

Tuesday, 8 July 2025

*Te Hui o Te Kaunihera ā-Rohe o Heretaunga*  
**Hastings District Council**  
**Council Meeting**

*Kaupapataka*

# Attachments Volume 1

---

*Te Rā Hui:*  
Meeting date: **Tuesday, 8 July 2025**

---

*Te Wā:*  
Time: **9:00 AM**

---

*Te Wāhi:*  
Venue: **Council Chamber  
Ground Floor  
Civic Administration Building  
Lyndon Road East  
Hastings**

---

**Watch Council meetings  
streamed live on our website  
[www.hastingsdc.govt.nz](http://www.hastingsdc.govt.nz)**

**HASTINGS DISTRICT COUNCIL**  
207 Lyndon Road East, Hastings 4122 | Private Bag 9002, Hastings 4156  
Phone **06 871 5000** | [www.hastingsdc.govt.nz](http://www.hastingsdc.govt.nz)  
**TE KAUNIHERA Ā-ROHE O HERETAUNGA**

| ITEM          | SUBJECT  | PAGE |
|---------------|--|------|
| <b>5.</b>     | <b>LOCAL WATER DONE WELL CONSULTATION AND HEARING OF SUBMISSIONS</b> |      |
| Attachment 1: | Attachment 1 - Submissions from Speakers                             | 3    |
| Attachment 2: | Attachment 2 - Tamatea Pokai Whenua                                  | 19   |
| Attachment 3: | Attachment 3 - Te Whata Ora/Health NZ submission                     | 23   |
| Attachment 4: | Attachment 4 - Maungaharuru-Tangitū Trust submission                 | 27   |



|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Speaking time</b>   | 9.20am                                   |
| <b>Entry ID</b>  | 944                                      |
| <b>Name</b>  | John Caccioppoli                         |
| <b>Do you live in town or in the rural area</b>  | Town                                     |
| <b>Area</b>  | Akina                                    |
| <b>Is the property you live in connected to a Council water service?</b>   | Yes – wastewater<br>Yes – drinking water |
| <b>Do you agree with Council's preferred option?</b>   | Yes                                      |
| <b>If not, what is your preferred option?</b>  | NA                                       |
| <p><b>Comments</b></p> <p>1. Support for the Preferred Model</p> <p>I support Hastings District Council's preferred option of forming a regional Council-Controlled Organisation (CCO) to manage the delivery of drinking water, wastewater, and stormwater services. This regional approach is a positive step forward, offering:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved long-term planning and service delivery,</li> <li>• Stronger financial capability and borrowing power,</li> <li>• Operational efficiencies through scale,</li> <li>• Consistent service standards across the region.</li> </ul> <p>To build public confidence and ensure equitable outcomes, however, the new entity must adopt robust mechanisms that guarantee fairness, transparency, and comprehensive water governance.</p> <p>2. Recommendations to Ensure Fairness and Effective Water Management</p> <p>a. Metering and Usage-Based Charging</p> <p>Charging a flat water rate for all properties is outdated and inherently unfair. It penalises low-use households and multi-unit dwellings while failing to incentivise conservation.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Install universal water metering.</li> <li>• Charge one base rate per property, with excess use billed according to metered consumption.</li> <li>• Promote water conservation through user education and clear access to consumption data.</li> </ul> <p>b. Support Growth Fairly – Review Export vs. Local Use</p> <p>While water shortages constrain new housing and development, large-scale water bottling for export is permitted. This creates a strong sense of inequity.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prioritise local housing, community needs, and regional development in water allocation decisions.</li> <li>• Re-evaluate high-volume water takes for commercial export that do not directly benefit the region.</li> <li>• Ensure water allocation aligns with sustainable, long-term regional priorities.</li> </ul> <p>c. Equitable Rating of Supplementary Dwellings</p> <p>Applying full water rates to supplementary or minor dwellings (e.g. granny flats, sleepouts, secondary units) on a single property is inequitable and out of step with their actual water demand. These dwellings often house family members, elderly relatives, or tenants with low occupancy levels, and do not place the same burden on infrastructure as standalone dwellings.</p> <p>Recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Move away from a blanket approach to charging supplementary dwellings.</li> <li>• Introduce metered or proportionate charges that reflect actual water consumption rather than</li> </ul> |  |

applying an arbitrary full dwelling rate.

- Consider equity-based adjustments, particularly for dwellings that share infrastructure and have demonstrably low usage.

This reform is essential to avoid disproportionately penalising homeowners who provide additional accommodation in line with intensification and housing supply goals.

#### d. Permanent Ring-Fencing of Water Revenue Within Each Council

To ensure accountability, fairness, and public trust, all water-related revenue and costs must be permanently separated from general council finances.

##### Recommendations:

- Permanently ring-fence water revenue and expenditure within each participating council area, and make this a foundational principle of the new entity's design.
- Allow only shared administrative and overhead costs to be pooled across councils, with clear accountability.
- Publish annual reporting on water revenue and spending at the council level so ratepayers can see where their money goes.

This permanent ring-fencing will protect local interests, prevent cross-subsidisation, and maintain clear accountability to each community.

#### e. Comprehensive Water Management – Include Allocation

Currently, water allocation is handled by Hawke's Bay Regional Council (HBRC), while the new entity will oversee service delivery. This separation can result in inefficiencies and a disconnect between planning and operations.

##### Recommendations:

- Transfer water allocation and permit management to the new water entity to ensure full integration of water planning and service delivery.
- This unified model will enable smarter resource use, better alignment with growth and infrastructure needs, and more responsive local service.

#### 3. Conclusion

The proposed regional water organisation represents an important opportunity to deliver safe, efficient, and sustainable water services. I support the preferred model, but success depends on embedding critical safeguards, including:

- Permanent ring-fencing of water finances within each council,
- Usage-based charging,
- Fair, proportionate charges for supplementary dwellings,
- Integrated water allocation under the new entity.

These changes will help create a transparent, efficient, and community-responsive water system for the future.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback.

