

Submitters 144 – 270

ID	Name & Organisation	pg
144	Iain McGibbon.....	1
145	Jason Fleming.....	2
146	Don Whitfield.....	3
148	Andrea Storry.....	4
149	John Tomlinson.....	5
150	Rowan Kyle.....	6
152	Ian Reisima.....	7
154	Lauren Smith.....	8
156	Ken Hunt.....	9
159	Paula Ferrick.....	10
160	Isabel Morgan.....	11
161	Keith Moretta.....	12
162	Leanne Cotter-Arlidge.....	13
164	Antony Steiner.....	14
166	Angie Rawlinson.....	15
168	Kevin Clark.....	16
169	Francis Buttle.....	17
170	John Wylie.....	18
171	Evan Gould.....	19
172	Cameron McKinnon.....	20
173	Tim Claudatos.....	20
174	Berit Sinden.....	21
175	Leen Fluit.....	22
176	Scott Patchett.....	23
177	Cheryl Newman.....	24
178	Rion Roben.....	25
179	Antjedine Borchers.....	26
180	Wendy Milne.....	27
181	Liz St John.....	28
182	John Reilly.....	29
183	Debra Chalmers.....	30
184	John Frith.....	31
186	Roy Holderness.....	32
188	Charles Daugherty.....	33
189	Glenn France.....	34
190	Oliver Sutton.....	34
192	Kim Hall.....	35
193	Ross Tremain.....	36
194	Robert Bell.....	37
195	Sonia Bauerfeind.....	38
196	Greg Brown.....	39
197	Brian Taylor.....	40
198	Andrew Pattullo.....	41
200	Nick Ratcliffe.....	42
202	Grant Nicholson.....	43
204	Barry Pearson.....	44
205	Earl Hartstonge.....	45
206	Keith Symonds.....	45
207	Stephen Domino.....	46
208	Genevra Veitch.....	47

ID	Name & Organisation	pg
210	Louis Boeyen	48
211	Robin Hape, Ngati Pahauwera Development Trust	49
213	Simon Beamish, S N Beamish & Company Limited	50
214	Emma Hamilton	51
215	Jamie Jefferys	52
216	Mark Holder	53
217	Johanna Bevin	53
219	Gary Smith	54
220	Craig Ireson	55
221	Alan Flitcroft	56
222	Bettina Driscoll, 1972	56
224	Vince Labat, Paritua	57
225	Sherrill Hood	57
226	Philip Stubbs	58
227	Greg Donnison	59
228	Malcolm White	60
229	Bruce Jans	61
230	Mike Hurley	62
232	Gary Heathcote	63
234	Jon Wichers	64
235	LY Keong	64
238	Hannah Coltart, Coastal Wine Cycles	65
239	Sunny Peters, Coastguard Eastern Region	66
240	Steve Reddish	67
241	P Brough	67
242	Leil Setchell	68
243	RW Burney	68
244	Roland Matley	68
245	Rev EW Body	69
246	Anireta Leah Rarere	69
247	Sarah Cotter	70
248	Pillipa Ellis	70
249	Te Wetini Amaru-Tibble	70
250	Atarau Hamilton-Fuller	71
251	Hamish Kynoch	71
252	Ann-louise Webster	72
253	Name not given, LIFT Social Enterprise	72
255	Jarrold Harris	73
256	David Barry	74
257	Paula Yeates	74
258	Neil Pritchard	74
260	Sir Graeme Avery	75
262	Alan Mumford, Left-behind Superannuates facing our future	75
263	Sean Burns, Milk and Honey	75
265	Andrew Castles	75
266	Ian Hill, Linden Estate	75
267	Charlotte Lindsay-Sales	76
268	Wendy and Peter Murphy	76
269	Unknown	76
270	Juliet Harbutt	76

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 1 - Status Quo –

I agree that the environment is important, on my 1ha+property I have planted over 100 trees and hundreds of shrubs. There is no erosion. I am 100 metres above the Heretaunga Plains but for some unfathomable reason HBRC has classified my property as being in a flood zone (I suspect it is because I have a dry stream bed running through it about 40 metres below my house - in the heaviest of rain I have never seen more than six inches of water in the stream). I have no idea how big a flood you are expecting.

My concerns about your proposed massive rates increase are simply that I am retired - on my limited income where is the money going to come from? I have done my fair bit for the environment. My proposed general rate is increasing from \$61.04 to \$141.34 - an increase of 131.55%. My Levy from \$221.47 to \$31.02 an increase of \$89.55 (\$1.72 a week) or 40.43%. Such rate increases are frankly obscene and will no doubt be used as the basis of increases the following year.

If there are run off problems then the landowners responsible for denuding the hills of trees should be responsible for replanting them and making good the damage.

I might also add that I did not attend the Havelock North Meeting on 4 April for the sole reason that my letter informing me of the proposed increase did not arrive in time for me to do so.

Partnerships Option 1 - Status Quo -

Sustainable Homes

Option 1 - Maintain

Civil Defence

Option 1 - Retain

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 1 - Status Quo

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 2 - Reduce

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 1 - Status Quo

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 2 - Fully Fund

Partnerships Option 2 - Fully Fund

Sustainable Homes

Option 2 - Extend

Civil Defence

Option 2 - Transfer to HBRC

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 1 - Status Quo

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 1 - Hold - The funding of the tourism sector in its current form enables coherent and effective economic impact for the region. This must continue and flourish if Hawke's Bay is to compete and attract outside region revenue streams to the varied dependents. A clear and concise rates scheme which dilutes HBRC strict liability and transfers some of this expense over time could be delivered but not at the levels indicated in your preferred option. To decrease funding so drastically will see less collaboration and successful initiatives delivered - which was the case prior.

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 3 - Join as unrated guaranteeing

General Comments

Over time all organisations tend to grow in size and start serving their own entity rather than the people they were intending to serve. When developing the final plans, please: 1 Decentralise as much as possible. 2 Trust other people as much as possible. 3 Minimise paperwork forms and bureaucratic layers of management 4 Minimise and simplify rules. Where formal legal wording is required ensure that there is a plain English summary available too. 5 Allow staff to provide assistance and advice. 6 Be prepared to quickly admit your own mistakes and bear the cost incurred by them.

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 2 - Fully Fund - Past practices have led to rapid environmental degradation and we need to be more cognisant of the change of our ways to enable this land to support future generations. To rely on 'market forces' is a cop-out. Market forces per se are impersonal, amoral and generally benefit the few at the expense of the majority. This is shown by the accumulation of monopoly power in the hands of a few corporates as is currently being shown with Facebook, Amazon, supermarkets and others.

Partnerships Option 2 - Fully Fund - The status quo cannot be sustained, Loss of topsoil, wetland habitat, deforestation, over use of fertilisers all will lead to future reduced biodiversity and ultimately productivity.

Sustainable Homes

Option 2 - Extend - Anything that reduces over reliance on centralised services is beneficial and would be the better option in the event of civil emergencies or natural disasters.

Civil Defence

Option 2 - Transfer to HBRC - I support this option 2 with some reservation. Efficiency of action is needed for civil defence because generally major events will involve more than one local authority. The danger of the centralised control is that it can easily ride roughshod over the local knowledge and expertise. It can also become an entity that will feed on itself to grow over large, over bureaucratic, and over confident in its own abilities.

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 2 - Increase - Engaging with Tangata Whenua requires understanding differing world-views and adapting to ways of thinking that ultimately should generate a better understanding of the way of serving all the people of the region. Above all avoid 'political correctness' and be ready to robustly debate issues, respecting opposing views and being prepared to modify current assumptions.

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 2 - Reduce - Long term environmental wealth is better than transient wealth from tourism. While there are benefits from tourism, there are hidden costs to the environment and infrastructure. Tourism cannot be treated as a long term benefit in a rapidly changing world environment.

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 3 - Join as unrated guaranteeing - Agree.

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 2 - Fully Fund - Hawke's Bay is a fantastic place to live. We have recently moved down here from Auckland although for my husband is a very pleasant return home. If we take the "she'll be right" attitude nothing will change and we will be having the same discussion in 10 yrs time with even worse circumstances. For an extra \$60 (annual increase in rates) I'd love to have cleaner, healthier waterways and get on top of erosion (sorry for the pun).

Partnerships Option 2 - Fully Fund - Bring in the experts and let's work together. Better to do this right the first time.

Sustainable Homes

Option 2 - Extend - We need to do this so it works in conjunction with the land, water and biodiversity.

Civil Defence

Option 2 - Transfer to HBRC - Let's face it - we do live in a lovely danger zone and it's best to be prepared and fully equipped should all hell break loose.

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 1 - Status Quo - No comment.

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 2 - Reduce - Can't add anything else to your explanation of the preferred option.

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 2 - Join as non-guaranteeing - Let's see how this goes and then take it from there.

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 2 - Fully Fund - quickest way

Partnerships Option 2 - Fully Fund

Sustainable Homes

Option 2 - Extend

Civil Defence

Option 2 - Transfer to HBRC

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 2 - Increase

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 2 - Reduce

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 1 - Status Quo

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 1 - Status Quo - It is unclear what will be achieved with the additional rates increase. It appears that saving the environment is always a convenient excuse for increased taxation, yet little is actually achieved (e.g. Emission tax applied to petrol a number of years ago, but no perceptible benefit to the community delivered). Highly probable this will be same in this instance.

Partnerships Option 1 - Status Quo - Again, much could have been achieved perhaps had not the Council wasted rate payer funds on pursuing the Ruataniwha Dam. The suspension is that this is just an attempt to recover these losses.

Sustainable Homes

Option 2 - Extend - There is a clear linkage between warm homes and a raft of positive social and health outcomes.

Civil Defence

Option 2 - Transfer to HBRC - Preferable if this results in an increase in efficiency and value for money outcomes for rate payers.

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 1 - Status Quo - Do not agree with an increase in involvement by non-elected organisations. If they wish to have a say, then run for Council.

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 1 - Hold - It seems illogical to reduce funding for a sector of the economy that brings in such a large amount of revenue and employment to the Region. Any change seems to be driven again by ideology around saving the environment at the expense of a vibrant economy. Refer to the earlier comments around the doubtful quantifiable benefits of trying to "save the environment".

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 2 - Join as non-guaranteeing - Always concerned when the term "unlimited" borrowing is used, especially given the current track record of Council around the Ruataniwha Dam.

General Comments

I reluctantly agree with the thrust of FOF, and helping to sort our environment, but we need to tackle things in a financially sustainable way. eg, my rate increase will be from \$289 per year to \$363. ie, a 25% increase. Way too high. I could accept a 5 to 10% increase in the circumstances - reluctantly, but not 25%. Council need to find a way to reduce this increase.

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 2 - Fully Fund

Partnerships Option 1 - Status Quo

Sustainable Homes

Option 1 - Maintain

Civil Defence

Option 2 - Transfer to HBRC

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 1 - Status Quo

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 1 - Hold

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 3 - Join as unrated guaranteeing

General Comments

Vague, uninspiring, uncreative. You need some fresh blood in your office.

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 1 - Status Quo - I don't prefer either of these choices! Why don't you consider working along side Forest and Bird to spread your resources and utilise communities out there like zero wasters and Forest and Bird supporters. You sound like politicians just asking for money to deliver vague promises, I find it 'old thinking'. Don't ask me if I agree with an incentive to change, I've been working towards it my whole adult life.

Partnerships Option 2 - Fully Fund - Of course you need to work with farmers and landowners to initiative and monitor positive changes.

Sustainable Homes

Option 1 - Maintain - I think the grants are great but they need refining. I currently have a home on one income, we get nothing to insulate our home and yet someone who owns a rental gets help to insulate their second. Plus you have a 6.9% interest rate to help pay for insulation - so HBRC earns money from it as a finance scheme. If this is all that can be offered as is, I don't feel confident in extending it.

Civil Defence

Option 1 - Retain - I thought HBRC already had money for this?

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 1 - Status Quo - Again, lack of trust on my part.

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 1 - Hold - Are you KIDDING ME!!!! I would lose my job, as would many.

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 2 - Join as non-guaranteeing

General Comments

I find it hard to believe the Regional Council can justify 19% rates increases in this economic environment. I certainly haven't had a 19% pay increase. Very out of touch with the real world.

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 1 - Status Quo - You wasted a lot of money on the dam proposal and as such the Regional Council should take responsibility for it. This is obviously a grab at trying to make up that wasted money.

Partnerships Option 1 - Status Quo - Learn to work with the resources you have. Plan properly.

Sustainable Homes

Option 1 - Maintain - This is the responsibility of the home owner. Again not something rate payers should shoulder.

Civil Defence

Option 1 - Retain - City Councils in general run this very well. A change will just cause disruption and a reduction in services.

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 1 - Status Quo

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 2 - Reduce

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 1 - Status Quo - Whats wrong with what we have. If it isn't broken don't try to fix it.

General Comments

A review of HBRC structure should be eminent. Of the 9 members there does not seem to be a fair representation of the HB community - 1 female, cultural backgrounds etc. This needs to be liked into and perhaps the process amended so that future councils are more based on the make up of HB. We have an amazing and progressive region, with plenty of potential and options for the future. Consulting with the community is a great start - this is the first opportunity I have had to do so since returning to HB almost 3 years ago. For consultation also - a 19% increase for next year is proposed. What will be the impact in the following years? It seems a very short term solution, but aimed at long term gain which is not clear.

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 1 - Status Quo

Partnerships Option 1 - Status Quo

Sustainable Homes

Option 1 - Maintain - Individual consumers should be paying for additional sustainability options. As contact are not supportive of solar heating there is little benefit from extending the program

Civil Defence

Option 1 - Retain - For this I am unsure as the HBRC documentation does not advise what the Civil Defense think is the best option. They have done a great job so far - continue as is unless they suggest otherwise

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 1 - Status Quo - There are no specific details as to how this would be achieved. Until specifics are identified - including which partners are to be worked with - the status quo should be maintained. Similarly for strengthening cultural competence of staff - this should be driven by individuals and individuals appointed to positions within the hbrc that have made the effort to do so. Attending a workshop will not assist - this needs to be personally driven.

