

CENTRAL HAWKE'S BAY DISTRICT COUNCIL

**2016/2017 ANNUAL PLAN
SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**

THURSDAY 19 MAY 2016

commencing at 9.00 am

F2016/2017 ANNUAL PLAN SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Thursday 19 May 2016

Contents	Page
Community Partnerships	2
Democracy	8
Land Transport	9
Parks and Reserves	11
Pourerere Beach	13
Rates	14
Multi Issue Submissions	15
LGFA Scheme and Anaerobic Pond	49

COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS

Page: 1 - 17	Business Hawke's Bay - Susan White	<p>Introduction</p> <p>Business Hawke's Bay is the regional business-led economic development agency in Hawke's Bay. We focus on supporting the growth of Hawke's Bay businesses and attracting new business/investment to the region. Business Hawke's Bay effectively and efficiently makes the best use of limited resources available in the region to fulfil our vision which is:</p> <p>To retain, grow and attract vibrant businesses and people talent, making Hawke's Bay the best regional location in which to work, invest, live and grow.</p> <p>We have the business expertise and knowledge required, both in our governance and operational personnel, to make a real and significant impact on business growth and development in Hawke's Bay. We work with a "for business by business" approach and provide hands-on experience to help businesses, large and small to successfully operate in the Hawke's Bay region. We are non-political and work in a collaborative way with a wide range of organisations and businesses.</p> <p>Successful Track Record</p> <p>Established in 2011 and becoming an independent incorporated society in July 2013, we are proud of our collaborative working style and track record of success which were only made possible through the co-funding of local government and members of the business community. Examples of these projects is included in Appendix 1. Messages of support for BHB are included in Appendix 3.</p> <p>Business Hawke's Bay Current Funding Model</p> <p>Business Hawke's Bay is currently funded by:</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 40%;">Unison Fibre, Unison Networks, Napier Port, PanPac</td> <td style="width: 20%; text-align: center;">\$145,000</td> <td style="width: 40%;">Second year of 3 year commitments</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hastings District Council</td> <td style="text-align: center;">\$100,000</td> <td>Annual submission</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hawke's Bay Regional Council</td> <td style="text-align: center;">\$100,000</td> <td>Third year of 3 year commitment</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Napier City Council</td> <td style="text-align: center;">\$110,000</td> <td>Included in NCC's Long Term Plan + annual submission</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Wairoa District Council</td> <td style="text-align: center;">\$4,000</td> <td>Annual submission</td> </tr> </table>	Unison Fibre, Unison Networks, Napier Port, PanPac	\$145,000	Second year of 3 year commitments	Hastings District Council	\$100,000	Annual submission	Hawke's Bay Regional Council	\$100,000	Third year of 3 year commitment	Napier City Council	\$110,000	Included in NCC's Long Term Plan + annual submission	Wairoa District Council	\$4,000	Annual submission
Unison Fibre, Unison Networks, Napier Port, PanPac	\$145,000	Second year of 3 year commitments															
Hastings District Council	\$100,000	Annual submission															
Hawke's Bay Regional Council	\$100,000	Third year of 3 year commitment															
Napier City Council	\$110,000	Included in NCC's Long Term Plan + annual submission															
Wairoa District Council	\$4,000	Annual submission															
Attending: Yes 9.20 am																	

The Council submission process involves significant time and resources to prepare written and present oral submissions to five audiences. The time and resources would be better spent on providing the services we have been set up to provide. We acknowledge that there is an action item in the REDS to review the economic development delivery model.

BHB has also relied on in-kind sponsors and targeted financial sponsors for specific projects. Examples include:

HBRC, NCC, BNZ, Tru Test Group & exhibitors	Infant Formula Conference
HBRC, Tomoana Food Hub, Strata Consulting	Frost & Sullivan research into F&B growth opportunities
HDC & NCC	Business Connections project
Crowe Horwath	In-kind financial services
Callaghan Innovation	HPWI; BBL
BNZ, Big Save, Co-Sell, FPG, Furnware, Hawke's Bay Technologies, Hurford Parker, Langley Twigg, NEC, Napier Port, Now, NZTE, Sportsground, Window Treatments	Hawke's Bay Business Hub

BHB's financial policy is to maintain a Net Surplus as part of its risk mitigation. PWC audits BHB's accounts. The audited financial statements for FY15 are available on request. We expect the audited FY16 accounts to be available by the end of July 2016.

BHB Plan

The BHB plan is structured into 8 focus areas which are summarised below.

The plan detailed assumes that all funding requests made during the Annual Plan process are supported. If that is not the case, we will contact representatives from funders to outline our priorities.

1. Focus on Partnerships – STRENGTHEN

Desired Outcomes: As the business-led regional EDA, the Board and CEO have increased their focus on strategic-level relationships important to regional economic development; to be the go-to partner for business-led economic development initiatives in Hawke's Bay.

- Strengthen partnership and communication with regional stakeholders at Board level;
- Continue to be the go-to regional partner for central government agencies which support business growth and development.

2. Focus on REDS – PARTICIPATE/LEAD

Desired Outcomes: The economic development delivery model includes business representation at governance level; BHB appointed and resourced to be lead agency for agreed actions.

- Sustain our active support of the process to develop the Hawke’s Bay Regional Economic Development Strategy;
- Participate in the discussion to determine the best economic development delivery model for the region;
- Deliver those actions BHB is resourced to deliver.

3. Focus on Hawke’s Bay Business Hub (HBBH) – STEP UP

Desired Outcome: Growth in business engagements; provide examples of collaboration amongst members; resource operations role to improve the customer experience and financial resilience of the HBBH.

HBBH is maintained as a BHB-managed initiative. We have established a leadership team at the HBBH. We acknowledge the contribution made by individual members (refer to the Appendix 1 - 1d for examples).

BHB provides the ‘glue’ behind the scenes of the HBBH. The BHB team provides leadership and operational support. We have a goal to increase resourcing to strengthen the financial resilience and management oversight of the Hub. On confirmation of our annual plan submissions, BHB will resource this effort by appointing a Partner & Marketing Manager whose role, amongst other duties, will include:

- Increasing & managing business partnerships/sponsors;
- The management of ‘licences to occupy’;
- Establishing a system to assist with reporting;
- Increasing messaging (story telling);
- Implementing a collaborative customer-focussed planning process to support continuous improvement;
- Engaging Māori businesspeople via relationships, links to programmes and communication;
- With the support of members such as the NZTE & Callaghan Innovation funded Regional Business Partners, extending our reach into CHB, Hastings & Wairoa;

4. Focus on Productivity Improvement & Innovation - SUSTAIN

Desired Outcome: Examples of businesses which have accessed programmes that help them lift their productivity and innovation; in the long term, to see improvement in GDP per capita.

- In partnership with HDC and Callaghan Innovation we have contracted consultant Smarter Better Faster to work with 10 organisations to improve productivity through High Performance Work Initiative (HPWI) during 2016;
- BHB is arranging a Better by Lean workshop during May 2016 in conjunction with Callaghan Innovation. BHB also provides facilitation services to the Hawke’s Bay Lean Cluster;
- To work in collaboration with HBBH members to hold an Innovation-themed conference in Hawke’s Bay.

5. Focus on F&B – BUILD

Desired Outcomes: To provide growth examples of F&B businesses; to support the establishment of a supply chain for a new goat/sheep dairy & value-add processing; to identify and promote at least one new F&B opportunity based on global market assessment.

Our programme for F&B will continue to provide support:

- To F&B businesses – one on one and as a member of the cluster of agencies located at HBBH which provide support to F&B businesses;
- For the establishment of a goat/sheep dairy industry and associated processing in the region;
- To F&B prospect investors.

Late last year we undertook a research project with Frost & Sullivan to research global F&B growth opportunities, focusing on 5-6 value-add product classes which presented possibilities for Hawke's Bay. We are now talking to F&B contacts to help us identify a subset to focus our resources on. This is a market-led, greenfields development process. We are also in the very early days of exploring an exciting opportunity relating to F&B innovation.

6. Focus on Business Connectivity – FAST TRACK

Desired Outcome: Sustain competition in airlines servicing Hawke's Bay.

Once Jetstar decided to service Auckland-Hawke's Bay flights, our focus shifted from seeking competition to sustaining competition. HDC & NCC are jointly funding a one-year project through which we are implementing a range of actions such as:

- Promoting the development of the Meetings, Incentives, Conferences & Events market specifically targeting businesses;
- Researching 'landing pad' options and associated services available in Auckland to support our SMEs to connect with their customers, supply chain partners and influencers;
- Developing an online business travel hub to point businesses to services and resources.

7. Focus on Agribusiness - NEW

Desired Outcomes: To provide growth examples of agribusinesses; to identify agribusiness capability in Hawke's Bay; to support Ruataniwha Water Storage Scheme (RWSS) assuming it proceeds; to publish specific Hawke's Bay agribusiness propositions; to manage a project related to "Fieldays" 2017.

On confirmation of funding, BHB will recruit a Programme Manager Agribusiness. The Programme Manager will start out by meeting agribusinesses providing referrals for support, identifying issues & opportunities; and recording information in BHB's CRM system so we can identify agri-networks. As our local knowledge deepens, we will market targeted agribusiness opportunities in Hawke's Bay. We anticipate that if the RWSS proceeds, then the Programme Manager will participate in the CHBDC/HBRC RWSS project to maximise economic impacts. The Programme Manager will also lead a collaborative project to showcase Hawke's Bay at Fieldays 2017. We

have developed a proposal to brand our showcase 'Great Things Grow Here' and expect that there will be opportunity for companies to co-exhibit.

8. Focus on Communications STEP UP

Desired Outcomes: To increase messaging within Hawke's Bay, to people with connections to Hawke's Bay, specifically targeting businesses and investors.

