

# SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

**Contents**

Emergency Management Planning 1  
 Rates 2  
 Roading 15  
 Water and Wastewater 16  
 Multi Issue Submissions 22

**Page**  
 1  
 2  
 2  
 15  
 16  
 22

Pg No	Submitter	Submission Summary	Staff Comments	Attending	Notes
-------	-----------	--------------------	----------------	-----------	-------

## EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

1	Lily Wilcox	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A request for some kind of warning device for Te Paerahi Beach in case of a disaster of some kind eg tsunami.</li> <li>Also a request for a regular operator of this device.</li> <li>A person to check that the people know. This could be arranged by the beach community but the person registered with the authority.</li> </ul>		No	
---	-------------	---	--	----	--

Pg No	Submitter	Submission Summary	Staff Comments	Attending	Notes
-------	-----------	--------------------	----------------	-----------	-------

## PLANNING

2	Rachel Coxhead	<p>Please continue to consider not putting homes too close together in the new developments of Otane. Homes jammed in too close change the nature of a small town. Easy to prevent – hard to fix afterwards!</p> <p>I like the improved entrance to Otane! Much safer.</p>		No	
---	----------------	--	--	----	--

## RATES

3	John White	<p>Rates are obviously totally out of control in this Council. If you carry on at the current rate of increase all farm income will be required just to pay the rates.</p>		Yes 1.10 pm	
4	Jamie Gunson	<p>The rates estimate shows my rates to increase on average by 13% (one block of land by 19%). It is inconceivable to me that Council could contemplate a rate increase of this magnitude given the current economic climate and more specifically the poor seasons, low prices and high costs currently afflicting the farmers in the Councils area. Rates are now our 3<sup>rd</sup> highest cost behind interest and fertiliser. Fertiliser is discretionary. Take that out and rates become our second highest cost. Any increase therefore has a major effect on our overall costs. When our income is under pressure we have to cut costs to balance our budget. I suggest Council does the same. We don't have the luxury of charging according to our needs. It is not good enough for Council to just keep increasing rates by an inordinate amount.</p>	<p>Council rates to fund the services the CHB Community ask it to provide – therefore rates can be reduced through a reduction in the level and type of services provided – but only if Council is given a clear mandate that this is what the CHB Community want. Council continuously seeks to deliver these services as efficiently as possible.</p>	Yes 1.00 pm	

Pg No	Submitter	Submission Summary	Staff Comments	Attending	Notes
5	Richard Gunson	<p>I am staggered to realise Council proposes to increase our rates by 13% on the back of a completely imaginary increase in land value. We are currently running around 65% of our stocking rate due to the present dry conditions and like many have not applied fertiliser this year as a consequence of having had 2 droughts. I am at a loss as to where Council thinks the money is going to come from to pay rates full stop, let alone rate hikes, when ourselves and many others are struggling to break even and essentials like fertiliser are being cut. Some strong leadership and serious belt tightening is required by CHB District Council.</p>		No	
6	Duncan Holden	<p>I submit that the UAGC be raised to maximum of 40%. The rate increase is way out of control. My rates have risen 103% since 2000! 14% this year alone (not 4% as you state in your estimate). Yes dairy is in the area, yet my income has not been driven up by this change at all. Rates are now my 4<sup>th</sup> highest expense in our farming business. Houses in Onga Onga haven risen only 7%. House in Waipukurau 3%. These people are employed on dairy farms.</p>	<p>The level of UAC was set by a Rating Review completed by Council in 2008/9 and subject to public consultation and submission process. No timeline has been set for any further review.</p>	Yes 1.00 pm	
7	George Williams	<p>I submit that the UAGC should be raised to the maximum allowable of 40%. Rural rates are already substantial and rural people use minimal council services that make up the general rate. This year your estimate shows us at yet another increase of 13% not 4% as you state in the estimate. Our 2008/09 increase was 6.5%, 07/08 year + 12.5% and 06/07 was +22%. Rates are now my 3<sup>rd</sup> biggest expense, behind fertiliser and wages. You are twice my animal health costs!!</p>		Yes 12.50 pm	

Pg No	Submitter	Submission Summary	Staff Comments	Attending	Notes
8	Robert Wilson	<p>Under the proposed plan my rates will increase by approx 13%. This is completely out of line with CPI and everything else. This is unaffordable totally!</p> <p>Old rates \$38,976.97 2010/2011 proposed \$44,061.54 Increase of \$5,084.57 - 13% obscene!</p> <p>65% rates collected by 30% of the people – inequitable.</p> <p>Many more points to be described upon hearing.</p>		Yes 1.20 pm	
10	Darryl Wilson	<p>The valuation of the properties I farm have all increased yet we seem to be in a recession and land and property are having trouble selling. Cook Estate, my immediate neighbour sold for a lot less than what the valuation of Kenley Green Trust is. This situation is getting out of hand and desperate for me as a sheep farmer who leases land.</p> <p>I also know that a large chunk of my rates are for waste management which I don't hardly use as I dispose of on farm. Recycling is a joke as the cost is prohibitive.</p> <p>I feel very unhappy with the continual increases especially the massive increase for the 2010/2011 draft - \$2500.</p>	<p>If all residents used the solid waste facilities the general rate would be lower and environment would be better off.</p> <p>The last Council survey asked the community whether they wanted to keep recycling. The large majority said yes.</p> <p>Sales of higher value rural properties since June 2009 exceed (on average) the proposed 2009 Rateable Values. (There are individual exceptions – as noted in a submission below)</p>	No	
11	Larry White	<p>As a rural landowner, I have benefited from a capital gain on the value of my land over the last 20 years. However, that cannot be realised unless I sell. Everyone knows that the value of farm land does not reflect its productive value. In general, farmers are asset rich and cash poor.</p>		No	