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 1 - Hold - Other aspects of spending should be reduced (not a refocus on the environment). This should be possible to have both as priorities, reducing spending on CD and other aspects. HBRC should identify the economic benefits from the previous spending on tourism for the region - this data has not been readily made available. Again, it does not need to be a choice b the environment and tourism - both can be catered for.

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 1 - Status Quo - The information provided is not clear as to what this actually involves. Until it is clarified then we should not be asked to vote on this.

General Comments

I would like rate payers to have available annually, a clear and detailed account of how the money has been spent and the positive environmental outcomes from this. As we are being faced with a rates rise I consider it appropriate that we should have regular information on biodiversity and environmental outcomes of money spent.

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 2 - Fully Fund - Reliance on market forces is problematic, as the market does not always 'behave' as we would wish.

Partnerships Option 2 - Fully Fund - This option would bring partnerships and working collaboratively .

Sustainable Homes

Option 2 - Extend - As you have stated in the option I have chosen.

Civil Defence

Option 2 - Transfer to HBRC - Seems the most sensible way to go.

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 2 - Increase - We must work together.

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 2 - Reduce - I consider it desirable for the Regional Council to invest more of our money in the environment.

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 2 - Join as non-guaranteeing - From your wording I summarise that you prefer option 3,so my summarise may not be correct.I do not wish to see the Regional Council taking on unlimited debt.

General Comments

Reforestation requires predator control. Deer destruction to forests in the Kawekas is destroying large sections of native beech. The deer population/control is not effective under the present partnership of giving control to a hunting organisation who have different interests/outcomes as environmental groups have. If the long term goals are for healthy forests, all predators must be controlled or limited access. If the long term investments are to maintain healthy forests, as an investor/supporter, I would want guarantees that these investments are being protected.

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 2 - Fully Fund - 1. I support the Regional Councils long term planting schemes, for a better environment, reducing CO2 emissions & climate change. 2. A better environment will result in fewer long term health problems. 3. Large scale planting, is a large investment for this region. What are the Regional council proposals to reduce pests (deer, possums, rabbits etc) 3. I will only support the regional council initiatives if this council stops/refuses to endorse any further oil exploration, fracking/injecting harmful toxic chemicals into the east coast region.

Partnerships Option 1 - Status Quo - Previous government partnerships eg. DOC & private partnerships in NZ has been ineffective, & disastrous. The long term effects of this partnership, has been a lack of support, investment & direction that have been damaging & harmful to the majority of conservation lands & waters in NZ. This project has huge potential for all NZers in the east coast, & any partnership will weaken the long term goals, directions & ownership.

Sustainable Homes

Option 2 - Extend - Cleaner environment. Healthy homes. Healthy community.

Civil Defence

Option 1 - Retain

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 2 - Increase

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 2 - Reduce

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

- Unknown & need more information

General Comments

Increase rates for farmers and those using large water consents. Water quality is the key to a healthy environment and we have slipped a long way in the health of our waterways through blase management of our most precious shared resources. Think seriously about making those who take more of a share of the natural resources pay more. They are the ones who profit the most and therefore they should pay more than they currently are. For eg, the vineyard I live on is valued at approx \$12million and pays tiny rates even though it uses water for irrigation and has the potential to have multiple income streams.

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 1 - Status Quo - Educate and penalise the polluters to modify their behaviour rather than punish those who don't pollute. We don't want to have to subsidise the polluters when we are struggling to make ends meet.

Partnerships Option 2 - Fully Fund - Im not sure if you should fully fund, but you should penalise polluters heavily and also increase rates for farmers and holders of large blocks of land who curently pay much less than those on town sections.

Sustainable Homes

Option 2 - Extend - You need to get Unison and Contact on board to force them not to penalise those who wish to make the switch to solar power. It is in the best interest of the environment to harness the suns energy and make each household more self-sufficient. Other countries offer subsidies for sustainable forms of energy such as installing solar. I know my cousin in Oahu Hawaii got large subsidies from the state for going solar and for using electric cars they get free parking. Convince the city councils to come on board with this as well and to allow the recycling of grey water.

Civil Defence

Option 1 - Retain - No, leave it as is. Its really just an idea that, if allowed to change hands, will just increase in cost but add no value to residents lives.

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 1 - Status Quo - No, I am tangata whenua and one of the more clever, proactive ones. Paying a few small minded trough feeders will not improve any of the kaitiakitanga outcomes of our region. How about I run for Council instead and be elected fairly?

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 2 - Reduce - Reduce it and get back to core business which is fixing the water crisis you allowed to happen in the first place! Tourism operators have had a fair whack at the funding and its time they stood on their reputations and funded their own body in conjunction with economic development divisions of the city councils. In all reality, tourism growth can be detrimental to the environment and needs careful scrutiny of operations.

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 2 - Join as non-guaranteeing - It's easy to borrow money, especially if you have no personal liability. No to OPTion 3 as this could be detrimental to ratepayers if poor decision making makes dodgy investment that fails to deliver.

General Comments

HBRC wasted colossal amounts of our money on the Dam project. The fact that they were able to do so without ratepayer consent is a shocking reminder of how undemocratic local government is in NZ. I hope that this process is not merely token, a necessary "consultation" step in a process of reinvention for HBRC to justify its existence and future growth

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 1 - Status Quo - HBRC has been charged with the responsibility to monitor the quality of our water for many years and we the ratepayers have funded that. What has been the result?

Partnerships Option 1 - Status Quo - See above

Sustainable Homes

Option 2 - Extend - Vital that we reduce our energy demands

Civil Defence

Option 2 - Transfer to HBRC - Only on the proviso that it does not cost ratepayers any more. I currently pay a total of \$464 to HBRC each year. Please re-assure me that the 5.2% rise (\$24) that this measure would entail would also mean that my NCC rates would reduce by the same amount

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 1 - Status Quo - Maori groups already have more sway when it comes to planning than is fair to the rest of NZ's multiracial society

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 2 - Reduce - My instinct is to reduce, given the boost that tourism has been given over the past few years. However what are the specific programmes that you propose to cut, and which do you propose to continue? I do not want any savings to be spent at HBRC's discretion on "The Environment". What does that mean? I came to HB 15 years ago and asked what the purpose of HBRC was. "Environmental protection" in general and water in particular was the most common answer. Well the track record isn't great

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 3 - Join as unrated guaranteeing - I strongly agree. Borrow from there rather than from the ratepayers, to whom you could pay a dividend. Once HBRC is paying interest on its capital (rather than receiving it free of charge from ratepayers) it will have a real incentive to make good economic decisions. This same argument applies, and doubly so, to NCC

General Comments

Land water & biodiversity are extremely important for our future . We want to promote improvements to all of these areas so we can all enjoy our beautiful region. So is Tourism and if we don't play on the same platform with tourism funding, will will drop back again and lose any market share we've picked up over the last few years. It's taken several years to lift the region to where it currently sits in the general view of New Zealanders and we are seen as a place to now visit. Everyone will suffer in the long run if we reduce this spend, and it's shortsighted to believe that status quo would remain if we don't fund to the same level. Hawkes Bay is a fantastic region to live, work and play and we need to encourage people from outside the region to come and enjoy as that's a huge part of our economy. Please don't let us go backwards!

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 2 - Fully Fund - We need to sort the waterways for the future

Partnerships Option 2 - Fully Fund - As above

Sustainable Homes

Option 1 - Maintain - I don't think additional funding should come from these rates. I'm building a house and no funding is available for people trying to start from new to build sustainably

Civil Defence

Option 1 - Retain - leave as is

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 2 - Increase - we need to work together going forward

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 1 - Hold - We've come so far with this - DON'T drop back otherwise the region will drop back, and all growth we are now enjoying will fall behind again

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 1 - Status Quo - not enough information around this

General Comments

Face the future one day at a time looking ten years into the future is just wrong . Lots of things can come up and then council have there hand out for more rates.Rates are meant to cover services etc. Im not even connected to water and sewage still you want me to pay for them (I dont think so) user pays you use it you pay.

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 1 - Status Quo - Farmers are already doing their bit. Reforesting should be undertaken by those that remove it

Partnerships Option 1 - Status Quo - already paying too much

Sustainable Homes

Option 1 - Maintain - leave as is

Civil Defence

Option 1 - Retain - if its not broken dont try to fix it. just another cost to rate payers

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 1 - Status Quo - We are all one people as far as i know so why fund one and not the other all one sided at the moment.

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 1 - Hold - Those involved in tourism industry can take care of there own promotions why should rate payers contribute its a user pay world so that's my answer

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 1 - Status Quo - Leave as is. Council have used enough of rate payers money on things that have turned to custard. Council should try to recover money of people that have given wrong info or just cheated the system

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 2 - Fully Fund

Partnerships Option 2 - Fully Fund

Sustainable Homes

Option 2 - Extend

Civil Defence

Option 2 - Transfer to HBRC

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 2 - Increase

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 1 - Hold - I've been working in tourism for nearly 40 years and can tell you that tourist numbers will fall if funding is reduced. There is strong competition for the tourist dollar which benefits the region through the multiplier effect. Certain sectors will not be effected by the proposed change (e.g. cruise ships into Napier) but events developers and principals will struggle to attract business with reduced support/funding. The idea that there is momentum in tourism is flawed. Other regions that lift or maintain their expenditure will take tourism traffic from the Bay. The Bay is an inconvenient distance from major centres of population and will need to continue to invest if numbers are to be maintained.

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 2 - Join as non-guaranteeing

General Comments

It is time councilors stopped jumping on the 'politically correct' bandwagon and always seeking 'vote catching' agendas. It is ratepayer money that is being spent and it is not supplied so that they can fund their own particular 'hobby-horse'. If you want to suddenly change past practice to now concentrate on 'our environment' then you should put this to the ratepayers by way of a referendum.

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 1 - Status Quo - This is already achieving a realistic change

Partnerships Option 1 - Status Quo - Disagree with your assumption that there will be a continuing decline

Sustainable Homes

Option 1 - Maintain - Homeowners have to take responsibility for their own homes, not expect everyone else to subsidise them.

Civil Defence

Option 1 - Retain - The Regional Council has not shown that it can do the job any better, and local control is better for local emergencies

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 1 - Status Quo - Any 'obligations' have been met by Treaty Settlements. We are 'ONE' people and no one should be given special treatment

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 1 - Hold - Everyone, including the HBRC, seems to consider that the existing funding has had a great benefit - this should therefore continue

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 1 - Status Quo - Against Council borrowing - they have proven to have no expertise in this area, and then leave it to ratepayers to 'pick up the tab'.

General Comments

The subsidised passenger transport rate is by far the biggest component of our rate assessment. I have noticed substantial increases in this rate over recent years. I also notice 40-50 seater buses travelling with few if any passengers. Smaller vehicles should be used and this subsidy should be held at the current level

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 2 - Fully Fund

Partnerships Option 2 - Fully Fund

Sustainable Homes

Option 1 - Maintain

Civil Defence

Option 1 - Retain - More detail required to ensure the ratepayer is not going to be disadvantaged. Have the various Councils agreed to this proposal?

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 1 - Status Quo - Increase in rates should not be necessary to "grow capacity". This should be something administration should get on and do without the need for an additional rate. Council is already "engaging" with Tangata Whenua in any event.

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 2 - Reduce - Any reduction should be short term only e.g.3 years

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 2 - Join as non-guaranteeing - Unlimited borrowing is not an option I favour our Council having as an option.

General Comments

Do your job properly!!!!

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 1 - Status Quo - If Council obeyed the rules as they stand the rivers would be in a far better state. When I arrived here in April 2016 you were allowing Cattle to graze in the Tuki tuki river. You were then and now not allowed to do this, by law! Yet you continued to allow this to happen! You now want to increase our rates to do what you should have been doing years ago? Why should I pay more because you can not carry out your lawful duties now?? Where I came from (Bay of Plenty) the Regional Council there used to regularly successfully Prosecute offenders that broke the laws! Not here, the Council just turned a blind eye to these lawbreakers. Now you want me to contribute to this mess by increasing my Rates! Go jump in the Lake!!!! Leigh Mckinnon. Havelock North.

Partnerships Option 1 - Status Quo - As above! cant you read!!

Sustainable Homes

Option 2 - Extend - What a stupid question!

Civil Defence

Option 1 - Retain

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 1 - Status Quo

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 1 - Hold

Submitter #173
Tim Claudatos
To be heard? No

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 1 - Status Quo - because I cannot afford any extra rates

Partnerships Option 1 - Status Quo - cant afford any extra rates. Let the people destroying the environment pay, ie. the farmers

Sustainable Homes

Option 2 - Extend - There should be more incentives from local and central govt. to fund these projects

Civil Defence

Option 2 - Transfer to HBRC - as long as no increase in rates

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 1 - Status Quo - Tangata Whenua should pay their share if not more

Hawke's Bay Tourism

- charge the benefactors extra ie the businesses

Submitter #174
Berit Sinden
To be heard? No

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 2 - Fully Fund

Partnerships Option 2 - Fully Fund

Sustainable Homes

Option 2 - Extend

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 1 - Hold

General Comments

I do not want to see one group of business people advantaged over another. There seems to be a perception from where I am sitting that you are putting the landowners ahead of everyone else. Granted they are your core business with regard to activities associated with land management, they in turn need to step up with assistance from ratepayers but not with a handout. No other business gets a handout and they should not be exempt.

