

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission

Your contact details

Name
Robyn Croker

Organisation

Hearings

Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?

Your feedback

What do you think of our proposed budget?

Leave the rates alone. We are only on one wage which is the minimum wage. This is putting more and more stress on us. The cost of living is so high now no wonder there is so many more suicides. Palmerston North city council you need to rain in your spending

What changes would you make?

Do you have any other feedback?

File uploads

FILENAME:



Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Submission on the Palmerston North City Council Draft Annual Budget 2022

21 April 2022



0800
327
646 | **FED
FARM**
.ORG.NZ

To: Palmerston North City Council
Private Bag 11034
PALMERSTON NORTH

Submission on: **PNCC Draft Annual Budget 2022**

Name of submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand
Manawatu – Rangitikei Province

Contact person: Coralee Matena
Regional Policy Manager – Central

Phone: 027 265 1648
Email: cmatena@fedfarm.org.nz

INTRODUCTION

1. The Manawatu – Rangitikei Province of Federated Farmers welcomes the chance to submit on the Palmerston North City Council Draft Annual Budget 2022. We acknowledge any submissions made by individual members of Federated Farmers.
2. Federated Farmers is focused on the transparency of rate setting, rates equity and both the overall and relative cost of local government to agriculture. We support councils that are making progress towards achieving fairness and equity in their rating policies.
3. Federated Farmers is conscious that there may be significant ‘consultation fatigue’ out in the community, following the LTP consultation process and 18 months’ worth of significant central government proposals. Our members do not want their busy silence to be misconstrued as disinterest in the proposed changes. Given the challenging regulatory and economic environment we are currently in, we acknowledge this may result in a low response rate to the consultation process.

SUBMISSION

General comments

4. We note that 2022 is an uncertain year for all ratepayers, as well as Council. Inflation is rising, the long-term impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic are unknown, and the future role of Council is uncertain. In terms of the proposed budget increase for 2022/23, we are of the opinion that lower costs, fit-for-purpose infrastructure and calculated spending is the best way that Council can assist the community right now.
5. Further, COVID-19, inflation and rising fuel and food prices are putting families under significant pressure. Our members as farmers also face additional substantial challenges, including labor shortages, compliance costs, supply chain problems and increases in farm input costs.

Rating burden

6. Federated Farmers continues to thank Council, elected representatives and staff, for the positive and open working relationship that we enjoy. We have appreciated working with a Council who has taken a reasoned and fair approach to how rates are spread across ratepayers.
7. Rates are among the top ten operational expenses of a farming business and are a source of considerable financial pressure for all farmers. We therefore appreciate Council’s willingness to consider affordability, fairness and equity issues when recovering rates (to the extent this is possible in a land value taxation system).

282-3

8. We continue to thank Council for the use of differentials for the general rate, and continue to support Council's rationale for utilising differentials. We agree that a general rate based on land value does not produce a fair and equitable allocation of rates, therefore justifying why the Council operates a system of differentials.
9. Federated Farmers supports the cost recovery mechanisms that Council has previously used to collect rates, and in particular has supported Council utilising the UAGC and uniform targeted rates rather than rely on the general rate to bring in rating revenue. We are therefore pleased to see that the underlying structure of the rating systems is not proposed to change. We continue to support Council utilising a UAGC and uniform targeted rates for water, wastewater, kerbside recycling and rubbish & public recycling.

UAGC vs General rate

10. In 2019 Council made the decision to reduce to the UAGC from \$690 to \$500 per property, in order to provide some relief to residential ratepayers who are facing higher than normal rates increases as a result of the recent property revaluation. This rating change was supported by a change to the differential system for rural and semi serviced properties, to increase the amount of rates increased via the general rate, while ensuring that the portion of total rates from rural/semi serviced rating units remains the same.
11. At this time, Federated Farmers submitted that while we understood that the proposed changes were an attempt to somewhat maintain the Long Term Plan status quo in terms of total rate take from various rating groups, we were concerned about the long term impact of changes to the rating structure, in particular the likelihood that it would create a precedence or trend to reduce the UAGC in future years to keep residential rates low. The 2022 proposed budget confirms these fears.
12. The UAGC is a useful mechanism in that it helps to ensure that each rating unit contributes a minimum amount, thus moderating rates on high value properties. By using the UAGC less, Council is therefore somewhat unfairly shifting more activities onto the General Rate, and shifting the affordability problem onto ratepayers with higher property values, like farms. Farmers regulatory compliance is ever increasing and with it, the cost to farm. It is not fair or viable to continue to shift the rating burden to rural ratepayers when the good or benefit received from the service is community wide.
13. We ask that in future years Council maintain its use of the UAGC, in order to preserve the integrity of the current rating model.

Federated Farmers thanks the Palmerston North City Council for considering our submission to the Draft Annual Budget 2022

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission

Your contact details**Name**

Barbara Mouat

Organisation**Hearings**

Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?

Your feedback

What do you think of our proposed budget?

What changes would you make?

See below

Do you have any other feedback?

I just want to voice my concern at the increase in my rates as result of my land value increasing by \$330,000. While the value of my land has increased, the services which I access and pay rates for remain unchanged, and the increase in value would only benefit me if I sold. I am the sole occupant of the dwelling and my use of services is nominal. While Council can in no way be held responsible for an individual's income, I would've thought they would have a moral obligation not to cause hardship for those on lower or fixed income. In my case an increase of almost \$850 negates the recent increase in National Super. One possible way to address this would be to increase the amount given as a rates rebate.

File uploads

FILENAME:

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission
Attachments: pncc_karen_adams.pdf

Your contact details

Name

Karen Adams

Organisation

Hearings

Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?

Your feedback

What do you think of our proposed budget?

See attached

What changes would you make?

See Attached

Do you have any other feedback?

Yes I would like to see a reduction in councilor numbers and return to Ward Councilors so the people in the area can vote for a person who will champion and fight for issue that anything gets done. I think we have one of the highest ratios of councilors to population of any local body. I think all councilors standing on a party ticket should have to declare this during the campaign and make it clear to voters on the voting form.

File uploads

FILENAME:

pncc_karen_adams

PNCC Council Submission Karen Adams

For this first part I would like to expand on Cr Karen Naylor's suggestions as a template that I agree with and add some of my own.

1. That the proposed additional budget for employee remuneration be revised to only be increased by 3% and 0% for any senior managers and employees earning over \$80K. The 9% increase is unheard of in other sectors and given the costs of the rate hikes to many fixed income ratepayers it would be seen as a kick in the guts to give someone, especially those over \$80K a pay rise when the cost of living and mortgage rates have increased. Also considering most valuations have actually dropped considerably since they were assessed it hurts more.

1a. One of the reasons for this is I would like to see an audit of how many of the current staff positions use outside consultants to make a decision that they are paid too. E.g. The second council planner I spoke with could not make a decision on a second dwelling on my property on College St as it's within the heritage area and said it would need to go to an outside consultant, even though I sent through all the information from the builder of exactly what would be there and paid for a ground assessment as I was told to by a previous planner as there were no council records, at a cost of \$1000 and that it would not be seen from the road. The second dwelling was for my mother to come and live as the house only has a shower over the bath and stairs up to the house so it's unsuitable and she also likes some independence. The irony is that I can put whatever style garage I like up that doesn't have to comply - like most houses already have, some with sleepouts. So I can put her in a garage but not a fully insulated and compliant house. It's also a conflict of interests that the only consultant used happened to previously work for council and wrote the design guidelines- he told me when I wrote to him. If the salaried planners can't read and apply design guidelines then what are we paying them for? The next question is what happens when that person retires or dies- who will make a decision then? What's the succession plan for the decision making.

1b. Additionally, I think it time to revise those design rules as the rates paid for the land of the Savage Cres area, that can't be subdivided, is rated at the same as those across the road that can and have been. A fresh approach to the design guidelines to update homes with modern extensions like they have done in real heritage areas like Melbourne, Sydney and other parts of NZ not only look great but allow the home owners can live in warmer, healthier homes that modern living affords.

2. That the following proposed new Operational programmes are removed from the draft 22/23 Annual Budget, and are included in a list titled: "Considered but not included":

Prog 2129 - Free rubbish bag per month to low-income households

No, many low-income families are in council or Kainga Ora housing which is already heavily subsidised, would meet the criteria of being on a community services card so will be getting additional help compared to those not in social housing that struggle to make ends meet who do not have a community services card. I would prefer to see a complete overhaul of rubbish and a regional incinerator paid for all councils under the Horizons Region and Horizons as burying rubbish or sending it offshore is not only disgusting for future generations with leaching and pollution but also moving the recycling to countries where they are just dumped is immoral.

Prog 2136 - City Marketing Campaigns - \$150K.

Unnecessary. The reason people don't come into the city is that the parking is expensive and too short to be able to do the things you want e.g have dinner, go to a movie and see a show. In line with this and as a gesture towards all the ratepayers, councillor free parking should be revoked as well as any staff that are given this privilege. We have DHB workers that have to pay for their own parking and quite frankly they do a more important, life changing job than anyone on council does.

3. That the following proposed Capital New programmes are removed from the draft 22/23 Annual Budget, and are included in a list titled: "considered but not included".

Prog 167 - James Line Improvements - \$1,443K.

My road, College St, as explained below has had many improvements, now the outcome is that it is now detrimental and damaging my home. Cook St has been "fixed" many times and is still full of potholes. Fix current roads before "improving others".

Prog 1676 - additional funding to improve participation in council meetings - \$150K

What exactly does this mean? Is this for public participation or something else- if it's public participation then the meetings should be held after hours so workers who are unable to come to daytime meetings can participate either in person or via zoom. There saved you \$150K

4. That the following proposed operational programmes are removed:

Prog 2133 - Health and Safety Improvement Programme - \$1,000K - That the proposed Health and Safety Improvement Programme is reviewed and that priority actions are delivered through existing capability, through reprioritising work.

What are the current staff doing and how have they not prioritised the work themselves? Again, what are these fulltime employees doing??

Prog 1936 - \$30K - (op) Funding for Section 17a review.

Operational funding as a whole need to be revised, just because it's always been the way councils have done it doesn't mean its best practice. In fact it is the whole reason we are in the position where our wastewater, rubbish and roads and footpaths are in the state they are- while frivolous spending, additional staff and consultants are used. Rates should be used mostly for core capital expenditure with the remainder on operating costs. This would keep borrowing to an absolute minimum, keep staff and contracts tied to performance of the project and mean greater consultation with ratepayers prior to any scoping work being applied. E.g the Square blowout before a plan is even in place.

Prog 2135 - \$21K - LGNZ Conference

I have no faith in LGNZ and its very existence is another bureaucratic expense that has no real benefit to ratepayers across the country and pays for staff accountable to no one. PNCC needs to opt out.

5. That the following programmes funding is reduced:

Prog 1506 - \$640K - Community Events

284-4

Prog 2130 - \$135K Heritage Advisory Panel – no funding.

No requirement That what your planners and the Arts and Heritage committee are for, if either aren't up to the job then they should stand down and be replaced. The fact the committee has approved this is a disgrace in itself. Take it out of the Arts budget as they get so much funding in one form or another but most people can't even afford to attend most events.

Prog 86 - \$103K - (cap ren) Furniture replacements 9 - reduce to damaged or broken only.

We'd all like new furniture in our workplaces and if it's a business and they can afford the latest and greatest that's all good, it comes out of their bottom line. If the furniture is serviceable and does the job as in it's a desk, chair, bookcase etc then it will suffice. This is a good example of frivolous, unnecessary spending.

Prog 2047 - \$154K - (cap new) Furniture transformation - reduce to as required for Health and Safety.

Reduce to as required for reason given as above

Prog 1826 - \$308K - (cap new) CAB Workplace Transformation - reduce to \$150K. KN/BP

For the same as furniture, are they able to deliver the services? If the answer is yes then this can wait til our rates decrease.

Prog 1929 - \$256K - (op) - Workforce Transformation - reduce to \$125K. KN/BP

What is this actually broken down into? I'd like to see the current Job Descriptions and whether they are meeting them and productivity analysis first. The only other observation is that many of the "highly qualified" staff are not from Palmerston North, they do not know or want to know previous issues for ratepayers whilst there are many experienced, workers that have a long history with the city that can do the jobs their managers are doing, possibly in a more efficient and effective way. They have more buy in to do a good job first time round as they live here and pay rates here. The only transformation I'd like to see is a process of hiring from within for many of the supervisory or management positions.

6. To defer for a year:

Prog 2044 - \$197K (op) Kerbside Food waste - Investigations and Trial - defer to 23/24. KN/BP

Defer. People can't even put their recycling in the right bin and the compost is terrible as it is- always full of weeds.

Social Housing.

I do not agree with any further spending on social housing for the following reasons:

The Papaioea Place housing was the most inefficient use of prime inner city real estate that should have maximised the number of homes in that place. I have had one councilor tell me that it was for elderly and disabled and that a lift would be an additional \$70 K. This just tells me the lack of experience or knowledge in housing people making decisions have. This should have been a multi, med to high density project that could have housed hundreds more and has been wasted by lack of foresight.

It is central governments job to provide social housing not councils and whilst it makes wealthier ratepayers and councillors feel good, the cost is borne by many on low and fixed incomes who are now subsidising others, that they already subsidise with KO housing, who may well be monetarily better off than they are.

Public Consultation.

I disagree with many of the proposals and also would like to see more austerity amongst council staff and certain councillors who seem to think ratepayers' money comes out of thin air and can be wasted on pet projects which are poorly consulted or not even consulted with the ratepayers in the first instance (do we even want it?), poorly costed (horrendous budget blowouts e.g the Bridge, Memorial Park, College St "upgrade", Planter boxes, square revitalisation to name a few examples which are then signed off when the workmanship is shoddy. e.g. The bridge and river pathway- major cracks appeared within a week- some because trucks were driven over it straight after it was laid, same has happened at Savage Cres Park, the cracks appeared the day after due to poor prep and is totally discolored from poor installation.