Pg No	Submitter	Submission Summary	Staff Comments	Attending	Notes
		<p>The current increase in rates worked out on land value will come off farmer's bottom line and will be paid only by increased overdrafts. The cash is not being generated to cover these extra costs.</p> <p>To add to the frustration of the rural community, we find that the increase is going largely to the general rate in order to subsidise urban amenities such as rubbish collection, pools, libraries. Many of these amenities the rural population never or rarely uses. For example, I use a private contractor to remove my rubbish at a cost over and above that provided for in the rates.</p> <p>I understand the cost to the ratepayer of rural roads, however there is no doubt as to the significance of agriculture to the CHB economy and it is essential that investment continues in this area.</p> <p>In conclusion, the rural sector has seen costs increasing at an alarming rate in recent years. Many of these costs, such as rates, are not discretionary and have to be met in many cases from overdraft facilities. The sector, already under strain, cannot keep having these cost increases without buckling. I urge the Council to have regard for this and to make necessary changes to prevent waste and inefficiencies. Farmers have to live within their means and councils should do likewise.</p>	<p>The general rate solid waste cost also includes landfilling from the private contractor.</p>		
13	Bruce Worsnop	<p>Council expenditure.</p> <p>It is very obvious that the current financial climate will not go away in a hurry. Predictions by positive people are good but likely a waste of</p>		No	

Pg No	Submitter	Submission Summary	Staff Comments	Attending	Notes
		<p>energy at this point as we are in the hands of the world situation to a major extent.</p> <p>If we are as well off in five years time as we are now we will be extremely lucky.</p> <p>Rural businesses are and have been suffering for several years due to low export returns and climatic dry's which have meant maintenance spending and reserves are often in a negative situation.</p> <p>No doubt town folk are having equal and in some instances are in far worse circumstances if loosing regular employment which is inevitable under prevailing conditions.</p> <p>It would be more than prudent of councillors to make adjustments now and be prepared for what will be a long drawn out period of falling and in some circumstance no income for to many.</p> <p>Even after such bad times good councillors' do get re elected!</p> <p>Plans made now to cope with worsening times coming in three or four years will be well worth the time taken to make such adjustments. I encourage you all to think carefully and make huge cuts for all concerned while you are in a position to do so!</p> <p>Perhaps commercial principles applied to areas such as solid waste disposal where people can make their own adjustments accordingly as a consequence of user pays.</p>			

Pg No	Submitter	Submission Summary	Staff Comments	Attending	Notes
15	Gerald Wilson	<p>That rates are increasing at an unacceptable level and that there is to greater burden on rural ratepayers on the UAC rating – Rural ratepayers burden be reduced by \$300 and urban increased by \$300 would give a greater and fairer distribution.</p>		Yes 2.50 pm	
16	Wendy Bradley	<p>For the 2010/11 rates for valuation number 10770 08000B there is an estimated increase of 18%. The 2009/10 rates were \$13,660.58. The estimate for 2010/11 is \$16,138.79. This is an estimated increase of \$2,478.21. Local body rate increases of this magnitude are totally unacceptable.</p>		No	
17	Jeromy Greer	<p>We are a rate payer for 5 properties in CHB. We totally oppose the proposed rate increase for the coming year.</p> <p>It is rather obvious that farmers are going through terrible financial problems due to a series of droughts in our region. This seriously affects the amount of income to run business's profitably. Most farmers would have gone through serious cost cutting measures to survive over these last few years.</p> <p>With the current financial crisis both locally and nationally, one would expect that the council itself would have to have gone through cost cutting measures as well.</p> <p>We would urge to reconsider this excessive hike in our rates. If we don't survive then you will have to find another way of revenue gathering.</p>		No	
18	Geoff Hornblow	<p>That I object to the 18.5% increase of our farm rates. I can see that we have had an 8.8% increase in capital value and the increase in the rate struck, the effect being unfair on a few</p>		Yes 3.00 pm	