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Speaking time</b>   | 9.30am                                   |
| <b>Entry ID</b>  | 203                                      |
| <b>Name</b>  | Jill Norman                              |
| <b>Do you live in town or in the rural area</b>  | Town                                     |
| <b>Area</b>  | Mayfair                                  |
| <b>Is the property you live in connected to a Council water service?</b>   | Yes – wastewater<br>Yes – drinking water |
| <b>Do you agree with Council's preferred option?</b>   | No                                       |
| <b>If not, what is your preferred option?</b>  | Option 3 (Hastings Council-delivered)    |
| <b>Comments</b><br><br><p>I don't want to be under a group regional CCO - keep it simple and under Hastings council-delivered - to heck with what the govt wants - they promise this &amp; that and give us S**t.</p> <p>I believe this little (whatever you call it) submission above is very biased &amp; leads people into the 1s option where they will save money ( and everyone wants to do that) but we all know how 'govts' can change their tune in a nano-second. So I will go with the 3rd option any day of the week</p> |  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Speaking time</b>   | 9.50am                                   |
| <b>Entry ID</b>  | 909                                      |
| <b>Name</b>  | Linda Gedye                              |
| <b>Do you live in town or in the rural area</b>  | Town                                     |
| <b>Area</b>  | Hastings                                 |
| <b>Is the property you live in connected to a Council water service?</b>   | Yes – wastewater<br>Yes – drinking water |
| <b>Do you agree with Council's preferred option?</b>   | No                                       |
| <b>If not, what is your preferred option?</b>  | Option 2 (Hastings CCO)                  |
| <b>Comments</b><br><br><p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment. As water is a precious, essential and a free resource, that is a basic human right to have access too, I feel it is important for it to stay very local. Hastings water for Hastings residents, run by Hastings residents that are voted into place by the locals and have chosen to live in Hastings. Decisions can be made quicker by people who are committed to the local community and live within that community, know the system inside out and what it needs to continue to run smoothly, and the challenges. They have local knowledge and commitment that cannot be fully understood by those in Wairoa, Central Hawkes Bay or even Napier, these districts all have their own set of challenges that they are more familiar with. Having a separate entity as in option 1, gives too much control of an essential service and resource to people that may not necessarily have the local interests or understanding at heart, because they haven't chosen to live there, and too much power over that resource. As a local Hastings resident, I would be happy to pay the extra \$400 per year predicted with option 2, if it meant Hastings council remains in control. Financially it might not be the most efficient option, but decision making would definitely be easier and would have our best interests at heart, especially with such an essential resource as water.</p> |  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Speaking time</b>   | 10.10am                                  |
| <b>Entry ID</b>  | 955                                      |
| <b>Name</b>  | Tawhana Chadwick                         |
| <b>Do you live in town or in the rural area</b>  | Town                                     |
| <b>Area</b>  | Akina                                    |
| <b>Is the property you live in connected to a Council water service?</b>   | Yes – wastewater<br>Yes – drinking water |
| <b>Do you agree with Council's preferred option?</b>   | Yes                                      |
| <b>If not, what is your preferred option?</b>  |  |
| <p>Comments</p> <p>Te Tiriti o Waitangi</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Te Tiriti o Waitangi put into writing out the expectations of the relationship between hapū and the crown. As the representatives of crown, local government is beholden to make effect to the text of Te Tiriti for the betterment of us all.</li> <li>- Therefore we expect the council gives effect to Te Tiriti by practicing responsible kāwanatanga and by opening space for Tino Rangatiratanga to thrive.</li> <li>- Te Tiriti also promises to hapū that they retain complete authority over their whenua (land), kāinga (properties and occupied spaces, institutions and homes) and taonga (all things tangible and intangible that are important to us). Water is a taonga and therefore council is obligated to ensure that hapū retain authority in this space as well</li> <li>- I recommend that council embed Te Tiriti o Waitangi into the constitutional makeup of water management for the Te Matau a Māui region.</li> </ul> <p>Mana Whenua</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- For Tino Rangatiratanga to thrive the council must include hapū in all levels of decision making processes and be given ample of spaces and ability to affect change.</li> <li>- I recommend that a Te Tiriti o Waitangi framework is developed in coordination with mana whenua that all local legislation, or policy created around the management of water must adhere to, whether within the council, the CCO or other organisations in which council (or the CCO) may contract.</li> <li>- Further i recommend that hapū (mana whenua) be given governance positions within the CCO with full rights to influence those space (i.e., having voting rights within kāwanatanga spaces)</li> <li>- Finally i recommend that hapū be given veto powers that affect their Tino Rangatiratanga. Such as mechanisms to protect their whenua, kāinga and taonga from exploitation, such as not having to pay for water for their marae.</li> </ul> <p>Community</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Currently the right of self determination requires significant wealth to access said right. Many in our community are stuck in poverty due to exploitation, through colonisation for Māori and other indigenous peoples and from historical class oppression initially in Europe which continued here in Aotearoa for many of our European poor families. This leads to insecure housing and lessens the access to water and other essentials of life.</li> </ul> |  |

- Majority of Māori and Pacific, black and some Asian communities experience insecure housing or are relying on whānau and community to be housed and to have access to water

- Rates are charged to landlords. Landlords offload the costs to tenants. but most of the aforementioned ethnic and racial groups are predominantly tenants.

- I recommend that a fund be created to support tenants in paying their landlords rates, also to support owners who live in their homes. I oppose giving landlords support to pay their rates unless they live in their own homes and don't own multiple homes that they rent out.

#### Privatisation

- The legacy of the neo-liberal reforms of the 80s and 90s weakened the ability of government both central and local to support our community, especially those who are most in need of support.

- The central government's obsession with state owned assets being financially sustainable and their equal obsession of taxing the poor while giving benefits to the rich and corporations has meant that the working class on a continual basis has had to bail out state owned assets, and formally state owned assets.

- I recommend that the council write into the constitution and policy of the CCO anti-privatisation mechanisms.

- I recommend that these anti-privatisation mechanisms protect from privatisation even if the CCO requires a bail out, and that no justification is enough to privatise.