In addition to supporting the Business Hub, the Partner & Marketing Manager will undertake marketing communications for both Hawke's Bay Business Hub and BHB, and:

- Develop and implement social media campaigns targeting people with links to Hawke's Bay;
- Redevelop the BHB website, publish the BHB annual report; develop business partnering proposals.

We therefore request that Central Hawke's Bay District Council:

- **Contribute \$10,000pa towards core funding of Business Hawke's Bay; and**
- **Implements a three-year funding contract;**
- **Executes a licence to occupy at Hawke's Bay Business Hub for a minimum of 2 years, ideally 4 years;**
- **Renews its subscription to Infometrics;**
- **Supports the establishment of a centrally-funded mechanism to support Business Hawke's Bay.** We are not advocating necessarily for a regional rate structure, but for a central funding structure that is supported by all five Hawke's Bay Councils. We would also like to see the funding confirmed on a three-year cycle, which we would report on annually but which would not necessitate returning to ask for funding annually.

Appendix 2 outlines BHB's funding requests being made to all Councils.

Central Hawke's Bay District Council

BHB acknowledges Council's support for the Ruataniwha Water Storage Scheme (RWSS).

Council will be aware that BHB has been particularly active in the primary and associated processing industries through our Food and Beverage Programme. BHB has been leading the initiative to establish the goat/sheep dairy industry and associated processing in Hawke's Bay, which will add value to and diversify our land-based industries as well as generate jobs throughout the whole supply chain. Council will also be aware of the support BHB has been extending

		<p>to an investor who is planning to establish significant dairy goat farming and value add processing in Waipawa (refer Appendix 3 – item 4). We find business people like talking to business people, so the positive relationships we have developed in our business networks are an advantage to the region when businesses are seeking to establish themselves here.</p> <p>Having reflected on our success with the Food & Beverage Programme, BHB is now planning the appointment of an Agribusiness Programme Manager. We anticipate a highlight of the agribusiness programme will be a collaborative project to market regional opportunities at Fieldays 2017 and with this in mind, BHB invited Paul Collits, representing CHBDC, to participate in the recent discussion with Fieldays in Hamilton. On confirmation of resourcing requests to Councils, our intention is to progress the Agribusiness Programme regardless of the outcome related to RWSS.</p> <p>The Hawke’s Bay Business Hub provides an opportunity for regional collaboration and we look forward to CHBDC joining us.</p> <p>SEE FULL SUBMISSION FOR ATTACHMENTS</p>
Notes		
Resolved	<p style="text-align: right;">Crs _____ / _____</p>	

DEMOCRACY

Page:	Grenville Christie	<p>My submission is that present council should cease and desist from making any binding decisions until such time that they learn to act in a legal, transparent and democratic manner or they are replaced by a new council that does</p> <p>Thank you for affording me this small window of opportunity to express my opinion</p>
18		
Attending:		
No		
Notes		
Resolved		
		Crs _____ / _____

LAND TRANSPORT

<p>Page: 19 - 39</p>	<p>Nick Battersby</p>	<p>Dust on Black Road, Ashley Clinton</p> <p>Over the last 25 years the volume of traffic generally and heavy truck and trailer units in particular, has increased to an extent that as a consequence the amount of dust created by these vehicle movements has become intolerable to the residents affected by this problem.</p> <p>On some days with still air conditions or near calm, the dust may rise to anything up to 100 feet and drift across the land like a fog and settle on anything encountered. It lands on roofs and eventually finds its way into house water tanks. This poses a health issue which is obviously unacceptable. Stock water troughs have a greater quantity of sludge that would normally be expected.</p> <p>If anyone is working on a road fence line or spraying with a gun and hose and a stock truck or milk tanker comes by, the dust created takes some time to dissipate and one can only hold one's breath for a limited time. Ingestion of dust to the lungs is another health problem, and this is exasperated if there are two vehicles in succession either coming or going.</p> <p>The normal practice of leaving windows open, especially bathroom windows, means dust intrusion is on a greater scale than would be experienced on a sealed road. Sometime leaving our driveways it is not uncommon for a truck to come past and a cloud of dust makes the visibility zero and to proceed on to the road is fraught with peril until the dust has cleared.</p> <p>The above was outlined to the Council's Roading Manager in September 2013 and he stated to the residents concerned that he was awaiting a price for "dustless gravel" and if suitable this would be applied.</p> <p>This was duly done in November 2013 on a stretch of road roughly 1.4 kms or so. The result was only very slightly less dust kicked up by cars but no noticeable difference by heavy vehicles. Potholes developed after a passage of time and in general the "dustless gravel" has proved to be ineffectual.</p> <p>The Member of Parliament for Tukituki was appraised of the concerns and the dust problems on Black Road in September 2013 and was updated again in Waipukurau in February 2016 and he indicated to proceed further to get the matter resolved. Section 19B and 20 of the Land Transport Management Amendment Act 2008 in part states:</p> <p>(a) (ii)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (A) Assisting economic development; (D) protecting and promoting public health (E) ensuring environmental sustainability <p>The increase of agricultural production in this local area must be reflected in the above parts of the act.</p> <p>Consequently, if two kilometres of the road was sealed where required, the problems for those residents concerned would be resolved and would also be for the general greater good for the other road users in the area.</p> <p>SEE FULL SUBMISSION FOR ATTACHMENTS</p>
<p>Attending: Yes 10.40 am</p>		

Staff Comments	Council has a policy whereby residents can seal for 200 metres in front of their property at their expense as a dust suppression mechanism. There are other numerous roads within the district that have more traffic and residents that are not sealed. The cost per kilometre of road including replacement of any culverts, stabilising of the pavement layers underneath, the application of appropriate gravels is approximately \$200,000.
Notes	
Resolved	Crs _____ / _____

PARKS AND RESERVES

<p>Pages: 40 – 41</p>	<p>Steffan Browning MP Green Party of Aotearoa New Zealand</p>	<p>This submission requests that the CHBDC phase out the use of glyphosate and similar based herbicides from its streets, playgrounds and parks.</p> <p>Glyphosate was listed by the World Health Organisation last year as a probable carcinogen, and glyphosate based herbicides have been shown to have other negative health and environmental effects, raising concern for community and worker health, and possible liability issues. Effective non-toxic alternatives to glyphosate based herbicides are increasingly being used by councils.</p> <p>Consideration of the negative effects of herbicides in the environment must be a clear part of the council's Long Term Plan, especially at a time when science validating community concerns is increasingly available. The Annual Plan process is an appropriate and quick way of ensuring urgent changes needed for improved community wellbeing.</p> <p>Tourism – Clean green 100% Pure Aotearoa New Zealand branding is an important component of the success of tourism to your region and New Zealand generally. However roadside, playground and park spraying is contrary to that image, with many tourists surprised to see what appears to be a cavalier attitude to agrichemical use here, especially in urban areas. Many countries have already severely restricted use of glyphosate based herbicides in urban areas, with some banning all uses. In fact, this April, the European Parliament called for a ban on all uses of glyphosate-based herbicides in private and public green areas, including spraying in and around public parks, playgrounds and gardens.</p> <p>Christchurch City Council also recently voted to stop the use of glyphosate based herbicides in all areas open to the public. While that doesn't go as far as many overseas jurisdictions, or ensure full community safety from the herbicide, it is an appropriate move for a local authority to take when a threat to community, worker, and environmental health is recognised.</p> <p>Continued use of glyphosate and similar based herbicides in your region, especially in urban areas, is a potential risk for the community, workers and for the tourism brand.</p> <p>Significant scientific evidence has shown that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Glyphosate affects bacteria's response to antibiotics 2. Glyphosate damages hormones and is a probable carcinogen 3. Glyphosate is often combined in weed killers with other active ingredients that are more toxic to animals and people than glyphosate by itself 4. When it enters waterways, glyphosate harms fish and other aquatic animals 5. Glyphosate negatively affects the natural behaviour of bees, causing them to forget where their hives are 6. Glyphosate leaches into groundwater 7. We don't know what a safe level of glyphosate is, as it has never been assessed by regulators at sub-lethal levels. <p>SEE FULL SUBMISSION FOR FULL DETAILS</p>
<p>Attending: No</p>		

Staff Comments	<p>Our FM contractor does use glyphosate sparingly in controlling weeds in Parks and Storm water drains etc. Where possible they weed or weed eat and spray as a last option. There is currently not a product on the market that is proven to be safer than or as effective as glyphosate in controlling weeds and grasses.</p> <p>All applicators have approved handling certificates which covers the safe use of the sprays.</p> <p>We rely on EMRA who stated in March 2016 The Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) has approved glyphosate for use in New Zealand.</p> <p>Glyphosate has also been reviewed in the European Union. In November 2015, the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) and the EU Member States finalised their reassessment of glyphosate. The EFSA assessment considered a large body of evidence with the EFSA concluding that 'glyphosate is unlikely to pose a carcinogenic hazard to humans'.</p>
Notes	
Resolved	<p style="text-align: right;">Crs _____ / _____</p>

POURERERE BEACH

Pages: 42	Pourerere Beach Improvement Assn – Noeline Lamont	<p>On behalf of the residents of Pourerere Beach we wish to thank you for your previous funding. It has allowed us to erect fencing and plant lots of suitable plants for the protection of the sand dunes.</p> <p>As this will be our 3rd year for planting, we are on the understanding that Council would fund us another \$5000. This will allow us to complete the 3 year plan.</p> <p>We will be planting down the Southern end of the beach in front of the cottages and through the camping ground as well.</p> <p>We have had lots of compliments on the plantings and fencing, which have been done, and how tidy it looks.</p>
Attending: No		
Notes		
Resolved		Crs _____ / _____