Pg No	Submitter	Submission Summary	Staff Comments	Attending	Notes
19	Tim Aitken and Lucy Robertshawe	<p>ratepayers when there has been a reduction for many. The UAC should be increased so that all the cost of democracy and the proportion of regulatory services not recovered by user fees are met by the UAC and not proportioned to Land and/or Capital value.</p> <p>The proposed rate increase is for a combined demand for the coming year of \$12,850.12. This is an increase of \$1,492.11 or 13%.</p> <p>We therefore submit that:  We note that just under half of this increase (5%) is due to a revaluation of the CV to \$3,870,000.</p> <p>It is inconceivable in the current economic climate that land values, and especially farm land values, can increase like this. The fact that the CHBDC website notes an average 5% CV decrease makes the relative increase applied here seem even more wayward.</p> <p>We object to the effect of the increase in the General Rate on the proposed rate demand. As rural rate payers who have less opportunity to use facilities, or have no need for certain facilities, we object to paying for services such as solid waste through the General Rate.</p> <p>Surely a "user pays" principle should apply. We have other avenues for dealing with our solid waste, which cost our business directly and do not cost the community anything. We fully fund our own "user pays" and we exercise our option to use the public facility provided.</p> <p>Provision for funds towards aspects of the district business that are essentially "people activities" such as cultural facilities,</p>	Solid waste costs are for all waste disposed of at the landfill. Including private contractors.	Yes 3.10 pm	

Pg No	Submitter	Submission Summary	Staff Comments	Attending	Notes
		<p>parcs/reserves and waste facilities should surely be better funded via user pays or by the UAGC. Funding by stealth – by using a proportion of the general rate – does not reflect the users the true cost of that facility. It never will.</p> <p>If use of a facility provided by Council, such as solid waste disposal, is user pays then those dumping the solid waste will pay. And they in turn will ensure that their costs are passed to their customers or clients. Why should we contribute to that when we pay for our own facilities, manage most of our own waste sensibly and willingly pay for the public service when we need to? If the public service becomes more expensive we will continue to use it but will apply a common-sense fiscal approach to how and when we use it.</p> <p>Roading funding has also increased. While we cannot make comment about the need for roading creation and repairs, the increase in DLT rates surely requires some explanation.</p> <p>We use some of those roads, both privately and in the course of our business – no question. If said increases centre on increased costs in the current recessionary (or post-recessionary) climate, then surely this too is way out of line. If we are expected to write out a cheque for a substantially larger rate demand, we also expect to be shown that those who stand to provide the service that uses those funds have indeed sharpened their own pencils.</p> <p>We assume that there is enough transparency within the council business to show that any unspent or unallocated roading funding does not end up funding General Rate or UAGC activities such as those alluded to above. Our proposed</p>	<p>Worldwide evidence shows there is a price point that people will no longer pay and start dumping.</p>		

Pg No	Submitter	Submission Summary	Staff Comments	Attending	Notes
		<p>annual payment of \$7,792.04 towards district roading is surly spent on that and that alone.</p> <p>I also note that in the last ten years our rates have increased from \$5,971.00 to \$12,850.12 a 115%, you will argue that our land value has increased more, we are making less money today as farmers, we are not asking or using any more services from the council. WHEN ARE THE SERVICES THAT COUNCIL PROVIDE GOING TO BE MORE EQUALLY FUNDED BETWEEN RURAL AND URBAN DWELLERS?</p> <p>We find the proposed increase in the rate demand for 2010/2011 somewhat galling in the current climate and see little justification for yet another significant increase in costs to our business.</p>			
21	Richard Hilson and Karen Middelberg	<p>The proposed rate increase is for a combined demand for the coming year of \$12,413.18. This is an increase of \$1,893.48 or 18%.</p> <p>We therefore submit that:  We note that just under half of this increase (8.4%) is due to a revaluation of the CV to \$3,935,000.</p> <p>It is inconceivable in the current economic climate that land values, and especially farm land values, can increase like this. The fact that the CHBDC website notes an average 5% CV decrease makes the relative increase applied here seem even more wayward.</p> <p>We object to the effect of the increase in the General Rate on the proposed rate demand. As rural rate payers who have less opportunity to use facilities, or have no need for certain</p>		No	

Pg No	Submitter	Submission Summary	Staff Comments	Attending	Notes
		<p>facilities, we object to paying for services such as solid waste through the General Rate.</p> <p>Surely a “user pays” principle should apply. We have other avenues for dealing with our solid waste, which cost our business directly and do not cost the community anything. We fully fund our own “user pays” and we exercise our option to use the public facility provided.</p> <p>Provision for funds towards aspects of the district business that are essentially “people activities” such as cultural facilities, parks/reserves and waste facilities should surely be better funded via user pays or by the UAGC. Funding by stealth – by using a proportion of the general rate – does not reflect the users the true cost of that facility. It never will.</p> <p>If use of a facility provided by Council, such as solid waste disposal, is user pays then those dumping the solid waste will pay. And they in turn will ensure that their costs are passed to their customers or clients. Why should we contribute to that when we pay for our own facilities, manage most of our own waste sensibly and willingly pay for the public service when we need to? If the public service becomes more expensive we will continue to use it but will apply a common-sense fiscal approach to how and when we use it.</p> <p>Roading funding has also increased. While we cannot make comment about the need for roading creation and repairs, the 17% increase in DLT rates surely requires some explanation.</p> <p>We use some of those roads, both privately and in the course of our business – no question. If said increases centre on increased costs in the</p>			