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 1 - Status Quo - Landowners should be responsible for their own properties. If I live in the city I do not get any form of payment from council to build a fence. If I have to comply with the law regarding having a warm home and no fire place then the cost is on myself as the landowner. If the land owner is required to fence a riparian strip I would have no objection to a council loan funding it, but I object to a hand out of my money as a freebie.

Partnerships Option 1 - Status Quo - You already have plenty of stick to wield, but dont have the mind to do it, you are looking for money as an easy option. Everyone is a steward, dont make the mistake of putting one group above the other, primary or secondary does not count.

Sustainable Homes

Option 2 - Extend

Civil Defence

Option 2 - Transfer to HBRC

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 1 - Status Quo - It would appear that this is nothing short of empire building, for both parties.

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 1 - Hold - You want to reduce funding to tourism but give more to farmers and agriculturists, you seem to be trying to pick winners.

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 2 - Join as non-guaranteeing

General Comments

Firstly, the questions are asked in a totally biased/ one sided way, which makes sense being is a council site. It really only directs ones answer to the 'positively worded' option... The council preferred option Its Propaganda -Its a slippery slope, next year accelerate health initiatives, year after, education, economic etc etc My familys' (wife, two young children) very little disposable income is being eroded from all directions it seems..

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 1 - Status Quo - do I want positive environmental change.. yes - do I want to pay through a 19% rate rise .. no

Partnerships Option 1 - Status Quo

Sustainable Homes

Option 1 - Maintain

Civil Defence

Option 1 - Retain

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 1 - Status Quo

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 1 - Hold - In my opinion Tourism is incredibly important to Hawkes Bay Showcasing Hawkes bay gives us all a proud sense of identity, Leave tourism funding alone

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 1 - Status Quo - .not sure on this one, so.. status quo

General Comments

I do question at what stage the '\$1 per week' will become \$2, \$3, \$4 etc? The investment needed is long term so will we always need to be the source of funding? Also, does the Governments agenda around the environment support what HBRC are doing? Seems fruitless to make regional changes if nationally there is no plan to reduce emissions/logging etc

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 2 - Fully Fund - I think the situation need a stronger response hence option 2

Partnerships Option 2 - Fully Fund

Sustainable Homes

Option 1 - Maintain - I think here needs to be a different approach post 2023 that looks at building sustainable new homes - so HBRC could provide grants to new builds for example, rather than adding to potentially bad housing stock

Civil Defence

Option 2 - Transfer to HBRC - Hoping that you will see the. Other picture and respond/plan accordingly

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 2 - Increase

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 2 - Reduce - Environment should come first - will be a better place for us and tourists in the long run

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 1 - Status Quo - Don't fully understand this hence status quo

General Comments

I would like to research into the area of Algae farming as apart of the clean rivers agenda. Algae blooms are an issue with waterways, and algae farming from this could be apart of the solution. it would help to remove nutrients from the water and could help as a feed source for stock and is relatively cheap to set up. work on this has been done close to home as seen in this video. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=edfgaS01b10>

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 2 - Fully Fund - The Environment needs urgent action. i support this option however I would like to see some research into the area of Algae farming. Algae blooms are an issue with waterways do to high levels of nutrients in the water algae farming from this could be ap

Partnerships Option 2 - Fully Fund - Would like to see more on how improvements would be measured and bench marked.

Sustainable Homes

Option 1 - Maintain

Civil Defence

Option 2 - Transfer to HBRC

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 2 - Increase

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 2 - Reduce - No Data exists to show the direct relationship between spending by tourism and the work that HBT does. If such data empirically shows this then funding should hold otherwise i see no reason not to reduce.

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 2 - Join as non-guaranteeing

General Comments

- stop use of unnecessary plastics - improve recycling - using less chemical sprays to kill weeds - there are other options

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 2 - Fully Fund - I think we all need to do something for our and the next generations future now. There is no time to wait.

Partnerships Option 2 - Fully Fund - Especially farmers in NZ need to learn more about sustainability and possibly more ecological or organic farming. It is not a matter of how to keep more animals but on how to produce good meat that has a price. Nobody needs to eat meat every day. Hawkes Bay is a reasonably dry region and we need to use our water much more wisely.

Sustainable Homes

Option 2 - Extend - I would love to install solar water heating and photovoltaic as well as store domestic water if the costs were lower. I would also propose to have water meters as it would make people think more about their water usage.

Civil Defence

Option 1 - Retain - At this stage I think we can't fund everything. This for me is currently not first priority.

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 2 - Increase - There is a high Maori percentage living in Hawkes Bay and NZ being bi-cultural partnerships like working with Tangata whenua should be encouraged.

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 2 - Reduce - Hawkes Bay has done heaps in the last couple of years in this area. I think the environmental challenges are more urgent to tackle.

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 2 - Join as non-guaranteeing - I am always cautious regarding borrowing money - you have to pay it all back one day.

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 1 - Status Quo - Central Government is waking up to this problem with a number of proposed initiatives and market forces are a more sustainable form of inducement. Regulatory enforcement by local body politicians is ad hoc between areas and expensive to create, enforce and then legally defend. For people such as myself on a fixed income, which has no built in increases in it, your proposed increase when placed along side the other increases in taxation from the CHB District Council mean I will be paying twice to achieve both organisations aims which are the same. The increase last year was meant to be a "one off." I see little result from this in my district. Waipukurau is a district with many who live on a small fixed income and the affordability of your schemes is not within our limited means. An extended timeframe is one option, or cut the fat from your own budget as we have already done with ours.

Partnerships Option 1 - Status Quo - If a continued decline in the regions environment is a result of the status quo, what has your organisation been doing with our rates to this point ? A targeted use of existing funds instead of throwing more money at the issue is more in step with your responsibilities to your ratepayers. Obviously less bureaucracy and an outcome driven plan is overdue.

Sustainable Homes

Option 1 - Maintain - No regard to the affordability of these programmes seems to a recurring theme.

Civil Defence

Option 2 - Transfer to HBRC - economy of scale.

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 1 - Status Quo - Throwing more money at the issue doesnt automatically mean better. If more engagement brings greater cost then a review of the manner of engagement is required.

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 2 - Reduce - A contestible fund, transparent to all is better. putting the cost back on the businesses is a very uninspired way of doing it though. This whole issue needs more reviewing. Businesses down here in Central Hawkes Bay dont gain from tourism, but I guess you will wish to include them in your net. More analysis is needed before any policy is adopted.

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 2 - Join as non-guaranteeing - Some sound financial advice is needed here, as I understand it, being called up to pay for a larger defaulting authority is a risk with option 3. I have no desire to fund Auckland's default.

General Comments

Napier Port was gifted to the council and has provided a good stream of revenue, effectively subsidising rates.

We are strongly against the regional council selling any part of the port. Privatisation has proven no benefit to the populace when it has occurred and instead shifts net benefits to a private enterprise. It only provides a one-time benefit at sale and returns value to the private sector (example – Tauranga port). My employer is 51% government owned and the outcome of the 49% private ownership has arguably been detrimental for the regions.

Several times in the past Napier Port has proposed strategies for growth which would be detrimental to our environment here in Hawkes Bay. If the Regional Council intends to ‘walk the talk’ about its concern for environmental issues, you will remove any consideration of selling any part of the port.

If the port needs to expand, a solution would be to divert the dividends back into the port business to cater for this growth. If this means an increase in rates while the Regional Council income is not received so be it. The long term outcome once the port has invested in necessary growth would be even greater benefit for the people of Hawkes Bay. So long as ownership is retained by the council, development could be controlled in terms of environmental impact.

All of the consultation topics raised would benefit from a long term approach and this is something which needs to be communicated to ratepayers and businesses. The ‘short term gain’ approach which is adopted by most corporates simply results in great bonuses for managers and a temporarily inflated and impressive looking result.

I would like to highlight the recent ‘difficulty’ in sourcing apple pickers as a great example of where this short-term mentality is flawed. It is clear that the orchard owners are not willing to pay enough, as the labour market is not interested. The seemingly acceptable practise of relying on backpackers to set the wage is staggering. Using the excuse of not paying more in this bumper year to make up for leaner years is a classic example of a short-term attitude. Perhaps taking a look over a 20 plus year time frame (still a relatively short period of time) would be more beneficial for both orchardist and the labour market.

As mentioned in my response to an earlier topic, we would do well perhaps to adopt a more Maori way of viewing these issues in terms of 100 year plus plans: what outcome do we want for our grandchildren and great-grandchildren? This should be the focus of our regional council and then it is about re-educating the populace away from short-term thinking, instant gratification and ‘cheap rates are good’. Many households would pay even more than the suggested increase to improve our environment in the beautiful Hawkes Bay for the long term.

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 2 - Fully Fund - Evidence shows that unless people are offered an incentive to change they will keep the status quo as any change involves a degree of stress. An example to support this argument is the current situation in Auckland - gridlock on the roads - yet the population is unwilling to pay more to end up with an efficient public transport system and subsequently have had a fuel tax imposed. Legislation will take too long to have an effect.

Partnerships Option 2 - Fully Fund - In 200 years (a very short period of time compared to other countries) here in NZ we have had a dramatically negative impact on our environment. Lets stop being the ambulance at the bottom of the cliff - farmers and environmental groups must start working together. What has happened to Lake Tutira says it all. We are playing catch-up to try to undo some of the damage already done and this will require funding.

Sustainable Homes

Option 2 - Extend - Heatsmart is having an impact on health and wellbeing rates nationwide - resulting in reduced sickness and death from damp and unhealthy homes. This in turn reduces the burden on the

taxpayer of overcrowded and pressured hospitals and time spent off work due to illnesses related to living in damp homes.

Civil Defence

Option 2 - Transfer to HBRC - A streamlined approach should reduce administration costs and ensure consistency.

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 2 - Increase - Strongly agree given the lack of consultation that has occurred (some in recent times) involving Hawkes Bay landmarks. Maori have a long-term approach to problem solving which would greatly benefit the way we view our environmental concerns.

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 2 - Reduce - Agree that all opportunities to divert money into the environment should be taken. Our perceived 'clean green' environment is why tourists visit - this must be a priority.

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 3 - Join as unrated guaranteeing

Submitter #182

John Reilly

To be heard? No

General Comments

Keep within a reasonable budget. Keep any rate increase to a reasonable amount.

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 1 - Status Quo - Until a better solution is found.

Partnerships Option 1 - Status Quo - I would prefer an option 3 to partly fund.

Sustainable Homes

Option 1 - Maintain - The sustainable examples are all expensive and could be considered luxury items.

Civil Defence

Option 1 - Retain - Too expensive

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 1 - Status Quo - expensive.

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 1 - Hold - We need tourism.

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 1 - Status Quo - Option 3 seems like "Pigs in a trough"

General Comments

We should be doing more for the environment Ban the use of plastic bags or institute a cost / tax that feeds back into the council to act as incentive to reduce use Penalty payments for excess water use / wastage Penalty payments for excess electricity use unless it is from a sustainable source (eg companies that leave lights on 24 hours a day) Incentives for sustainable energy provision Increase recycling capacity - make recycling stations available for use by general public eg. Glass / tin / paper recycling on the street

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 2 - Fully Fund - We need to spend more money and allow for more resources to be used to not only protect, but also improve our natural environment. For too long we have exploited the environment. The net result is dirty rivers and dirty water as we have seen. I am fully behind any initiative to improve the environment.

Partnerships Option 2 - Fully Fund - I think we could and SHOULD be doing even more. The farms and other landowners need to accept responsibility for their actions. I think that partnerships are important. But I also think that farmers need to realise the consequences of their actions and be held accountable for these.

Sustainable Homes

Option 2 - Extend - There should be incentives for sustainable infrastructure such as solar power and electric vehicles. There should be penalties for excess use that are in addition to usual charges eg for water wastage and excess use

Civil Defence

Option 2 - Transfer to HBRC

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 2 - Increase

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 2 - Reduce

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 3 - Join as unrated guaranteeing

General Comments

windup HBRIC & use those savings to achieve some of these goals

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 1 - Status Quo - saying option 1 votes for a continual decline of the region's environment is incorrect; I have paid rates to have this issue fixed previously whereas all HBRC has done is abdicated it's environmental responsibilities & squandered ratepayers money on schemes that benefitted no-one

Partnerships Option 1 - Status Quo - HBRC staff should already be working with farmers & other landowners and prosecuting any breaches that already are occurring now. Do your jobs now, we have been paying for this for years already.

Sustainable Homes

Option 2 - Extend

Civil Defence

Option 1 - Retain - wouldn't trust you lot with added responsibilities. if you'd amalgamated councils so there is one council for the region, there wouldn't be these distinctions

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 1 - Status Quo - I already fund thru my taxes & best person gets the job, no "cultural" appointments

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 2 - Reduce - businesses are in business to make money, why should I subsidise their advertising

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 2 - Join as non-guaranteeing - I would strongly disagree with the council in becoming a "unrated guaranteeing local authority" as it could place the council in financial hardship affecting my future rates, as of which I pay enough to 2 councils now

General Comments

As long-time residents of Hawke's Bay we have watched, in dismay, the lack of a cohesive performance by subsequent Regional Councils. We have had reports of in-fighting and disagreement between factions within the Council. Disaffected workers leak information to the media. We have seen many arguments between the Regional Council and City and District Councils. We feel that many of the so-called 'projects' proposed by the Council have a fuzzy 'feel-good' approach with very little foresight as to results which impact poorly on ratepayers.

The 'Clean Air' project caused us to spend \$3500 on a new log-burner when a minor adjustment to our existing efficient fire would have cost us a fraction, but Council requirements made no provision for any sensible alternative. We have yet to hear of any effective enforcement of the regulations.