RATES

Page: 43 - 44	David Tennent	<p>I wish to submit that all sports clubs should be exempt from all general and land transport rates. There are many inconsistencies with the present policy with a number of organisations receiving not only free use of council facilities but in fact some are benefitting from direct financial assistance from the district's ratepayers. These sports clubs are an essential part of the districts makeup and more importantly provide for the exercise and wellbeing of people in our communities. With the present drive to reduce obesity, especially among the young it is essential we encourage these clubs to remain viable. I firmly believe the council has a role to play with regard to health and wellbeing of its community. In some cases it does exactly that eg the pool complex. So please be consistent and support all sporting organisations to a greater extent than at present. I applaud the low rate rises but this must be kept in perspective. I am not talking about a large amount of money within the Council budget but every little bit helps when it comes to keeping sporting clubs participation affordable. For those clubs operating on council owned land there should be rebate of the rental paid if applicable. After all it is the community that in effect owns that land and in many cases is used by the community as a whole and not just the sports club that operates on the land in question.</p>
Attending: Yes 9.30 am		
Notes		
Resolved		Crs _____ / _____

MULTI ISSUE SUBMISSIONS

Pages:	Rayewyn Hansen	Do you support the Council participating in the New Zealand Local Government Funding Agency Ltd (LGFA) scheme as a Non-Guaranteeing Authority? Yes
45		
Attending:		
No		
Notes		
		Do you support Council building an anaerobic pond at the Waipukurau Wastewater ponds? Yes
Notes		
		Hurry up and get the dam started.
Notes		
		Civic theatre needs to be updated and perhaps do what theatre in Hastings and Cinema Gold have – 2 small theatres with more comfortable seats.
Notes		
Resolved		Crs _____ / _____

Pages: 46	A Neckelson	Do you support the Council participating in the New Zealand Local Government Funding Agency Ltd (LGFA) scheme as a Non-Guaranteeing Authority?
Attending: No		No No No. The model is based on assumptions. Change the word assumption to gamble. If the facts don't fit then don't gamble with my money.
Staff comments		The assumptions are based on current requirements from the LGFA and current known differences between other funding interest rates and rates that would be available from LGFA. This varies depending on the Council's size and access to funding. This is a savings to Council and doesn't not require any capital outlay unless Council borrows money.
Notes		
		Do you support Council building an anaerobic pond at the Waipukurau Wastewater ponds? Yes. Why aren't the meat companies semi treating their waste before it enters the sewer. Common sense really!
Staff comments		"Meat companies" are partially treating their wastewater before Council receives it.
Notes		
		Anything to do with RWSS. DUMP! We already have resource consent for town water.
Notes		
		Use Infracon Ltd liquidation to retire debt.
Notes		
		NO funding difference for our roading quality – our rods are all class II or below now – be funny to go back to shingle roads.
Staff comments		Our roads are divided into 5 different classifications which are part of the ONRC and there is no intention or plan to revert any sealed roads back to gravel
Notes		

	If the rural fire service is just going to suck up more rates it's time to burn it down and get rid of any further gambles!
Staff comments	Cost of new Fire & Emergency New Zealand will be met from an increase in insurance levy as of 01 st July 2017. There has been no increase in costs for the 2016/2017 FY, and a decrease in previous years.
Notes	
Resolved	

Crs _____ / _____

Pages: 47 - 48	Rachel Coxhead	Do you support the Council participating in the New Zealand Local Government Funding Agency Ltd (LGFA) scheme as a Non-Guaranteeing Authority? I don't understand it well enough but I'm against increasing debt in general.
Attending: No		
Staff comments		This is not about increasing debt levels beyond those indicated in the LTP. This is about having access to paying a lower interest rate for the debt that is raised.
Notes		
		Do you support Council building an anaerobic pond at the Waipukurau wastewater ponds? Whatever it takes! Don't you wish you had tried the guy who wanted to set up a forest and treat it all that way....?
Staff comments		Forest option was not affordable to CHBDC ratepayers.
Notes		
		Please please can we consider a railcar-style transport for people to go CHB – Hastings? The logging trucks aren't going away any time soon.
Staff comments		This is a national issue and not much we can do other than lobby from and elected representative level to effect this change
Notes		

	Please – again – consider not cutting up sections so small in Otane – this will lead to social problems.
Notes	
	The small not on p6 “roads may be rougher than they are” rang an alarm bell with me. I moved out of my last house (Lucknow Road, Havelock North) partly because of the increased noise from passing traffic when the road surface was altered in this way. In Otane, I live with constant (24 hr) noise from the highway. It is very loud at night, with all the heavy freight. I already know that the rougher surface will greatly increase the noise level. Is there another way?
Staff comments	Whether or not the roads will become rougher is not yet determined and will fall in line with the ONRC. Should the levels of service be reduced the public will be consulted prior to any decision
Notes	
Resolved	
	Crs _____ / _____

Pages: 49	Ross Coulson	Do you support the Council participating in the New Zealand Local Government Funding Agency Ltd (LGFA) scheme as a Non-Guaranteeing Authority? No
Attending: Yes 10.20 am		
Notes		
		Do you support Council building an anaerobic pond at the Waipukurau wastewater ponds? Yes and more across the CHB
Staff comments		Waipukurau pond is overloaded. All other oxidation ponds cope well.
Notes		

	No to RWSS and the Ruataniwha Water Storage Scheme
Notes	
	More work on cleaning up our soluble pollution
Notes	
	QEC: fault line maps, information on LIM report all needs to be looked at
Notes	
Resolved	
	Crs _____ / _____

Pages: 50	John Jukes	Do you support the Council participating in the New Zealand Local Government Funding Agency Ltd (LGFA) scheme as a Non-Guaranteeing Authority? I don't know enough to support it.
Attending: No		
Notes		
		Do you support Council building an anaerobic pond at the Waipukurau wastewater ponds? Don't know enough but certainly require extension of existing treatment.
Notes		
		RWSS is a folly – both financially and ecologically. “Growth” is not always healthy!!
Notes		
Resolved		
		Crs _____ / _____

Pages: 51 – 52	Gerard Pain	Do you support the Council participating in the New Zealand Local Government Funding Agency Ltd (LGFA) scheme as a Non-Guaranteeing Authority? Yes
Attending: Yes 10.10 am		
Notes		
		Do you support Council building an anaerobic pond at the Waipukurau wastewater ponds? Yes
Notes		
		“One Network Road Classification” – of the examples given, only one was positive so I presume Council is objecting to these new classifications
Staff comments		Council expressed its concerns when the ONRC was first being discussed and did not have any success at pre-empting its implementation for the entire country
Notes		
		RWSS – I trust Council will stick to its word and consult with the community rather than ram a decision through like you have tried to do with Otane and Takapau. I further trust the residents of Otane and Takapau will be given their own individual consultations as to whether they agree with Council’s decision.
Notes		
		There was no mention of what is happening with the Civic Theatre.
Notes		
		What progress has been made with regards the gravel build up in the local rivers.
Staff comments		This is a Regional council issue and we have been having discussions with them to see where we could assist
Notes		

	What progress has been made on getting logs from southern Hawke's Bay forests onto rail.
Staff comments	This is a national issue and not much we can do other than lobby from and elected representative level to effect this change
Notes	
Resolved	
	Crs _____ / _____

Pages: 53 - 54	Dan Elderkamp	Do you support the Council participating in the New Zealand Local Government Funding Agency Ltd (LGFA) scheme as a Non-Guaranteeing Authority? Yes, subject to any significant loans for any significant project or expenditure being consulted on beforehand.
Attending: No		
Staff comments	All loans have been consulted on as part of the LTP process.	
Notes		
	Do you support Council building an anaerobic pond at the Waipukurau wastewater ponds? Yes, if it resolves the current problems.	
Notes		
	<p>Yes, I refer to the consultation document, page 5, where it states "We are also looking at taking water from the dam as part of our long term strategy around water supply for the community. The Council is currently talking with HBRIC and will consult with the community when full details of the plan to take water are known. The consultation to commit to taking water would take place prior to Council reaching a final agreement with HBRIC."</p> <p>The Council has reneged on this commitment to ratepayers by signing an agreement and committing to take 250,000 m3 water for Takapau and Otane townships. Regardless of one's position on the RWSS, this is plainly a lie, and any councillor who voted in favour of signing for the water without prior consultation is not to be trusted to keep their word. Council in effect has broken their promise, as this promise was not conditional on the quantity or value of any water taken - it clearly implied any amount of water from the dam, no matter how small or insignificant. I therefore regard this commitment as null and void, and of no effect, until such time as Council fulfils its stated promise.</p>	

Notes	
Resolved	Crs _____ / _____

Pages: 55 - 57	Kathryn Bayliss	<p>Do you support the Council participating in the New Zealand Local Government Funding Agency Ltd (LGFA) scheme as a Non-Guaranteeing Authority?</p> <p>I agree to CHBDC participating in the NZ Local Government funding Agency Scheme. But only if it does not start borrowing more money because it is cheaper to do so than before. CHBDC must still keep borrowing and expenses and rates as low as possible.</p>
Attending: No		
Staff comments	All loans have been consulted on as part of the LTP process.	
Notes		
	<p>Do you support Council building an anaerobic pond at the Waipukurau wastewater ponds?</p> <p>I agree that an Anaerobic Pond should be built and debt funded by ratepayers connected to Wastewater. CHBDC should also reconsider alternatives to discharging wastewater into the Tukituki. To many people this is abhorrent and would never be approved regardless of how well it is treated.</p> <p>CHBDC should also not allow more volumes of wastewater to enter the wastewater system until it has got the treated wastewater well within it consent conditions permanently.</p>	
Staff comments	Treated wastewater from Waipukurau is well within consent limits except for ammonia. The Board of Inquiry into Tukituki Plan change 6 set new ammonia limits in the Tukituki River, and Waipukurau wastewater is well within these new limits.	
Notes		

RWSS:

I agree that CHB District Council and councillors must consult with the CHB people prior to council reaching a final agreement with HBRIC to take water from the RWSS as started in the LTP 2015-25 and Annual Plan 2016-17 Consultation Documents.
"The Council is currently talking with HBRIC and will consult with the community when full details of the plan to take water are known. The consultation to commit to taking water would take place prior to council reaching a final agreement with HBRIC."