Pg No	Submitter	Submission Summary	Staff Comments	Attending	Notes
23	Bay de Lafour	<p>current recessionary (or post-recessionary) climate, then surely this too is way out of line. If we are expected to write out a cheque for a substantially larger rate demand, we also expect to be shown that those who stand to provide the service that uses those funds have indeed sharpened their own pencils.</p> <p>We assume that there is enough transparency within the council business to show that any unspent or unallocated roading funding does not end up funding General Rate or UAGC activities such as those alluded to above. Our proposed annual payment of \$7,792.04 towards district roading is surely spent on that and that alone.</p> <p>We find the proposed increase in the rate demand for 2010/2011 somewhat galling in the current climate and see little justification for yet another significant increase in costs to our business.</p> <p>At this time of Annual Plan consultation I wish to bring up some disturbing trends particularly to the valuation methods and to the continuing imbalance between Urban and Rural.</p> <p>I do not want to sound dramatic, I warned in my submissions 2 years ago that land prices were getting out of balance between sheep and dairy and that without changes to the rating system we were facing problems ahead.</p> <p>I now believe sheep and beef farming is in crisis, the average farmer 3,500 / 4000 su has not earned as much as the average wage (before capital repayment and drawings). I doubt if the largest sheep farms in the District earn as much as the average paid to council staff over that period, it is not likely to get much better. Most hill country can get a subsidy from</p>		Yes 1.50 pm	

Pg No	Submitter	Submission Summary	Staff Comments	Attending	Notes
		<p>Govt. to plant trees and sell carbon credits earning far more than present income, that is already happening on quite a big scale in some areas. The rates burden could be the cost that break's the camels (read farmers) back.</p> <p>Recently I was asked to join a committee looking into methods of addressing imbalances between various sections of ratepayers, only a few of the recommendation's were implemented, none effecting Rural land.</p> <p>In the days that valuation was done by Government's Valuation Department each farm was valued independently, on its earning potential based on soil type rainfall location etc. for "unimproved value" and the "improvements" based on the level of infrastructure, fencing, buildings, pasture etc. by an insight inspection I would question whether the present system adequately addresses differences in lands ability to produce. I farm on land on the East of SHW 50, rainfall averages 850mm pa. (rainfall increases by approximately 25mm per km. As you go west from HW50) and soil is mostly stony terraces, unsuitable for dairying on both counts, we have not had success drilling for water.</p> <p>A sale two years ago of a farm on our boundary, sold to the owner of an adjoining irrigated dairy farm, the farm having a different soil type to that on our farm. The land in question was sold at auction for 20% more than Tukipo Farm Ltd. on the same day in 1976. my valuation appears the same as the reported last sale price of that property.</p> <p>Another was a large hill country property with a rainfall of approximately 2000mm per year,</p>			

Pg No	Submitter	Submission Summary	Staff Comments	Attending	Notes
		<p>scale of which only rarely come on to the market which may have had an effect on the whole riding. Farms in that area have a rate increase of 18%. I am sure its value today would produce very little increase. The rate effect for sheep farms of 400ha. in the district would be a reduction of approx. \$4000 over the three year period if values were reduced to present market values.</p> <p>In the period of the valuation, land was booming if suitable for Dairy or dairy support. Prior to the start of the new rating period any sales I have heard of have been at between 25 and 30% of that valuation, one farm at Ashley Clinton was sold for dairy conversion for \$5.1 million and sold two years later for \$3.9m.(presumably with large capital spend in the meantime) many farms are on the market but not selling at the present asking price.</p> <p>I believe a responsible Council would seek a revaluation. What would that cost? Of valuation? Of redistribution rural to urban? Assuming say a 25% reduction in land value Rural and very little in urban land value.</p> <p>I have argued in the past that Capital value for setting land transport is a fairer method of rating, it does go some way to fixing the fairness between Rural and Urban</p> <p>The Council has the ability to charge considerably more by way of Uniform Annual Charge. It should use the maximum allowable on services shared equally by all ratepayers.</p> <p>In conclusion Council must realise that the life blood of the District is the farming sector, Responsible Council would try to protect that</p>			

Pg No	Submitter	Submission Summary	Staff Comments	Attending	Notes
		sector, not help kill it. New Zealand is living beyond its means but council continues to ignore that fact.			

## ROADING

26	Donald Stephenson	I would like Council to seal the 3km portion of Paget Road that is at present unsealed. This section of Paget Road from 900 to 1200 is a dangerous stretch of road because of the bends, loose gravel and dust. This road is used in emergencies to detour from SH2. If this portion was sealed it would save constant maintenance expenses that occur at present. Please seal this 3km and finish the sealing of Paget Road.	As part of the LTCCP Council elected to maintain the roading network we have and not seal existing unsealed roads unless that is the most cost effective option.  NZTA cut back on funding throughout the country for new seals.	No	
27	Jeanette Louisson	I am writing on behalf of the many users of Ugly Hill Road to voice our concern and disappointment due to the last remaining 3.8km of this road which remains unsealed. The last two sections of this road sealing which were completed in 2005 and 2006 now appears to be some time ago, and it was indicated that the remainder of the road would be sealed after some preliminary work has done in 2006.  I wish to make my submission to the council that this last remaining stretch of road be sealed before any other new sealing is done on other roads in the district. This certainly looks like unfinished work as far as this road is concerned, and it should have been completed. Please can you see that a portion of the 25 million is set aside for this purpose.	As part of the LTCCP Council elected to maintain the roading network we have and not seal existing unsealed roads unless that is the most cost effective option.  NZTA cut back on funding throughout the country for new seals.	No	

