

Do you wish to speak in support of your submission at the hearing?: No

I am able to attend:

I intend to attend:

Would you like to be added to our database to be notified of future consultations?: Yes

Your Details

Full Name: Kathryn Jagodzinski (Breeding)

Do you agree with our preferred option or do you support another option?

Drinking water meters: Don't install meters

Let us know why: If water leakage is the principal reason for installing individual water meters then postpone installing meters until the main source(s) of leakage are investigated and rectified. Use the proposed cost of installing meters to detect and rectify any issues with leaks first. If significant water leakage is suspected then I am surprised that the initial reaction is to instal water meters at individual properties first (and the associated cost of doing this). Meters will only detect water leakage on the property - and as such are useful - however, this should not be the first step in addressing water leakage issues. The main water lines should be tested first to locate the likely sources of leaks before going down the path of installing meters on individual properties. The cost of installing individual meters would be better spent on locating the main source(s) of water leaks first and then rectifying the problem.

Elderly Persons Housing: Self-sustaining in 2 years - our preferred option

Let us know why: This is an essential community service and highlights where funds should be directed as a priority over non essential projects.

What do you think about our plans for our other projects and activities?: METHVEN PROPOSED RATES RISE Regarding the proposed 14.88% rate increase (with further significant increases to occur in the following 2 years) - I object strongly to this for the following reasons: What is the justification for singling out one township over all the other townships in the council district for such an exorbitant rates rise? Is it because critical infrastructure (including water) has been neglected in Methven by the Council in favour of non-essential projects for so many years that this is now at a crisis point? Why were these issues not prioritised long before now? I must admit I initially thought the proposed increase was a typographical error (that it was meant to be 4.88%) and was shocked to learn that it is in fact correct. Any rates rises should be in line with all other townships within the council district otherwise it is biased and unfair. This will just result in an untenable financial burden for many residents and businesses of Methven township who may already be struggling with the rising cost of living on top of the financial impact of the COVID crisis. Whilst

critical infrastructure updates and maintenance are essential, this should have been planned for, and carried out, long before now to reduce rates shocks like this. Look to cutting costs elsewhere - such as postponing non-essential and expensive projects in the District instead of singling out and financially burdening the residents of Methven to pay for essential services that should have been addressed years ago. Likewise, contributions for costs associated with private land development should be the responsibility of the developer and not the rate payers. This proposed rates rise is grossly biased and unjustified - it unfairly targets one community in the District over all others. I have never experienced a rates shock like this in all of the years I have been paying council rates - anywhere. It suggests poor planning and fiscal irresponsibility by the Council in the past as well as the present.