

Leigh Collecutt

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, 4 April 2019 8:29 AM
To: Thrive
Subject: Annual Plan 2019/20 Consultation - Feedback [#25]

Submitters Nicki Harper

Name

Postal 

Address 38 Kenilworth St
Waipawa, Hawke's Bay 4210

Day Phone 02102211093

Number

Mobile 02102211093

Phone

Number

Email nickharp68@gmail.com

Do you No

wish to
present
your
comments
to council
in person
at a
hearing?

Please note that your submission (including any personal information supplied) will be made available to Councillors and the public. Submissions Close on 12 April 2019 at 5pm

1. Tell us what you think about the proposal that Council give a \$250,000 suspensory loan to Water Holding CHB to keep the prospect of water storage alive in Central Hawke's Bay.

I object to this proposal. My main concern is process/transparency:

These men say they are acting on behalf of the community, but have given no detail on how this ratepayer funding would be spent and no commitment other than a quote in the media that community water supply and river health will be at the forefront of any investigations.

In detailing this investment, the council says water storage is critical for the future security of water in CHB, but it does not seem to have explored any other options that might ensure adequate quantity and quality for community water users (all ratepayers) all year around.

The council has also said there will be strict criteria to be eligible for the loan, but has given the public no information on what these criteria are.

Also no information about this Rural Ward Fund that the money would come from ... how have these coffers been filled, what was it intended for?

My second concern is:

Shouldn't the conversation be about conserving and protecting this resource rather than using more?

Ministry for the Environment statistics for the year ended June 2014 show that nationally more than 5 billion cubic metres of fresh water was taken from the ground and surface water for irrigation, compared to less than 1.5 billion cubic metres consumed by people for drinking.

There's a large dairy farming conglomerate in Central Hawke's Bay using twice the amount of fresh water than is used by the entire townships of Waipukurau and Waipawa.

As a ratepayer I want my money spent on ensuring water is used sustainably, and that there is a safe public drinking water supply and clean, healthy waterways.

Water storage does make sense, but can't help but feel a project such as this will encourage more water use by relatively few people, further land intensification and resultant water pollution, and supply issues.

If this Rural Ward Fund money is up for grabs, I would like to see the council using this money to explore other sources and means of supplying water that can meet the New Zealand Drinking Water Standards, to encourage water conservation by all, and to encourage primary producers to improve the efficiency of their water use.

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, 6 April 2019 9:27 AM
To: Thrive
Subject: Annual Plan 2019/20 Consultation - Feedback [#26]

Submitters Name Di Petersen

Postal Address



496 Farm road RD4
Waipukurau 4284

Day Phone Number 06 8589735

Mobile Phone Number 0211300441

Night Phone Number 0211300441

Email dmpetersen@farmside.co.nz

Do you wish to present your comments to council in person at a hearing? No

Please note that your submission (including any personal information supplied) will be made available to Councillors and the public.
Submissions Close on 12 April 2019 at 5pm

1. Tell us what you think about the proposal that Council give a \$250,000 suspensory loan to Water Holding CHB to keep the prospect of water storage alive in Central Hawke's Bay.

2. Do you agree with the changes to the Revenue & Financing Policy?

No. You are planning a rating review next year – this is the appropriate time to change your rating policy and not just now.

I understand the new valuations have had an affect overall, but that generally applies to most ratepayers. We all have the same benefit arising from the Leadership, Governance and Consultation activity so the proper place for that rate is the UAC.

3. Do you support the establishment of the Disaster Relief Fund Trust?

Yes – no problem with this.

4. Do you have any feedback on the Draft Environmental Strategy?

This is really important for us all and will not be cheap to fulfill the aspirations, but together we can achieve this, even if it takes some time. There will have to be priorities set.

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, 7 April 2019 11:59 AM
To: Thrive
Subject: Annual Plan 2019/20 Consultation - Feedback [#27]

Submitters Name Magali Martin

Postal Address



183B Tapairu Road RD5
Waipawa, Yes, settling in July 4275
New Zealand

Day Phone Number 0226723912

Email martinmagali3333@gmail.com

Do you wish to present your comments to council in person at a hearing? No

Please note that your submission (including any personal information supplied) will be made available to Councillors and the public. Submissions Close on 12 April 2019 at 5pm

I am a little concerned over the suspensory status of the loan . If the IP is then sold by Water Holdings CHB Ltd , the loan should be repayable.

1. Tell us what you think about the proposal that Council give a \$250,000 suspensory loan to Water Holding CHB to keep the prospect of water storage alive in Central Hawke's Bay.

2. Do you agree with the changes to the Revenue & Financing Policy?

The impact of the rate increase is huge, considering we are rural. CHB does not have any public transport, limited health providers and communal activities. Compared to other districts, I think the rates are too high compared to what we are getting. The pool should have been solar powered, so it could be used all year long. Investments might have to be considered to increase productivity of the CHBDC.

3. Do you support the establishment of the Disaster Relief Fund Trust?

I do believe it might be a good idea as long as it is closely managed, as to what event can be classified as a disaster

4. Do you have any feedback on the Draft Environmental Strategy?

Reducing waste is ideal, but with China now refusing the export of NZ waste, I believe our options are very limited

Any other suggestions?

Increase of rates should be proportionate between rural and town residents, as it would make it fair. As rural residents, we do not use town or river water, recycling and waste pick up services, sewage...

Leigh Collecutt

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, 7 April 2019 2:45 PM
To: Thrive
Subject: Annual Plan 2019/20 Consultation - Feedback [#28]

Submitters Kathryn Bayliss
Name

Postal 
Address 116 Maharakeke Road R D 1
 Waipukurau, Hawke's Bay 4281
 New Zealand

Day Phone 068589900
Number

Night Phone 068589900
Number

Email kall@xtra.co.nz

Do you wish No
to present
your
comments to
council in
person at a
hearing?

Please note that your submission (including any personal information supplied) will be made available to Councillors and the public. Submissions Close on 12 April 2019 at 5pm

1. Tell us what you think about the proposal that Council give a \$250,000 suspensory loan to Water Holding CHB to keep the prospect of water storage alive in Central Hawke's Bay.

I am against the proposal to give a suspensory loan and any other money to Water Holdings CHB Ltd.

I am against CHBDC being a partner and funder of public funds for rural Water Storage Schemes.

I am against making changes to the Special Funds Policy.

I am against making changes to the Investments Policy.

It is an imprudent use of public funds and exposes ratepayers to a very high risk.

I want CHBDC stop investigating and getting involved in water storage schemes for rural areas and irrigation.

Some Reasons for opposing the loan to Water Holdings CHB Ltd:

1. HBRC had to write off \$19.5million for the RWSS. And there was more spent on pre-feasibility costs for CHB irrigation water storage. National Government has already given at least \$13 million and also had costs covering court proceedings and DoC negotiations. CHBDC has already spent undisclosed time and money on the RWSS. HBRIC/HBRC couldn't make CHB irrigation water storage happen with all the time (over 10 years), money and expert help (at least 30 consultant teams and expertise from a wide cross-section of HBRC) they spent on it, and with CHBDC's help and support. I very much doubt CHBDC can make a large water storage scheme a reality with partners whose only assets are the RWSS IP and who relies on donations and public funds.

2. In the CHBDC Treasury Management Policy Including Liability Management and Investment Policy included in the objectives is " To minimise exposure to credit risk by dealing with and investing in credit worthy counter-parties." "Council is, above all, a risk averse entity activity which may be construed as speculative in nature is expressly forbidden."

"All investments should be low risk.....avoiding speculative investments". "Counterparty credit risk: Counterparties and limits are only approved on the basis of Standard & Poor's long and short term credit ratings matrix."

The hoped for outcomes of the RWSS or similar scheme are very speculative in nature. Over at least 8 years figures including expenses, profits, job numbers, GDP, dam size, type and cost, water for sale, farming type forecast, investors and financiers, have all changed, some numerous times.

Water Holdings CHB LTD has no credit rating.

3. Water Holdings CHB LTD is not credit worthy, it is a limited liability company with it's only assets being the intangible RWSS IP with cost price \$100,000. It would not be enough to repay the loan even if they could sell it or their company. They were the only people who negotiated with HBRIC to buy the RWSS IP so no one else thought it worth the risk buying.

The CHBDC conditions proposed for the loan are too weak. There is little to no chance the loan could or would be repaid.

4. In the March 2016 Butcher partners Ltd Update RWSS Regional Economic Analysis the RWSS capital costs was \$333

million and on farm capital costs \$556 million. This was a large increase from their October 2012 Analysis. Total cost would probably be over \$1 billion by now. Now the Central Government is no longer funding mega irrigation schemes it will be very difficult to be funding to pay for it all.

5. CHBDC is not required to supply water to rural areas and for irrigation. Most irrigation schemes are owned by farmers and very few councils, if any, help fund them.

CHBDC contracted with HBRIC to buy 0.3 million m³ water from the RWSS for Takapau and Otane (in about 2016), it indicated it might increase that to 1.6 million m³ to include water Waipukurau and Waipawa also. (I suspect this was mainly to increase water uptake from the RWSS. HBRIC had trouble getting people to sign up for water. Deadlines for them to do so kept being extended.) Now it has superseded that need/want with all the water supply projects in the 30 year Infrastructure Strategy 2018 – 2048 included in the Long Term Plan 2018–28.

It doesn't need to invest in a dam up to 91million m³ for town water supplies.

CHBDC already has 48 water storage facilities and is already working on a second supply of water, pipeline, reservoir and treatment plant for Waipukurau.

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

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

CHBDC will not be denied water for town supplies that is a reasonable and justifiable amount in times of low water flow.

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

There is no guarantee the population of our towns will increase substantially and more business will start up in the towns.

If the dam is built any people involved in the building of it could be out of jobs after it is finished, or shift to areas where there is new work.

There has been many labour shortages for fruit picking and now there is a shortage of bus drivers.

Automation is being used more and will probably be increased in future so less people could be needed for jobs now and in the future.

Processing of produce might be done in Hasting/Napier where there is a larger workforce. Another deterrent for new businesses setting up in CHB is the high rates CHBDC charges. That is unless CHBDC intends to charge lower rates for new business setting up in CHBDC and expect domestic ratepayers to subsidise them.

Hastings and Napier are closer to the Port of Napier and the Airport for getting supplies in and exporting finished products. It would probably be more economical for processors to set up business in Napier or Hastings districts.

8. Many people in CHB are on limited, and low incomes, including those who are retired.

If CHBDC becomes a partner and/or investor of public funds we will have financial insecurity with increasing rates or rents to fund such infrastructure and activities. Some people will struggle to pay them as well as having difficulty buying their necessities and wants.

Less money that ratepayers have means some people will spend less locally and not be able to support our retailers and other businesses. Large rate increases could break some ratepayers.

CHBDC has a small ratepayer base and it is unfair to expect us to spend any more money and time on such risky loans and big water storage schemes.

It is unfair to put us all through the hopes, despairs and arguments again.

CHBDC has said the District has very limited funding sources. In the Key Issues Report, Notice Requirement and Resource Consent Applications as part of the Tukituki Catchment Proposal for the EPA CHBDC said that it's resources for administration of complex consent conditions are limited and are likely to remain so in the long term.

9. CHBDC has not been openly clear about their long term intentions by putting their statement:

"How Council supports such initiatives of Ruataniwha Water Storage Scheme will vary and need to be carefully managed as both a regulator and potential partner and funder of public funds" in the supporting information which many people will probably not bother to get and read. It is more than \$250,000 that ratepayers could lose. It also yearly interest (at today's interest rate of \$8750.). Once again council only puts this in the supporting information and I have never seen or heard it mentioned when they refer to the \$250,000 loan.

CHBDC will also have legal costs and staff time costs setting up the loan and monitoring the conditions.

CHBDC involvement will mean some other work will be neglected or else more staff would need to be employed which will cost more.

We are also losing the opportunity to use the money on other assets rural people might prefer. As it is said water security via Water Holdings CHB Ltd's proposal will benefit all of CHB and the environment, then money should not be taken only from the rural fund.

The CHBDC annual plan supporting document included in the CHBDC Agenda Thursday, 28 February 2019:

"Water holdings CHB will use the funding sought from council to review the Ruataniwha Water Storage Scheme intellectual property to examine two scenarios

Option 1 – developing a full scale Makaroro dam, providing for environmental flows.

Option 2 – build a lower level dam, with no provision of environmental flows and reduced regional impact."

I expect this is still intended.

10. So many conflicting statements have been reported from CHBDC and Water Holdings CHB Ltd.

We have been told "the RWSS will not be revisited. We're starting afresh with no preconceived ideas. This is not the history of the RWSS." But it is! The new lot of public funds if given will be used to review the historical RWSS IP."

(According to the Oxford dictionary revisit and review can mean the same.)

One should learn from history so as not to make mistakes made in the past.

Already a Water Storage Dam on the same river as the RWSS dam is being considered. Ways to get the DoC conservation land are being thought and talked about.

It appears to be the RWSS with different owners and in need of different investors and people paying for it. It will probably be given a new name.

11. HBRC/HBRIC has done all the pre-feasibility and feasibility work on the RWSS. An extensive high-level review costing \$209890 of the RWSS was done by HBRC and released to the public in May 2017.

(<https://www.hbrc.govt.nz/hawkes-bay/projects/ruataniwha-water-storage-scheme/reports/>) Soon after this the RWSS was abandoned as the Supreme Court ruled it was illegal for the DOC conservation land to be swapped or disposed of.

I have spent the last 5 weeks reviewing my 7 years of RWSS IP, the Board of Inquiry's Tukituki Catchment Proposal Final Report and various other relevant reports. (unpaid!). I have come to the same conclusion. It is imprudent and too risky for councils to invest public funds (i.e. ratepayers money) in RWSS and similar mega Water Storage Schemes (size and cost).

12. The Department of Internal Affairs is reviewing how to improve the management of drinking water, storm water and waste water.

HBRC is doing a Regional Review of the Three Waters, (which includes CHB). They will provide the Hawke's Bay perspective to Central Government's Three Waters Review.

HBRC is also doing a new \$5 million Freshwater Security Scheme over the next three years, which involves a Regional Freshwater Assessment and Ready Reaction Fund including a Tukituki Water Security Project.

CHB Council and the Tukituki Task Force are already working together with Regional and Central Government on a sustainable water retention solution for the community.

It would be prudent to wait the outcomes of these before getting involved with a mega (cost and size) water storage scheme and Water Holdings CHB Ltd.

13. Already there has been statements by new promoters on how they are thinking about how to get the DoC land. This would conflict with the proposed Environmental and Sustainability Strategy and the Hawke's Bay Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan which CHBDC has signed.

Monique Davidson CHBDC CEO has said the river must come first. A dam on any river would disrupt the river and would have flow on affects to all the environment, and living organisms.

Water Holdings CHB Ltd said they a searching for an inclusive solution to provide water for all, including the environment.

A dam on a river with with no provision of environmental flows should not even be considered.

The building of a renamed the Water Storage dam the same size and in the same place as the RWSS dam would cause: The total area affected by flooding, the dam structure and spoil disposal is approximately 450.18 ha. A total of 185.18 ha of ecologically significant indigenous vegetation and habitats would be flooded by the proposed reservoir, or covered over by associated infrastructure including the dam structure, new access tracks and soil disposal sites. This comprises of:

- 80.71 ha of mature and secondary indigenous forest including a number of trees which would be in excess of 300 years old and one At-Risk plant species the red mistletoe.
 - Loss of significant terrestrial indigenous vegetation. This is the area of ecologically significant indigenous vegetation covered by the dam and reservoir footprint, which is calculated to be 106.10 ha
 - Edge effects. The assumed detectable edge effects area which would be adversely affected is 10 ha
 - Braided river habitat. The area of braided river habitat (gravel river bed) lost under the reservoir and dam footprint is calculated to be 73.97 ha. Braided rivers are classified as historically rare terrestrial ecosystems in New Zealand.
 - Wetland habitat. The area of ecologically significant wetland and seep zone habitat which would be lost is estimated to be 5.11 ha
 - Loss of habitat for Threatened and At Risk Species. Loss of significant habitat for seven At Risk and Threatened terrestrial fauna and flora species would result as a consequence of the dam and reservoir, equating to 185.18 ha. The Long Tailed Bat which is found on the DoC land is Nationally vulnerable.
- A total of 38 bird species (11 endemic) were identified at the proposed reservoir locality during formal field surveys. Of all individual birds formally observed 55% were native and 45% introduced. Threatened or At Risk species comprise 2.5% of all observations, including one pair of nesting and Nationally Vulnerable New Zealand bush falcon, and one adult banded dotterel with a chick. Nationally 'At Risk' species detected were pied stilt, New Zealand pipit, black shag and North Island fernbird.
- Loss of habitat for some indigenous aquatic species that are unlikely to find the reservoir habitat suitable for them
 - Loss of trout spawning habitat in the areas occupied by the dam and reservoir

- Loss of the established walking track from the end of Wakarara Road, across the Makaroro River, to the DOC tracks extending throughout the Ruahine Forest Park
 - Loss of fish passage beyond the proposed dam to the upper bounds of the Makaroro River and Dutch Creek
 - Changes to the flow regime of the Makaroro and Waipawa Rivers; in particular, upstream of Caldwell Road with a consequent adverse effect on the invertebrate population and trout spawning in those reaches.
- It will be a terrible catastrophe to cause such destruction of our precious natural environment.

It was estimated that in killing 350 Hectares of the Catlins State Forest Park (native forest), it also killed 2500 birds. (source: "The Fight For our Forests." Written By Paul Bensemann).

High numbers of birds could also be killed if CHB native habitats were destroyed when building a dam.

After reading "The Fight For our Forests" one realises if it wasn't for these environmentalists in the 1950's to 2000's NZ would have probably lost all its native forests to logging companies and Government departments for money. Our National Parks and Forest Parks and Conservation land are now very popular with tourists and New Zealanders. More of NZ's native birds would have probably become extinct or nearing extinction.

In the Board of Inquiry's Tukituki Catchment Proposal Final Report and Decisions it stated:

"Considered in isolation the RWSS would not meet s 6 (c) of the RMA and it would be inconsistent with the proposed National Policy on Indigenous Biodiversity."

For this reason alone a Water Storage dam the same size and in the same place as the RWSS dam should not be built as no amount of mitigation, remediation or offset can truly replace the natural environment and the Indigenous Biodiversity that would be lost or disturbed. There are better ways to protect and improve both the rivers and natural environments.

Ecologically significant indigenous vegetation and habitat utilised by a wide variety of species, some of which are Threatened and At Risk Species, should not be sacrificed in the hope of economic improvement.

We are told to plant more trees to help mitigate climate change and a dam on the Makaroro negates this by destroying a large area of mature native trees and bushes.

14 . The Annual Plan 2017/18 has been superseded by the Long Term Plan 2018/28. In the Long Term Plan 2018/28 it says "capital projects already identified in the LTP are designed to address the needs of currently predicted growth water consents include sufficient volume to meet expected demand." "The RWSS project will not proceed in its current form and has not been included in the LTP."

But if we can refer to outdated plans and decisions then CHBDC should take the following into consideration:

Proposed investment by CHBDC in the Ruataniwha Water Storage Scheme

Date: 11 July 2014 4:01:13 PM NZST

"Thank you for your submission on the Council's proposed investment in the Ruataniwha Water Storage Scheme, we appreciate your input and have taken your opinion into consideration when making our decision.

Council met on the 10th of July 2014 to discuss the proposal to invest in the Ruataniwha Water Storage Scheme. Council voted not to invest in the Ruataniwha Water Storage Scheme."

15. In the Provincial Growth Fund's position paper for Water Storage it says "Size of investments: The PGF will not support mega irrigation projects. It will consider micro level (i.e. that cover one or a small number of farms), micro scale and medium scale water storage projects. There is no maximum acceptable size of projects (below the mega schemes that are greater than 20,000 hectares), however, the tests applied to the benefits of large schemes will become more stringent as the scale of the project gets larger. "

The RWSS or a similar sized water storage would be classified as mega. The chances of Water Holdings CHB getting funding are very small if they honestly stated they were hoping to build a storage and scheme that will have similar benefits based on the RWSS.

16. As Water Holdings CHB Ltd are business men they should be able to find the money elsewhere or do the review free instead of getting ratepayers/CHBDC to pay them to do it.

17. In the CHBDC Rural Ward Fund Investment Commercial Structuring Discussion Paper – Funding Structure is says that "It is worth nothing that the investment to date was via Hawke's Bay Regional Investment Company " It is foolish to spend more time and money on a water storage scheme that is worthless even after about 10 years work on it.

18. There are other options and alternative methods for farmers and growers to farm sustainably so as not to degrade the environment. There are many other factors that influence their prosperity besides lack of water. Frosts, high winds, hail, market demand and other factors have effects.

19. Financial security, water security and the environment are just as important for all residents and ratepayers as water security and profits are for some farmers and businesses.

2. Do you agree with the changes to the I agree with the changes to the Revenue and Financing Policy to have Leadership, Governance, and Consultation funded from the General Rate.
the changes to the It makes my rates cheaper. If it was unchanged and Leadership, Governance, and Consultation funded from the Uniform annual charge my rates increase will be over the Rates (Increases) affordability index.

**Revenue &
Financing
Policy?**

3. Do you support the establishment of the Disaster Relief Fund Trust? I agree with the establishment of the Disaster Relief Fund Trust. If CHBDC plans to donate to the Disaster Relief Fund Trust it should consult with ratepayers before doing so.

4. Do you have any feedback on the Draft Environmental Strategy?

I agree with most of the Draft Environmental Strategy, with the amendments:

1. "Managing our impact on waterways" should be changed to "Improving our Rivers."
2. Water storage should be deleted.
3. "Successful environmental guardians ensuring future generations THRIVE here" should be changed to "Successful environmental guardians ensuring we and future generations THRIVE here"

More feedback:

1. "Managing our impact on waterways" should be changed to "Improving our Rivers." Managing our impact on waterways could mean maintaining their status quo or even allowing our rivers to deteriorate. Many of our rivers are some of the worst in HB. HBRC and the Governments National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management are focused on to trying to improve our freshwater conditions where they have been degraded. Dams on rivers should not be supported.

2. Water storage should be deleted. Urban water supply infrastructure is already included in the CHBDC 30 year Infrastructure Strategy 2018 – 2048.

CHBDC is not required to supply water to rural areas and for irrigation. Most irrigation schemes are owned by farmers and very few councils, if any, help fund them.

A dam on the Makaroro River or on any other river is not protecting the natural environment, it is destroying it. If a dam was built on the same site as the RWSS dam the total area affected by flooding, the dam structure and spoil disposal is approximately 450.18 ha. A total of 185.18 ha of ecologically significant indigenous vegetation and habitats would be flooded by the proposed reservoir. The Makaroro is a braided river classified as a historically rare terrestrial ecosystem in New Zealand.

#28
10/01/16

As "protecting the natural environment is council's core business" a dam should not be built on the Makaroro River as it flows in an unmodified and natural state and is one of the highest water quality rivers in HB.

In The Board of Inquiry's Tukituki Catchment Proposal Final Report it said "within the footprint of the dam and reservoir the natural environment of the Makaroro River will be irreversibly changed and this cannot be avoided, remedied, or mitigated."

Any on river dam should be opposed.

3. "Successful environmental guardians ensuring future generations THRIVE here" should be changed to "Successful environmental guardians ensuring we and future generations THRIVE here"

4. Rain water tanks should be mandatory for new buildings and encouraged for existing homes. Even if the water was for outdoor use and toilets this would help save water.

Industries that use a large amount of water should be encouraged to recycle it. I think Wattie's recycles some of its water.

In the Section "What we need to do? Ensuring environment vitality through our way of working" the Action to "Investigate long term water supply storage solution" should be deleted as it doubles up on the Action "Council and the Tukituki Task Force will continue to work together with Regional and Central Government on a sustainable water retention solution for the community."

The Department of Internal Affairs is reviewing how to improve the management of drinking water, storm water and waste water.

HBRC is doing a Regional Review of the Three Waters, (which includes CHB). They will provide the Hawke's Bay perspective to Central Government's Three Waters Review.

HBRC is also doing a new \$5 million Freshwater Security Scheme over the next three years, which involves a Regional Freshwater Assessment and Ready Reaction Fund including a Tukituki Water Security Project.

5. CHBDC need to prove they are genuine in their intentions and should stop discharging wastewater into our rivers. Even if it is treated to a high standard many people have the perception it is polluting our rivers and seas.

6. CHBDC via the CHB Water Task-force should stop trying to change the rules in Plan Change 6 to delay the new low flow limits.

The rivers belong to all New Zealanders and flora and fauna, not just the irrigators. For years the Tukituki catchment has had water over allocated and people and the fauna and the flora have had to put up with poor water quantity and quality. Even when the new minimum flows come in force fauna, including the long-fin eel and torrent fish, (both of

which are in the top 150 priority NZ threatened and at risk species in the NZ's Threatened Species Strategy), will have to make a 10% sacrifice of their habitat protection.

The irrigators have known since 2013 when the new minimum water flow limits for the Tukituki catchment would apply. They've had plenty of time to plan their strategies for the possibility of water restrictions.