The Ruataniwha Dam project was a debacle. Commercial interest appeared to be the only driving force. Enterprises such as that need to stand on their own merits, but we did not see a stampede of investors wishing to be involved without a heavy ratepayer subsidy. Dire warnings as to river quality were ignored in the headlong rush for farmer support. Towns' ratepayers were shown the image of having to pay for their water from the scheme when they were already drawing it for a minimal charge from the local river. It was the only way that the Regional Council could guarantee sufficient demand to warrant the outlay. And now we hear that the scheme is to be abandoned and \$15-20 million development costs 'written off' with absolutely nothing to show for it. Where was the legal advice which would have warned that a land swap with DOC was a non-starter from the very beginning? The cart had been put completely before the horse!

But the Regional Council now expects us to swallow a dead rat. We have received a letter, full of grand ideals and serious warnings, asking us to accept a 19% increase in our rates to pay for a raft of 'accelerated changes', with no solid figures or proposals other than an open-ended wish list. If any District or City council suggested such an increase their tenure would be very short.

The letter dismisses this increase as 'around \$1 a week more per property'. This is patronising in the extreme. A 19% increase is what it is! The assertion completely ignores those on fixed and limited incomes. Imagine what would happen if the Government decided that, in order to implement some "worth-while" projects, it would increase taxation by 19%.

Perhaps it would concentrate the minds of councillors if they reflected on how much work could have been achieved with the \$15-20 million which has just been flushed down the drain. The list of projects in the letter just goes to show how much has been neglected or deferred over the years by the very Council which is now proposing to gouge its 'so far' compliant source of income. Remember that the next local body elections are not too far away. We are sure that there will be some very serious questions asked of candidates who have, in the past, supported this huge proposed increase in our rates.

Although a number of the proposals may be quite laudable, we suggest that councillors take a good look at an extended time frame and a reasonable rate of staged increase.

General Comments

I want to congratulate the Council on strong initiatives that will support recovery and restoration of biodiversity and the natural environment. The degradation of the natural environment and decline of biodiversity in Hawke's Bay due to historical and current land management practices are clearly evident, and they require aggressive management to ensure recovery. I support strongly the Council's preferred options because they acknowledge the problems and understand that change is required. While ratepayers will indeed pay more, any other choice would ensure continuing decline of the environment that will harm long term economic prospects for this region. Sustainable environmental management, on the other hand, is the essential foundation for strong economic future for Hawke's Bay.

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 2 - Fully Fund - The need for environmental improvement is urgent. Changes will not happen unless landowners are incentivised to help make these changes occur. In the long term, agriculture and other land based activities will not survive and prosper unless and until land management practices work to restore biodiversity and create a sustainable environment. Option 2 has my strongest support.

Partnerships Option 2 - Fully Fund - Support of landowners is critical to achieving environmental improvement. Many landowners already understand that current practices are not sustainable and that the natural environment is deteriorating. We must all work in the same direction, with farmers and other landowners helping to lead the way.

Sustainable Homes

Option 2 - Extend - Extending the HeatSmart programme is common sense. Solar hot water heating and improvements to domestic water storage and septic tank replacement will reduce the pressure on the environment and are a critical element to long term sustainability. These steps also will increase property values for all and are in the individual property owners' interests.

Civil Defence

Option 2 - Transfer to HBRC - In the event of natural disasters, we're all in it together. It makes sense to collect rates on a regional basis, because regional planning is the most effective and cost efficient way to mitigate risks and provide help in the event of natural disasters.

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 2 - Increase - Tangata whenua have a long term commitment to this region. Strong partnerships and co-governance and co-management with tangata whenua are common sense in the same way that these are with farmers and other landowners. I strongly support this initiative.

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 2 - Reduce - Tourism has been well funded in previous years, but tourism is largely a land-based enterprise and as dependent on a healthy environment as farming and many other businesses. Supporting environmental recovery and sustainability as in the Land, Water & Biodiversity initiatives will benefit tourism and is essential to their long term survival. The change proposed in option 2 thus does not harm tourism, but will provide more broadly based benefits including those that will benefit tourism.

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 3 - Join as unrated guaranteeing - The flexibility provided by Option 3 makes sense, with the additional risk balanced by the added benefits.

Submitter #189

Glenn France

To be heard? No

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 1 - Status Quo - Lets see some more detail and costings please

Partnerships Option 1 - Status Quo - What does this entail - these are very broad aspirations and we need some more specific detail which you must have to make this statement

Sustainable Homes

Option 2 - Extend - Makes sense

Civil Defence

Option 2 - Transfer to HBRC - Makes sense but please don't waste this money on even more staff and new vehicles

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 1 - Status Quo - iwi need to consider their own options and work in partnership with HBRC including funding

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 1 - Hold - Why change when it's going well - keep a very close eye on where spending is occurring and more analysis on outcomes are needed

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 2 - Join as non-guaranteeing

Submitter #190

Oliver Sutton

To be heard? No

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 2 - Fully Fund - The fully funded option is my preferred choice as it provides a real imperative for substantial improvements to our environment. Fresh water is absolutely fundamental to the Hawkes Bay economy and its people and therefore measures to safeguard its health

Partnerships Option 2 - Fully Fund - The fully funded option offers incentives for farmer buy-in and this is essential for creating a collaborative response to the environmental issues of today. Water quality, water use, and biodiversity concerns all require council and community engagement

Sustainable Homes

Option 1 - Maintain - Option 1 to maintain current funding levels without incurring more debt.

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 2 - Reduce - Tourism is a sector of the economy that is thriving and therefore should not be receiving subsidies. The sector is well enough established to now look after itself. Agree that commercial sector should pay more rates.

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 2 - Fully Fund - i dont think the current progress is going fast enough to improve our water quality and this needs to be accelerated even if i have to pay more rates to cover the cost

Partnerships Option 2 - Fully Fund

Sustainable Homes

Option 1 - Maintain

Civil Defence

Option 2 - Transfer to HBRC - i think a combined organisation is better for the region, combining resources will beter serve the people in the region so we have consistency across the region in terms of service & education, this should be funded by one organisation so the all areas are also funded consistently or according to some form of risk formula, ie coastal / urban / rural will all have different risks relating to there areas and expected support from the organisation

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 1 - Status Quo - these outfits are getting large payouts from treaty claims, we should not be funding to fix their land areas, we should be helping to educate them to look after and fix their own land as this is mostly not available to the general public to access, they have the money to do this if used wisely, i agree we need to help them with management plans but not giving them more all the time

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 2 - Reduce - we keep seeing how big the tourism industry is and it is worth multi millions of dollars, the money tourists spend goes to accomodation providors, events and tourist activities, bars & restaurants, the tourism industry should be self supporting and funded by these businesses who directly benifit from these visitors to our area, not funded by the general ratepayer who has to pay the same entry fee to these businesses as a tourist would pay, the HBRC should spend its money on its core activities not helping these businesses get richer as most of their profits go out of our area

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 3 - Join as unrated guaranteeing

General Comments

HBRC should be looking for ways to utilize current funding more effectively rather than simply looking to rate payers to fund projects especially if they are unproven.

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 1 - Status Quo - I feel that a rate increase of 13% plus a further 5% is extremely unreasonable to the rate payer. This rate is far above inflation percentages. We are on a fixed income and along with many others in the region will find this difficult to pay. Accelerating uptake and behavior change is all very well but not when the impact affects so many people in a negative manner. We disagree with the HBRC taking this course of action.

Partnerships Option 1 - Status Quo - Option one is preferred as option two is not acceptable.

Sustainable Homes

Option 1 - Maintain - Option one. People should accept responsibility for heating their own homes.

Civil Defence

Option 1 - Retain - Prefer local council management.

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 1 - Status Quo

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 1 - Hold - Working well, why change it.

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 2 - Join as non-guaranteeing - Don't want to provide guarantee for any other area.

General Comments

Am not at all interested in having my rates go up by 19%, it's already a rip off and you people think us ratepayers are just a bottomless pit of funding.

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Partnerships Option 2 - Fully Fund

Sustainable Homes

Option 1 - Maintain

Civil Defence

Option 1 - Retain

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 1 - Status Quo

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 1 - Hold

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 1 - Status Quo

General Comments

No other suggestions - I rely on your expertise to make the best decisions and also to look ahead regarding water, waste and weather implications to our environment.

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 2 - Fully Fund - It is a sad reality of life that people find changing their habits difficult especially if it is going to cost them money. Looking after our land, water and biodiversity is very important so providing incentives, giving support and making regulations are all useful ways to ensure change.

Partnerships Option 2 - Fully Fund - As for my first reasons.

Sustainable Homes

Option 2 - Extend - I like anything that is good for the environment. I would prefer to see this in the form of loans or rates rebate incentives rather than grants.

Civil Defence

Option 2 - Transfer to HBRC - I think Hawkes Bay needs to become a region in many more ways than it does at the moment. ie: stop being so parochial about being Napier and Hastings. Therefore one Civil Defence Management Group makes sense to me.

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 1 - Status Quo - Why does this need funding? It should be happening already and it appears it is. Keep Status Quo funding.

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 2 - Reduce - Totally agree that our focus should be on the environment at this time. Tourism has had its injection of cash and hopefully can now carry on happily.

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 2 - Join as non-guaranteeing - I would need to find out more about this. I do not like the sound of unlimited borrowing and higher risk. Is it not possible to try out the LGFA under Option 2, see if it proves beneficial and then change membership to Option 3 if it does prove beneficial?

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 2 - Fully Fund - Need to make a change to current behaviours and it will only get more expensive in the future.

Partnerships Option 2 - Fully Fund

Sustainable Homes

Option 2 - Extend

Civil Defence

Option 2 - Transfer to HBRC - Provided the local Council (HDC) pas on the savings and don't use this as an excuse to cover other rises.

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 1 - Status Quo - I would need to see more detail about how this would be used. Not opposed to the idea, just don't think the vague statement is enough to form an opinion.

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 2 - Reduce

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 2 - Join as non-guaranteeing

General Comments

I do not agree with such a high rate increase to cover your proposed plans. As a single income household I struggle to make my budget cover the ever demanding and quickly increasing costs of living in this region. To ask for a 19% increase in regional rates is unrealistic. My employer would laugh in my face if I was to ask for this size increase of my salary and quite frankly this increase in the first year of your proposed plan could be the first of many of this size over the next few years. You need to rethink the costs and timeliness of these proposals and the financial impact it will have to the already over burdened rate payer.

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 1 - Status Quo - I do not agree with the high rate increase to cover your proposed plans.

Partnerships Option 1 - Status Quo - I do not agree with the high rate increase to cover your proposed plans.

Sustainable Homes

Option 1 - Maintain - I do not agree with the high rate increase to cover your proposed plans.

Civil Defence

Option 2 - Transfer to HBRC

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 1 - Status Quo - I do not agree with the high rate increase to cover your proposed plans.

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 1 - Hold - We need expanded and targeted funding to continue growth in tourism, required to grow our status as a holiday destination of choice to national and international travelers.

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 2 - Join as non-guaranteeing

General Comments

I totally disagree with the council's plan to increase rates by 19% next year and will object to this at every opportunity. Council must be able to live within its means, as we all have to; surely a 5% rates increase for next year and then 3.75% thereafter would suffice and still be above the rate of inflation. I do support more environmental initiatives provided there is a genuine JV model.

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 1 - Status Quo - Poor choice of option here. I believe that there should be more of a JV between land owner and council and that council should not have to fully fund this initiative on its own. This should be done at an affordable pace, one that avoids a massive rates increase on ratepayers.

Partnerships Option 1 - Status Quo - Again another poor choice re option. Come on guys, there has to be a mid way point where partnerships can be formed and JVs formed as opposed to a fully funded model. Fully funded by ratepayers is going to be too costly and council must live within its means and understand that rate rises above the rate of inflation, no matter how small, has to come from somewhere.

Sustainable Homes

Option 1 - Maintain - Great to maintain heat smart funding. Solar hot water heating and septic tank replacement must be a cost that is borne by the homeowner that is benefitting, and not a cost that is borne by the rate payer at large. Yes let's have warm homes with insulation, but the other benefits to be paid for by the owner.

Civil Defence

Option 2 - Transfer to HBRC - It makes sense to transfer this funding to one entity, but only on the basis that there is a rates relief for that portion of funding that is not now needed from the respective city / district council.

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 1 - Status Quo - Again as in other options, there must be a model that can promote a JV as opposed to the council fully funding this initiative.

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 1 - Hold - Tourism is important to this region and should be maintained

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 3 - Join as unrated guaranteeing - For once I agree with you provided borrowing does not become extreme as is the case with the Auckland super council.

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 2 - Fully Fund - "Business as Usual" fails to deliver results in this field. However, results must be delivered for the good of the region in the long-term.

Partnerships Option 2 - Fully Fund

Sustainable Homes

Option 2 - Extend

Civil Defence

Option 2 - Transfer to HBRC

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 2 - Increase - Obligations should be met.

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 2 - Reduce - I believe that the tourism industry is now at a level where it can sustain itself at its current capacity.

General Comments

The Regional Council should concentrate on the environment for the next few years. The environment is under threat from all sorts of events/people and there doesn't appear to be enough done to sort it out. There needs to be punitive penalties for litterers/dumpers with maybe a dedicated team trying to trace such people – especially a "name and shame" regime put in place – we have to stop making excuses for these morons.

The same applies to landowners who pollute the environment – punitive penalties rather than the "wet bus ticket" fines including confiscations, asset sales to remedy the problem (rather than the council paying for said remedy), and the same "name and shame" – these people just don't care and need to be brought into the public gaze.

