

**Extraordinary Meeting of the Hawke's Bay Regional Council**

**Date:** 21 May 2025  
**Time:** 9.00am  
**Venue:** Council Chamber  
Hawke's Bay Regional Council  
159 Dalton Street  
NAPIER

**Attachments excluded from the Agenda**  
**[available online only](#)**

---

<b>Item</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Page</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>Hearing of submissions on our Annual Plan 2025-2026</b>	
	Attachment 2: Annual Plan 2025-26 Submissions Report	2
	Attachment 3: Public comments on HBRC's Facebook posts	30

---

## Index of Submissions on the Annual Plan 2025-26

*Verbal submissions hearing is on Wednesday, 21 May 2025*

ID, name (& organisation)	Page
#20 Katrin Wunderlich	1
#21 John Wuts	1
#23 Andrew McCrory	1
#25 Pamela Rae Lane	2
#26 Sue Glover	2
#31 David Trubridge	2
#32 Stephen Wallis	2
#33 Sam Newbigin obo Fern Ridge Property Ltd	2
#38 Chris Flannery	3
#39 Cathy Heath	3
#40 Paul Olsen	3
#41 Alex Bush	3
#43 Fiona Hale	4
#46 Shane Anderson	4
#50 Jessica Norton	4
#51 Nathan Makris	4
#54 Stu Burden	5
#67 Bridget Paku	5
#68 Sandra Moy	5
#74 Michael Harding	5
#75 Julie-Anne MacPhee	6
#79 Tim Cullwick	6
#80 Anja Read	6
#81 Bianca	6
#82 Tyson	7
#83 Rose Robinson	7
#88 Junior Tuakana	7
#92 Helen Barbier	7
#93 Garth Goodwin obo Pinevale Trust	7
#95 Mel Tuck	8
#96 Tony Robson	8
#99 Christine Wilson	8
#108 Ben Deller	8
#111 Margaret Boyd	9

ID, name (& organisation)	Page
#113 Debbie Monahan obo Biodiversity Hawke's Bay	9
#115 Randolph Holmes	9
#117 John King	9
#119 Gerard Pain	10
#120 Desmond Brice	10
#121 Andrea Holmes	10
#127 John West obo EIT	10
#128 Sharon Malaitai	11
#129 Maree Diamond	11
#132 Irina	11
#134 Patrick Lander	12
#135 Hannah Small	12
#136 Tony Fitch	12
#137 Anita	12
#139 Claire Morgan	12
#140 David Matthew Bishop	12
#141 Craig Morgan	13
#143 Wim Pepping	13
#147 Sue Macdonald obo Ahuriri Estuary Protection Society Inc	13
#148 Shanon Tait	14
#152 Kathryn Bayliss	14
#154 Ann Galloway	17
#161 Carol-Ann Guard	17
#163 Janece Price	17
#169 Federated Farmers of New Zealand <b>Rhea Dasent speaking at 9.05am</b>	<a href="#">18</a>
#175 Alister Miller	22
#177 Emma Ellis obo Hastings Youth Council	22
#181 Chantal Pagel obo Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.	22
#183 Stuart Taylor <b>Speaking at 9.15am</b>	<a href="#">27</a>
#184 Greenstone Land Developments Limited <b>Tim Wilkins speaking at 9.25am</b>	<a href="#">27</a>

## Submission (by order of entry)

(Note: if no answer has been given, the question has been deleted from the response. This has been done to keep the report as concise as possible.)

\* = Council's preferred option in Consultation Document.

<b>Submitter ID: #20</b>	Hastings District
<b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Katrin Wunderlich	
1. <i>How many years should Regional Council collect the targeted rate for flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream in the Hastings district?</i> <b>Option A*:</b> Collect rates over 3 years	
2. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport?</i> <b>Option A*:</b> A new rating method	
3. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for the Upper Tukituki Flood Resilience Scheme?</i> <b>Option A*:</b> A new rating method	
6. <i>Other feedback</i>  My general feedback is that you make it really hard for people who don't have much time or education to participate in this. Not having options like "I don't know" or "Not applicable" is really poorly as some people might not have an opinion about some points but really want to have their say on other points.  Also, I note that you provided all the information in supporting documents. But even as someone with a tertiary degree I find it confusing where to find in depth information (broken down into digestible bits of information) about certain topics. The page numbers you are referring to in the survey don't seem to match with the ones in the supporting documents at times.  I would appreciate a more democratic approach.	
<b>Submitter ID: #21</b>	Napier
<b>Name/(Organisation):</b> John Wuts	
1. <i>How many years should Regional Council collect the targeted rate for flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream in the Hastings district?</i> <b>Option A*:</b> Collect rates over 3 years	
3. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for the Upper Tukituki Flood Resilience Scheme?</i> <b>Option A*:</b> A new rating method	
4. <i>We are proposing three amendments to our Rates Remission and Postponement Policies. Tell us what you think.</i> Seems reasonable	
5. <i>We are proposing six amendments to our Revenue and Financing Policy. Tell us what you think.</i> Ok with this	
<b>Submitter ID: #23</b>	Hastings District
<b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Andrew McCrory	
1. <i>How many years should Regional Council collect the targeted rate for flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream in the Hastings district?</i> <b>Option A*:</b> Collect rates over 3 years	
2. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport?</i> <b>Option A*:</b> A new rating method	

<b>Submitter ID: #25</b>	Napier
<b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Pamela Rae Lane	
1. <i>How many years should Regional Council collect the targeted rate for flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream in the Hastings district?</i> <b>Option A*: Collect rates over 3 years</b>	
2. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport?</i> <b>Option B: Keep the current rating method</b>	
3. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for the Upper Tukituki Flood Resilience Scheme?</i> <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b>	
<b>Submitter ID: #26</b>	Napier
<b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Sue Glover	
1. <i>How many years should Regional Council collect the targeted rate for flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream in the Hastings district?</i> <b>Option A*: Collect rates over 3 years</b>	
2. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport?</i> <b>Option B: Keep the current rating method</b>	
3. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for the Upper Tukituki Flood Resilience Scheme?</i> <b>Option B: Keep the current rating method</b>	
<b>Submitter ID: #31</b>	Hastings District
<b>Name/(Organisation):</b> David Trubridge	
1. <i>How many years should Regional Council collect the targeted rate for flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream in the Hastings district?</i> I am not commenting on your choice of options. I am concerned about your "targeted rates". Who is targeted and why? Nowhere in your document do you say who this is. I received a letter about this implying that I am to be targeted. I live by the Herehere.	
6. <i>Other feedback</i> Why is the rate rise to pay for the Mangarau stream work "targeted"? The work is needed because the Council failed to properly maintain the streams in the past. If that work had been done it would have been paid for out of the general rate, ie from everyone's rates payments. Now you are expecting only those affected to pay the targeted rate. That is not fair! And it seems that people like me who do not live on the Mangarau, but border on other streams (Herehere in my case) are included in the targeted rate. That is also unfair. By all means recoup your loan over 3 years but it is everyone's expense, just like all the other rates.	
<b>Submitter ID: #32</b>	Napier
<b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Stephen Wallis	
2. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport?</i> <b>Option B: Keep the current rating method</b>	
<b>Submitter ID: #33</b>	Hastings District
<b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Sam Newbigin on behalf of Fern Ridge Property Ltd	
1. <i>How many years should Regional Council collect the targeted rate for flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream in the Hastings district?</i> <b>Option A*: Collect rates over 3 years</b>	

I am in the dark as to how much extra you are planning to collect from me. It seems very opaque which makes me uncertain as to whether I should be supporting the proposed 3 years or not. Can you make the extra amount we are to pay clearer.	
<b>Submitter ID: #38</b>	Napier
<b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Chris Flannery	
1. <i>How many years should Regional Council collect the targeted rate for flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream in the Hastings district?</i> <b>Option A*: Collect rates over 3 years</b>	
2. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport?</i> <b>Option B: Keep the current rating method</b>	
3. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for the Upper Tukituki Flood Resilience Scheme?</i> <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b>	
<b>Submitter ID: #39</b>	Napier
<b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Cathy Heath	
1. <i>How many years should Regional Council collect the targeted rate for flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream in the Hastings district?</i> <b>Option A*: Collect rates over 3 years</b>	
2. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport?</i> <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b>	
3. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for the Upper Tukituki Flood Resilience Scheme?</i> <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b>	
<b>Submitter ID: #40</b>	Hastings District
<b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Paul Olsen	
1. <i>How many years should Regional Council collect the targeted rate for flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream in the Hastings district?</i> <b>Option B: Collect rates over 20 years</b>	
2. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport?</i> <b>Option B: Keep the current rating method</b>	
3. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for the Upper Tukituki Flood Resilience Scheme?</i> <b>Option B: Keep the current rating method</b>	
<b>Submitter ID: #41</b>	Hastings District
<b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Alex Bush	
1. <i>How many years should Regional Council collect the targeted rate for flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream in the Hastings district?</i> <b>Option B: Collect rates over 20 years</b> This targeted rate should be confined to Havelock North	
2. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport?</i> <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b>	
3. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for the Upper Tukituki Flood Resilience Scheme?</i> <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b>	