College St was consulted on ad nauseum until the cyclists got their way but the final draft was not what was done- for example the tree was supposed to be removed from outside my house (which would have fixed the tree root ingress into the sewage pipe on my property and lifting of the footpath, that I have sent numerous requests over five years to be repaired. The main issue is that due to the change in road surface and a poorly laid manhole cover and the volume and weight heavy trucks that now utilise College St as a main thoroughfare, have made affected the foundations in my house and it now has multiple cracks and gaps that weren't there beforehand.

I have again raised this issue with council and spoke to the roading team (Dan?) who said he'd get back to me and that was over a year ago. The noise pollution and vibrations now in the house is massive and affects our wellbeing and sleep, and as our house is in the middle of the two intersections it is when cars and trucks are at their highest speed. I have asked that someone come and see the damage and experience it to understand the issue that wasn't there prior to the road being resurfaced. As an aside, most cyclists ride on the footpath as the rucks tend to bounce of the manhole cover and caused a child to ride into the curb- also reported.

Senior Council Staff.

The attitude of many of the senior council staff that appeared in the online forum was an interesting observation in how dismissive they were of the questions and feedback unless it suited their agenda. To have Sarah Sinclair scoffing and sighing at comments was a disgrace and showed just how superior she believes she is. I firmly believe there is an attitude of unaccountability with many of the senior staff, demonstrated by the bloody mindedness of the planter box trail, and emphasis on cyclists only for the active communities manager over pedestrians is notable and needs to be reined in. I would like to see frequent reviews and assessments of their decisions and budget spend and overruns.

Call Centre and Online Chat staff, Cleaners, Gardners, Workers- Doers.

I am happy for these people to receive a pay rise- every single time I have called the help desk or contacted the online chat the staff have been friendly and helpful. The toilets especially at the

284-6

Esplanade and near the bridge are always lovely and clean, the lady and other staff friendly that clean them are a delight to speak with.

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission

Your contact details

Name

Nick Dow

Organisation

Disability Reference Group

Hearings

Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?

Tues 10 May 3.30pm to 5.30pm

Thurs 12 May 3.30pm to 5.30pm

Fri 13 May 3.30pm to 5.30pm

Your feedback

What do you think of our proposed budget?

What changes would you make?

The DRG asks that funding be included in the 2022/23 budget for programme 2041 (Facilities Assessment). As representatives of the disability community, we wish to stress the importance of auditing Council facilities with a particular focus on accessibility. Changes made as a result of such an audit have the potential to increase the participation of disabled people in public life. The DRG asks that Council considers an expansion to the programme (through further funding) to cover an increased scope, in terms of what is assessed and how it is assessed. The programme is currently limited to an assessment of Council-owned buildings against the Building Code. We suggest a programme covering infrastructure more generally (for example, pedestrian crossings, footpaths, and disability carparks) in addition to buildings, checked against an accessibility-focused framework such as New Zealand Standard NZS 4121:2001 – Design for access and mobility: buildings and associated facilities.

Do you have any other feedback?

File uploads

FILENAME:

From:
Subject:

Submission
FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission

Your contact details

Name
Emma Prouse

Organisation

Hearings

Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?

Your feedback

What do you think of our proposed budget?

The proposed rates increase is unaffordable for families who live in this city. 3% would be the number I'd expect to see.

What changes would you make?

There are lots of areas where spending can be cut or deferred without impacting essential services. Cut back on non-essential services particularly in Goal 2 (city making, city centre and placemaking). Cut back on International Relations spending. Stop funding for Smokefree Education, this should not be the role of a City Council. This is a health activity. Defer: Reserve renewals Arena sound system replacement Arena kitchen equipment replacement Parks and Reserves shade development Walkway extensions Sportsfield Improvements New social housing

Do you have any other feedback?

File uploads
FILENAME:

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission

Your contact details

Name

Caragh Aspden

Organisation

Palmerston North Youth Council

Hearings

Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?

Thurs 12 May 3.30pm to 5.30pm

Thurs 12 May 7pm to 9pm

Fri 13 May 9am to 11am

Your feedback

What do you think of our proposed budget?

Kia Ora, we are the Palmerston North Youth Council for 2022. After discussing the information provided within the consultation document and the supporting information, our thoughts on the Draft Annual Budget are discussed below: Safe and Connected Communities: The Palmerston North Youth Council believe that Safe and Connected Communities are a priority. We hope to see the city council engage directly with the youth sector, and prioritise youth voice in both the workshopping, planning and execution of these aspirations. Young people play a key role in creating a safer city in areas like the CBD and around schools. As the Palmerston North Youth Council, we encourage Elected Members to engage with us on this topic. There is much good being done throughout the city for youth development, and we would hope to see Elected Members continue to seek out and value youth voice by engaging directly with our young people within their own communities and spaces. Active Transport: We believe steps to create a safer city go hand in hand with goals around active transport, especially for young people commuting to and from school. With the figures given for transport, we as the Youth Council would like to see a continued emphasis on active transport, especially surrounding support for youth using active transport to and from school. In discussion with young people of the city, it is clear the safety of the roads and pathways surrounding schools is severely affecting youth participation in active transport. This lack of road safety may be contributing to a school 'car-culture,' a common phrase used in our discussions. We believe that there are many practical additions, such as clearer painting and lines on bike lanes and more protected sidewalks, that would empower youth to commute in a more eco-friendly way. Eco City: In discussing the budget allocated to becoming an Eco City, there were a number of areas we felt could specifically be improved upon to benefit youth. Resource recovery was one we felt especially passionate about, and creating a more circular system with our natural resources. These past years during the pandemic seemed to have created a more

disposable, one-use culture. It seems urgent to start using our resources more consciously to help reduce the harm already done. Even though Eco-city makes up a small percentage of ratepayer's rates (2.09% / \$1.32), we would like to see an increased focus on this goal within all areas of council goals, and a priority on sustainability for future generations across all projects. As compared to last year's LTP, there seems to be much less of a focus on PNCC's personal goals surrounding creating an Eco-city. The Youth Council hopes to see the council follow through on the hopes expressed by the 2021 LTP, and lead by example within Palmerston North with its own eco practices. It would be so exciting to see Council consider goals such as going plastic free or becoming carbon neutral. Additionally, a common sentiment expressed by Youth Councillors and other young people has been the importance of seeing real environmental progress in the city. We believe this confirms a shared responsibility and encourages us to continue making the small changes in our day-to-day lives that can mitigate our environmental footprint. Besides our suggested areas of emphasis, Youth Council was especially happy to see the large percentage of ratepayer rates going towards Active Communities (14.63%) and Connected Communities (6.52%), two areas that have such clear positive benefits for youth.

What changes would you make?

Do you have any other feedback?

Not a comment for the budget changes, but as a group that works with making local governance accessible, engaging, and understandable for youth, we as the Youth Council would really appreciate if the + and - bullet points were larger and clearer in the consultation document.

File uploads

FILENAME:

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission

Your contact details

Name

Margaret Wood

Organisation

Hearings

Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?

Your feedback

What do you think of our proposed budget?

Firstly, thanks to all the Councillors who could see the bigger picture and advocated for a lower rate increase. Too extravagant - too many frills. The proposed rate increase is not fair or just and targets those whose land value has seen a huge increase. The value is only seen when a property is sold. Council needs to be realistic and apportion the rates across all PN ratepayers. One flat rate. We all receive the same services and have access to the same amenities. It feels like we are being punished for having a larger section. Perhaps the PNCC needs to be looking at city boundaries and seeing where we can build without all this infill happening, placing additional pressure on current infrastructure e.g. sewage, parking on residential streets due to lack of driveways and off-street parking. Some areas are becoming brick & concrete jungles, no where for children to play. Some parents don't have vehicles to take children to parks and not always within a reasonable walking distance.

What changes would you make?

Items could be cut or delayed: - Streets for People - Budget already reduced but is it necessary? Have the businesses in Cuba Street been consulted - Cycleways - user pays? Not everyone is able to use them for various personal reasons - Albert St river entrance - not necessary. Doesn't have to be done. Not a basic need or requirement - Tamakuku Terrace - section buyers should pay for the subdivision expenses not us. It's their dream home! - Tenants Lounge not essential. Would tenants here have a rent increase to cover costs? - Lido - user needs to pay - Is the 150k audiovisual equipment really needed? Seems an unnecessary expense in these tough times of high inflation.

Do you have any other feedback?

Animal Shelter upgrade important and has been waiting for a long time Budget needs to reflect current situation of increased expenses and make big cutbacks - tighten the belt - go without the frills. Not everyone has two incomes and some already struggle to provide for their families without additional stress. Come on PNCC - share the rates equally across all ratepayers and make some services user pays. WE ALL RECEIVE

THE SAME SERVICES AND HAVE ACCESS TO THE SAME AMENITIES - Why should our rates be all different? Having a bigger section or a higher LV value is not a good enough reason to justify this unreasonable increase. Some residents have less than a 5% increase while others are facing a 25% increase. Not fair - come on do the right thing!

File uploads

FILENAME:

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission

Your contact details**Name**

Chris Channing

Organisation**Hearings**

Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?

Your feedback**What do you think of our proposed budget?**

The budget spend should be restricted to essential services while we get through these unusual hard economic times. The disruption of the supply chains has resulted in increased products cost

What changes would you make?

Eliminate non essential spend for the next year Spend can continue in future years when the supply chain costs have settled

Do you have any other feedback?

I am moving into retirement and have not had an increase in pay rate for the last three years. Any substantial increase in rates would have a negative financial impact. I am sure there are many others in the same predicament Decreasing the rates burden on the elderly should be considered as they are generally not big users of the facilities provided

File uploads

FILENAME:

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission

Your contact details**Name**

Golda Smith

Organisation**Hearings**

Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?

Your feedback**What do you think of our proposed budget?**

The budget is only helpful to the council. The amount of money wasted on things that the community does not want nor need yearly is astounding. We pay to be sick at the hospital, we pay for lack of recycling, we pay for stupid planter boxes, and roadworks in the areas of town that people do not ask for. Your consultation process or lack thereof leaves no faith in the current council. The only thing since I have lived in Palmerston North that is good is the renovated park with splash pad. Consider taking a pay cut yourself to show that you understand at ground level how these changes are affecting us. We are getting smashed on interest, food costs, rent increases, petrol, dirty car tax and we get no reprieve. Are you planning on providing food for those that can't afford it or just relying on Zilch to do that?

What changes would you make?

More transparent council members. There is no faith. No trust in you, your process or your words.

Do you have any other feedback?

Get real! Do not use this as a chance to make money from those still recovering from the effects of covid. Nothing council has done has given the community anything in addition to what we have had. Recycling options here suck compared to other areas in the country. The rubbish bags are over priced. Really disappointing to say the least.

File uploads

FILENAME:

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission

Your contact details

Name

John Wood

Organisation

Hearings

Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?

Your feedback

What do you think of our proposed budget?

Not a lot. PNCC need to be realistic when setting the budget and trim unnecessary expenses and costs especially at this time of high inflation and the flow on effect from the pandemic. Support the Animal Shelter project

What changes would you make?

- Streets for People - not necessary. High budget - Cycleways - has a detailed cost analysis been done. Many Seniors & people with disabilities are unable to use these. Perhaps the money needs to be spent elsewhere - Tamakuku Reserve - people wanting to build their dream homes should have these costs added to the price of the section - Tenants lounge at Papaioea Place not necessary currently - Overseas consultants for the City Centre -not necessary and what exactly is it costing?? - Albert Street river entrance - not really necessary - Audiovisual equipment - I'm sure it functions well enough

Do you have any other feedback?

A brief history: - Bought section in PNCC approved subdivision in 1956 - Built a modest house in 1958-59 and moved in March 1959 so have lived here for 63 years. Intended to be our forever home (while healthy and I'm not dead) - The value is only realised when the property is sold. I shouldn't feel that the drastic step of subdividing or selling and relocating should be an option because of an exorbitant increase of rates. Our proposed new rates will be \$11.10 per day - say goodbye to insurances. What extra services will Council be providing for this substantial increase? All of this is causing undue stress, affecting wellness and overshadowing retirement as the challenges of becoming more senior happen. - Inflation is at its highest for 30 years and as you get more senior, you can incur additional expenses for help, health and wellness issues.

File uploads

FILENAME:

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission

Your contact details**Name**

Joanne Wilson

Organisation**Hearings****Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?****Your feedback****What do you think of our proposed budget?**

Sad to see that PNCC Council have not taken into account the rate of inflation and the financial struggles many people are already facing. Budget needs to be realistic and sensible. Get rid of all the "Nice to have" and get back to basics. "We can't live on champagne when we only have a beer/bare income" Review, reassess and make wise decisions. As a landlord we have kept our rent below the market rental for many years as we considered that this was a way of helping people save to buy their own homes. With the Healthy Homes Standards, we have also covered these costs. Sadly, we will need to pass on to our tenants some of the proposed rate increase should this go ahead, as I'm sure many other landlords will be in the same situation. This just makes it harder for people to save and to make ends meet. Present PNCC rates = \$59.78 per week proposed 2022/23 = \$76.86 per week - just too much!!

What changes would you make?

Delay or not even do: Heritage Consultant City transformation - not again Tamakuku Terrace - pass on costs to section buyers not rate payers Lido water filtration system - user pays? Upgrade to audiovisual equipment - do it by Zoom or Team meetings

Do you have any other feedback?**File uploads**

FILENAME:

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission

Your contact details

Name

Joanne Wilson

Organisation

Joanne Wood (Girls Brigade)

Hearings

Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?

Your feedback

What do you think of our proposed budget?

In the Annual Budget 2022/23, Council acknowledges that it has been tough for everyone and that we are all facing increases. The rising cost of living, petrol prices, mortgage payments and now a proposed rate increase, not just for PNCC but also for Horizons (8.4%). The cost of living has seen a 6.9% inflation rate (the highest in 30 years) and more OCR are forecasted for the year. While some increases are inevitable, the proposed rate increase seems very unfair especially with land values having seen a huge increase with recent QV valuations. Why are rates based on LV? Does someone with a bigger section, receive additional services? Should someone with a bigger section from an earlier subdivision now be penalised? Shouldn't rates be simply a flat rate for all. Where is the fairness in this? We pay a flat rate for doctor's appointments, buying a coffee (can't afford that treat now), attending a show, and yet our rates are based on LV. Are you assuming that people with a bigger section, have a higher income? The value in the land is really only seen when the property is sold, not before. With rates being based on LV, some home owners are now facing a huge increase. Our LV increased from \$300,000 to \$700,000, an increase of 133.33%. Our section is large but is not subdividable due to the way it was surveyed. We are now looking at an 29.36% increase in our 2022/23 proposed rates. While we accept there are increased costs - this increase is simply NOT fair! How will people be able to afford these increases. Some people are already struggling, these increases will just put more financial pressure on them and their well-being. The recent increases to Working for Families and Seniors, will simply disappear to cover the proposed rate increase.