#### Bail outs and unforeseen Costs

- The cost of Cyclone Gabriel fell on working class people through the rates process and the central govt. tax system which working class people prop up.

- Last year Water Wise in Auckland had to be bailed out to the tune of \$250 million.

- I recommend that the council push for a MOU (or similar) with central government for them to wear the costs of a CCO that requires to be bailed out.

- I recommend that the council collectivise with councils across Aotearoa to garner support for this MOU

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Speaking time</b>  | 10.50am                                |
| <b>Entry ID</b>   | 22                                     |
| <b>Name</b>   | Angela Hair                            |
| <b>Do you live in town or in the rural area</b>   | Rural                                  |
| <b>Area</b>   | TukiTuki                               |
| <b>Is the property you live in connected to a Council water service?</b>  | No – wastewater<br>No – drinking water |
| <b>Do you agree with Council's preferred option?</b>  | Yes                                    |
| <b>If not, what is your preferred option?</b>   | NA                                     |
| <b>Comments</b><br><br>I agree to Option 1 Regional approach as this may help the Councils to be strong enough to stand against government overreach - like forcing Hastings District Council to put a known neurotoxin like HFSA into the drinking water. The government has Napier and Wairoa next on the list. Only Central Hawkes Bay have resisted the government's carrot and stick approach. The right for everyone to choose what they put into their body is fundamental to good health and politicians, councils, doctors and dentists have a responsibility to First Do No Harm. |  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Speaking time</b>  | 11.00am                                |
| <b>Entry ID</b>   | 965                                    |
| <b>Name</b>   | David Scott                            |
| <b>Do you live in town or in the rural area</b>   | Rural                                  |
| <b>Area</b>   | Havelock North                         |
| <b>Is the property you live in connected to a Council water service?</b>  | No – wastewater<br>No – drinking water |
| <b>Do you agree with Council's preferred option?</b>  | No                                     |
| <b>If not, what is your preferred option?</b>   | Option 2 (Hastings CCO)                |
| <b>Comments</b><br><br>No savings will be realised by the Hasting's District Councils choice of option 1. The reason being, Wairoa and CHB, in their 10 year water costs per connections figures, will increase to \$6400 and \$7400 respectively. which are unsustainable for communities of their size and demographic. This will mean the Regional CCO ( Option 1) will have to make Napier and Hastings users subsidise Wairoa's and CHB's waters costs, or as the Major Water Services document interestingly puts it enter into Price Harmonisation. This will increase the cost to Hastings and Napier water users eliminating all projected savings.<br><br>Also under Option 1, borrowing cost will increase significantly due to higher financial gearing, for which lenders will require higher interest rates. Lenders will also require all shareholders in the Option 1, to provide Joint and Several Guarantees for all lending, including that made to Wairoa and CHB. This would make HDC liable for all debts of the the Option 1 organisation especially Wairoa and CHB. Both Councils are less financially stable than the other 2. |  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Speaking time</b>  | 11.10am                                |
| <b>Entry ID</b>   | 315                                    |
| <b>Name</b>   | Terry O'Conner                         |
| <b>Do you live in town or in the rural area</b>   | Rural                                  |
| <b>Area</b>   | Puketapu                               |
| <b>Is the property you live in connected to a Council water service?</b>  | No – wastewater<br>No – drinking water |
| <b>Do you agree with Council's preferred option?</b>  | No                                     |
| <b>If not, what is your preferred option?</b>   | Nothing selected                       |
| <p><b>Comments</b></p> <p>Combining all councils including Regional Council is the only thing that makes sense as the water is either taken from groundwater or rivers and streams which are under the auspices of the Regional Council. Storm water problems are also mainly related to rivers and streams under the control of the Regional Council. Forming a seperate water CCO is also a problem as it puts the people paying at arm length from those running things and they will almost certainly put up their charges way above those in the model. Also note that lwi are given a privileged position - they are treated differently to the other ratepayers who fund the bulk of the three waters.</p> <p>Council should be looking to create a fail safe resilient system and to stop the uncontrolled growth that is overloading all three water systems. The drinking/tase water pipes that were put in 80 or 100 years ago are not up to catering for increased growth, nor are the waste and stormwater systems which are now designed for catastofic failure -ie the waste and storm water default is to overflow into streams etc while fresh water is rationed or cut of. We need a fail safe system which can only be provided by each property having their own rainwater tanks and modern filter and UV system. Waste should use composting toilets. With both these systems in place the system should cope with the stormwater as long as the Regional Council puts in retention dams and recreates many of the swamps we have drained over the last 150 or so years. Technology has changed significantly so stand along systems make sense and we can get away from the reticulated systems that put us at risk due to the failure to do regular maintenance and also are fail safe in the major earthquakes we are overdue for.</p> <p>If you really want to get value for money give us one council for the whole area so we don't have so many councillors or council officers w ho often are doing overlapping jobs or even the same job.</p> |  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Speaking time</b>  | 11.20am                                |
| <b>Entry ID</b>   | 938                                    |
| <b>Name</b>   | Marie Apatu (personal submission)      |
| <b>Do you live in town or in the rural area</b>   | Rural                                  |
| <b>Area</b>   | Hastings                               |
| <b>Is the property you live in connected to a Council water service?</b>  | No – wastewater<br>No – drinking water |
| <b>Do you agree with Council's preferred option?</b>  | Yes                                    |
| <b>If not, what is your preferred option?</b>   | NA                                     |