The fact councillors and Mayor and CEO of CHBDC knowingly broke their promise and signed an agreement for Otane and Takapau is unprincipled and unethical. Councillors and CHBDC CEO have moral duty to keep their promises made to CHB people. Council must consult before signing any more agreements with HBRIC regardless of how much water or cost is involved.

I want CHBDC to decide against any other proposal to invest ratepayer money in the RWSS or to buy more water from the RWSS. Water usage over the by Waipukurau, Waipawa, Otane and Takapau over the years 2011-2015 show it is well within the water consent limits.
On page 103 of the Long term plan 2015-2025 it states that the water consents include sufficient volume to meet the expected demand.

I am totally against the CHBDC's original proposal to have a Uniform annual charge to pay for buying water from the RWSS for our towns.
It is unfair to make people including myself who will get no benefit from the RWSS and who aren't connected to the water supplies to have to pay for it.
In the Long term plan 2015-2025 it states on page 21 that Uniform Annual Charges are used when the benefit is considered to be shared equally by all ratepayers.
This is not the case for the proposed new water rate if CHBDC buys more water from the RWSS. Some people get the water, some don't. They have their own water supplies and pay for their own water systems.
Some people might get economic benefit, other people will only get economic detriment through having to pay higher rates.
In my and many other peoples view the environmental and ecological destruction that will occur if the RWSS is built far outweighs any benefits from it.

In the Long term plan 2015-2025 on pages 160, 161,169, in The Revenue and Financing Policy it states Water Supplies will be funded by Targeted Rates and Fees and charges. So a Uniform Annual Charge should not be used for the proposed water supply from the RWSS.

When CHBDC put out the Special consultation for Central Hawke's Bay District Council Investing in the Ruataniwha Water Storage Scheme in May 2014 nothing was said about the need to buy water. I and other people suspect this as just another tactic to use rate payers money to support the RWSS.

Plan Change 6, Pol TT9 Implementing Minimum Low Flow Regime and Allocation Limits:

1. (f) (iii) Consented Takes for public water supplies.....shall have to be required to reduce their daily rate to a reasonable and justifiable amount as specified in their consents conditions.

CHBDC will not be denied water for town supplies that is a reasonable and justifiable amount in times of low water flow. Obviously CHBDC is trying to cover up that there is no need to buy water at this time and probably for not years to come.

The CHB population growth is still uncertain and there is no guarantee that people will live in the towns if the RWSS is built.

	<p>There is no guarantee the population of our towns will increase substantially and more business will start up in the towns. If the dam is built any people involved in the building could be out of jobs after it is finished, or shift to areas where there are new work. If farmers/agriculturists take on more workers they might be accommodated on their properties in the rural areas and it might be only seasonal work. Automation is being used more and will probably be increased in future so less people could be needed for jobs now and in the future.</p> <p>Processing might be done in Hasting/Napier where there is a larger workforce. Another deterrent for new businesses is the higher rates CHBDC charges compared to Napier and Hastings, especially for water rates. That is unless CHBDC intends to charge lower rates for new business setting up in CHBDC and expect domestic ratepayers to subsidise them as well as the RWSS.</p> <p>Hastings and Napier are closer to the Port of Napier and the Airport for getting supplies in and exporting finished products. It would probably be more economical for processors to set up business in Napier or Hastings districts.</p> <p>The local meat-works is in rural area and doesn't rely on town supplied water, milk supplied to Fonterra will most likely be taken away to be processed. If processors come to CHB they might get their own water needs direct from the RWSS.</p> <p>Until there is a proven necessity to source more water the CHBDC should not be committing to any more long term contracts to take water. The difficulty in getting water uptake from the RWSS proves there is no rush to sign up as the RWSS water probably won't be fully allocated for many years.</p>
Notes	
	<p>I think Central Hawke's Bay should officially become free of genetically modified organisms.</p> <p>Organic farming should be encouraged.</p> <p>We would be healthier and happier if Central Hawke's Bay was farmed organically and the earth and the environment wasn't poisoned or polluted.</p> <p>We need to make Central Hawke's Bay a clean, healthy, eco-friendly place to live and visit.</p> <p>We need to care for the environment and live sustainably if we want to help make the world a better place to live in now and for generations to come.</p> <p>Food grown here would be known for being safe and sustainable. If grown organically it could also provide more jobs on farms.</p> <p>Eco-tourism could also attract more visitors.</p>
Notes	
	Big burn offs and fires that burn or smoulder for more than a day should be banned.
Staff comments	This would require a change under the Resource Management Act as burning in the rural sector as recognised as a land management practice.
Notes	

	Rates must be kept as low as possible and only for necessities
Notes	
Resolved	
	Crs _____ / _____

Pages: 58 - 59	Sharleen Baird	Do you support the Council participating in the New Zealand Local Government Funding Agency Ltd (LGFA) scheme as a Non-Guaranteeing Authority? Yes as a borrower. My submission is that ratepayers are consulted before any monies are borrowed under this scheme.
Attending: Yes 9.10 am		
Staff comments		All loans have been consulted on as part of the LTP process.
Notes		
		Do you support Council building an anaerobic pond at the Waipukurau wastewater ponds? I support the anaerobic pond but would also like the UV treatment reinstated in the 2016-2017 plan by prioritising over other spending.
Staff comments		The wastewater is UV treated. (Probably referring to UV treatment of drinking water which is on hold until a decision is made whether water will come directly from the RWSS or from the river as at present.)
Notes		
		Economic Development – yearly report on how money spent
Notes		

	Recreation – I recommend CHBDC build an adult/sport appropriate skateboard park at Russell Park. There are individual public resources for children but not the 12 yr upward group – boredom creates problems in any community.
Notes	
	<p>My Urgent Priority Submission is that CHBDC rescind their decision to buy water from the RWSS for urban Otane and Takapau without public consultation. CHBDC documents clearly stated that Public consultation would occur before such a controversial decision was made - number of towns involved is irrelevant. It's the issue thats important.</p> <p>This is a suspension of democracy and the supposed urgency/opportunity was clearly an excuse to avoid the promised democracy and to boost the RWSS take-up figures Many ratepayers will willingly pay the \$3 extra supposed saving rather than being shut out of a decision that affects us all</p>
Notes	
Resolved	
	Crs _____ / _____

Pages:	Louise Phillips	<p>Do you support Council building an anaerobic pond at the Waipukurau wastewater ponds?</p> <p>I fully support the addition of an anaerobic pond to the current waste water treatment plant. I believe it to have several benefits, including reduced smell, improved efficiency and at a lower cost.</p>
60		
Attending:		
No		
Notes		

	<p>The buying of water from the RWSS for municipal supply.</p> <p>I do not support the buying of water from the RWSS for municipal supply for the reasons listed below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) One of the arguments put forward for the taking of water from the RWSS is that water supply to the townships is reduced during periods of summer dry due to low river flows. This argument becomes irrelevant under the consents of the RWSS that require water to be released from storage to maintain good summer flows. (2) That there is no justification for increasing costs to the ratepayers, when the current system is adequate as long as it is maintained.
Notes	
	<p>In addition to the above I believe that the recent action of the CHB district council in which they agreed to sign up water for the townships of Takapau and Otane raises serious questions about the motivations involved in the councils wish to use the RWSS for municipal supply. In your own words:</p> <p>“The consultation to commit to taking water would take place prior to council reaching a final agreement with HBRIC.”</p> <p>It was a year ago that I put a submission in on the Buying of water from the RWSS, so there has been plenty of time for public consultation to take place. It has also been well known that the date for sign up to the scheme was the 18th of April 2016, yet the agreement to sign up to water for Takapau and Otane was passed under some urgency. It would be easy to assume then that the motivation to purchase water from the RWSS is to give support to the scheme rather than to secure the best outcome for ratepayers.</p>
Notes	
Resolved	<p style="text-align: right;">Crs _____ / _____</p>

Pages: 61 - 62	Paula Fern	<p>Do you support Council building an anaerobic pond at the Waipukurau wastewater ponds?</p> <p>There is a lack of information provided in the consultation document in order to truly evaluate the effectiveness of yet another add on to a wastewater plan that, from the outset, has had failure after failure.</p>
Attending: Yes 10.30 am		<p>Has all incoming effluent into the plant been assessed and tested for at least 24 months to truly understand what is being treated and what is required to effectively meet current and future demand? Could evidence of this and its findings please be provided publicly.</p> <p>The plan that was originally adopted as a cheaper option has failed. What is the true cost of the cheaper option initially adopted and all the subsequent additions as each new "problem" of non-compliance arises? Ratepayers deserve to know, not just be given another cheaper option that may or may not solve another issue.</p> <p>Will this last at least 30 years and cope with projected growth?</p>
Staff comments		<p>The original plan has been modified from experience, and now produces complying wastewater except for ammonia levels. Ammonia will be treated much more effectively once the anaerobic pond is built. The anaerobic pond is designed to handle the present and future wastewater loadings, and will improve the operation of the total wastewater treatment plant.</p>
Notes		
		<p>In the LTP Consultation Document it is stated, "We are looking at taking water from the dam as part of our long term strategy around water supply for the community. The Council is currently talking with HBRIC and will consult with the community when the full details of the plan to take water are known. The consultation to commit to taking water would take place prior to Council reaching a final agreement with HBRIC."</p> <p>The Council having made the decision to purchase water for Otane and Takapau have breached its commitment to the community. The Councils decision to renege on its promised consultation is inexcusable, and the reasoning given untenable.</p> <p>No other options for municipal supply were proposed or given to ratepayers to assess, if indeed any change to the current supply is needed at all.</p> <p>The degree of secrecy, lack of transparency and accountability apparent in the current council is the cause for major concern for many within the community.</p> <p>I would like to speak to my submission about this and other matters.</p>
Notes		
Resolved		
		Crs _____ / _____