Pg No	Submitter	Submission Summary	Staff Comments	Attending	Notes
28	Derek Williams	<p><b>Compliance – System density – RMA Definition of Cumulative Effects.</b></p> <p><b>Refer to submission on pages 28 –32 for fill details.</b></p> <p>Desired outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HDC accepts change now from “Act on Complaint” which it has used to avoid its paramount responsibilities to “Pro-active Compliance” on arrival of HBRC Plan Change 4.</li> <li>HDC accepts its responsibilities and anticipates HBRC Plan 4 and formulates a funding programme via its LTCCP this year that will deal with identified health risk within its territorial responsibilities at the earliest date possible.</li> <li>The HDC officers prepare a comprehensive data base as to how many onsite systems it has in its jurisdiction that has no consents (Note only 10% do in Napier that are post 1996.)</li> <li>That the data includes what type system is, its age and level of treatment contaminates received prior to discharge. (ie primary-secondary-advanced).</li> <li>That the completed data base is made available to HBRC within a specified time to be directed to elected members in consultation with officers and work programmes placed on high priority rating.</li> </ul>		Yes 2.10 pm	

## WATER AND WASTEWATER

Pg No	Submitter	Submission Summary	Staff Comments	Attending	Notes
33	Derek Williams	<p>CHBDC substandard waste water discharges to Tiki river system.</p> <p><i>Refer to submission on pages 33 - 34 for fill details.</i></p> <p>Submission desired outcome:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>That Council applies urgency in its inter authority work with the consenting authority HBRC to remove the discharges from the Tuki and upgrade the treatment to a world standard prior to discharge to land.</li> <li>That Council acts now not when the 12 year extension to the consent lapses in making the required financial commitments to facilitate this starting on this years LTCCP.</li> </ul>	<p>Council is working now with Hawke's Bay Regional Council to achieve this.</p>	<p>Yes 2.20 pm</p>	
35	NZ Motor Caravan Association	<p><i>Refer to submission on pages 35 - 36 for fill details.</i></p> <p>The NZMCA requests council to budget for the installation and maintenance of a new public dump station at either the upgrade to the Waipukurau Railway Esplanade toilet block or Post Officer Corner toilets. And, to install this public dump station to the requirements of the NZ Standard NZS 5465:2001.</p> <p>REASON: Thousands of motor caravanners travel through the CHB District, however there are very few public dump stations and none in Waipukurau. This is deterring many from staying overnight (or longer) within the towns therefore having an impact on local tourism.</p> <p><b>Public Dump Stations</b> The NZMCA encourages councils to install public dump stations as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>They provide recreational tourist (including motor caravanners) with the facility to safely</li> </ul>	<p>This is not budgeted but prices could be asked for as part of the toilet upgrade project.</p>	<p>No</p>	

Pg No	Submitter	Submission Summary	Staff Comments	Attending	Notes
		<p>dispose of their black and grey waste water.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local businesses profit from the increase number of tourists. Motor caravanners visit areas that have necessary facilities eg public dump stations.</li> <li>• They help protect our communities and the environment from the indiscriminate disposal of waste water.</li> </ul> <p>The NZMCA have a dump station guide which provides all the information one would need to install a unit that meets NZ Standards. We also provide funding by way of a complete pre-cast unit and signage (valued at \$1,200). Council would cover the installation and maintenance costs. We have experienced representatives in CHB willing to offer practical advice on suitable locations as well as volunteer their time to install (if need be).</p> <p><b>Motor Home Friendly Town</b></p> <p>The NZMCA has developed a new scheme where towns can market themselves as motor home friendly. Part of the criteria requires the town to have a public dump station. These towns will be marketed to all our 40,000 members and every other tourist as a place that accommodates them. Our scheme is modelled off Australia's RV Friendly Town Scheme which has over 200 participating towns (expected to double by the end of 2010).</p> <p>Hastings has become NZ's first Motor Home Friendly Town. Should council wish to investigate this opportunity further please contact the NZMCA National Office.</p> <p>We hope Council looks favourably on our request. By supporting and promoting motor caravanning you will be seen by the motor</p>			