What changes would you make?

Programmes/Projects that could be delayed or not started at all. Let's live within our means instead and get the basics covered without all the icing on the cake! - Cycleway - don't remove the planter boxes to install another temporary barrier before a permanent one is installed - Artwork/Sculptures - Pause. Let's enjoy the ones we currently have - City Centre transformation (what another one?) Arup Group consultations. Why do we

need this? What are the costs? No - Heritage Planner \$135K - No - Free rubbish bags - \$654K - No - Audiovisual equipment \$150K - No - Papaioea Place Social housing - is a Tenants lounge necessary? Don't they have a lounge in their units? - Albert Street river entrance - delay - Streets for People - \$1.45m - necessary?? - Railway Road bore - cost? - Reduce the number of Councillors - especially if we are creating two Maori seats - Cycleways - Albert & Ruahine Streets - delay - Events funding - \$160K - review/reduce/scale down - James Line - incorporate this cost into the price of the sections at Tamakuku Terrace.

Do you have any other feedback?

I congratulate the Councillors that voted No to the proposed rate increase. People are struggling now, this increase is simply not equitable - introduce a flat rate for all rate payers. Also review user pays - e.g. Lido entry fees/subscriptions, events. Let's get real, get back to basics and what we can afford. We are already tightening our belts - PNCC need to do the same. Thanks

File uploads

FILENAME:

Date:	21 April 2022
To:	PNCC
From:	Awapuni Park Community and Recreation Centre (aka Awapuni Community Centre)
Subject:	Awapuni Community Centre Submission on PNCC Annual Plan

Summary

1. The Awapuni Community Centre submits on the PNCC Annual Plan to advocate for improved funding for Community Centres and Facilities, and development of the Awapuni area

The Centre wishes to speak to the submission, We would like to speak to this Submission on Thursday 12 May, 9-11 or 3-30 - 5.30 alongside our partner's River Stop. Details for a contact person are below:

- **Name Norelle Ward (committee member)**

About the Awapuni Community Centre

2. The Centre is managed by an incorporated society Committee, with support from PNCC, and oversees the use of the Centre by a wide range of groups including the following:
 - Age Concern
 - Apostolic Oneness Church
 - Awapuni Community Library
 - Awapuni Garden Club
 - Awapuni Library
 - Awapuni Tennis
 - Ballroom Dancing Practice
 - DHD Hearthland Home School Group
 - Evening Flora
 - Filipino Bible Study
 - Harmony tai Chi Group
 - Hinengaro Trust
 - Manawatū Amateur Winemakers and Brewers
 - Manawatu Freshwater Anglers Inc
 - Mens Bible Study
 - PN Magic Circle
 - PN Miniature Makers
 - Palmy Play group
 - Palmy Cropswap
 - Pilates
 - Riverdale Country ASoundz Club
 - Rose City Quilters
 - Sew In Circle
 - Textile Arts
 - Tokelau community Group
 - Veterans Tennis
 - Wagon Wheels Country Music Groupo
 - Widowed and Friendship Club
 - Saddle Up Club

General Comments on annual plan

3. The Centre supports the PNCC's intent to develop a diverse, connected, and safe community. The Centre also works towards this by supporting community development in Awapuni, representing the coming together of member groups, and facilitating the activities of groups and communities in Awapuni.
4. The Centre recommends that the PNCC maintain and increase funding to community centres and groups. The centre is managed by a committee of user group representatives, local supporters, and residents.
5. We would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge and thank PNCC for the work that has been completed to date at the Awapuni Park and around the community centre. This includes the new fully fenced unders playground, the upgraded overs playground and improvements to the Basketball court and carpark. We and the wider community are grateful for these efforts and the inclusion of the tuna and the kereru in the final designs of the playground.
6. We also thank PNCC for working with us to plant fruit trees in the park, and look forward to the next planting day to increase the community orchard around the gardens.

Awapuni Park and Community Centre

7. The Committee recommends that PNCC allocate further funding for safety improvements to Community Centres including the Awapuni Community Centre. Committee members have noted safety concerns including, but not limited to;
 - A lack of outdoor lighting at the building entrance, creating risk for users. Installation of outdoor security light is recommended.
 - A lack of lighting in the nearby Park despite frequent usage as a thoroughfare. Low level path lighting is recommended.
 - Unusable and unsafe pathways made of gravel or limestone, that have steps, unsuitable for people with pushchairs, children on scooters and wheelchair access.
 - Reinstatement of the pathway around the left side of the centre and around the Tennis Courts area.
 - Alterations to the Barrier arm on the left side of the centre to make it safer for uses (especially elderly, and disabled and young families with prams).

Better connectivity

The Awapuni Community Centre committee would also like improvements to engage better connectivity with our community such as but not limited to;

- We continue to support Te Waihanga wahi tumatanui placemaking. Provide seed funding and support for people to lead public space projects to develop accessible, active, comfortable and social public places.
- Adding developments to encourage more engagement around Community Gardens
- A seating and bbq area.

Other improvements we continue to support and recommend for consideration in the Awapuni area.

- Support potential new library Community Hub on St Marks land with a large kitchen.
- Wayfinding between shops and the Awapuni Community Centre on all pathways merging with Riverstop and iwi with consistent imagery. We Would love to see the correction of the Awapuni Signage at the Awapuni Shops, and the imagery from these signs be brought down onto the current Red markings on the road ways to soften the road markings and potentially slow drivers through the shopping area.
- Correction, replacement or removal of the Yellow markers in the shopping centre road way.
- The committee, after community consultation are investigating installing planter boxes with bench seating. Installing WiFi.
Getting an artist to erect two pou to have a welcoming entrance way to the front door. Commissioning an artist to paint murals on the walls. A welcome sign. We are still working through naming our large room and small room. With the carpark nearly complete, we continue to wish to create an outdoor room with painted concrete and bench seating.
- We still support the installation of the paper walkway between number 8 and number 9 Panako place for better connectivity for Awapuni, in line with the councils connected communities goal.
- We love the Awapuni Days and the movie nights, these brought a total of 4000 people from our community together to proudly enjoy the space. We hope to help host another event in the coming months – with restrictions lifting.

Rates Increases

While we acknowledge we are asking for items to be included in the budget (or worked on in partnership with the Community Centre committee) we also acknowledge the current housing issues and cost of living increases, and how this is and will continue to affect many people in our community (and further afield). We urge PNCC to be conservative with the Rates increase, especially given recent QV revaluations which will also have an impact on rates, and therefore a knock on effect to renters in the community.

Having nice places to go is aspirational and important to allow people to escape their own spaces, but they also need to live (well) in their own places.

Conclusion

8. The Awapuni Community Centre urge PNCC to continue to support Community Centres, with adequate resourcing, and to improve the safety and accessibility of the Awapuni Park and community.

We would like to speak to this submission. We would like to speak to this Submission on Thursday 12 May, 9-11 or 3-30 - 5.30

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission

Your contact details**Name**

Lee Pendergrast

Organisation**Hearings**

Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?

Your feedback**What do you think of our proposed budget?**

Some aspects of the proposed budget are positive. I am not however able to endorse the proposed 32% rates increase on our property. I am aware that rates are calculated on the current property valuations which are not carried out by the PNCC, but a 32% increase (despite a reduction in the Uniform Annual General Charge) is not acceptable particularly when I understand that some proposed property rates will decrease.

What changes would you make?

Consideration of capping rates increases at 10 - 12% Re-consider the way rates are calculated

Do you have any other feedback?

File uploads

FILENAME:

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission

Your contact details**Name**

Lydene Davey

Organisation**Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?****Your feedback****What do you think of our proposed budget?**

I am very upset about the proposed budget. My rates are going up by 30%. I am on a very low income and currently receive the rebate. The rebate has been super helpful but now you want to add \$900 to my bill. If the rebate determines I need the added assistance then how do you think I can afford this massive rise. My home needs rewiring but the bank won't lend me the money to do it because they say I can't afford the extra \$12.50 a week and yet you seem to think everyone can afford any price increase you decide on.

What changes would you make?**Do you have any other feedback?**

You need to budget to last years income plus inflation. Don't spend money you don't have.

File uploads

FILENAME:

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission

Your contact details

Name

Robert Dabb

Organisation

Hearings

Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?

Tues 10 May 9am to 11am

Fri 13 May 3.30pm to 5.30pm

Your feedback

What do you think of our proposed budget?

While I've not studied the proposed budget in full detail (only became aware of the proposed rate increases today 21 April so getting a submission in before 4pm). What I am concerned with is the outcomes of the budget - being a disproportionate increase of rates across those parts of the city least able to afford an increase. I spent a few minutes on the PNCC website comparing houses at random in a few suburbs, including my own. Here's a snapshot of that 15 minutes worth of research: 104 Ruamahanga cres +9.5% 12 Airport Dr +11% 36 Birmingham St +25% 20 Benmore Ave + 11% 100 Te Awe Awe St -16% (a \$2.6M house) 360 Albert St - Hokowhitu end 0.0001% 10 Lockhart +12% 69 Maxwells Line +20% 50 Rugby St +7.5% 20 Buick Cres +10.8% 120 Ruapehu Dr +0.6% 120 Pacific Dr -2.9% 90 Wood St +25% 15 Clyde Cres +14% 10 Upham Tce +13.5% 25 Snowdon Ave +30%

What changes would you make?

The issue seems to be because in the low socio-economic areas like Roslyn and Takaro that Land Values have increased quite disproportionately to improvements on the last valuations. With rates based significantly on land Value this has hit these low-paid, low value homes especially hard. For example a widow in a 2 bedroom takaro home is seeing a 35% increase. meanwhile across town in a \$2.67M Te Awe Awe St home, rates have decreased by 16%. I would like to see two things: 1. A more equitable spread of rates increase across the city, with a cap imposed of 10% increase on any property (and that in itself is still way and above the underlying inflation rate) 2. A lower rates collection in total to achieve (1) - this means employing less people and spending less money

Do you have any other feedback?

File uploads

FILENAME:

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission

Your contact details**Name**

Lesley Lowdon

Organisation**Hearings**

Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?

Your feedback**What do you think of our proposed budget?**

I am very concerned about the proposed rates increase. From my perspective as an almost 67 year old living on my own, (with a dog for company) this sort of increase prevents me from contemplating retirement.

What changes would you make?

I do not understand how the land value of my home of 19 years can be over \$650,000 while my house itself is apparently valued at only \$85,000. I would like to see a system that more fairly shares rates over the actual value. I do not live in a mansion, merely a two bedroom cottage that has been extended by a previous owner. It would appear that my rates will, most likely, be more expensive than those for large households with modern expensive homes. This seems to be highly inequitable and unjust.

Do you have any other feedback?

I am unable to attend any of the hearings as I will be isolating prior to visiting/caring for my very elderly parents.

File uploads

FILENAME:

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission

Your contact details

Name

Sandy Nimmo

Organisation

Memorial Park Sports Trust Board

Postal address

c/o Sport Manawatu, 40 The Square, Palmerston North

Hearings

Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?

Thurs 12 May 3.30pm to 5.30pm

Your feedback

What do you think of our proposed budget?

While we are very sensitive to the challenges presented to all local Councils by the Covid-19 pandemic, some of our Trustees who have taken the time to review the documents with which we have been provided, arrived at the general consensus that Palmerston North City Council is taking some brave and quality steps to manage the resulting problems while still moving forward in positive directions. We, as a volunteer based community group working hard to restore and upgrade a community venue, have experienced some negative and adverse situations over the past 18 months, including Covid, PNCC staff shortages, Mother Nature and availability of volunteers. But we are keenly aware that we are not alone.

What changes would you make?

We would like to see more funding allocated to Community group relief efforts. Yes, we would appreciate being able to access some of that support to help make up for devastating revenue losses and to help us accommodate some unexpected and, frankly, unaffordable costs that are being projected in the short term. The amount we could be looking for might be anywhere between \$1,000.00 and \$10,000.00. More details will be available in time for our in-person presentation to Council. We understand that we won't be the only group looking for support.

Do you have any other feedback?

Yes. I believe that 6 years have flown by since I made our first presentation to Palmy Council, the one pertaining to the much needed restoration of and upgrading to the now 70 year old roller skating rink in Memorial Park. We are and will be eternally grateful

for PNCC's early investment to the described project with an allocation of funds to resurface the large, old rink and to support costs, in that early period of time, for improved drainage and for supplying electricity. We, as part of our share of the responsibilities involved, managed to raise close on \$15,000.00 (after starting with nothing) enabling us to acquire numerous styles and sizes of skates intended for rental purposes and have since been most fortunate to be granted \$67,000.00 from Central Energy Trust with which to acquire new lights and a high end outdoor sound system which we are in the process of acquiring. The sound system has been acquired and the invoice for the lights and poles is expected any time soon. But we are not done yet. We had a vision for a cool, modern, exciting place to hand over to the Council and to the people of Palmerston North. Roller sports are very trendy these days, hyped by the popularity of roller skating being a low impact recreational pursuit and by skateboarding having been included in the 2024 Paris Summer Olympics. What we anticipate, within the next 2 years, are costs related to installing the lights and the sound system, along with the manufacture and installation of new see-through rink boards to surround the skating surface. These costs could exceed \$250,000.00 and we will do everything and anything in our power and within our capabilities to find that money. We have been on a journey, one that we hope will come to an end within the next couple of years. In the interim we hope to maintain good relationships with Council and improved working relationships with PNCC staff.

File uploads

FILENAME:

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission

Your contact details**Name**

David Hargreaves

Organisation**Hearings**

Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?

Your feedback**What do you think of our proposed budget?**

Rates increases (ours are almost 10%) are too high, especially in light of all the other cost of living expenses.