<p><b>6. Other feedback</b> I am very concerned to hear of the significant reduction in environmental monitoring by HBRC in our region. This is aligned with the current government, but it is short sighted and will have long term negative impacts on all the environmental elements our region relies on to thrive and grow.</p>	
<p><b>Submitter ID: #43</b> <b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Fiona Hale</p>	<p>Napier</p>
<p>2. Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport? <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b></p>	
<p><b>Submitter ID: #46</b> <b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Shane Anderson</p>	<p>Hastings District</p>
<p>1. How many years should Regional Council collect the targeted rate for flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream in the Hastings district? <b>Option A*: Collect rates over 3 years</b></p>	
<p>2. Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport? <b>Option B: Keep the current rating method</b> stop changing stuff that is working, the old say goes if it isn't broke don't fix it</p>	
<p>3. Which rating method do you prefer for the Upper Tukituki Flood Resilience Scheme? <b>Option B: Keep the current rating method</b></p>	
<p><b>Submitter ID: #50</b> <b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Jessica Norton</p>	<p>Central Hawke's Bay</p>
<p>1. How many years should Regional Council collect the targeted rate for flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream in the Hastings district? <b>Option B: Collect rates over 20 years</b></p>	
<p>2. Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport? <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b> Please bring back bus services to Napier and Hastings from Central Hawkes Bay</p>	
<p>3. Which rating method do you prefer for the Upper Tukituki Flood Resilience Scheme? <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b></p>	
<p>4. We are proposing three amendments to our Rates Remission and Postponement Policies. Tell us what you think. Looks ok</p>	
<p>5. We are proposing six amendments to our Revenue and Financing Policy. Tell us what you think. Looks ok</p>	
<p><b>6. Other feedback</b> Would love to have actual rubbish bins, not expensive bags</p>	
<p><b>Submitter ID: #51</b> <b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Nathan Makris</p>	<p>Hastings District</p>
<p>1. How many years should Regional Council collect the targeted rate for flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream in the Hastings district? <b>Option B: Collect rates over 20 years</b></p>	

2. Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport? <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b> People using this service need to Pay more.	
3. Which rating method do you prefer for the Upper Tukituki Flood Resilience Scheme? <b>Option B: Keep the current rating method</b>	
<b>Submitter ID: #54</b>	Hastings District
<b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Stu Burden	
2. Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport? All non-urban ratepayers should be excluded from the targeted rate as they have no practical way to utilise public transport.	
<b>Submitter ID: #67</b>	Hastings District
<b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Bridget Paku	
1. How many years should Regional Council collect the targeted rate for flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream in the Hastings district? <b>Option A*: Collect rates over 3 years</b>	
2. Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport? <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b>	
3. Which rating method do you prefer for the Upper Tukituki Flood Resilience Scheme? <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b>	
<b>Submitter ID: #68</b>	Hastings District
<b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Saundra Moy	
1. How many years should Regional Council collect the targeted rate for flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream in the Hastings district? <b>Option A*: Collect rates over 3 years</b>	
2. Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport? <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b>	
3. Which rating method do you prefer for the Upper Tukituki Flood Resilience Scheme? <b>Option B: Keep the current rating method</b>	
<b>Submitter ID: #74</b>	Central Hawke's Bay
<b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Michael Harding	
1. How many years should Regional Council collect the targeted rate for flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream in the Hastings district? <b>Option A*: Collect rates over 3 years</b>	
2. Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport? <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b>	
3. Which rating method do you prefer for the Upper Tukituki Flood Resilience Scheme? <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b> Option A is a great idea and much fairer on us. My wife and I always felt aggrieved at the high rate cost on land near the river but which we would never build. But we were paying for other people to be protected down stream	

<b>Submitter ID: #75</b>	Hastings District
<b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Julie-Anne MacPhee	
1. <i>How many years should Regional Council collect the targeted rate for flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream in the Hastings district?</i> <b>Option B: Collect rates over 20 years</b> I do not agree with this. HDC neglected to maintain their asset in the first place. It should not be the people of Havelock North, yet again, to be covering the cost of the Cyclone. Rates are not affordable. I am a single parent.	
2. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport?</i> <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b>	
3. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for the Upper Tukituki Flood Resilience Scheme?</i> <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b>	
<b>Submitter ID: #79</b>	Central Hawke's Bay
<b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Tim Cullwick	
3. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for the Upper Tukituki Flood Resilience Scheme?</i> <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b> A much fairer plan	
<b>Submitter ID: #80</b>	Napier
<b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Anja Read	
2. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport?</i> <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b>	
3. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for the Upper Tukituki Flood Resilience Scheme?</i> <b>Option B: Keep the current rating method</b>	
<b>Submitter ID: #81</b>	Hastings District
<b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Bianca	
1. <i>How many years should Regional Council collect the targeted rate for flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream in the Hastings district?</i> <b>Option B: Collect rates over 20 years</b> you can renovate the civic square as a 'priority' but are asking for more money on much more pressing issues	
2. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport?</i> <b>Option B: Keep the current rating method</b>	
3. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for the Upper Tukituki Flood Resilience Scheme?</i> <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b>	
4. <i>We are proposing three amendments to our Rates Remission and Postponement Policies. Tell us what you think.</i> link didn't open	
5. <i>We are proposing six amendments to our Revenue and Financing Policy. Tell us what you think.</i> prioritise the cyclone recovery!	

<b>Submitter ID: #82</b>	Napier
<b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Tyson	
1. <i>How many years should Regional Council collect the targeted rate for flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream in the Hastings district?</i> <b>Option B: Collect rates over 20 years</b>	
2. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport?</i> <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b>	
3. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for the Upper Tukituki Flood Resilience Scheme?</i> <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b>	
<b>Submitter ID: #83</b>	Hastings District
<b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Rose Robinson	
1. <i>How many years should Regional Council collect the targeted rate for flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream in the Hastings district?</i> <b>Option B: Collect rates over 20 years</b>	
2. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport?</i> <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b>	
3. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for the Upper Tukituki Flood Resilience Scheme?</i> <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b>	
<b>Submitter ID: #88</b>	Hastings District
<b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Junior Tuakana	
1. <i>How many years should Regional Council collect the targeted rate for flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream in the Hastings district?</i> <b>Option B: Collect rates over 20 years</b>	
2. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport?</i> <b>Option B: Keep the current rating method</b>	
3. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for the Upper Tukituki Flood Resilience Scheme?</i> <b>Option B: Keep the current rating method</b>	
<b>Submitter ID: #92</b>	Napier
<b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Helen Barbier	
1. <i>How many years should Regional Council collect the targeted rate for flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream in the Hastings district?</i> <b>Option A*: Collect rates over 3 years</b>	
2. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport?</i> <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b> Having a reliable and efficient bus service is essential for the region. HBRC must ensure that there is sufficient funding for such a service to be provided to our communities.	
<b>Submitter ID: #93</b>	Hastings District
<b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Garth Goodwin on behalf of Pinevale Trust	
2. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport?</i> <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b>	

3. Which rating method do you prefer for the Upper Tukituki Flood Resilience Scheme? our rates need to reflect that we are most definitely not flood prone being in the very upper reaches of the tuki tuki catchment	
<b>Submitter ID: #95</b>	Central Hawke's Bay
<b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Mel Tuck	
1. How many years should Regional Council collect the targeted rate for flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream in the Hastings district? <b>Option B: Collect rates over 20 years</b>	
2. Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport? <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b>	
3. Which rating method do you prefer for the Upper Tukituki Flood Resilience Scheme? <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b>	
<b>Submitter ID: #96</b>	Central Hawke's Bay
<b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Tony Robson	
1. How many years should Regional Council collect the targeted rate for flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream in the Hastings district? CHB ratepayers should not pay for Hastings	
2. Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport? <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b>	
6. Other feedback Every year you keep putting up rates ,yet have wasted over 20 million on a failed dam , get some accountability and stop using us as walking ATMs!	
<b>Submitter ID: #99</b>	Napier
<b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Christine Wilson	
1. How many years should Regional Council collect the targeted rate for flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream in the Hastings district? <b>Option B: Collect rates over 20 years</b>	
2. Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport? <b>Option B: Keep the current rating method</b>	
3. Which rating method do you prefer for the Upper Tukituki Flood Resilience Scheme? <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b>	
<b>Submitter ID: #108</b>	Napier
<b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Ben Deller	
1. How many years should Regional Council collect the targeted rate for flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream in the Hastings district? <b>Option A*: Collect rates over 3 years</b>	
2. Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport? <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b>	
3. Which rating method do you prefer for the Upper Tukituki Flood Resilience Scheme? <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b>	

<b>Submitter ID: #111</b> <b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Margaret Boyd	Napier
1. <i>How many years should Regional Council collect the targeted rate for flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream in the Hastings district?</i> <b>Option A*: Collect rates over 3 years</b>	
2. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport?</i> <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b>	
3. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for the Upper Tukituki Flood Resilience Scheme?</i> <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b>	
<b>Submitter ID: #113</b> <b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Debbie Monahan on behalf of Biodiversity Hawke's Bay	Napier
6. <i>Other feedback</i> <p>Biodiversity Hawke's Bay appreciates the opportunity to comment on the proposed Annual Plan and acknowledges the financial pressures facing the Council. We also recognise HBRC's commitment to biodiversity and the importance it places on environmental leadership.</p> <p>However, we are concerned that the proposed reduction in biodiversity funding risks undermining this commitment. Biodiversity should not be viewed as a discretionary expense, but rather as a strategic investment in the region's long-term ecological and economic resilience. Functioning ecosystems contribute significantly to climate adaptation, tourism, and community wellbeing. Furthermore, they are fundamental to the productivity of the region's agricultural and horticultural sector through the provision of ecosystem services such as pollination, improved water quality and soil health which in turn support the viability of Hawke's Bay's primary industries and export economy.</p> <p>HBRC plays a crucial role in leading and supporting collaborative biodiversity efforts across the region. Continued investment ensures that community-led projects can thrive, leveraging additional funding and volunteer support to achieve greater impact. We encourage Council to consider alternative approaches that maintain momentum on biodiversity outcomes while balancing budget constraints. Biodiversity is fundamental to Hawke's Bay's future and we urge Council to continue prioritising it accordingly.</p>	
<b>Submitter ID: #115</b> <b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Randolph Holmes on behalf of Anywhere Moving & Storage Ltd	Hastings District
1. <i>How many years should Regional Council collect the targeted rate for flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream in the Hastings district?</i> <b>Option B: Collect rates over 20 years</b> This work should have already been done, poor planning in past 20 years is what it is, why should we have to pay for what should have been planned for in advance anyway?	
2. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport?</i> <b>Option B: Keep the current rating method</b>	
3. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for the Upper Tukituki Flood Resilience Scheme?</i> <b>Option B: Keep the current rating method</b>	
<b>Submitter ID: #117</b> <b>Name/(Organisation):</b> John King	Hastings District
1. <i>How many years should Regional Council collect the targeted rate for flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream in the Hastings district?</i> <b>Option A*: Collect rates over 3 years</b>	

2. Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport? <b>Option B: Keep the current rating method</b>	
3. Which rating method do you prefer for the Upper Tukituki Flood Resilience Scheme? <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b>	
<b>Submitter ID: #119</b>	Central Hawke's Bay
<b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Gerard Pain	
2. Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport? <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b> I take you on your word that it is fairer. Don't understand why CHB ratepayers are involved.	
3. Which rating method do you prefer for the Upper Tukituki Flood Resilience Scheme? <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b> I take you on your word that it is fairer; looks like we will pay more but not get any direct benefit.	
4. We are proposing three amendments to our Rates Remission and Postponement Policies. Tell us what you think. N/A ( yet)	
6. Other feedback I'm all for keeping rates affordable but do have concerns about proposed cuts to biodiversity funding at any time; I refer to your own words:  (1) "identified sites that we are not able to undertake new protection work on will continue to degrade with ongoing biodiversity loss "  (2) "some community-led biodiversity projects may lose momentum "	
<b>Submitter ID: #120</b>	Napier
<b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Desmond Brice	
1. How many years should Regional Council collect the targeted rate for flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream in the Hastings district? <b>Option A*: Collect rates over 3 years</b>	
2. Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport? <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b>	
3. Which rating method do you prefer for the Upper Tukituki Flood Resilience Scheme? <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b>	
<b>Submitter ID: #121</b>	Hastings District
<b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Andrea Holmes on behalf of Anywhere Moving & Storage Ltd	
1. How many years should Regional Council collect the targeted rate for flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream in the Hastings district? <b>Option B: Collect rates over 20 years</b> yes i do THIS SHOULD HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED AT LEAST 10 years AGO not wait till an event happened and NOW TRY and tell us as rate payers that we HAVE TO FOOT THIS COST over only a small period of 3 years W	
<b>Submitter ID: #127</b>	Napier
<b>Name/(Organisation):</b> John West on behalf of EIT	
1. How many years should Regional Council collect the targeted rate for flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream in the Hastings district? EIT has no view on the period over which rates would be collected	

<p>2. Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport?  <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b>                      EIT would support a model that ensured their was equitable access to transport, and value the Total Mobility model and a charge related to population base</p>	
<p>3. Which rating method do you prefer for the Upper Tukituki Flood Resilience Scheme?  <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b></p>	
<p>4. We are proposing three amendments to our Rates Remission and Postponement Policies. Tell us what you think.                      EIT has no view on this.</p>	
<p>5. We are proposing six amendments to our Revenue and Financing Policy. Tell us what you think.                      EIT has no view on this.</p>	
<p><b>Submitter ID: #128</b></p>	<p>Hastings District</p>
<p><b>Name/(Organisation): Sharon Malaitai</b></p>	
<p>1. How many years should Regional Council collect the targeted rate for flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream in the Hastings district?  <b>Option B: Collect rates over 20 years</b></p>	
<p>2. Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport?  <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b></p>	
<p>3. Which rating method do you prefer for the Upper Tukituki Flood Resilience Scheme?  <b>Option B: Keep the current rating method</b></p>	
<p><b>Submitter ID: #129</b></p>	<p>Napier</p>
<p><b>Name/(Organisation): Maree Diamond</b></p>	
<p>1. How many years should Regional Council collect the targeted rate for flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream in the Hastings district?  <b>Option A*: Collect rates over 3 years</b></p>	
<p>2. Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport?  <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b></p>	
<p>3. Which rating method do you prefer for the Upper Tukituki Flood Resilience Scheme?  <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b></p>	
<p><b>Submitter ID: #132</b></p>	<p>Hastings District</p>
<p><b>Name/(Organisation): Irina</b></p>	
<p>1. How many years should Regional Council collect the targeted rate for flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream in the Hastings district?  <b>Option B: Collect rates over 20 years</b></p>	
<p>2. Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport?  <b>Option B: Keep the current rating method</b></p>	
<p>3. Which rating method do you prefer for the Upper Tukituki Flood Resilience Scheme?  <b>Option B: Keep the current rating method</b></p>	

<b>Submitter ID: #134</b>	Hastings District
<b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Patrick Lander	
1. <i>How many years should Regional Council collect the targeted rate for flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream in the Hastings district?</i> <b>Option B: Collect rates over 20 years</b>	
2. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport?</i> <b>Option B: Keep the current rating method</b>	
3. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for the Upper Tukituki Flood Resilience Scheme?</i> <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b>	
<b>Submitter ID: #135</b>	Napier
<b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Hannah Small	
2. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport?</i> <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b>	
3. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for the Upper Tukituki Flood Resilience Scheme?</i> <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b>	
<b>Submitter ID: #136</b>	Napier
<b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Tony Fitch	
2. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport?</i> <b>Option B: Keep the current rating method</b>	
<b>Submitter ID: #137</b>	Hastings District
<b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Anita	
1. <i>How many years should Regional Council collect the targeted rate for flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream in the Hastings district?</i> <b>Option A*: Collect rates over 3 years</b>	
2. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport?</i> <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b> Pleased that you listened to the community and revised your decision to base levy on capital value, a fixed rate is a much fairer option. Disappointed that a portion is still being calculated on the capital value.	
3. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for the Upper Tukituki Flood Resilience Scheme?</i> <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b>	
<b>Submitter ID: #139</b>	Napier
<b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Claire Morgan	
2. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport?</i> <b>Option B: Keep the current rating method</b>	
3. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for the Upper Tukituki Flood Resilience Scheme?</i> <b>Option B: Keep the current rating method</b>	
<b>Submitter ID: #140</b>	Central Hawke's Bay
<b>Name/(Organisation):</b> David Matthew Bishop	
1. <i>How many years should Regional Council collect the targeted rate for flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream in the Hastings district?</i> <b>Option A*: Collect rates over 3 years</b>	

<p>2. Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport?  <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b>  Total Mobility Service has to be a minor component of the work that needs doing to get single car commuters onto public transport. I want to see Council survey commuters and establish a database to enable Council 2 subsidise public trpt from CHB CHB</p>	
<p>3. Which rating method do you prefer for the Upper Tukituki Flood Resilience Scheme?  <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b>  Council changing to a capital based rates system penalises the productive sector creating angst from this sector. Those that benefit from flood resilience directly should pay a higher rate</p>	
<p>4. We are proposing three amendments to our Rates Remission and Postponement Policies. Tell us what you think.  Not considered</p>	
<p>5. We are proposing six amendments to our Revenue and Financing Policy. Tell us what you think.  Not considered</p>	
<p><b>Submitter ID: #141</b></p>	<p>Napier</p>
<p><b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Craig Morgan</p>	
<p>1. How many years should Regional Council collect the targeted rate for flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream in the Hastings district?  <b>Option B: Collect rates over 20 years</b></p>	
<p>2. Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport?  <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b></p>	
<p>3. Which rating method do you prefer for the Upper Tukituki Flood Resilience Scheme?  <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b></p>	
<p><b>Submitter ID: #143</b></p>	<p>Hastings District</p>
<p><b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Wim Pepping</p>	
<p>1. How many years should Regional Council collect the targeted rate for flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream in the Hastings district?  <b>Option A*: Collect rates over 3 years</b></p>	
<p>2. Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport?  <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b>  There needs to be a major push for people to use public transport leave cars behind, the amount of traffic between Havelock North and Hastings per day is huge where is the incentive with many one person in the vehicle. Parking is a problem because of this</p>	
<p><b>Submitter ID: #147</b></p>	<p>Napier</p>
<p><b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Sue Macdonald on behalf of Ahuriri Estuary Protection Society Inc</p>	
<p>6. Other feedback  The Ahuriri Estuary Protection Society Inc wishes to re-iterate our concerns on the state of the water quality of the Ahuriri Estuary. In particular the problem of the invasive Tubeworm. We know the HBRC has completed some preliminary work and commissioned a report from the Cawthorne institute on suggested solutions to try and combat this problem. The society was informed some months ago that funding was not available at that time to carry out any of the recommendations. With concern we note that this annual Plan wishes to cut the funding for Biodiversity/ Biosecurity, including staffing levels and reduces budget for pest surveillance, and management, advice, research. Will this include any more work on the Tubeworm problem. This invasive pest continues its relentless march up the estuary. We</p>	