There was always an 'IF' for the Ruataniwha Water Storage Scheme, it was never guaranteed. The Board of Enquiry stated in it's final report that Plan Change 6 will have to stand on it's own feet regardless of whether the RWSS (or any other irrigation scheme) proceeds.

The DOC conservation land case would not have gone through the courts if Forest and Bird thought they would lose the case.

It is senseless to waste time and money doing a Plan Change for 2018/2019 and 2019/2020 as the Tukituki Water Task Force requested. The Central Hawke's Bay Surface Water Group has previously had funding assistance from HBRC to help with finding a solution.

No budgets were in the HBRC 2018–2028 Long Term Plan for any PC6 changes.

What is done in the Tukituki catchment and Plan Change 6 sets a precedence for other catchment areas.

There should be no need to give irrigators more time and to waste HBRC resources doing a plan change.

7. CHBDC should stop accepting waste from out of our district going into the CHB landfill. If they expect CHB residents to reduce waste to the land fill then CHBDC should also.

The main reasons for opposing the selling landfill space to other councils and allowing rubbish from other areas to fill up CHB's landfill are :

Selling landfill space to other councils and bringing in rubbish from other areas conflicts with the aim of minimisation of solid waste in CHB.

As CHBDC promotes and funds waste minimisation it's hypocrisy to then take waste from outside the district for our landfill.

With the increase in CHB population predicted there will probably be more residual waste to go into the landfill. In the years 2013/14, 2014/15, 2015/16 and 2016/17 there has been an increase in residual waste from the CHB District.

This is likely to continue with increased population.

CHB can not be a proud district if it is full of rubbish.

It is not smart thinking to voluntarily fill our landfill up quicker.

Even though selling landfill space helps fund management and upkeep of the landfill now, it would be more economical in the long term to make the present landfill last as long as possible.

Not accepting out of district solid waste will defer the costs of having to build new cells extensions and then having to monitor the closure of the landfill and having to build a new one.

It is not nature friendly or good for the environment to use CHBDC as a dumping ground.

Allowing rubbish from other areas into CHB is not protecting our unique landscape and soils. It increases the risk of harmful effects from the wastes.

It is hypocrisy to promote waste minimisation in schools and elsewhere while the CHBDC are also increasing the waste in CHB by obtaining it from out of the district.

Allowing rubbish from other areas to fill up CHB's landfill lessens the durability of the infrastructure. It is not smart growth and it doesn't use our resources intelligently and with care to ensure they are protected for citizens of the future.

Selling of landfill space to other councils does not meet the objective of improving the opportunity for avoiding or reducing waste at source.

8. Central Hawke's Bay should officially become free of genetically modified organisms and Organic farming should be encouraged.

We would be healthier and happier if Central Hawke's Bay was farmed organically and the earth and the environment wasn't poisoned or polluted.

We need to make Central Hawke's Bay a clean, healthy, eco-friendly place to live and visit.

We need to care for the environment and live sustainably if we want to help make the world a better place to live in now and for generations to come.

Food grown here would be known for being safe and sustainable. If grown organically it could also provide more jobs on farms.

Eco-tourism could also attract more visitors.

9. CHBDC should plant native plants and trees whenever possible. Our existing native habitats should be protected.

10. There should be some policy or bylaw for nuisance activities which includes large fires that burn and smoulder for over a day. Last year we had to endure forestry slash being burned that lasted for over 3 weeks. The fire brigade had to be called out four times. Our houses were contaminated for months and health was affected. With more forestry plantations and cropping in CHB this could become more frequent.

11. I hope CHB can be "Successful environmental guardians" and can achieve most of the high aims in the Environment and Sustainability Strategy. We all have changes to make both in ways of thinking and doing.

Any other suggestions?

Rates must be kept as low as possible and only for necessities.

User pays should be a priority when charging rates.

Errors:

1. on page 3 of Funding Impact statement: Rates Factors for UAC factor \$367.650 was the 2018/19 rate. It should be \$276.63 for 2019/20
2. Fees and Charges, Wastewater (Sewerage) Group, Trade Waste, Category B6 Phosphorus last line should be Waipawa not Waipukurau (which is on the above line).
3. It would be good to have council meetings recorded and able to be viewed on the internet and downloaded as an audio file. Meeting minutes should be more informative.
4. If CHBDC or councillors wish to discuss my submission with me they can phone me.

Leigh Collecutt

From: kall@xtra.co.nz
Sent: Friday, 12 April 2019 6:11 AM
To: Thrive
Subject: amendment to submission Annual Plan 2019-2020

Importance: High

4. Do you have any feedback on the Draft Environmental Strategy?

"Managing our impact on waterways" should be changed to "Improving our water."

Water includes all forms of water including rivers, streams, groundwater in aquifers, wetlands, ponds, lakes, reservoirs and seawater.

Managing our impact on waterways could mean maintaining their status quo or even allowing our waterways to deteriorate. Many of our rivers are some of the worst in HB. HBRC and the Governments National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management are focused on to trying to improve our freshwater conditions where they have been degraded. Dams on rivers should not be supported.

Any other suggestions?

If CHBDC or councillors want to discuss my submission with me they can phone me.

Kathryn Bayliss
116 Maharakeke Road,
R D 1
Waipukurau 4281.

phone: 068589900

From: kall@xtra.co.nz
Sent: Monday, 8 April 2019 2:37 PM
To: Thrive
Subject: Annual plan additional submission

Categories: Purple category

Hello,

I have sent in my submission but would like to add the following as I have just had an answer to my question:

"As it is said water security will benefit all of CHB and the environment, why is money only taken from the rural funds and not the urban funds also?"

CHBDC Answer:

"It has been suggested that the Rural Community will be the ones that have the highest benefit from increasing water security and storage. Therefore the Council has asked for feedback from the community as to whether this is the appropriate funding."

I belong to the rural community but will get no benefit from increasing water security and storage. I have my own water storage. All funding given to Water Holdings CHB Ltd is inappropriate.

I have read how much water CHBDC can take under it's water consents.

Water taken in each of the 2010 to 2018 years and 2019 up to now, for each of Waipukurau, Waipawa, Otane and Takapau was all well within the consented limits. There is no need to build a big dam like RWSS for town water supply.

Yours sincerely,
Kathryn Bayliss
116 Maharakeke Road,
R D 1
Waipukurau 4281.

phone: 068589900

Leigh Collecutt

From: kall@xtra.co.nz
Sent: Wednesday, 10 April 2019 2:40 PM
To: Thrive
Subject: Draft Annual plan 2019-2020 additional submission

Categories: Purple category

Draft Annual Plan 2019-2020 additional submission:

Instead of giving money from the Ruahine Ward Disbursement Reserve Account, Aramoana Ward Disbursement Reserve Account and Ruataniwha Ward Disbursement Reserve Account to controversial projects I suggest liquidating them and disbursing them among eligible ratepayers (each rating unit) of each particular ward. The ratepayers then could chose themselves what they want to do with the money.

An alternative use could be:

To donate the yearly interest earned on the Ward Disbursement Reserve Accounts to the HBRC Hotspot project for Lake Whatuma. Their long term objective is for the long term restoration, enhancement and management of it. This could become a major attraction in CHB.


Kathryn Bayliss
116 Maharakeke Road,
R D 1
Waipukurau 4281.

phone: 068589900

Leigh Collicutt

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Monday, 8 April 2019 8:52 PM
To: Thrive
Subject: Annual Plan 2019/20 Consultation - Feedback [#29]

Submitters Graham Palmer
Name

Postal 
Address 813 Lawrence Street Akina
 Hastings , HB 4122
 New Zealand

Mobile Phone 0212650487
Number

Email grahampp1972@gmail.com

Do you wish No
to present
your
comments to
council in
person at a
hearing?

Please note that your submission (including any personal information supplied) will be made available to Councillors and the public. Submissions Close on 12 April 2019 at 5pm

1. Tell us what you think about the proposal that Council give a \$250,000 suspensory loan to Water Holding CHB to keep the prospect of water storage alive in Central Hawke's Bay.

I oppose the giving of this loan on the basis of probable poor economic and environmental outcomes if the project should proceed.

My understanding of catchment dynamics comes from many years of study at Massey University. This experience tells me that this project is doomed to underperform both financially and from an environmental standpoint. The likely

downstream impacts would be significant and would extend all the way to the coast.

It is my opinion that if this project were to proceed, that ratepayers and the environment would end up bearing the cost on behalf of an interested few.

Rather than modifying the land and rivers to suit traditional farming practices, we must make suitable land use decisions for the benefit of everyone.

2. Do you No.
agree with
the changes
to the
Revenue &
Financing
Policy?

3. Do you Yes.
support the
establishment
of the
Disaster
Relief Fund
Trust?

Leigh Collecutt

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, 9 April 2019 7:07 AM
To: Thrive
Subject: Annual Plan 2019/20 Consultation - Feedback [#30]

Submitters Myles Henderson

Name

Postal 

Address 20 Blackhead Road, , Waipukurau, 4284 20 Blackhead Road
Waipukurau, Hawkes Bay 4284
New Zealand

Day Phone 068554866
Number

Night 068554866
Phone
Number

Email kokomoko@xtra.co.nz

Do you No
wish to
present
your
comments
to council
in person
at a
hearing?

Please note that your submission (including any personal information supplied) will be made available to Councillors and the public. Submissions Close on 12 April 2019 at 5pm

1. Tell us what you think about the proposal that Council give a \$250,000 suspensory loan to Water Holding CHB to keep the prospect of water storage alive in Central Hawke's Bay.

I would like to give my strong support to Council in providing a Suspensory Loan to Water Holdings CHB.

I read that the local towns and communities are facing water shortages and there seems to be no easy solution to this. Water storage would provide water to the growing towns, allow development and diversified crops on the Ruataniwha Plain adding jobs and security for the CHB district. Water storage will allow irrigators to shift away from ground water use so this combined with possible flushing should help restore the Tuki Tuki river.

I am not in the irrigation footprint but I encourage the council to do everything they can to help facilitate and lead public support towards water storage in CHB.

Water storage is vital for our district now and into the future.

Leigh Collecutt

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, 9 April 2019 12:49 PM
To: Thrive
Subject: Annual Plan 2019/20 Consultation - Feedback [#31]

Submitters Name Duncan Smith

Postal Address



69 Evan road R. D. 2
Otane , Hawke's Bay 4277
New Zealand

Mobile Phone Number 0275066710

Email staghill@farmside.co.nz

Do you wish to present your comments to council in person at a hearing? No

Please note that your submission (including any personal information supplied) will be made available to Councillors and the public. To whom it may concern
I am strongly in favour of our council investing in this project.
Submissions Close on 12 April 2019 at 5pm

1. Tell us what you think about the proposal that Council give a \$250,000 suspensory loan to Water Holding CHB to keep the prospect of water storage alive in Central Hawke's Bay. The benefits for the whole of the Growing community in CHB will be substantial.
CHB has the opportunity through projects like this to really put itself on the map as being a desirable place to work and play and invest in

Leigh Collecutt

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, 9 April 2019 8:54 PM
To: Thrive
Subject: Annual Plan 2019/20 Consultation - Feedback [#32]

Submitters Mike Petersen

Name

Postal



Address

418 Farm Road, R.D.4
Waipukurau, Hawke's Bay 4284
New Zealand

Mobile 021 2437344

Phone

Number

Email tepuna@farmside.co.nz

Do you No

wish to

present

your

comments

to council

in person

at a

hearing?

Please note that your submission (including any personal information supplied) will be made available to Councillors and the public. Submissions Close on 12 April 2019 at 5pm

1. Tell us what you think about the proposal that Council give a \$250,000 suspensory loan to Water Holding CHB to keep the prospect of water storage alive in Central Hawke's Bay.

I fully support the CHB District Council providing a \$250,000 suspensory loan to Water Holdings CHB to investigate and identify water security options for Central Hawke's Bay under the terms of the Consultation Document provided.

The economic and social wellbeing of the CHB community depends on a thriving and vibrant rural economy. Water security and further water storage options are vital in ensuring that Central Hawke's Bay can withstand and endure the challenges of climate change in the future. This work by Water Holdings CHB is an important part in securing the future success of Central Hawke's Bay.

2. Do you agree with the changes to the Revenue & Financing Policy? I do not support the change in rating for the Leadership, Governance and Consultation from the Uniform Annual General Charge to the Capital Value Based General Rate. This change does not reflect the true cost of these activities across all ratepayers and places an unfair burden on land owners relative to the general population.

Leigh Collecutt

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, 10 April 2019 9:00 AM
To: Thrive
Subject: Annual Plan 2019/20 Consultation - Feedback [#33]

Submitters Name Angus Mabin

Postal Address



Taniwha 3440 SHWNo2, R.D.1,
Waipukurau

Day Phone Number 0274405390

Mobile Phone Number 0274405390

Email angusmabin@wnation.net.nz

Do you wish to present your comments to council in person at a hearing? Yes

Please note that your submission (including any personal information supplied) will be made available to Councillors and the public.
Submissions Close on 12 April 2019 at 5pm

I support the proposal on the basis that water security is needed to ensure the economic, environmental and social future of this district.

1. Tell us what you think about the proposal that Council give a \$250,000 suspensory loan to Water Holding CHB to keep the prospect of water storage alive in Central Hawke's Bay.

Leigh Collecutt

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, 10 April 2019 3:16 PM
To: Thrive
Subject: Annual Plan 2019/20 Consultation - Feedback [#34]

Submitters Name Reidun Marshall

Postal Address 
30 Alison St
Otane 4202
New Zealand

Do you wish to present your comments to council in person at a hearing? No

Please note that your submission (including any personal information supplied) will be made available to Councillors and the public. No way! Don't give ratepayers money to a private company to build a dam.
Submissions Close on 12 April 2019 at 5pm

1. Tell us what you think about the proposal that Council give a \$250,000 suspensory loan to Water Holding CHB to keep the prospect of water storage alive in Central Hawke's Bay.

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, 10 April 2019 6:28 PM
To: Thrive
Subject: Annual Plan 2019/20 Consultation - Feedback [#35]

Submitters Name Duncan Holden

Postal Address 
Forest Gate R.D.1
Ongaonga 4278
New Zealand

Mobile Phone Number 0274371549

Email ddh@xtra.co.nz

Do you wish to present your comments to council in person at a hearing? No

Please note that your submission (including any personal information supplied) will be made available to Councillors and the public. Submissions Close on 12 April 2019 at 5pm

The opportunity to take surplus water for storage must be explored. We have seen what Rob Muldoon did with water storage. His foresight will be remembered for ever. We can be the same in CHB if given the opportunity.

1. Tell us what you think about the proposal that Council give a \$250,000 suspensory loan to Water Holding CHB to keep the prospect of water storage alive in Central Hawke's Bay.

The opportunities are knocking on our door and we can't open these due to lack of vision.

Kiwifruit, apples, specialist seed crops. The list goes on.

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, 10 April 2019 7:15 PM
To: Thrive
Subject: Annual Plan 2019/20 Consultation - Feedback [#36]

Submitters Name Sheryl Bayliss

Postal Address



192 Maharakeke Rd RD1
Waipukurau 4281

Do you wish to present your comments to council in person at a hearing? No

Please note that your submission (including any personal information supplied) will be made available to Councillors and the public. Submissions Close on 12 April 2019 at 5pm

I disagree with the proposal to give a loan to Water Holdings CHB which is a private company. I disagree with damming the Makaroro river (or any other river) and this is what the IP purchased by Water Holding CHB is all about. I disagree to having changes made to current policies to allow any loan to occur.

1. Tell us what you think about the proposal that Council give a \$250,000 suspensory loan to Water Holding CHB to keep the prospect of water storage alive in Central Hawke's Bay.

2. Do you agree with the changes to the Revenue & Financing Policy?

I agree with this proposal for a fairer rating system

3. Do you support the establishment of the Disaster Relief Fund Trust?

Yes

Leigh Collecutt

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, 10 April 2019 8:15 PM
To: Thrive
Subject: Annual Plan 2019/20 Consultation - Feedback [#37]

Submitters Name Lorraine Horder

Postal Address



78a White Road RD2
Otane, Hawkes Bay 4277
New Zealand

Day Phone Number +642041288118

Email mrs@horder.me.uk

Do you wish to present your comments to
council in person at a hearing? No

Please note that your submission (including
any personal information supplied) will be
made available to Councillors and the public.
Submissions Close on 12 April 2019 at 5pm

I object to a private company getting money from the ratepayers for a
project which does not benefit the ratepayers.

1. Tell us what you think about the proposal
that Council give a \$250,000 suspensory loan
to Water Holding CHB to keep the prospect of
water storage alive in Central Hawke's Bay.

Leigh Collecutt

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, 10 April 2019 9:27 PM
To: Thrive
Subject: Annual Plan 2019/20 Consultation - Feedback [#38]

Submitters Name Sharon Ritchie

Postal Address 
339 Drumpeel Road R.D. 1
Otane , CHB 4276
New Zealand

Mobile Phone Number 0272729129

Email sharon@drumpeelfarms.co.nz

Do you wish to present your comments to council in person at a hearing? No

Please note that your submission (including any personal information supplied) will be made available to Councillors and the public. Yes to this investment. We need an over arching look into the best solution for water storage, allocation and distribution within CHB, to meet everyone's needs.
Submissions Close on 12 April 2019 at 5pm

1. Tell us what you think about the proposal that Council give a \$250,000 suspensory loan to Water Holding CHB to keep the prospect of water storage alive in Central Hawke's Bay.

2. Do you agree with the changes to the Revenue & Financing Policy? Yes

3. Do you support the establishment of the Disaster Relief Fund Trust? Yes

4. Do you have any feedback on the Draft Environmental Strategy? Looks to be environmentally sustainable and financially sound. Adding benefit to local economy.

Leigh Collicutt

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, 11 April 2019 8:37 AM
To: Thrive
Subject: Annual Plan 2019/20 Consultation - Feedback [#39]

Submitters kevin Davidson

Name

Postal 

Address 313 Wakarara Road RD 2 Ongaonga 4279
4279

Day Phone 0272000098
Number

Mobile 0272000098
Phone
Number

Night 0272000098
Phone
Number

Email kldavidson@xtra.co.nz

Do you No
wish to
present
your
comments
to council
in person
at a
hearing?

Please note that your submission (including any personal information supplied) will be made available to Councillors and the public. Submissions Close on 12 April 2019 at 5pm

1. Tell us what you think about the proposal that Council give a \$250,000 suspensory loan to Water Holding CHB to keep the prospect of water storage alive in Central Hawke's Bay.

I Support this loan, It's a no brainer that we should have a Dam plenty of Countries have no water we on the other hand are only short in the Summer months we just need to work out how best to do it. Plan Change 6 now restricts 65% of CHB water that has never been restricted before and has been estimated to cost 1000 jobs some thing we know CHB can't afford. We now have a ownership structure that holds the ownership of the dam in our CHB community and with directors that will think out side the square and explore all avenues, we just need to assist with funding it. The majority of the proposed irrigated area will not go in dairying but rather Horticulture and Lamb finishing. I for one are even exploring Horticulture our selves with our existing land. If this was to go ahead the environment foot print will be less. If the extra and some existing land was to go into Horticulture there would be thousands of jobs created and hundreds of thousands of dollars flow through our community. It is already starting to happen with the recent sale up Wakarara Road of irrigated land

Leigh Collecutt

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, 11 April 2019 1:49 PM
To: Thrive
Subject: Annual Plan 2019/20 Consultation - Feedback [#40]

Submitters Hay Rose

Name

Postal



Address 52 Argyll Road R.D.1
Otane, Hawkes Bay 4276
New Zealand

Day Phone 0274616413

Number

Email hayhunt@extra.co.nz

Do you No

wish to

present

your

comments

to council

in person

at a

hearing?

Please note that your submission (including any personal information supplied) will be made available to Councillors and the public. Submissions Close on 12 April 2019 at 5pm

1. Tell us what you think about the proposal that Council give a \$250,000 suspensory loan to Water Holding CHB to keep the prospect of water storage alive in Central Hawke's Bay.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to submit my views.

I am opposed to the proposal that Council give a \$250,000 suspensory loan to Water Holding CHB.

Water Holding CHB is a private company made up of local farmers and a plumbing business owner. It's aim is to find a new water storage solution for farmers using the intellectual property (based on the Ruataniwha Dam project) purchased from HBRC for \$100,000. This property cost HBRC \$18,000,000 and was funded by ratepayers.

It appears to me that they are now asking CHBDC rate payers to gift them a further quarter of a million dollars.

As a rate payer, the investigation into water storage at the Ruataniwha site has cost us enough. It was not taken up by CHB farmers in sufficient numbers (unless with a view to intensify), and was proven by experts to be uneconomic and environmentally damaging. The scheme was incredibly divisive to our community.

The \$250,000 could be put to much better use: to investigate other ways to increase town water supply (eg water storage incentives for every new or existing home or building) and to investigate alternate farm practices for dry conditions so our community thrives in the long term.

I am opposed to the proposal that Council give a \$250,000 suspensory loan to Water Holdings CHB.

Leigh Collecutt

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, 11 April 2019 5:06 PM
To: Thrive
Subject: Annual Plan 2019/20 Consultation - Feedback [#41]

Submitters Name tony Murphy

Postal Address 
1196 state highway 2 RD1
Otane 4276

Mobile Phone Number 0275833324

Email spu.d@xtra.co.nz

Do you wish to present your comments to council in person at a hearing? No

Please note that your submission (including any personal information supplied) will be made available to Councillors and the public. Submissions Close on 12 April 2019 at 5pm

I do not think the council should give a suspensory loan to water holdings CHB.

My reasons for opposing the loan is that besides flogging the dead horse of a large dam in the makaroro river, there is not enough detail as to what is proposed for "securing the long term and sustainable water security for the region".

1. Tell us what you think about the proposal that Council give a \$250,000 suspensory loan to Water Holding CHB to keep the prospect of water storage alive in Central Hawke's Bay.

Maybe once the finding of HBRCs Ruataniwha aquifer study are released Water holding CHB or other conglomerates may have a more solid business case to put to council to secure public funding.

Leigh Collecutt

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, 11 April 2019 10:19 PM
To: Thrive
Subject: Annual Plan 2019/20 Consultation - Feedback [#42]

Submitters Robin Horder
Name

Postal 
Address 78a White Road RD2
Otane, Hawkes Bay 4277
New Zealand

Day Phone +642041288116
Number

Email robin@horder.me.uk

Do you wish Yes
to present
your
comments to
council in
person at a
hearing?

Please note that your submission (including any personal information supplied) will be made available to Councillors and the public. Submissions Close on 12 April 2019 at 5pm

1. Tell us what you think about the proposal that Council give a \$250,000 suspensory loan to Water Holding CHB to keep the prospect of water storage alive in Central Hawke's Bay.

I object strongly to the proposed loan.

1. Private company is an inappropriate corporate entity to receive ratepayer grant/soft loan. No guarantee that they will deliver benefits. Company law requires that they act in interests of shareholders. Better for council to employ consultants

2. Misleading. Company has started a PR campaign promising benefits to river flow, to get a law change to allow

flooding of DOC land to allow construction of RWSS tall dam. In reality company asset are consents and IP for RWSS v1, sole employee is ex Shell engineer. What other options will they really consider?

3. Premature. Council has not explored alternative ways to achieve water security and assumes that a big dam (RWSS v2) is required.

Regional council are modelling the aquifer to identify sustainable reserves and best way to manage water.

I attach more details in the attached document

4. Do you Welcome council support for biodiversity, however this is inconsistent with support for RWSS dam
have any company and flooding of DOC reserve.
feedback on I request that the council review alternative ways to create wetlands to retain water, sustain summer
the Draft river flow and encourage biodiversity.
Environmental
Strategy?

Attach a File



[chbc_annual_plan_r_horder_submission.pdf](#) 64.99 KB · PDF

CHBC Annual Plan – Objection to Proposed Suspensory Loan to CHB Waterholdings Ltd

Summary

I object strongly to the proposal for CHB DC to provide \$250k Suspensory Loan to CHB Waterholdings Ltd (Company) principally because the interests of the ratepayers are inadequately protected from the conflicting interests of the landowning shareholders. The proposal is presented as a cheap way to access the IP arising from \$26m spent on RWSS and a modest contribution to catalyse a beneficial project expenditure, I fear that the risks are understated, the benefits exaggerated and the council proposes to pledge good money after bad.

The companies sole assets relate to RWSS dam. To make a business case a tall dam (>70m high) is required which requires a law change to flood 22Ha DoC conservation land. Company state that without flooding the ancient pristine forest, storage capacity is only 20%. The company plans a PR campaign to gain support for a law change so that their tall dam IP can be exploited. Any other options offered are misleading claims designed to secure more taxpayer funding. The claims that the company is not intending to make profit and is working for the common good implies that the board is operating improperly. The reality is that it can change policy anytime and discharge its duties under company law after it has secured public funds.

The council is correct to investigate options to provide water security and should consider engaging competent parties to evaluate a wide range of options before supporting this RWSS v2. Company is NOT competent to conduct this type of investigation since it has no track record and the sole employee is an oil industry engineer. This is a misuse of public funds and a shabby way to procure a feasibility study.