Pg No	Submitter	Submission Summary	Staff Comments	Attending	Notes
37	Fluoride Network Byrne – Action Mary	<p>caravan tourism industry as a must visit destination.</p> <p><b>Refer to submission on pages 37 – 82 for fill details.</b></p> <p>We ask the Council to incorporate one of the following in its Annual Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(Recommended) End water fluoridation permanently, and pass a by-law prohibiting the use of the public water supply for medical intervention purposes.</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suspend water fluoridation indefinitely, until such time as the international scientific community has reached a consensus that water fluoridation is safe, and can adduce a significant body of scientific evidence of benefit that meets the standard classified as "A" by the York Review Board in its systematic review published in 2000.</li> </ul> <p>Water fluoridation is arguably the most controversial health issue in history. The overwhelming weight of scientific evidence today is that it is ineffective and, more importantly harmful to humans at current levels of fluoride exposure. And to make matters worse, your community has told you it does not want it. Your refusal to follow the wishes of the majority of a comprehensive survey shows a complete lack of respect for the democratic process, as the continuation of fluoridation shows a complete lack of respect for people in general.</p> <p>We do not seek a referendum on this issue as</p>		No	

Pg No	Submitter	Submission Summary	Staff Comments	Attending	Notes
		<p>the Council should act on the fact that fluoridation is causing harm to people in its community and stop doing it. Asbestos, DDT, and leaded petrol were discontinued on the scientific evidence – there was no referendum required for this to happen. There is no reason why fluoridation should be any different.</p> <p>We also not that the Council has never been given a mandate by the people of Waipukurau to fluoridate the water. As guardians of the public interest, and custodians of the water supply, it is perfectly within the Council's ability to take the responsible and precautionary approach of ceasing fluoridation.</p> <p>Further, you may be aware Food Standards Australia New Zealand (FSANZ) has approved packaged fluoridate water to be sold. There is therefore no need to continue fluoridation of Waipukurau. Those who want fluoridated water will not only be able to buy it but, just as importantly, will be able to control their daily intake (to that which the Ministry of Health considers 'optimal') which they cannot currently do.</p>			
83	CHB Promotions	<p>The proposed public toilet upgrades in Waipukurau for the next two years.</p> <p>CHB Promotions Inc would ask that the CHBDC reconsider the change in their toilet upgrade program.</p> <p>It is well documented that visitors travelling throughout NZ stop at well maintained and well situated toilets.</p> <p>The public toilets on Railway Esplanade are used by many thousands of travellers each year</p>		Yes 1.40 pm	

Pg No	Submitter	Submission Summary	Staff Comments	Attending	Notes
		<p>and are an obvious stopover for north and south bound traffic. Many coaches use the stop and particularly during our high visitor season the number of toilets available isn't always adequate. Many of the coaches that do park at this stop are there for 30 minutes or longer, and passengers wander around the town as do many other travellers looking for a toilet, nourishment. The staff at the Visitor Information Centre are often asked to allow travellers to use the Railway Station toilets because of queues.</p> <p>Therefore we applauded your plan to extend the toilets; it was timely considering the increase in numbers over the last five years.</p> <p>We can only imagine your decision to list the toilet at the east end of Ruataniwha Street a priority, has come about because of pressure from local businesses. And while we understand the desire to establish new toilets elsewhere in the town, we believe changing the priority is short sighted, particularly when the Railway Esplanade toilets are within a very short distance of any main street businesses.</p> <p>We would also question the plan to establish those toilets on the one and only green area in town, when there are other small buildings through the CBD with the potential to be converted for this use.</p> <p>Offering high standard and adequate toilets, easily accessible to vehicles, is the first step in getting visitors to stop. It is then up to the businesses and community to entice them into looking around, have a meal or coffee and make them so welcome they will come again. They may even want to stay!</p>			

Pg No	Submitter	Submission Summary	Staff Comments	Attending	Notes
-------	-----------	--------------------	----------------	-----------	-------

## MULTI ISSUE SUBMISSIONS

85	Department of Conservation Benjamin Reddiex	<p>DOC's primary interest in this plan is a desire for the District Plan review to prioritise the review of information and provisions related to the management of biodiversity, including the provisions for goat farming. DOC is also supportive of future wastewater improvements at Porangahau and would like to be involved in the consultation for these improvements.</p> <p><b>District Plan Review – biodiversity and goat farming</b></p> <p>The Annual Plan seeks direction as to which matters should be priorities for Council's rolling review of the District Plan (pg 16). I strongly suggest that the provisions relating to the maintenance and protection of biodiversity be given priority in this review.</p> <p>The protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna are matters of national importance under the RMA 1991 (section 6(c)), and the District Plan can be a key method that Council uses to meet its obligations for maintaining indigenous biodiversity (section 31(1)(b)(iii)).</p> <p>I also specifically mention the need to review the adequacy of the protection the District Plan gives to areas of significant biodiversity with the Controlled Activity status for goat farming. The review of this rule should also be given priority in the rolling review.</p> <p>I suggest that Council ensure sufficient funding has been allocated in the Annual Plan for the review of information and provisions in the District Plan related to biodiversity. I support the development of a Biodiversity Strategy as one</p>		No	
----	--	---	--	----	--