| <p><b>Comments</b></p> <p>I support option 1. I belong to a local hapū, my whanau have lived and farmed my property in the Karamu/ Waipatu for many generations, I have no Council service connections but very much in support of a local regional authority grouping make up, successive governments meddled with and created grand idea policies and interventions that have created huge cost the us the tax and rate payers and led to nothing other than a waste of time and valuable resources.</p> <p>My preference are for the following reasons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A whole of region approach, tuakana teina, an equilibrium for the larger authorities i.e. Hastings and Napier rate payer base to support in collaboration with the smaller rate payer base authorities Central HB and Wairoa. To ensure no smaller authority rate base is left to stand alone.</li> <li>- The Hastings DC have made considerable advances and investment to upgrade network services following the contamination outbreak 2019, the greatest ever community impact in the world, we dont want this to ever happen again to any of our communities.</li> <li>- We the hapu of Ngati Hawea, Hori Hinemoa gave support to the waste management diversification system bio filter trickling system construction in the 1990's to serve and provide the urban base of Hastings Havelock North and Flaxmere. The waste pipe network extends over the fertile plains of Heretaunga going past our maori communities to East Clive. It is my wish that one day all the rural communities will be able to connect to this waste network to remove the hundreds of septic tanks off the plains.</li> </ul> <p>This is a potential groundwater disaster in the making in the long term, lets not repeat a disaster in the making to occur again</p> <p>The beautiful facility Te Ha o Waiaroha is a testament to the community and our Council to put real value at its utmost, water is a taonga from our Atua, however we need to ensure contamination i.e. nitrogen and other contaminants are not within the source. We should be proud as a community to have taken a matauranga based framework over managing waste and drinking water</p> <p>In the late 1800's there was a thriving aquaculture economy serving our maori people and communities, this unfortunately was overtaken with drainage schemes to turn the plains into intensive land use management activities. Our waterways are now contaminated drains i.e. Karamu</p> <p>My hope and vison for Te Karamu is a return back to the prestine vibrant waterway it once was and can be returned back to that state.</p> <p>I am happy to make a verbal submission to support this option</p> <p>Nga mihi</p> <p>Marei Apatu</p> |  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Speaking time</b>  | 11.30am  |
| <b>Entry ID</b>   | 964  |
| <b>Name</b>   | Marie Apatu (on behalf of Te Taiwhenua o Heretaunga) |
| <b>Do you live in town or in the rural area</b>   | Town   |
| <b>Area</b>   | Hastings   |
| <b>Is the property you live in connected to a Council water service?</b>  | Yes – wastewater<br>Yes – drinking water             |
| <b>Do you agree with Council's preferred option?</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>If not, what is your preferred option?</b>   | NA   |
| <p>Comments</p> <p>This submission is presented on behalf of the Community Growth and Development unit of Te Taiwhenua o Heretaunga (TToH)</p> <p>We support Council's preferred option 1 and the reasons outlined</p> <p>Our organisation mandate represents the voice and position of the 14 marae hapu of Heretaunga, community representatives proactive toward the active protection of all things (nga mea katoa) our values and aspirations for overall community wellbeing in regards to water in its various forms and association with community drinking water, stormwater drainage and human waste management.</p> <p>TToH collaboration with the Hastings DC over the many years reflects an enduring partnership taking cultural advice and input into planning key civil engineering projects, BTF waste management plant Clive, Te Ha o Waiaroha high tech community water treatment plant and the Cultural assessment for the HDC stormwater network</p> <p>We wish to speak to our submission</p> |  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Speaking time</b>   | 12.00pm  |
| <b>Entry ID</b>  | NA   |
| <b>Name</b>  | Heather Bosselmann (on behalf of Tamatea Pokai Whenua) |
| <p>Comments</p> <p>Please see separate letter in <b>Attachment 2</b></p> |  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Speaking time</b>   | 12.10pm                                    |
| <b>Entry ID</b>  | 313  |
| <b>Name</b>  | Yuval Sela (on behalf of his mother Naama) |
| <b>Do you live in town or in the rural area</b>                          | Town                                       |
| <b>Area</b>  | Havelock North                             |
| <b>Is the property you live in connected to a Council water service?</b> | Yes – wastewater<br>Yes – drinking water   |
| <b>Do you agree with Council's preferred option?</b>                     | Yes  |
| <b>If not, what is your preferred option?</b>                            | NA   |
| <b>Comments</b>  |  |
| None provided in submission  |  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Speaking time</b>   | 1.10pm                                   |
| <b>Entry ID</b>  | 156                                      |
| <b>Name</b>  | Rizwaana Latiff                          |
| <b>Do you live in town or in the rural area</b>                          | Town                                     |
| <b>Area</b>  | Mahora                                   |
| <b>Is the property you live in connected to a Council water service?</b> | Yes – wastewater<br>Yes – drinking water |
| <b>Do you agree with Council's preferred option?</b>                     | Yes                                      |
| <b>If not, what is your preferred option?</b>                            | NA                                       |
| <b>Comments</b>  |  |
| None provided in submission  |  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Speaking time</b>   | 1.20pm                                   |
| <b>Entry ID</b>  | 984                                      |
| <b>Name</b>  | Michael Newby                            |
| <b>Do you live in town or in the rural area</b>  | Town                                     |
| <b>Area</b>  | Havelock North                           |
| <b>Is the property you live in connected to a Council water service?</b>   | Yes – wastewater<br>Yes – drinking water |
| <b>Do you agree with Council's preferred option?</b>   | No                                       |
| <b>If not, what is your preferred option?</b>  | Option 2 (Hastings CCO)                  |
| <p><b>Comments</b></p> <p>My preference is Option 2.</p> <p>This is a precursor to moving to Option 1, with Option 1 being conditional upon the Councils who wish to move to a regional CCO model, also choosing to amalgamate their Councils into a regional Council.</p> <p>The reasoning being that the Hastings District Council should first setup the Hastings CCO (Option 2) for the right reasons to best suit Hastings District. This gives clarity in the planning of the needs and delivery for Hastings District, without being encumbered or compromised by the needs and wants of other Councils.</p> <p>When the argument to move to a regional model is promoted (by the motivated Councils who choose to move in this direction) the governance, structure, efficiencies on a regional basis will either make sense or not, and will reach agreement then or not.</p> <p>The risk of moving directly to Option 1 will be dysfunctional governance and relativity issues of priorities between the respective Councils. The Councils up until now (with elected members on a 3 year basis) have shown not to be able to form a cohesive narrative on regional issues of this significance.</p> <p>Until the Councils can demonstrate true regional thinking by amalgamating Councils and governance, above their own self-interest and patch protection, a regional CCO will not make sense. Maybe this is the issue that will bring a true regional focus.</p> <p>I write this from the perspective of a professional civil/structural engineer and property developer - developing and delivering these services for more than 40 years. I have also seen and experienced Auckland CCO's - Watercare and Auckland Transport since their inceptions. I can elaborate in more detail when speaking to my submission.</p> |  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Speaking time   | 1.30pm (TBC)                               |
| Entry ID  | 941  |
| Name  | Dr Nicholas Jones (on behalf of Health NZ) |
| Do you live in town or in the rural area                          | Town                                       |
| Area  | Hawkes Bay                                 |
| Is the property you live in connected to a Council water service? | Yes – wastewater<br>Yes – drinking water   |
| Do you agree with Council's preferred option?                     | Yes  |
| If not, what is your preferred option?                            | NA   |