Regarding sanctuaries, protected areas and so on – again punitive penalties as above – for the rape of marine sanctuaries confiscations should be automatic as well as fines – in the worst cases there should be a criminal record and jail time – these people don't deserve our support – if their families suffer it's their problem not ours – I'm sick to death of excuses and liberal support for these criminals

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 2 - Fully Fund - The environment is deteriorating at an ever greater rate - time to put a rocket under it and get changes made regardless of protests - especially a change to behaviors such as dumping and riparian destruction

Partnerships Option 2 - Fully Fund - Farmers are natural caretakers of the environment (with the odd moron taking liberties - who should be hammered with punitive fines/confiscations/costs to correct and especially public notification through the media) - it makes sense for HBRC to act as a partner rather than as a dictator with proper discussion and cooperation

Sustainable Homes

Option 1 - Maintain - While I'm for assistance to fund solar and so on, it should primarily be the homeowner's responsibility to obtain these - an interest free short term loan would help certainly but the onus should be on the individual homeowner rather than the community as a whole

Civil Defence

Option 1 - Retain - Only reason is that HBRC should be concentrating on environmental concerns. Civil Defence should be a cooperative effort between all councils with maybe an overall controller independent of the bureaucrats who tend to be more speed bumps rather than helpers

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 1 - Status Quo - There should be no change - Tangata Whenua should be able to stand on their own auspices and there's no excuse for not being in full partnership with all councils. Any natural discussion should be automatic rather than a special occasion

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 2 - Reduce - Tourism should be funded by the tourism industry - no other industry is subsidised to the same extent - this is certainly a money maker for the region but it's still up to the industry to be the main player. Some input from Councils is okay but not to the extent of being the main prop for the industry

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 2 - Join as non-guaranteeing - I have strong doubts about any council undertaking guarantees - As an ex Bank Manager I have seen the destruction that guarantees can cause to individuals and businesses. I would hate to see any Council stuck with a guarantee for a poor decision that would rebound onto ratepayers.

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 1 - Status Quo - It is a huge problem and it will take many, many years to make real improvements. I prefer a slowly, slowly approach where the equilibrium position is gradually pushed towards improvement. A lot of discussion will be needed and a lot will be learnt along the way.

Partnerships Option 1 - Status Quo - This is a problem for the rural community and I don't see why someone living on a tiny urban section should fund a farmer who, by his farming practices, has created pollution of his own and general land / water.

Sustainable Homes

Option 2 - Extend - We have to invest in solar energy - water heating and electricity generation. It should be applied to everyone, homeowners and property investors. PV cell technology is now very good, battery storage is improving and will probably be viable for "off the grid" living soon. People will readily invest in a flash new car which has a life of only a few years but few will invest for the long term in solar water heating, etc.

Civil Defence

Option 2 - Transfer to HBRC - It would seem to be a sensible option.

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 1 - Status Quo - We already spend far too much time talking and not enough in "doing" and achieving results. Why is there so much family violence? Why is there so much crime?

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 2 - Reduce - I gain no benefits from tourism and I don't see why I should pay to support it through my rates bill.

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 2 - Join as non-guaranteeing - I don't think the HBRC should be exposed to a financial risk with the LGFA scheme.

Submitter #205
Earl Hartstonge
To be heard? No

General Comments

There should only be increases in line with overall cost of living - certainly NOT the increases in rates proposed

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Partnerships Option 1 - Status Quo

Sustainable Homes

Option 1 - Maintain

Civil Defence

Option 1 - Retain

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 1 - Status Quo

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 1 - Hold

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 2 - Join as non-guaranteeing

Submitter #206
Keith Symonds
To be heard? No

General Comments

I wholeheartedly support the councils plan to fix our environment - it is long overdue. This year marks 30 years since the devastation caused by Cyclone Bola - if only millions of trees had been planted after that event we would have a magnificent forest by now and would not be losing 7 million tons of soil every year.

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 2 - Fully Fund

Partnerships Option 2 - Fully Fund

Sustainable Homes

Option 2 - Extend

Civil Defence

Option 2 - Transfer to HBRC

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 2 - Increase

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 2 - Reduce - If tourism needs more funding it should come from the local city and district councils - it doesn't make sense to me for ratepayers to be paying rates to both local and regional councils which then both fund tourism. Also putting the money into improving the environment is good for tourism. Every time I cross the Clive bridge and see all the camper vans parked there I wonder what the tourists think of the "no swimming" signs.

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 3 - Join as unrated guaranteeing

General Comments

I strongly disagree on the proposed increase as our individual rate increase is 44% in one year alone! Definitely see the need for environmental clean-up and protection and if a reasonably large increase is required to "kick start" programs, so be it but our individual rate increase of 44% for one year and future increases annually is absurd! Profits from the Napier Port Authority (i.e. Hawke's Bay Regional Investment Company) should be used to fund the majority of increases required without putting the burden on the individual taxpayers. Rate Increases should not be used as an "open checkbook" by HBRC to forcibly take taxpayers money to fulfill their requirements. Yours Truly, Stephen Domino

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 2 - Fully Fund - Strongly agree that we increase rates for for Land, Water and Biodiversity Incentives!

Partnerships Option 2 - Fully Fund - Farmers and Landowners should be held accountable for protecting our Ecosystems and partnerships are a must!

Sustainable Homes

Option 1 - Maintain - Maintain current funding and individual properties should be the financial, responsibility of the property owners to upgrade or maintain their current systems.

Civil Defence

Option 1 - Retain - HBRC seems quite inefficient at their current workload at present so I agree with Option 1.

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 1 - Status Quo - Should be able to liase better with Tangata Whenua without having to increase our individual rates!

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 2 - Reduce - Agree that funding should be reduced as our rates increase should not be funding companies and corporations profits as it's their own responsibility. Profits from the Napier Port should be allocated to HB Tourism to increase any tourism development!

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 1 - Status Quo - Napier Port profits should be used instead of borrowing!

General Comments

Good luck - I hope all goes well for the initiatives.

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 2 - Fully Fund - I am very happy to support an increase in the annual rate for the areas that have been identified as critical for Hawkes Bay. I would like to ask that this money is protected and used solely on initiatives it's ear-marked for. This will be my response for all areas (except Tourism).

Partnerships Option 2 - Fully Fund - I am very happy to support an increase in the annual rate for the areas that have been identified as critical for Hawkes Bay. I would like to ask that this money is protected and used solely on initiatives it's ear-marked for. This will be my response for all areas (except Tourism).

Sustainable Homes

Option 2 - Extend - I am very happy to support an increase in the annual rate for the areas that have been identified as critical for Hawkes Bay. I would like to ask that this money is protected and used solely on initiatives it's ear-marked for. This will be my response for all areas (except Tourism).

Civil Defence

Option 2 - Transfer to HBRC – - I am very happy to support an increase in the annual rate for the areas that have been identified as critical for Hawkes Bay. I would like to ask that this money is protected and used solely on initiatives it's ear-marked for. This will be my response for all areas (except Tourism).

Working with Tāngata Whenua

I am very happy to support an increase in the annual rate for the areas that have been identified as critical for Hawkes Bay. I would like to ask that this money is protected and used solely on initiatives it's ear-marked for. This will be my response for all areas (except Tourism). As an aside, I would have appreciated a translation for Tangata Whenua. All other English headings had a Maori translation. The only Maori heading had no English one....

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 1 - Hold -To reduce the Tourism investment by so much.....is that the only way?

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 2 - Join as non-guaranteeing

General Comments

With reference to HBRC covering letter dated 28 March 2018: FACING OUR FUTURE 2018–28

To quote "Every year we lose 7 million tonnes of soil from our hills, to clog our waterways and coastline, while too many native plants and animals are threatened by pests. We need to turn this around."

HBRC then goes on to support key proposals to accelerate change– millions more trees planted.

How much of the 7 million tonnes of soil clogging waterways is directly attributed to the effects of land-clearing and earthworks for forestry planting, and subsequently forest harvesting?

How many native plants and animals are threatened by land clearing and monocultural planting of pine trees
Wilding pines are a problem not only in the South Island, but in the Kawekas and central plateau. They are a pest plant and are spreading out of control. DOC spends millions of tax payer dollars trying to eradicate wilding pines.

What species of the millions of trees are HBRC proposing or encouraging to plant?

It seems ironic that on the one hand HBRC has promoted the planting of exotic problem trees (subsidised by tax and ratepayers), then wants to clean up the negative effects, also at tax and ratepayer expense.

This is not sustainable; the cost to the tax and ratepayer will go up exponentially.

If you are serious about facing the future, is mass planting of exotic tree species really appropriate environmentally and financially?

The alternative is to return land to native species (plant and animal) in an affordable way (natural regeneration) with a focus on wilding pine eradication funded by forest owners.

On the front page you state "unsustainable practices", "silt from forest harvesting", "we have cleared our land of trees" and "our plan is to increase rates".

The LGFA appears to be funding for reforestation.

If it is for pine trees, Why?

Mass planting of exotic monoculture species has proven to be unsustainable. Silt and log slash from harvesting causes all sorts of environmental damage and is continuously in the media.

Other negative effects: yellow pollen dust, stuffed roads, highest industry fatalities, community decline, corporate welfare, polluted log yards, pest invasion, clogged waterways, loss of arable farms, loss of regenerating native species, logging trucks, etc.

The areas in NZ where forestry is prevalent are now also the poorest. What happened to the promises of riches and high employment?

Please do not encourage more pine plantations. After harvest, once again, the good old ratepayer is left with cost of the cleanup and the raft of negative environmental and social effects.

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 2 - Fully Fund - On the front page you state "unsustainable practices", "silt from forest harvesting", "we have cleared our land of trees" and "our plan is to increase rates". Agree with riparian fencing, maintaining planted areas, etc. Do not agree with extensive exotic monoculture planting.

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 1 - Hold - All well and good increasing tourism numbers but who pays infrastructural development to meet needs of tourism when it happens. Good old residential ratepayer, again! How about getting beneficiaries of tourism to pay, namely, tourist operators/providers. Not residential property owners.

General Comments

Take greater cognizance of Maori aspirations and the plans of iwi in the development of the region.

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 2 - Fully Fund - Regulatory measures are a driver for change, but the preferred catalyst and driver is ownership of the change and identifying the value of the change as a part of the market forces itself. Regulatory change must be matched by educational best practice, support and investment otherwise compliance costs will increase with regulatory pressure and the desired result will not be achieved. Demonstrate the value of the changes and the investment, including involvement by Maori and Iwi in the regional development plans. Iwi unlike other ethnic groups have no where else to go, even though they may relocate to other areas their land resources and connections remain.

Partnerships Option 2 - Fully Fund - Industry must take account of the full cost of their business. The quick fix options must be considered alongside the wider opportunities and costs for maintaining the environment.

Sustainable Homes

Option 2 - Extend - Education and investment not regulation.

Civil Defence

Option 2 - Transfer to HBRC - Only if the HBRC do a better job which should be expanded. Centralising civil defence makes sense but if HBRC can't do what they are doing now, what makes them think they can do any better. Better coordination in the communities and resourcing for those emergency centres.

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 2 - Increase - Tangata whenua have mana over the area and they should be involved in the decision making. Good advice comes at a cost and for too long Maori values and views have deemed to carry little value when in fact matauranga Maori has a spiritual and scientific reality. the costs for engagement are the costs and HBRC should make adequate provision for those costs.

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 1 - Hold - Tourism bring foreign investment, is the boom industry that if managed can provide good economic return. the investment should be in Maori tourism as the wine growing/ drinking culture , art deco architecture has limited appeal. Providing unique cultural and indigenous experiences should be fostered and invested not reduced. Support for new tourism initiatives and investment in Maori initiatives should be considered alongside the environmental protection investment because they are an inherent part of the tourism potential and appeal to come to the region. Language, culture, scenic areas, sites of cultural significance and history, pre and post settlement add to the appeal of the region.

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 3 - Join as unrated guaranteeing - The rates of investment and business cases are the driver for this option.

General Comments

I think it is a good idea to sell down some interest in the Port. HBRC has too much invested in one asset which carries too much risk.. natural disasters , capital requirements etc

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 2 - Fully Fund - Only some will buy in to change. To effect real change via mind and behaviour we need to all contribute and team together

Partnerships Option 2 - Fully Fund

Sustainable Homes

Option 2 - Extend

Civil Defence

Option 2 - Transfer to HBRC

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 1 - Status Quo - I find this hard to support. I don't believe it needs more funding. A new strategy maybe because we do need to engage more but smart change not more money thrown at it

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 2 - Reduce - HBRC is about land, water and air... NOT tourism. Hand it onto Hastings and Napier

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 2 - Join as non-guaranteeing

General Comments

Please consider everyone - not just the wealthy people who an extra dollar a week wouldn't be noticed. You are asking for 19%!! Shall I say it again, 19% ... Be wise, please.

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives - You have missed the crucial option. Instead of increasing the taxes yet again for all parties - many of us whom are living pay check to pay check, you should be looking more critically as to why and how we are in the situation we are in. Tax the farmers possibly (who will almost always post a loss so they don't pay taxes - and have done for a very long time (and yes, I do know this for a fact)). Get people out planting trees - we have plenty of able bodied people who could help out (currently unemployed). Do actual analysis on how and why this has happened. I find it amazing that only about 2.2% is actual increase to maintain with inflation, and I understand the 5.5% (or thereabouts) for civil defence (hold on - isn't this voluntarily run!). And I am actually a massive advocate of restoring all of those things - but tax the people who have caused it. Many of us can't afford yet more tax.

Partnerships - See above. Your limited options are astounding and are smelling somewhat of propaganda. You are all very smart people in elected positions. You can do better than this. Please.

Sustainable Homes

Again - there is simply not enough info here. How many people would benefit. I think the healthy homes initiative has made a significant difference on the health and well-being of our vulnerable children and elderly - but all of us, and indeed our environment would benefit from affordable sustainable energy.

Civil Defence

Option 2 - Transfer to HBRC - Finally - something very sensible.