Pages: 63 - 64	Gwyn Burton	Do you support the Council participating in the New Zealand Local Government Funding Agency Ltd (LGFA) scheme as a Non-Guaranteeing Authority? Yes
Attending: No		
Notes		
		Do you support Council building an anaerobic pond at the Waipukurau wastewater ponds? Seems like another add on. Anything to improve the quality of discharged water into the river has to be a good thing.
Notes		
		Consultation with the public re taking water for town use has not been good. Decisions should not have been taken 'public excluded' when the issue involved was and is so important. One minute we need it, the next we don't. What is going on In the 2016-2017 Annual Plan, consultation with the community was promised before decisions to commit to taking water supplies for community use would take place. Why no consultation?
Notes		
Resolved		Crs _____ / _____

<p>Pages: 65 - 66</p> <p>Attending: Yes 9.40 am</p>	<p>Hawke's Bay District Health Board</p>	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the Central Hawke's Bay District Council's (CHBDC) Annual Plan 2016-17.</p> <p>The Hawke's Bay District Health Board (HBDHB) focuses on the health of the whole population of Hawke's Bay. In supporting health and wellbeing we aim to work collaboratively with other sectors of our community impacting on health. The activities of CHBDC overlap with those of HBDHB and we see the two organisations working together to support the wellbeing of the Central Hawke's Bay community.</p> <p>We generally support the direction of the Annual Plan and request further dialogue in respect of two aspects.</p>
<p>Notes</p>		
		<p>Do you support Council building an anaerobic pond at the Waipukurau wastewater ponds?</p> <p>1.1. We request that Council assess the impact of the proposed new anaerobic treatment pond on health risks to river users downstream of the wastewater plant discharge. We would also like to work with Council on such an assessment.</p> <p>1.2. Reason for submission We note that there have been several e.coli exceedances reported to the Hawke's Bay Regional Council since the commissioning of the new treatment plant and we believe it is important that any further investment addresses public health risks as well as environmental concerns.</p>
<p>Staff comments</p>		<p>The anaerobic pond will improve the wastewater treatment. E.coli is treated by UV in the filter process but extra overflows from the pond can increase E.coli levels to the river. The extra treatment from the anaerobic pond will reduce the levels of E.coli in the pond and thus reduce E.coli levels in any overflows. The addition of extra storage capacity will mean that more of the wastewater goes through the UV treatment.</p>
<p>Notes</p>		
		<p>2016/17 Rate Factors</p> <p>2.1. We note that in the townships of Waipukurau and Waipawa, rates appear to be increasing for owners of lower value properties and reducing for higher value properties. We recommend that Council considers implementing a rating approach that reduces the impact on families who are most likely to be adversely affected by increases in costs.</p> <p>2.2. Reason for submission Families with no or minimal disposable income may need to cut back on other expenditure such as GP visits.</p> <p>Some increase may be due to the cost of providing wastewater services. We suggest that the benefits of investment in improving wastewater treatment apply to rural ratepayers as well as those connected to the network. This is because under recent changes to the Regional Resource Management Plan failure to adequately reduce nutrient, chemical and microbial discharges from the wastewater plant could result in land use controls and on farm costs for rural ratepayers.</p>

Notes	
Resolved	Crs _____ / _____

Pages: 67	Catherine Ashby	<p>Do you support Council building an anaerobic pond at the Waipukurau wastewater ponds? Refer back to Robbie Sidwells drying bed plan!! They will meet the standards required with a wee bit of work.</p>
Attending: Yes		
Notes		
		<p>A playground for our seniors and those with varying (dis)abilities. It needs to have non static equipment. The benefits include, not exclusively, enhanced movement, muscle strength, bone density, balance and mobility. Plus its FUN.</p> <p>Napier and Hastings has such areas, why can't we?</p>
Notes		
Resolved		Crs _____ / _____

Pages: 68 - 74	Trevor Le Lievre	<p>Do you support the Council participating in the New Zealand Local Government Funding Agency Ltd (LGFA) scheme as a Non-Guaranteeing Authority?</p> <p>A: Undecided – insufficient information provided</p>
Attending: Yes 10.00 am		<p>Comment:</p> <p>The Consultation Document provides high level analysis of potential savings from entering the scheme, while the Supporting Information considers the risks associated with the four levels of participation. Additional information is available in the Statement of Proposal on the Council's web site; however, this document is not readily accessible and a search in preparation for this submission did not locate it.</p>
		<p>The Supporting Information document cites Council's obligation under the section 82 consultation provisions of the LGA, namely:</p> <p><i>Section 56 of the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA 2002) requires that before a local authority may establish or become a shareholder in a council-controlled organisation, the local authority must undertake consultation in accordance with section 82.</i></p> <p>It is considered that the information provided in the Annual Plan is insufficient to enable informed input, and accordingly falls short of the section 82 provisions. Core information required includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For comparative purposes, the rates council are borrowing at presently, and lending sources? • The reason Council has not entered the LGFA scheme previously, given the more favourable interest rates, and why it is considering the option at this time? • Council's intent – as borrowing projections are already costed in the Long Term Plan do Council envisage big-ticket borrowing items that deviate from those projections, such as to purchase Ruataniwha dam water or possibly to subsidise this scheme by investing in it, or providing associated infrastructure?
Staff comments		<p>The Statement of Proposal was included with the Supporting Information. The rates council is borrowing varies and is not always a good indication of the future rates. Loans have been consulted on as part of the LTP process and savings are based on estimated difference in margin between current commercial rates and LGFA rates</p>
Notes		

	<p>Do you support Council building an anaerobic pond at the Waipukurau wastewater ponds?</p> <p>A: No – this investment will be insufficient to provide long-term solutions to Waipukurau’s wastewater discharge shortcomings.</p> <p>Comment:</p> <p>The Council has received 2 Regional Council abatement notices to date for breach of resource consents in relation to excess ammonia levels. Regional Council sources indicate that a third abatement notice is immanent. In January 2016 it was reported that Council had applied for a variation in the plant's consent on the basis that the discharge was not having an effect on the Tuki Tuki river, and therefore varying the consent was a better option than investing in a new oxidation pond. This stance is nonsensical on two counts. Firstly, it does not explain how the consented levels were arrived at in the first instance; however, these were presumably set at levels able to be sustained by the river’s ecosystem. Secondly, it is a fallacy to argue that the discharge levels are having no effect on the river as ammonia is still a nutrient which, while possibly not having acute effects, will certainly have long-term chronic effects.</p> <p>The Council’s track record of discharges from the Waipukurau Wastewater ponds, which have been monitored and well documented since 2008, is unfortunately very poor. A changed mind-set and new political-will prioritising the health and well-being of the Tuki Tuki River, a precious taonga, is required. The proposed anaerobic pond is a short term least-cost solution and will certainly not accommodate any growth in discharge from possible population growth.</p> <p>Options for investment in a long-term and best-practice sustainable solution should be undertaken and presented to ratepayers for consideration. This type of future-proofing would be worthwhile taking a loan against to be paid for by rates amortised over several years. Current best-practice, increasingly being adopted across Australasia, is the Sequencing Batch Reactor (SBR) system. This system has a medium capital cost with commensurate discharge outcomes, comparative with other systems. For Council’s consideration please refer to attachment 1.</p> <p>SEE FULL SUBMISSION FOR ATTACHMENTS</p>
Notes	

	<p>Ruataniwha Water Storage Scheme</p> <p>Q: Do you agree that Council should take water from the dam for community water supply? A: No</p> <p>Comment</p> <p>This is nonsensical, and only makes sense if the Council's real agenda is to progress the dam by contributing to the uptake of water contracts. Otherwise, there is no apparent rationale for contracting to pay for water which is currently available at no cost under resource consents which are nowhere near fully utilised. Arguments that paying for a common good essential to sustain human and environmental life are a cost saving, on the basis of infrastructure savings, are similarly specious.</p> <p>In my 2015 written submission to the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan I commented: <i>'The Council are to be commended for committing to consult with ratepayers when full details of any plan to contract for water are known, and prior to finalising any agreement with HB Regional Council Investment Company'</i>. That commitment to ratepayers was made in the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan and more recently in the current 2016-2017 Annual Plan Consultation Document, and states:</p> <p><i>"The Council is currently talking with HBRIC and will consult with the community when the full details of the plan to take water are known. The consultation ... (will) take place prior to Council reaching a final agreement with HBRIC"</i>.</p> <p>However, at the recent extraordinary Council meeting of 14 April Council betrayed its promise in a most perfidious manner by committing to sign Water User Agreements (WUA's) to supply the townships of Takapau and Otane.</p> <p>Council's core justifications were twofold. Firstly, they maintained that their undertaking to consult referred to taking water for all of the CHB towns. Taking water for just two of the smaller towns was something different, and in cost terms an insignificant deviation from the budget. Council's earlier commitment, however, makes no mention of which towns might be supplied – it is to consult prior to <i>any</i> agreement being signed.</p> <p>Secondly, to obtain the 6 cents cu³ water discount necessitated signing up by the following Monday deadline, and was 'too good an opportunity to miss'. The discount rate has of course been on offer for several years, affording plenty of time to consult. In short, neither of these arguments bear scrutiny.</p> <p>Moreover, Council have committed an ethical breach of trust with ratepayers and in so doing assailed the cornerstone of any functioning democracy.</p> <p>In legal terms this action also breaches sections 77, 78, 80 and 81 of the LGA and in consequence has a high likelihood of attracting legal proceedings. Legal advice has been obtained that the Council decision is likely to be found ultra vires by the High Court. The Hawkes Bay Regional Council Investment Company should be put on notice by Council of this risk.</p>
Notes	