| Comments<br>Please see separate letter in <b>Attachment 3</b>     |  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Speaking time</b>  | 1.40pm                                 |
| <b>Entry ID</b>   | 967                                    |
| <b>Name</b>   | Mark Kupa                              |
| <b>Do you live in town or in the rural area</b>   | Rural                                  |
| <b>Area</b>   | Hastings                               |
| <b>Is the property you live in connected to a Council water service?</b>  | No – wastewater<br>No – drinking water |
| <b>Do you agree with Council's preferred option?</b>  | No                                     |
| <b>If not, what is your preferred option?</b>   | No alternative given                   |
| <p><b>Comments</b></p> <p>I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed Regional Council-Controlled Organization (CCO) structure for managing water services. While the intention to enhance the Council's borrowing capacity and facilitate shared resources is noted, this proposal poses significant financial risks to ratepayers through increased debt and another layer of bureaucratic inefficiencies.</p> <p><b>Financial Risks and Bureaucratic Inefficiencies</b><br/>Handing over the responsibility of water services to unelected officials could undermine local control and community engagement. This shift may result in higher costs for services that our capable water services team can manage effectively. The current structure allows for direct accountability and responsiveness to the community's needs, which is crucial for maintaining trust and ensuring that services are delivered efficiently.</p> <p><b>Te Tiriti o Waitangi and Community Engagement</b><br/>The principles of Te Tiriti o Waitangi emphasize partnership, protection, and participation. It is essential that any changes to water service management uphold these principles by ensuring that Tangata Whenua are actively involved in decision-making processes. The proposed Regional CCO structure risks creating a barrier between the community and our assets, diminishing the ability of Tangata Whenua to participate meaningfully in governance.</p> <p><b>Current Reporting Obligations</b><br/>Currently, the Council meets its reporting obligations to the Government on water service delivery, allowing them to assess our needs for potential funding. This established process ensures that our water services are monitored and supported without the need for drastic structural changes. Before making any changes, a thorough cost analysis is essential to understand the financial impact on ratepayers.</p> <p><b>Need for Thorough Cost Analysis</b><br/>Given the uncertainties surrounding the proposed Regional CCO structure, it is prudent to maintain our local governance structure, which fosters community involvement and prioritizes ratepayer needs. The Council should conduct a comprehensive impact and hardship cost analysis to assess affordability and ensure that any decisions made are in the best interest of the community.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b><br/>Instead of rushing into potentially problematic changes, the Council should continue its established reporting process while exploring more viable solutions to serve the community better and protect our resources. Maintaining local governance ensures transparency, accountability, and the ability to address the unique needs of our community. We urge the Council to consider the principles of Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the importance of community engagement in their decision-making process.</p> |  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Speaking time</b>  | 1.50pm                                 |
| <b>Entry ID</b>   | 1051                                   |
| <b>Name</b>   | Tania Huata                            |
| <b>Do you live in town or in the rural area</b>   | Town                                   |
| <b>Area</b>   | Omahu                                  |
| <b>Is the property you live in connected to a Council water service?</b>  | No – wastewater<br>No – drinking water |
| <b>Do you agree with Council's preferred option?</b>  | No                                     |
| <b>If not, what is your preferred option?</b>   | No alternative given                   |
| <p><b>Comments</b></p> <p>I oppose the proposed Regional CCO structure to enhance the Council's borrowing capacity and facilitate shared resources, it poses significant financial risks to ratepayers through increased debt and another layer of bureaucratic inefficiencies. Handing over this responsibility to unelected officials could undermine local control and community engagement, resulting in higher costs for services that our capable water services team can manage effectively.</p> <p>Currently, the Council meets its reporting obligations to the Government on water service delivery, allowing them to assess our needs for potential funding. Before making any changes, a thorough cost analysis is essential to understand the financial impact on ratepayers. Given the uncertainties of this proposal, it is prudent to maintain our local governance structure, which fosters community involvement and prioritizes ratepayer needs. Instead of rushing into potentially problematic changes, the Council should continue its established reporting process while exploring more viable solutions to serve the community better and protect our resources.</p> <p>I wish to speak to my submission</p> |  |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Speaking time</b>  | 2.00pm (via Zoom, Perth)                |
| <b>Entry ID</b>   | 674                                     |
| <b>Name</b>   | Paul Baker                              |
| <b>Do you live in town or in the rural area</b>   | Rural                                   |
| <b>Area</b>   | Whirinaki                               |
| <b>Is the property you live in connected to a Council water service?</b>  | No – wastewater<br>Yes – drinking water |
| <b>Do you agree with Council's preferred option?</b>  | Yes                                     |
| <b>If not, what is your preferred option?</b>   | NA                                      |
| <p><b>Comments</b></p> <p>A solution that is safe, effective and efficient is required. This needs to be in a delivery sense for potable water, best value fiscally and acceptable socially.</p> <p>The current system not as safe or as good as it could be:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) for example, too much manganese and calcium in the Esk / Whirinaki water supply. (Black / brown water, at times, with calcium deposits in the kitchen jug and hot water cylinders. These hardware items need to be replaced periodically due to copper erosion.)</li> <li>2) \$700 per year is charged for water that is contaminated, undrinkable at times and limited over drier periods. It is not great value for money.</li> <li>3) Due to poorer water supply, many residents have water filters / treatment plants / ionization treatments installed at their own expense to counter water that stains, looks colored, erodes copper pipes and cylinders. (Domestic water filters will turn black at the input end with this council supplied water.)</li> </ol> <p>A larger more focused water supply organization would hopefully improve substandard water supplies. In the Esk / Whirinaki case, connecting to the Napier City water supply which extends from Bay View to near Kaimata Heights would be sensible. Hopefully the parochial intergenerational limited cooperativeness between HDC and NCC would be eliminated and the "best" solution in a given "bigger picture" would be implemented.</p> <p>I have little confidence in the current HDC water reticulation situation and have reinstated my well, pump and secondary water supply in the event that the council's water supply fails. Resilience is a key in a remote area as we realize that we are a much lower priority for water and council services generally than the urban residents of central Hastings</p> |   |



