

Monday, 8 June 2026

*Te Hui o Te Kaunihera ā-Rohe o Heretaunga*

**Hastings District Council**

**Hastings District Rural Community Board Meeting**

*Kaupapataka*

# Agenda

*Te Rā Hui:*  
Meeting date: **Monday, 8 June 2026**

*Te Wā:*  
Time: **1.00pm**

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

*Te Hoapā:*  
Contact: **Democracy and Governance Services  
P: 06 871 5000 | E: [democracy@hdc.govt.nz](mailto:democracy@hdc.govt.nz)**

*Te Āpiha Matua:*  
Responsible  
Officer: **Transportation Manager - Jag Pannu**

## Hastings District Rural Community Board – Terms of Reference

The Community Board is a separate entity to the Council. The role of the Community Board is set out in Section 52 of the Local Government Act 2002. Membership of the Board is set out in Section 19F of the Local Electoral Act 2001. The Council is authorised to delegate powers to the Community Board.

### Membership (7 members)

- Chair (elected by the Board).
- Deputy Chair (elected by the Board).
- 4 Elected Community Board Members.
- 1 Mōhaka Ward Councillor.
- 1 Kahuranaki Ward Councillor.
- 1 Takitimu Ward Councillor.

### Quorum – 4 members

#### DELEGATED POWERS

##### General

- 1) To maintain an overview of services provided by Council within the Community Board's area.
- 2) To represent, and act as an advocate for, the interests of the community represented.
- 3) To consider and report on all matters referred to the Board by Council, or any matter of interest or concern to the Community Board.
- 4) To communicate with community organisations and special interest groups within the community.
- 5) To undertake any other responsibilities that are delegated to it by Council.
- 6) To appoint a member of the Community Board to organisations approved by the Council from time to time.

### Long Term Plan/Annual Plan/Policy Issues

Authority to make a submission to the Long Term Plan/Annual Plan process on activities, service levels and expenditure (including capital works priorities) within the Board's area or to make a submission in relation to any policy matter which may have an effect within the Board's area.

### Roading and Traffic

Authority to exercise the Council's powers and functions in relation to roads within the Board's area under the following sections of the Local Government Act 1974:

- Section 335 (vehicle crossings);
- Section 344 (gates and cattle stops);
- Section 355 (overhanding trees).

Authority to exercise the Council's statutory powers in accordance with Council policy (including any relevant powers conferred by bylaw) over roads within the Board's area in respect of;

- Road user behaviour at intersections.
- Controls on stopping or overtaking.
- Controls on turning.
- Pedestrian safety.

- Footpath maintenance and improvements.
- Accident investigation studies, lighting and other safety works.

For the avoidance of doubt, nothing in this delegation authorises a Community Board to deal with a matter, in the exercise of delegated authority, in a manner which is in conflict with any policy or decision of Council or any standing committee of Council in relation to the same matter.



---

Monday, 8 June 2026

---

*Te Hui o Te Kaunihera ā-Rohe o Heretaunga*

**Hastings District Council**

**Hastings District Rural Community Board Meeting**

*Kaupapataka*

# Agenda

---

*Heamana*

**Chair:** Isabelle Crawshaw

**Deputy Chair:** Abby Morley

*Mematanga:*

Committee Members:

Peter MacLennan and George Macmillan

*Ngā KaiKaunihera*

**Councillors:** Elisha Milmine, Derek Nowell-Usticke and Siam Daniel

---

*Tokamatua:*

Quorum:

4 members

---

*Apiha Matua:*

Officer Responsible:

*Kaiwhakahaere Rōpū*

Transportation Manager: Jag Pannu

---

*Te Rōpū Manapori me te*

*Kāwanatanga:*

Democracy & Governance

Services:

Louise Stettner (Ext 5543)

---



## *Te Rārangi Take*

# Order of Business

---

### *Apologies – Ngā Whakapāhatanga*

- 1.0** At the close of the agenda no apologies had been received.  
At the close of the agenda no requests for leave of absence had been received.
- 

### **2.0** *Conflict of Interest – He Ngākau Kōnatunatu*

Members need to be vigilant to stand aside from decision-making when a conflict arises between their role as a Member of the Council and any private or other external interest they might have. This note is provided as a reminder to Members to scan the agenda and assess their own private interests and identify where they may have a pecuniary or other conflict of interest, or where there may be perceptions of conflict of interest.

If a Member feels they do have a conflict of interest, they should publicly declare that at the start of the relevant item of business and withdraw from participating in the meeting. If a Member thinks they may have a conflict of interest, they can seek advice from the General Counsel or the Manager: Democracy and Governance (preferably before the meeting).

