

Submission	Submitter	page
1	Hawke's Bay Foundation	2
2	Patrick Power	3
3	Sheryl Pledger	3
4	Angela Hair	3
5	Cherry Taylor	4
6	Kelly Annand	4
7	Teresa Redington	5
8	Simon Blakesley	5
9	Daniel Armstrong	5
10	Lisa Malde	5
11	A Stolk	5
12	Jeremy Randall	6
13	Sharyn Hunter	6
14	Sue Penman	6
15	Steven Chamberlain	6
16	Willow Sharp	7
17	Rachael McNaught	7
18	Adrienne Tully	7
19	Craig M	8

Hawke's Bay Foundation

22 February 2017

Submission #1

Andrew Newman
Hawkes Bay Regional Council
NAPIER



By email: andrew@hbrc.govt.nz

Dear Andrew,

Thank you for taking the time to meet with Giles Pearson and myself on 20 February to discuss the Hawke's Bay Foundation.

We would ask the Hawke's Bay Regional Council to consider providing funding in the range of \$15,000 to \$20,000 per year for 3 years to cover operating costs of the Foundation.

We attach a document entitled 'Firing Up Hawke's Bay Foundation' which provides much of the background to our request for operating funding, but to support this we'd also make the following points:

1. 3 individuals in Hawke's Bay along with a Charitable Trust have already committed \$80,000 per year under the same basis – so we are close to achieving our goals;
2. Focus of the Foundation is on all areas of community wellbeing, including the environment (our predecessor organisation was instrumental in the development of the Pekapeka wetlands), so this fits with goals of Council;
3. We will report annually on progress towards our goals and the activities the Foundation has undertaken;
4. We are only asking for funding for 3 years. In that time, we expect the Foundation to be a long way towards sustainable funding of its operations;
5. In rough terms, we'd expect that \$20,000 of funding should allow us undertake activities that should unlock \$200,000 of capital funds for the Foundation, which in turn should produce \$8,000 to \$10,000 of on-going distributions to the community – EVERY YEAR! A strong investment case;
6. The Foundation is the only Community Foundation for Hawke's Bay, and is the only such organisation seeking capital donations to grow a fund for the benefit of all charitable causes in the Hawke's Bay community. The faster we can build momentum the faster we can help build a better community for all residents of Hawke's Bay.

We would also ask for the non-monetary support of the Council – for example with inclusion of articles about the Foundation in Council newsletters, and access to Council land for signage.

We would be happy to further present our case to you and or Councillors if this will assist in the Council decision making.

If you need any more information, please don't hesitate to contact us.

Yours sincerely

Andrew Wares
Trustee

ARW-017427-1-59-V1-JSH

IRD No: 87 – 015 – 750 Charities Commission Registration: CC28009
PO Box 11014 | Hastings 4158 | 06 870 4648 | www.hawkesbayfoundation.org.nz

PLEASE SELECT ONE OPTION: *

- 1. No rate increase (as detailed above)
- 2. 4.88% (\$849,332) rate increase (as detailed above)
- 3. 9.88% (1,719,821) rate increase (as detailed above)

Do you wish to speak to your submission? **Yes** / No Please circle one

- Is there any other information you wish to include in your submission?

No rate increase means falling further behind, which is untenable.
 The maintenance of services option of 4.88% means nothing will improve,
 So the 9.88% increase is the only option
 At least it is focussed on a specific goal.

I would like someone to explain to me why I need to contribute extra rates for the cleaning up of waterway which we all know is mainly caused by dairy farmers. They do not give me any money from the profits of their farm and they are the cause of the problem and respective councils are NOT limiting the amount of cows per area so nothing is going to change and our extra money will be wasted. Let this government pay as they want more dairy farms and to hell with the water ways. CHARGE THE FARMERS WHO HAVE COWS \$1 PER COW AND GET THE EXTRA THAT WAY AND for goodness sake limit the amount of cows per region.

I do not agree with a general rates rise to fix the rivers. The problem is squarely in the laps of the dairy farmers, and district Councils.
 HDC allow fluoride to be flushed into the river even though fluoride is not able to be discharged to waterways by businesses.
 The increased dairy farming in our catchments needs to be stopped and that is why I have not supported the dam.
 A tax on the farmers is the way to create a fund that can be applied to planting riparian strips around streams and rivers.
 Please target this rates rise more precisely.

1. No rate increase

We the ratepayers should be responsible for the debt made by the HBRC. HBRC dropped the ball on the environment/waterways. The focus has been on the dam and everything else was left behind. The money spent on the dam and payouts to staff who have resigned such as the CEO has left the council in debt and we are not responsible to pay for this debt.

HBRC have had years to fix the problems of clean waterways and I strongly oppose any rate increase because of the inefficiency of staff and board members.

3. 9.88% (1,719,821) rate increase

Congratulations on the much better submission form and process this year. Also well done on showing leadership in the environmental space and being prepared to fund it. I certainly am happy to pay the rate rise to support such a way forward.

1. Lake whatuma came up a lot in our recent CHBDC THRIVE consultation process. Thank you for considering it on your environmental plans – it would be great if you could add to the plans for the lake a full investigation into the benefits of dredging for recreational use again such as rowing and waka ama and irrigation to outer farm land. However we would probably need a source of flowing water into the lake to achieve this – when we build a dam that could pipe water into the lake to create flow?