Friday 13 June 2025

Hastings District Council  
207 Lyndon Rd East  
HASTINGS 4122

**ATTN: Hastings District Council Councillors**

Via email: [craigt@hdc.govt.nz](mailto:craigt@hdc.govt.nz)

Tēnā koutou,

### **Submission on Local Water Done Well**

1. Te Mātai Ao, the environmental entity of Tamatea Pōkai Whenua, thanks you for the opportunity to provide a submission on this kaupapa. This response is informed by our review of the available material, conversations with staff at Hastings District Council and Central Hawke's Bay District Council, and feedback gathered during a mana whenua engagement with HDC on 9 June 2025.
2. As a Post-Settlement Governance Entity, we represent the 23 Marae and 43 Hapū of Heretaunga and Tamatea. This submission reflects the shared aspirations of our people across the rohe.

#### **Option 1**

3. We strongly support Option 1 as the only viable path to ensuring the long-term sustainability of water infrastructure across Hawke's Bay. While larger councils (HDC and NCC) may be able to manage their networks independently, smaller councils such as CHBDC and WDC do not have the financial scale to meet the required upgrades without regional coordination.
4. If Option 1 does not proceed, rural and under-resourced communities—including many Māori communities—will be disproportionately impacted. We urge Councillors to consider the regional equity and long-term sustainability that Option 1 offers.

#### **Mana Whenua Engagement and Partnership**

5. We understand that once an option is selected, council engagement with mana whenua will likely default to the minimum requirements under the Local Government Act 2002. As we highlighted in our submission to Taumata Arowai, the LGA offers insufficient safeguards to uphold mana whenua partnership rights.



Tamatea Pōkai Whenua

6. We commend HDC for their relationships with mana whenua to date. However, we encourage you to move beyond compliance and honour the intent of Te Tiriti o Waitangi through active partnership. This includes:
  - Establishing mana whenua representation in the governance of the new water entity
  - Ensuring ongoing engagement is meaningful, not procedural
  - Recognising that mātauranga Māori adds strategic value to infrastructure planning
7. We acknowledge that the terms “co-governance” and “co-design” have been politicised and undermined by the current government, causing real damage to the pursuit of genuine Tiriti-based partnership. However, this political context must not deter local councils from upholding their moral and legal responsibilities to mana whenua. Now more than ever, bold local leadership is needed to honour Te Tiriti o Waitangi and embed enduring partnership with mana whenua at the heart of water governance.
8. Additionally, we recommend that councils begin discussions now on the future governance model for Māori participation, rather than waiting until after a final decision is made. Waiting risks marginalising mana whenua involvement at a critical point in the entity’s design.

#### Governance Structure Recommendations

9. We support the creation of a CCO under Option 1 and the appointment of independent directors. However, we submit that clear selection criteria must be established, including:
  - Proven understanding of Te Ao Māori and Mātauranga Māori
  - Commitment to equity and cultural competency
  - Experience with community engagement and infrastructure governance
10. Mana whenua must be present in decision-making processes, not just as stakeholders but as partners. We recommend drawing on successful Hawke’s Bay examples:
  - **Regional Planning Committee:** Equal membership from each settled PSGE and regional councillors and responsible for making recommendations to HBRC on RMA policy decisions.
  - **Future Development Strategy Joint Committee:** Includes iwi and council representatives responsible for recommending a strategy back to the partner councils. This included the selection of a diverse and independent hearing panel members.
  - **Tangata Whenua Joint Wastewater Committee:** This was highlighted at the engagement on 9 June as an example of successful Māori-Council partnership.
11. We also encourage the inclusion of cultural values and aspirations within the new water entity’s Statement of Expectations. This will ensure that mana whenua perspectives are embedded into the operational philosophy and priorities from the outset. These models provide examples of what effective shared governance can look like.



Tamatea Pōkai Whenua

### Addressing Equity in Infrastructure Funding

12. We recognise that the proposed ring-fencing of funding for each council's water services aims to provide assurance to ratepayers. However, this approach risks entrenching inequity across the region.
13. Smaller districts such as CHBDC, with a limited ratepayer base, will face higher relative costs and fewer service improvements—disproportionately affecting mana whenua living in rural areas.
14. We urge councils to consider a collective, region-wide funding approach that ensures fair outcomes for all communities. Long-term infrastructure sustainability should not depend on arbitrary district lines.
15. We also note the importance of ensuring affordability for low-income households, including pensioners and whānau living in rural communities. These groups are particularly vulnerable to sharp rate increases and should be a priority in any transitional support planning.

### Water Use and Infrastructure Efficiency

16. Although water allocation is governed by HBRC, actual water use significantly affects infrastructure needs. Reducing water use can defer expensive upgrades and improve the health of our waterways. We support:
  - Universal water metering to encourage conservation
  - Leak detection and proactive maintenance
  - Public education campaigns on water efficiency

We seek a commitment that the new entity will prioritise these measures in its design and operation.

### Community Engagement and Accessibility

17. We echo concerns raised at the 9 June hui regarding limited awareness and engagement across Māori communities about this kaupapa. We urge councils to strengthen their communication and engagement strategies, including:
  - Direct outreach to marae and hapū
  - Use of community networks and social media
  - Tailored engagement for kaumātua and vulnerable whānau

Building trust and transparency at this early stage is critical for long-term partnership success.