Pg No	Submitter	Submission Summary	Staff Comments	Attending	Notes
		<p>way to guide this review.</p> <p><b>Wastewater treatment at Porangahau</b>  An investigation into a final wastewater treatment solution at Porangahau is identified as a key issue in the Annual Plan (pg 15). I support this investigation and note that the health of freshwater and marine ecosystems is of concern to DOC. Therefore I anticipate that Council will include DOC in the discussions on these investigations.</p>	<p>DOC will be included.</p>		
88	Di Petersen	<p>Overall there is not a lot to comment on as it is pretty basic, but I wonder at the proposed rate increase of 4% as against the much lower increases proposed by our neighbouring Councils. Is this brought about solely by the debt repayment? What is the "additional rate funding for capital renewals" – page 19?</p> <p><b>Solid Waste – page 15</b>  Has landfill space been sold to another Council?</p> <p><b>Growth Strategy – page 16</b>  Has CHB Promotions the expertise to develop a vision for CHB? Who will they consult with?</p> <p><b>Old Waipukurau Hospital – page 17</b>  We are all in agreement that this site is a disgrace. I cannot see why the Ministry of Health should be responsible for cleaning up the mess when the area was sold to a private developer.</p> <p><b>General comment</b>  For years I have been advocating that all grants given to organisations and halls etc should be listed in the Annual Plan. I am always told that it will happen! The public is entitled to know how much is given to the Pool, the Museum, CHB</p>	<p>Funding within rates for capital renewals is not offset in the Income Statement as part of Operating Expenses – hence creating an accounting surplus.</p>	Yes 2.00 pm	

Pg No	Submitter	Submission Summary	Staff Comments	Attending	Notes
89	Frances Heke	<p>Promotions and to the various halls amongst other things.</p> <p>I suspect that timing may be an issue – organisations are reporting to the Council too late to be able to include the proposed budgets into the Annual Plan. How then can you do an accurate activity budget? For example, if you look at page 37 – Parks, Reserves and Swimming Pools Activity – there is a statement that says the overall rate requirement is lower than forecast in the LTCCP. It doesn't tell me from where the decrease is coming.</p> <p>I look forward to discussing these issues with you.</p>			
90	Hawke's Bay District Health Board	<p>As residents of Te Paerahi can we please be informed of the Tsunami Plan for this area, and what is expected of us.</p> <p>Water meters at Te Paerahi – I'm told that our meter is "historical" replaced at the water up grade. Why are all "commercial" operations not metered? The system is unfair – there should be the same rules for all ratepayers.</p>	<p>Water metres are installed on extraordinary use properties. Commercial property fits this description. As we become aware of commercial operations that are likely to use over 300m<sup>3</sup> a year a metre is installed.</p>	<p>No</p>	
90	Hawke's Bay District Health Board	<p>The Hawke's Bay District Health Board's function is to improve, promote and protect the health of people and communities within Hawke's Bay and the Chatham Islands. Therefore our submission will provide commentary in this regard. The key public health issues that have been identified in the plan are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wastewater</li> <li>• Drinking water</li> <li>• Former Waipukurau hospital site</li> <li>• Food safety</li> </ul>		<p>Yes 12.40 pm</p>	

Pg No	Submitter	Submission Summary	Staff Comments	Attending	Notes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Healthy housing</li> <li>• Reducing alcohol-related harm</li> <li>• Youth input.</li> </ul> <p><b>Wastewater</b> It is noted that a new consent for wastewater treatment for Waipukurau and Waipawa will be sought by the CHBDC for disposal of treated effluent to land. This is intended to be the alternative disposal method of treated effluent, from these systems, which is currently discharged to the Tukituki River/Waipawa River.</p> <p>It is encouraging that both the CHBDC and HBRC are working together to find a more acceptable method for disposal of treated effluent from these systems. It is noted that the upgrading of treatment plants will take place to provide the right quality of effluent.</p> <p>The primary concerns about irrigation with treated sewage effluent to land are nuisance and odour, and these are usually dealt with by buffer zones. It is indicated that the HBRC intends establishing forests on which treated effluent will be discharged. Consideration needs to be given by the Council as to whether to permit public access to this land by recreational users. If so, the risk to public health would need to be addressed. In addition, any potential for runoff, which may expose people to effluent, would also need to be considered and addressed if appropriate.</p> <p><b>Drinking Water</b> It is commendable that the focus has been on improving the Waipawa and Waipukurau water treatment plants to comply with the Drinking Water Standards New Zealand 2005 (DWSNZ 2005), as these plants serve the highest</p>			

Pg No	Submitter	Submission Summary	Staff Comments	Attending	Notes
		<p>populations in CHB.</p> <p>It should be noted however that the quality of water supplies at Te Paerahi – Porangahau do not fully meet the DWSNZ 2005 as stated under the Section “Water Supplies Activity”. The reason being is that the ground water has not been verified as being secure, or the micro filtration treatment process for protozoa removal has not been demonstrated as being compliant under the DWSNZ 2005 (Revised 08) criteria. It would be necessary for some type of assessment of the functionality of the micro filters rather than an intention to replace after “x” years only.</p> <p>In addition, there is mention of “Activity Management Plans” for all water supplies. No mention is made if work is being undertaken towards developing Public Health Resource Management Plans for Council owned supplies. These will be necessary by 1 July 2014 for communities serving between 501 and 5,000 consumers, and 1 July 2015 for communities serving 101 to 500 consumers. For communities serving 25 to 100 consumers 1 July 2016 will be relevant.</p> <p>Though not legislatively mandated and provided evidence can be supplied to support the procedure, would the Council wish to consider having its water supplied graded.</p> <p><b>Former Waipukurau Hospital Site</b></p> <p>The CHBDC’s responsibilities under the Building Act to secure buildings considered “insanitary or Dangerous” is recognised in the Draft Annual Plan. It is noted that the Council is of the opinion that if costs are incurred should the former Waipukurau Hospital site be required to</p>	<p>Verification will be completed before DWSNZ deadlines.</p> <p>Public Health Resource Management Plans are being compiled.</p>		