<p>are informed that it has already breached the Stopbanks and is now found in the waterways of the PAMU (Landcorp) Farm.</p> <p>We acknowledge that Councils have a hard job in balancing budgets with public expectations and needs but any budgets relating to cuts to funding solutions to the Tubeworm problem risks a possible 'solvable' issue rapidly becoming an even more expensive problem. Do 'we' value the Estuary or Not.</p> <p>The Society strongly encourages the HBRC to revisit allocation of funding for solutions to the Tubeworm issue, in this years Annual Plan.</p> <p>Thank You</p>	
<b>Submitter ID: #148</b>	Hastings District
<b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Shanon Tait	
<p>1. How many years should Regional Council collect the targeted rate for flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream in the Hastings district?</p> <p><b>Option A*: Collect rates over 3 years</b></p>	
<p>2. Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport?</p> <p><b>Option A*: A new rating method</b></p>	
<p>3. Which rating method do you prefer for the Upper Tukituki Flood Resilience Scheme?</p> <p><b>Option A*: A new rating method</b></p>	
<b>Submitter ID: #152</b>	Central Hawke's Bay
<b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Kathryn Bayliss	
<p>1. How many years should Regional Council collect the targeted rate for flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream in the Hastings district?</p> <p><b>Option A*: Collect rates over 3 years</b></p>	
<p>2. Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport?</p> <p><b>Option B: Keep the current rating method</b></p> <p>I disagree with "The indirect targeted rate of 10% for the Total Mobility service to be charged to all ratepayers in Napier, Hastings, and Central Hawke's Bay calculated on capital value. This acknowledges that our Total Mobility service is available for all eligible people in these areas."</p> <p>It is not available to rural people in CHB so rural people should not be charged the indirect targeted rate of 10%.</p> <p>The Total Mobility service does not give lesser congestion on roads and reduced emissions.</p> <p>In the Regional Public Transport Plan 2025-2035 on page 40: 4.3.1. 65. HBRC will continue to provide the Total Mobility Scheme in Napier, Hastings, Waipawa and Waipukurau.</p>	
<p>3. Which rating method do you prefer for the Upper Tukituki Flood Resilience Scheme?</p> <p><b>Option A*: A new rating method</b></p> <p>It is a better method than the old one but still not ideal.</p> <p>I am especially affected because I live on a 2.0120 hectare lifestyle property in a rural area. Land is a much higher value for lifestyle properties compared to larger properties. I can't and don't earn income from my land. 4 hectares or less is not viable for an economic business and isn't large high value productive land.</p> <p>The Maharakeke Stream should be taken out of the Upper Tukituki Flood Control Scheme and be maintained under the Central and Southern Rivers &amp; streams maintenance activity and rated in the Rivers and Streams Maintenance Category. This would be more Clear and Fair, Simpler, and Consistent.</p>	

Maharakeke Stream has no hard engineering structure south of Highway 2. It has less maintenance work done on it than most rivers.

I have been paying rates for the Upper Tukituki Flood Control Scheme since 1995. I don't get any benefits from the Upper Tukituki Flood Control Scheme and no service has been provided to my property for it.

I live near the Maharakeke Stream. There are no stopbanks on the Maharakeke Stream south of State Highway 2 and no flood control works are done for it south of State Highway 2. The only flood control structures for the Maharakeke Stream is at the Maharakeke Stream - Makaretu confluence at the bottom of the Maharakeke Stream, north of SH2. It's totally unfair to rate the entire catchment upstream for them when we get no benefit.

Only part of the Maharakeke Stream is in the Upper Tukituki Flood Control Scheme footprint.

My house is on a high terrace above the stream. My land has been in our family for over 100 years and there is no memories of it ever being flooded by the stream. My parents would not have subdivided the land so I could build my house on it and CHBDC would not have allowed me to build there if there was a risk of flooding. It isn't in a flood hazard zone in the CHBDC proposed district plan.

The CHBDC have an esplanade strip bordering the river which they took when the land was subdivided in 1994.

My house has never flooded nor was it flooded during Cyclone Gabrielle and my house paddock has never flooded in living memory. The water has not even reach my pump shed which is lower down on the river bank. Only a small portion of land in the north-west corner of my second paddock was slightly flooded for a short time during Cyclone Gabrielle.

HBRC does nothing for the Maharakeke Stream which prevents flooding. Indeed we need a flood through it occasionally to clear the river of weeds.

In the Revenue and Financing Policy review FAQs HBRC said "Many rates charges such as drainage and flood control can be applied geographically. For example – flood protection activities throughout the region are funded by those properties which are directly impacted, and therefore receive the benefit."

This has not been done correctly for my property. My property was unlikely to have been inspected to check if it had been placed in the correct rating class for the Upper Tukituki Flood Control Scheme when my land was subdivided in 1994. From maps one can't see the high bank above the Maharakeke Stream which protects me from floods.

When the 11 class from the Upper Tukituki Flood Control Scheme were proposed to be condensed to 3 rating classes - A, B, C, it appears to have been done with a broad-brush and not researched properly.

In the Upper Tukituki Catchment Control Scheme the original 1986 rating classification notice U4 is stated as being the equivalent of Classes E & F. This proves E is more akin to F than Class D. Class D included the area between the Makaretu and Tukipo Rivers which is a flood hazard zone. There are some stopbanks on the Makaretu and Tukipo Rivers and more maintenance is done on them. In the Tukituki Catchment Rivers Ecological Management and Enhancement Plan - May 2017 Maharakeke Stream is not mentioned, the Makaretu and Tukipo Rivers are included. Even the maps showing the Upper Tukituki Flood Control Scheme the Maharakeke Stream is not shown as part of the Scheme.

The Upper Tukituki Flood Control Scheme Asset Management Plan 2021 shows there are no assets on the Maharakeke Stream though there is on the Makaretu and Tukipo Rivers. Gravel is taken out of Makaretu and Tukipo Rivers as part of the Upper Tukituki Flood Control Scheme maintenance work. Much more maintenance work is done on the Makaretu and Tukipo Rivers.

Class E should not be put in the same new class B with former class D and charged the same rating factor. It feels a rip-off for the amount of rates paid by rate payers in the Maharakeke Stream catchment and the amount of work that is done on our streams. We do not receive any direct benefit from the Upper Tukituki Flood Control Scheme Asset Management and any indirect benefit has paid for under the general rate for previous years.

To change the category of the Upper Tukituki Flood Control Scheme Class F which is classified as 'indirect' to the new Class C and describe them as receiving 'direct' benefit is wrong and dishonest. No properties on the Maharakeke Stream south of State Highway 2 receive benefit from stopbanks and river control works.

My U.T.T.F.C.S rate is too high when I no benefits from Flood Protection.

The reason my property wasn't flooded is because there is a high bank beside the land next to the stream and I am on a high terrace. Upstream and downstream the floodplains flood in high rain. Nearby upstream the large floodplain was sometimes completely covers. My sister lives upstream from me and all her flood plains and swamp was covered with flood water during Cyclone Gabrielle and in previous big floods. One just has to see the dirty colour of the Maharakeke Stream every time it rises during rain to see the erosion that is happening on our stream. Even walking along the stream upstream from my property one can see the erosion occurring along the stream banks. This is natural and preferable to man controlled waterways.

Most staff have never seen the situation of my property and the lay of the land.

Also each landowner is responsible for maintaining vegetation adjacent to the stream on their property.

*4. We are proposing three amendments to our Rates Remission and Postponement Policies. Tell us what you think.*

I think it is Unfair to people who have to pay all their rates. Remission should not be allowed.

*5. We are proposing six amendments to our Revenue and Financing Policy. Tell us what you think.*

Sustainable Land Management:

I am charged the targeted rate even though I get no greater benefit due to improved livelihood from my property and the surrounding area. I don't earn any income from my land, I have only 2.021 hectares of land with my house taking up some of it.

The Sustainable Land Management targeted rate and Land Research and Science Monitoring rate and the Water Quality rate and the Primary Production Pest rate, should exclude lifestyle properties under 4 hectares. This would be easily done with HBRC computers.

"Lifestyle land is generally in a rural area, where the predominant land use it for a residence. The principal use of the land is non-economic in the traditional farming sense, and the value exceeds that of a comparable farmland. A sub-category of lifestyle: It is improved to the extent where there is a dwelling."

The Sustainable Land Management targeted rate and Land Research and Science Monitoring rate and the Water Quality rate and the Primary Production Pest rates are totally unfair to small rural lifestyle property owners! Please be flexible and exclude properties under 4 hectares. Or reconsider and change the ratings and to exclude rural lifestyle property owners or give rural lifestyle property owners a rebate for the extra rates for burden you have inflicted on us.

I agree with Tourism funding being stopped and removed.

I also think the Regional Economic Development should be stopped. The government is telling Local Government, local councils, to focus on essential services and infrastructure.

The Upper Tukituki flood protection rate needs further changes to exclude the Maharakeke Stream.

The Public transport 10% indirect rate needs to exclude rural CHB rate payers who don't have access to the Total Mobility service It is not available to rural people in CHB so rural people should not be charged the indirect targeted rate of 10%.

The Total Mobility service does not give lesser congestion on roads and reduced emissions.

In the Regional Public Transport Plan 2025-2035 on page 40: 4.3.1, 65. HBRC will continue to provide the Total Mobility Scheme in Napier, Hastings, Waipawa and Waipukurau.