My Background

Before moving to NZ in 2016 and to Otane in 2017, I was a professional mechanical engineer with experience in civil/military aerospace design. However I claim no competence in hydrology or agriculture and my observations are therefore based on recent research into the environmental concerns for water quality, lost biodiversity and from first principles.

Detailed Reasons for Objections

- ***Inappropriate Corporate Structure for Partnership with Ratepayers.*** Loan is to a Limited Company, therefore Directors are required by company law to act in best interests of the company and shareholders. Most of the shareholders own farmland close to SH50 where capital values will be increased by the prospect that secure water supplies will permit higher profit, intensive land use. If they secure low cost Venture Capital project funding from government (\$250k from CHB DC and \$250k from Provincial Growth Fund) and retain control of the water allocation, then the shareholders may profit substantially. The only benefits to ratepayers will be achieving the milestones and deliverables that council intend to define.
Potential mitigation that is not included in the proposed annual plan:
 - Rigorous, loan conditions. Stage payments based on independent scrutiny of milestones.
 - CHBDC take a majority shareholding and with rights to appoint the board.
- **Premature Before HB RC Hydrology Study.** RC have established a 2 year study to determine sustainable capacity of aquifer. Therefore it is premature to conduct feasibility study into Makaroro stream dam before any shortfall of supply from aquifer is understood.

- **Misleading Benefits Offered.** The company and councillors state that 4cu m/sec (4000 litres/sec) of water can be allocated to augment low flow river flows in Makararo, Waipawa and Tukituki which would thereby reduce the probability that 'surface water' users would be 'turned off' in time of drought when minimum river flow rates occur. Whilst presented as a useful environmental benefit with improved river conditions, the surface water users are the main beneficiaries and should be required to fund this capability if it is shown to be feasible.

However such augmentation rates are unlikely to be deliverable. About 50% of the Tukituki flow originates in the Makararo stream. For perspective, minimum flow rates which lead to 'no take' restrictions are rising to 4.3 cu m/s (Tukituki @ Redbridge) and it is forecast that 1 year in 2, flows will be below this for at least 10 days. As an illustration, to augment river flows by the 4cu m/s to avoid 'no take' restrictions requires 350,000 cu m/day which is roughly the daily demand for about 70 irrigated dairy farms. Dairy is, I understand the most water intense land use in Hawkes Bay, so the notion that in times of drought the dam operators could afford to augment the river and so deprive at least 70 customers at a time of peak demand is incredible.

In summary, substantial capacity is required to provide significant augmentation of river flows, so it seems very unlikely that the dam will make economic sense and achieve the GDP growth projected.

- o "Secures Municipal Supplies". Potable water is taken from surface water which may be curtailed if river flows are low. However the quantity required is very small compared to agricultural irrigators and this modest total volume required could be secured by deep bores to access groundwater.
- o "All Options are Under Consideration". The IP purchased by CHB Waterholdings relates to the RWSS scheme preferred location at Makararo, so is of limited value for any other storage options or damming locations. The proposal to council, which probably represents the real intent of the company, was for 2 options a low dam or a tall dam.
- The company project manager told me that the capacity of the small dam which does not require flooding of the DoC land is 20% the capacity of the 'tall' dam proposed by RWSS. They intend to campaign for a law change to allow the DOC land to be swapped.
- **Business Case.** The RWSS IP should already be sufficient for the company to produce a conceptual business plan to demonstrate how a dam and distribution network could be funded with or without loss of sensitive native bush. Income streams may include deemed value for river flow augmentation, for agricultural/horticultural water supplies and costs for construction and maintenance, including removal of silt. Clearly any estimates at this stage would bear considerable uncertainty, but they should be provided to council for independent scrutiny as condition of any loan. Ovious adverse factors when compared to RWSS are:-
 - o Dairy farming and associated water demand will be curtailed by plan change 6 (PC6) nutrient leaching restrictions leading to changing land use.
 - o Law change is required to build substantial dam to permit land swap and flooding 22Ha of pristine bush. This conflicts directly with councils commitment to biodiversity and other hollow pledges.
- **Sustainability.** By providing secure water supplies, current patterns of irrigation and intensive agriculture would be secured against impacts of climate change. However this discourages

adaptation to water scarcity and encourages the continued pollution of ground water. Sustainable responses to climate changes may require changes of land use and may require reductions in existing consents.

- Alternative Methods to Provide Water Security. By funding this storage scheme study, Council has assumed that water storage is the best way to deliver water security and failed to examine alternative approaches. Alternatives may derive from:-
 - Restoration of wetlands and forest in the catchment improves biodiversity and acts to hold water back. Wetlands are natural storage schemes that can maintain low water flows, reduce peak flooding events, hold back gravel and potentially enhance aquifer recharge rates. As demonstrated at Such a re-wilding scheme could be a substantial sustainable asset to the district.
 - Campaign to rebalance water consents granted by HB RC. Low river flows are caused by over extraction.
- Opportunity Cost. Funding the project from the Rural Reserve fund deprives the fund of the capital and associated \$9k pa interest. Therefore if it is not required to provide a capital reserve which is not explained, it reduces potential funding support for alternative services for the wider benefit of the rural community, such as for example proactive measures to promote rural fibre, cellphone coverage, carpooling etc etc.

Leigh Collecutt

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Friday, 12 April 2019 9:15 AM
To: Thrive
Subject: Annual Plan 2019/20 Consultation - Feedback [#43]

Submitters Jamie Gunson

Name

Postal 

Address 234 Pettit Road
OngaOnga, Hawkes Bay 4278
New Zealand

Day Phone +6421 442098

Number

Email gunsonja@gmail.com

Do you No

wish to

present

your

comments

to council

in person

at a

hearing?

Please note that your submission (including any personal information supplied) will be made available to Councillors and the public. Submissions Close on 12 April 2019 at 5pm

1. Tell us what you think about the proposal that Council give a \$250,000 suspensory loan to Water Holding CHB to keep the prospect of water storage alive in Central Hawke's Bay.

I fully encourage Council to support a \$250,000 suspensory loan to Water Holding CHB. Water Storage for CHB is a no brainer for the future prosperity of this community. If any one has any doubt on this they only have to go and visit Ashburton, Timaru, Oamaru etc etc. The boom they have had on the back of water is enormous. The concerns of water driving intensification which in turn harm our water systems is already mitigated by plan change 6. You will no doubt

be aware what is happening on Wakarara Road with the sale of 460 H approved by the OIO and now under development with Apples, vineyards, and Berry orchards going in. To support this development accommodation for up to 200 people will be built. This would not have happened with out a current water right/consent. It also comply's with plan change 6. We just need more water for this kind of development to happen all over CHB. The future is in Land use Change driven by water.

Thank you

44

Leigh Collecutt

From: Sheryl Bayliss <slbayliss@xtra.co.nz>
Sent: Wednesday, 10 April 2019 7:40 PM
To: Thrive
Subject: Submission on Annual Plan



Hello, I tried using your online submission form but could not submit the completed form. I do not wish to present my comments to council in person.

Submission on Annual Review:

1. I disagree with the proposal to give a loan to Water Holdings CHB which is a private company. I disagree with damming the Makaroro river (or any other river) and this is what the IP purchased by Water Holding CHB is all about. I disagree to having changes made to current policies to allow any loan to occur.
2. I agree with the proposed changes to the Revenue and Financing policy for a fairer rating system.
3. I support the establishment of a Disaster relief fund trust.

Thank you.

Sheryl Bayliss

192 Maharakeke Rd

RD1

Waipukurau 4281

068588846

Need more room?

You can attach extra pages but please make sure they include your name and contact information.

Submission Form

Your Details

Submitters Name: Allan Neckelcon

Postal Address: 31 Church street

Day Phone: 8577216 Night Phone: _____

Mobile: _____ Email: _____

Do you wish to present your comments to Council in person at a hearing? Yes ☐ No ☐

Please note that your submission (including any personal information supplied) will be made available to Councillors and the public. Submissions Close on 12 April 2019 at 5pm.

Submission Questions

1. Tell us what you think about the proposal that Council gives a \$250,000.00 suspensory loan to Water Holdings CHB Ltd to keep the prospect of water storage alive in Central Hawke's Bay.

This is not your business & it reeks of under handness further down the track
NO!

3. Do you support the establishment of the Disaster Relief Fund Trust?

yes.

2. Do you agree with the changes to the Revenue & Financing Policy?

Either way this will impact on a lot of rate payers. It's great having a big water story & then making people into oblivion. Pay of debt like I have to!

Any other suggestions?

climate change

4. Do you have any feedback on the Draft Environmental Strategy?

A lot of fancy words here but totally meaningless. Impact on water ways that's why all previous tips were on river banks - west coast thinking. Recycling. sorry only 12 grades now. landfill. why even have one shread & high temp incineration - you are 60 years behind in your thinking. conserving water under cap pumps & pipes as you have now will help you achieve this. lets build a dam & stuff up everything totally.

Happy East

12 April 2019
44 Waverley St
Waipawa 4210

Central Hawke's Bay District Council
By email to: thrive@chbdc.govt.nz

Submission on the proposed Central Hawke's Bay Annual Plan 2019-2020

I am a resident and ratepayer of Central Hawke's Bay. The "community" that I keep hearing mentioned by the mayor and other interested parties does not represent myself or my family.

I submit this on behalf of myself, my husband and children.

I am interested in a truly resilient long term vision and plan for the district that is the complete opposite of what is being promoted and proposed.

1/ I have opposed the plan to dam our local river vocally for many years and will continue to do so. It doesn't stack up environmentally, socially or financially. Three of the largest allocations of water in CHB, all dairy, are currently allocated 8,329,665 cu m 6,118,883 cu m and 3,700,832 cu m of water respectively on an annual basis; CHBDC's allocation, to supply the townships and businesses within in comparison is 3,202,655. CHB Water Holdings director Hugh Ritchie's farming operation Drumpeel is already allocated more than half of CHBDC's annual allocation. This proposal is being touted as water security for the community but the existing allocation figures illustrate that it is anything but that. It is an irrigation scheme, as it always was. CHB Water Holdings proposal is another attempt to resurrect this failed model which supports over extraction of water and industrialised farming practices over the environment. This ethos contradicts CHBDC's Environmental and Sustainability strategy.

2/ I oppose wealthy farmers and businessman expecting "the community" to fund a water storage and delivery scheme for their benefit. This is blatant corporate welfare. If CHBWH wish to further investigate the IP that the ratepayers of Hawke's Bay have already funded millions of dollars towards then they can fund it themselves. There also needs to be a legal framework in place where CHBWH are held to account for any negative consequences of their proposed scheme and pay the true cost of any clean up. The public should not have to carry the cost of these externalities any more, and it needs to be legally binding.

3/ Water storage is not a mitigation for climate change. The proposal, rather than creating resilience, creates reliance on a resource that will be further impacted in the coming years. Moving away from irrigation reliant agriculture should be where we are heading not running towards the cliff edge as this promotes. Anthropogenic climate change is here and impacts and extremes will be felt more frequently. By promoting the means for industrial agriculture to exploit our resources is not taking climate change seriously; again this contradicts the Environmental and Sustainability strategy.

4/ The suspensory loan is not a loan, it's a gift. How is CHBWH eligible for this gift when no other group was invited to apply for council monies to investigate their own plans to move CHB into a resilient future? Where is the transparent process and where is the open contest?

5/ This past summer our waterways were in particularly bad shape despite the rain events that we had. The irrigators didn't stop, but the river flows slowed. Artificial flushing flows from a dam would not solve this as they have one point of energy which quickly dissipates, as opposed to a natural flood event with multiple points of energy. Anyone promoting flushing flows as a solution is being dishonest and misleading the wider community. The only way to increase flows is for big users to be stopped. CHBDC needs to work with the RC and Central Government to implement law change

to decrease water allocations, and stop the trading of water with the sale of land. Shorter showers, and watering your garden by hose every second day does nothing to conserve water when irrigators are carrying on business as usual.

Relief sought:

The suspensory loan or any other funds are not granted to CHB Water Holdings and no further assistance is offered to them.

Paula Fern, on behalf of the Fern family

M. 0273619450

From: CHB Forest Bird Society <chbforestbird@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, 12 April 2019 8:47 AM
To: Thrive
Subject: Annual Plan Submission
Attachments: CHBDC Annual Plan submission 2019_20.pdf

Please find attached our submission on the Annual Plan.
We do wish to present comments to council in person at a hearing

Louise Phillips
Clint Deckard
Co-chairs, Central Hawkes Bay Branch Forest and Bird Protection Society.

12 April 2019

Submission on the proposed CHB District Council Annual Plan 2019-20

Emailed to thrive@chbdc.govt.nz

Central Hawkes Bay Branch of The Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society

Email: chbforestbird@gmail.com

We do wish to present comments to council in person at a hearing.

The Central Hawkes Bay branch of the Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society has a membership of 54.

The Central Hawkes Bay branch has been closely involved in the issue of water storage, farming intensification and environmental protection in CHB for many years.

This submission relates to two of the four areas of the proposed annual plan; the decision to give a suspensory loan to Water Holdings CHB Limited and the proposed environmental strategy.

Loan to Water Holdings CHB Limited

The CHB branch of Forest and Bird are strongly opposed to the proposal to give \$250,000 from the Rural Ward Funds to "work specifically with Water Holdings CHB Ltd and other key stakeholders to determine feasible water storage options for Central Hawke's Bay".

There are numerous reasons we believe this course of action is not in the best interest of ratepayers or the environment.

No business plan to justify investment

We consider it is irresponsible for Council to invest such a significant amount of ratepayer money from a reserve fund without a business plan, details of how the money will be spent and an analysis of the chances of success. The price of water from the failed RWSS, even though it was subsidised by a variety of means, was too expensive for most CHB farmers and the vast majority of farmers rejected it. Since there is virtually no chance of a dam of the scale of the original, any alternative dam will have to be smaller and the price of water will be even higher. That this investment is being made without any analysis of this risk is unwise.

Undermines community involvement

The Tukituki Water Taskforce was created as a way for the community to come together to share insights into our water issues. By passing responsibility for water storage to Water Holdings CHB Limited it effectively side-lines involvement from the community and places the responsibility in the hands of six shareholders of a privately owned company. Given that by law the directors of this company must act in the best interests of the 6 shareholders, the community interest will be secondary.

Restricts options and alternatives

Given that Water Holdings CHB Limited hold the IP of the failed RWSS it is clear that this will form the basis of any proposed works thereby reducing the chance of alternative strategies being considered. The proposal that went to council on February 28th 2019 stated:
“Water Holdings CHB propose to use the funding sought from Council to review the Ruataniwha Water Storage Scheme intellectual property to examine two scenarios for water storage and distribution, being: Option 1 – developing a full scale Makaroro Dam, providing for low flow allowances. Option 2 – build a lower dam, with no provision of environmental flows and reduced regional impact.”

In the documents used to support the public consultation this statement has been dropped which may cause the public to think that all options are being considered.

Forest and Bird is not anti water storage

Forest and Bird is not anti-water storage. If an off river water storage proposal were suggested that included real, meaningful and measurable ways to enhance our rivers and protect our groundwater from the effects of farming intensification it would receive a more favourable response.

Based on false assumption

The assumption that water storage is required is flawed in our opinion and the opinion of several experts that gave evidence at the Board of Inquiry and the review of the RWSS.

This is an example of putting the horse before the cart. HBRC are about to embark on a significant science project to explore, with new technology, the nature and extent of artesian water resources in the Ruataniwha Basin. It is clear that this work will provide valuable information that may, or may not, show that water storage of any particular size or location is viable. To preempt this work seems rash. Fully exploring alternatives would be seen as a wise move, considering the work being undertaken by the HBRC

We have a situation where currently the majority of our consented ground water is in the hands of a very few with most being used to irrigate free draining soils for dairy. This is hardly smart use of our water. We would implore council to lobby the Minister for the Environment to amend the faulty law that allowed this situation to occur. With a more equitable allocation of water there may well be sufficient water to permit a wide range of alternative uses to occur, without the need for a massive amount of capital to be spent on a dam.

Rather than trying to fight against nature we should be promoting farming practices that align with the environment we have. An investment in dry-land farming research would be a better long term strategy. There is ample research to show that investment in dry land farming research, education and exhibition can deliver equal or better productivity returns than irrigation with the added benefits that environmental degradation is reduced and recreational and social outcomes are increased.

River destruction not environmental benefit

The effectiveness of flushing flows is unproven. This view is held by HBRC scientists and was expressed by NIWA during their review of the RWSS.

“The proposed flushing flow is the maximum that can be released by the proposed dam design. This means it would not be possible to increase higher peak flows, even if monitoring of flush effectiveness (proposed as a consent condition) identified that this would be beneficial, or if an unexpected change within the catchment (such as didymo becoming established) required a change in flush magnitude. This limitation on adaptive management is similar to what has occurred with flushing flows downstream of the Opuha Dam (Lessard et al. 2012), and it would be unfortunate if the Opuha lessons went unlearned.”

-NIWA Report to HBRC, 11 April 2017

Add to climate change problems

The loss of thousands of trees in order to accommodate travelling irrigators coupled with the intensification required to pay for the water will further increase greenhouse gas emissions. The justification for needing more water being due to climate change is ironic considering that irrigation has been a driver of increased GHG emissions.

Environmental, and Sustainability Strategy

We applaud CHBDC for developing an Environmental and Sustainability Strategy. We consider the environment to play a key role in the future wellbeing of the whole community.

We do however question Council's commitment to their own primary objectives. CHBDC proposal to give Water Holdings CHB \$250,000, does not align with: Managing our impact on waterways, conserving water, and managing for climate change. Three of the four primary objectives contained in the Strategy.

As outlined in the first part of this submission document, any plan to put a dam on the Makaroro River will have a negative impact on the health of the river, it will not encourage water conservation, will likely increase carbon emissions, and lead to less resilience to climate disruption events.

Building a sustainable economy

The desired outcome as stated in the draft strategy is “we attract businesses that our natural environment can sustain” and “we encourage business to operate sustainably”

To achieve these outcomes Council would be better served working with Regional, and Central Governments to find ways to achieve an equitable and more sustainable distribution of current water consents, to businesses (including farms) that can work within the constraints of the natural environment.

Connecting place and people

We thank CHBDC for their continual support of educational initiatives which build on environmental and sustainability objectives, such as: Enviro schools, Zero waste, and the recent free community composting workshops.

We thank CHBDC for their continued support of the Hawkes Bay Biodiversity strategy.

Management of Otaia / Lindsay Bush:

We acknowledge the ongoing financial support of \$1000 per annum from CHBDC to aid in the management of Otaia/ Lindsay Bush. CHB branch of Forest and Bird also receive funding from HBRC of \$1000 and have been the recipients of a grant from the DOC community fund over the last three years. These have largely been spent on weed control, which has been our biggest ongoing issue. However, we are now looking at the reserve as a whole and members of the CHB branch of Forest and Bird are currently drafting a strategic plan for Otaia / Lindsay Bush.

Under the Heading of 'Recreation and Community awareness' is the following goal.

"To ensure the bush is known as an attractive, easily accessed and safe destination for recreation and wellbeing of all community and visitors"

The following actions have been identified for work in the next twelve months. We believe that these actions fit within the goals and aspirations of the environmental and sustainability strategy. We would welcome CHBDC's support either financial and / or in kind to upgrade and promote visitor experience to the bush. Initial investigation suggests that the total cost would be in the region of \$5,000.

- Investigate boundaries and negotiate with HBRC areas for entrance / picnic/ parking
- Develop plans for entrance / picnic / parking
- Implement above plans
- Pay for signage (Forest and Bird to design with mana whenua)
- Develop clear and concise maps of the bush for ease of identifying areas for management.

Question for Discussion

Our branch has been looking closely at our Health and Safety obligations. On work days and planting days the branch has health and safety plans in place, our concern is in

relation to members of the public visiting the bush. Who is responsible / liable for the safety of members of the public when they enter the bush?

Solid waste management

We support the development of a solid waste management and minimisation plan. We believe that raising community awareness is a key component of any plan. We believe the community is keen to 'Do the right thing' but is not always sure what the 'Right thing' is. Currently there are a lot of changes happening in the recycling market. Clear messages are necessary to enable community to make 'Good' choices.

Some Hawkes Bay councils have stopped collecting plastics 3-7 sending a clear message that these are no longer recycled. This empowers consumers to make their own purchasing choices, sending clear messages to producers.

Does council have a plan for responding to changes in the recycling markets, are they working with neighbouring councils to ensure continuity of the messages, and cost to the public. *This could avoid the misuse of dumping and recycling sites.*

Funding

The environmental and sustainability strategy has at its heart the following four primary objectives.

- Managing our impact on waterways
- Increasing recycling and reducing waste to landfill
- Conserving water
- Managing for climate change

A comprehensive strategy that supports and enables these objectives to be achieved has huge value to the overall wellbeing of the community and the environment now and into the future. Therefore, we would support funding being allocated to achieve these outcomes.

From: Angus Robson <apr@xtra.co.nz>
Sent: Friday, 12 April 2019 9:14 AM
To: Thrive
Subject: Submission on CHBDC Annual Plan
Attachments: Submission CHBDC 2019 2020 Plan.docx

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please find my submission on the CHBDC Annual Plan attached. Please acknowledge receipt.

Yours faithfully,

Angus Robson.

12 April 2019
110 Tower Rd
Matamata 3471.

Central Hawke's Bay District Council
By email to: thrive@chbdc.govt.nz

Submission on the proposed Central Hawke's Bay Annual Plan 2019-2020

I submit this as an interested party who is trying to improve water quality NZ-wide and has concerns about future-proofing and greenhouse gases.

I am interested in the failure nationally of territorial authorities to accept and implement the environmental aspects of their plans even when court-ordered.

I am also concerned about capture of territorial authorities by vested special interests.

The proposed plan ticks all these boxes.

1. The proposal by CHB Water Holdings is an attempt to restart the RWSS in another guise. This plan was shelved after vast quantities of ratepayer money were wasted on it and trying to restart it shows that CHBWH do not accept the democratic and court findings of the decision. To use even more ratepayer money to try to relitigate the process is wrong.

2. The proposed funding of CHB Water Holdings is simply corporate welfare for wealthy farmers to suck the public purse instead of paying their own way with any water storage and delivery scheme they may desire. CHBWH must spend entirely their own money on irrigation and must prove before they start that they will meet water quantity and quality objectives in the near and long term. A suitable method to ensure that negative water quality outcomes are insured against is to bond CHBWH for the cost of cleanup. This bond must be assessed by an independent body and levied before any scheme starts. In any case the public should be indemnified against any negative outcomes, including bailouts from failure due to drought. (Noted in (4))

3. Since the nitrate levels in the Tukituki catchment are already above the Environment Court defined limit of 0.8mg/l NO₃-N, then ANY increase in farm output will increase N levels further, thus frustrating the water quality objectives of PC6. HBRC and CHBDC will likely be in contempt of court and open to legal challenge.

4. CHB Water Holdings' own study, by Aqualinc, shows rapidly increasing frequency of dry years. This is clearly a result of climate change. Far from future-proofing the region, irrigation promotes highly risky farming styles with severe financial and human costs in drought years when water is restricted. We now have substantial data from Canterbury to prove this. All currently accepted science shows that even greater drought risk is inevitable in the future and that we need to adjust systems to cope and mitigate for climate change, as well as decreasing carbon footprint. Any increase in water availability will add to greenhouse gases, not reduce them. It is unconscionable for Council to fund an increase in climate change and the enormous consequences that go with it.

To prove that climate change has been accounted for, CHBWH members should each sign a statutory declaration acknowledging that anthropogenic climate change exists, is increasing, and that their proposed scheme will make it worse.

5. Small dams paid for by the public are a slam-dunk money loser. Water is very expensive from small schemes, and no agricultural or horticultural enterprise can afford to pay the true cost of water from these schemes. This was acknowledged during the RWSS process. Since CHBDC already knows this, using public money to help further those aims is nothing more than a cynical wealth transfer from ratepayers to scheme promoters.

6. To use CHBWH effectively as a consultant in their own interest is an obvious conflict of interest. To be one of several stakeholders, along with proper (reasonably proportional) representation of other major stakeholders, would be acceptable, but the way the process is being set up is not like this at all and therefore not acceptable.

7. Yet again we are hearing the rubbish about the benefits of environmental flushing flows which would come from a dammed scheme, compared to a free-flowing river. CHBDC cannot come up with any evidence to support this claim and will never be able to because it is false. This is simply lying to the ratepayers to try to assuage them and should be exposed as such. Unfortunately, in NZ there is no suitable mechanism to legally prevent such lies being told by Councils, but that does not take away from the fact they are morally reprehensible.

8. How did CHBWH become eligible for this grant? (A suspensory loan is a grant, especially in the absence of performance criteria). It appears that the funding they seek is not contestable by other entities, which makes it more of a free gift simply because they asked. There is no problem with Council giving money to worthy causes but a bare minimum requirement should be that potential grant money is contestable, that other contestants are equally supported both with knowledge of the grant availability, council and officer time, access to the plan process etc. More importantly, any scheme the same or similar to one which has already had huge sums spent on it and has been rejected, should be disqualified. The CHBDC approach fails these tests and in the absence of proper process the CHBWH proposal should be disqualified.

