of footpaths, street lights etc. so must remain at a 0.5 differential or lower.

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

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

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.

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

Hearings: 1st - 17th November 2023

Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023

Changes take effect: 1st July 2024

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:

- Email Address
- Phone Number; or
- Postal Address;

Contact Phone Number

redacted

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 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 Rooding Rate
2. A new Rooding 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 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 Roding Rate

We are suggesting that there is a new differential on the Roding 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
 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

No proof has been presented that shows the suggested land uses have a higher impact on roads. Many rural or lifestyle residents work from home and do few trips each week. More research is required to make a fair determination.

2. A new Roding 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 Roding Rate, and this new fixed amount roading rate, work best in tandem with each other.

New Roding 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 Roding Uniform Targeted Rate

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

As 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 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 Centre Rates

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

My information is required to determine if semi-rural residents use services at a level that makes the differential fair. Council does not have enough data to determine this.

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

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 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 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

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.

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

Hearings: 1st - 17th November 2023

Adopt the changes: 29th November 2023

Changes take effect: 1st July 2024

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 *

Lynne and Chris

Family Name *

Wilson

Organisation Name (optional)

Contact Details (required)

In the space below, please provide either:

- Email Address
- Phone Number; or
- Postal Address;

Contact Phone Number

redacted

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 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 Rooding Rate
2. A new Rooding 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 Roothing Rate

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

- 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 rooding rate

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

The concept of setting differentials on rooding is fundamentally flawed given that every ratepayer, whether urban or rural who uses any form of transport benefits from rooding wherever they travel. To suggest travel is restricted to the relatively immediate vicinity of any group of ratepayers is ludicrous. Roads are roads and available to everyone be they locals, visitors or tourists. Refer also summary submission from Ecco on manipulation of rates.

2. A new Roothing Uniform Targeted Rate

We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the rooding 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 rooding, while at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportionate impact of the rooding rate differential on high value properties. Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roothing Rate, and this new fixed amount rooding rate, work best in tandem with each other.

New Roothing 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 Roothing 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 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 Centre Rates

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

Another manipulation of rates to favour urban ratepayers - refer to the summary submission by Ecco

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.

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 separate charge then it should still be so given there are only three pick-up sites. Furthermore this is the only waste service provided in these areas leaving locals no option but to deal with their own general waste. Yet another example of moving the rates burden away from urban onto rural ratepayers.

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

Comment about the Public Rubbish Bin Charge

Add your comments and alternative suggestions here

All commercial activities attract visitors so the existing charges are 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 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

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 general 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

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 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.

Yes

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

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 *

Chris

Family Name *

Wilson - ECCO

Organisation Name (optional)

East Coast Community Organisation (Ecco)

Contact Details (required)

In the space below, please provide either:

- Email Address
- Phone Number; or
- Postal Address;

Contact Phone Number

Redacted

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 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.

In summary the suggested changes cover:

1. A new differential on the Rooding Rate
2. A new Rooding 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 Roothing Rate

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

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 Roothing Uniform Targeted Rate

We are suggesting that all properties outside the urban area should contribute an initial fixed amount towards the rooding 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 rooding, while at the same time the fixed amount mitigates the disproportionate impact of the rooding rate differential on high value properties. Note we are proposing that the differential on the Roothing Rate, and this new fixed amount rooding rate, work best in tandem with each other.

New Roothing 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 & 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

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

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

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.

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

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

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