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 1 - Status Quo - We should probably increase working in partnership and introducing co-design across the council (and then the proposals may be more palatable), not just with Maori, (which needs to happen) but to a wider group, including Pacifica, European and Asian

Hawke's Bay Tourism

- This is tricky. Tourism is pretty much our bread winner. But taxing those who benefit most would be helpful - but ultimately we all do benefit. Would need more information to be able to make an informed choice on this

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

- WHAT!! Really!! Borrowing from a non guaranteed or unrated scheme is absolutely ludicrous. This is public money. Come on - be responsible with our money. In fact - ideally don't get into debt as any good business should operate...

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 1 - Status Quo - Expenses continue to rise while payrates remain the same. We already pay huge amounts in tax and rates, and these taxes and rates are supposed to cover things like this so why should the council propose a further 19% for rate payers. Perhaps look at council spending reductions instead.

Partnerships Option 1 - Status Quo - Expenses continue to rise while payrates remain the same. We already pay huge amounts in tax and rates, and these taxes and rates are supposed to cover things like this so why should the council propose a further 19% for rate payers. Perhaps look at council spending reductions instead.

Sustainable Homes

Option 2 - Extend

Civil Defence

Option 2 - Transfer to HBRC

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 1 - Status Quo

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 1 - Hold - Tourism brings foreign money into the region. The regions economy is booming, why reduce. Increase.

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 2 - Join as non-guaranteeing

Submitter #216
Mark Holder
To be heard? No

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 2 - Fully Fund

Partnerships Option 2 - Fully Fund

Sustainable Homes

Option 1 - Maintain

Civil Defence

Option 2 - Transfer to HBRC

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 1 - Status Quo

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 2 - Reduce - A focus on the core business of the HBRC is preferred to getting involved in tourism. Tourism is a focus for the district councils concerned and if they want to spend money in their areas they can collect rates accordingly.

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 1 - Status Quo

Submitter #217
Johanna Bevin
To be heard? No

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 2 - Fully Fund

Partnerships Option 2 - Fully Fund

Sustainable Homes

Option 1 - Maintain

Civil Defence

Option 2 - Transfer to HBRC

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 1 - Status Quo

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 2 - Reduce - Concentrate on the core business which the council is expected to do . District councils can fund and promote their own areas if ratepayers want to spend money that way.

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 1 - Status Quo

General Comments

The consultation topics are diverse. Suggest HBRC focuses on environment issues and let the councils carry on with the good work in civil defence. Environmental management should be funded by those who are making greatest use of the regions environmental resources. Wasteful extraction of water by bottling plants should be discontinued as soon as practical. Tax the individuals and organisations who are polluting our rivers, streams, lakes and estuaries. Individuals and employers are facing significant increases from Central Government in the form of a petrol tax and minimum wages. We don't need anymore taxes.

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 1 - Status Quo - I do not support an increase in rates to fund environmental problems. An increase to rates is a blunt instrument. Tax the polluters who are impairing our environment. HBRC has provided water rights to bottling plants in the Hawke's Bay. A general rates increase is inconsistent with your strategy that favours mining of our scarce water resource.

Partnerships Option 1 - Status Quo - There is no evidence that these partnerships will be successful. Likely to be a poor use of ratepayers funds.

Sustainable Homes

Option 1 - Maintain - Current programme is adequate. Our home is insulated based on existing existing programme. New builds are sufficiently insulated to comply with building code. 2023 is sufficient time for households to get sorted.

Civil Defence

Option 1 - Retain - The City Council does an excellent job of Civil Defence. Keep the status quo where the experience resides. Don't try to fix what isn't broken

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 1 - Status Quo - There is adequate funding amongst Maori pseudo organisations and Iwi. Use these funds. If staff aren't culturally competent now then you need to review how your current funding is utilised.

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 2 - Reduce - Tourism has provided substantial benefits to our region. This strategy has been successful and is now time to pair back.

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 3 - Join as unrated guaranteeing - Will require excellent financial management and prudence.

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 2 - Fully Fund - I agree that this must be fast tracked

Partnerships Option 2 - Fully Fund

Sustainable Homes

Option 2 - Extend

Civil Defence

- Unsure

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 2 - Increase

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 1 - Hold - There has been significant growth in tourism related infrastructure and coordination thanks to the leadership shown by HBRC. I believe these gains would easily be lost if there was to be a reduction in funding. Further, i believe that the two metropolitan HB authorities, along with HBRC should contribute to a centralised event fund which is administered by HB Tourism. At present only 3-4 events are co-funded by all three agencies. NCC and HDC largely compete against each other in event development. This is contrary to the ethos of cooperation exemplified by HBT, who work across TA boundaries. If the \$500,000 or so NCC and HDC each spend on discretionary events per year was pooled and coordinated this would rival any similar TA's spending on event funding and HB would start to compete against Rotorua, Taupo and New Plymouth. HBRC could use the funding of this concept as leverage to maintain status quo for HBT. What i mean is: NCC and HDC agree to pool their event funding for the combined benefit of Hawke's Bay if HBRC maintains status quo funding for HBT. This fund could be centrally administered by HBT and would allow the year by year scramble for funds which HBT undertakes from each Council to cease which could reduce their administration and accountability reporting to each Council, increasing their efficiency in delivery. It may also allow a very small reduction in funding from HBRC to HBT to reflect this. I would be happy to speak to this point or to elaborate if required.

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

- Unsure

Submitter #221

Alan Flitcroft

To be heard? No

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 1 - Status Quo - As a nation the PAYE taxpayer is flogged to death. We provide, in Taxes & Gst \$60 billion of the \$70 billion total tax take. Sadly, I support nothing that puts more money effectively to the tax take.

Partnerships Option 1 - Status Quo - The choices you give are clearly a threat. Use the money you have got.

Sustainable Homes

Option 1 - Maintain - Not a responsibility of Local Government. Simply police the standards thru the building consent process.

Civil Defence

Option 2 - Transfer to HBRC - HDC is proven to have failed with this responsibility

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 1 - Status Quo - Tangata Whenua has an insatiable appetite for fees. I dont support feeding it.

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 2 - Reduce - Business people are a lot smarter than Council people & will "milk" you. Dont get involved in their businesses.

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 1 - Status Quo - Just another "Agency" requiring funding no doubt.

Submitter #222

Bettina Driscoll, 1972

To be heard? No

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 1 - Status Quo

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 1 - Hold - Hawkes Bay Tourism has been one of Hawkes Bays biggest success stories over the last few years. Tourism like 'restoring the environment' is key for Hawkes Bay. As a local resident and rate payer of Havelock North I would be hugely disappointed if we were to cut spending on tourism. It benefits everyone.... more jobs, more young families wanting to live here, happy retailers, world class events and restaurants and a region that now offers a vibrant and promising future for our children. 10 years ago before we invested in such a dedicated tourism plan this was not the case. I believe it would be a disaster to cut back the tourism budget now when it has proven to be so successful and beneficial to us all. One of the best returns we have seen on our rate paying money for a long time!

Submitter #224
Vince Labat, Paritua
To be heard? No

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 1 - Hold - Reducing funding to the Tourism sector is a backward step. Tourism is a huge contributor to the Hawke's Bay region not only for the tourism sector but for the region as a whole! The financial, economic and employment impact gained via tourism is real and tangible. The funding has helped the Hawke's Bay Tourism team drive real growth in visitors, media, travel agents, film crews to focus on Hawke's Bay. It is important to also consider the direct correlation between visitors to Hawke's Bay and their continued purchase of Hawke's Bay goods (Wine, Fruit, Beer, Meat, Olive Oil ..etc) once they have gone back home to Auckland, Shanghai, New York, London etc. There are surely more intelligent ways of going about this than reducing the tourism funding and pulling the rug out from underneath a very successful Hawke's Bay contributor. Most other regions are increasing tourism funding...

Submitter #225
Sherrill Hood
To be heard? No

General Comments

Because of Hawkes Bay's geographical position which has been used to our advantage with GM free, I suggest that we take this to a further step, which may seem radical in NZ but is common practice particularly in Europe, Bhutan< parts of India and South America and ban herbicides. Commercially it can only benefit our food exporters as there is increasing concern about the wholesomeness of foods grown with glyphosate. It will benefit the health of our soils our biodiversity and of course the health of all those living in Hawkes Bay. I encourage the council to investigate how other countries are managing their biodiversity, including Denmark, which is nearly 100% organic. There are many countries in the world who are taking this path to the future, I sincerely hope that Hawkes Bay will follow their lead to be a leader for healthy change in NZ.

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 2 - Fully Fund - My submission will save expenditure. Countries moving ahead of NZ in terms of encouraging bio diversity are curtailing the use of herbicide containing glyphosate. Examples in Europe manage roadside areas in such a way as to encourage biodiversity of beneficial insect life. The Department of the Doub in northern France is a prime example in this area. They are managing their roadside without the use of glyphosate by timing mowing of these areas to maximise the seed producing wildflowers for the benefit of the environment. It looks really beautiful too. Not only could Hawkes Bay lead the way with GM free but could lead the way in managing our land without the use of herbicides. Our wine would be more keenly sought after as many wines now contain glyphosate.

Partnerships Option 2 - Fully Fund - Our land, water and biodiversity are essential, changing the way we do things in Hawkes Bay will improve our bio diversity along with water quality and the fundamental health of the land.

Sustainable Homes

Option 2 - Extend - Sustainable homes are the way into the future. Government and local councils need to take a lead in encouraging these initiatives.

Civil Defence Option 2 - Transfer to HBRC - Makes sense.

Working with Tāngata Whenua Option 2 - Increase

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 2 - Reduce - Tourism does benefit businesses so costs need to be fairly distributed to the sector that has the most to gain.

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 2 - Join as non-guaranteeing - Would have concerns about unlimited borrowing and high risk.

General Comments

Whilst not an expert, I suggest that the lakes at Whakaki, days are numbered. It seems only natural to me that these lakes with silt up and eventually become flood plains. Committing resources to delay the inevitable seems futile.

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 1 - Status Quo - lower cost to rate payers

Partnerships Option 1 - Status Quo - lower cost to rate payers. I disagree with the premise that this will result in a 'continual decline in the region's environment'.

Sustainable Homes

Option 1 - Maintain - I am currently opposed to subsidising solar heating and photoVoltic cells as these installation typically don't make sence financialy.

Civil Defence

Option 2 - Transfer to HBRC - makes sence to simplify the funding framework

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 2 - Increase - Ongoing engagement with the traditional land owners helps address longstanding issues of marginalisation.

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 2 - Reduce - Lower cost to rate payers

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 3 - Join as unrated guaranteeing - Better access to low cost funding.

General Comments

Yes, I was very happy to hear about the work about to be undertaken regarding aquifer management. In my opinion there needs to be a lot more facts gathered around the aquifer and how this can be managed in an environmentally sustainable way. I also believe there needs to be much more stringent rules around the application of ground sourced water for agricultural irrigation - night vs day application and application limits seems obvious options - and also limits (perhaps terminations dates for properties with access to town water supply) placed on underground water rights for land parcels that have turned into non-economic life style blocks - 20 acres or less.

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 2 - Fully Fund - I agree with the carrot and stick approach of enlisting farmer support through incentives, and deterring errant or static behaviour through regulation. It seems to me, however, that a serious amount of goodwill could be engendered through hands on urban support of the rural community through volunteer work day schemes. This is a national issue and urban dwellers have an equal responsibility to jump in, get their hands dirty, and support the regeneration of our environmental systems.

Partnerships Option 2 - Fully Fund

Sustainable Homes

Option 2 - Extend

Civil Defence

Option 2 - Transfer to HBRC

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 2 - Increase - At the very least, there should ongoing engagement with Tangata Whenua. Having been to last nights Napier Meeting, however, I have a strong sense of the commitment and expertise of HBRC to deliver. To that extent I would hope that there has already been an in-principle agreement between HBRC and representatives of Tangata Whenua of the broad plan. Secondly, I would hope that there is an agreed framework for making decisions, that defers where necessary to the expertise within the HBRC where no such expertise exists within Tangata Whenua.

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 2 - Reduce - Yes agree in principle, however, I believe an equitable position does need to be reached that reflects the benefits of tourism funding for the commercial sector directly, and for the region more broadly. A mixed model of public funding and user pays is the correct mechanism to achieve this in my view.

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 3 - Join as unrated guaranteeing - As a mechanism for getting best bang for buck (lowest funding costs) then yes. However, the comments around the Port of Napier were instructive and if this represents a serious concentration of risk for current owners, then it seems an obvious solution to sell down (yet retain controlling stake) and use those proceeds instead of borrowing. I am not a fan of loading up with excessive debt to meet what are going to be long term environmental commitments. What rules are in place to ensure debt levels are kept at a manageable level?

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 2 - Fully Fund - Needs flexibility. For example riparian fencing. We practice holistic planned grazing and animals are only in paddocks with a creek for 10 days of the year. 355 days are stock free. We also have Mohaka river frontage which is popular with anglers. Arguably 10 days of grazing is of net benefit in maintaining a flood plain and maintaining access to the river. Cattle hardly ever enter the river (too much water moving too quickly). Without grazing the vegetation will move to blackberry and gorse. Farm plans are an opportunity to address complexity in partnership with HBRC

Partnerships Option 2 - Fully Fund - A caveat. The discussion needs to be about landscape function/ecosystem services across the whole catchment. This is because no amount of wire can protect a waterway if its catchment is degrading. Conversely if the water cycle has healthy function (high infiltration rates and no exposed spoil) there is no need for riparian fencing. Lack of fencing is not the cause deteriorating water quality. Further evidenced by the fact that waterways have never been fenced. The Mohaka was pristine until land use changed to intensive dairy upstream. This year in early January the river stank of dairy effluent and was covered in algae. I'll wager that little or none of that eutrophication was due to animals grazing unfenced waterways. That amount of pollution can only be from effluent flows into the waterway. Silage effluent has the highest biological oxygen demand of any waste and yet you seem to have no policy to contain it. English farmers have to bund their clamps or face massive fines. That level of dairy intensification on free draining pumice soils is always going to leak nutrients. Finally you cannot fence a waterway. It is a dendritic pattern (like the branches of a tree). Most of the water is in the higher order "branches". Wherever the fence starts the water has come from elsewhere.