Pg No	Submitter	Submission Summary	Staff Comments	Attending	Notes
		<p>be secured by the Council, this costs should be the responsibility of the Ministry of Health. This matter has been brought to the attention of the Ministry of Health to make its own submission in this regard.</p> <p>The DHB is aware that Council intends to develop a tactical plan for responding to any further fire event at the former hospital site and encourages Council to proceed with this work while efforts to address long term risks associated with the site are underway.</p> <p><b>Food Safety</b> In preparation for the proposed Food Act, we would encourage the Council to promote Food Control Plans.</p> <p><b>Housing</b> The HB DHB supports the Council initiative of offering retirement housing for people who do not own property. Evidence shows that warm, dry homes have significant health benefits in the prevention of respiratory illness especially for the elderly. The HBDHB urges the Council to ensure that all Council owned flats are fully insulated, are appropriately heated and have key home safety devices fitted (eg smoke alarms, slip mats in wet areas, ramps etc). The CHB is happy to provide information and support to the Council in this area. The Council may not be aware that together with the HB PHO, the HBRC and EECA that it offers fully funded insulation to home owners and private tenants who have significant health issues and meet other eligibility criteria.</p> <p><b>Reducing Alcohol-related Harm</b> The DHB and the Council have a very good relationship around liquor licensing and</p>			

Pg No	Submitter	Submission Summary	Staff Comments	Attending	Notes
		<p>enforcement and thanks the Council for its open dialogue and support in this area. As the Council will be aware significant changes are likely to be made to the Sale of Liquor Act this year and we look forward to working together to reduce the harmful effects that alcohol has on communities.</p> <p><b>Public Toilet Upgrade</b> The DHB would be interested in how it could work with the Council to ensure that the refurbishment of the public toilet stock could include opportunities for social marketing around significant public health issues. This would include signage around the importance of washing hands and may include advertising of DHB services such as sexual health information.</p> <p><b>Youth Input</b> The DHB congratulates the Council on its current initiatives that provide an opportunity for a youth voice to be heard in Council decision making processes and hope that the Council will continue to look for ways for young people's thoughts and ideas to be heard.</p>			
93	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	<p><b>Refer to submission on pages 93 – 102 for fill details.</b></p> <p>The content of this submission includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The importance of agriculture to the economy</li> <li>• General comments on the Annual Plan</li> <li>• Specific comments on the Council's use of general rates and targeted rates</li> <li>• Comments on the reform of local government funding.</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommendations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Federated Farmers recommends that the</li> </ul>		Yes 1.30 pm	

Pg No	Submitter	Submission Summary	Staff Comments	Attending	Notes
		<p>following activities for which the benefits are received by the person and not the property should be funded via the UAGC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Planning and regulatory activities</li> <li>o Solid Waste</li> <li>o Parks and reserves</li> <li>o Public toilets</li> <li>o Cemeteries</li> <li>o Emergency management</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Federated Farmers recommends that Council continue to use targeted rates as a method to ensure that the incidence of rating is spread more equitably across the District's ratepayers.</li> <li>• Federated Farmers recommends that the Council continue to fund economic development activities through a uniform targeted rate on each separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit that is non-residential and non-rural.</li> <li>• That Council adopt and implement the Roading Cost Allocation Model (RCAM) outlined in Appendix 1, (pages 99 – 102) using this model as a basis for funding roading costs rather than relying on property value as the primary basis.</li> <li>• Federated Farmers recommends that the Council advocates to Central Government for meaningful reform of local government funding.</li> </ul>	<p>Council considered these issues in its 2008/9 Rating Review – which was fully consulted with the CHB Community – including with groups such as Federated Farmers.</p>		
103	New Zealand Historic Places Trust – Ann Neill	<p><b>Refer to submission on pages 103 – 105 for fill details.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Plan Review</li> <li>• Maori Built Heritage</li> <li>• Consistency with other local authorities</li> <li>• Waipawa Town Hall</li> <li>• Former Coles Joinery Factory Building</li> <li>• Other Heritage Protection</li> </ul>		No	

Pg No	Submitter	Submission Summary	Staff Comments	Attending	Notes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Archaeology Alert Layers</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommendations:</b> That Council engages in early consultation with the NZHPT in progressing the District Plan review. NZHPT can assist in identifying and updating heritage listings in the plan, assisting in the development of more robust district plan provisions for historic heritage protection helping to ensure protection and support including incentive assistance through policies and rules in the plan.</p> <p>That Council supports a meeting with NZHPT to discuss heritage triggers when processing building and resource consents.</p>			