What changes would you make?

Cut out all the 'nice to haves' (described as "little extras" in the pamphlet) & focus only on what is necessary/essential services.

Do you have any other feedback?

The pamphlet mentions that some works have been delayed & the wording suggests this is a reason for cost increases - but surely this means there is actually money left unspent? These works should be reassessed to ensure they are still appropriate & if not, funds reallocated to offset this year's expenses.

File uploads

FILENAME:

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission

Your contact details

Name

Glenn Pendergrast

Organisation

Hearings

Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?

Your feedback

What do you think of our proposed budget?

I miscalculated the rates increase on my submission of an hour ago. The rate of increase in my rates is nearly 32%. Could you please modify this on my submission. Thank you.
Glenn Pendergrast.

What changes would you make?

Do you have any other feedback?

How can you think that such an increase is any way fair?

File uploads

FILENAME:

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission

Your contact details

Name

Glenn Pendergrast

Organisation

Hearings

Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?

Your feedback

What do you think of our proposed budget?

Our rates are going up by over 19% which is outrageous. Our superannuation increase will be minor and in a time of increasing inflation and cost-of-living increases we will find budgeting increasingly difficult.

What changes would you make?

Cap rates to a maximum of 10%.

Do you have any other feedback?

Reconsider.

File uploads

FILENAME:

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission

Your contact details

Name
Craig ROSS

Organisation

Hearings

Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?

Your feedback**What do you think of our proposed budget?**

I think that the budget proposals, that increase the rates for our property at 73 Churchill Avenue (Val. # 14720 305 44 Lot 3 DP 22837) by 14.25%, are a SCANDALOUS abuse of power by the Council! NZ's Inflation was announced today at 6.9% My wife and I are retired pensioners, whose pensions have just had their annual increase of 6.3% Yet PNCC is proposing to increase our rates by just over twice inflation and pension increase rates! Year after year, our City Council has raised rates higher than the yearly inflation rates and, certainly more than the annual increases in pensions. Is there a hidden agenda by PNCC to drive those of us with normal-sized sections out of our properties, so that exploitative property developers can move in to replace our single dwelling with multiple dwellings? We will be voting this year for Councillors and a Mayor who campaign on restraining city rate increases to affordable levels!

What changes would you make?

Reduce the proposed annual increase in rates for citizens who own houses on normal-sized sections by changing the basis upon which rates are calculated. i.e., not relying so heavily on the property section valuations. Section valuations have only increased substantially, in recent times, by the city trend of replacing single dwellings with multiple dwellings = infill. Which I agree is a good approach to city planning for additional housing. Rather than extra houses causing urban sprawl, especially onto high class land/soils for food production.

Do you have any other feedback?

File uploads
FILENAME:

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission

Your contact details**Name**

Brian Green

Organisation

Brian Green Property Group

Hearings

Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?

Your feedback

What do you think of our proposed budget?

What changes would you make?

Do you have any other feedback?

We totally disagree with rates increases over the years at increased rates well beyond inflation. Council needs to have more stringent cost controls, e.g. the square possible development committee has engaged overseas consultants at an initial budget of \$200k, now this has ballooned to over \$750k and councillors haven't as yet seen the proposed plans according to newspaper reports. Service has also declined and consents etc are taking far too long to be granted. Too much being spent on planners whims re cycleways etc etc etc. We have to live within our means and some "nice to have projects" will have to wait.

File uploads

FILENAME:

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission

Your contact details**Name**

Tania Putu

Organisation**Hearings**

Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?

Your feedback**What do you think of our proposed budget?**

I am dumbfounded by the rates increase. We are getting punished on every avenue and expenses are rising every where, to then add this on top is adding insult to injury. I know the council also has rises too, but when people are struggling to put food on the table and then have their rates rise so much its just barbaric. Ours alone has gone up over 17% but we were told approx 8%. We also are being charged for recycling that isn't even happening so i think a refund on that would be due.

What changes would you make?

Listen to your residents. Wasting money on things we don't need eg planters, That money would have been better used to offset rate increases. All this other so called beautification (Cuba St, The Square) which has made the roads and parking worse and just more evidence of wasted money.

Do you have any other feedback?

People need money in their pockets not all the wasted spending on things we didn't want or need. I feel very sorry for pensioners and people already struggling. This could be the last straw for them.

File uploads

FILENAME:

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission

Your contact details**Name**

Julia Tong

Organisation**Hearings**

Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?

Your feedback**What do you think of our proposed budget?**

Incredibly concerned with the proposed rates increase. I know land values have gone up but I am unsure how you can justify this level of increase. I also read that if your property was able to be subdivided that you might incur a greater increase again. This to me seems ludicrous. How can you increase someone's rates based on something they may never do? I get the increase if properties do subdivide, but as a home owner who values her backyard I can guarantee this will not be happening at our property so think it is unfair to have to pay this.

What changes would you make?

Ensure you have people on staff with the required experience so expensive consultants aren't needed on a regular basis. Also, having lost so many experienced staff I feel projects and consultations that have been done in the past are being done all over again.

Do you have any other feedback?

Just consider your residents who are already struggling in an economy where even putting food on the table is a challenge when deciding on these rates increases. Thank you

File uploads

FILENAME:

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission

Your contact details**Name**

Sue Shirriffs

Organisation**Hearings****Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?****Your feedback****What do you think of our proposed budget?****What changes would you make?****Do you have any other feedback?**

Some thoughts regarding the rates increases, which in some cases are beyond the pale. Particularly for elderly property owner with large property zoned residential, which they do not wish to subdivide, is faced with a \$2000 rates increase from \$3000 to \$5000. Will they be forced out of their property as they can neither afford the rates nor to subdivide!! Give rate-payers the option/choice to rate on land or house value. Rate every residential property equally, regardless of RV or section size. Rate on dwelling value not land value. Rates based on means testing of property owner. I have noticed some property prices dropping - is there still an opportunity to have a property revalued for the purposes of rates? Will there be a rubbish rate rebate while glass not being collected?

File uploads

FILENAME:

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission
Attachments: pncc_annual_budget_2022-23.docx

Your contact details

Name
Jean Hera

Organisation
Te Hā o Hine-ahu-one Palmerston North Women's Health Collective

Hearings

Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?
Tues 10 May 9am to 11am
Tues 10 May 3.30pm to 5.30pm
Thurs 12 May 9am to 11am

Your feedback

What do you think of our proposed budget?

What changes would you make?

Do you have any other feedback?

File uploads
FILENAME:
pncc_annual_budget_2022-23

Te Hā o Hine-ahu-one
Palmerston North Women's Health Collective
53 Waldegrave Street
P.O. Box 4253
PALMERSTON NORTH 4442

Phone: (06) 357 0314
pnwhc@xtra.co.nz
www.pnwomenshealth.org.nz



21st April 2022

Papaioea Palmerston North City Proposed Annual Budget 2022/2023 Consultation

submission@pncc.govt.nz

Introduction/Background

Te Hā o Hine-ahu-one Palmerston North Women's Health Collective is a small community health group that due to funding pressure has been reduced to 1.6 FTE staff, but are moving to 1.8 FTE in May. Our Collective currently numbers 19 which includes our governance group members and staff. We are strong advocates for women's health, for community development, and for the needs of those on low incomes and other vulnerable members of our communities. We always appreciate the support we get from PNCC in terms of funding/resources and advice which assists our important work which is of particular benefit to low income women and other disadvantaged women and their whānau. This is of even more importance at this time with the impacts of covid-19, the recent rapid rise in cost of living and ongoing housing shortages and the high cost of renting.

TE MOEMOEĀ VISION

Our vision, moemoeā: a future where every woman/wahine understands, cares for and is able to heal her body, mind, spirit, whānau, community and te taiao the natural environment.

TE MATAWHĀNUI MISSION STATEMENT

Te Hā o Hine-ahu-one Palmerston North Women's Health Collective empowers wāhine/women and their whānau to have more control over their health and fertility.

Support Emphasis

Te Tiriti o Waitangi is the founding covenant of Aotearoa New Zealand and we support PNCC in meeting our Te Tiriti responsibilities, and the associated development work with mana whenua. We look forward to the development of Māori Ward representation.

We commend the work Council has done in developing free facilities and parks such as the Memorial Park Upgrade, the Esplanade, cycle ways and walkways and the development and promotion of these; the native/tree planting etc.

We particularly want to support and emphasize spending which:

- benefits the community, particularly those on lower incomes and in hardship; and the community groups that provide social service support
- is important to protecting public health (water quality, waste and storm water management, housing, sun shade etc)
- addressed important eco city issues including the climate emergency and greenhouse gas reduction (and those on low incomes/in hardship will bear the greatest impacts from climate change) - this includes funded public transport (with a goal of free public transport) and active transport options; environmental sustainability, tree planting, protecting waterways, and particularly our awa Manawatū, reduces pollution, and protecting biodiversity in our city.

All of these areas are closely interconnected.

New funding items:

1. We support the continuation of community relief for those affected by Covid restrictions (1675).
2. The free rubbish bag trial as an initiative important to those on low incomes and to help in avoiding rubbish contaminating recycling bins, and being dumped around the city (2129) is something we have mixed feelings about. While we strongly support making rubbish removal free (funded by rates) which will significantly assist those on low incomes, we do not think that plastic rubbish bags are the best option. We prefer the system that is used by New Plymouth where there are Council provides bins including for recycling, glass, rubbish, compost, food scraps. We support kerbside food waste recovery development which will play an important part in reducing landfill and carbon emissions.
3. It is good to now have the recycling wheely bin lid latches – we have seen the chaos of fallen recycling bins on windy days (2131).

We continue to be very strong supporters of PNCC social housing initiatives (we are keen to see these continue to develop), community development including Council support for community groups providing important services to those on low incomes, and those involved in important work for the natural environment. We strongly support edible planting city wide (967) and work for food resilience development; and increased planting of native plants/trees within the city boundaries. We support work for a fairer rates system including one based on capital value rather than land value as occurs in other cities.

Dr Jean Hera

Manager and Community health worker

for Te Hā o Hine-ahu-one Palmerston North Women's Health Collective Inc.

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission

Your contact details

Name

Hannah Cameron

Organisation

Hearings

Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?

Your feedback

What do you think of our proposed budget?

I don't have an understanding of every part of the budget, however overall I have a feeling that there is a lot that the council could focus on in terms of reduction of costs rather than adding to budgets for everything which it looks like is happening. There's a general consensus when talking to people I know, and comments online that seem to happen in response to lots of the council's choices that have a common theme towards the council wasting money. The waste on unnecessary 'improvements' to the cityscape which often are ugly, sometimes pretty - but are they actually necessary? I think things that aren't actually a necessity to the running and maintenance of all actually needed amenities, buildings and shared services should be marked in order of priority and maybe some things get put off to save money for more important changes eg water, pipes and drainage etc. As I said I don't have extensive knowledge of every choice the council makes but I sure do question the importance of things that money gets spent on - especially with the proposed increase in rates heading our way when life in general is increasingly becoming more unaffordable than ever. This change in rates would mean an increase in over \$700 for our particular household, which may not sound like much to the council but to our family is financially going to make huge negative impacts on our budget. We are currently a one income household, and budget extremely well to make this work. However, this increase is enough to make our already tight budget stretch to the point of not affording basic needs which we only just cover at the moment. We also have a baby on the way, and fall within the lower middle income bracket so don't qualify for government support. Regardless of our smart budgeting and careful financial choices, missing out on lots of things due to budget restraints this increase is enough to impact us significantly. I cannot stress the frustration I feel from my perception of the rates increase being extremely unfair and unequal. It is simply not fair for there to be such inequity and difference in people's rates. My rates increasing by a much higher percentage than someone else paying the quoted 8.5% is just not fair, not acceptable and not ok. I haven't received some magic pay increase to cover this, along with the raising cost of living also! I am not using more facilities, more of any council provided services, buildings or amenities than the other people in our community so why should I pay more just due to land value or whatever has caused this inequity in rates increase. I don't have

all the answers, but I know for sure that there being a range of rate increases just is not right. Especially when it is probably the more lower income areas that are being hit the hardest (I'm in Roslyn) and have friends in Takaro and highbury in the same situation, and they just simply cannot afford it. I truly hope that the council sees the severity of these rate increases and readjusts their thinking of the budget in general towards only focussing on the basics and the necessities to improve the things actually we need. I hope the council starts looking where they can actually cut budgets not just keep spending and increasing budgets and expecting us to all pay for it. I have had so many discussions within my own circle about how wasteful some choices come across to the general public and have engaged in some reading online from what seems like a lot of people in our community who feel the same. How our city looks is an example of wasteful spending. I'm an art lover, have a background in the arts and appreciate this immensely but see this as wasteful spending when there are much more important things to spend money on such as our expensive pipe and waterway costs. Are there ways that the council themselves, workers, buildings, costs of admin, costs of staff or productivity where people can be used across jobs to save money. I have a personal connection to a council worker who I know is not completing 40 hours of their job, as it's very cruisy - I'm sure they could be doing other jobs as well instead of just being stuck to their very small list of responsibilities. Overall I just hope for a way for council to rethink how the rates increase is spread across the community evenly, fairly and there is more equitably because at the moment for me and my family it doesn't feel like it is.

What changes would you make?

Do you have any other feedback?

File uploads

FILENAME:

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission

Your contact details**Name**

Abby Jones

Organisation**Hearings**

Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?

Your feedback**What do you think of our proposed budget?**

"I have not looked at the proposed budget."

What changes would you make?

"I would like to add in, Pitt Park is part of the local park maintenance done by contractors, hired by Parks committee of PNCC, is not being maintained to the average level you would expect from a parks maintenance contractor, or a business to upheld up. I am calling in reference to Edwards Pitt Park, in Roslyn, Palmerston North, where the maintenance is not being upheld but all the money and wages and pay is still being accepted by the contractors and we would like to have a more proactive approach and a more dedicated team to actually maintain the park, to even just a standard that is accepted by the general public. Because it is not being done right now, it is being neglected and I believe the maintenance people who are in charge of the park, need to uphold. We need better maintenance of the park – that's all there is to it. We want some of the money in the annual plan, to go towards maintenance of parks. Contractors or the people currently doing are not doing a good enough job. As a member of Edwards Pitt Park and we have an EOU with Council, the end of the bargain is not being upheld and this has been going on for about a year. It is getting tiring to be let down by Council and the parks maintenance crew."