<p>6. <i>Other feedback</i></p> <p>I agree with the planned budget cuts. More should be done.</p> <p>HBRC should oppose the Tukituki Water Storage Project and any damming of our waterways, especially in CHB, and the Makaroro River and the Maharakeke Stream. No funding or advocating or giving advice or help for the Tukituki Water Storage Project should be consider or given.</p> <p>The NZ national Government is telling Local Government, i.e. local councils, to focus on essential services and infrastructure.</p>	
<p><b>Submitter ID: #154</b></p> <p><b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Ann Galloway</p>	<p>Napier</p>
<p>1. <i>How many years should Regional Council collect the targeted rate for flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream in the Hastings district?</i></p> <p><b>Option A*: Collect rates over 3 years</b></p>	
<p>2. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport?</i></p> <p><b>Option A*: A new rating method</b></p> <p>Sounds fairer to rate on availability of the service. (Although the graphs, maps etc in the consultation document are almost impossible to read.)</p>	
<p>3. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for the Upper Tukituki Flood Resilience Scheme?</i></p> <p><b>Option A*: A new rating method</b></p>	
<p>4. <i>We are proposing three amendments to our Rates Remission and Postponement Policies. Tell us what you think.</i></p> <p>Should never have changed to capital value in the first place.</p>	
<p><b>Submitter ID: #161</b></p> <p><b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Carol-Ann Guard</p>	<p>Hastings District</p>
<p>1. <i>How many years should Regional Council collect the targeted rate for flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream in the Hastings district?</i></p> <p><b>Option A*: Collect rates over 3 years</b></p>	
<p>2. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport?</i></p> <p><b>Option B: Keep the current rating method</b></p> <p>It might be helpful to consider a common/middle ground.</p>	
<p>3. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for the Upper Tukituki Flood Resilience Scheme?</i></p> <p><b>Option A*: A new rating method</b></p>	
<p><b>Submitter ID: #163</b></p> <p><b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Janece Price</p>	<p>Central Hawke's Bay</p>
<p>1. <i>How many years should Regional Council collect the targeted rate for flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream in the Hastings district?</i></p> <p><b>Option A*: Collect rates over 3 years</b></p>	
<p>2. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport?</i></p> <p><b>Option A*: A new rating method</b></p> <p>We have no choice with this - totally against being charged for this. We do hope rate payers will receive data over how the money is spent in CHB!!</p>	

<b>Submitter ID:</b> #169	Hastings District
<b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Rhea Dasent on behalf of Federated Farmers of New Zealand	
1. <i>How many years should Regional Council collect the targeted rate for flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream in the Hastings district?</i> <b>Option A*: Collect rates over 3 years</b> Please see FFNZ submission (attached)	
2. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport?</i> <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b> Please see FFNZ submission (attached)	
3. <i>Which rating method do you prefer for the Upper Tukituki Flood Resilience Scheme?</i> <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b> Please see FFNZ submission (attached)	
4. <i>We are proposing three amendments to our Rates Remission and Postponement Policies. Tell us what you think.</i> Please see FFNZ submission (attached)	
5. <i>We are proposing six amendments to our Revenue and Financing Policy. Tell us what you think.</i> Please see FFNZ submission (attached)	
6. <i>Other feedback</i> Please see FFNZ submission (attached)	
<b>SUBMISSION</b> TELEPHONE 0800 327 646   WEBSITE <a href="http://WWW.FEDFARM.ORG.NZ">WWW.FEDFARM.ORG.NZ</a>	
	
To:	Hawke's Bay Regional Council 159 Dalton Street NAPIER 4110
Submission on:	<b>Draft Annual Plan 2025-26</b>
Date:	2 May 2025
Submission by:	Hawke's Bay Federated Farmers  <b>JIM GALLOWAY</b> HAWKE'S BAY PROVINCIAL PRESIDENT Federated Farmers of New Zealand
Address for service:	<b>RHEA DASENT</b> SENIOR POLICY ADVISOR Federated Farmers of New Zealand
Hawke's Bay Federated Farmers welcomes the opportunity to submit to Hawke's Bay Regional Council on its draft Annual Plan 2025-26 Consultation Document.	

Federated Farmers is pleased with the reduction of this year’s average rate increase from the forecast 18.3% to a proposed 9.9%, and we congratulate the Council on finding ways to make savings and utilising its assets to provide alternative funding.

Federated Farmers was critical in our submission to the 2024-34 Long Term Plan last year about internal overhead costs. We noted that the [Annual Report for 2022-23](#) showed budget overruns in the group activities Governance and Partnerships, Transport, and a whopping 155% overrun in the Policy and Regulations group. We raised concerns not only about the increased budgets in the years ahead for these activities, but also that this level of overspend means that the ratepayers will be required to fund even more spending for these activity groups than anticipated. We are therefore in support of the reduction of internal staff and operational costs by \$4 million.

We again raise concerns regarding RMA planning where we fear the Council is making a rod for its own back by increasing the number of activities that require resource consents, and lower consent threshold limits, which not only puts a productive drag on farming, but also burdens the Council with a high volume of consents that need processing. We note that many irrigation consents have expired, sometimes for years, where the Council is not keeping up with consent processing timeframes.

**SPECIFIC CONSULTATION**

- **New targeted rate for post-cyclone flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream, in Havelock North.**

Federated Farmers is pleased that the Crown will fund 75.15% of the \$10 million work package for Mangarau Stream,

Federated Farmers understands that Hastings District Council has asked Regional Council to collect the local portion – \$2.49 million – and then pass it on to them, along with the funding from the Crown.

Urban ratepayers within the Hastings Rating Area 1 have the following differentials proposed, based on land value:

Differential Rating Area One Urban	Differential
Residential	1.0
Residential Clive	0.81
Residential non-urban (including townships & small settlements)	0.76
Horticulture farming	0.68
Central business district commercial	3.0
Other commercial	2.75
Commercial non-urban -peripheral	2.35

It is unlikely that farms will be impacted by this new targeted rate, however we support the proposal to target a rate that is ringfenced solely for this activity as a method that is transparent and accountable.

We wish the 38 Category 2C properties bordering Mangarau Stream all the best for repairing or rebuild their homes that were destroyed by Cyclone Gabrielle.

- **Total Mobility Service: Split the Passenger Transport rate to include an indirect CV targeted rate of 10% to be charged to all ratepayers in Napier, Hastings, and Central Hawke’s Bay.**

Federated Farmers understands that the Total Mobility Service is a door-to-door transport service by taxis, for people with impairments who have been assessed and meet the criteria. These people may be living in rural or urban areas, but will have the opportunity to become part of the scheme and receive subsidised transport when required.

The proposal included a new indirect Total Mobility Service rate to be charged on capital value and will be applied region wide (except Wairoa District because they don’t have an approved taxi service.) The average rating impact of the new indirect rate is reported to be \$8.46 a year. The proposal also has a direct rate targeted at all non-commercial/industrial ratepayers (eg residential, lifestyle) to pay 72.5% as a fixed charge per SUIP, which will be \$82.90.

Federated Farmers agrees with the balance of 10% indirect and the rest direct funding is reasonable, reflecting that urban areas will likely get more value due to proximity, but the Total Mobility Service is still available for rural properties that may need this door-to-door service. We support a targeted rate so it is transparent and ringfenced for this activity.

Federated Farmers suggests that the Total Mobility Service indirect rate be charged on a SUIP basis, similar to the direct rate. This is because the Total Mobility Service is people-based and not related to capital value of the property.

Looking at the CHB ratepayer examples, adding up the pastoral and lifestyle property contributions will total \$419.51, which if charged on a SUIP basis would be \$69.91 per property.

However we do not support a 10% indirect rate for passenger transport such as buses for the general population, charged to ratepayers that are not within the serviced areas. Being door-to-door and on-demand, the Total Mobility Service could be utilized by rural ratepayers, however bus transport would not be available to other rural citizens.

• **Split the Upper Tukituki Flood Resilience Scheme rate to include a new, indirect targeted rate**

Federated Farmers supports the proposal to for a new indirect CV rate to provide 10% of the total targeted rate which will be charged to all ratepayers in Central Hawke’s Bay, and parts of the Hastings district, within the scheme’s footprint.

It is reported that the Tukituki Flood Resilience Scheme protects around 24,750 ha and about 7,000 Properties within the scheme are assessed as high, medium, or low (known as bandings or rating factors) to reflect the benefit they receive from the scheme. Most properties (5,600) are in the low-banding. The average rate will be around \$17 a year, but high bands will pay much more.

Property Type	Bandings (or rating factor)	Capital Value \$	Option A: A new rating method	Option B: Keep the current rating method
			Proposed amount per annum	Proposed amount per annum
<b>Central Hawke's Bay</b>				
Horticulture	High, Medium & Low	36,400,000	6,231.98	6,346.32
Pastoral	High & Medium	5,100,000	3,368.20	6,249.12
Industrial	High	1,980,000	1,478.79	2,922.37
Residential	High	1,080,000	1,008.06	2,004.40
Pastoral	Medium	1,672,000	568.80	1,092.17
Residential	Medium	480,000	368.38	322.52
Lifestyle	Medium & Low	425,000	12.82	43.93
Residential	Low	245,000	30.02	4.37
Commercial	Low	102,000	11.90	1.68
Other	Low	51,000	5.95	0.84
<b>Hastings</b>				
Other	Medium & Low	4,790,000	695.88	87.58
Horticulture	Medium & Low	2,190,000	415.34	76.06
Pastoral	Low	1,580,000	163.14	11.53
Lifestyle	Low	620,000	64.02	4.33
Pastoral	Low	241,000	30.87	2.34
Residential	Low	150,000	15.45	1.10

Federated Farmers supports the consistency that the Tukituki Flood Resilience Scheme shares with all the Council’s flood schemes in that a targeted rate provides 70% of the funding and the general rate provides 30% towards repairs, improvements, and maintenance work. Consistency between flood scheme funding mechanisms is supported.

• **Changes to Rates Remission and Postponement Policies**

Federated Farmers is neutral on the deletion of the remission policy *Significant Impact Remission resulting from changes to the Rating Policy*. Only providers of utility network infrastructure were eligible for this remission.

Federated Farmers supports the deletion of the remission policy *Postponement of Sustainable Homes Voluntary Targeted Rate*. Other organisations provide assistance for upgrading houses to sustainable energy like solar power and increasing energy efficiency, like the [Warmer Kiwi Homes](#)

[scheme](#) and the [Community Renewable Energy Fund](#) which has 19 Hawkes Bay-specific projects run by the Energy Efficiency & Conservation Authority, and private providers like the ANZ [Good Energy Home Loan](#).

Federated Farmers is neutral on the amendments to the *Hardship Remission resulting from changes to the Rating Policy*. The purpose of the amendments is stated to make the policy relevant over time, but we do not see how this is being achieved because the policy's scope is now narrowed to only the first year of implementation of a rating change following a Revenue & Financing Policy review.