	<p>Draft User Fees and Charges</p> <p>Q: Do you agree with the proposed changes to Fees and Charges? A: No (Refuse and Greenwaste charges)</p> <p>Comment</p> <p>The Schedule of Fees and Charges is set out in the Supporting Information document; however, only shows the re-scheduled charges which does not allow a comparative analysis with current charges. While the categories of Fees and Charges are numerous, of specific interest to ratepayers due to widespread and recurrent usage are the Refuse and Greenwaste charges which have increased, albeit by small amounts.</p> <p>These charges pose a cost burden additional to rates, especially for low income earners. They are also a likely cause of the problematic and ongoing practice of dumping household refuse, green waste and offal along the Tuki Tuki river bank. In the case of both household refuse and offal this poses both environmental and health risks, and detracts from the amenity value of the Tuki Tuki river. In the case of green waste this is also an environmental hazard as it introduces invasive plant species that adversely impact on indigenous biodiversity.</p> <p>Accordingly, Council should consider making dumping of refuse and green waste free to local residents, and also make offal pits available free of charge. Both the Waipukurau and Waipawa dumps should also be open on Saturday's and Sunday's as most working residents only have these two days to visit the transfer station. If one of those days is inconvenient then both pecuniary and time costs are incurred to travel to whichever station is open. This proposal would require costing; however, costs would be offset by savings currently incurred in cleaning up the Tuki Tuki river bank, and could be considered an investment in maintaining the river's environmental and amenity values. Other means to subsidise free disposal could be considered, such as running a recycle shop at the dump which has proven very successful in other jurisdictions.</p>
Staff comments	<p>Our transfer station costs are well below the neighbouring Councils and the current rates have been in place for about 3 years.</p> <p>The green waste rate is done as a break even exercise. The current rates have been in place for about 5 years. There is no such thing as "free" dumping, as a Council we would be required to gain consent for any free dumping area. Legislatively we would have to pay ETS and waste levy charges which would require the installation of load weighing or measuring equipment.</p>
Notes	

	<p>Infracon Ltd Liquidation Comment</p> <p>In August 2014 Infracon Ltd, which Council are 34% shareholders in, was placed into liquidation due to it being in breach of banking covenants. Council as a 1/3 owner had representation on the Board and are therefore accountable to ratepayers for the loss of their asset, valued at \$3.7 million (from which a sum of \$304,000 has been recouped). The statement by Council's Chief Executive reported in October 2015 that Council 'haven't invested any money in (Infracon)' ... and therefore 'from a cash point of view (ratepayers) are no worse off than they were before' are disingenuous in the extreme. To the contrary, Infracon was an asset built up with ratepayer money (cash) over several years which has now evaporated and so certainly ratepayers are worse off.</p> <p>There has been insufficient information provided to ratepayers about how this event transpired. An independent inquiry should be initiated by Council and the full report released to the public. This would both provide lessons for the investment in, and management of, future enterprises, and provide hitherto absent transparency and accountability.</p>
Notes	
	<p>Rural Fire Authority</p> <p>Comment</p> <p>The Minister of Internal Affairs announced in November 2015 that urban and rural fire services are to be amalgamated into a unified fire service operation. Central Government have undertaken to ensure that the strengths of both these services will be retained and enhanced. Initial thoughts that this move makes good sense are confirmed by recent communication with several local volunteer fire officers, with one volunteer maintaining that: 'this is the best thing since sliced bratwurst sausage'. Clear advantages will arise from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elimination of duplication of services and costs; • Clearer fire ground responsibilities and reporting lines; and • Adequately funded and qualified central administrative bodies. <p>However, several caveats apply and more information is required, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What will become of the assets of rural fire bodies which Council have committed resources to? • Will there be redeployment of Council staff currently engaged in the running of rural fire services? • What mechanisms for monitoring and engaging with Central Government will Council employ to ensure that there is no net reduction to current levels of service?
Staff comments	<p>Council will cease to have any direct or indirect responsibility, or operational involvement as a Rural Fire Authority as of 01 July 2017. Models on transfer/sale/lease of existing rural fire assets are still to be determined by the NZ Fire Service Commission, as is the model for establishment of Regional Committees to ensure community/stakeholder involvement as prescribed in legislation and administered by the NZ Fire Service Commission.</p>

Notes	
Resolved	Crs _____ / _____

Pages: 75 – 82	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	<p>1.0 SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Overall, we congratulate the Council on providing an Annual Plan that by large, provides its community with minimal extra rating burden. For our membership, and a big part of the overall agricultural economy, substantial drops in incomes and value mean that this year is not business as usual. 2. We commend the Council on the proposed reduction in debt of \$6.8 million for 2016-17, compared to \$9.5 million forecast in the Long Term Plan. We also support the proposal by the Council to participate in the New Zealand Local Government Funding Agency LTD. We are encouraged by the indicative savings, between \$200,000 and \$400,000 over the 10 years to 2025, and recommend that if these savings are realised, Council look to further reduce debt. 3. The Draft AP proposes an overall rates increase of 2.18%, which is a decrease on the 2.38% forecast for 2016-17 in the Long Term Plan. While we are pleased to see that the level of increase is slightly less than projected, we encourage Council to keep rates increases as low as possible, especially given the current low inflation rate. 4. While the overall rates increase has decreased, we remain concerned about the actual rate increase for those in the rural zones. Of note, we see in the Funding Impact Statement, the increase in the general rate and UAGC as the sources for operational funding, while less is recovered from the targeted rate. 5. We also understand that the rates increases will not impact equally on all ratepayers as a result of the recent revaluation process carried out by QV on Council's behalf. In the provision of rating samples, the majority of rural values have increased, at rates between 2.3% and 16.8%. Aligned with our submission to the General Rate below, we encourage Council to reduce the reliance on the general rate as the primary means of recovering costs, as it is our members as rural ratepayers who will face the burden of any revaluation increases. 6. The general rate for the 2016-17 year is to be struck at 0.12 (0.118 rounded to 3.d.p) cents in the dollar of capital value. Federated Farmers recommends that to keep the reliance that Councils often have on the general rate in check, that targeted rates and fixed charges are utilised to fund specific activities instead. 7. Federated Farmers is strongly in support of rural differentials. Federated Farmers therefore recommends that 1) a boxed differential system is introduced to the general rate to moderate the major discrepancies between ratepayers, and 2) where ratepayers receive the same level of service from an activity, that funding is shifted from the general rate to a fixed charge to reflect the equal benefit received. 8. Federated Farmers congratulates the Council for the good use of targeted rates and funding these services on a user-pays basis. Federated Farmers therefore recommends that targeted rates continue to be used to fund kerbside collection, water supply and
Attending: No		

		<p>sewerage activities, and that the targeted rate for Economic Development is extended to reduce reliance on the general rate as a funding source.</p> <p>9. Federated Farmers recommends that Council make full use of the Uniform Annual Charge and raises this to the legislative maximum of 30% of the total rates income.</p> <p>10. In our submission to the Long Term Plan, Federated Farmers confirmed our support for the RWSS. We continue to support Council interest in the possibility of taking water from the scheme as part of the long term strategy around water supply for the community.</p> <p>11. We would like Council to set targets to decrease the number of unsealed roads, to ensure that those in the rural zone have the necessary infrastructure to support them, socially and economically. In addition, recently Federated Farmers submitted a letter of support for Black Road residents requesting that Council seal their road due to dust issues. We reiterate in our submission to the draft AP, that this roading asset is given priority.</p> <p>12. The draft AP provides an update on wastewater developments, specifically the proposal to build an anaerobic pond at the Waipukurau Wastewater ponds. Federated Farmers support Council in its proposal to progress with the anaerobic pond given the cost savings as well as the potential environmental benefits.</p>
Staff comments		<p>11. Council has a policy whereby residents can seal for 200 metres in front of their property at their expense as a dust suppression mechanism. There are other numerous roads within the district that have more traffic and residents that are not sealed. The cost per kilometre of road including replacement of any culverts, stabilising of the pavement layers underneath, the application of appropriate gravels is approximately \$200,000.</p>
Notes		
		<p style="text-align: center;">FULL SUBMISSION</p> <p>General comments</p> <p>13. Hawke's Bay Federated Farmers appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Central Hawkes Bay Draft Annual Plan 2016-17 (draft AP).</p> <p>14. 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 submit to Annual Plans and Long Term Plans throughout New Zealand and make constructive proposals every year to almost every Council. We also submit on central government policies that affect local government revenue and spending, with the aim of ensuring that local government have the appropriate tools to carry out their functions.</p> <p>15. Overall, we congratulate the Council on providing an Annual Plan that by large, provides its community with minimal extra rating burden. For our membership, and a big part of the overall agricultural economy, substantial drops in incomes and value mean that this year is not business as usual. We therefore appreciate Council actions to ensure that rating costs are fair and do not pass on any unnecessary burdens to its communities.</p> <p>16. Federated Farmers is underpinned by two key strategic policy objectives, one of which focusses on sustainable farming, and the other on profitable farming. We believe that the direction of the draft Plan aligns with our overarching strategy and we are in a position where we can work effectively with Council, to ensure that regulations are beneficial to our Members and the wider Central Hawke's Bay community.</p>