Relief sought:

That CHB Water Holdings is not funded or assisted with a suspensory loan or any other ratepayer funds.


Angus Robson.

P 07 888 5102

M 021 963 109

Leigh Collecutt

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Friday, 12 April 2019 10:26 AM
To: Thrive
Subject: Annual Plan 2019/20 Consultation - Feedback [#49]

Submitters Name	Robby Smith
Postal Address	 PO Box 238 2294 Takapau Road Waipukurau 4200 New Zealand
Day Phone Number	06 8586041
Mobile Phone Number	0272277158
Night Phone Number	06 8585184
Email	robby@sntltd.co.nz
Do you wish to present your comments to council in person at a hearing?	Yes
Please note that your submission (including any personal information supplied) will be made available to Councillors and the public. Submissions Close on 12 April 2019 at 5pm	Fully support the move and will discuss at the hearing
1. Tell us what you think about the proposal that Council give a \$250,000 suspensory loan to Water Holding CHB to keep the prospect of water storage alive in Central Hawke's Bay.	

151
1 of 2.

To:
Annual Plan 2019-20 Consultation
Central Hawkes Bay District Council
PO Box 127
WAIPAWA

10 April 2019

Submitters name: David Bishop
Postal address: 137 Porangahau Road, Waipukurau 4200
Day/night phone: 06-8589022
Email: dmbishop@xtra.co.nz

Attend Hearing: No

Submission Questions

1. The proposal for a \$250,000 suspensory loan to Water Holdings CHB Limited

I agree that the matter of a long term water storage solution for Central Hawkes Bay District is integral to the ongoing development of the District, particularly for maintaining river flow volumes for cultural, recreational and biodiversity reasons; for water supply resilience to the towns and townships; and for improving agriculture. Climate change will likely bring warmer and longer summers with a consequential need for water in all activities.

Supply of water for agriculture is a vexed issue, since dairying does not pay the full environmental cost of its discharges (methane, CO₂, nitrates), and by that omission shows through as highest return per hectare. If the environmental costs of these discharges were fully factored in to the dairy farm budget, dairy as an activity would likely be less profitable than other agriculture such as cropping or fruit and vegetable production.

If Council is to become involved in developing water storage solutions, then it needs to become more heavily involved in the regional council processes for water consent takes and renewals as an affected party.

Sourcing the monies for a non-repayable grant/ loan from a rural ward fund appears a sensible move, since Council's contribution to a water storage solution must be found from somewhere! There will as a consequence be a reduction of interest monies available for recreational and cultural developments in the Aromoana and Ruahine Wards, however re-topping those funds in due course should be initiated.

I support the proposed loan.

2. Changes to the Revenue and Financing Policy

I support the Leadership, Governance and Consultation activity being included as a General rate.

In respect of Animal Control, it is often the miscreants that create some of the costs of this activity, and since they don't pay animal registration fees, their costs are unfairly loaded on to law abiding registered dog owners.

I would like to see Council officers apportion the costs of animal control time by recording output costs against either a registered owner group, or against a non-registered owner group. In this way the Council approved rating share between private funding (90%) and public funding (10%) could be

#51
2 of 2

realistically evaluated for subsequent annual plans. This information should be presented to Councillors annually

3. Disaster Relief Fund

This Fund proposed to be administered by a CCO representing all five local authorities, appears to have some merit for receiving private funds for any future disaster event in the region. Being prepared is sensible.

If the costs of servicing such a CCO was minimal, then I support this initiative!

4. Draft Environmental Strategy-by the four strategies

a) Leading the way in environmental sustainability

-this is a very laudable initiative for Council to set its own practises on a sound environmental footing, but it will be a pin prick compared to the greenhouse gas discharges from 250 cows.

-use of Council supplied bicycles or mopeds, should if practicable be an option for staff over 4x4 vehicular use.

-I would like to see Council intensively zone private land in the district for food and crop production, and promote its use for these purposes. Further I would like to see Council actively disallow such land to be used for dairy and beef, since dairy and beef are huge contributors to greenhouse gases.

-as to global environmental issues, council needs to actively promote grain and vegetable based food production activities in the district due to their much lower carbon footprint. New systems for beef and lamb (covered yards trapping greenhouse gases) with feed provided from the pastoral system should be promoted more fully. Slopes retired into forestry.

b) Environmental vitality through the way of working

-Council needs to implement the programs to fix the wastewater and ageing water distribution infrastructure, with costs spread over generations.

-I agree for council to work alongside community to investigate sustainable water storage solutions.

c) Connecting people with place

-having a strong website with links to up to date information on environmental sustainability is very important. I support this!

-protecting and enhancing sites of significance is a responsibility for Council under the RMA, so this action shouldn't be watered down by saying someone else will do this. Since the district has a low number of RAP's from the Protected Natural Areas Programme, Council's effort should concentrate on protecting corridors and linkages between formally protected sites.

d) building a sustainable economy

-promoting alternative land use options should be at the forefront of this initiative.

-I support the appointment of the Economic Development Officer and development of an Economic Development Strategy


DAVID BISHOP

You are able to comment on anything included in the Consultation Document or provide any other feedback.

Need more room?

You can attach extra pages but please make sure they include your name and contact information.

Submission Form

Your Details

Submitters Name: ALAN + DELPHINE DELUGAR

Postal Address: PO BOX 117 WAIPAWA

Day Phone: 8578782 Night Phone: 8578782

Mobile: _____ Email: totara.grove@xtra.co.nz

Do you wish to present your comments to Council in person at a hearing? Yes ☐ No ☒

Please note that your submission (including any personal information supplied) will be made available to Councillors and the public. Submissions Close on 12 April 2019 at 5pm.

Submission Questions

1. Tell us what you think about the proposal that Council gives a \$250,000.00 suspensory loan to Water Holdings CHB Ltd to keep the prospect of water storage alive in Central Hawke's Bay.

We support the CHB council to give a suspensory loan to Water Holdings CHB.

3. Do you support the establishment of the Disaster Relief Fund Trust?

yes.

2. Do you agree with the changes to the Revenue & Financing Policy?

4. Do you have any feedback on the Draft Environmental Strategy?

Any other suggestions?

You are able to comment on anything included in the Consultation Document or provide any other feedback.

Need more room?

You can attach extra pages but please make sure they include your name and contact information.

Submission Form

Your Details

Submitters Name: Peter Meredith
 Postal Address: P.O Box 76 Onga Onga
 Day Phone: 027 6875572 Night Phone: _____
 Mobile: _____ Email: peterm1@yahoo.co.nz

Do you wish to present your comments to Council in person at a hearing? Yes ☐ No ☒

Please note that your submission (including any personal information supplied) will be made available to Councillors and the public. Submissions Close on 12 April 2019 at 5pm.

Submission Questions

1. Tell us what you think about the proposal that Council gives a \$250,000.00 suspensory loan to Water Holdings CHB Ltd to keep the prospect of water storage alive in Central Hawke's Bay.

I disagree. - I believe it is wrong to give public money to private enterprise. I believe that "water storage" is a water security issue. The water inequity has been caused by over allocation. HBLC needs to address this and give guidance to all water users including CHBLC.

3. Do you support the establishment of the Disaster Relief Fund Trust?

I support CHBLC setting up a trust in readiness for relief funds.

2. Do you agree with the changes to the Revenue & Financing Policy?

4. Do you have any feedback on the Draft Environmental Strategy?

I support CHBLC Env. strategy and support for HB Biodiversity strategy, zero waste & Enviro schools. I am pleased we have a progressive and innovative council, which takes an holistic approach that is leading, and involving us in creating a better natural environment to live & work.

Any other suggestions?

Need more room?

You can attach extra pages but please make sure they include your name and contact information.

Submission Form

Your Details

Submitters Name: Arthur Pywandel
 Postal Address: 636 SPEEDY ROAD RD 3 TAKAPAU 4288
 Day Phone: 027 241 7565 Night Phone: 06 8558319
 Mobile: 027 241 7565 Email: katoaform@gmail.com

Do you wish to present your comments to Council in person at a hearing? Yes ☒ No ☐

Please note that your submission (including any personal information supplied) will be made available to Councillors and the public. Submissions Close on 12 April 2019 at 5pm.

Submission Questions

1. Tell us what you think about the proposal that Council gives a \$250,000.00 suspensory loan to Water Holdings CHB Ltd to keep the prospect of water storage alive in Central Hawke's Bay.

I SUPPORT THIS PROPOSAL.
 TO CONTINUE WITH THE CHB.
 DISTRICT COUNCIL CAPITAL
 EXPENDITURE WE MUST RAISE
 THE VALUE OF ITS RATINGS
 BASE AND THIS IS ONE
 INVESTMENT WHICH WILL
 CONTRIBUTE TO THIS.

3. Do you support the establishment of the Disaster Relief Fund Trust?

2. Do you agree with the changes to the Revenue & Financing Policy?

4. Do you have any feedback on the Draft Environmental Strategy?

Any other suggestions?

55

Leigh Collecutt

From: Louise Phillips <louisephillips799@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, 11 April 2019 4:25 PM
To: Thrive
Subject: Submission document to Annual plan 2019-2020
Attachments: Personal submission CHBDC Annual plan 2019-2020.docx

To CHBDC,

ENTERED
12/4 Apr

Please find attached my submission to the CHBDC Annual plan 2019-2020.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kind Regards
Louise Phillips

Submission on the proposed CHBDC Annual plan 2019-2020

From: Louise Phillips

Ongaonga

Louisephillips799@gmail.com

I would like the opportunity to speak to my submission

My Submission relates to both the Draft environmental and Sustainability strategy and the proposal to allocate \$250,000 from the rural ward fund to Water Holdings CHB Ltd.

I congratulate CHBDC for their efforts in developing an Environmental and Sustainability strategy. The environment plays a pivotal role in our economic, social, and personal wellbeing. We are all paying the costs of environmental degradation, and short-term thinking. I look forward to seeing how the details unfold.

Connecting Place and People

I thank CHBDC for their continued support of the Hawkes bay Biodiversity strategy, and for educational initiatives such as Enviro schools, Zero waste, and the recent free community composting workshops.

I believe that the establishment of an environment centre in CHB would fit very well within the theme of connecting place and people. I believe it would also be a useful vehicle for raising community awareness and empowering the community to 'do the right thing' particularly in relation to waste minimisation.

I would support CHBDC to look at ways to fund some of these environmental projects, in view of the long-term gain in acting sooner rather than later.

Proposal to allocate \$250,000 to Water Holding s CHB Ltd.

I am strongly opposed to the allocation of \$250,000 to Water Holdings CHB Ltd. My reasons are outlined below.

- While much of the publicity around this issue suggests that a range of options are being considered, Water Holdings CHB Ltd are examining only two options for water storage and distribution. That is a full scale Makaroro Dam, or a smaller version on the Makaroro river (CHBDC Annual Plan 2019/20 supporting information pg4)

I believe that either of these options is contradictory to CHBDC's own Environmental and Sustainability objectives of:

- Managing our impact on waterways
- Conserving water
- Managing for Climate change

Members of Water Holdings CHB Ltd have suggested that a dam would benefit the river this is unproven. During review of the RWSS scientists expressed doubt as to the effectiveness if flushing flows. A smaller Dam would have less capability in this regard. Any Dam would have a negative impact on freshwater fish and other fauna.

Any dam and associated infrastructure require huge expenditure. The water must then be sold to make it pay. The risk is that this will drive intensification rather than conservation of water use. Business then becomes dependent on the water. This creates a situation in which there is no resilience when water is unavailable. In view of the potential for catastrophic climate change events this is a likely scenario.

Conventional farming practice in CHB is to remove trees to make way for pivot irrigators. Not only does the removal of trees increase carbon emissions, it also increases the pastures vulnerability to extreme weather events. Despite changes required by plan change 6 there seems to be little change to the practice.

I believe CHBDC would be better served lobbying / supporting regional and central governments to find ways to address the overallocation of water to industry that does not fit well within the natural parameters of local soil, and climate conditions. Soils are one of our best resources for storing water and sequestering carbon, if managed well. Dryland farming research, and education would be a wiser investment.

Tukituki Water Taskforce

The Tukituki taskforce was set up to consider water quantity issues in CHB. I believe that this proposal undermines that work, and the science projects planned for this.

Economic Considerations

Approximately \$18,000,000 of ratepayer money has already been spent on trying to proceed the RWSS. Not only was the land swap proven to be illegal, the scheme was also unable to secure investors, and had difficulty achieving the required farmer sign up. A smaller dam would cost purchasers more for the water, making any proposed scheme less attractive. It therefore is imprudent for CHBDC to spend more public money on this. The risk is too high.

Changes to farming practice are happening across the country some of these are because of environmental constraints including new nutrient requirements and greenhouse gas emission targets. Articles in recent rural papers demonstrate that some of these changes are already influencing dairy farm sales in some parts of the country. I believe the proposal to use \$250,000 of rate payer money is "Jumping the gun". Any water storage would need to be a very long-term proposition there is risk that a large water storage scheme would become redundant. This has the potential to leave CHB with a very expensive and high maintenance "White Elephant" There may be a need for water storage 'right now' but this will change as land use changes to reflect environmental parameters.

I am sure that some of the share holders in Water Holding CHB Ltd do believe they have the interests of the community at heart, but several of them do have an economic stake in irrigation and are hardly objective. Public comments by some of the share holders also demonstrate a lack of understanding of the whole river ecosystem including the coast and reflects their bias towards irrigation.

Thank you
Louise Phillips

From: Rhea Dasent <RDasent@fedfarm.org.nz>
Sent: Friday, 12 April 2019 10:10 AM
To: Thrive
Subject: Federated Farmers submission on the Annual Plan 2019-20
Attachments: FFNZ submission CHBDC Annual Plan 2019.docx

Dear Central Hawkes Bay District Council,

Please accept Federated Farmers submission on the draft Annual Plan 2019-2020.

We wish to be heard at the hearing.

Sincerely,

RHEA DASENT
SENIOR REGIONAL POLICY ADVISOR

Federated Farmers of New Zealand
Box 715, Wellington 6140

P 021 501 817
www.fedfarm.org.nz



This email communication is confidential between the sender and the recipient. The intended recipient may not distribute it without the permission of the sender. If this email is received in error, it remains confidential and you may not copy, retain or distribute it in any manner. Please notify the sender immediately and erase all copies of the message and all attachments. Thank you.



THINK BEFORE YOU PRINT

This email communication is confidential between the sender and the recipient. The intended recipient may not distribute it without the permission of the sender. If this email is received in error, it remains confidential and you may not copy, retain or distribute it in any manner. Please notify the sender immediately and erase all copies of the message and all attachments. Thank you.

SUBMISSION

TELEPHONE 0800 327 646 | **WEBSITE** WWW.FEDFARM.ORG.NZ



To: Central Hawkes Bay District Council
PO Box 127
Waipawa 4210

Submission on: **Draft Annual Plan 2019-2020**

Date: 12 April 2019

Submission by: Hawke's Bay Federated Farmers

JIM GALLOWAY
HAWKE'S BAY PROVINCIAL PRESIDENT
Federated Farmers of New Zealand
Ph 027 3625 755
E jim.nette@xtra.co.nz

Address for service: **RHEA DASENT**
SENIOR POLICY ADVISOR
Federated Farmers of New Zealand
PO Box 715, Wellington 6140
Ph 021 501 817
E rdasent@fedfarm.org.nz

Hawke's Bay Federated Farmers welcomes this chance to submit on the Central Hawke's Bay District Council draft Annual Plan 20219-2020.

We acknowledge any submissions made by individual members of Federated Farmers.

We wish to be heard in support of our submission.

SUMMARY

1. Federated Farmers thanks the Council for its bold decision last year not to introduce the district-wide \$21.32 water rate and \$27.40 wastewater rate.
2. That reticulated water and wastewater remain 100% funded by rates targeted at connected and serviceable properties.
3. The Council becomes compliant with Schedule 10 Section 20(3)(b) of the Local Government Act 2002, in that the UAGC percentage and the calculation method needs to be reported .
4. That Council fully utilises the UAGC mechanism at 30% of the total rates income to provide equity between ratepayers.
5. That district planning is shifted off the general rate and into the UAGC.
6. Federated Farmers is pleased that the General Rate value is being lowered from 0.11738 cents in the capital value dollar, down to 0.10743.
7. The concern around the impact of revaluations on rates affordability will not be alleviated by using the General Rate more, but instead to utilise uniform charges as these are not vulnerable to property value fluctuations.
8. We recommend that the Community Leadership activity is not shifted to the General Rate, and remains funded by the UAGC instead.
9. The General Rate should be dropped even further as there is no need to charge ratepayers collectively over a million more dollars than last year to fund the same activities.
10. The activities that desperately need more funding are reticulated wastewater and water. The targeted rate for these should be lifted, and the lower General Rate would ensure connected and serviceable ratepayers' overall rates bills are not any higher than they would be.
11. That a new rate remission policy is introduced to provide relief for revalued properties, where their new valuation is disproportionately higher than comparable properties due to unrealised subdivision or development potential.

THANK YOU

Federated Farmers wishes to extend our thanks for the decision not to introduce the proposed district-wide rates to fund reticulated water supply and wastewater. These rates were proposed \$21.32 per SUIP for water and \$27.40 per SUIP for wastewater and charged to all ratepayers whether or not they were connected to these services or within the serviceable areas.

While we commiserate with the expense of managing wastewater treatment, the cost needs to fall upon those who benefit. Farmers already manage their own domestic and farm wastewater, and are rightly expected to fund this themselves. This includes cost of installation, maintenance, a resource consent if required, and fees when disposing septic tank muck into the reticulated system.

Like the Council, our farmers are facing considerable costs in order to comply with the Regional Council's Tukituki River regulations. We are thankful that we don't have to fund services that we aren't connected to, as well as our own compliance challenges.

We appreciate this bold decision to remain with 100% user-pays water and wastewater.

Recommendations:

1. Federated Farmers thanks the Council for its bold decision last year not to introduce the district-wide \$21.32 water rate and \$27.40 wastewater rate.
2. That reticulated water and wastewater remain 100% funded by rates targeted at connected and serviceable properties.

UNIFORM ANNUAL GENERAL CHARGE

The UAGC has taken a dive this year down to \$276.63, which is disappointing, as it had been steadily improving over the last five years.

We were also disappointed to see that the 2018 proposed UAGC at \$409 didn't eventuate, being charged at the lower \$383 instead.

Year:	UAGC:
2014-15	\$311.08
2015-16	\$317.31
2016-17	\$323.66
2016-17	\$329.81
2018-19	\$383.51
2019-2020	\$276.63 (proposed)

Now it might seem unusual for Federated Farmers to advocate to pay a higher rate! However the reason for this is because better use of a UAGC means less reliance on the General Rate, which is the expensive one for farmers.

We understand that the Council is concerned about affordability, but using the UAGC less and shifting more activities onto the General Rate will only shift the affordability problem onto ratepayers with higher property values, like farms. Having a higher property value does not mean the owner can afford anything.

Last year we calculated that the UAGC is sitting on only 13% of total qualifying rates, and this was using the proposed \$409.63 charge. The final UAGC from 2018 would have resulted in a lower percentage, and the 2019 proposed rate will drop it even further, to 9.21%. Compared to the 30% allowable under the Local Government Act 2002, this is a disappointing low use of the UAGC by the Council. As a comparison, Hastings District Council is at 22%, which although an improvement on 9% we will still be suggesting ways for Hastings to lift.

The lower UAGC percentage is a policy shift of some significance that is not directly addressed in the Annual Plan consultation document.

We remind the Council that in our view it is currently not compliant with Schedule 10 Section 20(3)(b) of the Local Government Act 2002, in that the UAGC percentage and the calculation method needs to be reported.

As always, we suggest that "equal benefit" activities are shifted off the general rate and onto the UAGC, like District Planning. All ratepayers receive the same benefits from the district plan providing sustainable environment management. With the District Plan currently under review Councillors will be aware of how this document benefits all ratepayers across all zones, so there is no reason why a ratepayer with a high value property like a farm should pay more than someone with a lower-valued town property.

Recommendations:

3. The Council becomes compliant with Schedule 10 Section 20(3)(b) of the Local Government Act 2002, in that the UAGC percentage and the calculation method needs to be reported .
4. That Council fully utilises the UAGC mechanism at 30% of the total rates income to provide equity between ratepayers.
5. That district planning is shifted off the general rate and into the UAGC.

GENERAL RATE

This year the General Rate is proposed to be 0.10743 cents in the capital value dollar, which is a drop from last year's 0.11738 cents.

This is great news that the General Rate is dropping.

Last year we noted that the General Rate had held steady at 0.12 cents since 2014-15, and that ratepayers enjoyed a drop in last year's LTP. A further drop in 2019-20 is appreciated.

The Council is correct to be concerned that the General Rate is vulnerable to fluctuations in capital value, leaving ratepayers with much higher bills when their property value increases. We share this concern with the Council as it has a significant impact on farmers. This increased property value is unrealised, meaning that ratepayers are not seeing the extra value in their bank accounts, but only on paper.

We see that the total amount collected from the General Rate has been growing.

General Rate		
Year:	Total Amount collected:	Cents in the CV dollar:
2014-15	\$4,378,370	0.12
2015-16	\$4,563,493	0.12
2016-17	\$4,844,721	0.12
2017-18	\$5,149,537	0.12
2018-19	\$4,948,150	0.11738
2019-20	\$6,021,432	0.10743

The General Rate will generate an extra \$1,073,282 more than last year. This is even with the drop in how it is struck.

The General Rate will fund the same activities it did as last year, with the addition of community leadership:

1. General Rate

A general rate set under section 13 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 for the purposes of providing all or some of the cost of:

- Community leadership, including administration, cost of democracy, community voluntary support grants
- All regulatory activities, including district planning, land use and subdivision consent costs, building control, public health, animal control, and compliance
- Solid waste
- Parks and reserves, public toilets, theatres and halls, cemeteries, and miscellaneous property costs

For the 2019/20 year this rate will be 0.10743 cents per dollar (including GST) based on the rateable capital value of all rateable land within the District.

Why is the General Rate showing a steady, and accelerating, increase when it is funding the same activities? Why do these activities need so much more money?

Given that the Council is collecting 21% more than it was last year, and 37% more than it was in 2014, further savings could be passed onto the ratepayer by dropping the general rate even further, and keeping the community leadership activity funded by the UAGC. How the General Rate is charged could be dropped so it receives the same total it did last year.

The UAGC and fixed targeted rates are not vulnerable to fluctuating property value like the General Rate is, so if the Council is worried about affordability issues and discrepancies between ratepayers arising from the General Rate, then the solution is to use these other rating mechanisms more.

The activities that desperately need more funds are reticulated water and wastewater. Perhaps the targeted water and wastewater rates could be lifted for those connected to help provide much-needed funds for these activities. Hopefully the overall rates bill for those in town will remain neutral with the lower General Rate compensating for the increased targeted rates.

Recommendations:

6. Federated Farmers is pleased that the General Rate value is being lowered from 0.11738 cents in the capital value dollar, down to 0.10743.
7. The concern around the impact of revaluations on rates affordability will not be alleviated by using the General Rate more, but instead to utilise uniform charges as these are not vulnerable to property value fluctuations.
8. We recommend that the Community Leadership activity is not shifted to the General Rate, and remains funded by the UAGC instead.
9. The General Rate should be dropped even further as there is no need to charge ratepayers collectively over a million more dollars than last year to fund the same activities.
10. The activities that desperately need more funding are reticulated wastewater and water. The targeted rate for these should be lifted, and the lower General Rate would ensure connected and serviceable ratepayers' overall rates bills are not any higher than they would be.

REMISSION FOR REVALUED FARMS

We note that last year's revaluations and their impact on rates has been a concern of the Council in this draft Annual Plan. We share this concern as revaluations impacts affordability for farmers.

Federated Farmers has long been concerned that farms are valued for their subdivision and development potential rather than as primary production land. Farmers who experience significant increases in property value because of subdivision potential and amenity aspects like being close to a village, beach or on a tourist route, may feel forced to subdivide in order to gain capital to pay their rates bills. While the Council may feel that the origin of this problem lies with QV, QV maintain that councils set rating policies and so what rates a property is charged is the responsibility of a council.

This problem could be solved by a rates remission or postponement policy. A rates postponement or remission policy would allow farmers in "desirable" locations to continue farming and not feel forced to subdivide to release capital and reduce their rates burden, nor to be rated significantly higher than similar properties.

Council Retains Control

Council will retain control over the application of the postponement policy:

- A postponement policy would be intended only for landowners who continue with their existing primary production land use.
- When the property is sold and the increased capital value is realised, the postponed rates may be payable back to Council.
- Only be available on application, which will allow the Council to assess each case according to its individual merits.
- Council will have full discretion to grant or decline the application, and to determine what the postponed amount will be.

Other Council Examples

A number of other councils have a similar issue and have approached it by offering a rates remission or postponement for properties used for primary production that have experience an increase in value and subsequently rates disproportionate to a farming use when compared to other farming properties within the district.