### Conclusion

18. We thank Councillors for their consideration of this submission. This is a once-in-a-generation opportunity to build a water infrastructure system that is resilient, equitable, and inclusive. Option 1 provides the best foundation to achieve this.



19. We urge you to adopt Option 1 and commit to embedding mana whenua voices at all levels of governance and implementation.
20. We wish to speak to this submission at the upcoming hearings and welcome the opportunity to elaborate on the points raised.

Hai konā mai,  
Nā



Heather Bosselmann  
Principal Policy Planner  
Te Mātai Ao



13 June 2025

**Health New Zealand**  
Te Whatu Ora

To'osavili Nigel Bickle  
Hastings District Council  
Private Bag 9002  
Hastings 4156

Tēnā koe Nigel,

## Hawke's Bay councils' Local Water Done Well

This technical advice has been written by Health New Zealand | Te Whatu Ora National Public Health Service (Health NZ) in Hawke's Bay. The National Public Health Service is a directorate within Health NZ. Incorporating public health aspects helps to support the health and wellbeing of our communities.

Health NZ has statutory obligations under the Pae Ora (Healthy Futures) Act 2022 and the Health Act 1956 to improve, promote and protect the health of people and communities.

This advice aligns to Health NZ's commitment towards healthier and more resilient communities by reducing inequities and promoting good health, particularly for Māori, Pacific peoples, and disabled people.

Health NZ wishes to be heard regarding this response.

For any clarification regarding this advice, please contact Dr Nicholas Jones, Public Health Physician and Medical Officer of Health via email: [nicholas.jones@tewhatuora.govt.nz](mailto:nicholas.jones@tewhatuora.govt.nz).

Nā māua iti nei,



**Paula Snowden**

Ngāpuhi ki Whāingaroa  
Regional Director, Te Ikaroa-Central  
National Public Health Service



**Dr Nicholas Jones**

Public Health Physician and Medical Officer  
of Health  
Te Matau a Māui | Hawke's Bay  
National Public Health Service

## Response to the consultation question

### Do you agree with joint councils' preferred option for water services delivery – a regional council-controlled organisation?

On the basis of modelling carried out by Hawke's Bay councils for this consultation, Health New Zealand supports the preferred option to establish a jointly owned Council-Controlled Organisation (CCO) for water services delivery across the region. The rationale for supporting this option is outlined below:

1. The consultation modelling report demonstrates that a jointly owned CCO is the most cost-effective of the Government-supported options. The modelling projects lower household costs over a ten-year period. Affordability of services is a key determinant of household income which is linked to health outcomes.
2. A joint CCO has potential to increase expertise and capacity for the development and operation of water infrastructure. Strengthening the water services system in this way is likely to support better public health outcomes.
3. Health NZ agrees a jointly owned CCO could provide a stronger platform for meaningful mana whenua participation in water service governance and decision-making. This structure creates opportunities for more consistent and formalised involvement of iwi, hapū, and Māori communities across the region. It supports aspirations for partnership and shared stewardship of water resources. However, Health NZ notes that the effectiveness of this participation will depend on governance arrangements yet to be established.

### Why Health NZ is providing this advice

The National Public Health Service team in Hawke's Bay played a central role in the response, investigation and recovery of the 2016 Havelock North *Campylobacter* outbreak. The team remains committed to partnering with councils to reduce the risks of waterborne illness in the region.

Health NZ recognises the connection between climate change, infrastructure and community resilience. The proposed CCO structure has potential to enable a more coordinated and effective response to climate-related challenges. It also aligns with actions identified in the Health National Adaptation Plan.<sup>1</sup>

- LG3: Establish and strengthen mechanisms for working with local government, iwi, hapū and hāpori Māori and other groups on climate-related risk, adaptation and emergency response.
- KRA10: Assess risks from climate change to drinking water security.

---

<sup>1</sup> [Health National Adaptation Plan 2024–2027](#)

Section 13 of the Pae Ora (Healthy Futures) Act 2022 sets out the objectives of Health NZ. Under s13, Health NZ has an objective:

*“to promote health and prevent, reduce, and delay ill-health, including by collaborating with other agencies, organisations, and individuals to address the determinants of health;”*

Under s14(k), Health NZ has the function to:

*“collaborate with other agencies, organisations, and individuals to improve health and wellbeing outcomes and to address the wider determinants of health outcomes;”*

## The Havelock North Campylobacter outbreak

In 2016, between 6,260 and 8,320 cases of Campylobacter occurred due to contamination of the Havelock North drinking water supply.<sup>2</sup> This was the largest ever reported waterborne Campylobacter outbreak globally.

The Government Inquiry into Havelock North Drinking Water, drawing on a multiagency investigation, identified sheep faeces as the source of contamination. The most likely pathway was contamination of the aquifer from a stream near the affected bore. Multiple failures across regulatory and delivery systems were identified.<sup>3</sup>

Stage Two of the Inquiry made a number of key recommendations relevant to Local Water Done Well. This included the need to remove “all practicable steps” provisions from the drinking water legislation (Health Act 1956 at the time). This change effectively removed the water supplier’s ability to contest that complying with regulatory requirements was not affordable.

Other relevant recommendations included establishing and mandating collaboration between environmental regulators, water suppliers and public health (recommendations 18 and 31). Further work was recommended on the case for establishing dedicated water service providers and amalgamation of local water services. Information exchange and collaboration were deemed necessary to prevent information and regulatory gaps that had contributed to the outbreak. Dedicated suppliers and/or amalgamation were considered potential opportunities to strengthen service provision expertise and address affordability issues (recommendation 32).