It is noted that while Members can seek advice and discuss these matters, the final decision as to whether a conflict exists rests with the member.

---

### *Confirmation of Minutes – Te Whakamana i Ngā Miniti*

- 3.0** Minutes of the Hastings District Rural Community Board held Monday 4 May 2026.  
*(Previously circulated)*
- 

- 4.0** **Rural Transportation Activity Report** **9**
- 

- 5.0** **Annual Plan 2026/27 - Consideration of Submissions** **21**
- 

- 6.0** **National Environmental Standards for Commercial Forestry - 2026 Amendment update** **31**
- 

- 7.0** *Minor Items – Ngā Take Iti*
-

---

**8.0** Urgent Items – *Ngā Take Whakahihiri*

---

Monday, 8 June 2026

*Te Hui o Te Kaunihera ā-Rohe o Heretaunga*

**Hastings District Council: Hastings District Rural Community Board**

*Te Rārangi Take*

# Report to Hastings District Rural Community Board

**Nā:**  
**From:** Adam Jackson, Transportation Operations Manager

**Te Take:**  
**Subject:** Rural Transportation Activity Report

## 1.0 Executive Summary – *Te Kaupapa Me Te Whakarāpopototanga*

- 1.1 This report is to update the Hastings District Rural Community Board with the Rural Transportation Programmed Project Status and Activities Report.
- 1.2 This report concludes by recommending that the report be received.

## 2.0 Recommendations - *Ngā Tūtohunga*

That the Hastings District Rural Community Board receive the report titled Rural Transportation Activity Report dated 8 June 2026.

## 3.0 2025/2026 Major Works Programme

- 3.1 The 2025/26 financial year is the second portion of the 2024-27 Long Term Plan (LTP) programme.
- 3.2 The following is the status of the final Area Wide Pavement Treatment (AWPT) programme for the 2025/26 financial year and beyond.

| Road        | Section                           | Status/Impact |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|
| Kererū Road | Maraekakaho to Aorangi Road – 5km | Complete      |

| Road                     | Section                            | Status/Impact  |
|--------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Matapiro Road            | Km 0 to km2                        | Construction completed.  |
|                          | Km7 to km10                        | Construction completed.  |
| Mangaroa Road            | 0 to 880m                          | Construction completed.  |
| Soldiers Settlement Road | Puketitiri Road to Pekapeka Stream | Works are underway. Planned to be completed by May 2026              |
| Waipunga Road            | State Highway 5 to bridge          | Works are underway. Planned to be completed by May 2026              |
| Raukawa Road             | Various sections                   | Construction completed.  |
| Puketitiri Road          | Various sections                   | Construction underway. Works are planned to be completed by May 2026 |
| Waimārama Road           | RP 10.55 – 10.67                   | Construction completed.  |

The 2025/26 reseal programme is complete. All planned reseals were completed prior to the due date of 31 March.

#### 4.0 2026/2027 Major Works Programme

The 26/27 major works programme is detailed below. Depending on available budgets, not all of these projects may be constructed this coming season. Where that is the case, projects will be designed only ready for the following year.

| Road                     | Section     | Status/Impact                                     |
|--------------------------|-------------|---|
| Valley Road              | 2800-3220   | Design underway                                   |
| Aorangi Road             | 9560-10060  | Design complete                                   |
| Taihape Road – Section 1 | 21900-22550 | Crownthrope Settlement S curves - Design underway |
| Taihape Road – Section 2 | 27880-28160 | Otamauri S curves - Design underway               |
| Taihape Road – Section 3 | 28980-29600 | Lee Road site. Design underway                    |
| Kahuranaki Road          | 11250-12750 | Design underway                                   |

#### 5.0 Procurement – Rural Maintenance Contract

- 5.1 The rural road maintenance contract closed in February and the recommendation to award was approved by Council on 7 May 2026.

- 5.2 The successful tenderer was Fulton Hogan Ltd, and the Tender Evaluation Team were very impressed with the bid presented by them. This contract provides a step change from our previous Contract, which ensures we get value for money, and maintains our ability to be reactive when needed as demands change on the road network.
- 5.3 Representatives from Fulton Hogan have been invited to meet and greet the Rural Community Board today, and also to provide a brief update on the new contract and what the Board can expect to see in the coming months.