- Policy 12/412 in the Northland Long Term Plan provides for postponement of rates for land that is farmed near the coast but may have experienced a huge increase in rates due to subdivision potential. The Northland Regional Council recognises that forced development in these situations is not necessarily desirable and there are advantages in the land remaining as farmland. Remission Policy P06/04 address the rating of farmland that previously received a rates-postponement value pursuant to Section 22 of the Rating Valuations Act, providing relief for farmers whose values were increased beyond that of other farmland in the district because of the potential use to which the land could be put for residential, commercial, industrial, or other non-farming development.
- Kapiti Coast District has Policy Part 2, for farmland whose rateable value in some measure is attributable to the potential use to which the land may be put for residential, commercial, industrial, or other non-farming development; and is actively and productively farmed by the ratepayer or the farming business.
- Horowhenua District Council have Remission Part 7 available for farms that were rezoned as residential or business due to an ambitious new town boundary expansion around Levin. The remission is only available to farmers who continue their farming activities. The Council needs to be satisfied that the rating valuation of the land is in some measure attributable to the potential use to which the land may be put for residential, commercial or industrial development. The purpose of the remission is to preserve uniformity and equitable relativity with comparable parcels of land used for primary production and rural lifestyle purpose land, that is able to be subdivided, in the district where the valuations do not contain any "potential value".

Recommendation:

11. That a new rate remission policy is introduced to provide relief for revalued properties, where their new valuation is disproportionately higher than comparable properties due to unrealised subdivision or development potential.

Federated Farmers is a not-for-profit primary sector policy and advocacy organisation that represents the majority of farming businesses in New Zealand. Federated Farmers has a long and proud history of representing the interests of New Zealand's farmers.

This submission is representative of member views and reflect the fact that local government rating and spending policies impact on our member's daily lives as farmers and members of local communities.



Leigh Collecutt

From: Ian Bayliss <iannliz@xtra.co.nz>
Sent: Friday, 12 April 2019 10:22 AM
To: Thrive
Subject: Fw:
Attachments: Submission to HBRC re granting of a suspensory loan to Water Holdings CHB Ltd.doc

From: Ian & Liz Bayliss
Sent: Friday, April 12, 2019 10:20 AM
To: Ian & Liz Bayliss

Submission to HBRC re granting of a suspensory loan to Water Holdings CHB Ltd.

The need for water management in CHB is clearly needed for the safety and security of the population. However, the granting of a suspensory loan of \$250 000 is not deemed in the best interest of that objective. We appreciate the opportunity to express our concerns.

1. The purchase of the intellectual property rights and consents by Water Holdings CHB Ltd has already used substantial public funds with no measureable positive outcomes.
2. The suggestion by Water Holdings CHB Ltd that they would like to find ways to purchase DOC land to build a water storage facility on the Makororo river contravenes the purpose of land being set aside for conservation of areas of land important for the biodiversity of the region.
3. The focus of energy, education and resources needs to be on finding ways to increase the economic viability of the region while working within the constraints of soil types and climate change. Adaptation of farming practices to be more realistic and diverse given the above constraints is what is needed. The council and farmers have been slow to consider such adaptation as witnessed by their tardiness in making compliance compulsory and monitoring consents systematically and without bias. We do not consider that council had been demonstrating proactive leadership in sustainability locally or nationally for the benefit of the whole community as it claims. We look forward to seeing that demonstrated in action.
4. HBDC would be placed in a position of Conflict of Interest if they were to become both manager/regulator and part funder of such a scheme and there is no guarantee of continuity of commitment or wisdom given regular changes in council personnel.
5. At this point sources of other funding have not been confirmed and therefore there is no guarantee that this loan would achieve the proposed outcome. There is also no evidence to support that this loan would not result in increased rates for the community in the future. Is the Rural Ward Fund not existing money that could be made available for a Disaster Relief situation and, therefore, should be kept in tact?
6. As with the Ruataniwha Water Storage scheme, the claim that it would provide extra jobs may be an outcome in the short term if the building of a dam, albeit a smaller one, is proposed but that would be a short term gain. Resulting increase in population,

economic activity and regional income as predicted requires a wider range and more comprehensive consideration of strategies.

On the basis of these concerns we are opposed to the suspensory loan being made to Water HoldingsCHB n and the changes in the Special funds and Investment Policy .

Liz Bayliss
Ian Bayliss

#58.

Leigh Collecutt

From: eldernz@farmside.co.nz
Sent: Friday, 12 April 2019 10:34 AM
To: Thrive
Subject: Submission for Annual Plan
Attachments: CHBDC Submission Annual Plan 2019.20.doc

1 of 4

Good morning,

My submission to the 2019/20 Annual Plan is attached.

Kind regards
Dan Elderkamp

#58

2 of 4

12 April 2019

Annual Plan 2019/20
Central Hawke's Bay District Council
PO Box 127
Waipawa 4210

D. J. Elderkamp
387 Maharakeke Rd
RD1
Waipukurau 4281
phone 06-8588828
mobile 021 0235 9434

Thank you for the opportunity to make a submission regarding the Annual Plan 2019/20

I do not wish to speak to my submission in person.

My response to the questions as set out in the Consultation Document are as follows.

1. I do not support the Council giving Water Holdings CHB Ltd (WHCHB) a suspensory loan of \$250,000 for the reasons that it is effectively a gift to a private commercial enterprise with no requirement to repay same. Given that there are other potential projects in Central Hawke's Bay that in my view are more deserving of ratepayer's funds, there is no logical, commercial or other reason for the Council to offer this loan.

The directors and shareholders are more than capable of funding their endeavours and plans out of their own equity, or from funds raised by selling shares to interested parties as has been done with many irrigation projects in the South Island.

To further state that the suspensory loan is an "investment" by the Council is misleading, as an entity that invests funds in a commercial project expects a commercial return. In this case that does not appear to be the intention at all.

WHCHB has furthermore not supplied any details as to how the funds will be spent or used, and the Council supporting what is in effect a vision with no supporting evidence or business plan to back it is nothing less than fiscally irresponsible, and a gross misuse of ratepayer's funds. The Council is, in my view, putting the cart before the horse. WHCHB should have provided a solid business case to Council and ratepayers before this consultation exercise commenced.

It is furthermore quite plain to me that the statement in the Rural Ward Fund Investment Commercial Structuring Discussion Paper, which states: "The requirement for water storage in some form is required to not only ensure water security and resilience for the District, but to allow for future growth and economic development." is a fallacy that is not backed up with facts or evidence. It is quite clear that it is, in fact, a plan to resurrect the Ruataniwha Water Storage Scheme in some form or another, in order to provide "water security" for existing and potential future irrigators rather than for the district as a whole. This is proven by the fact that the largest irrigator in the district has water consents for irrigation in excess of 8.3 million m3 per annum which, to the best of my knowledge is more than thrice the annual water use (2.33 million m3 for 2017/18) of Waipukurau, Waipawa, Otane and Takapau combined.

In my view genuine water security for residents of the towns in CHB can be achieved by instigating a Domestic Water Storage Scheme by providing loans to ratepayers and residents to install water storage tanks on their properties, to harvest rain water. I suggested this to the Council during consultations for Project Thrive. Such a scheme would provide genuine water security for town residents, especially in the event of natural disasters such as earthquakes, where Council infrastructure may be disabled for some time. And for irrigators genuine water security would be best served by on-farm water storage.

Again, as with the RWSS, it seems obvious that WHCBH intends exploring a large in-river dam, most likely on the Makaroro river. This will entail large-scale environmental destruction, which I am unable to support. However I will tentatively not oppose WHCHB investigating water storage alongside a river, similar to the Rangitata Water Scheme in Canterbury, provided nutrient leaching into ground water and rivers can be guaranteed not to increase.

2. Yes, I agree with the changes to the Revenue and Financing Policy.

3. Yes, I support the establishment of the Disaster Relief Fund Trust. However I question the fact that no Council funds will be apportioned to the Trust - this is exactly the type of activity that the Council should commit funds to from the Rural Ward Fund.

4. I am broadly in favour and supportive of Council's Draft Environmental Strategy. In my view, however, there are a few gaps that I'd like to highlight.

Firstly, landfill and recycling - I am still astonished every time I visit the Waipukurau Transfer Station at how much recyclable material still gets sent to landfill. This needs some serious and urgent attention and mahi - we are burying valuable resources that could be re-used or recycled or re-purposed. Our whole attitude to waste disposal needs a re-set.

Secondly, Council needs to take climate change a lot more seriously, considering the future our descendents face if we don't. The science is clear and abundant, and we no longer have the luxury of procrastination to delay any further action. Pointing fingers at other regions and countries that don't take climate change seriously is not an excuse - we need to show leadership on this issue. This needs to be an immediate priority for Council, and methods to reduce its climate impact need to be prioritised urgently.

Thirdly, Council urgently needs to prioritise protection, restoration and conservation of what's left of our native species within the district. This should include things as insignificant as using native species for Council plantings within towns, to identifying, protecting and publicising Significant Natural Areas within the district. The Government will be doing significant work on various National Policy Statements in the near future, and Council should spend more time and resources, together with the Government, on working and facilitating this within our district.

Council should prioritise sustainable housing development rather than allowing the status quo to continue. Encouraging, and/or regulating for passive housing, grey

waters systems, environmentally sustainable waste water treatment systems, composting toilets, solar/wind power, etc, should be seriously considered and worked on. These will reduce the strain on current Council infrastructure, and limit the need for very expensive expansion works in future at ratepayers expense.

Regarding "Long term water supply and storage", Council could seriously look at urban water storage in conjunction with Regional Council initiatives already in place. Council could further encourage town residents to reduce water consumption by establishing low water-use gardens, using native plants. Much of the water used in summer is for watering lawns and gardens. Both of these suggestions will, if implemented, reduce water use and consequently reduce wear and tear on Council's water reticulation infrastructure. Council could further discourage water storage initiatives that involve destruction of already threatened native habitats, and prioritise that over economic development. Given that over 3,000 of our native species are threatened or endangered highlights how desperately important preserving whatever areas of native bush and habitat are left in the district is.

Dan Elderkamp
Waipukurau

Leigh Collecutt

#59
1 of 4

From: clint.deckard <clint.deckard@frontiers.co.nz>
Sent: Friday, 12 April 2019 10:47 AM
To: Thrive
Subject: Annual Plan submission- Clint Deckard
Attachments: Submission on Central Hawkes Bay District Council Annual Plan 2019 Clint Deckard.pdf

Please find attached my submission for the Annual Plan 2019/20.
I do wish to speak to the submission at any hearing that takes places.

Best wishes,
Clint.

Clint Deckard
184 Tukituki Road
Ashley Clinton
RD1
Takapau
Central Hawkes Bay, New Zealand.

021 2075004
clint.deckard@frontiers.co.nz

12 April 2019

Submission on the proposed CHB District Council Annual Plan 2019-20

Clint Deckard, 184 Tukituki Road, Ashley Clinton

Tell us what you think about the proposal that Council give a \$250,000 suspensory loan to Water Holding CHB to keep the prospect of water storage alive in Central Hawke's Bay

Given the paucity of detail around this proposal I am opposed.

I think it is unreasonable to ask ratepayers to comment on giving such a large amount of ratepayer funds to a private company when there are so few details presented. There is no business case, no details about the Key Commercial Terms and no analysis of why this, as opposed to any alternative investment, is prudent.

Although described as a loan there is almost no chance that it will ever be repaid. Even worse, ratepayers may end up having to pay approximately \$120000 a year for valueless assets. If, under dispensation point 4, *"The review of IP does not identify any tangible or financially sustainable water storage solution"* and the IP reverts to CHBDC ownership the Council will be liable for the on-going operational costs associated with the consents. HBRC Chief Executive James Palmer explained this at the August 30th 2017 HBRC council meeting. We have the unpleasant prospect of ratepayers having to pay again and again with no chance of a return.

Openness and accountability

The fact that this non-repayable loan is being made to a privately owned limited liability company causes concern that any accountability will be hidden behind the excuse of 'commercially sensitive' and that discussion of this matter by Council will take place behind closed doors with the public excluded.

In order to facilitate this extraordinary contribution to a private company the council's own rules will have to be changed. This should be causing alarm amongst councillors. These reserve funds are supposed to be for council owned infrastructure and not for the profit of private company shareholders. Notwithstanding the assertion that these shareholders are community minded businessmen they are obliged by law to act with the interests of the six shareholders first and foremost.

Irrigation- a boon for a few

To date, irrigation in CHB has led to further declines in rural communities; the amalgamation of property ownership in fewer hands, proliferation of low wage, low skill seasonal employment and increased difficulty for young people to buy their first farm all resulting in a diminished social community. Despite thousands of hectares of local land being irrigated with millions of cubic metres of water over the last twenty-five years, our local school's roll

is less than half of what it was when the first pivot irrigator was installed. It is an often repeated fallacy that irrigation leads to a vibrant, thriving community.

Water security- a no brainer?

It appears that this council has become fixated on water storage. I implore council to explore and advance alternatives to a reliance on large amounts of water. The prospect of a dry land farming institute of excellence is an example of how we, as a district, can facilitate and encourage practices that work alongside our climate and soils rather than try to adopt agricultural systems that require massive investment in infrastructure.

We need to be smart with our water. Pouring huge amounts of water on stony, free draining soils to grow grass for dairy cows is not a smart use of a limited resource. I implore this council to lobby central government to change the laws that allowed this nonsense to happen so this water can be used for high value, environmentally sustainable uses.

PC6

A great deal has been made of the effect of the new low flow regime contained in Plan Change 6 (PC6) in the absence of the RWSS. Whilst it is true the RWSS may have helped alleviate some of the effects of the new low flow limits in some years, the Board of Inquiry made it clear from the outset that PC6 would stand on its own whether or not the RWSS or any other dam went ahead. A justification for exploring building a dam on the Makaroro River has been the need to mitigate the effects of the low flow regime however a report commissioned largely with ratepayer money found that:

"to obtain the current reliability in 9 years out of 10, (which would be a realistic target for water storage), about 2,330,000 cubic metres of water would be required. This would be a pragmatic volume of water to store collectively in a dam if refilling of storage during the irrigation season was not possible. If refilling was possible, a lower storage dam volume could be used". -Aqualinc Report, 2018.

This volume is hardly a justification for a dam of 100 million cubic metres. To put this into context the amount detailed in the report is less than half of just one consentee's allocation used for dairying.

The assertion that this type of farming intensification could not happen in the future because of PC6 is specious. The business case for the RWSS relied upon a third dairy, a third dairy support and a third 'other' and this was alongside PC6.

Consultation or selling a done deal?

I have found the consultation process to be far from ideal. Spin, obfuscation and half-truths seem to be the modus operandi. Public use of the 'D' word has been avoided at all costs despite this being entirely about a dam on the Makaroro River. The proposal that went to council in February clearly stated that the money was going to be used by Water Holdings CHB Ltd to investigate two dam options on the Makaroro River. This was removed from the public consultation documents.

Since a dam that does not include the 22ha of public conservation land would have just 20% of the capacity of the original it will clearly be uneconomic. That leaves the only possibly economic option being a dam of the original size and this has already failed. It is becoming clear that ratepayers' money will be used to attempt a retrospective law change to permit the RWSS to go ahead, a course of action with very little chance of success.

It is time to let the rotting corpse of the RWSS lie in peace. Let's move on.

Leigh Collecutt

From: Kerry Mackintosh <kerrymmackintosh@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, 12 April 2019 11:37 AM
To: Thrive
Subject: Submission on the proposed Central Hawke's Bay Annual Plan 2019-2020

Submission on the proposed Central Hawke's Bay Annual Plan 2019-2020

Submitter(s):

David & Kerry Mackintosh

The proposal by CHB Water Holdings to be granted a suspensory loan from CHBDC should be declined. Granting a suspensory loan to CHBWH with no requirement to repay is untenable and amounts to an abuse of public funds. The RWSS was abandoned after enormous quantities of ratepayer money was wasted on it and it should not be allowed to happen again. CHBWH should raise their own capital to investigate and implement any water storage scheme. Using public money to help further their private interest is nothing more than corporate welfare, a no strings attached gift from ratepayers to CHBWH.

We seek the following decision:

That the proposed granting of a suspensory loan and any other granting of ratepayer funds to CHB Water Holdings be declined.

#61

Leigh Collecutt

From: Tom Kay <T.Kay@forestandbird.org.nz>
Sent: Thursday, 11 April 2019 5:32 PM
To: Thrive
Cc: Monique Davidson; Debbie Hewitt
Subject: Submission on Annual Plan 2019-2020
Attachments: CHBDC annual plan submission.pdf

1 of 10

Kia ora,

Please find attached Forest and Bird's submission on the CHBDC Annual Plan 2019-2020.

Please note Forest & Bird wish to be heard in support of our submission.

Ngā mihi nui,

Tom Kay
Lower North Island Regional Manager
Forest & Bird
022 183 2729

#61
2 of 10



Forest & Bird

GIVING NATURE A VOICE

12 April 2019

Central Hawke's Bay District Council

By email to: thrive@chbdc.govt.nz

Copied to: monique.davidson@chbdc.govt.nz
debbie.hewitt@hbrc.govt.nz

Royal Forest and Bird Protection
Society of New Zealand Inc.

Head Office:

PO Box 613

Wellington

New Zealand

P: +64 4 3857374

www.forestandbird.org.nz

Submission by the Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc on the proposed Central Hawke's Bay Annual Plan 2019-2020

Contact person: Tom Kay
Regional Manager, Lower North Island
022 183 2729
t.kay@forestandbird.org.nz

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION

1. Forest & Bird's submission relates to Central Hawke's Bay's proposed Annual Plan 2019-2020. In particular, our submission relates to 'the even bigger water story' and the 'Draft Environmental Strategy'. Forest & Bird wishes to be heard in support of this submission.
2. Forest & Bird is strongly opposed to the proposal to allocate \$250,000 from the Rural Ward Funds to "work specifically with Water Holdings CHB Ltd and other key stakeholders to determine feasible water storage options for Central Hawke's Bay".
3. There is insufficient information about the scope and purpose of the review and the milestones that CHB Water Holdings must comply with. Is it a broad scale water management investigation, or an attempt to reinvigorate the Ruataniwha Water Storage Scheme (RWSS)? There are issues - in terms of this funding proposal - for both options, not least that the RWSS relied on unlawfully obtaining conservation land to flood it.
4. Without flooding specially protected public conservation land, we understand that if the Makaroro River site is pursued, a water storage facility of around 20% of the capacity of the RWSS would be possible - which is uneconomic. It does not cost \$250,000 to check that.

5. We suspect (based on statements from those involved) that the intention is to attempt to win support for a law change to enable specially protected conservation land to be flooded, in order to proceed with a full scale RWSS. We are completely opposed to the use of public funds for a lobbying exercise intended to undermine the protection of public conservation land, and we seek a public undertaking from CHBDC that this will not occur.
6. We oppose the selection of CHB Water Holdings as an appropriate entity to carry out a review of water storage options in Central Hawke's Bay, due to its interest in the intellectual property for the RWSS. CHB Water Holdings Ltd's interest is in capitalising on its investment in the RWSS intellectual property, which conflicts with Central Hawke's Bay ratepayers' interests in an unbiased investigation of water management options.
7. We do not support the use of public funds to investigate large scale water storage. We do not agree with the unsubstantiated assertions about the need for large scale water storage, and we disagree that an assessment of benefits of water storage based on the RWSS (pre- PC6 nutrient limit constraints) can be translated to a new proposal.
8. We consider that the financial implications of using capital from the Rural Ward Fund have been poorly addressed.

OUR INTEREST

9. The Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand (Forest & Bird) is New Zealand's largest independent conservation organisation. It is independently funded by private subscription, donations, and bequests. Forest & Bird's mission is to protect New Zealand's unique flora and fauna, and its habitat. Key matters of concern therefore relate to the protection of ecological values, particularly the sustainable management of New Zealand's indigenous biodiversity; natural landscapes; publicly owned land, rivers and lakes; and protection of the conservation estate.
10. Forest & Bird's Central Hawke's Bay branch has invested substantial time and resource into processes surrounding the RWSS and Plan Change 6, as well as other regional planning processes relating to freshwater and land use. Our branch members are represented on the Tukituki Taskforce, which was established as a way for the community to come together to discuss issues with water security and the impacts of over-extraction on the health of waterbodies in the catchment, and to discuss potential solutions.
11. Forest & Bird's national office was also involved in Hawke's Bay's water planning and water storage processes described above, including through litigation to ensure that conservation land would not be unlawfully removed from the conservation estate to enable the RWSS reservoir to flood it. As specially protected land, this land must be protected for conservation purposes for as long as its natural values are present.
12. Forest & Bird is not opposed to water storage, particularly on-farm dams or "run of the river" type schemes provided these are sensitively designed. However, we remain opposed to any proposal to reinvigorate a RWSS-type scheme, primarily because of:
 - a. The impacts of a large-scale dam on freshwater fish and other fauna.

- b. The impacts of the dam reservoir on significant indigenous vegetation and the habitat of indigenous fauna.
 - c. The land use intensification (and consequent impacts on water quality) that is enabled by, and economically driven by, high cost water from expensive water storage infrastructure.
 - d. Impacts on the receiving environment at the coast.
 - e. Impacts on the geomorphological (channel-forming) processes of the affected river and implications for riverine habitat, sediment transfer, and flood management.
13. We do not support the use of public funds for this purpose, particularly where it is provided to an entity that is intrinsically linked to the Ruataniwha Dam.

SUBMISSION

Purpose of the review unclear

14. The discussion document says the following about the purpose of the review:

Council have explored with Water Holdings CHB Limited (Water Holdings CHB) the proposition of providing financial assistance to support Water Holdings CHB in completing a **review of the Ruataniwha Intellectual Property to identify potential water storage solutions and commercialisation opportunities.**

Water Holdings CHB, as the holder of the intellectual property associated with the RWSS, is in a unique position to **explore what value remains in the science, consents and construction plans to create a new approach to water storage** as a part of the regional solutions for water security.

The scope of work that Water Holdings CHB are seeking financial support for intends to **work through the intellectual property and engage with key stakeholders on a number of factors involved in the current consented structure. The work will measure and prioritise the role of each factor in reaching a water storage solution that has wide community benefits and acceptance.**

15. We take it that the purpose of the review is not to identify water storage and management options for Central Hawke's Bay, but purely to identify whether the RWSS resource consents and construction plans can be used. That is consistent with the proposal that was put to Council in February 2019, which was to provide funding for CHB Water Holdings to investigate two options only: a full scale Makaroro Dam, or a lower dam with no provision of environmental flows. The discussion document is vaguer about the investigation's focus, but the intent appears the same.
16. The way in which the review is described in the discussion document conflicts with the statement by the CHBDC Chief Executive that "this is not about re-hashing the Ruataniwha

#161

5 of 10

conversation".¹ In fact, the review appears to be entirely about re-hashing the Ruataniwha conversation.

17. As a result, we are left uncertain as to the intended nature and scope of the review. If it is purely to review the RWSS intellectual property and identify feasible storage opportunities authorised by the existing consents, we cannot see the point:

- a. We are astonished that after watching Hawke's Bay Regional Council spend around \$20 million on developing the RWSS without achieving a feasible scheme, CHBDC would consider it sensible to spend its own money on the same failed scheme. The proposal for CHBDC to take over ownership of the intellectual property in the RWSS if it is shown to be worthless² is a striking illustration of how illogical this proposal is.



CHBDC TO OWN RUATANIWA DAM INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY IF CHB WATER HOLDINGS SAYS IT IS WORTHLESS

- b. The RWSS would have flooded specially protected conservation land. The Supreme Court found that authorisation of access to the conservation land was unlawful, and held that the specially protected land remains protected for as long as its natural values are present. The RWSS cannot proceed based on a design that involves flooding the conservation land.
- c. Any other scheme which does not involve flooding the conservation land would be substantially different from the scheme provided for in the RWSS construction plans and authorised by the RWSS resource consents and would only provide around 20% of the RWSS' capacity. The existing plans and consents could - at most - be of value in demonstrating what not to do.

18. We suspect that Water Holdings CHB's intention (and the purpose of the planned meetings with key stakeholders) is to attempt to win support for a law change to enable specially protected conservation land to be flooded, in order to proceed with a full scale RWSS. We

¹ <https://www.stuff.co.nz/environment/110889921/the-ruataniwha-dam-proposal-might-be-dead-but-now-another-dam-is-touted-on-the-same-river-with-ratepayer-funding-sought>

² Proposed dispensation 4 is that "The review of IP does not identify any tangible or financially sustainable water storage solution that can be implemented." The discussion paper says that if Water Holdings CHB do receive a dispensation under point 4 Council should as condition of the loan agreement have access to all IP obtained and developed by Water Holdings CHB as part of the investigation exercise.

are completely opposed to the use of public funds for a lobbying exercise intended to undermine the protection of public conservation land.

19. If the review is broader and is intended to involve a neutral consideration of water storage and management opportunities for the district (as the Chief Executive's comments suggest), then we consider that a wiser use of public funds than the review described above. However, the issue then becomes the suitability of Water Holdings CHB to carry out that review, as discussed below.
20. A report by Aqualinc Research Limited that was produced for a group of Tukituki surface water users identified that any future storage scheme proposal must be community-led, and the first step in the investigation must be to obtain full clarity and understanding of the surface water and groundwater hydrology – how much water is available in the catchment and how much is required for all uses, including abstractive (municipal, rural water supply, irrigation, industry, etc.) and in-stream (environmental, recreational, etc) uses, and:

From that, catchment shortfalls in groundwater and surface water flow and volume can be identified, collective storage needs determined and solution concepts considered.