2. My concern is for farmers in our district that are reliant on water to irrigate and the effects of plan change 6 if they don't have the option of taking water from the RWSS. We as a community need to know what the Regional Councils plan is for ensuring that CHB has a plan wider than the RWSS. I think public meetings and visits to the farming community to explain this will be important moving forward.

3. With the council stepping into the area of leadership in many spaces I would like to request HBRC set up a fund that rural councils can apply to help with new environmental projects and upgrades of services that are being required of them. Perhaps the money used in this financial year taking CHB council and your rate payers to court could be a starting pot of funds?

4. Finally thank you to Anne Redgrave and her team for their hard work in the area of driver licencing in the region. The investment all round is making a difference.

Kind regards Kelly

Teresa Redington

Submission #7

3. 9.88% (1,719,821) rate increase

Simon Blakesley

** Submission #8

3. 9.88% (1,719,821) rate increase

Daniel Armstrong

Submission #9

1. No rate increase

Lisa Malde

Submission #10

2. 4.88% (\$849,332) rate increase

You should be limiting the intensity of livestock and fruit/vege production in order to clean up our waterways long term. It's an obvious problem that is not being directly addressed.

A Stolk

Submission #11

1. No rate increase

Rates are high enough, There are many in our communities with low incomes who can't absorb these costs as rent increases. Take it out of the exorbitant rates that are paid to the managerial staff and such. They don't need more than what other people are expected to live on... minimum wage.

Jeremy Randall

**** Submission #12**

1. No rate increase

Beneficiaries can't absorb these increases that landlords will inevitably foist upon them.

What little they get needs to be budgeted appropriately for them to live week to week. You should do the same rather than beg for money from people that don't have it.

What little people got from the recent increase in the minimum wage will be absorbed by you now and I find that deplorable, as if it is not enough that all your chair people and management make thousands more than just basic employees in our society. IF you're in such a dire need of money why don't you take it from those with bloated pay packets instead of punishing the small people? How about tax the companies that actually do the polluting rather than those working hard and struggling just to put food on their tables?

Sharyn Hunter

Submission #13

3. 9.88% (1,719,821) rate increase

Sue Penman

Submission #14

3. 9.88% (1,719,821) rate increase

<http://www.radionz.co.nz/programmes/water-fools/story/201840326/water-fools-spray-and-pray>

Considering what is being talked about soil conservation there needs to be wider work to protect our water-ways!

Steven Chamberlain

Submission #15

1. No rate increase

I am sick of high percentage rate increases every year.

They should be in line with inflation and no more.

If the lakes/ rivers are polluted let the persons responsible for this, pay for the clean up.

Willow Sharp

Submission #16

3. 9.88% (1,719,821) rate increase

Good on the HBRC for recognising that we need to fix our environmental issues ASAP – and it doesn't matter who did the damage, we are all in this together. Our household for one considers an additional small rates rise a worthwhile sacrifice if it means our precious landscape and water can have damage control applied, and protected for our children and grandchildren. Heartening to see the new council intends to get stuck into the job of protecting our environment.

Rachael McNaught

Submission #17

2. 4.88% (\$849,332) rate increase

Why not spend the first year in office consolidating the information and options you have in front of you, rather than jumping straight into the money jar?

Adrienne Tully

Submission #18

3. 9.88% (\$1,719,821) rate increase

1. No rate increase

Option 4. Tick –A Rate decrease.

Thanks to a booming regional economy and Napier Port's unprecedented growth, there will be higher future dividend payments. Stating dividend payments "may" reduce is not supported by any figures or business case. This is pure scaremongering.

An increase of local residents and businesses means the HBRC rate take is also increasing so keeping any rate payer changes at zero is not limiting HBRC spending. It will increase annually by default.

There are also legacy projects that are winding down and require less spending. (i.e home heating).

I do not agree to any rate charges that are effectively "Green Taxes" that should be funded by Central Government or Community grants (Lotto etc.) There is far more accountability and transparency with these sources than any local council. Lake Tutira is a good example of how ineffective the HBRC has been. Tutira has had these problems before (I remember about 25 years ago the Lake was nearly dead with weed and low O2 issues – this was solved with aeration schemes). HBRC is responsible for monitoring water quality yet has failed to even notice or maintain Tutira until it is too late. Where's the accountability? Where was the monitoring?

Real businesses remunerate and promote based on KPI's. HBRC gets a big fail in this area. Your employees should not receive any pay increases while these basic deliverables are not met. Your performance is sub standard.

Every rate payer dollar should be treated as if its coming out of your pocket. Aim for better efficiencies and less rates. You should not be dreaming up new projects to build the HBRC empire to make your jobs more secure and justifiable. I'm sure the Councillors would not vote so easily for rate increases if this also meant that the same amount of increase would be applied as a pay CUT to their Salaries.

So I say a big NO to any rates increase. Fund it from somewhere else. Why not crowd fund for these Green initiatives.

Also scrap the public bus service. Expensive to travel on, high cost overheads, poor usage (I see empty buses a lot of time, otherwise maybe a few passengers at best) and UBER is far more cost effective and efficient. Perhaps providing Rate payers an UBER discount chit??

SPEND RESPONSIBLY !!!!!

Craig M