Do you have any other feedback?

"Thank you very much for listening, and I really appreciate any feedback made to Pitt Park. I really appreciate any and all effort that is being done in all parks around Palmerston North"

File uploads

FILENAME:

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission

Your contact details**Name**

Karla Jayne McGrath

Organisation**Hearings**

Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?

Your feedback

What do you think of our proposed budget?

I don't think the proposed rate increases are fair.

What changes would you make?

Have reasonable rate increases. Stop wasting money on 'beautification'. There's a global pandemic. Nobody gives a flying fxxx about 'beautification'. It's just foolish, silly vanity.

Do you have any other feedback?

The rental situation is out of control. The housing situation is a nightmare. I'm tired of seeing new homes being built and then rich people ending up in them. My little two-bedroom house has gone from \$175 to \$330 per week. You are going to force my landlord to put it up again and damn, it's not worth that much. It's one of the concrete block houses so it's damp in winter. Sure - landlords have a list of things they have to put into homes BUT they use the cheapest options so it's basically like they did nothing.

File uploads

FILENAME:

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission

Your contact details**Name**

Richard Bedford

Organisation

R Bedford

Hearings**Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?**

Fri 13 May 9am to 11am

Your feedback**What do you think of our proposed budget?**

I would have an increase of \$1,461.15. That is a 40% increase in my rates from the previous year. That is totally unacceptably high. Also the increases are completely illogical as my neighbor has the exact same land size but a land value that is rated as \$135,000 less and a rates bill that is \$805.60 less. How is that?. Also I live in West End and a friend has a house in Hokowhitu (a supposedly more prestigious suburb) with a greater land area - yet they are paying less in rates than I am!!! My current bill is \$3,680.25 and proposed is \$5,141.40. Unacceptable.

What changes would you make?

There needs to be a 10% increase price cap and reducing future caps each following year.

Do you have any other feedback?

If the Council cannot work within the current income it should not take on future projects it cannot afford. Eg: redevelopments of the Square, the library etc. Greater infill housing will lead to less space that can absorb rainfall putting greater pressure on stormwater, sewerage etc. Housing development and rating should focus on new development on city fringes to retain capacity. I have requested a time to speak to Council on 13 May and will bring documentation to prove illogical variables.

File uploads

FILENAME:

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission

Your contact details

Name

J Ivamy

Organisation

Hearings

Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?

Your feedback

What do you think of our proposed budget?

Rates are far too expensive and needless to say, excessive for council "needs"; I.e. "wants". There are massive issues here that the council continues to ignore. The increases are out of control! Councilors should be doing far more to sensibly prioritise spending especially when we are in the midst of a 'cost of living' crisis.

What changes would you make?

Stop taking rate-payers hard earned money as your quick and easy fix. Prioritise spending and cut costs just as everyone else is having to do; Covid is not an excuse to have rate-payers solve your money issues. Get resourceful! And stop wasting 'our' money on 'your' feel-good projects that obviously serve to inflate councilor and council staff egos.

Do you have any other feedback?

The councilors are simply out of their depth, operating in a fantasy world. In the real world, rate payers are needlessly suffering because of council staff's very ill-considered decisions. Consider and constructively reflect on the very real concerns your community is pleading with you to take on board. Include feedback given on social media sites as submissions – after all, this is feedback you've requested; don't then pretend it doesn't exist because it's situated on a separate platform or because it doesn't fit the narrow-minded narrative that's been created here. There's evidently a lot of unhappy members of community – work to genuinely rebuild the broken trust by valuing feedback given, and placing community needs ahead of council niceties.

File uploads

FILENAME:

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission

Your contact details**Name**

Tracey hutton

Organisation**Hearings**

Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?

Your feedback

What do you think of our proposed budget?

What changes would you make?

Do you have any other feedback?

Rates rise in takaro of over %30 is not right. Buying in a lower area where we can afford living and with a huge rates increase makes it not affordable and well over the %8

File uploads

FILENAME:

From:
Subject:

Submission
FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission

Your contact details

Name
Emily Weston

Organisation

Hearings

Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?

Your feedback

What do you think of our proposed budget?

I think it is garbage. Why are our rates going up when our income isn't going up? You are assuming because we own our home we have disposable income. We absolutely do not and can barely make ends meet. We've already had to make the tough choice not to have children as we just cannot afford it and now the city wants to put up the rates? We barely have our rubbish and recycling collected as it is. I think the rates need to be left alone especially after covid has affected everybody's income.

What changes would you make?

Leave the rates as they are or even better, give us a break and slightly decrease them.

Do you have any other feedback?

Don't put the rates up. You will force families out into the street. Absolutely worst timing.

File uploads

FILENAME:

From:
Subject:

Submission
FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission

Your contact details

Name

Dale O'Reilly

Organisation

Hearings

Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?

Fri 13 May 7pm to 9pm

Your feedback

What do you think of our proposed budget?

Its too optimistic in the current economic climate.

What changes would you make?

Make changes so that rates are not increased at the rate that is suggested they will be.

Do you have any other feedback?

Stop spending on the PNITI proposed business cases - they can't be afforded and stop saying that PNCC is one Community (when its not - Longburn, Ashhurst & Bunnythorpe are separate rural communities) . Stop saying that you are planning to take heavy traffic out of urban streets, when PNITI planning is to put that same traffic and more (with the Kiwirail Freighthub plans) through the urban streets of another of PNCC's community's - Bunnythorpe.

File uploads

FILENAME:

From:
Subject:

Submission
FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission

Your contact details

Name
Richard Hunter

Organisation

Hearings

Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?

Your feedback

What do you think of our proposed budget?

I am very concerned about the statement in your recent leaflet about rates which stated "properties with the largest percentage increase are those with large sections capable of subdivision". Why? I will still be using the same amount of water, street lighting, roads, pavements, etc, etc. Lots of sites can be described as capable of subdivision - possibly any section above the minimum square metre area taking into account access. To sub divide my property it would cost heaps as a few \$100k would be spent removing the main dwelling and garage and then there would be your (Council) costs which are not small. The latest valuation on this property is, in reality, pie in the sky. This is Takaro, I enjoy living here, close to town, etc., but no-one in their right mind would pay the latest government valuation, it's ridiculous and to increase my rates based on the increased land value rating is wrong.

What changes would you make?

My rates should increase in line with the overall median increase.

Do you have any other feedback?

File uploads
FILENAME:

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission

Your contact details**Name**

Steve Allan

Organisation**Hearings****Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?**

Thurs 12 May 7pm to 9pm

Your feedback**What do you think of our proposed budget?**

The intention to lessen the impact of total rate increases by reducing fixed charges is a short term tactic by dollar and % terms especially with respect to water related rates. A financial strategy toward lessening the city long term burden from govt 3 waters reforms, especially when it would appear the city has little opportunity to access the Govt "better off funding" to progress present water initiatives is required.

What changes would you make?

With the uncertainty of the costs and impact of the fait-accompli three waters reform program all cost associated with Palmy 3 waters strategy work in progress including cost of borrowing and contingencies for inflation should be captured and reflected in the fixed charge. This is equitable as residential use has no bearing on property value and the bulk of infrastructure is on council land i.e. a shared community resource. This also sets the city up better to transfer the cost along with the asset to future entities. The general population has been naive to believe that the reforms were a consultative initiative only and similarly it would be naive to think that current borrowing against the cities 2 Billion dollars asset value to fund the commitment to the current Palmy 3 waters strategy will be uplifted by a future entity. Separation of the total 3 waters cost from general rates now and adjustment of the rating factor so that the city rate take stays substantially as calculated for 21-22 rate period would shift the rate burden away from property value and offer a possible strategy to separate the city from the cost of the current 3 waters strategy .

Do you have any other feedback?**File uploads**

FILENAME:

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission

Your contact details

Name
Steve Allan

Organisation

Hearings

Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?

Your feedback

What do you think of our proposed budget?
Public Consultation - ref below

What changes would you make?
Public Consultation - ref below

Do you have any other feedback?

Public consultation: Though rate payer attendance at direct interface public forums is traditionally low I have concern that the non contact forms of consultation engagement required as a result of Covid red traffic light status has reduced engagement (due to access to and technology challenges) which has stymied the value of the consultation process. Now that we are under Orange rules of public gatherings and to ensure credible and full opportunity for engagement has occurred, a public attendance forum should be organised and a special submission extension date offered to those who have attended.

File uploads
FILENAME:

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission

Your contact details**Name**

Margaret Armstrong

Organisation**Hearings**

Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?

Your feedback**What do you think of our proposed budget?**

I don't think rates should be increased. I for one am struggling with the last increase. You will be forcing people to sell their houses because we can't afford to keep up.

What changes would you make?

Do you have any other feedback?

File uploads

FILENAME:

Presbyterian New Church

Submission - PNCC Year 2 Draft Annual Plan 2022-23

In 2019 the parishes of St David's (Roslyn), St Marks and St Andrews (Awapuni and Central City) combined to create a new parish, presently named Presbyterian New Church (PNC).

The prime project in 2021-22 is the Earthquake strengthening of St Andrew's church building in Church Street along with interior re-design to achieve a modern fitout with updated technology. The work on this significant inner city heritage building is expected to be completed this year.

We thank PNCC for their support and heritage funding contribution towards the re-establishment of this building as a worship centre with community outreach activities.

In last year's 10 year Plan Submission we re-stated our situation of having the St Mark's Awapuni site surplus to requirements and again expressed our interest in making this land available to PNCC for community facilities. This was in response to many years of Awapuni submissions seeking a larger Community Library and requests for a Community Hub. Your response indicated that PNCC would need to develop a Policy for the acquisition of land for community facilities and your proposal to do this. We understand the Covid-19 imposed delays to some Council work but ask that such a Policy be drafted for community consultation and resolution in this next financial year.

Background to our 2022-23 Submission

Our Submission addresses the CONNECTED COMMUNITIES PLAN which refers to St Marks Church requesting Council to consider taking on the church property in Awapuni for continued community use. This property is near to the Awapuni shops and Library. We continue to endorse this direction for Council and encourage the development of POLICY to guide Council's response to community requests for the support or development

of community facilities, including provision for Community Libraries. We acknowledge the planned residential growth in the area and the already high use the Awapuni Community Library enjoys, but which necessitates a larger, fit for purpose venue.

For many years since the formation of the informal group - AWESOME AWAPUNI - (initially chaired by Inspector Brett Calkin and meeting at St Marks Church at the invitation of Rev Ken Wall) a request for a COMMUNITY HUB has circulated and featured in feedback to Council. The green space at St Marks was nominated as a suitable, central space. There is always a demand for available community and organisational meeting space, especially with parking and easy access.

AWESOME AWAPUNI runs an annual community day. Other activities have moved to be the action of the Community Library or the newer RIVER STOP AWAPUNI informal group, formed when cycle lanes and the new roading corridor were promoted. RIVER STOP AWAPUNI includes business owners and representatives from both churches in the Awapuni Village.

Since the last 10 Year Plan, PNC has appreciated the attention of the then City Planner, David Murphy, who visited the St Mark's site as have the then Library Manager Debbie Duncan and later Jo Ransome with Norelle Ward.

Once the Central (St Andrew's) site is earth quake strengthened, interior work completed and congregational relocation achieved we will be in a position to finalise future plans with regard to work at Roslyn's worship space and to have a clearer view about St Mark's.

Annette Nixon

Peter Thomson

Parish Council Representative

Previous Parish Clerk

We do not wish to speak to our submission.

Palmerston North City Council Draft Annual Budget 2022-2023

Submission to Palmerston North City Council (PNCC)
From
Central Palmerston North Business Improvement District Inc.
(Palmy BID)

Central Palmerston North Business Improvement District Inc.
PO Box 1535
Palmerston North
4410

April 19th 2022

Contacts: Rob Campbell (Chair) – rob_campbell@actrix.co.nz
Amanda Linsley (MBC) – info@palmybid.nz

Palmy BID is a collective of property owners and businesses within the City Centre who work together to improve the wealth and wellbeing of Palmerston North city. Our aim is to achieve this by better defining and highlighting the identity and environments within the City Centre for visitors, locals and businesses. Our mission is to create a vibrant, connected City Centre where businesses feel supported and want to be, to support the PNCC Vision of Small City Benefits, Big City Ambition.

Our focus is on bringing business together to endorse projects and help create a better Palmerston North. Palmy BID was incorporated on 16th August 2019 and is funded by a targeted rate on our City Centre business ratepayers.

This submission is made after consultation with the Palmy BID Exec Committee and on behalf of the City Centre businesses.

- 1) Palmy BID would like to thank PNCC for the opportunity to consult on the Draft Annual Budget 2022-2023.
- 2) Palmy BID would like PNCC to review the funding for various programmes aimed at maintaining a Safe Community. It has been well reported that there has been an increase in crime (including Youth Crime) during the last year throughout the city and to reduce spending in this area at this time does not make sense.

We would like to see the City Ambassador programme funding at least retained at its current level and not halved for the next two years as budgeted.

We fully support and thank the City Ambassadors for the work that they have done during this past summer. They are perceived as authority figures which tends to positively influence behaviour. In addition, they are observers and can report anti-social activity to the appropriate authorities where it is warranted. Perhaps as importantly they are engaging and connecting with Rangatahi, potentially opening the door to social service agencies and others to provide long term solutions to what are often complex problems.

The view of the City Centre Community is that the program, while perhaps not the total answer, is an important part of maintaining a safe and welcoming city centre.

We make the point that the program targets only the summer months and that safety and security are year-round problems. Palmy BID would like to engage with Council to develop a permanent solution that will allow the Community to feel safe and to be safe. The safety and the feel of safety within a city is one of the major contributing factors to the vibrancy of a city centre.