21. The Aqualinc report identifies that some of this data may be available from the information generated as part of the RWSS development (although we note that it would require significant work to take into account more recent constraints that have been imposed post-development of the RWSS science – in particular PC6 nutrient limits and minimum flows). That type of broad "state of the environment" investigation does not appear to be proposed, but it is impossible to know for sure because the funding proposal is so vague.

Who is Water Holdings CHB?

22. The discussion document says that it provides:

...a high-level assessment of who Water Holdings CHB are, a review of the strategic and policy fit for any investment by Council, a review of the structures available to Council for making the investment and recommendations on the preferred option as well as condition precedents for any investment being made.

23. The additional information provided about Water Holdings CHB is inadequate to justify providing public money to this entity.
24. The discussion document says that Water Holdings CHB is a limited liability company with an interest in securing long term and sustainable water security for the region, and that it holds the intellectual property for the Ruataniwha Water Storage Scheme.
25. What is not clear is what qualifications or experience this entity has to make it an appropriate recipient of Council funding. The public has an interest in ensuring council funding is directed towards appropriately qualified recipients, who can demonstrate:
 - a. Expertise and experience in water storage and water management feasibility assessments.
 - b. Expertise and experience in project management of a feasibility study.

- c. An understanding of catchment hydrology, including likely impacts of climate change.
 - d. The ability to engage with stakeholders. Preferably this would include having a diverse board that is itself reflective of the broader community (not currently the case).
 - e. That they will be able to undertake a broad, sustainability-focussed and community-focussed review of water management options in an unbiased way, and do not have a predisposition towards a particular outcome.
26. Water Holdings CHB's only qualification appears to be the fact that it holds the RWSS intellectual property. We do not accept that this makes it an appropriate recipient for this funding. In fact, that makes it an inappropriate recipient for funding because its interest is in capitalising on the value of its investment in the intellectual property rather than in identifying a range of water management options for the community to consider.
27. CHBDC should clarify the scope of the review it is proposing to fund, and then identify the most appropriate entity to undertake the review, including by carrying out proper due diligence in relation to candidates.

Conditions precedent for any investment being made

28. Conditions precedent for an investment should be a clear problem statement and objective for the inquiry. As set out above, we do not see evidence of this approach.
29. We understand that maintaining the RWSS resource consents costs approximately \$100,000 per year. Any funding arrangement should ensure that public funds are not spent on this outlay, which should be the responsibility of Water Holdings CHB. There can be no confidence Water Holdings CHB will not be back looking for more funding in a year or two.

Conservation land impacts

30. The manner in which the CHBDC proposal is described is misleading. In the CHBDC proposal it is noted that "the Ruataniwha Water Storage Scheme as we have understood it, is unlikely." Following the Supreme Court decision regarding specially protected land, the RWSS as understood is not possible. While it could be achieved with a retrospective law change the now-Minister for the Environment, David Parker, ruled out such an approach as "constitutionally outrageous".³ It is misleading to suggest otherwise.
31. We would like to see a commitment from CHBDC that it will not support any water storage options that would have an adverse impact on protected conservation land.

"Requirement" for water storage

32. The Discussion Paper states that:

...the requirement for water storage in some form is required to not only ensure water security and resilience for the District, but to allow for future growth and economic development.

³ <https://www.labour.org.nz/national-must-rule-out-retrospective-override-for-ruataniwha>.

33. Forest & Bird consider this statement to be incorrect.
34. Hawke's Bay Regional Council's 31 March 2017 report *Assessment of the production systems, techniques and technologies for dry land farming, without irrigation, in the Tukituki Catchment*⁴ was commissioned as part of the RWSS review. The report detailed how various farms in Hawke's Bay would be better off if they refrained from 'purchasing' water for irrigation from a large-scale irrigation scheme and instead introduced better management practices. This finding was based on case studies of real farms in the area, including dairy farms. The report illustrated that farms that can adapt to local environmental limits reap significant economic and environmental gains, while those that rely on irrigation are exposed to greater risks and have a reduced return on investment. Several Hawke's Bay farmers who farm without irrigation were consulted for the report. It appeared that farmers who looked at the attributes of their land and worked to what the land will do most years were doing well. The report concluded with a note that with the application of simple on-farm adjustments, substantial gains in efficiency could be made, allowing Plan Change 6 changes to be profitably met.
35. We therefore consider that while some level of water storage is needed for security of supply in a farming business as usual scenario, large scale water storage is not "a requirement" for sustainable farming in Central Hawke's Bay. We request that CHBDC financially support further research and innovation, such as that in the HBRC report, which provides for sustainable farming within environmental limits, rather than committing further funds to investigating large scale water storage. Central Hawkes Bay has an opportunity to lead the way on this front.
36. Even under a business-as-usual land use scenario, the Aqualinc report identified that the storage capacity required to provide security of supply is a fraction of the RWSS' storage capacity of 90 million m³. Aqualinc assessed the impact of the change in minimum flows on the surface water consent holders to calculate reliability of supply pre- and post-PC6 minimum flows, and used that to determine the volume of water that would be needed to return water supply reliability back to pre-PC6 levels, and thereby maintain a level of reliability in their production systems. There are 48 surface water consent holders in Central Hawke's Bay potentially affected by the Plan Change. Of those, 39 consent holders, collectively holding 49 surface water consents, joined the study. Aqualinc calculated that the average annual volume of water required for the 39 consent holders to drive reliabilities back to current levels is about 882,000 m³/year, and that storage capacity of 2.3 million m³ would provide current reliability in 9 years out of 10 (which the author says would be a realistic target for water storage).
37. Water storage at the scale provided for in the RWSS plans is therefore unnecessary.
38. The Tukituki Taskforce has been established as a multi-stakeholder community group to grapple with water protection and use in the catchment. Funding CHB Water Holdings to investigate what is essentially a single option – large scale water storage – cuts across the work of this group.

⁴ Appendix 19 here: <https://www.hbrc.govt.nz/assets/Document-Library/RWSS-Reports/Appendices-to-RWSS-report.pdf>

The myth of improved river health

39. The CHBDC proposal states that an irrigation scheme could result in (scaled) “improved river health and habitat”. The myth that dams create environmental benefits is widely believed and repeated whenever a new dam proposal is being discussed. In reality, there are very rarely ‘benefits’—and if there are, they tend to be outweighed by the many negative impacts. In this regard we note that:⁵

- a. In a recent review of 165 scientific papers, 92% reported a decrease in ecological health as a result of flow regulation.
- b. When provided, ‘flushing flows’ are often ineffective in flushing algae from a river, and fail to turn over gravels and scour the riverbed. Even when well-planned and well-intentioned, flushing flows are not effective (as an example, consider the Tongariro River scheme and the difficulties experienced in trying to effectively flush periphyton⁶).
- c. Exotic species thrive in the modified landscapes a dam provides.
- d. In a study of 30 dammed catchments in New Zealand, over 80,000 kilometres of habitat was inaccessible to migratory fish.
- e. Even when fish passes are provided, they often allow only a tiny proportion of fish through. Many native fish are killed in reservoirs by exotic fish populations, in dam turbines and in inadequate fish passes.

40. Those are only the direct effects of dams. The polluting effects of intensified land use that result from greater water availability and the need to pay “dam rates” for water would cripple the Tukituki River and mean that achieving the 0.8 mg/l DIN target within the Tukituki catchment is completely out of reach.

Financial benefits

41. The discussion paper states that:

... the project as proposed was projected to result in significant economic benefit. Water Holdings CHB believe any such adaptation of the original proposal will have comparable ‘scaled’ benefits for the region and further economic development, as to a range of further value add outputs for the District and Region as a whole, that could include:

- Improved summer flows in the Tukituki River
- Improved river health and habitat
- A predicted increase of between 1.9-5.5% in current GDP (between \$130 to \$380million a year by full water uptake)

⁵ Joy & Foote, 2017, ‘Damn the Dams’, in *The Journal of Urgent Writing*, Massey University Press.

⁶ Tonkin & Death, 2013, *The combined effects of flow regulation and an artificial flow release on a regulated river*, River Research and Applications.

#61
10 of 10

- The potential to create between 1,130 and 3,580 jobs across Hawke's Bay through increased activity and its flow-on impacts

(Based on RWSS benefits assessment)

42. We note that this is asserted in the discussion document as a belief of Water Holdings CHB (i.e. "Water Holdings CHB believe...") and question whether CHBDC have tested this assertion. We reiterate that CHB Water Holdings has a financial interest in its reliance on these findings.
43. We understand that if a dam smaller than that of the RWSS were constructed it would demand a much higher distribution cost per cubic metre of water 'sold' than that proposed for the RWSS. We understand this to be a reflection of the poor 'economy of scale' in constructing a smaller dam – storage capacity is significantly reduced but building costs are not.
44. Forest & Bird are advised that no pasture-based industry user would be able to pay more than \$0.10/m³ of water supplied in order to remain profitable. We have also been advised that costs for water from a smaller dam would need to be around \$0.80 cents/m³ in order to sufficiently finance the dam's construction.
45. It is irresponsible to conflate the supposed economic benefits of an alternative smaller scheme with those purported for the original RWSS proposal – particularly when there were doubts about the economic benefits claimed for the RWSS in the first place.
46. We reiterate that the RWSS benefits assessment did not take into account the nutrient limits imposed under PC6 (or any water quality limitations that may come into place through an updated National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management). A benefits assessment that took those constraints into account would produce very different predictions of intensification and consequential GDP increase and employment. We suspect any financial benefits are at this stage grossly overestimated.
47. As previously mentioned, a better understanding of soils, pastures, management, and agricultural economics would lead to a much more financially (and environmentally) robust outcome.

Not a prudent financial investment

48. The Rural Ward fund that the funds are proposed to be drawn from is currently used in a form where only the interest and not the capital of the fund are available for use. We have not seen any justification for the proposal to change this approach.
49. The cost of interest that will be foregone as a result of the fund being depleted by almost one third has not been taken into account.

SUBMISSION ENDS

Leigh Collecutt

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Friday, 12 April 2019 11:59 AM
To: Thrive
Subject: Annual Plan 2019/20 Consultation - Feedback [#62]

Submitters Name Victoria Bloomer

Postal Address 
24 Church Street
Waipawa, Hawkes Bay 4210
New Zealand

Day Phone Number 0278489336

Email vickypfb@gmail.com

Do you wish to present your comments to council in person at a hearing? No

Please note that your submission (including any personal information supplied) will be made available to Councillors and the public. Submissions Close on 12 April 2019 at 5pm I give my full support to CHBDC granting this loan. Water security is critical for our region to thrive.

1. Tell us what you think about the proposal that Council give a \$250,000 suspensory loan to Water Holding CHB to keep the prospect of water storage alive in Central Hawke's Bay.

From: Megan Fitter <hellojakeandmegan@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, 12 April 2019 11:56 AM
To: Thrive
Subject: Submission on the proposed Central Hawke's Bay Annual Plan 2019-2020

Submission on the proposed Central Hawke's Bay Annual Plan 2019-2020

I submit this as past resident of Taradale Hawkes Bay and have watched from afar and observed during visits the degradation of the rivers where I camped, played, swam as a child of a forth generation family who has lived along the Tuki Tuki in Waipawa and Otane since arriving as settlers from England. My grandparents who live in a Havelock North Rest Home both were affected by the water quality failure in 2016.

The restoration of the awa, with removal of willow and stock should be a priority in the plan. Dredging is not a long term solution to the sediment loads entering the Bay.

As others have submitted I support the following points in the failure of territorial authorities to accept and implement the environmental aspects of their plans even when court-ordered. I am also concerned about capture of territorial authorities by vested special interests.

The proposed plan ticks all these boxes.

1. The proposal by CHB Water Holdings is an attempt to restart the RWSS in another guise. This plan was shelved after vast quantities of ratepayer money were wasted on it and trying to restart it shows that CHBWH do not accept the democratic and court findings of the decision. To use even more ratepayer money to try to relitigate the process is wrong.
2. The proposed funding of CHB Water Holdings is simply corporate welfare for wealthy farmers to suck the public purse instead of paying their own way with any water storage and delivery scheme they may desire. CHBWH must spend entirely their own money on irrigation and must prove before they start that they will meet water quantity and quality objectives in the near and long term. A suitable method to ensure that negative water quality outcomes are insured against is to bond CHBWH for the cost of cleanup. This bond must be assessed by an independent body and levied before any scheme starts. In any case the public should be indemnified against any negative outcomes, including bailouts from failure due to drought. (Noted in (4))
3. Since the nitrate levels in the Tukituki catchment are already above the Environment Court defined limit of 0.8mg/l NO₃-N, then ANY increase in farm output will increase N levels further, thus frustrating the water quality objectives of PC6. HBRC and CHBDC will likely be in contempt of court and open to legal challenge.
4. CHB Water Holdings' own study, by Aqualinc, shows rapidly increasing frequency of dry years. This is clearly a result of climate change. Far from future-proofing the region, irrigation promotes highly risky farming styles with severe financial and human costs in drought years when water is restricted. We now have substantial data from Canterbury to prove this. All currently accepted science shows that even greater drought risk is inevitable in the future and that we need to adjust systems to cope and mitigate for climate change, as well as decreasing carbon footprint. Any increase in water availability will add to greenhouse gases, not reduce them. It is unconscionable for Council to fund an increase in climate change and the enormous consequences that go with it. To prove that climate change has been accounted for, CHBWH members should each sign a

statutory declaration acknowledging that anthropogenic climate change exists, is increasing, and that their proposed scheme will make it worse.

5. Small dams paid for by the public are a slam-dunk money loser. Water is very expensive from small schemes, and no agricultural or horticultural enterprise can afford to pay the true cost of water from these schemes. This was acknowledged during the RWSS process. Since CHBDC already knows this, using public money to help further those aims is nothing more than a cynical wealth transfer from ratepayers to scheme promoters.

6. To use CHBWH effectively as a consultant in their own interest is an obvious conflict of interest. To be one of several stakeholders, along with proper (reasonably proportional) representation of other major stakeholders, would be acceptable, but the way the process is being set up is not like this at all and therefore not acceptable.

7. Yet again we are hearing the rubbish about the benefits of environmental flushing flows which would come from a dammed scheme, compared to a free-flowing river. CHBDC cannot come up with any evidence to support this claim and will never be able to because it is false. This is simply lying to the ratepayers to try to assuage them and should be exposed as such. Unfortunately, in NZ there is no suitable mechanism to legally prevent such lies being told by Councils, but that does not take away from the fact they are morally reprehensible.

8. How did CHBWH become eligible for this grant? (A suspensory loan is a grant, especially in the absence of performance criteria). It appears that the funding they seek is not contestable by other entities, which makes it more of a free gift simply because they asked. There is no problem with Council giving money to worthy causes but a bare minimum requirement should be that potential grant money is contestable, that other contestants are equally supported both with knowledge of the grant availability, council and officer time, access to the plan process etc. More importantly, any scheme the same or similar to one which has already had huge sums spent on it and has been rejected, should be disqualified. The CHBDC approach fails these tests and in the absence of proper process the CHBWH proposal should be disqualified.

Relief sought:

That CHB Water Holdings is not funded or assisted with a suspensory loan or any other ratepayer funds.

Regards,

Megan Fitter (nee Crawley)
021 619 854 | 09 816 8528

Leigh Collecutt

From: Murray Rosser <murray.rosser@rosser.co.nz>
Sent: Thursday, 11 April 2019 11:14 PM
To: Thrive
Subject: Submission on Annual Plan 2019 - Suspensory Loan to Water Holdings CHB Ltd

District Councillors

Having been away from home most of the last few months I have only now become aware of the unconscionable intent expressed in this years Annual Plan to gift \$250,000 of the citizens money to a private company. The grossly negligent and careless spending of some \$18M on the Ruataniwha dam project by the Regional Council is injury enough but the proposal to now give away money to a private company to explore another dam in the same area is adding further direct insult to local ratepayers.

Irrespective of the merits of any ideas that a former mayor and his colleagues may have concerning their private and unproven project the gifting of council controlled money to a private company for the private benefit of a private business, in many jurisdictions including New Zealand, could easily be seen as corrupt practice. The proposal to make a suspensory loan on terms which, I understand, essentially enable the private company to avoid repayment irrespective of success or otherwise makes the loan nothing more nor less than a grant or gift.

If CHBDC, as stated in the proposal for the loan, wish to:

1. identify water security options, and;
2. address the environmental, social and economic challenges and opportunities that water security creates;

the gifting of \$250,000 into the hands of a private company is no way for a responsible body to behave. If the council requires advice or needs to consult on the matters outlined above handing over cash to a company owned by people with no professional expertise in such matters is worse than irresponsible. Even the concept of making this loan suggests a too cosy relationship between the promoters and council. Thankfully it is not too late for council to avoid making the sorry step of indulging in this act of corporate welfare. I strongly urge council to come to its senses and disabuse Messrs Gilbertson, Streeter and Ritchie of any notion that they will be the beneficiaries of ratepayers largesse.

Kind regards

Murray Rosser

Residential Address: 73 Kyle Road Waipukurau 4281

Postal Address: P O Box 248 Waipukurau

Phone 027 4433539

Leigh Collecutt

From: Dean Hyde <dean-nph@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, 1 April 2019 2:33 PM
To: Thrive
Subject: Annual Plan Submission
Attachments: Submission (AP 2019).docx

Dean Hyde (JP)
4 Smith Street
Waipukurau 4200
Central Hawkes Bay
Aotearoa/New Zealand
Mobile: 027 2886748

DEAN HYDE (JP)

4 SMITH STREET, WAIPUKURAU, CENTRAL HAWKES BAY 4200
AOTEAROA/NEW ZEALAND
MOBILE TELEPHONE: 027 2886748
EMAIL: dean-nph@hotmail.com

1st of April 2018

Attn: Central Hawkes Bay District Council
WAIPAWA
Via Email: thrive@chbdc.govt.nz

Your Worship the Mayor and Councillors

Annual Plan 2019

Firstly, thank you for the opportunity to submit on this year's Annual Plan.

Before I offer my submission for your consideration, I wish to take this opportunity to commend Council on its hosting of the various public forum as part of the consultation process.

I attended the Waipukurau forum on the 27th of March. I found the presentations helpful and coupled with the ability to engage directly with our civic leaders of immense value. Thank you.

Accordingly, I would respectfully submit the following.

Bigger Water Story:

Council is proposing that a \$250,000 Suspensory Loan be provided to a private company, Water Holdings CHB Limited. For the purpose of assisting with further work to be undertaken on the potential options for water storage facilities.

Whilst appreciating the nature of a suspensory loan as the financial mechanism to enable this funding to take place, I need to make the point to Council that it is my view that in essence this is a grant of public money to a private business entity.

Notwithstanding Council's ability to recover these funds in certain circumstances, we have to be quite candid as to what is taking place; we are providing monies that will ultimately enable potential and substantial private benefit to the shareholders of Water Holdings CHB Limited.

I am left asking the philosophical question as to '*is this the place of Local Government?*' This proposal is quite different from providing grants for community initiatives, or even District wide funding for tourism promotions, etc. In these latter examples there is a solid argument for there being a wider collective/communal benefit.

Having returned to Central Hawkes Bay early last year, I am struck with the economic disparity that exists, now further complicated with rapidly increasing housing costs applying further pressure particularly on those on low and fixed incomes.

How does Council therefore propose to justify too many of its residents and electors that such largesse to the benefit of private business interests is warranted?

Regardless of my misgivings, should Council proceed with this proposal then I will add my voice in support of the financial mechanism of a suspensory loan as a pragmatic option.

Disaster Relief Fund Trust:

The move to a single collective management structure for Civil Defence in Hawkes Bay was welcomed and appropriate, it therefore makes absolute sense that any potential Relief Funds also be managed on a regional basis and in this case through a Trust.

Having served on various Trust Boards, I can contest that they can work extremely well as long as their establishment is sound, focus clear and accountabilities set; with best practice governance mechanisms in place.

I would ask Council to seek that the final governance methodology ensures our community is represented and that representational equity exists for all communities of interest i.e. urban, city, rural, coastal and smaller communities.

Draft Environmental Strategy:

I have got say that I am impressed with the Environmental and Sustainability Strategy (February 2019); it clearly marks a sea change in the organisational culture of Council and how in partnership with our community we will strive to maintain and enhance our local environment.

But not in isolation; by partnering with key stakeholders Council has recognised that to achieve what not only is desirable but meaningful, we need to call upon others.

As such my comments thus far are brief, I do however look forward to and participating in the upcoming Village Planning exercise; in-particular I believe that we can do more by better utilisation of our public green spaces (overall plantings, water storage, reticulation and reuse) and urban street scape (tree planting).

I am further buoyed by the appointment of an Economic Development Officer and believe that hand in hand with this strategy that there are very real and significant economic opportunities in respect to recycling, up-cycling and re-purposing. Central Hawkes Bay could become a key national hub for such innovation.

Thank you once again for this opportunity.

Yours sincerely

DEAN HYDE

Leigh Collecutt

#66
1 of 4

From: Genevieve Toop <genevieve.toop@greenpeace.org>
Sent: Sunday, 7 April 2019 4:22 PM
To: Thrive
Subject: Greenpeace NZ submission on CHBDC Annual Plan 2019-2020
Attachments: GPNZ submission - CHBDC plan.pdf

Kia Ora

Please find attached Greenpeace NZ submission on Annual Plan 2019-2020.

Best wishes,

--

Genevieve Toop
0800 223344 ext. 28 or 021 316 840
Campaigns
Greenpeace New Zealand



“Participation - that's what's gonna save the human race.” - Pete Seeger

#66
2 of 4
07/04/2019

Dear Central Hawkes Bay District Council

Re: Submission on Annual Plan 2019/2020

Greenpeace NZ welcomes the opportunity to submit on the Central Hawkes Bay District Council (**CHBDC**) Annual Plan 2019/2020.

Our submission relates solely to the proposal by Council to provide a \$250,000 suspensory loan from Council's Rural Ward Funds to Water Holdings CHB. Greenpeace opposes this proposal.

Greenpeace is an international organisation working in around 52 countries to protect the environment and promote peace. In New Zealand Greenpeace has been operating for 45 years and has tens of thousands of members across the country.

We are a global organisation which in the last few years has joined with local and national organisations in opposition to the Ruataniwha dam (also known as the Ruataniwha Water Storage Scheme).

We are opposed to this dam and the Council's investment in it because the dam would pollute the Tukituki River as well as other water bodies in this catchment for generations to come.

The land-use modelling prepared in 2016 by Butcher partners Ltd. for the Hawkes Bay Regional Investment Company (**HBRIC**) clearly showed that the Ruataniwha dam would result in the intensification of agriculture, particularly dairying, in the Tukituki catchment.¹

Despite many public claims to the contrary, this report predicted that 35% of land irrigated by the dam would be dairying (over 9,000ha) which would be the single biggest user of the dam water.²

It also predicted that less than 1% (2,000ha) would be in orcharding and less than 1% would be in viticulture (2,075ha).³

There is now a swathe of incontrovertible evidence showing that intensive dairying impacts negatively on the health of waterways.

The National Institute of Water and Atmospheric research (**NIWA**) states:

*"There is no doubt that our declining river water quality over the last 20 years is associated with intensification of pastoral farming and the conversion of drystock farmland to dairy farming, particularly in Waikato, Southland, and Canterbury."*⁴

In a 2013 report, the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment (**PCE**) noted:

*"Unfortunately, [our] investigation has shown the clear link between expanding dairy farming and increasing stress on water quality".*⁵

¹ Ruataniwha Water Storage Scheme review of regional economic impacts and net present value Butcher Partners Ltd – March 2016 <https://www.hbrc.govt.nz/assets/Document-Library/RWSS-Documents/RWSS-Regional-Economic-Analysis-Update-March-2016.pdf>

² Ibid.

³ Ibid.

⁴ National Institute of Water and Atmospheric research 2010, How clean are our rivers? Water & Atmosphere July 2010 <http://docs.niwa.co.nz/library/public/W&A2010-1.pdf>

The Tukituki River is already seriously polluted - nitrogen and phosphorus levels in the river exceed ecological health limits.⁶

Unfortunately, the Council's "Supporting documentation for community consultation Annual Plan 2019/2020" makes the claim that the dam could be used to improve summer flows in the Tukituki River and improve its health and habitat.

While these claims are frequently used by the irrigation lobby they are not backed by scientific evidence and should not be adopted by Council for their decision-making.

Contrary to industry claims, there is a wide body of evidence linking big irrigation schemes to negative environmental effects.

A peer-reviewed scientific paper published in the top freshwater journal, *Freshwater Biology*, reviewed 165 scientific papers on schemes that altered natural flows and found:

"As expected, our qualitative analyses clearly demonstrated the many ecological consequences of flow alteration. Of the 165 papers reviewed, 152 (92%) of them reported negative ecological changes in response to a variety of types of flow alteration. Only 21 papers (13%) reported an increased value for ecological response metrics, and these often reflected shifts in ecological organisation such as increase in non-native species or non-woody plant cover on dewatered floodplains."