Sustainable Homes

Option 2 - Extend - Gets it done

Civil Defence

Option 2 - Transfer to HBRC

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 2 - Increase -

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 2 - Reduce -

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 2 - Join as non-guaranteeing

General Comments

Publish more facts pertaining to the (historic) ability of Councillors to govern. Cutting tourism spend proposal is so foolish when the benefits are so obvious. Sure, better governance or people may be required but the base concept should be expanded not depreciated! Also, proposal of extra funding racially based is pointless for the majority of people .I have some doubts about Bus funding. Finally I believe HBRC does not allocate enough spend to Biosecurity.

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 1 - Status Quo - Too much Council now

Sustainable Homes

Option 1 - Maintain

Civil Defence

Option 2 - Transfer to HBRC - Hawkes Bay is better as one (hope HBRC up to job)

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 1 - Status Quo - I am for N.Z. being one people....already too much emphasis on race.

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 1 - Hold - Tourism gives our province by far the best "bangs for bucks". I am spending circa \$2million on a tourist facility this year...creating 2 jobs initially plus major job and other peripheral benefits.

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 2 - Join as non-guaranteeing – Best

General Comments

Stop giving handouts to Maori and start looking after everybody. Regional Council should start doing their job and look after the natural assets of the Region - rivers and lakes etc., Stop the landowners from polluting the air with dirty filthy burnoffs that in this day and age should not be needed, follow up on foliage risks such as Old Mans Beard rather than giving up and putting it in the too hard bin. Staff levels should be reduced and higher level of Management should have salary caps and be bought back to a reasonable and sensible level. Why is the Regional Council involved in things like tourism, doing the job that rail management should be doing (opening the rail link to Wairoa/Gisborne), forcing change on homeowners (fireplaces etc).

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 1 - Status Quo - Force the landowners to start doing the correct thing. Why should the ratepayers prop up private businesses, because that's what farms are - private businesses.

Partnerships Option 1 - Status Quo - Make the landowners clean their act up at no expense to the ratepayer

Sustainable Homes

Option 1 - Maintain - Why can't people build proper homes to start with, and for rented properties make it compulsory on the landlord to bring houses up to scratch. Why should the Regional Council prop up homeowners on one hand and fleece them for rates with the other.

Civil Defence

Option 2 - Transfer to HBRC - The new Fire and Emergency NZ should be able to do the majority of the emergency management work and reduce the rates take from the ratepayers. Why duplicate resources such as command units when they are already available from an organisation which is competently trained to operate them. Civil Defence should be reduced to a minimum level which caters for wellbeing of people only.

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 1 - Status Quo - We are supposed to be "one" people, but all this funding for a minority race is causing racism within the community. Why can't Maori be part of the rest of the community instead of driving the one sided racism. I am tired of my rates propping up a bunch of people too lazy to help themselves.

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 2 - Reduce - Tourism is a business so should fund itself. Apparently all these millions of dollars come into the Region from tourists, so where is this money? Tourism should be self funding. I say stop feeding the tourist industry anything, or, go public and show us exactly where the money goes.

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 2 - Join as non-guaranteeing

General Comments

Nothing more to say, just had enough of your wastage of rate payers money.

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 1 - Status Quo - Don't get too involved in business to make money from planting trees. One forest fire and everything is lost.

Partnerships Option 1 - Status Quo - This should have been done by somebody already employed and being over paid. I'm sure you have people already in a department that should have been looking after this problem before it has got to this stage.

Sustainable Homes

Option 1 - Maintain - All old fires should have been replaced by now but if not, certainly by 2023. To get people to put in such things as Solar hot water heating I have to ask you, where do you expect them to get the money to afford solar power. We are not all on inflated salaries like council staff nor are we guaranteed good wage rises each year like council staff.

Civil Defence

Option 1 - Retain - If the regional council gets the civil defence rate I bet the Napier City Council does not reduce our rates accordingly, so in the end we will be paying for the same bad service twice.

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 1 - Status Quo - Why should we pay extra to employ staff and train staff to be more culturally competent. The benefits of increases is for the well being of all citizens in Hawkes Bay, why should one breed receive more than another.

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 2 - Reduce - Tourism is booming in Hawkes Bay and operators are doing very nicely out of it. They can now stand on their own feet.

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 1 - Status Quo - No doubt there are going to be costs involved by joining LGFA and with the Regional Council's history and proven track record, someone on a ridiculous salary will be employed to go to conferences organised by the LGFA. If you want more money to do all these improvements, instead of doing it the easy way you always do, increase rates that low income families can least afford, why don't you try cutting your own costs within your organisation. To give you a couple of ideas, don't send staff to conferences around NZ on a regular basis unless the content of the conference is going to benefit this region, (I know of someone who is not even a Manager who goes away regularly and he's just a supervisor). Don't pay severance pay of \$300,000 to a staff member who has had enough and is really just resigning. Holiday pay is all he should have received just like in most companies. Oh and here's another one. Kiwi Saver...new staff should start on 2 percent contribution rising to 3 and finally after several years, to 4 percent. Instead you started all staff immediately at 4 percent. That was many years ago but people have had enough of being kicked by rises in all areas and yet their family life is getting harder and harder having less money for necessities.

Submitter #234

Jon Wichers

To be heard? No

General Comments

Drive efficiency in this organisation. As with many bureaucracies they are far to top heavy and too much of the income spent on salaries. So the rates keep going up

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives - Why should I pay to reforest land to try and repair waterways. This situation is a direct result of what is happening on the land. You can plant as many trees as you like at huge cost but I dont believe you will change a lot while you have farmers polluti

Sustainable Homes

Mind your business you get paid for and let individual owners sort this

Civil Defence

Option 1 - Retain

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 2 - Increase - Tangata whenua will force you to confront polluters which are currently getting looked at with a blind eye

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 2 - Reduce - yeah focus on the real enviromental problems. Conventional farming

Submitter #235

LY Keong

To be heard? No

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 2 - Fully Fund - I agree and the more trees planted the better. I wont be around to see the 2028 attempts have succeeded but hope so.

Civil Defence

Option 2 - Transfer to HBRC - I agree with the Civil Defence rate

Working with Tāngata Whenua

- Working with Tangata Whenua - I don't know

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 2 - Reduce - I agree that everything possible

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 3 - Join as unrated guaranteeing - I agree and the more trees planted the better.

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 1 - Hold - We own and manage Coastal Wine Cycles, a bike hire company based out at Te Awanga. It is a relatively small business but has grown rapidly over the past 5 years with turnover increasing by 20% last year, 15% in the previous 2 years before that. If tourism continues to grow in the region on the current growth path driven by Hawke's Bay Tourism, I am confident our business will continue to grow at this rate, if not higher. It has so much potential. I have stopped working and I am now focusing full time on our business as we can see the opportunities.

The feedback to date from our guests has been incredibly positive. Our ratings are excellent and we wish to develop the experience and offers even further. We have plenty of ideas on how to grow the business within Hawke's Bay, fully utilising the incredible cycle pathway the council has created.

Currently we employ one person as a contractor to manage all the bookings as well as myself but due to the recent growth, we will be employing at least an additional person, if not 2 people in the next season. This is on the assumption that tourism continues to grow at the same rate.

We have plans to invest in another depot in the near future, we just need another strong year like this one to be in the position to do so and really put our business on the next level where we would need two teams running the depots.

We also employ local businesses in a supporting role including bike maintenance, lawyer, accountants and local marketing/print companies. Our riders visit local wineries, galleries, shops, restaurants and cafes around Te Awanga and Haumoana, supporting these local businesses on a daily basis by bringing new money into the region.

We actively support Hawke's Bay Tourism through membership as well as offering famils for media and trade. We have done so since we established our business 5 years ago. We would like to continue to support them as we grow, especially through attending trade/conference shows in the near future as these are hugely beneficial to be apart of. We support them through adding to their website content, events and social media channels. An example this week is offering discounted bikes for Air New Zealand Hawke's Bay Marathon which Hawke's Bay Tourism actively secured to the region.

We strongly vote for funding to stay as it is as we can see the benefits that Hawke's Bay Tourism are creating through the work they do within New Zealand and globally. The one obvious area I can see they have made a difference in our business alone is in shoulder seasons. We had no bookings during late Autumn/Winter/early Spring – we basically were closed unintentionally but in the last year alone our shoulder seasons have grown remarkably. Hawke's Bay Tourism ran their seasonal campaigns and I assume the change in bookings is through their work.

We understand and agree the environment is incredibly important but don't believe the argument proposed – that funding should be for environment OR tourism. They are both vital for the region. If HBT funding is cut, then obviously tourism will drop as there will be reduce marketing taking place. Thereby other competing regions will get our visitors as they will be buying our media spaces. The impact won't be immediate, but we will feel the effects in 2–3 years time, then the money that these visitors are bringing into the region will drop – affecting tourism related companies, but as you can see through our small business alone, the on–flow effect of tourism cashflow. There will be a downturn in the region through a drop in tourism promotion, which will obviously affect your cash flow more than a reduction in tourism funding now.

Please keep funding at the current level to Hawke's Bay Tourism so they can continue to grow the sector and bring more tourists, thereby money into the region. Thank you.

Hawkes Bay Regional Council Support for Coastguard

Some of Hawkes Bay's greatest recreational and commercial assets are its beaches, lakes and waterways. They are enjoyed by Hawkes Bay communities and are a source of income for the many businesses that make their living from them. The users of these diverse waterways enjoy them and benefit from them, confident in the knowledge that they are safeguarded by the volunteers of Coastguard's Eastern Region.

In the Hawkes Bay Region, 'Coastguard' consists of 1 unit. This unit is a charity registered with NZ Charity Services. The unit is staffed entirely by volunteers who commit to providing continuous, year-round Search and Rescue services on Hawkes Bay's coasts and waterways.

Coastguard takes a multi-pronged approach to saving lives at sea that includes:

- Providing highly trained rescue vessel crews and equipment to respond to life-threatening marine incidents;
- Providing year-round safety and communications services to Hawkes Bay's marine users;
- Educating boats owners and users to maximise their enjoyment and minimise risk;

With no staff overheads, the cost of running Coastguard units is low. Today Coastguard receives Government funding to recover fuel costs for SAR activities and for repairs and maintenance of their vessels, however the other necessary costs of operating a unit, such as accommodation, insurance, communications and training are not sustainably funded and require volunteers to give more of their time to raise funds through disparate means.

The consequence of this situation is significant strain on volunteers and variation in units' ability to meet their expenses. Furthermore, this approach fails to achieve a planned and appropriate means of providing the emergency service provision that Hawkes Bay inhabitants and businesses require.

Coastguard seeks Hawkes Bay Regional Council support to sustain and improve Coastguard services in your region. Hawkes Bay Regional Council is requested to provide Coastguard with details of the 2018 Long-Term Plan process in order that Coastguard may submit a proposal for the creation of a three-year partnership arrangement with Hawkes Bay Regional Council for Volunteer Emergency Services. Such a partnership would take the form of a contribution to operational costs, which along with other funding sources will more sustainably meet the costs of Coastguard operations in your region.

As a volunteer-led organisation Coastguard is able to provide a high-quality, all year-round service to the Hawkes Bay community in a highly cost-effective manner. Hawkes Bay Regional Council support is sought to ensure that such a service may be sustained into the future.

Additionally, in recent times Coastguard Eastern Region have been developing a team of people who have had training, demonstrated skills and have acquired a range of experience in fitting into and running Incident Management Teams. We refer to them as ICP or Incident Control Point teams. It has become clear with the frequency that Coastguard need to establish an ICP to fit into the IMT structure of Police and RCCN, that we have become rather proficient at dealing with complex incident management and coordinating various assets, resources and organisations. It is likely that this could add value to the emergency management capacity of the Regional Councils in the area.

While we appreciate the support that the Hawkes Bay Regional Council can and have offered Coastguard Eastern Region we are also interested in exploring ways that we can lend assistance if you even have a need.

Yours sincerely

Sunny Peeters,

Regional | Manager Coastguard Eastern Region

Submitter #240

Steve Reddish

To be heard? No

General Comments

Overall agree with the need to apply additional effort and resources to environmental improvements. It may prove that further increases are necessary in subsequent years to achieve the desired outcomes and this too is supported.

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 2 - Fully Fund

Partnerships Option 2 - Fully Fund

Sustainable Homes

Option 2 - Extend

Civil Defence

Option 2 - Transfer to HBRC

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 2 - Increase

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 2 - Reduce

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 2 - Join as non-guaranteeing

Submitter #241

P Brough

To be heard? No

General Comments

I am replying to your ten year plan, I as a single income pensioner do not support your rate increase. We all know it does not matter what rate payers say, the decision has already been made by council, this is another smoke screen. So very soon you will be facing a Rate Payers Association who will oppose this council for rate increases, Hastings District Council has been sent paper cutting to say, as region gets more single income pensioners, we will oppose rate increases as this points to both councils, to say, you can't have a budget, just a cash cow, rate payer who is expected to pay up, so no more, you won't be in council at next election, look at waste money on dam project. What about \$1m set aside for Clifton Limestone wall to number 2 camp, Hastings has some amount of money, Mr Yules letter April 2016. What is hold up, you have very poor public relations on this project, when will you make a statement to HB Today, we all like me do not have cellphone or computer, and no more money for rates, sick and tired of having to go without to get by. What ever happened to Clive River, 5 years ago, that was sent to Regional Council with water tested result from Williams Street. Water result, polluted, do not swim or drink that water. So before much longer we will stop paying rates to you people and Hastings Council. What about user pays, we don't use it. How about look at pensioners. P.S. When will rates be targeted to inflation.