- 3) Palmy BID looks forward to further engagement with PNCC in respect to the Parking Framework and is calling on businesses for feedback. There is a small focus group from around the City Centre being formed by Palmy BID to gauge our businesses views. It is key that meaningful consultation occurs to find a sustainable solution for the city that meets the needs of all our in our community.
- 4) Palmy BID looks forward to further engagement with PNCC on other projects including, Business Zones, Streets for People, the Civic and Cultural Precinct, the Urban Design review, Earthquake Strengthening and as mentioned above the continuation of conversations with regards to the safe-city and the security issues that we have been experiencing.
- 5) Palmy BID would like PNCC to 'agenda' Easter Sunday Trading to be reviewed during the year given that PNCC are one of 25 councils from across New Zealand who have still not adopted a local Shop Trading Policy, and this has not been reviewed since 2016. We believe that whether a business opens or not on Easter Sunday is down to individual choice. We would like to see 2022 being the last year that businesses are forced to close.

Signed on behalf of Palmy BID

By;



Rob Campbell
Chair
Palmy BID

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission

Your contact details**Name**

Zaneta Park

Organisation**Hearings**

Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?

Your feedback**What do you think of our proposed budget?**

Very happy with all the exciting people-friendly initiatives happening around Palmerston North. The new splash-park at Memorial Park is amazing! And the development at Linklater reserve is great too, so many people (and dogs) which use this!

What changes would you make?

Under the Footpaths funding, would it be possible to please consider a footpath (and possibly a cycle path too) from Kelvin Grove to the new entrance to Linklater Reserve on Roberts Line? The new carpark here is already well-used, and we believe a lot of people would use a footpath here. We often see families walk along Roberts Line to this entrance and it would be excellent if there was a safe route along this way.

Do you have any other feedback?

File uploads

FILENAME:

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission
Attachments: rate_increases_for_2022.docx

Your contact details

Name

Marc Austin Paterson

Organisation

Hearings

Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?

Your feedback

What do you think of our proposed budget?

Please see attached letter.

What changes would you make?

Please see attached letter.

Do you have any other feedback?

Please see attached letter.

File uploads

FILENAME:

rate_increases_for_2022

321-2

Rate Increases for 2022/2023

It is astoundingly cruel to see that in the midst of “uncertain times” the council are penalising the average households and gifting money to the wealthy.

Our property is XXX Amberley Ave.

The proposed rates are \$3446.60

The current rates are \$2823

This is a 22% increase.

As a comparison I looked at XX Pastoral Lane.

The proposed rates are \$4,844.60

The current rates are \$4,886.75

This is a decrease!

(out of interest this is true for all the properties I checked in Pastoral Lane.)

It is hard to see how this is fair to the working people of our area. Our street is not populated by those who have the time or knowledge to request revaluations, or to fight against such inequity.

Inflation is 5.9% Please limit increases to this amount.

Make it fair and don't take this bizarre **reverse** Robin Hood scenario any further.

Marc Paterson
Santi Budhia
21 April 2022

From:
Subject:

Submission
FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission

Your contact details

Name

Alice Wilde

Organisation

Hearings

Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?

Your feedback

What do you think of our proposed budget?

The budget is disappointing. Many of us have lost our jobs and all of us are facing frightening levels of inflation, and as such we have had to cut those "little extras" out of our budget. So it is unforgivable that the Council is considering spending money on nice-to-haves rather than reducing the rates burden on those lower value properties that face an unreasonable increase. Palmerston North used to be a liveable city for everyone, and it used to be a fairer city. But as a long term resident, the gloss has finally worn off and the middle class disdain for those of us at the bottom of the privilege heap has become clear. No matter how much rebranding the city does to dazzle onlookers, the impact of poor infrastructure management and a bloated city bureaucracy has reduced the quality of life of us all, but as always, it has hit the lower income residents the most. We might not have fancy electric bikes and a house on the hill away from the peasants, but at least we could benefit from clean, safe, well lit streets and walkable footpaths. Sadly this is again shunted off the plan in favour of a little more window dressing. (And even the window dressing is shonky - Savage Crescent might be the city's historic garden suburb gem, but clearly no councillor has relatives living here as judged by their refusal to attend to the unsafe street lighting. We were assured that it would be addressed but after 5 years we are still waiting to be able to navigate the street after dark) The core issue in the budget this year is the way the city is preparing to dismiss the well-being of current residents for the prospect of many more future residents. I had always assumed that Palmerston North would retain a sense of the provincial about it, because that was the only thing that made it tolerable - friendly communities, quiet safe streets, large sections, basically room to breathe. Those that wanted the big city excitement were free to go and seek that, but we were confident in our identity as a provincial centre and that was sufficient. Unfortunately we are being delivered all the disadvantages of the big city (high crime, high density) with an emphasis (or encouragement) to subdivide the heart out of our streets. A visionary Council would recognise this for what it is and refuse to pave over our city with concrete and tiles, and acknowledge that fresh air and access to a little grass (or garden) is the birthright of kiwis. I have some questions to ponder - Where is the spreadsheet that tracks the loss of access to private green space for residents? Who is overseeing the impact on bird life as those large established trees are ripped up?

Which one of you is assigned the role of monitoring access to sunlight and fresh air for children? And what is the justification for reducing happiness, health, and wellbeing by denying future residents access to the above? I note that the city has a number of goals listed and wonder how you manage to reconcile the third and fourth goals (a safe and connected city, and an eco city) with the vision of medium-density. We know that higher density is associated with higher crime and higher mental health issues, with some researchers suggesting that this is partly caused by alienation from nature. With the emphasis on green corridors as opposed to private gardens, to provide for nature access, I am startled at how anti-nature (and anti-human) the PNCC's vision is.

What changes would you make?

The change to the rating schedule is concerning, especially in light of the disproportionate impact it will have on those on lower incomes. This is a particularly egregious example of regressive taxation as even the Council itself acknowledges that it will unduly affect properties at the lower end of the spectrum, where low income home owners and renters are stuck. You can't downsize your way out of living in the least desirable areas in the city, which leaves us scrabbling to reduce our grocery and power bills further. For this to be happening at a time of dire financial stress on low income residents, further convinces me that the PNCC is out of touch with ordinary people. I have a particular concern about the folly of transitioning from a city of low density housing to medium-high density, as per the ideological imperative. I understand that there is a lot of fancy graph work and spreadsheet magic justifying our city's adherence to the UN's sustainability goals, but it fails to pass a critical analysis on any human centred parameters. A safe and sustainable city would ensure every resident had access to safe private outdoor space, and the right to enjoy their home in peace without interference from unreasonably close neighbours. Because if residents are not satisfied with their home life, they cannot attend to their roles as parent, worker, volunteer, ratepayer. I suggest that the PNCC rates properties on capital value rather than mainly land value as this reflects more fairly on the wealth of the owner. Small low impact older houses on large unsubdividable sections should not be charged more in rates than unsustainable modern mansions, and the proposed rating schedule favours exactly this. Failing any desire to be progressive, I suggest restoring the previous rating model and maintaining rates at last year's level with no indexed adjustment. The onus is on the Council to make expenditure fit a reduced budget, like the rest of us are being forced to. Attend to core responsibilities and scrap the rest until this period of uncertainty is over.

Do you have any other feedback?

I have a particular issue with my rates at XX XXX Crescent which are increasing around 12% despite being a section that cannot be subdivided. The District Plan modifications to dwellings and subdivision in the Savage Crescent Conservation Area and requires a resource consent as well as proof that the proposed changes do not violate the historic value of the area. This clearly prohibits the demolition or removal of any of the houses in order to subdivide, yet we are being inflicted with a rates increase that assumes we can actually benefit in that way. In addition to this, my property, as well as others on the eastern end of the Crescent are precluded from adding additional dwellings by the location of the main sewer line that runs beneath our properties. This isn't reflected on my rating notice and I would be pretty upset to find out that QV haven't considered this when doing the valuation. Overall I am disheartened to see that my efforts to have minimal environmental impact and to beautify the area I live are considered decadent and something to discourage through a regressive tax. You can't even satirise a situation whereby a Council sets out to promote sustainable environmental practises and then punishes those who actually have the inclination to

make a difference. For example, I have reduced the afternoon temperature in my back yard by planting shade trees. The temperature difference between there and the street outside the front is 6-10 degrees. I don't need air conditioning because I have passively cooled air flowing through the house. Yet somehow it would be preferable to all for me to raze the section and build a global warming favela instead? I heard a morepork in my garden this morning at dawn, and everyday I have bellbirds and wood pigeons, a flock of fantails and so many tui that they are a perennial hazard. Isn't this the sort of city we want - where humans and wildlife coexist, where we moderate our impact by living amongst trees and the food we grow ourselves?

File uploads

FILENAME:

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission

Your contact details**Name**

Regina Malili

Organisation**Hearings**

Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?

Your feedback**What do you think of our proposed budget?**

I would honestly like to see this city council financially cut back on things we don't need. Everyone is doing it tough and it's only going to get worse with the coming food shortages. We are a single income household trying to deal with all the rising costs like everyone else. Instead of raising the rates hundreds of dollars can you please cut back on things we really don't need.

What changes would you make?

Cut back on anything to do with the city centre eg new statues, the lights used on the clock tower etc. Councilors try saving power by working from home, a few days a week. Cut back on bonuses/miscellaneous spending by councilors. Look at the maintenance of things less often so instead of every 2 weeks maybe every 3-4 weeks. Start getting resourceful and think outside of the box in ways money can be spent and stretched to go further.

Do you have any other feedback?

Stop putting on any events, you'll save money there too

File uploads

FILENAME:

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission
Attachments: 20220421_boho_submission.docx

Your contact details

Name
Jeanine Gribbin

Organisation
Boho Cafe

Hearings

Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?
Thurs 12 May 9am to 11am
Thurs 12 May 3.30pm to 5.30pm

Your feedback

What do you think of our proposed budget?
Please see attached

What changes would you make?
Please see attached

Do you have any other feedback?

File uploads
FILENAME:
20220421_boho_submission

Boho Café

Jeanine Gribbin

Boho Café

I would like to speak to this Submission on Thursday May 9-11 or 3-5.30 pm

Creative and Liveable City Strategy

Goal 2: A creative and exciting city

Boho Café is an anchor business for the Awapuni/Riverstop community. It has won the hearts and minds of locals and those from further afield. The café is not only a place to get great food, but also well recognised as a place to connect with neighbours, friends and family; a destination in its own right.

Achieving this vision is a result of connecting with our community. We remain deeply grateful for the support of the community, who have kept our business afloat through the tough times of the Covid pandemic. As a SME we are incredibly proud of what our community has been able to achieve in making this area more vibrant and attractive, and the resulting economic benefit for business owners in this area.

The Awapuni/Riverstop group has delivered on a range of small projects that benefit all. As a group we owe a great deal of thanks for Placing Making fund and to the staff of PNCC (with a special thanks to Keegan and Laura) for their considerable energies, and experience in helping us shape our area, for the benefit of Boho café and other businesses in the area.

Without this vital support from both PNCC and the community, it is not an understatement to say, that Boho Café would not have been able to continue our success and thrive again as the effects of the pandemic start to ease.

Requests to this Annual Plan 2022-23

- A right-hand turn arrow from Botanical Road to College Street, which is dangerous and in peak hours a time onerous intersection that means cars turn down Kingston Street, which would not be necessary if there was free traffic flow
- Replacement bus shelters
- More plantings in the village
- Signage/way-finding from Pioneer Highway to Awapuni/Riverstop Village
- Signage/way-finding indicating river access around the village
- Addressing speed and pedestrian dangers from traffic turning from College Street to Pitama Road and speed through the village in general
- Pedestrian safety on walk-ways
- Bike rack outside 4 Pitama Road (can be dove-tailed with public art)
- Public Art programme/funding
- Place Making funding
- Creation of a Awapuni/Riverstop Village enhancement plan with corresponding funding allocations. We note the erection of the Awapuni artworks at the entrance to the village, which may have lost much of its appeal in the final translation of the vision, and has resulted in little impact (and some negativity). Additionally, work that went into putting the cycle

324-3

way in and around the village several years ago, represent an opportunity lost. This piecemeal activity lacks an overall vision for development of the Awapuni / Riverstop Village area.

Looking forward; and to continue to attract and engage gifted, passionate and diverse people, enabling the delivery of lofty strategy outcomes requires that we deliver on quality of place.

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission
Attachments: submission_enm_pncc_draft_budget_2022_final.pdf

Your contact details

Name

Helen King

Organisation

Environment Network Manawatū

Hearings

Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?

Tues 10 May 3.30pm to 5.30pm

Thurs 12 May 9am to 11am

Thurs 12 May 3.30pm to 5.30pm

Your feedback

What do you think of our proposed budget?

Please see the attached document

What changes would you make?

Do you have any other feedback?

Please note the submitter will not necessarily be the person who talks to the submission at the given opportunity.

File uploads

FILENAME:

submission_enm_pncc_draft_budget_2022_final



P.O. Box 1271
145 Cuba Street
Palmerston North 4410
P 06 355 0126
E admin@enm.org.nz
www.enm.org.nz

Submission to PNCC Draft Annual Budget Consultation

To: Palmerston North City Council

Contact Details:

Organisation: Environment Network Manawātū (ENM)
Contact Person: Stewart Harrex.
Address for service: 145 Cuba St, Palmerston North 4410
Phone: (06) 355 0126
Email: coordinator@enm.org.nz

Overview: A submission linking to support and suggestions around the Draft Annual Budget.

Background:

Environment Network Manawatu (ENM) is the environment hub for the Manawātū Region with the key purpose of facilitating and enabling communication, cooperation, and increasing collective action amongst its member groups and the wider community. ENM provides leadership by underpinning, fostering, and encouraging environmental initiatives in the region and our 60 current member groups are from throughout the Manawātū River Catchment with interests including biodiversity regeneration, freshwater management, citizen science, food security and resilience, sustainable living, alternative energies, and active transport. The network is organised into two collective focus areas: Manawātū Food Action Network and Manawātū River Source to Sea.

ENM's constitutional purposes are to:

- coordinate and communicate the efforts of the member groups to enhance the local environment:
 - actively protect, maintain, restore and enhance the environment of the Manawātū

325-3

- promote ideas to the wider community to encourage them to participate in environmental projects
 - develop concerted long-term plans of action to enhance the environment and actively progress the implementation of these plans
 - encourage the provision of “green” areas for passive recreation
 - work together to identify, initiate, support, implement and maintain environmental projects that benefit the wider community
 - initiate, develop, implement and participate in environmental education
- act as a central point of access to environmental information.
- advocate for ecological sustainability and matters of agreed environmental significance.
- work in partnership with iwi to recognise kaitiakitanga and environmental aims and objectives in common.
- liaise with similar organisations elsewhere in Aotearoa New Zealand and around the world as appropriate to source and share ideas for environmental projects and issues.