*"Fish abundance, diversity and demographic rates consistently declined in response to both elevated and reduced flow magnitude"*⁷

A study done on the Opuha dam found that despite the company's stated objective of augmenting summer flows and creating "flushing flows" it was ineffective and instead water quality declined as a result of the dam, excerpts below.

"Attempts to use dam re-operation to introduce flushing flows to remove nuisance periphyton below the Opuha Dam were not effective."

*"As with many dams, the altered flow regime below the Opuha Dam has led to significant negative downstream impacts."*⁸

We urge the Council to consider not only the environmental impacts of the Ruataniwha dam but also the financial and regulatory framework that will likely turn any investment into the dam into a waste of public money.

The dam does not have legal access to the conservation land it needs to go ahead.

In July 2017, the Supreme Court has held that an area of conservation land cannot have its protected status revoked to make way for the Ruataniwha dam.

⁵ PCE, Dr Jan Wright (2013) "Water quality in New Zealand: Land use and nutrient pollution

⁶ <http://www.epa.govt.nz/Resource-management/NSP000028/FINAL%20Report%20and%20Decisions%20-%20Volume%201%20of%203%20-%20Report%2018%20June.pdf>

⁷ Poff, N.L. and Zimmerman, J.K., 2010. Ecological responses to altered flow regimes: a literature review to inform the science and management of environmental flows. *Freshwater Biology*, 55(1), pp.194-205.

⁸ Lessard, J., Hicks, D.M., Snelder, T.H., Arscott, D.B., Larned, S.T., Booker, D. and Suren, A.M., 2013. Dam design can impede adaptive management of environmental flows: a case study from the Opuha Dam, New Zealand. *Environmental management*, 51(2), pp.459-473.

The dam does not have anywhere near the finances it needs to go ahead. Before it was canned, the cost of building the dam skyrocketed to nearly one billion dollars⁹, a number of key investors walked away from it and economists called it a "lemon" that should be abandoned.¹⁰

HBRIC consistently and repeatedly failed to sign up enough farmers to progress the dam nor could they secure an institutional investor.

Water Holdings Ltd is looking to the Government's Provincial Growth Fund for support. We would like to advise the Council that under the agreed lending rules this dam cannot receive support from the PGF. We attach those rules along with this submission.

We would like to advise you that we will be communicating with all Ministers concerned to remind them that lending to this dam would be in breach of the rules and their promises to the public about ceasing Government support to large-scale or environmentally damaging irrigation schemes.

The dam will likely become unviable in the near future due to a strengthened regulatory environment.

In order to protect the country's waterways and reduce our emissions there are several upcoming changes to New Zealand's national freshwater and climate regulations designed to impact on the viability of large scale irrigation schemes, intensive dairying and intensive livestock farming.

In this tightening regulatory environment investing in a scheme which is both financially and legally tenuous and widely opposed by the public would be an irresponsible use of ratepayer money.

Greenpeace NZ is committed to the ongoing campaign to ensure this environmentally damaging dam is not built.

Please direct any queries regarding this submission to Steve Abel – sable@greenpeace.org

We do not wish to speak to the submission.

ENDS

Submission prepared by Genevieve Toop on behalf of Greenpeace NZ.

⁹ [http://www.radionz.co.nz/news/regional/301334/dam%27s-cost-jumps-to-more-than-\\$900m](http://www.radionz.co.nz/news/regional/301334/dam%27s-cost-jumps-to-more-than-$900m)

¹⁰ <http://www.radionz.co.nz/news/rural/257123/abandon-planned-dam,-says-economist>

#67
1 of 4

Leigh Collecutt

From: Miriam and Murray Howarth <tawa.park@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, 7 April 2019 8:20 PM
To: Thrive
Subject: Annual Plan comments
Attachments: CHB submission.docx

I would like to offer the following submission to the annual plan.

see attachment

Murray Howarth

RD1

Takapau 4286

phone 027233 5089

email tawa.park@gmail .com

yes I would like to present my comments in person.

The proposal to allocate \$250,000 to Water Holding CHB , a private company , concerns me and I offer these thoughts. I feel that the N leaching allocation has been overlooked in this irrigation story.

- I would prefer to support the funding of a “Think Tank” group of CHB businesses to consider the future of Irrigation in CHB with particular emphasis on the impact of Plan Change 6 ,ie ***can we have irrigation and still be N leaching compliant with our allocation.*** This would be similar to the “Greening Tukituki” study that was done on four farms that were non compliant under PC6.

Funding would be needed to provide the Overseer and Farmax modelling.

It may be that some soil types are less leaky than others and some enterprises / crops are worse than others and only a portion of a farm may be irrigated before their allocation of N leaching is exceeded. This information would be useful to determine the requirements that farmers may want in an irrigation scheme.

Leigh Collecutt

From: Miriam and Murray Howarth <tawa.park@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, 12 April 2019 7:37 AM
To: Thrive
Subject: Water Holdings CHB Ltd Submission
Attachments: CHB submission.docx

I have previously lodged a submission and I would like to add some notes to my original.

Thankyou

Murray Howarth

RD1

Takapau

0272335089

I am happy to present in person.

The proposal to allocate \$250,000 to Water Holding CHB , a private company , concerns me and I offer these thoughts. I feel that the N leaching allocation has been overlooked in this irrigation story.

- I would prefer to support the funding of a "Think Tank" group of CHB businesses to consider the future of Irrigation in CHB with particular emphasis on the impact of Plan Change 6 ,ie ***can we have irrigation and still be N leaching compliant with our allocation.*** This would be similar to the "Greening Tukituki" study that was done on four farms that were noncompliant under PC6.

Funding would be needed to provide the Overseer and Farmax modelling.

It may be that some soil types are less leaky than others and some enterprises / crops are worse than others and only a portion of a farm may be irrigated before their allocation of N leaching is exceeded. This information would be useful to determine the requirements that farmers may want in an irrigation scheme.

Notes

These are background notes regarding my submission to the Water Holding CHB submission.

There is generally a very poor understanding of Plan Change 6 and in particular the Nitrate Leaching allocation system that has been imposed on us.

The LUC (Land Use Capability) allocation system is an attempt to treat all Farms fairly making allowance for land with better capability to have a higher leaching number compared to land with lesser potential. Hence the grading of land from 1 to 8. Dr Mackay estimated that Class 1 which has good soils and is probably flat ,when farmed appropriately with a legume based pasture would leach 30 kg N/ ha. Whereas Class 6 would be medium hill country with sheep and cattle, a legume pasture and would leach 17 kg N /ha.

The system tries to treat all classes fairly but does not allow for added extras like, bought in feed, nitrogen fertiliser, or irrigation. These technologies would increase production and increase N leaching.

Given the above I question whether there is a place for large scale irrigation if we are to comply with our N leaching allocation.

From the "Greening Tukituki "report it is noted that of the 846 FEMPs that were submitted to the Regional Council by 31 May 2018, 87 were above their LUC allowance (another 188 were still in progress).

It is unclear how the Regional Council is going to treat these noncompliant businesses.

Will using irrigation to increase production make our farms noncompliant?

Leigh Collecutt

From: customerservice
Sent: Monday, 8 April 2019 8:58 AM
To: Thrive
Subject: FW: CHBDC Consultation Document Submission Form
Attachments: Central Hawkes Bay District Council 20190407.pdf

Received by Customer Service Email.

From: Bruce Anderson <andy74@xtra.co.nz>
Sent: Sunday, April 7, 2019 1:59 PM
To: customerservice <customerservice@chbdc.govt.nz>
Subject: CHBDC Consultation Document Submission Form

Gday CDHBDC

Please find attached a PDF copy of my document submission form for your consideration

Contact me if you have any queries

Kind Regards

Bruce Anderson

Mobile - 0272 754431

Home - 06 8588626

Central Hawkes Bay District Council

Consultation Document

Bullet Point Submission

Dated - 2019.04.07

My Details –

Submitters Name -	Bruce Anderson
Postal Address -	26a Reservoir Road, Waipukurau, 4200
Day/Night Phone -	06 8588626
Mobile Phone -	0272 754431
Email -	andy74@xtra.co.nz

Submission Details –

Submission-1 Proposal to give \$250,000 to Water Holdings CHB Ltd (WHLCHB)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I agree with this submission only so long as WHLCHB use the suspensory loan “to keep the prospect of water storage alive in Central Hawkes Bay” 2. I agree with this submission only so long as the provision of the suspensory loan to WHLCHB does not give WHLCHB any proprietary rights to the implementation, construction, and/or downstream reticulation rights etc. 3. Refer to submission-4, item-2 for an alternative consideration to the proposed water storage dam 4. Refer to submission-4, item-3 for consideration to the proposed water storage dam 5. Refer to submission-4, item-4 regarding rubbish collection
Submission-2 Revenue & Financing Policy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I agree
Submission-3 Disaster Relief Fund Trust	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I agree
Submission-4 Draft Environmental Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I agree with the declared principles and aims of the Draft Environmental Strategy but would like the council to consider the following items 2. Water Storage – instead of a water storage scheme based on one large water storage dam complete with downstream piped water reticulation, the council should consider implementing a water storage scheme based several storage ponds complete with “local” piped water reticulation. The “pond” system would ultimately contain a stored water capacity something equal to the single dam method and the implementation and construction costs would be spread over a longer time frame. Further details/back-ground can be supplied if required 3. Dairy Farming – I believe that the water storage scheme would have a better chance of success if the rate-payers/public could be assured that dairy farming would be excluded (or severely limited) from the scheme and that horticulture would be the preferred farming activity. One only has to consider the impact dairy farming has had on the Southland environment for a cautious approach to be taken

- | | |
|--|---|
| | <p>4. Rubbish Collection – It seems like not many district councils in NZ have solved the problem of rubbish collection. I propose that the council considers implementing a practical and sustainable system based on “rubbish separation” provided by the householder via allocated bins. As I understand it, rate-payers are required to separate rubbish in to three sub-groups, group-1 being glass, group-2 being plastics, paper and metal cans, and group-3 being non-recyclables. The provision of a two plastic bins and a plastic bag is not suitable for this purpose. I propose that the council consider providing a set of three color-coded rate-payer funded plastic wheelie-bins for curb-side collection via a truck-mounted mechanical arm arrangement</p> |
|--|---|

Signed - *Bruce Anderson*

Leigh Collecutt

From: Margaret Munro
Sent: Tuesday, 9 April 2019 11:33 AM
To: Thrive
Subject: verbal Feedback

My Name is William Stevenson I am all for the dam Criteria plan go ahead spend the money!



Margaret Munro
Customer Experience Representative
Central Hawke's Bay District Council

PO Box 127
28 - 32 Ruataniwha Street
Waipawa 4210

06 857 8060

■ This communication, including any attachments, is confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, please c
■ it. Refer to the disclaimer on our website.

Got an idea or feedback? Fantastic! You can [let us know here](#)



Leigh Collecutt

From: customerservice
Sent: Wednesday, 10 April 2019 8:33 AM
To: Thrive
Subject: FW: Suspensory loan to CHB Water Holdings

Received by Customer Service Email

-----Original Message-----

From: NicolaHobson <nerang@inspire.net.nz>
Sent: Wednesday, April 10, 2019 8:05 AM
To: customerservice <customerservice@chbdc.govt.nz>
Cc: Fiona Limbrick <fiona.limbrick.98@gmail.com>
Subject: Suspensory loan to CHB Water Holdings

To whom it may concern

We fully support the proposed suspensory loan to CHB Water Holdings to fully investigate the future of water management in Central Hawkes Bay.

Nicola Hobson
Fiona Limbrick
311 State Highway 50
Tikokino

Leigh Collecutt

From: Gill Tracy <gillitracy@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, 12 April 2019 8:03 AM
To: Thrive
Subject: Submission to Annual Plan 2019/20
Attachments: Submission to AP.docx

Categories: Red category

From
Gill Tracy
2A Waverley Street
Waipawa
8577976
0273345477
gillitracy@gmail.com
No to submitting in person

Environmental and Sustainability Strategy

I applaud the CHBDC in developing this strategy in view of the importance of the environment in the future wellbeing of us all.

Some points:

The strategy states that one of the top priorities of Council is **conserving water**. However this is not addressed. Instead the focus is on investigating long term water storage solutions.

HBRC are currently investing in major research on the aquifer and possible ways to address the water availability. Any investigation prior to this by CHBDC is premature, and so this should not be a priority at present. This not CHBDC's core business.

Instead, CHBDC should be looking to the 'Economic Development Opportunities Assessment' project to identify suitable businesses that will be sustainable - without high water input.

'Ensuring environmental vitality through our way of working'.

For urban users CHBDC has a water demand management plan as part of the consents – this should be a key part of this Strategy.

Monitoring of leakage and waste could be reported on. Also ways to encourage water conservation for urban dweller could be promoted: rainfall and grey water tanks, 'dry' gardens, and most effectively, metering.

Solid waste management

What is the council's response to the changes in the recycling market? I believe that CHBDC should be following the lead of other Hawke's Bay councils which have stopped collecting plastics 3-7. This will give residents a clear message that these plastics are not recyclable and will put more pressure on producers to change their practises.

Funding for the Strategy

What funding and resources have been allocated for the actions required in this strategy?

Water Storage Funding

I do not support a suspensory loan to Water Holdings CHB Ltd

This is not Council's core business

CHB residents do not know what the money is specifically for – no business plan or milestones identified. Council should not spend this amount of money without providing more information for people to decide on its merits.

The Water Holdings budget is small in comparison to the money spent by HBRC on water storage proposals and unlikely to achieve progress in identifying solutions.

The timing is not right – HBRC is in the middle of major investigations on the aquifer and any work done around solutions should be informed by this.

The question of who would benefit from this project is not clearly identified. It cannot benefit the whole rural community; so is this a fair use of rural ward funds? It appears that eastern parts of the

rural district will be subsidising some of the western parts. District wide benefit was ruled out last year by rural ratepayers when the district wide water and waste water rates were proposed. So it would be fair to assume this will be the case here also.

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Friday, 12 April 2019 12:46 PM
To: Thrive
Subject: Annual Plan 2019/20 Consultation - Feedback [#72]

Submitters Adrienne Tully
Name

Postal 
Address 402 Hinerua Road RD1
Ongaonga, CHB 4278
New Zealand

Day Phone 068789819
Number

Mobile Phone 0277264536
Number

Night Phone 068789819
Number

Email lacebark64@gmail.com

Do you wish No
to present
your
comments to
council in
person at a
hearing?

Please note that your submission (including any personal information supplied) will be made available to Councillors and the public. Submissions Close on 12 April 2019 at 5pm

1. Tell us what you think about the proposal that Council give a \$250,000 suspensory loan to Water Holding CHB to keep the prospect of water storage alive in Central Hawke's Bay.

I am strongly opposed to this proposal, as I was to the proposal that the CHB District Council invest money in the RWSS. I am opposed to the prospect of the Makaroro River once again being under threat. The building of a dam of any size is an archaic solution.

I feel nervous that a private company will have control of this project and that their likely focus will be on an outcome developed through the intellectual property they hold from the failed RWSS. I think this will reduce the chance of alternatives being explored.

It appears that the concerns of Water Holdings CHB Ltd have sidelined the Tukituki Water Taskforce, an avenue for community involvement. Also as a private company Water Holdings CHB Ltd will be under legal obligation to act in the best interests of their shareholders thus putting aside council and community interests and concerns and certainly the intrinsic rights of the Makaroro River.

I am not convinced that water storage is the way of the future. We need to learn to work with what we have and there is an avalanche of information, from very experienced people, to tap in to.

Permaculture, Bio-Dynamics, Regenerative agriculture and the advice of Phyllis Titchener and Nicole Masters are tip of the iceberg examples.

The destruction of the Makaroro River is environmental vandalism and shouldn't be considered. The river is not a means to an end, but an end in itself. Respect the river.

2. Do you agree with the changes to the Revenue & Financing Policy? I want to write "No Comment", but I am not clear how this minor variation achieves fairness from the information given. It seems to me that rural property rates will increase.

3. Do you support the establishment of the Disaster Relief Fund Trust? Yes, but with the awareness that rates will eventually increase to fund this.

4. Do you have any feedback on the Draft I am delighted that the Council are supporting the Hawkes Bay Bio Diversity Strategy. I am also pleased Council are working on an environmental strategy for the district, but it seems all rhetoric and no substance at this stage. Even the word environment distances us from what we are part of and what makes up our home. Our

Environmental only home.

Strategy? I would suggest some wider reading is required. ie Charles Eisenstein , Kate Raworth , Marilyn Waring and Nicole Foss, research transition towns working to insulate and enable local communities and engage in some radical brainstorming.

Any other suggestions? Remember it is local body election year.

Leigh Collecutt

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Friday, 12 April 2019 12:48 PM
To: Thrive
Subject: Annual Plan 2019/20 Consultation - Feedback [#73]

Submitters Name Susan Dudson

Do you wish to present your comments to
council in person at a hearing? No

Submission Form

#74

You are able to comment on anything included in the Consultation Document or provide any other feedback.

Need more room?

You can attach extra pages but please make sure they include your name and contact information.

Your Details

Submitters Name: Diane Seager
 Postal Address: 260 Burnside Rd
 Day Phone: R.D.3. TAKAPAU Night Phone: _____
 Mobile: 021 202 1491 Email: amulet@actrix.co.nz

Do you wish to present your comments to Council in person at a hearing? Yes ☐ No ☒

Please note that your submission (including any personal information supplied) will be made available to Councillors and the public. Submissions Close on 12 April 2019 at 5pm.

Submission Questions

1. Tell us what you think about the proposal that Council gives a \$250,000.00 suspensory loan to Water Holdings CHB Ltd to keep the prospect of water storage alive in Central Hawke's Bay.

I believe it is highly inappropriate for CHBDC to give money to private businessmen! You will be setting a precedent that will cause problems in the future.

3. Do you support the establishment of the Disaster Relief Fund Trust?

Yes - I think it important to be prepared for the increasing adverse (weather events). Both in severity and frequency.

2. Do you agree with the changes to the Revenue & Financing Policy?

Would like to see our polluters (agric. + businesses) pay more rates so we can use the money to help alleviate the effects on our environment.

4. Do you have any feedback on the Draft Environmental Strategy?

Would like to see agriculturists to be "encouraged" to farm "smarter" ie producing food etc. by choosing crops more suitable to our climate here instead of trying to make nature do their

Any other suggestions?

We don't need water storage in CHB if we farmed in accordance with nature. Not try to impose our will on her - We know what the problems are - Lets have the guts to make the tough decisions!

Submission Form

75
ENTERED
12/4 Ana

You are able to comment on anything included in the Consultation Document or provide any other feedback.

Need more room?

You can attach extra pages but please make sure they include your name and contact information.

Your Details

Submitters Name: Jim and Waike Macaulay

Postal Address: 10 Kenderdine Road, Glenthorne

Day Phone: 85 84 280 Night Phone:

Mobile: Email:

Do you wish to present your comments to Council in person at a hearing? Yes ☐ No ☒

Please note that your submission (including any personal information supplied) will be made available to Councillors and the public. Submissions Close on 12 April 2019 at 5pm.

Submission Questions

1. Tell us what you think about the proposal that Council gives a \$250,000.00 suspensory loan to Water Holdings CHB Ltd to keep the prospect of water storage alive in Central Hawke's Bay.

Yes.

3. Do you support the establishment of the Disaster Relief Fund Trust?

Good idea.

2. Do you agree with the changes to the Revenue & Financing Policy?

4. Do you have any feedback on the Draft Environmental Strategy?

Any other suggestions?

ensure in any shared services, our local voice and representation remains.

Submission Form

77
ENTERED
12/4/19

You are able to comment on anything included in the Consultation Document or provide any other feedback.

Need more room?

You can attach extra pages but please make sure they include your name and contact information.

Your Details

Submitters Name: Catherine Pedersen 4272
Postal Address: 29 Swamp Rd RD2 Waipawa.
Day Phone: 0275500309 Night Phone: 06 8578862
Mobile: ~ Email: catto2616@gmail.com

Do you wish to present your comments to Council in person at a hearing? Yes ☐ No ☒

Please note that your submission (including any personal information supplied) will be made available to Councillors and the public. Submissions Close on 12 April 2019 at 5pm.

Submission Questions

1. Tell us what you think about the proposal that Council gives a \$250,000.00 suspensory loan to Water Holdings CHB Ltd to keep the prospect of water storage alive in Central Hawke's Bay.

Completely disagree with this suggestion.
① WHCHB is a private company.
② Why do they think they'll get a different answer to HBRC where it's already cost us several million dollars.
③ Farm & live within the environment

3. Do you support the establishment of the Disaster Relief Fund Trust?

Yes.

2. Do you agree with the changes to the Revenue & Financing Policy?

Yes.

4. Do you have any feedback on the Draft Environmental Strategy?

I haven't had enough time to look at this properly but absolutely believe Council should have (& publish & monitor & change as necessary) an Environmental Strategy. Thanks.

Any other suggestions?

From: Andrew Robb <andrew.robb@actrix.co.nz>
Sent: Friday, 12 April 2019 12:13 PM
To: Thrive
Subject: Submission on Annual Plan 2019-2020
Attachments: 190412 Submission against suspensory loan.doc

Tena koe, tena koutou.

Please find attached my submission on the Council's Annual Plan, which focuses on the proposed suspensory loan to Water Holdings CHB Ltd.

Would you please acknowledge receipt of this submission.

Kia ora, Andrew Robb.

--

Andrew Robb
+64 29- 482 8494

This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.
<https://www.avast.com/antivirus>

361 Elsthorpe Road
RD 2 Otane 4277

12 April 2019

Submission on Central Hawkes Bay Annual Plan 2019-2020
In opposition to proposed suspensory loan to Water Holdings CHB Limited

To Whom It May Concern
Central Hawke's Bay District Council

Tena koe, tena koutou,
I nga ahuatanga o te wa.

I strongly oppose the proposal that the Council grant a suspensory loan of \$250,000 to Water Holdings CHB Ltd, a private company owned by six shareholders, for the following main reasons:

1. The suspensory loan on the terms indicated in the Council's proposal is nothing other than a grant, with no realistic chance that it will be repaid
2. The grant commits the Council to endorsing a course of action which has, in effect, a single goal: the building of a dam on the Makaroro Stream as proposed by the RWSS, which is now highly unlikely
3. The proposition is not to fund an open-ended inquiry into various options, from various proponents, for how to improve water security in the district, but aims to resurrect an plan for water storage in Central Hawke's Bay that has already been discredited
4. The vague assurances provided by the company of economic development, employment and environmental benefits of this proposal cannot be relied upon, being based on the defunct and discredited Ruataniwha Water Storage Scheme, which collapsed because private investors could not be convinced of the business case, farmers were unwilling to pay the (subsidised) price of the water, and the transfer of necessary DoC land was found to be unlawful
5. Even if the proposal does prove to be viable, the CHBDC will get no benefit from its grant of \$250,000, and will end up buying water from the developers at commercial rates
6. If the proposal proves not to be viable, the developers will be discharged from any obligation to repay the \$250,000 of ratepayers' money they will have spent on flogging a dead horse
7. Once the loan money is granted, it becomes the asset of a private company which is legally required to make the best possible return to its shareholders – six private individuals – with no further obligations or responsibilities to the Council or ratepayers, other than the terms and conditions of the grant

8. The proposition is in breach of both the current Rural Ward Funds and Investment policies, and disguises the need for a general rates increase by drawing down funds reserved for rural ratepayers
9. The arguments that a repayable loan to the company or an investment to purchase a shareholding are too complex or difficult suggest that the CHBDC is unwilling to manage the basic business of any Council, and call into question the competence of management

In particular, I take issue with the following aspects of the council paper supporting the proposition (in italics, with direct quotes in inverted commas).

Heading of paper:

“CHBDC Rural Ward Fund Investment Commercial Structuring Discussion Paper: Supporting documentation for community consultation Annual Plan 2019-2020.”

In reality, this proposition is not an investment – it is a grant by another name. It is not in accordance with the intention or the spirit of investment from the Rural Ward funds, which have been reserved for the benefit primarily of rural ratepayers.

Introduction:

“As a Council, and key infrastructure provider responsible for ensuring the long-term social, cultural, environmental and economic development of the district, the need for some form of investment in finding and implementing a solution to the current requirements and demands for water security need to be considered.”

If water security is the issue, then we need an open-ended consultation, inviting proposals for a range of solutions from a range of interested parties, perhaps through a contestable fund. They might cover education or assistance to switch from intensive dairy farming to dry-land alternatives, or changes to legislation. The Water Task Force is taking such an approach. This proposition is for a grant to a single private entity to investigate water storage – which is not the same as water security because, paradoxically, water storage makes farmers more dependent on irrigation and less resilient in the face of drought.

“The reality is the scale required to achieve the district and region wide outputs will require collaboration and partnership across a range of stakeholder groups. What was learnt from the Ruataniwha proposal was no one entity alone will have the resources or ability to enable any water storage proposal of the required scale or scope alone.”