As has been acknowledged in the consultation, the cost of enhancing water services continues to be a major challenge for territorial authorities. There is also a cost associated with not investing in water infrastructure. The cost of the Havelock North Campylobacter outbreak was estimated to be \$21,029,288. This estimate, published in August 2017, was anticipated by the authors to be an underestimate as further consequential and residual costs were expected.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> A large scale waterborne Campylobacteriosis outbreak, Havelock North, New Zealand, Gilpin, Brent J. et al. Journal of Infection, Volume 81, Issue 3, 390 – 395

<sup>3</sup> [Government Inquiry into Havelock North Drinking Water Report - Part 1 - Overview - dia.govt.nz](#)

<sup>4</sup> [havelock\\_north\\_outbreak\\_costing\\_final\\_report\\_-\\_august\\_2017.pdf](#)

## The importance of municipal water services for public health

The development of municipal sanitary infrastructure, including drinking water and wastewater services, has been recognised as a major contributor to significant reductions in mortality. These improvements were observed in the United States and many European countries during the first half of the twentieth century.<sup>5</sup>

One study found that the introduction of water filtration and chlorination systems explained nearly half of the overall reduction in mortality in the US between 1900 and 1936.<sup>6</sup> Medical Officers of Health (MOoH) and Health Protection Officers are responsible for aspects of wastewater and stormwater safety. This includes assessing risks and advising the public on potential exposures from infrastructure failures.

These functions are generally carried out under the Health Act 1956, although aspects of the relationship between Water Services Authority - Taumata Arowai and MOoH are set out in the Water Services Act 2021. For example, Section 35 (3) of the Water Services Act 2021 states that Water Services Authority must, on receiving notification under subsection (2)(b), notify the relevant MOoH that a notifiable risk or hazard exists.

## Additional comments

The joint councils' proposal defers a number of decisions that may influence the likelihood of achieving the desired outcomes. For example, the proposal states that assets and liabilities will be ring fenced, and charges will initially be based on service provision costs for each shareholding territorial authority. While this approach is understandable, it could result in higher service charges in some areas, particularly those with smaller populations and greater infrastructure needs.

Health NZ notes the current proposal does not specify intentions for public health or Water Services Authority - Taumata Arowai input to the operations of the CCO. Health NZ would welcome the opportunity to explore how the collaboration mechanisms proposed by the Havelock North Inquiry might be reflected in the new Local Water Done Well environment.

---

<sup>5</sup> <https://doi.org/10.1080/1081602X.2019.1605923>

<sup>6</sup> <C:\Working Papers\10511.wpd>

Maungaharuru-Tangitū Trust  
1st Floor, Suite 3B  
1 Wright St  
Ahuriri, Napier  
0800 TANGOIO / 06 835 3300  
Taiao@tangoio.maori.nz

12 June 2025

Local Water Done Well Submissions  
Hastings District Council  
Private Bag 9002  
Hastings 4156

Submission on the Local Water Done Well proposal

Tēnā koutou

Maungaharuru-Tangitū Trust and Hapū

Maungaharuru-Tangitū Trust (MTT) represents a collective of hapū in northern Hawke's Bay, including Ngāi Tauira, Ngāti Marangatūhetaua (also known as Ngāti Tū), Ngāti Kurumōkihi, Ngāi Te Ruruku ki Tangoio, Ngāti Whakaari and Ngāi Tahu (the Hapū). The takiwā (traditional area) of the Hapū extends from north of the Waikari River to the Waitaha Stream, southwards to Keteketerau (the former outlet of the Napier inner harbour) and from Maungaharuru (range) in the west, to the coast and beyond, Tangitū (the sea) in the east.

MTT is a post settlement governance entity established to hold and manage the Treaty settlement assets of the Hapū and to be the representative body for the Hapū. Its Deed of Settlement is dated 25 May 2013 and was given effect to by the Maungaharuru-Tangitū Hapū Claims Settlement Act 2014. MTT has approximately 7,000 registered Hapū members.

MTT provides preliminary support for the Regional Council Controlled Organisation

MTT supports, in principle, a Regional Council Controlled Organisation (Regional CCO) between Hastings District Council (HDC), Napier City Council, Wairoa District Council and Central Hawke's Bay District Council. We are providing preliminal support as further engagement between MTT and councils is required to determine how the Regional CCO would work and how it aligns with our values.

We expect the Regional CCO to be the most cost-effective option for our Hapū. HDC estimates this option will save residential property owners between \$2600-\$2800 over the next ten years relative to other options. Strict oversight of the Regional CCO is necessary to ensure this remains the most cost-effective option, through efficient and transparent use of funds. We do not want to see the water services bill unnecessarily burdening Hapū members that are already impacted by the cost of living crisis.

The Regional CCO provides the region with the best opportunity to respond to natural hazards. Our Hapū have an intimate understanding of the immediate and ongoing impacts of natural hazards. Most recently, 2,346 Hapū members were directly impacted by the devastation of Cyclone Gabrielle. Therefore, we support councils to have greater financial capacity to respond to emergency events resulting from debt transferred to the Regional CCO. However, we expect councils to continue engaging with MTT regarding investment in the takiwā.

MTT involvement in decision-making

Further engagement is needed between MTT and councils to determine how the Regional CCO would work. This includes (but is not limited to):

1) What governance looks like for the Regional CCO and how councils' make space for Hapū involvement in decision-making. This includes discussion about Hapū involvement in the Stakeholder Council and input into the statement of expectations.

2) What funding and allocation models are used and how we ensure all Hapū members have access to safe, secure and reliable drinking, storm and wastewater services.

3) How MTT values can be embedded throughout the Regional CCO's operations. This includes:

He Kāinga Taurikura (A Treasured Environment): Caring for and protecting the environment;  
Kaitiakitanga (Guardianship) building the understanding, connectedness, and involvement of MTT hapū with the environment;

Kia Niwha (Strong People): Building the capability (ability and knowledge) and capacity (resources and energy) of MTT hapū to achieve their potential; and

Kia Rawaka (Strong Hapū Economy): Building our hapū economy to provide the resources we need to plan and action MTT hapū dreams and goals over the relevant time.

We look forward to engaging with you on this kaupapa and finding a pathway forward that works for our Hapū and wider communities.

Nāku noa nā,

Adele Small

Kaiwhakahaere Matua | CEO

Maungaharuru-Tangitū Trust