- **Removing the range under the description for the UAGC**

Federated Farmers is skeptical about the purpose of this increased flexibility, and that it's true purpose is to flexible downward so the UAGC can be reduced to below 20%.

In 2018, the UAGC was at 28.01%, however the 2024-2025 rates making up this category amount to just over 25.5% of Council's total rates, so there has been a demonstrated erosion of this mechanism over time. Removing the 20% minimum is concerning.

A full 30% use of the UAGC meets our principle of *equal benefit = equal rate*. Federated Farmers submits that more funding is shifted onto the UAGC and off the general rate. This will mean that all ratepayers are contributing the same toward the activities which provide them with the same benefit, rather than their contributions being uneven due to their differing land or capital values.

Using the UAGC fully is also necessary when there is no link between a ratepayer's capital value and the level of service they receive, such as the *Regulation* group of activities which provides equal benefit in that the Council's legislative responsibilities are met and the environment is managed in a sustainable manner. *Governance and Partnerships* should also be funded by the UAGC as it provides a complete public benefit that is spread equally across all ratepayers, and there is no extra benefit for high value properties compared to low value.

---

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.



**FEDERATED  
FARMERS  
OF NEW ZEALAND**

The Federation aims to add value to its members' farming businesses. Our key strategic outcomes include the need for New Zealand to provide an economic and social environment within which:

- Our members may operate their business in a fair and flexible commercial environment;
- Our members' families and their staff have access to services essential to the needs of the rural community; and
- Our members adopt responsible management and environmental practices.

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.

**Federated Farmers thanks the Hawke's Bay Regional Council for considering  
our submission to the draft Annual Plan 2025-26.**

<b>Submitter ID: #175</b>	Central Hawke's Bay
<b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Alister Miller	
3. Which rating method do you prefer for the Upper Tukituki Flood Resilience Scheme? <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b>	
<b>Submitter ID: #177</b>	Hastings District
<b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Emma Ellis on behalf of Hastings Youth Council	
1. How many years should Regional Council collect the targeted rate for flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream in the Hastings district? <b>Option B: Collect rates over 20 years</b>	
2. Which rating method do you prefer for Passenger Transport? <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b>	
3. Which rating method do you prefer for the Upper Tukituki Flood Resilience Scheme? <b>Option A*: A new rating method</b>	
<b>Submitter ID: #181</b>	Out of region
<b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Chantal Pagel on behalf of Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.	
	
<p>Head Office PO Box 613 Wellington New Zealand P: +64 4 38 57374 www.forestandbird.org.nz</p>	
2 May 2025	
<p>Hawke's Bay Regional Council (HBRC) 159 Dalton Street Napier 4110 haveyoursay@hbrc.govt.nz</p>	
<p><b>Feedback on the Hawke's Bay Regional Council Annual Plan 2025/2026 by the Royal Forest &amp; Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.</b></p>	
<p><b>Submitter details</b> Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest &amp; Bird) Ground floor/205 Victoria Street Te Aro, Wellington 6011</p>	
Contact Name: Dr Chantal Pagel	
<p>This feedback is on behalf of the organisation (Forest &amp; Bird), including its Napier, Hastings-Havelock and Central Hawke's Bay branches. The preferred method of contact is email, as provided above.</p>	

## Introduction

### Forest & Bird is New Zealand's largest and oldest conservation organisation

1. Forest & Bird is New Zealand's largest and longest-serving independent conservation organisation, with over 100,000 members and supporters. It is an incorporated society with the constitutional objective to

*take all reasonable steps within the power of the Society for the preservation and protection of the indigenous flora and fauna and the natural features of New Zealand.*

2. Forest & Bird's mission is to be a voice for nature on land, in fresh water, and at sea, by and on behalf of its members and supporters. Volunteers in 47 branches carry out community conservation projects and advocate for nature throughout Aotearoa New Zealand.
3. This submission has been produced by Forest & Bird and is supported by the local branches and their members.

### Forest & Bird actively supports conservation across Hawke's Bay

4. Forest & Bird has three active branches in the Hawke's Bay region and has expressed and acted upon a strong interest in the region for many years, particularly regarding the protection and maintenance of indigenous biodiversity. This has included advocating for greater protection of indigenous species through sharing direction in planning, resource consents and policy.
  - Our Napier branch cares for the Little Bush Reserve in the Puketitiri area, with a focus on trapping, replanting and maintenance carried out by our members. Our branch is also participating in several advocacy groups, watchdog groups and liaison with local authorities and Iwi.
  - Blowhard Bush is under the wing of our Hastings-Havelock branch, helping native species thrive. They're also running a Kiwi Conservation Club (KCC) to raise the next generation of nature enthusiasts and conservationists.
  - The Central Hawke's Bay branch is responsible for maintaining and enhancing Ōtaia Bush, one few remaining examples of lowland Podocarp Forest in Hawke's Bay. Our branch is actively advocating on behalf of our community and whanau for the betterment of our natural environment, particularly when it comes to access to clean freshwater.

### Forest & Bird projects enhance Council investment in managing its resources

5. Forest & Bird leverages private funding and volunteer time to help deliver conservation outcomes on Council land and therefore boosts the effectiveness of Council spending on management of its own land, on behalf of the people of Hawke's Bay. Forest & Bird also undergo activities focused on upskilling our communities, which supports region-wide outcomes and ensures ongoing success of conservation initiatives.
6. Furthermore, the work of Forest & Bird and its branches increases the resilience of Hawke's Bay by helping to restore and protect forest cover (preventing erosion) and stream margins (mitigating flood severity).

### The annual plan needs to address Hawke's Bay's urgent environmental issues

#### Investment in conservation is needed to help keep Hawke's Bay a great region

7. Aotearoa New Zealand is currently facing a biodiversity crisis. Four-thousand of our species are threatened or at risk of extinction. This is largely due to increasing pressures from invasive pests, land use, and climate change<sup>1</sup>. Hawke's Bay is no exception to these crises.

8. HBRC has the responsibility of sustainably managing the natural and physical resources in its region to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; to safeguard the life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil, and ecosystems; and to avoid, remedy, or mitigate any adverse effects of activities on the environment.
9. When nature thrives, our communities thrive. Healthy native forests, wetlands, and rivers sequester carbon, provide habitat for native species, filter freshwater, and protect us from floods and droughts.

#### **Hawke's Bay and Biodiversity**

10. HBRC should also ensure all work and priorities are in accordance with the Aotearoa New Zealand Biodiversity Strategy<sup>2</sup>.
11. This means significant Council investment is needed to address these challenges to help maintain the quality of life that residents value.
12. Due to this, we are alarmed that Council is considering cutting funding to protect indigenous biodiversity as part of the current Annual Plan consultation, particularly when long-term planning budgeted for a spending increase.
13. We are concerned that the decision included in the current Annual Plan consultation may indicate to Hawke's Bay ratepayers that indigenous biodiversity is not a priority. It is crucial to communicate that healthy ecosystems are essential, not just a "nice to have." This is especially important for the implementation of nature-based solutions for flood mitigation. Thriving ecosystems, such as riparian protection and wetland development, are key factors in ensuring these solutions are effective.
14. It therefore seems contradicting to cut funding for 'the cornerstone of protecting indigenous biodiversity', the Priority Ecosystem Programme. Recognising that as well as being vitally important for its own sake, nature is an asset that provides HBRC with services that it cannot afford to lose.
15. Further, we're concerned about the impact of the proposed budget cuts on community-led conservation projects. Our communities continue to put in the mahi to preserve what nature is left and create new spaces for nature to thrive. Across multiple organisations and thousands of hours of volunteer commitment we have seen pest populations managed (in some cases eradicated), wetlands replanted and urban ngahere (forest) established and maintained.
16. All these efforts contribute to the mitigation and adaption to climate change and the preservation and enhancement of the habitat our indigenous species depend on. With a healthy natural environment comes a healthy society<sup>3</sup>.

#### **Hawke's Bay needs to invest in ecosystem services to strengthen climate change resilience**

17. There are many benefits, known as 'ecosystem services' provided by a well-functioning natural environment and the indigenous biodiversity within<sup>4</sup>. Ecosystem services are a great way to relate the presence and health of biodiversity to our built environments and the people which inhabit them. Following the devastating events Hawke's Bay experienced

in 2023, we need the budget to reflect the urgency needed to work with, not against, nature.

18. Nature-based solutions are defined as “actions to protect, conserve, restore, sustainably use and manage natural or modified terrestrial, freshwater, coastal and marine ecosystems, which address social, economic and environmental challenges effectively and adaptively, while simultaneously providing human well-being, ecosystem services and resilience and biodiversity”<sup>5</sup>.

In the context of infrastructure, nature-based solutions may include some of the following:

- Daylighting streams and making room for rivers<sup>6</sup>
  - Permeable paths
  - Urban forests<sup>7</sup>
  - Green roofs
  - Green corridors
  - Rain gardens
  - (indigenous) swales
  - Floodable parks
  - Wetland restoration<sup>8</sup>
19. While it is important to integrate more healthy green spaces/nature-based solutions in our urban environment, such as those listed above, it is also crucial that we protect and enhance those already present. It is estimated that nature-based solutions can provide 37% of the mitigation until 2030 to achieve the targets of the Paris Agreement <sup>9</sup>.
20. Looking after nature also means prioritising the extension of native forests and their protection through holistic pest-control.
21. Native forests have been recognised by the Climate Change Commission as nationally significant carbon sinks that are vital to climate protection efforts. The Commission has called for a massive forest restoration programme alongside a ramped-up browsing pest and weed control programme to protect all existing native forests.
22. Introduced browsers such as deer, pigs and goats have been eating their way through native forests, shrubland, and tussock lands. The combined impact of these animals consuming seedlings, leaf litter, leaves, buds, bark, and branches and killing trees has significantly reduced the natural ability of native habitats to lock in carbon, to hold the whenua together, and to absorb and slow the movement of water.
23. Therefore, the funding and implementation of browser control is critical for flood mitigation and must not be overlooked.