Notes	
	<p>Finances</p> <p>17. In our submission to the Long Term Plan, we noted that Council was looking to undertake a business as usual approach to the level of service provided over the next 10 years, and agreed that given the fiscal situation that the community and ratepayers are facing at present, this was the most sensible approach.</p> <p>18. We also made reference to the Council's Financial Strategy which recognises in particular the "<i>desire to manage future rate rises to ensure affordability</i>" and "<i>the application of the user pays principle</i>". Farmers continue to face tough financial times. Consideration of affordability of rates is therefore top priority to the Federation, as rates are one of the largest outgoings for our members. Federated Farmers also supports the user pays principle, as we believe this is consistent with Local Government Rating guidelines, in particular Section 101 (3) of the Local Government Act.</p> <p><i>S101 Financial Management</i></p> <p><i>(3) The funding needs of the local authority must be met from those sources that the local authority determines to be appropriate, following consideration of, -</i></p> <p><i>a) In relation to each activity to be funded, -</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>i. the community outcomes to which the activity primarily contributes; and</i> <i>ii. the distribution of benefits between the community as a whole, any identifiable part of the community, and individuals; and</i> <i>iii. the period in or over which those benefits are expected to occur; and</i> <i>iv. the extent to which the actions or inaction of particular individuals or a group contribute to the need to undertake the activity; and</i> <i>v. the costs and benefits, including consequences for transparency and accountability, of funding the activity distinctly from other activities; and</i> <p><i>b) the overall impact of any allocation of liability for revenue needs on the community.</i></p> <p>19. Federated Famers encourages Council to ensure that rating allocations are consistent with Local Government Act guidance. While there are some 'community good' activities which are rightly funded by all ratepayers, it is still important that each ratepayer's relative contribution for these activities is reasonable. For activities where the direct beneficiaries are identifiable, we consider that the allocation of rates should be directly related to services provided and received.</p>
Notes	

	<p>Debt</p> <p>20. We commend the Council on the proposed reduction in debt of \$6.8 million for 2016-17, compared to \$9.5 million as forecast in the Long Term Plan. In our submission to the Long Term Plan, we indicated that while the level of debt proposed was to peak at \$10.5M over the next 10 years, we understood that the majority of the debt was to fund the renewal of existing assets and provide resilience to the water and wastewater systems.</p> <p>21. Federated Farmers advocates for efficient local governments, focussed on the core responsibilities of delivering affordable public good services and infrastructures to its communities. We are therefore supportive of the proposed debt expenditure to ensure that infrastructure is maintained appropriately, and new assets are developed as required for the community. We do however encourage Council to ensure that debt is recovered proportionately from those that will benefit from the expenditure.</p> <p>22. Federated Farmers also supports the means at which the Council will spread debt for new assets, paid off over the course of their life (noting the maximum of 30 years). We agree that each generation should be accountable to pay for its fair share of new assets to ensure intergenerational equity. As mentioned earlier, Federated Farmers are strong advocates of the 'user pays principle' which this approach to debt repayments is aligned.</p> <p>23. We also support the proposal by the Council to participate in the New Zealand Local Government Funding Agency LTD. We are encouraged by the indicative savings, between \$200,000 and \$400,000 over the 10 years to 2025, and recommend that if these savings are realised, Council look to further reduce debt rather than re-directing any savings to new activities.</p>
Notes	
	<p>Rates</p> <p>24. The draft AP proposes an overall rates increase of 2.18%, which is a decrease on the 2.38% forecast for 2016-17 in the Long Term Plan. While we are pleased to see that the level of increase is slightly less than projected, we encourage Council to keep rates increases as low as possible, especially given the current low inflation rate. It is important when considering any rate increase, to remember that the income of ratepayers will in no way increase to the same extent as the proposed increases in rates.</p> <p>25. While the overall rates increase has decreased, we remain concerned about the actual rate increase for those in the rural zones. While the average total rate increase is consulted at 2.18%, there are notable variations to those in the rural zone. Of note, we see in the Funding Impact Statement, the increase in the general rate and UAGC s the sources for operational funding, while less is recovered from the targeted rate. We recommend that Council continues to seek ways in which other rating mechanisms can be used to ensure less reliance on the general rate, therefore more fairly allocating rates across the zones.</p> <p>26. We also understand that the rates increases will not impact equally on all ratepayers as a result of the recent revaluation process carried out by QV on Council's behalf. As rural rate payers already contribute substantially to rating revenue, we are therefore concerned that the Consultation Document and Supporting Information does not provide an explanation as to the effect of the revaluation process on rate increases. We do however note that in the provision of rating samples, the majority of rural values have increased, at rates between 2.3% and 16.8%. Aligned with our submission to the General Rate below, we encourage Council to reduce the reliance on the general rate as the primary means of recovering costs, as it is our members as rural ratepayers who will face the burden of any revaluation increases.</p>

Notes	
	<p>General Rate</p> <p>27. The general rate for the 2016-17 year is to be struck at 0.12 (0.118 rounded to 3.d.p) cents in the dollar of capital value. This is consistent with that forecast in the Long Term Plan.</p> <p>28. Federated Farmers recommends that to keep the reliance that Councils often have on the general rate in check, that targeted rates and fixed charges are utilised to fund specific activities instead. We are pleased to see that Central Hawke's Bay already makes good use of targeted rates for activities such as water and wastewater supply, refuse and recycling, where beneficiaries are clearly identified.</p> <p>29. Activities like district planning, or parks and reserves will be appropriate to shift to a fixed rate funding mechanism. All ratepayers receive the same benefits from the district plan providing sustainable environment management. All ratepayers have the same opportunity to visit parks and reserves, however a farmer with a high value property does not have more access to a park than a ratepayer from a small residential property. This means that ratepayers should be contributing an equal amount when they receive equal benefit. A targeted fixed rate would reflect this.</p> <p>30. Another method of reducing the discrepancy between ratepayers is to employ differentials to the general rate. Many councils around the country use differentials to ensure that ratepayers with high value properties are not paying disproportionately high rates.</p>
Notes	
	<p>Differential rating</p> <p>31. Federated Farmers is strongly in support of rural differentials. Federated Farmers supports differentials as a constructive means to achieve both transparency and equity in a funding system limited to rates and charges on property. Differentials are widely used around New Zealand to offset the impact of valuation based rating, including New Plymouth, Hastings and Palmerston North District Councils.</p> <p>32. Where Council is concerned that the effects of introducing differentials would be regressive and impact upon lower capital value properties, Federated Farmers submits that the rates remissions scheme, alongside the broader central government welfare system, remain the most robust and efficient methods of income redistribution, with the ability to target each concern on a case by case basis in a way that is not possible using the blunt property value basis afforded by rates. Council is not in a position to assess who is most able to afford its rates. Central government via tax and welfare policies retains all responsibility for income redistribution; this is not a role for councils.</p> <p>33. Federated Farmers therefore recommends that 1) a boxed differential system is introduced to the general rate to moderate the major discrepancies between ratepayers, and 2) where ratepayers receive the same level of service from an activity, that funding is shifted from the general rate to a fixed charge to reflect the equal benefit received.</p>

Notes	
	<p>Targeted rates</p> <p>34. Targeted rates are an appropriate mechanism to fund activities that provide a direct benefit to certain communities. Federated Farmers congratulates the Council for the good use of targeted rates and funding these services on a user-pays basis.</p> <p>35. Federated Farmers supports the use of targeted rates to fund kerbside recycling and refuse collection activities paid by ratepayers where these services are provided. Also supported is the excellent use of rates targeted at properties that are connected to or serviceable by reticulated water and sewerage. Farmers that do not receive these services should not be expected to pay for them.</p> <p>36. Federated Farmers is also pleased to see that Economic Development is partially funded by a fixed targeted rate on non-residential and non-rural properties. We do not consider the rating of farms to be appropriate when the activity provides a direct benefit to a different industry - tourism. Although this targeted rate only partially funds economic development, we consider that this rate targeted at commercial/industrial properties is a good step in the right direction. We encourage the Council to consider extended this targeted rate to reduce reliance on the general rate as a funding source.</p> <p>37. Federated Farmers therefore recommends that targeted rates continue to be used to fund kerbside collection, water supply and sewerage activities, and that the targeted rate for Economic Development is extended to reduce reliance on the general rate as a funding source.</p>
Notes	
	<p>Uniform Annual Charge</p> <p>38. The Uniform Annual Charge which is applied District-wide is struck at \$323.66 for 2016 -17. We note that this has increased from \$317.31 for 2015-16. We ask if this increase is because more activities are now being funded by the UAGC to reduce reliance on the general rate, or if this is attributable to overall increases to the costs of running the activities.</p> <p>39. As with our submission last year, Federated Farmers considers that many activities being funded by the general rate would be more appropriately funded by the UAGC. This allows all ratepayers to contribute equally to activities that they receive an equal benefit from. Activities like District Planning provide the same benefit to all ratepayers regardless of the value of their property, so property-value rates should not be used as a funding source.</p> <p>40. Federated Farmers recommends that Council make full use of the Uniform Annual Charge and raises this to the legislative maximum of 30% of the total rates income, and also that funding is shifted away from the capital value general rate to the Uniform Annual Charge for Community and Leadership activities, Planning and Regulatory activities and Recreation and Community Facilities in recognition that ratepayers all receive equal benefit.</p>
Notes	

	<p>District Land Transport Rate</p> <p>41. The roading rate has been proposed at 0.272 cents in the dollar. While this is consistent with the rate value in 2012, it is a dramatic reduction from the previous year, where it was charged at 0.307 cents per dollar.</p> <p>42. There is an enormous discrepancy between what farmers pay and what other ratepayers contribute to roading, for example a Takapau member farmer will pay 1,034 times more than the commercial ratepayer, and an extraordinary 2,403 times more than the Waipukurau residential ratepayer. It is important to remember that owning a million-dollar farm property does not mean that the farmer has a million dollars available in their bank account. The property is their home and their means of earning an honest living.</p>
Notes	
	<p>3.0 SPECIFIC ACTIVITIES</p> <p>Ruataniwha Water Storage Scheme (RWSS)</p> <p>43. In our submission to the Long Term Plan, Federated Farmers confirmed our supports for the RWSS. We believe that this will be a great asset to the region, and provide benefits to direct users of the scheme, as well as the wider community. We support the comments in the plan with regard to the likely outcomes of the scheme, including the predicted increase of 4% in GDP and the potential to create 2250 jobs through increased farming activity and its flow on impacts. We also believe that it will provide environmental benefits, including to the Tukituki River summer flows, ultimately delivering improved river health and an improved habitat.</p> <p>44. We continue to support Council interest in the possibility of taking water from the scheme as part of the long term strategy around water supply for the community, an option currently being progressed with the Hawkes Bay Regional Investment Company. Federated Farmers welcomes further information on this opportunity as it becomes available.</p>
Notes	
	<p>Roading</p> <p>45. Roading provides vital connections for those living in rural communities, and is an integral component of New Zealand's economic productivity. An operational road network enables primary producers to efficiently move inputs and outputs, allows farm servicing agencies to access their customers, and allows farmers to access population hubs for goods and services.</p> <p>46. Not only is roading of great importance to our members, but it also comprises a large part of the costs which our members pay through rates every year. The contributions our members make to the maintenance and development of the region's roading is a significant portion of their yearly costs, given the reliance on land value to provide the necessary capital. This reliance means that farm properties with high values will be contributing a disproportionate amount compared to a residential property. Given the amount of capital that rural rate payers provide, we would like Council to ensure that rural roads are maintained and upgraded appropriately.</p>