Submission:

We acknowledge the pressure that the last two years of living with a pandemic has placed on council operations. The pandemic and the slow-moving emergency that is climate change have highlighted the need to allow for risk velocity in budgets in order to build up the city’s resilience.

- We support the major timing and capital programme cost changes on page 8. The timing of the 3 Waters “ Better Off Funding” of 8.1 m could align well with the potential within the city’s waste water upgrade to optimize resource recovery opportunities.
- The disparity between the rates increases for residential properties as opposed to others appears unfair. All property owners benefit from improvements to services and infrastructure.
- We particularly support the following budget lines:
 - 2026,2056. Active transport and cycling infrastructure
 - 2027,2120 and 2121 Shared pathway networks, off road and footpaths
 - 1680 Public Transport Infrastructure
 - 1073, 2000 and 2005 Active communities supporting city reserves. We support these and would like to see this including naming reserves to recognize their history e.g. Opie Reserve with an explanation of the man and his achievements. These stories are likely to reduce to cost of vandalism and connect users to the place.
- We strongly support:
 - 111 The work of Pitt Park
 - 558 Urban Growth Local Reserve Takaro

325-4

- 967 Edible Planting City Wide
- 1099-Parks and reserves and city-wide shade provision.

In areas of new urban growth developers should have factored in space for local reserves or contributions towards them. Councils should not have to purchase land for reserves.

- Connected Communities We particularly support the value of building resilience through
 - 2023 Small Grants Funding for Community Development
 - 2116 Funding for SPG's
- Climate Change adaption and mitigation. We support this budget item
- Environmental Sustainability. We strongly support funding as outlined on Pages 57 and 58 and appreciate the ongoing support for the sector
- Resource Recovery We strongly support the budget proposal and items listed on pages 62,64,65, and 66 item 2129 – investigating kerbside food waste recovery is a very welcome inclusion
- Water. We support the budget proposal items on page 69,70 and 71
- Stormwater. We support the budget proposal set out on pages 73 and 74
- Wastewater Operational. We support the budget proposal set out on pages 77,78,79 and 80

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission
Attachments: submission_mfan_pncc_draft_budget_2022_final.pdf

Your contact details

Name

Helen King

Organisation

Environment Network Manawatū- the Manawatū Food Action Network

Hearings

Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?

Tues 10 May 9am to 11am

Thurs 12 May 9am to 11am

Fri 13 May 9am to 11am

Your feedback

What do you think of our proposed budget?

Please see the attached document.

What changes would you make?

Do you have any other feedback?

Please note the submitter will not necessarily be the speaker to the submission.

File uploads

FILENAME:

submission_mfan_pncc_draft_budget_2022_final



P.O. Box 1271
145 Cuba Street
Palmerston North 4410
P 06 355 0126
E admin@enm.org.nz
www.enm.org.nz

Submission to PNCC Draft Annual Budget 2022-23

To: Palmerston North City Council

Contact Details:

Organisation: Manawātū Food Action Network
Environment Network Manawātū (ENM)
Contact Person: Madz BatachEl
Address for service: 145 Cuba St, Palmerston North 4410
Phone: (06) 355 0126
Email: coordinator@enm.org.nz

Overview: We support the majority of the proposed draft annual budget but would like the addition of a budget line to develop a city-wide food resilience policy.

Background:

Environment Network Manawatu (ENM) is the environment hub for the Manawātū Region with the key purpose of facilitating and enabling communication, cooperation, and increasing collective action amongst its member groups and the wider community. ENM provides leadership by underpinning, fostering, and encouraging environmental initiatives in the region and our 60 current member groups are from throughout the Manawātū River Catchment with interests including biodiversity regeneration, freshwater management, citizen science, food security and resilience, sustainable living, alternative energies, and active transport. The network is organised into two collective focus areas: Manawātū Food Action Network and Manawātū River Source to Sea.

Manawātū Food Action Network (MFAN) is a collective of social service and environmental organisations (and other community stakeholders) working together to increase collaboration, education and awareness around issues of food security, food resilience and food localisation. Currently MFAN's main focus is preparation and implementation of a strategy to improve Kai Security in the 4412 postcode of Palmerston North.

ENM's constitutional purposes are to:

- coordinate and communicate the efforts of the member groups to enhance the local environment:
 - actively protect, maintain, restore and enhance the environment of the Manawatū
 - promote ideas to the wider community to encourage them to participate in environmental projects
 - develop concerted long-term plans of action to enhance the environment and actively progress the implementation of these plans
 - encourage the provision of “green” areas for passive recreation
 - work together to identify, initiate, support, implement and maintain environmental projects that benefit the wider community
 - initiate, develop, implement and participate in environmental education
- act as a central point of access to environmental information.
- advocate for ecological sustainability and matters of agreed environmental significance.
- work in partnership with iwi to recognise kaitiakitanga and environmental aims and objectives in common.
- liaise with similar organisations elsewhere in Aotearoa New Zealand and around the world as appropriate to source and share ideas for environmental projects and issues.

Submission:

We support the majority of the proposed draft annual budget but would like the addition of a budget line to *develop a city-wide food resilience policy*. The purpose of this would be to enable the work highlighted in the recently released 4412 Kai Resilience Strategy to be broadened to encompass the whole city and lay the foundations for the city to implement this policy in the future. Some arguments to support this inclusion are outlined below.

- The right to food is a human right. It protects the right of all human beings to live in dignity, free from hunger, food insecurity and malnutrition. The right to food is not about charity, but about ensuring that all people have the capacity to feed themselves in dignity. As such, having a policy around food resilience that can speak to and support this right is of utmost importance.
- Food resilience stems from the ability of communities to produce their own food, and as such is dependent on appropriate land for this production. PNCC are kaitiaki over much of the land within this city and are, to an extent, able to regulate land use. Given the power PNCC have, it is appropriate they have a policy in place to ensure that its' citizens can take an active part in growing their own food if they so wish.
- Palmerston North is a city that boasts a wide range of food-related industries, hosts a university with a centre on food research, and is surrounded by fertile land that produces

food. Having a policy on food resilience would be a good fit with our regions status as a “food basket”.

- As an organisation that works alongside and supports other organisations helping the most vulnerable in our communities, we know the additional stresses that food insecurity is having on those whose lives are already heavily stressed. Food insecurity is a growing problem and one that has numerous detrimental flow-on effects for those individuals it directly affects, and the wider communities within our city. Having a policy in place to support programs that help move communities from food insecurity to food resilience and beyond is a social investment in these communities that will contribute to a safe future for our city and all its citizens.

Context:

The recently released 4412 Kai Resilience Strategy has outlined some of the challenges that citizens within this rohe face with food insecurity issues. A major theme that was discovered was that Food Insecurity is not the issue, but a symptom of the deeper issues that divide our communities. However, if we create a robust strategy to alleviate food insecurity, it gives whānau the time and space to focus on overcoming the greater challenges they face. In the long-term people with access to cheaper, healthier food are better equipped to positively contribute to our community.

The 4412 Kai Resilience Strategy recommendations have been made with the consultation of the community and outline what have been identified as the next steps in moving communities from food insecurity to food security, and beyond. There are over 100 existing and potential initiatives that this report has identified as being of importance within the 4412 area alone. The Manawātū Food Action Network will work towards supporting the implementation of this important document; however, this is work we see as being bigger than just within the 4412 area. Although our organisation can and does directly support some of these projects, there is more work to do than our current staffing and budget allows.

The right to food *is* a human right. It protects the right of all human beings to live in dignity, free from hunger, food insecurity and malnutrition. The right to food is not about charity, but about ensuring that all people have the capacity to feed themselves in dignity. In a world facing the challenges of a climate unstable future, and still facing the supply line uncertainties caused by a global pandemic, supporting citizens to be food resilient and food secure is not an abstract goal, it is an immediate need we must plan to address now.

We as a community have an obligation to ensure all members have access to healthy food. As the leaders of our community, it is imperative that the Palmerston North City Council recognises its responsibility to ensure our people are well fed. A citywide Food Resilience Policy will ensure we are doing everything we can to support those within our community that are struggling to feed their whānau.

From:
Subject:

Submission
FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission

Your contact details

Name
Kelly Morris

Organisation

Hearings

Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?

Your feedback

What do you think of our proposed budget?

It's ludicrous to suggest rate increases should be based on a false inflated property market. People pay already when buying a home and when people haven't been a party to the property market and have had homes for years then they are punished by an over inflated market. How on earth is it fair to increase rates based on property prices? Does the council provide 30% more services? NO! Shouldn't the increase be based on actual inflation and cost of living at the very most ? This is a money making scheme for the Council and I feel a revolution may ensue should this proceed.

What changes would you make?

Cost of living increase at the maximum. Unless you can with 100% certainty promise and provide the increase in services based on each respective property rates increase.

Do you have any other feedback?

I feel that there may be a group submission taken to higher authorities to investigate this Council and i for one would support that. The lack of support for the current Council is evident based on social media posts. I would think the Council would want to look out for their people but in my view that is not evident.

File uploads
FILENAME:

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission

Your contact details**Name**

Kate Speirs

Organisation**Hearings**

Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?

Your feedback**What do you think of our proposed budget?**

Extremely sad about the increase in rates. There will be many families that can't afford it! We currently pay for road side recycling & that's not happening so do we get a discount???

What changes would you make?

Less of a increase.

Do you have any other feedback?

No, but thank you for reading this.

File uploads

FILENAME:

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission

Your contact details**Name**

James Sheu

Organisation**Hearings**

Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?

Your feedback**What do you think of our proposed budget?**

I think this is an unfair rate increase for everyone. How can you justify increasing the rates solely based on the increased CV. This should not have any affect on rates. It's not like anything has changed with the property. Also there's still the same amount of houses (and more being built each day) so having such significant increase seems greedy. Also it is going to make owning a house even more unaffordable for first home buyers. Is this something you took into consideration?

What changes would you make?

Keep the rates the same or only increase rates in line with inflation (at most). The 30% increase for some households is going to be a killer.

Do you have any other feedback?

It's like the council only sees the money side of things and not the flow on effects that would result to the home owners. With inflation on the rise as well it's going to make it even harder to live for some families who now also have to account for such a massive rate increase. I would suggest you reconsider your plans and take a more conservative approach to your rate increases.

File uploads

FILENAME:

Annette Nixon

SUBMISSION TO PNCC DRAFT Annual Plan Year 2 2022-23

I do not wish to speak to my submission

RATES INCREASE PROPOSED

I am concerned that the land value rate increases proposed are indicating an unsustainable and unaffordable burden for many house holders.

Such a large increase, which seems designed to move residents off larger properties rather than allowing the natural turnover of such sections, will result in many difficult situations. Having to move to a smaller property when most of these are the new in-fills built for and selling at currently high amounts will reduce well-being and create a new group of people without adequate options for happy housing.

Where Palmerston North has been known as a green, tree graced city, this is gradually diminishing. We are losing this desirable city character as properties are subdivided along with losing the variety of homes available, historic architecture and lived history. We invite visitors to Palmerston North to enjoy walkways, cycle paths (including biking past farmland), parks, reserves, bike park, yet propose to turn suburbs into areas devoid of points of interest, shade, gardens and community connection. Up to 3 storied dwellings are ok but they need to be offset with places for people to spend time in open space and green environments. Older people need these areas to be accessible, near at hand. Maintaining character neighbourhoods and treed properties are in some cities enabled by Councils providing Rates Rebates for resident ownership and maintenance of such trees and properties.

Awapuni Park Recreation and Community Centre

The new pre-school fenced playground is a great asset in this community. It is a delight to see so many families with little children using the playground and getting to know what else goes on at the park. The park would benefit from (Shade Development 1099), shade tree planting, seating and perhaps BBQs. The challenge is to provide for and encourage family use of the park as children get older.

St Mark's site - Please complete consultation and Policy Development to guide decision making for the acquisition of land for community facilities, such as an

330-2

extended Community Library and Community Hub. The Awesome Awapuni group has repeatedly requested attention to this.

Awapuni Community Library and City Libraries

Truly Living Rooms of the City. These welcoming spaces are such a valuable and appreciated resource. Removal of fines and fees has helped many people to stay connected.

Reserves

I oppose the sale of any city reserves. I support the developments of more parks and reserves to meet the needs of a growing population. These can be Pocket Parks, special interest areas e.g. to accommodate a community project, or to feature and nurture biodiversity.

Nature Calls

Continue with this planning and upgrade development making waste water disposal to land a priority in these times of climate change influenced low rainfall. It is hoped the application for Government funding is supported allowing one measure of Rates reduction.

2037 Additional sweeping - Cycle Lanes in College Street

While cycle lanes are useful, they are not when cyclists are riding into the carriage way to avoid the large cones dropped from the accacia trees along the route.

1611 Free Swimming for under 5 year olds Supported

1935 Cat Management

Making a start with education and colony management is a great move.

186 Public Toilets

I support maintenance and renewals, but I did not see any additional public toilets planned for this year.

1447 Earthquake Prone Heritage Building Fund Supported

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission

Your contact details

Name

Renee Murray

Organisation

Hearings

Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?

Your feedback

What do you think of our proposed budget?

I have concerns about the % rates increase for my Mothers property. She is looking at an increase of 16%, which is an additional \$452 a year, taking her total yearly rates up to \$3212. As someone who is already struggling on the pension with the rising costs of living this is making it almost unaffordable for her to remain in her home. She will now go without something such as heating or food to be able to pay her rates and I imagine there will be many similar to her in the same position. I know of some people who are looking at a 30% increase - I think this is an absolute disgrace.

What changes would you make?

I think there have been huge improvements in Palmerston North recently however maybe this is the time to step back and cut all non-urgent spending. Surely it's more important in these hard times to look after the vulnerable people in our community who are financially struggling than spend money beautifying a park etc. These things can wait a few years. Postpone anything that is not urgent.