#### **Recommended Budget Decisions**

##### **24. Biodiversity**

While we appreciate current efforts by Council to protect the regions precious biodiversity, we believe the resourcing of these efforts could be significantly increased. A report released by the Environmental Defence Society last year highlighted the unfortunate fact that

Hawke’s Bay Regional Council is allocating only 1.6% of rates revenue directly to biodiversity<sup>10</sup>. This positions Hawke’s Bay Regional Council third to last of all regional and

unitary councils for relative biodiversity spending. Given the region's growing population and urban environment, coupled with the degraded environmental measures (as mentioned above), it's essential that the Council appropriately fund biodiversity. To meet the national biodiversity spending average of 5.3%, Council would need to make significant adjustments across the budget, prioritising rates income to ensure the life-supporting capacity provided by healthy biodiversity remains. We know that appropriately resourcing this spending now will save ratepayers in the future<sup>11</sup>.

#### 25. Freshwater and flood resilience

We call on Council to prioritise:

- Protecting communities and enhancing environmental health by ensuring funding for Making Room for Rivers is complete and sustainable.
- Increasing resourcing, ideally through 'user pays', for compliance monitoring relevant to significant earthworks to decrease sedimentation in the regions fresh water and marine environment.
- Implement and fund a nature-based solutions strategy to ensure freshwater and the wider natural environment is protected as the region's urban areas grow.

#### 26. Local board priorities

Forest & Bird support the following local board priorities throughout the region:

- Funding and support for community driven environmental work (e.g., habitat restoration, plant and animal pest control).
- Funding and support for community groups that focus on climate action (e.g., waste, active transport, education, etc).
- Growth of active transport networks such as cycleways and walkways.
- Establishment and development of green corridors.
- Development and implementation of Climate Action Plans.
- Circular economy strategies and actions.

#### **Conclusion**

In dealing with the dual crises of climate and biodiversity, no single portfolio can be looked upon in isolation. Integrating ideas, proper resourcing and working effectively with others while being inclusive of those in the community with knowledge and expertise, will help achieve environmental outcomes and climate resilience, faster. Nature-based solutions rely on healthy ecosystems and nature needs to be prioritised by local authorities.

Forest & Bird strongly supports innovative green funding mechanisms to deal with climate change, on the condition that nature-based solutions cut across all portfolios and underpin any climate change action plan for Hawke's Bay.

Hawke's Bay Regional Council has a crucial role to play in helping the nation meet our climate obligations. We must also ensure action is taken to protect our amazing natural environment and the precious species which call it home, so, in turn, Papatūānuku can protect us.

We thank you for the opportunity to submit and look forward to seeing a shift in priorities. We wish you all the best in your deliberations.

(Signed)

Dr Chantal Pagel

<p><b>Regional Conservation Manager (RCM) – Bay of Plenty and East Coast</b>                  Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated.</p> <p><sup>1</sup> <a href="https://www.doc.govt.nz/globalassets/documents/conservation/biodiversity/anzbs-2020.pdf">https://www.doc.govt.nz/globalassets/documents/conservation/biodiversity/anzbs-2020.pdf</a>  <sup>2</sup> <a href="https://www.doc.govt.nz/nature/biodiversity/aotearoa-new-zealand-biodiversity-strategy/">https://www.doc.govt.nz/nature/biodiversity/aotearoa-new-zealand-biodiversity-strategy/</a>  <sup>3</sup> <a href="https://www.weforum.org/stories/2020/05/5-reasons-why-biodiversity-matters-human-health-economies-business-wellbeing-coronavirus-covid19-animals-nature-ecosystems/">https://www.weforum.org/stories/2020/05/5-reasons-why-biodiversity-matters-human-health-economies-business-wellbeing-coronavirus-covid19-animals-nature-ecosystems/</a>  <sup>4</sup> <a href="https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/environment/what-we-do-to-help-environment/Documents/indigenous-biodiversity-strategy.pdf%20">https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/environment/what-we-do-to-help-environment/Documents/indigenous-biodiversity-strategy.pdf%20</a>  <sup>5</sup> <a href="https://wwf.panda.org/wwf_news/?5226891/nature-based-solutions-UNEA">https://wwf.panda.org/wwf_news/?5226891/nature-based-solutions-UNEA</a>  <sup>6</sup> <a href="https://www.forestandbird.org.nz/resources/tukua-nga-awa-kia-rere-making-room-rivers">https://www.forestandbird.org.nz/resources/tukua-nga-awa-kia-rere-making-room-rivers</a>  <sup>7</sup> <a href="https://openknowledge.fao.org/items/72d6e8ed-90ff-4f61-a54b-00e57e3c4ad3">https://openknowledge.fao.org/items/72d6e8ed-90ff-4f61-a54b-00e57e3c4ad3</a>  <sup>8</sup> <a href="https://www.forestandbird.org.nz/sites/default/files/2022-02/Every%20Wetland%20Counts%20brochure_1.pdf">https://www.forestandbird.org.nz/sites/default/files/2022-02/Every%20Wetland%20Counts%20brochure_1.pdf</a>  <sup>9</sup> <a href="https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2022/05/19/what-you-need-to-know-about-nature-based-solutions-to-climate-change#:~:text=Nature%2Dbased%20solutions%20are%20actions,well%2Dbeing%20and%20biodiversity%20benefits">https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2022/05/19/what-you-need-to-know-about-nature-based-solutions-to-climate-change#:~:text=Nature%2Dbased%20solutions%20are%20actions,well%2Dbeing%20and%20biodiversity%20benefits</a>  <sup>10</sup> <a href="https://eds.org.nz/wp-content/uploads/2024/08/Restoring-Nature-Report-FINAL-web.pdf">https://eds.org.nz/wp-content/uploads/2024/08/Restoring-Nature-Report-FINAL-web.pdf</a> Figure 11.4  <sup>11</sup> <a href="https://wwf.org.nz/sites/default/files/2024-11/A%20Nature%20Positive%20Aotearoa.pdf">https://wwf.org.nz/sites/default/files/2024-11/A%20Nature%20Positive%20Aotearoa.pdf</a></p>	
<p><b>Submitter ID: #183</b></p>	<p>Hastings District</p>
<p><b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Stuart Taylor</p>	
<p>1. <i>How many years should Regional Council collect the targeted rate for flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream in the Hastings district?</i></p> <p><b>Option B: Collect rates over 20 years</b></p> <p>I am very concerned regarding the completeness of the works proposed for the flood protection in Mangarau Stream. The works proposed on the lower Mangarau Stream do not correspond with the Tonkin &amp; Taylor engineering report that has been proposed as a solution. In particular, the widening of the stream does not continue the proposed length, which will result in a bottle neck and future flooding as a result. I request a full independent review of the proposed flood protection works including an impact assessment and flood modeling for the catchment.</p>	
<p>6. <i>Other feedback</i></p> <p>I am very concerned regarding the completeness of the works proposed for the flood protection in Mangarau Stream. The works proposed on the lower Mangarau Stream do not correspond with the Tonkin &amp; Taylor engineering report that has been proposed as a solution. In particular, the widening of the stream does not continue the proposed length, which will result in a bottle neck and future flooding as a result. I request a full independent review of the proposed flood protection works including an impact assessment and flood modeling for the catchment.</p>	
<p><b>Submitter ID: #184</b></p>	<p>Hastings District</p>
<p><b>Name/(Organisation):</b> Tim Wilkins on behalf of Greenstone Land Developments Limited</p>	
<p>1. <i>How many years should Regional Council collect the targeted rate for flood resilience work for Mangarau Stream in the Hastings district?</i></p> <p>We object to the targeted rates at 32 Keirunga Rd, Havelock Nth. Greenstone Land Developments Ltd. land.</p>	

## Have Your Say Hawke's Bay

### HBRC's resilience-focused Annual Plan 2025-26

#### Social media posts, comments, and replies

31 March – 2 May 2025

#### March 31

**Hawke's Bay Regional Council** Published by Amber Roydhouse-Ross  
 March 31

Our resilience-focused Annual Plan 2025-26 is now open for your feedback.

We're bringing down forecast average rate increases from 18.8% to 9.9% and reprioritising to deliver time-critical flood infrastructure.

We want to balance affordability with action. Have we got it right for this year's annual plan?

Consultation closes 2 May 2025. Want to know more and make a submission? Check out our consultation page here: <https://hbrc.info/haveyoursayhb>



Views	Reach	Interactions	Link clicks
3,751	2,637	10	26
Interactions			
10			
Reactions	Comments	Shares	Saves
7	0	2	1

April 8

Hawke's Bay Regional Council and GoBay Hawke's Bay  
April 8 at 10:54 AM

We're proposing a new way to rate for passenger transport, focused on who benefits from having access to our services and who should pay.

Our GoBay bus service operates in the urban areas of Napier, Hastings, Havelock North, Bay View, and Clive. We also offer alternative transport options to support people with permanent disabilities across Napier, Hastings, and Central Hawke's Bay.

This was a big topic of discussion during our Three-Year Plan 2024-2027 and we want you to have your say on the proposed changes.