	<p>47. The Long Term Plan consultation document mentioned that there was still 403km of unsealed roads. As these roads are rural roads, Federated Farmers encourages Council to direct funding to these roads to ensure that those who are contributing substantially to the budget for roading, are benefiting directly. We would like Council to set targets to decrease the number of unsealed roads, to ensure that those in the rural zone have the necessary infrastructure to support them, socially and economically.</p> <p>48. In addition, recently Federated Farmers submitted a letter of support for Black Road residents requesting that Council seal their road due to dust issues. We reiterate in our submission to the draft AP, that this roading asset is given priority.</p> <p>49. Federated Farmers also notes the comments with regard to the classification of roads as a result of the 'One Network Road Classification' (ONRC) which Council will transition to in the next three years. We see that Council have developed the LTP without consideration of the impact of the ONRC and further, that once the <i>"impacts are known there will be consultation with the public on whether the charges to the levels of service are acceptable"</i>. Federated Farmers appreciates Council stating the importance of consulting with the community in the future on this issue, because as stated earlier, the roading infrastructure is of great significance to rural land owners.</p>
Staff comments	<p>46 – Council will continue to maintain the roads to the levels set now and then go to consultation if changes are indicated by the implementation of the ONRC</p> <p>47 – This is doable at a cost of \$200,000 per kilometre so would have to happen over a 30 year + period and be acceptable to NZTA or the cost would be borne entirely by the ratepayers</p> <p>48 – Council has a policy whereby residents can seal for 200 metres in front of their property at their expense as a dust suppression mechanism. There are other numerous roads within the district that have more traffic and residents that are not sealed. The cost per kilometre of road including replacement of any culverts, stabilising of the pavement layers underneath, the application of appropriate gravels is approximately \$200,000.</p>
Notes	
	<p>Water supply, Wastewater and Storm water</p> <p>50. In our submission to the Long Term Plan, we noted that over the next 30 years, Council will undertake projects in order to maintain the existing water supply assets, and in addition upgrade the systems for Waipukurau and Waipawa to meet the New Zealand Drinking Water Standards.</p> <p>51. In addition, we understood that development would focus on six public sewage collection and treatment systems across the Council region. We note that resource consents for two sites (Otane and Takapau) will be required in the next three (now two) years, and that at the time, Council were not in a position to know what developments were required. This also included consideration of new treatment facilities to be installed at two sites (Porangahau and Te Paerahi) in addition to the ongoing renewal of the other sites across the district.</p> <p>52. The Draft AP provides an update on these developments, specifically the proposal to build an anaerobic pond at the Waipukurau Wastewater ponds. The anaerobic pond has been costed at \$300,000, comparable to \$2 million if a second oxidation pond was built. Federated Farmers support Council in its proposal to progress with the anaerobic pond given the cost savings as well as the potential environmental benefits.</p>

	53. Federated Farmers also supports the approach Council will take to recover the capital for the upgrade projects relating to water supply, wastewater and storm water. We note that Council are expecting to fund these projects via a loan repaid by targeted rates. Federated Farmers believes that Targeted Rates, are a useful means of funding activities to ratepayers in identifiable locations. Use of a Targeted Rate to those who will benefit from the residential and industrial developments will ensure that those people who receive the service/utilise the activity, are proportionality cost-recovered for the services they are receiving.
Notes	
Resolved	Crs _____ / _____

Pages: 83 - 85	Tim Gilbertson	Do you support the Council participating in the New Zealand Local Government Funding Agency Ltd (LGFA) scheme as a Non-Guaranteeing Authority? Yes
Attending: Yes 9.00 am		
Notes		
		Do you support Council building an anaerobic pond at the Waipukurau wastewater ponds? Yes
Notes		
		1 reduce rates and /or improve quality of spending through shared services. LASS is a non performing embarrassment
Notes		

	2 Compliment the parks and reserves crew who do a great job
Notes	
	3 do something about global warming No one else is so it is up to local communities perhaps an electric vehicle charging station to show councils commitment Council could consider buying an EV to reduce the rates charged for vehicles
Notes	
	4 chop down the tree obscuring the clock in Waipawa
Notes	
	5 pressure HBRC and Central Government to take action on feral cats
Notes	
	6 reduce costs to ratepayers through a more efficient user friendly approach to resource consents and inspections I have recently tried to subdivide a paddock in to three sections My dealings with council have been difficult Council has been inconsistent contradictory and generally unhelpful The last straw was placing two concealed entrance signs at a place where there are two entrances which are not concealed at all while at the same time my request to have a dangerous corner on river road fixed has been ignored for twenty years . Fixing the corner would take two hours with a digger and a truck. It is mind boggling really
Staff comments	The signs were required based on available sight distance and the acceptable requirements
Notes	
	7 I am concerned about the recent goings on at council over among other things the investigation in to the building section It appears that a committee has been operating I outside standing orders and this has resulted in much discord in council ,Councillors should be an example to the community and recent events have brought council in to disrepute .personality and ego are not a good recipe for good governance
Notes	

	8 Council should be 150% supportive of the dam
Notes	
Resolved	
	Crs _____ / _____

LGFA SCHEME AND ANAEROBIC POND

Pages: 86	Kathryn Donoghue	Do you support the Council participating in the New Zealand Local Government Funding Agency Ltd (LGFA) scheme as a Non-Guaranteeing Authority? Yes
Attending: No		
Notes		
		Do you support Council building an anaerobic pond at the Waipukurau wastewater ponds? Yes
Notes		
Resolved		Crs _____ / _____

Pages: 87	Peter Cole	Do you support the Council participating in the New Zealand Local Government Funding Agency Ltd (LGFA) scheme as a Non-Guaranteeing Authority? I support the CHBDC joining the LGFA but you haven't provided sufficient information for rate payers to determine whether joining as a guaranteeing or non guaranteeing local authority is the best option. Your preferred option is based on avoiding what you acknowledge is a low financial risk but you have provided no information (such as the interest rate differential the two membership options might incur or the modelled financial benefits of both options) about the financial benefits arising from each option. The LGFA has a AA+ credit rating. The Government has the same credit rating. The likelihood of financial default and the associated calling in of the guarantees is very low. This very low level of risk suggests that the choice of option would be better determined on the basis of the benefits of each option rather than a risk of failure that is most unlikely to occur.
Attending: No		
Notes		

	<p>Do you support Council building an anaerobic pond at the Waipukurau wastewater ponds? I don't support the proposal to build an Anaerobic Pond</p> <p>The discussion of this proposal in the Consultation Document in my view doesn't meet your obligations under Part 6 of the Local Government Act.</p> <p>There is no discussion of an option to do nothing, nor the consequences of such an option. There is no mention of the HBRC consent to discharge waste water and whether this has any bearing on the need to reduce the amounts of nitrates in the discharge. Nor is there any discussion of why rate payers should fund a facility to facilitate greater levels of waste water from industry (which the document suggests is one of the reasons for the proposal). Here is what you wrote in the LTP p113 on the subject of greater levels of waste water from industry. "Industrial waste water flows have been assumed to have no significant increase although any departure from this assumption would be expected to be largely funded by Development Contributions under the Council's Development Contribution Policy". This strongly suggests that the user should fund any future enlargement of the waste water facility.</p> <p>And finally, the Mayor has denied on many occasions that there is anything fundamentally wrong with the new waste water treatment facility, most recently stating that the nitrate issue had been resolved to the satisfaction of the HBRC. Given the second paragraph in the proposal, which suggests there is still a nitrates issue, a somewhat fully discussion of the adequacies of the new facility is surely called for.</p>
Notes	
Resolved	<p style="text-align: right;">Crs _____ / _____</p>

Pages: 88 - 90	Richard Wright	Do you support the Council participating in the New Zealand Local Government Funding Agency Ltd (LGFA) scheme as a Non-Guaranteeing Authority? Yes
Attending: No		
Notes		
		Do you support Council building an anaerobic pond at the Waipukurau wastewater ponds? No, not without seeing the overall aerobic and anaerobic treatment strategy. Anaerobic releases a lot of methane and does not remove nitrogen or phosphorus which aerobic does and which threaten the Tuki Tuki. Please advise whether the planned anaerobic pond is a continuous flow or a batch (sealed) system. Batch systems are notorious for smelling and wouldn't seem flexible in light of the fluctuating load described. Continuous flow will produce useful biogas if managed well. SEE FULL SUBMISSION FOR ATTACHMENTS
Notes		
Resolved		Crs _____ / _____

Pages: 91	David Weir	Do you support the Council participating in the New Zealand Local Government Funding Agency Ltd (LGFA) scheme as a Non-Guaranteeing Authority? No
Attending: No		
Notes		
		Do you support Council building an anaerobic pond at the Waipukurau wastewater ponds? Yes
Notes		
Resolved		
		Crs _____ / _____