Do you have any other feedback?

I don't think these changes have been effectively communicated to the community. A lot of people will see a comment on social media etc about a proposed rate increase but won't delve deeper to find out their own rates might be going up as high as 32%. I feel the council have misled our most vulnerable community about these rates increases.

File uploads

FILENAME:

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission

Your contact details**Name**

Patricia Avery

Organisation**Hearings**

Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?

Your feedback**What do you think of our proposed budget?**

I personally will have to sell my home that I have been in for 17 years with the proposed rates increase. Mine are going up just shy of \$1000. With the interest rate rises and these rates increases you are going to cripple many families reality of owning / keeping their homes. You don't even supply a rubbish bin for that cost.

What changes would you make?

I appreciate an increase may be needed but keep it manageable - keep the dream of home ownership alive in Palmerston North. Stop spending money on unnecessary costs - like painting the roads pretty colours - colourful dangerous side bin barriers along our roads .

Do you have any other feedback?

Make Palmerston North somewhere people want to and can afford to live. By tis rates increase you will drive people away

File uploads

FILENAME:

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission

Your contact details

Name

Rex Williams and Josine van Melsem

Organisation

Hearings

Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?

Your feedback

What do you think of our proposed budget?

Under the current economic situation an 8.3% rate increase is too high. 8.3% year on year for the 10 year plan will result in rates doubling over that period which will be unaffordable for many homeowners. While the need for social housing is great the cost to the ratepayer is also great. Social housing should be a central government obligation as we pay for it in our taxes, however, they are not doing it well. Again in these times spending should be curtailed. This is not the time for the council to be spending on niceties such as the Cuba street beautification and flash entrances to the Albert Street river walkway etc. Maintenance of the walkways is more important. eg control of noxious weed species. Essential work such as seismic strengthening, construction of the bore and the widening of Fergusson street should proceed.

What changes would you make?

The unspent rates collected for projects that were not started could be used to off set rate increases for those who have had large percentage rise in their rates with some amount going to social housing. Stop heavy transport vehicles (at least those with trailers) in the central city to make it safer for cyclists. Deliveries can be scheduled outside times when there are many cyclists on the roads.

Do you have any other feedback?

Palmerston North is a wonderful city with great amenities but if we are to progress national politics must be discouraged to avoid political agendas in decision making.

File uploads

FILENAME:

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission

Your contact details

Name

Amanda Borren-Lean

Organisation

Hearings

Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?

Tues 10 May 7pm to 9pm

Your feedback

What do you think of our proposed budget?

Costs need to be cut back. Arts and sculptures for the city aren't essential.

What changes would you make?

Reconfigure unnecessary spending. No more sculptures, proposals/budgets from the PNCC being looked over by overseas bodies (resulting in 100's of thousands of dollars being used) and listening to the actual people you are meant to be representing. You went ahead with coloured plastic boxes at intersections and coloured boxes for cycle lanes which everyone told you was going to be a disaster and the meters you were going to charge people for parking longer in town. These are just a few examples that could have been avoided had you listened to the people you were meant to be representing.

Do you have any other feedback?

Our rates for a average home in Awapuni are due to increase by \$781.00 for the next Financial year. Other increases we are facing are; increased interest rates on our mortgage an additional \$85 a fortnight, increases we are experiencing with child care costs, daycare costs, power increases (low user rates removed) and petrol prices to get to work (husband works out of town), insurance increases and not to mention the price of food is astronomical. In 3 years i have had one pay increase which resulted in an additional \$50 a week, my husband no increase. We would be considered a medium to low income family and fall just on the cusp of not being entitled to WFF. This sort of increase with severely effect our family. Interestingly in comparisons two people i work with who live in Kelvin Grove and Hokowhitu (the wealthier areas of town) are seeing a decline in their rates. Again another attempt at favouring the rich and ruining the poor.

File uploads

FILENAME:

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission

Your contact details

Name

Ava Reidy

Organisation

Hearings

Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?

Fri 13 May 7pm to 9pm

Your feedback

What do you think of our proposed budget?

I would like to acknowledge the cost of everything has gone up, and as a result, a rates increase is inevitable. I am concerned by the fact that the largest increases (proportionately) are at the lower end of the property market, meaning you're asking for more money from those who are already most affected. In turn, this is going to drive up aid required for those people, further, and needlessly, increasing costs to the residents of the city again. Simultaneously, these are the areas least likely to reap the rewards of paying extra. Equality is one thing, but equity is another.

What changes would you make?

Rather than improving central streets that are comfortably usable for pedestrians and traffic, perhaps we look at improving road quality, i.e. Pioneer Highway from Botanical Street, and out of town, as well as Highbury Avenue. There are roads in the city that keep getting repaired, while roads in much worse condition are neglected, and the condition of these roads is damaging to cars, increasing the number of cars being sent to salvage, and increasing the carbon footprint of the city needlessly. Furthermore, the Tamakuku Terrace project is taking place in a part of the city with high land values; yet the work is factored into the budget but not the return (that I can see).

Do you have any other feedback?

I feel the council budgeting has been veiled in mystery and inaccessibility. I feel taking these documents to people isn't a hard ask, just put the budget document and a submission form in everyone's letterbox, and engage those less likely to have a say. I also believe the community would benefit from greater transparency in communication from the council regarding the appropriation of funds as services/projects change throughout the year.

File uploads

FILENAME:

Palmerston North City Draft Annual Budget 2022/23

Submission to Palmerston North City Council (PNCC)

From

Manawatū Business Chamber (MBC)



Manawatū Business Chamber
Unit 9a, Northcote Office Park
86, Grey Street
Palmerston North
4410

20 April 2022

Mobile: 021 0533071 Email: amanda@manawatuchamber.co.nz

Contact People: Amanda Linsley, CEO, Manawatū Business Chamber

Steve Davey, Chairperson, Manawatū Business Chamber

Manawatū Business Chamber Board Members: Blair Alabaster, Ed Teece, Paul O'Brien, Steve Davey, Rahui Corbett, Alex Boustridge, Guy Dobson, Chris Long, Rachel Hoskin and Holly Killgour

1. The Manawatū Business Chamber ("MBC") is a 440+ Business Member organisation, which represents a sizeable proportion of the City and Region's GDP.
2. This submission is presented to Council by the MBC Board after seeking feedback from our Advisory Board and Members.

Draft Annual Budget – 2022/23

3. MBC thank PNCC for the opportunity to consult on this matter, we continue to support the vision of Small city benefits, Big city ambition.
4. MBC acknowledge the proposed rate increase to 8.3% against the 10 Year Plan increase of 8.1%. MBC question whether the increase is prudent given the difficulties that businesses (and individuals) have experienced during the last year (and before) through the impacts of Covid-19.
5. We urge PNCC to review its debt-servicing and consider using finances that have been saved during the current financial year in capital projects and major events (that have been delayed or cancelled, due to Covid-19) to keep the rate increase at least at the rate forecasted in the 10 Year Plan (8.1%) and preferably lower. We are interested in the amount of capital projects underway at various stages from initial consultation through to implementation and suggest

336-2

there should be a review of all the overall timelines and whether given some of the current constraints a prioritisation process could be implemented for budgeting purposes.

6. MBC acknowledge the work carried out by PNCC to mitigate for what would have been a disproportionate increase in rates for the lower-end of the residential market following the recent property revaluations.
7. MBC would like PNCC to review the funding for the Safe Communities programmes. It has been well reported that there has been an increase in crime during the last year throughout the city and to reduce spending in this area at this time does not make sense. We would like to see the City Ambassador programme funding retained at its current level (if not increased) and not halved for the next two years as budgeted. We understand that potentially the operation of this is something that Palmy BID could be involved with. We ask PNCC to review all options and to consider the initiatives of other city councils. MBC suggests PNCC should look to tighten its internal budget (potentially a zero-based review) including decreasing the amount allocated to computer and furniture replacement during the coming year if this re-allocation of funding resource would mean being able to fully support the Safe Communities programmes. The increase in crime as mentioned above has impacted the city's business community at the time when it has been hardest hit.
8. MBC urges PNCC to ensure that the Procurement Policy going forward favours regional business opportunities. Although such opportunities may not initially appear to be the most 'price-competitive,' if they come to fruition, they are likely to have the biggest positive economic impact overall for our region.
9. MBC reiterates as in previous years that we would like to see PNCC further explore Public/Private Partnerships (PPPs) as there is undoubtedly potential benefit to all parties in doing so, specifically with the large amount of central government funding coming into the region ensuring that there is a balanced approach.
10. MBC acknowledge the continuing scarcity of resource for housing and the steps that PNCC are taking to mitigate this; whilst there will be an influx of people coming into the city/region to meet the demand for jobs plus further increases in people through NZDF it is important to ensure that our people are not disadvantaged, and that housing remains available and affordable.
11. MBC wish to continue to engage with PNCC/Planning Policy Team with regards to the review of the PNCC Business Zones to provide feedback. The discussions had this far give MBC confidence that PNCC will get this right in order to protect our city centre retail and hospitality sectors.
12. MBC look forward to the engagement with PNCC with regards to the Parking Framework to ensure that the business community are properly consulted with and there are no surprises (referring to the extended hours suggested last year, then reverted).
13. MBC are keeping a watchful eye on discussions with regards to 3 Waters and currently are sitting on the Waste-Water Review committee. We understand that the 3 Waters are due to be taken over by the 'new entity' on 1 July 2024 and whilst we understand that this does not impact on this budget, we are mindful that these changes are causing uncertainty and potentially there could be unforeseen costs (or benefits) of which we are unaware.

336-3

14. MBC support the strengthening of Council owned earth-quake prone buildings; however, we have questions as to whether this should be tied-in with the current Cultural Precinct Review and whether these should be mutually exclusive. Further discussion is needed.

Summary

MBC would like to thank PNCC elected members, leadership team and staff for their service during another difficult year due to the long-term nature of the Covid-19 pandemic. We value the relationship between the two organisations and the consultation processes that we believe are adding value.

MBC recognises and is encouraged by the engagement PNCC have with Rangitāne o Manawatū across the city.

Yours sincerely

Signed on behalf of the Manawatū Business Chamber Board
by;

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'A Linsley', with a stylized initial 'A'.

Amanda Linsley
CEO
Manawatū Business Chamber

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Draft Annual Budget 2022-23 submission

Your contact details

Name

Tomas Burleigh Behrens

Organisation

Hearings

Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?

Your feedback

What do you think of our proposed budget?

I support the spending on cycleways. I strongly support the installation of permanent barriers on the Main Street Cycleway. I oppose any interim/temporary barriers being installed, the planters work just fine. I live on a street that joins Main Street at the cycleway, and use it often. The planters have been effective. Instead of another temporary solution being installed, we need to roll out cycleways on more streets. I generally support increases in rates to maintain the planned level of operational and capital expenditure. I'd even be happy with larger increases. The city should instead pursue affordable rates, by pursuing a dense/compact city policy. If we had more people living close to the middle of town, we'd start seeing infrastructure cost savings.

What changes would you make?

An urgent cycleway project on the arterials/sub-arterials that are most in need of safety improvements. Featherston Street should be first - it is the street with the highest number of cyclists killed / seriously injured in the city (based on NZTA crash statistics). Where the street has cycle lanes, they're too narrow and in the doorzone. Either the painted median or car parking on one or both sides needs to go, before more cyclists are killed or seriously hurt. The city has a goal of reducing CO2 emissions. Transport emissions could be lowered if we restricted motor vehicle use. The city should start a project to create a traffic circulation plan, based on successful traffic circulation plans implemented in Ghent Belgium and Groningen Netherlands. A traffic circulation plan breaks up the (inner) city into zones. Drivers can access zones, but to drive between zones, drivers must use designated arterials (ring roads). Physical barriers and one-way CCTV cameras are used to prevent drivers crossing zones. Traffic circulation plans reduce private vehicle use, and are cheap compared to other road projects. The Ghent traffic circulation plan cost approximately the price of a single bicycle bridge, but did a lot more to increase cycling than any single bridge could. <https://stad.gent/en/mobility-ghent/circulation-plan>

Do you have any other feedback?

It is hard to understand what each item in the budget refers to. Is this on purpose? The budget should be presented in a way which is easy to dig into. Each item in the budget is a cryptic code and a one line summary. If each item was linked to a project summary, it would be easier to understand what spending proposals relate to, making it easier to make an informed judgement.

File uploads

FILENAME:

Your contact details**Name**

Doug McArthur

Organisation**Hearings**

Would you like to speak to Council in support of your submission?

Your feedback

What do you think of our proposed budget?

I fully understand this has to go up but the position I am in, trying to get things upgraded (underfloor, roof, installation) trying to get up to scratch and having to pay extra for this and I don't like your budget as it will increase my rates.

What changes would you make?

If possible, cut it back.

Do you have any other feedback?

No

File uploads

FILENAME:

Michael & Janet King

Palmerston North.

20/04/2022

Palmerston North City Council.

To whom it may concern.

After recent press reports, we were astounded to find our rates for the next year are to increase by more than 25%. We are both age beneficiaries with only meagre interest to supplement our income. While our property valuation has escalated on paper, to us the value is no different to previous years! We have owned our property for the last 22 years with no intention of moving. I consider the forthcoming rates will be disproportionate to the services we receive. Along with other increases in the cost of living, this increase is untenable and I feel it must be adjusted in fairness to us and the many others who find themselves in this situation.

Yours sincerely,
Michael King.

Malcolm Frith – phone submission – taken down by Courtney Kibby

Concerned proposed rate increase 8.3% in relation to the financial pressure that people are under due to Covid and increasing costs of living at the moment. Believe the council could live within current budget that they have

They are also going to gain financially through property value increases of most people in the city.

There are a few that properties have gone down in value, most people have gone up in value, so council could live within that, getting a 12 percent increase in the rates.

Don't need to apply any rate increase this year.

Article in today's standard with gentleman and his property increase would equate to 20 percent thereabouts.

People are struggling. Rate increase would be another financial burden for people to try and find a way to cover that increased cost.

Period that consultation has been opened for during school holidays and public holidays, unfortunate that with those holidays' people aren't engaged in local body process. Engaged in other things. No allowance from staff, does make it trickier for people to be involved.