You can read more about the amendment here: <https://www.consultations.nz/.../amending-two-targeted.../>  
Make your submission here: <https://hbrc.info/haveyoursayhb>



Views	Reach	Interactions	Link clicks
29,393	16,357	50	284
Interactions			
50			
Reactions	Comments	Shares	Saves
19	18	12	1

Roger A C Hedley  
I'd hardly call it an "alternative", limited buses to te awa ,no service Napier hill , no buses to airport , some bus stops barely marked and or no shelters let alone even a seat at bus stop , if public transport in Napier was half as good as Wellington we would have a winner 🙄🙄🙄🙄

4w Like Reply 12

Hawke's Bay Regional Council  
Hi Roger, agreed Wellingtons public transport is awesome. GoBay are also proposing planned route changes which may interest you in checking out. You can have a look at the planned routes here and leave a comment on the map to give your feedback! <https://www.hbrc.info/haveyoursayhb> See more

AUJ.REMIX.CO.UK  
Remix

3w Like Reply 5

Roger A C Hedley  
Hawke's Bay Regional Council oh wow !!! Would be great to have a bus that traversed Napier terrace 🙄🙄

3w Like Reply 3

Hawke's Bay Regional Council  
Great suggestion Roger. Drop a pin comment on Napier Terrace that would be really appreciated. - Cheers, Amber

3w Like Reply 3

Tania Hutchinson  
Hawke's Bay Regional Council I would love a bus that went over to mitre 10 kmart etc in Napier. Also a couple of runs to the port on a Sunday would be great

Leanne Sutherland  
You could start by removing the transport rate from rural properties where there are no services available!

3w Like Reply 12

Nicki Guerin  
Leanne Sutherland word! Questioned this one when we got our rates bill but got shot down.

3w Like Reply 2

Hawke's Bay Regional Council  
Hi Leanne, the changes made back in February 2024 were specifically aimed at improving how we set our rates to make the process clearer, fairer, simpler, more consistent, and flexible. As part of this review, we adjusted some targeted rates, including the passenger transport rate as certain ratepayers benefit more as you mention rural properties do not. When the Three-Year Plan 2024-2027 was adopted in July 2024, it indicated that it would revisit the Passenger Transport rate which is what this post is encouraging. - Cheers, Amber

3w Like Reply Edited 6

Leanne Sutherland  
We got credited \$142

Continued

**Tracey Adrian**  
**Leanne Sutherland** yep no kerbside collection not on town sewerage/water. 😊  
 3w Like Reply

**Leanne Sutherland**  
**Tracey Adrian** same  
 3w Like Reply

**Hawke's Bay Regional Council**  
 Hi **Tracey**, both of these are the responsibility of the City Council. - Thanks, Amber  
 3w Like Reply

**Tracey Adrian**  
**Hawke's Bay Regional Council** thanks Amber. Just stating the obvious. 😊

**Tom Gainey**  
 Running 6 wheeler Bus on routes that 10 seater vans more than sufficient.if private enterprise was running the service it would a lot different.  
 3w Like Reply

**Yvonne Hewitt**  
**Tom Gainey** As it used to be.  
 3w Like Reply

Reply as GoBay Hawke's Bay

**Yvonne Hewitt**  
 It's easy to use public transport when you live on or very near the bus route. But when you have to walk over 1 km to catch the bus, and you are frail and/or elderly, that is not an option. So why should ratepayers living so far away from a bus stop have to pay for public transport they can never use? I think everyone using the bus services should pay per ride, and be able to buy multiple rides for a discounted price. This would make it a 'user pay' service and be fair to everyone. Therefore, every ratepayer would be free of this transport fee included in their rates every year.  
 3w Like Reply Edited

**John Kent**  
 How much are you paying for this dam now .Remember you have already spent the income generated by the Ōnekawa industrial area and other leasehold properties plus half the ownership of the port  
 3w Like Reply

**Simmy Jones**  
 Where can we find info on the Bee Card being discontinued later this year. What is the replacement? Hopefully not just cash or bank cards as it's not a safe option for kids taking the bus for school

April 23

**Hawke's Bay Regional Council**  
 Published by Amber Roydhouse-Ross  
 April 23 at 11:01 AM

Join us next Tuesday 29 April from 7pm as we chat with our Senior Advisor, Transport Strategy and Policy, Bryce Cullen.  
 All details in the event.  
 Bring your questions along.  
 📌 Check out the proposed new bus routes here:  
<https://hbrc.info/hbrcrptp>  
 📌 Have a read of the Annual Plan here:  
<https://hbrc.info/haveyoursayhb>



Tue, Apr 29  
**Facebook live - let's chat about transport!** [Set up live video](#)

<b>Views</b> ⓘ	<b>Reach</b> ⓘ	<b>Interactions</b> ⓘ	<b>Link clicks</b> ⓘ
1,642	980	8	15
<b>Interactions</b> ⓘ			
8			
<b>Reactions</b> ⓘ	<b>Comments</b> ⓘ	<b>Shares</b> ⓘ	<b>Saves</b> ⓘ
5	3	0	0

- 
**Glenis Libby**  
 Why do you give someone only 3 days to give feedback on this document?  
1w Like Reply Hide
- 
Author  
**Hawke's Bay Regional Council**  
 Morning **Glenis**, the consultations we talked about in this live have been open to submit and have your say on since the 31st March. You can check out the consultation here and it's got a timeline there as well 😊  
<https://hbrc.info/haveyoursayhb> - Cheers, Amber
 

1w Like Reply Remove Preview
- 
**Glenis Libby**  
 Hawke's Bay Regional Council sorry I thought it was the 31st of April.

April 29 (Facebook live session)

Hawke's Bay Regional Council was live.  
 Published by Amanda Dawson  
 April 29 at 7:03 PM Public

Let's chat about transport.  
 Here are the links discussed:  
 Check out the proposed new route map here:  
<https://hbrc.info/hbrcrptp>  
 Draft Regional Public Transport Plan:  
<https://hbrc.info/regionalpublictransportplan>  
 Make a submission through the Annual Plan here:  
<https://hbrc.info/submissionform>  
 Hawke's Bay Regional Council's Annual Plan 2025-26  
<https://hbrc.info/haveyoursayhb>  
 Read more about the total mobility scheme and check your eligibility here:  
<https://www.hbrc.govt.nz/services/transport/total-mobility/>

Thanks for tuning in!



Views	Reach	Interactions	Link clicks
7,442	2,663	33	5
Interactions			
33			
Reactions	Comments	Shares	Saves
19	12	2	0

KR Lane  
 Great to HB Airport served  
 Tw Like Reply Hide 2

Glenis Libby  
 Why do you give only 3 days for someone to read the draft plan, analyse it and comment on it.  
 Tw Like Reply Hide

Hawke's Bay Regional Council  
 Morning Glenis, as said in my other comment to you, the consultations we talked about in this live have been open to submit and have your say on since the 31st March. You can check out the consultation here and it's got a timeline there as well. Hope that helps.  
<https://hbrc.info/haveyoursayhb> - Cheers, Amber

Hawke's Bay Regional Council  
 You can check out the proposed new route map Bryce has mentioned here:  
<https://hbrc.info/hbrcrptp>

AU.REMIX.CO  
 Remix  
 Tw Like Reply Remove Preview

Hawke's Bay Regional Council  
 Welcome everyone, please feel free to leave your questions here. 🙏  
 Tw Like Reply

Deni Ewart  
 Why do we in whakatu still have to pay towards public transport in our rates but have no public transport through our area and now school busses are being removed aawell.  
 Tw Like Reply Hide

KR Lane  
 Deni Ewart one of the services will include Whakatu ( service via Clive to Napier

Hawke's Bay Regional Council  
 Morning Deni, the new proposed route 8 is going to service Whakatu. In this consultation we are also asking for feedback on that very issue of how we rate for passenger transport. As part of our current consultation, we're also asking for feedback on this when some communities benefit more directly than others as you say. The targeted rate for public transport has been updated as part of our Three Year Plan. When that plan was adopted, it was agreed we would review how these rates are applied, particularly where certain ratepayers either cause the need for a service or benefit from it more. You can read more about the proposed changes to targeted rates here (see page 24) [https://www.consultations.nz/.../amending-two.../...](https://www.consultations.nz/.../amending-two...). We encourage you to make a submission we appreciate your feedback. - Thanks, Amber

Continued

**Shanon Tait**  
 Will the MyWay service be staying?It is fantastic and has great drivers.

1w Like Reply Hide

**Hawke's Bay Regional Council**  
 Hi Shannon, in Hastings the MyWay service will end up being replaced with these new routes once they are implemented. Thank you for the feedback on our drivers!

1w Like Reply

**Grenville Eising**  
 MyWay service increase that .. most buses are empty.. have payWave too not just credit card

1w Like Reply Hide

**Hawke's Bay Regional Council**  
 Hi **Grenville**, MyWay service is being discontinued in Hastings in favour of these new routes once they are implemented. It will be more economic and although MyWay may well appear elsewhere in the region in the future in locations which won't support scheduled services. Buses are currently full at peak times and that's why we need all the seats, and it's not economic to have two fleets of buses for use at different times. Thank you for your question

May 2

**Hawke's Bay Regional Council**  
 Published by **Amber Roydhouse-Ross**  
 May 2 at 9:15 AM

Reminder!  
 Our resilience-focused Annual Plan 2025-26 is closing today (Friday 2) at 5pm. 📅  
 We're bringing down forecast average rate increases from 18.8% to 9.9% and reprioritising to deliver time-critical flood infrastructure.  
 We want to balance affordability with action and we need your input. Have we got it right for this year's annual plan?  
 Check out all the info and make your submission here:  
<https://hbrc.info/haveyoursayhb>



**Pete Rutter**  
 Good job you didn't try to impose 18% increase,or you'd have a riot on your hands

1w Like Reply Hide

**Kevin McIlroy**  
 Does that include dredging the Clive river

<b>Views</b> ⓘ	<b>Reach</b> ⓘ	<b>Interactions</b> ⓘ	<b>Link clicks</b> ⓘ
3,651	2,411	15	3
<b>Interactions</b> ⓘ			
15			
<b>Reactions</b> ⓘ	<b>Comments</b> ⓘ	<b>Shares</b> ⓘ	<b>Saves</b> ⓘ
11	2	2	0