

## Attachment 4 – Response to request for referendum questions

Requested referendum question	Draft revised AP proposal	Draft AP CD reference	Comment
<p>Do you agree with Council's Policy Committee's decision to recommend an average residential rates increase of 7.6%?</p> <p>Yes / No</p>	<p>Council is now proposing to further reduce the overall rates increase from 7.6% to 4.7%</p> <p>This also means the following changes:</p>	<p>Please refer to the consultation document section titled "What you need to know"</p>	<p>Council seeks submissions on the proposed level of rates. Where lower rates are suggested by submitters it would be helpful for potential areas of savings to achieve that to be identified.</p>
<p>Do you want the average annual residential rate increase, including the 2020/2021 year, to be ZERO%, particularly due to the severe financial hardship caused by Covid-19?</p> <p>Yes/No</p>	<p>Median residential rates rise: 1% (44 cents per week)</p> <p>Median commercial rates rise: 11% (\$9.32 per week)</p> <p>Uniform Annual General Charge reduction from \$475 to \$296</p> <p>Commercial differential remains at 1:1.2</p> <p>New capital expenditure of \$209 million</p> <p>Debt-to-revenue ratio of up to 250%</p>		<p>In addition, the median residential rates increase that was consulted on from 3 April to 3 May was actually 4.4%. The 7.6% relates to the overall rates increase.</p> <p>Tauranga City Council uses the median ratepayer rather than the average ratepayer, for comparative purposes, because a relatively small number of high value residential or commercial properties in the city significantly increase our average values and distort the true impact of rates on most ratepayers.</p>
<p>Should commercial rate differential be limited to 1.2:1?</p> <p>Yes/No</p>	<p>Commercial rate differential proposed of 1.2:1</p> <p>The median commercial ratepayer (capital value \$1,070,000) would pay (11%) \$9.32 a week more than they do now. Overall, their proposed annual rates bill would be \$4,844</p>	<p>Please refer to the consultation document section titled "Proposed changes to the UAGC and commercial differential rate"</p>	<p>The increase to 1.2:1 is the implementation of the third increase over 3-year period to transition from 1:1 to 1.2:1.</p> <p>This was consulted and approved through the 2018-28 Long-term Plan. Council has signalled it will further review the commercial rate differential in the 2021-31 Long-term Plan.</p>
<p>Do you consider the Council's compulsory kerbside rubbish collection proposal at \$400+ GST per annum is unnecessary, too</p>	<p>See comment</p>	<p>See comment</p>	<p>The proposed kerbside residential rubbish collection service was consulted on through the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan. The proposed</p>

## Attachment 4 – Response to request for referendum questions

Requested referendum question	Draft revised AP proposal	Draft AP CD reference	Comment
<p>expensive and should be abandoned?</p> <p>Yes/No</p>			<p>kerbside rubbish and recycling service would not be introduced until 2021/22 and therefore falls outside of this annual plan period. This proposal is subject to a Request for Proposal process confirming that a comprehensive service can be provided at an affordable cost. It is anticipated that the service cost would be less than or similar to the costs many people are already paying for a less-comprehensive, commercially provided service.</p>
<p>Do you require Council to reduce operating expenditure, including inter alia: a reduction of staff and consultant costs, to defer all capital expenditure for 2020/2021 year?</p> <p>Yes/No</p>	<p>Since the last round of consultation finished, Council have looked at ways to further reduce expenditure on services we provide to the community, and we are seeking feedback on these measures.</p> <p>In addition, Council has led a comprehensive review of capital expenditure, which has seen a reprioritisation of the capital budget proposed in the original draft annual plan.</p>	<p>Please refer to the consultation document section titled “Changes to our operational budgets” and “Changes to the capital programme”</p>	<p>A complete deferment of the capital expenditure programme is not considered appropriate. This would see no work undertaken on maintaining and renewing existing assets, no work on delivering assets to enable future residential and commercial land to be developed, and no work on other projects agreed with the community through the Long-Term Plan.</p> <p>Delivering no capital expenditure would further reduce the city’s available land supply (and further reduce compliance with the mandatory National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity) and would significantly reduce the city’s likelihood of benefitting from the</p>

**Attachment 4 – Response to request for referendum questions**

<b>Requested referendum question</b>	<b>Draft revised AP proposal</b>	<b>Draft AP CD reference</b>	<b>Comment</b>
			government's economic stimulus package investments.