Submitter #242
Leil Setchell
To be heard? No

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 1 - Status Quo

Partnerships Option 1 - Status Quo

Sustainable Homes

Option 1 - Maintain - To encourage the retrofit, conversion of existing or use in new builds of more sustainable alternatives (e.g. solar heating) we would support the refunding of HDC compliance costs as an incentive. To be truly beneficial, the regional council and Unison sh

Civil Defence

Option 1 - Retain

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 2 - Increase

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 2 - Reduce

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 2 - Join as non-guaranteeing

Submitter #243
RW Burney
To be heard? No

General Comments

With regard to your letter dated 28 March and flyer, I make the following comments. You say fix the recourses now and everyone must agree with the proposed actions but: 1. Why hasn't the council taken an aggressive action progressively over the years? Instead of costing Ratepayers millions in excessive management salaries and remuneration packages in failed and not thought out undertakings. 2. The Council must be one action body rather than setting themselves up as a regulating body diverting responsibility eg. the ridiculous intention on taking action against the Hastings District Council over the Havelock North water disaster! Like you going to threaten a similar action against NCC over the Pandora Pond. 3. If you propose to proceed with "Facing Our Future" you must take FULL RESPONSIBILITY and refrain from directing responsibility elsewhere. Should you engage the help of District Councils, they should act as your agents making you with over-all responsibility. The thought of one local body taking action against another is just plain ridiculous and defeats the whole object of local body cooperation and of course any action results in the rate payer footing the bill no matter what the outcome. The flyer outlines your proposals & if they are accepted and adopted then your Council must accept full responsibility for their implementation and outcome at competitive costings, both in management and actual work undertaken.

Submitter #244
Roland Matley
To be heard? No

General Comments

Thank you for your 28 March 2018 letter. You appear to propose a 19% rate increase. I oppose yr. proposal. My proposal is that you reduce rates by 10% by economising and budgeting accordingly. Your CFO will confirm this can be done ... as has our CFO at WDC. Please bring my proposal to the notice of your Councillors at the next meeting and inform day, date, time and place of meeting.

Submitter #245

Rev EW Body

To be heard? No

General Comments

As ratepayers, both my wife and myself support each of the proposals set out in Facing our Future. Action now is necessary to retrieve Hawkes Bay's great environment and ensure that the future is gifted the opportunity to share in such a vibrant environment

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 2 - Fully Fund

Partnerships Option 2 - Fully Fund

Sustainable Homes

Option 2 - Extend

Civil Defence

Option 2 - Transfer to HBRC

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 2 - Increase

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 2 - Reduce

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 3 - Join as unrated guaranteeing

Submitter #246

Anireta Leah Rarere

To be heard? No

Sustainable Homes

Option 2 - Extend

Civil Defence

Option 2 - Transfer to HBRC

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 2 - Increase

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 1 - Hold

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 3 - Join as unrated guaranteeing

Submitter #247
Sarah Cotter
To be heard? No

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 2 - Fully Fund

Partnerships Option 2 - Fully Fund

Sustainable Homes

Option 1 - Maintain

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 2 - Increase

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 1 - Hold - Tourism grows our capacity

Submitter #248
Pillipa Ellis
To be heard? No

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 1 - Status Quo

Partnerships Option 2 - Fully Fund

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 2 - Increase

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 1 – Hold

Submitter #249
Te Wetini Amaru-Tibble
To be heard? No

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 2 - Fully Fund

Partnerships Option 2 - Fully Fund

Sustainable Homes

Option 2 - Extend

Civil Defence

Option 1 - Retain

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 1 - Hold - Tourism as an industry too important for our local economy. A reduction in tourism an it's effects are felt across the region. ie. staff shortage in Horticulture if tourism spending is cut, other regions will benefit from those that would otherwise visit Hawkes Bay

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 3 - Join as unrated guaranteeing

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 1 - Status Quo

Partnerships Option 1 - Status Quo

Sustainable Homes

Option 1 - Maintain

Civil Defence

Option 1 - Retain

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 2 - Increase - With Tangata Whenua there is a number of issues that apply only to Tangata Whenua

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 1 - Hold - This will encourage more opportunities for all people and local attractions

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 1 - Status Quo

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 1 - Status Quo - An increase of 25% (from \$2486 to \$3345) in HBRC rates since Y/E 2017 will reduce potential expenditure on achieving the objectives of improving our land and water resources and HBRC 'support' will not replace these funds. There are many agencies, some of which we fund directly, which already provide information, advice and assistance to us in achieving more environmentally and financially sustainable land and water use.

Partnerships Option 1 - Status Quo - See above. HBRC can only duplicate the work already undertaken by farmer funded agencies.

Sustainable Homes

Option 1 - Maintain - Expenditure targeted to benefit those on lower incomes should be funded from income tax not property tax.

Civil Defence

Option 2 - Transfer to HBRC - Sensible proposal

Working with Tāngata Whenua

- No evidence that HBRC activities with tangata whenua are not meeting statutory requirements or a reduction in environmental protection.

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 2 - Reduce - Tourism spending should be focussed on providing amenities to ensure that increased tourist numbers do not damage environmental or social values of the region.

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 3 - Join as unrated guaranteeing - A potential saving on loan costs.

General Comments

All very well to produce a nice brochure with pretty pictures, but really it doesn't give you detail. Very wishy washy without detailing anything. To expect people to front up with a 19% rates increase is damn arrogant. Didn't notice a 19% payrise in my pay packet!! Where do you councils get the cheek from to expect people to agree to this?

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 1 - Status Quo - This isn't really my preferred choice. I am in between. Partially fund this or increase what is currently being funded. I am happy for a small % increase overall but NOT 19%.

Partnerships Option 1 - Status Quo - Again, this is not my preferred choice BUT I do not want it fully funded. I am happy for a small % increase overall but NOT 19%.

Sustainable Homes

Option 1 - Maintain - If people choose to have these different options, then they should pay for them. Why should I help to pay for someone else to have solar water heating or a new septic tank??

Civil Defence

Option 2 - Transfer to HBRC - This seems to be the more sensible option BUT with the way councils love to spend rate payers money will we actually get any savings from our own councils??? I doubt it.

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 1 - Status Quo - Already too much.

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 1 - Hold - Not happy you want to charge us more for some things and then drastically reduce a major area for the Bay. Tourism is a major contributor to our local economy and if anything, more money should be invested in it. It's not rocket science.

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 1 - Status Quo - Is there a cost to joining the LGFA scheme? If yes, then we want to know it before deciding which option to choose.

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 2 - Increase

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 1 - Hold

General Comments

I am a Napier resident and a Napier rate payer, I have just read the letter and the pamphlet regarding "Facing our future", and rates rises we are faced with. In the letter addressed to me it states figures of 13.8% and 5.2% increases to my regional rates or \$1 pr week.

My simple calculations of \$1 pr week, 52 weeks of the year equals \$52 pr year, on my rates bill of \$208 dollars pr year, an extra \$52 pr year taking my rates bill to \$260 pr year seems to be slightly more than 19%.

As ratepayers we are given a whole lot of information, spun a whole lot of propoganda on all sorts of subjects to do involving the environment and how we need to do this and need to do that, to try and suck us in to believing the council are finally going to act and do something to rectify the so called problems.

I have heard it all before, over the years we have had it drummed into us as ratepayers and yet it seems to me the problems continue to evolve and worsen.

I have no problem with rates rises if indeed I knew my hard earned cash would be put to good use as i guarantee neither would the general population of rate payers but deep down I know this will not be the case.

I can almost bank on ... at some stage within the next 12 months we will hear that Councillors have granted themselves an annual pay rise which I might also add will be slightly more than the average wage rise will be.

You may ask, How do I know this? I say this because of past proven recollections. This is a continual event within central govt, local govt, the likes of energy companies, insurance companies and the likes of, where we as consumers actually have no say at all, we just have to accept the rises, pay the additional charges because... we actually have no say, what ever we do say seems to fall on deaf ears or is very quickly dismissed and we are titled moaners and whingers.

I also find myself feeling this way as on a business level I have had dealings with the HBRC and every time I ring or make contact with the person I deal with I am constantly told sorry we have no funds left or, no money in the coffers to fix the problem which is indeed a factor into why we are facing the problems with our waterways. For 3 years now I have been told this and have actually given up trying to sort this problem out because I know dam well I am banging my head against a brick wall.

This waterways problem in my instance is an easy fix in my eyes, I could indeed ring up a contractor and rectify the problem myself for a simple fee but this particular waterway is council land and I cant touch it.

Anyway I have digressed slightly away from being a simple "Townie" ratepayer, living in Tamatea that is faced with in fact not a 19% increase but more nudging the 23%.

Faced with this increase, being on a fixed income i will just have to suck it up, pay the increase, trim the already strained purse strings, and accept that once again, I will be in the majority with my concerns and thoughts but it will make no difference at all, I will watch and wait for my new HBRC statement, watch the increases take action and over the next 12 months, no changes will happen. I will also continue to add that probably this time next year we will indeed receive another letter with yet another level of increases but will be worded slightly different to cover up that this years charges have actually made no difference at all.

I hear the words continually from friends, peers, family members, fellow ratepayers, "Well you voted them in", its up to the ratepayers to make the change, what a joke . Nothing changes really no matter who gets voted in, "Does it Councillors?"

I will keep this email as a reference for next year and if I am wrong it will eat my words, somehow I strongly doubt it though.

I look forward to a response but I add will not be holding my breath.

Kind regards Concerned but not shocked in the slightest ratepayer.... Jarrold Harris

Submitter #256

David Barry

To be heard? No

General Comments

I Agree with the Regional Councils recommendations on all six of the Consultation topics and with the rates increase.

Land, Water & Biodiversity

Incentives Option 2 - Fully Fund

Partnerships Option 2 - Fully Fund

Sustainable Homes

Option 2 - Extend

Civil Defence

Option 2 - Transfer to HBRC

Working with Tāngata Whenua

Option 2 - Increase

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 2 - Reduce

Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA)

Option 3 - Join as unrated guaranteeing

Submitter #257

Paula Yeates

To be heard? No

General Comments

I received your letter and flyer in the mail yesterday and looked up a breakdown of my personal 2018-2019 Regional Council rates. Last year was \$161.97 which I have paid Then it says Instalments YTD \$180.30 – does this mean I owe you some money?? If so how much and when is it due by?? Estimated next year levy is \$213.45 – by my reckoning this is \$33.15 more than last year. That is a huge increase. I am on a fixed income (pension). I think this is a little harsh given that the NCC council rates will also go up for next year. While I whole heartedly agree that our water areas need urgent attention I think this levy should be on all Hawkes Bay Residents not just property owners.

Submitter #258

Neil Pritchard

To be heard? No

General Comments

To be frank I can't get over your arrogance in thinking that you can just increase rates by 19.% AND EXPECT the community to just accept it. In your advert in HBTD you didn't mention how much money you wasted on the dam. I am 72 on a fixed income and you just think, we need more money let's put the rates up. Get a life you can't just do that.

Submitter #260
Sir Graeme Avery
To be heard? No

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 1 - Hold

I write in support of maintaining the current funding levels for Hawke's Bay Tourism (Options 1).

I appreciate the primary focus you have in getting on with core business. However, the HB Regional Council is the one single entity that can ensure all in Hawke's Bay contributes to an industry that benefits all in the region. Hawke's Bay Tourism is the one and only entity advocating and promoting our region at a national and international level.

Your investment in tourism to date has been sound, Hawke's Bay Tourism are delivering results and exceeding their targets.

As someone with a former involvement in the organisation and someone also passionate about continued economic development of the region, may I ask you to continue to see tourism as a positive for the whole community and maintain HBT funding.

Thank you for your favourable consideration

Submitter #262
Alan Mumford, Left-behind Superannuates facing our future
To be heard? No

General Comments

We're quite happy to entertain the increase you propose, provided you organise a pension percentage increase of the same amount.. Like you, we are interested in improvement and progress, if we can afford such huge hikes

Submitter #263
Sean Burns, Milk and Honey
To be heard? No

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 1 - Hold - Hawke's Bay Tourism's funding should be kept at current levels

Submitter #265
Andrew Castles
To be heard? No

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 1 - Hold - I support the funding of tourism in Hawke's Bay at current levels.

Submitter #266
Ian Hill, Linden Estate
To be heard? No

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 1 - Hold - Hawkes' Bay Tourism 's funding must be kept at current levels. I select Option 1 We at Linden Estate are spending well over a million dollars in developing wine tourism with a new 1200 sq metre barrel hall, pathways through our vineyards and a new Cellar Door. We need the support of Hawkes Bay Tourism in achieving these goals and to reduce funding in such a vital area which is aimed at enhancing and positioning Hawkes Bay as a must visit for tourists and the benefit for the local community is short sighted and irresponsible.

Submitter #267
Charlotte Lindsay-Sales
To be heard? No

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 1 - Hold - Hawke's Bay Tourism's funding should absolutely be kept at current levels

Submitter #268
Wendy and Peter Murphy
To be heard? No

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 1 - Hold - Hawke's Bay Tourism's funding should be kept at current levels

Submitter #269
Unknown Unknown
To be heard? No

Hawke's Bay Tourism

- Hawke's Bay Tourism's funding should be kept at current levels.

Submitter #270
Juliet Harbutt
To be heard? No

Hawke's Bay Tourism

Option 1 - Hold - Hawke's Bay Tourism's funding should be kept at current levels.