Council cannot know what the required scale or scope is, until alternative proposals have been considered. Efficient water use will reduce the need for water storage. The real learning from the RWSS is the importance of involving the community in developing any proposal, right from the start; and of setting clear timelines and milestones for funding, and sticking to them.

Water Holdings CHB Ltd

*“Water Holdings CHB Ltd is a limited liability company, 100% owned by private shareholders.”
“The investment made by the Shareholders is relatively modest in the context of the overall investment that will be required and having visibility of this and their longer-term strategy is recommended.” (A table shows \$100,000 from shareholders [for IP] of a total of \$650,000 for their proposal.)*

This is a major grant of ratepayers' money to private developers who have very little skin in the game. The legal responsibility of company directors is to maximise the return on shareholders' investment. The proposition is for a suspensory loan, not an investment in a shareholding. The directors will owe no duty to the council or ratepayers, once the money is handed over, and the proposition shows that the council will have virtually no control over what the money is spent on.

Council's Proposed Investment

*“The [Rural Ward Funds] were established to provide funds for the provision or maintenance of recreational, cultural or infrastructural assets within the Aramoana/Ruahine Wards.
The Special Funds Policy [that governs the use of the Rural Wards Funds] states that, unless otherwise stated, only the interest earned on each fund shall be available to be spent, thereby preserving the individual fund amounts. A decision by Council to provide \$250,000 by way of a suspensory loan to Water Holdings CHB Ltd would require a change to the policy given the current policy is limited to only granting interest earned.
... By drawing on the reserve funds there would be no further impact on rates.”*

The presumption must be that such assets are primarily for the benefit of rural ward ratepayers, not to be appropriated for the wider district or region – otherwise why have a separate fund independent of Council's general funds? This proposal effectively transfers funds out of the rural wards, leaving reserves depleted, so the impact on rates is not avoided, only disguised. The proposed alteration to policy completely defeats the purpose of the rural ward funds.

“In addition to providing a water source, the [RWSS] project as proposed was projected to result in significant economic benefit. Water Holdings CHB Ltd believe any such adaptation of the original proposal would have comparable 'scaled' benefits for the region and further economic development, as to a further range of value-add outputs for the District and Region as a whole that could include:

- Improved summer flows in the Tukituki River*
- Improved river health and habitat*
- A predicted increase of 1.9-5.5 in current GDP (between \$130-380 million a year by full water uptake)*
- the potential to create between 1130 and 5380 jobs across Hawke's Bay through*

*increased activity and its flow-on effects
(based on RWSS benefits assessment)."*

Such projections carry no weight. HBRIC was unable to convince banks or private investors of the truth of their business case; farmers did not take up sufficient water because of the cost. The weight of research shows that dams harm river environments and so-called flushing flows are ineffective. In these times, environmental impacts must be front and centre of any development plans.

The paper says *Water Storage CHB propose to use the funding to review the IP to examine two scenarios for water storage and distribution, being:*

Option 1 – developing a full-scale Makaroro dam, providing for low flow allowances

Option 2 – a lower dam, with no provision for environmental flows and reduced regional impact.

Option 1 has already been fully explored and abandoned as unrealistic and unlawful. Option 2 has even greater risks – with fewer water users, the cost per user will be higher. More importantly, the useful life of a lower dam will be much shorter before the dam fills with gravel.

"We believe the proposed structure of the funding is consistent with the intent of the fund and the potential benefits to the district could be significant. While the Rural Ward Fund have typically been used for Council owned assets, the policy does not specify that it must be Council assets."

"Council's current investments policy limits equity investments to shares. The proposition to provide funding to Water Holdings CHB Ltd via a suspensory loan is regarded as an investment because of the nature of the proposed key terms and conditions.

For Council to go ahead with this proposal a small change to the current Investment Policy would be required to allow this structure."

"It may be appropriate to have limited investment(s) in equity (shares) and other appropriate structures when Council wishes to invest for strategic, economic development or social reasons, such as Local Government Insurance Corp.

Council will approve equity investments on a case by case basis, if and when they arise."

Councils invest for strategic, economic development and social reasons only when there are benefits to ratepayers (e.g. reduced insurance premiums). Such investments make the Council a stakeholder with a voice at the table and ongoing rights to manage assets.

This proposition benefits six shareholders whose company is legally required to manage its assets for their benefit – not for the Council or ratepayers. Altering the policies and using Rural Wards funds for this grant is completely inconsistent with the purpose of the funds, which were set up to be managed independently of Council's general funds for the benefit rural ratepayers in particular. To plunder the base funds to make this grant, and to diminish the interest accruing to the Rural Wards funds, is unconscionable.

Commercial Structuring

"The proposed investment being sought by Water Holdings CHB Ltd is not a unique investment precedent. There are multiple examples whereby public/private investment has been made into large-scale infrastructure/social infrastructure projects by Governments and Councils, where there is a direct tangible community benefit and return."

This is not a Public-Private Partnership. Once the grant is made, the Council is no longer a partner. Control of the funds transfers to the company, which is legally required to secure the best possible return to shareholders.

The paper says that *what is unique is the investment already made into validating and designing a scaled water storage development [via HBRIC].*

The point of the RWSS is that it was never validated. Water uptake never met targets, the business case failed despite massive support from HBRIC, DoC land was not available and the whole project collapsed! To use the RWSS as an argument to support this proposition suggests the CHBDC is biased towards this proposal, at the expense of a proper consideration of all the alternatives.

The paper says that *Council, in making any form of investment, must give careful consideration to how the funds will be used and what caveats and conditions will be imposed to protect the Council's position. The investment options considered by Council were a grant, an interest-bearing loan, a non interest-bearing loan, an investment for ownership stake, or to make no contribution.*

A table purports to set out the pros and cons of each option. A grant is described as *"a one-off non-repayable grant of monies provided as payment for a set of outputs. Payment can be made in advance, milestone or upon the successful completion of the contracted outputs. A grant would be documented between the parties by way of a funding agreement. The funding agreement would set out the mechanisms by which the investment would be made, timings for payments, requirements and outputs for funding."*

The preferred option, a suspensory loan, is described as *"a non-repayable loan, dispensated over time or upon completion of a set of agreed outputs. A suspensory loan is normally non-repayable; however there can be mechanisms whereby repayment is required. ... With a suspensory loan there is normally no requirement for a guarantee or security interest to be noted."*

The suggested caveats and conditions on the suspensory loan are extremely vague, namely:

Repayment: *The sale or divestment of Water holdings CHB, or the transfer of IP to a subsidiary entity or third party, other than Council;*

Dispensation: *The development of water storage facilities and measurable economic benefits being created and realised, being*

1. *Water security (agreed m3 quantum)*
2. *Employment*
3. *New business/investment*
4. *The review of IP does not identify any tangible or financially sustainable water storage solution that can be implemented.*

The paper says if this last dispensation is triggered, the Council should have access to all IP obtained and developed by Water Holdings CHB. The paper also recommends that funds are paid on achievement of agreed milestones (outputs). This would protect the Council's position and the potential for any loss. It would also ensure if the initiative is not feasible there will be a short No rather than a long No with any unnecessary Council expenditure not occurring. This will also provide a feedback loop for reporting.

A suspensory loan appears to be the same, in all respects set out in the table, as a grant. In contrast, a non-interest bearing loan is said to involve the registration of an interest over all IP, and repayment could be time-bound or upon a trigger being effected (implementation or divestment).

"The legal and accounting structures around establishing such a facility would be a lot more complex than for a grant or a suspensory loan and the establishment and ongoing compliance requirements would be costly. The facility would also need to be accounted for as a liability on Council's books. Further accounting and legal advice would be required if the Council decided to pursue this option."

An interest-bearing loan would be at an agreed rate of return, that could be based on the Council's cost of borrowing plus a margin to cover administration costs. There would be costs of establishment and ongoing compliance, but they are recoverable from the interest payable. The option of investing for an ownership stake could offer the Council a role as either passive or active shareholder, depending on whether or not a governance and decision-making role is sought. This would trigger an assessment of whether or not the entity thus became a Council-Controlled Organisation, requiring additional audit and legislative requirements. "The risk of assuming such a role will be an ongoing requirement or potential for further investment being required as to Council's role potentially becoming confused."

These arguments do not stack up. Managing a loan or an investment in a shareholding is part of the core business of any council. If the Central Hawke's Bay District Council really is unwilling or incapable of administering either, and therefore proposes to give away ratepayers money, then it is time for the Chief Executive to resign and for the Auditor-General to be called in.

Under the heading 'Council's proposed investment', the paper states that this proposition should be regarded as an investment. However the caveats and conditions imposed are no different than those that could be applied to a grant. A grant would require no change to the investment policy. It appears that the idea of a grant would be politically unacceptable, so it is called by another name.

Strategic Alignment

Water Holdings CHB's work strategically aligns with the Regional Economic Development Strategy -Matariki , the Water Task Force objectives of providing security/quality of supply of water across the district.

This proposition completely cuts across the work of the Water Task Force, which is still developing proposals for water security drawn from and developed by a wide range of interested parties. The Regional Council is about to embark on a major survey of the size and inter-relationships of the major aquifers in Hawke's Bay, to guide their own decisions on improving water security. If the CHBDC has \$250,000 to spend investigating water security in CHB, it should abandon this proposition and wait for the report of the Water Task Force and the results of the Regional Council's survey to get some guidance on how to proceed.

Conclusions

I have concerns about the process of this decision. I think the arguments in support of the proposition do not stack up and the paper is misleading as to the impacts on ratepayers. I think the timing is wrong. Ratepayers (and the Council) are being asked to judge the merits of the proposal before a proper business case has been developed or the terms and conditions of the grant have been decided.

I also think this proposal puts the cart before the horse. The big issue is water security; water storage may or may not be one way to achieve water security. Alternatives are currently being investigated, e.g. changes to land use; others could include a buy-back of over-allocated water rights, or amendment to the Public Works Act to provide for requisition of water rights in the public interest. The Council is being asked to support inter-generational water storage infrastructure before the need is properly established, on the basis of vague or discredited assurances of economic and environmental benefits, and in the absence of clear alternatives.

Finally, I think that environmental considerations should be paramount in decisions on major infrastructure. We all, public and politicians, can no longer buy our way out of the complex environmental crises looming. We have to change our way of thinking about our relationships with the environment and how we manage natural resources, for the benefit of future generations. We look to our public representatives on the Council to take a lead in this.

Kia ora,

Andrew Robb
029 482 8494

From: Sharleen Baird <sharleenb@xtra.co.nz>
Sent: Friday, 12 April 2019 1:30 PM
To: Thrive
Subject: Submission to CHBDC Annual Plan 2019-2020
Attachments: sharleen 2019 SUBMISSION TO CHBDC ANNUAL PLAN 2019.docx

Nga Mihi

Please acknowledge receipt of my Submission

Thank You

Sharleen Baird

SUBMISSION TO CHBDC ANNUAL PLAN 2019-2020

SHARLEEN BAIRD
341 Racecourse Rd RD2
Waipukurau 4282
06 858 6587
sharleenb@xtra.co.nz

I wish to speak to my submission

I submit that all except question two in this Plan have implications and ramifications for all Hawkes Bay not just Central Hawkes Bay. (e.g pollution and sedimentation along all of the Tukituki River to the rivermouth)

Q1 -I strongly oppose the Proposal to give \$250,000 to the private Limited Company Water Holdings CHB Ltd.

My rationale – The desire to keep prospect of water storage alive in CHB is flawed and retrograde. It seems to me CHBDC has learnt nothing from the RWSS research and Board of Inquiry outcomes. Water storage is not the solution to water allocation and misuse in the dryland farming region of CHB.

This is a private Company. Maybe CHBDC accountants and legal advisors can be convinced that Water Holdings business plan, cost structure, identified uptake and their case for what CHBDC ratepayers will get back in return for our money being spent in this way will stand up to local body rules and scrutiny., I believe CHBDC could gain this information themselves at very little cost to ratepayers.

Why would we want to pay people who have vested interests and a bias towards now discredited (economically and environmentally) water storage rather than alternative water options. If these people wish to build water storage facilities and use them, they should pay. It's their business, not mine. Also the rural community demonstrated in the last submission process that they wanted User Pays and this is a clear example of where user pays should definitely apply.

I also submit that it can't be categorically stated there will be no impact on rates. Taking Funds from Rural Ward may very well impact on all ratepayers if there are future events due to climate disruption that need urgent Funding

CHBDC have a responsibility to ratepayers to be fiscally responsible with our money. If they really needed more information unobtainable inhouse (all of which is available under RWSS research) was there a request proposal and the cheapest and most neutral chosen?

I see a conflict of interest for CHBDC where on one hand they wish to be part of the Hawkes Bay Strategy to improve biodiversity in CHB and to be environmentally responsible and sustainable and conversely, wanting to fund

#79

3 of 3.

exploration of an already “proven to fail on both an environmental and economic basis” idea. There’s no such thing as drought proofing – the climate crisis will mean really unpredictable weather . The current modelling has more rainfall in summer and autumn and less in spring and winter. Which may mean less need for additional summer water. However there may well be more droughts so landuse change to products using less water is a far more safe option. Farming too will change with global trade changes including downturns, import duties, changing consumer demand, etc. My submission would be to support exploration of how to change to meet these upcoming challenges rather than such a limited in scope suggestion.

Q2 – Agree

Q3 – Agree

Q4 – Agree but see above re conflicting goals. Easy to have aspirations but actions speak louder.

370 Porangahau Road
Waipukurau
Cell 272844349

80
ENTERED
12/4 Apr

CHB District Council Annual Plan 2019/20 Submission

Submission against the proposal for a \$250,000 suspensory loan to Water Holdings CHB Ltd.

1. Environmental

Fact - Rainfall and irrigation directly affects nutrient leaching.

Given that the catchment and many farms are already struggling to meet their reduced nutrient leaching requirements under the new PC6 rules, where is the supporting numbers and rational that any further or significant extra irrigation can be utilised without exceeding PC6 nutrient leaching limits.

2. Viability

The original Ruataniwha dam proposal did not proceed, not just because they could not get access to the DOC land required but more importantly because it never became financially viable and was such a bad business case that it could not attract commercial backers. Also note that in the final HBRC analysis reviewing whether the dam should proceed or not it was deemed that the farmer uptake threshold should have been set significantly higher.

The Ruataniwha water was priced at a high (compared to other schemes) of 27cents/ cm³. Never the less irrigators and supporters claimed that it was going to pave the streets in gold but when the incoming Labour government raised the prospect of a 1 cent/ cm³ tax on irrigation water there was a public outcry from irrigators saying that it would make them very marginal or uneconomic. The farmers themselves were in effect saying that a 3.7 % increase in cost would deem it non-viable. Who in their right mind would invest in such a marginal proposition.

A lot of the so called financial benefits are misleading as they reference increased production which in many cases does not translate to increased nett farm profit. If we take the dairy industry for example we have over recent years seen a huge lift in production but a reduction in nett farm profitability and historically high and crippling on farm debt.

With the original Ruataniwha dam project there was no real recognition of risk and what the compounding implications of increased debt could be. The fact is that if the dam had proceeded to be built in the original time frame it would have coincided with the down turn in the dairy industry which was to be a significant part of the water take. This situation would have left many farms and their supporting industries critically exposed as they would have borrowed and geared up for it.

3. What has changed – Where is Water Holdings CHB Ltd's business case.

What new perspective does Water Holdings CHB Ltd bring to the table considering that their IP and consents relate only to the RWSS and river. I suggest none.

Approximately 15 million dollars has already been invested by the Regional Council (our money) in assessing various storage options and dam sites, not only the full scale Ruataniwha dam but also smaller ones at different locations on the river to achieve other various purposes. All these proposals have been extensively researched and debated over a considerable period of time.

At the latest Waipawa meeting Water Holdings CHB Ltd suggested that the public mood had shifted to one of supporting another attempt at the Ruataniwha dam and with the legal precedence that the Waimea dam has since set, there is the potential with a law change to be able to obtain the required DOC land. This is purely their perception. I suggest that there would be less support for the proposal now than before.

Water Holdings CHB Ltd suggested that the dam might be cheaper to build if there was no pipe network but just keep minimum flows up in the Waipawa and Tuki-Tuki rivers to enable irrigators to operate longer. This would have a disastrous effect on the water table drawdown in marginal areas as water does not flow uphill.

Water Holdings CHB Ltd also suggested that hydro could be attached to the dam to make it more economic. Did they miss the financial analysis done early in the piece by Trust Power saying that it was not economic.

4. Rural Ward Fund

The consultation documentation does not make it clear as to how much of the \$811,114 dollars in the Rural Ward fund is interest accrued or from its capital base.

We can only assume that a large part of the \$250,000 proposed will be capital from the original base fund on which interest is earned and if this is the case then it is very misleading to infer (which one of your flyers does) that it would only be a loss of interest earned for one year amounting to \$8750.

This is wrong as it would have a year on year compounding effect because you have eroded the funds earning base.

Although this money is seen as not being directly funded from current rates it does mean that it is taking away the opportunity for funds generated by it to be used elsewhere that might have a direct effect on rates.

Why are the loan conditions not conditional on Water Holdings CHB Ltd securing the extra \$300,000 funding from the indicated "Other funds" and "Provisional Growth Fund".

How much money is the council prepared to throw at this exercise because you would be very naïve to think that this would be the only expenditure required.

5. The alternative.

I suggest that the council should first assess what its current and future urban and industrial needs actually are. Look at what its resources are and take into account any reasonable efficiencies it can employ, only then investigate any alternative water security if needed. It might well have better options other than just the RWSS.

The district council should not assist building infrastructure for only a few farmers to benefit and enabling bad and destructive farming practices to continue.

There is an unfair allocation of water resources in our region and we continue to see some individual farming businesses taking a disproportionate amount of community water for personal financial gain while at the same time imposing costs on others in the community.

The river suffers from excessive water draw off from inefficient farm systems and from bad farming practices which have greatly degraded our soils and landscape ability to capture and store rainfall.

In some cases there is a total lack of fitting appropriate farm systems to resources. For example using irrigation for dairying on light stoney soils in a dry environment is an extreme waste of water resource.

There are new farm systems being employed both here and around the world that greatly reduce, and in many cases totally remove the need for irrigation. These new systems give greater resilience to our farms and our landscapes, dramatically improve environmental outcomes while returning improved profits to farmers.

These new farm systems are what the council should be looking at promoting but unfortunately we seem to suffer at the hands of a few who lack the vision and knowledge to change their ways and who continue to operate and promote destructive and wasteful systems.

These new generation farm systems lead to a win / win situation for everyone.

I challenge the council to raise its sights and empower itself with the knowledge of this new science.

I oppose the loan to Water Holdings CHB Ltd

Submission Form

81

You are able to comment on anything included in the Consultation Document or provide any other feedback.

Need more room?

You can attach extra pages but please make sure they include your name and contact information.

Your Details

Submitters Name: Rāwiri Barlow Johnston.

Postal Address: 53 Great North Rd Waipawa.

Day Phone: 068577234 Night Phone:

Mobile: Email:

Do you wish to present your comments to Council in person at a hearing? Yes ☒ No ☐

Please note that your submission (including any personal information supplied) will be made available to Councillors and the public. Submissions Close on 12 April 2019 at 5pm.

Submission Questions

1. Tell us what you think about the proposal that Council gives a \$250,000.00 suspensory loan to Water Holdings CHB Ltd to keep the prospect of water storage alive in Central Hawke's Bay.

Water storage
" resource
" management
" contamination
" ownership
" Equity
" sustainability
Cost to Ratepayer.
3 water story.

3. Do you support the establishment of the Disaster Relief Fund Trust?

2. Do you agree with the changes to the Revenue & Financing Policy?

4. Do you have any feedback on the Draft Environmental Strategy?

Any other suggestions?

+82
1 of 3

CHB District Annual Plan

Submission on the proposed suspensory loan of \$250,000 to Water Holding CHB Ltd.

As it is imperative that the council locate alternative sources of water for the CHB towns, I support the Proposal to offer a suspensory loan of \$250,000 to Water Holding CHB Ltd. I do question why the money is proposed to come from the Rural Ward Reserve Fund, as a only a small proportion of rural ratepayers would be able to benefit from any project that eventuates (and they would have to pay for that benefit), when the greatest benefit would accrue to the urban areas of the district. Once again the council seems to be saying "The rural rate payers can afford this, so let's tap them".

Charles Nairn
17 B Holyrood Tee
Waipukurau 4200

06 85 85 301



#82

2 of 3

CHB District Annual Plan

Submission on the proposed changes to the Revenue and Finance Policy

I am against the proposed changes to the Revenue and Finance Policy, as it increases the rates burden for the rural rate payer without any increase in benefit. In my case the increase in rates due to this proposal for my (top end) Waipukurau house is \$86. The increase for my (average sized) farm is \$945. This shows to me that the rural rate payer will pay disproportionately for this proposal. The stated cause for this proposal is that some urban land valuations are now double what they had been = resulting in their owners having to pay a disproportionately higher rate levy. If the council thinks that some rate payers deserve to pay lesser rates (for whatever reason) then these rate payers should be given a specific rebate so that it is clear and evident what is happening. The council should not adopt arbitrary, broad changes to the rating criteria that distort the way rates are levied and obscure the effect of these changes.

Further the CHB D Council should make greater use of Uniform Annual Charges as these more accurately target the rate payers that benefit from the service provided. At present the CHB DC has one of the lowest rates of UAC of any council in NZ.

Incidentally, the proposed rate increase for my Waipukurau house is 6% and for my farm is 11%. How does the average rate increase become 4.3%?

Charles Nairn
17 B Holyrood Tce
Waipukurau 4200
06 8585 301

Submission Form

3 of 3

You are able to comment on anything included in the Consultation Document or provide any other feedback.

Need more room?

You can attach extra pages but please make sure they include your name and contact information.

Your Details

Submitters Name: Charles Naim
 Postal Address: 17 B Holy road Tee WAPUKUNAH 4200
 Day Phone: 06 8585 301 Night Phone: 06 8585 301
 Mobile: Email: omakere.naim@xtra.co.nz

Do you wish to present your comments to Council in person at a hearing? Yes ☒ No ☐

Please note that your submission (including any personal information supplied) will be made available to Councillors and the public. Submissions Close on 12 April 2019 at 5pm.

Submission Questions

1. Tell us what you think about the proposal that Council gives a \$250,000.00 suspensory loan to Water Holdings CHB Ltd to keep the prospect of water storage alive in Central Hawke's Bay.

3. Do you support the establishment of the Disaster Relief Fund Trust?

2. Do you agree with the changes to the Revenue & Financing Policy?

4. Do you have any feedback on the Draft Environmental Strategy?

Any other suggestions?

83

You are able to comment on anything included in the Consultation Document or provide any other feedback.

Need more room?

You can attach extra pages but please make sure they include your name and contact information.

Submission Form

ENTERED
12/4 Ana

Your Details

Submitters Name: George T. Konia
 Postal Address: 11 McCreery ST WAIKANA
 Day Phone: 06 8578736 Night Phone: _____
 Mobile: _____ Email: _____

Do you wish to present your comments to Council in person at a hearing? Yes ☐ No ☒

Please note that your submission (including any personal information supplied) will be made available to Councillors and the public. Submissions Close on 12 April 2019 at 5pm.

Submission Questions

1. Tell us what you think about the proposal that Council gives a \$250,000.00 suspensory loan to Water Holdings CHB Ltd to keep the prospect of water storage alive in Central Hawke's Bay.

THE 6 share holders
should pay out of
their own pockets
enough money has
been spent on this
project.

3. Do you support the establishment of the Disaster Relief Fund Trust?

I do support the
establishment of The
Disaster Relief Fund
ABOUT TIME!

2. Do you agree with the changes to the Revenue & Financing Policy?

Rates should be
accessed on the area
you live in.
If you want to live
on the top of the
mountain (so be it)
you pay

4. Do you have any feedback on the Draft Environmental Strategy?

I agree with the top
4 priorities
especially 1st two

Any other suggestions?

More dog control, Police Patrol more around Town
streets. Connecting Cycle Lane between Wpa. Wpuk. (MAIN HIGHWAY)

Submission Form

Your Details

Submitters Name: John Lukes
Postal Address: 183 Ponangahau Rd Wph
Day Phone: 021 243 7339 Night Phone: 021 243 7339
Mobile: 021 243 7339 Email: jukes.wph@gmail
Do you wish to present your comments to Council in person at a hearing? Yes ☒ No ☐

Please note that your submission (including any personal information supplied) will be made available to Councillors and the public. Submissions Close on 12 April 2019 at 5pm.



You are able to comment on anything included in the Consultation Document or provide any other feedback.

Need more room?
You can attach extra pages but please make sure they include your name and contact information.

Submission Questions

1. Tell us what you think about the proposal that Council gives a \$250,000.00 suspensory loan to Water Holdings CHB Ltd to keep the prospect of water storage alive in Central Hawke's Bay.

DONT!
Council should not be involved in commercial enterprise.

3. Do you support the establishment of the Disaster Relief Fund Trust?

2. Do you agree with the changes to the Revenue & Financing Policy?

4. Do you have any feedback on the Draft Environmental Strategy?

A policy of restoring a certain percentage of both wetlands & native flora - should be considered.

Any other suggestions?