## 6.0 Bridge 253 - Taylors Bridge Update - Kikowhero Road

- 6.1 On 26 October 2023 Council resolved to stop the strengthening programme as the original target budget had been reached. However, the target number of bridges was not achieved.
- 6.2 At that stage, Bridge 111 Waikoau Gorge Bridge was approved as the last one to be strengthened. Thirteen other bridges were selected for ongoing monitoring only rather than strengthening. This has been undertaken on an annual basis for posted bridges and a bi-annual basis for others.
- 6.3 Bridge 111 Waikoau Gorge Bridge was completed in August 2025 and came in under budget. Since then, we have sought to use the surplus wisely. We have strengthened Bridge 101 Porters with the help of a 50% cost share with HBRC. And we are considering other “monitor-only” bridges.
- 6.4 While planning for 101 Porters was under way, Bridge 253 Taylors came up for its monitoring inspection, This was completed in January 2026, revealing at least five concerns:
- The strength of the timber deck in its original form was marginal. The maximum allowable axle load was 4,000 kg, compared to 5,200 kg for general access trucks.
  - The condition of the timber deck was marginal. It displayed broken and rotting timber planks and loose and worn fixings.
  - The landowners confirmed that the deck had been replaced in the early 1990s, more than 30 years ago. It was nearing the end of its design life.
  - There has been some confusion as to the weight limits of the bridge, as the posting signage has not always been present on site. So, farm service trucks continue to cross the bridge as part of normal farm operations. Drivers are ignoring the weight restriction signs. (stock truck and trailers, fertilizer trucks, fuel tankers, and transporters carrying earthmoving machinery)
  - This bridge is the only access to the fully functioning sheep and beef farm beyond. There are no other accessways.
- 6.5 The deck urgently needs to be strengthened as soon as possible. While the onus for complying with the limits falls legally to the carriers, we believe that Council itself holds serious safety risk, knowing the condition and limitations and usage of the bridge.
- 6.6 We have adequate surplus in the strengthening budget but have insufficient time to complete the works before NZTA withdraws the funds 30 June 2026. So, we will be paying for the design and some materials before 30 June but will be seeking other funding to complete the works in the new financial year.
- ## 7.0 New Zealand Transport Agency Update
- 7.1 Representative from NZTA will provide an update to the Board on matters pertaining to state highways in the region.

## 8.0 Works Update

- 8.1 **Attachment 1** provides the Board with a photographic snapshot of activities undertaken between April 2026 and May 2026.

### Attachments:

1 [↓](#) 33\_RCB Photos - April 2026 to May 2026 CG-18-07-0028

---

## Summary of Considerations - *He Whakarāpopoto Whakaarohanga*

---

### Fit with purpose of Local Government - *E noho hāngai pū ai ki te Rangatōpū-ā-Rohe*

The Council is required to give effect to the purpose of local government as set out in section 10 of the Local Government Act 2002. That purpose is to enable democratic local decision-making and action by (and on behalf of) communities, and to promote the social, economic, environmental, and cultural wellbeing of communities in the present and for the future.

### [Link to the Council's Community Outcomes](#) – *Ngā Hononga ki Ngā Putanga ā-Hapori*

This report promotes the performance of regulatory functions for the purpose of providing safe, reliable, and efficient transport networks.

---

### Māori Impact Statement - *Te Tauākī Kaupapa Māori*

No known impacts for tangata whenua over and above the impact on the rural district.

---

### Sustainability - *Te Toitūtanga*

This is a progress report and sustainability issues are not addressed.

---

### Financial considerations - *Ngā Whakaarohanga Ahumoni*

The works identified within this report are within existing budgets.

---

### Significance and Engagement - *Te Hiranga me te Tūhonotanga*

This report has been assessed under the Council's Significance and Engagement Policy as being of minor significance. Individual projects will have been addressed under the significance and engagement policy during the planning and decision-making phase of those projects.

---

### Consultation – internal and/or external - *Whakawhiti Whakaaro-ā-roto / ā-waho*

No consultation is required as part of this report.

---

---

## Risks

Risk management and mitigation issues have been addressed in project planning and organisational health and safety policies. The major risk noted in this report is the potential for increase in tender costs in the maintenance contract rewrite. There are many ways to manage this risk such as decreased level of service, increased funding (and rate take), loan funding projects and negotiations with successful tenderer.

---

### **Rural Community Board** – *Te Poari Tuawhenua-ā-Hapori*

The Rural Community Board will have an interest in the operations and transportation activities within the DRA2 rating area.

---

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p><i>Crownthorpe Settlement Rd: Sight Rails.</i></p>  | <p><i>Crownthorpe Settlement Rd: Sight Rails.</i></p>  |
| <p><i>Dartmoor Rd: Drainage Inspections</i></p>       | <p><i>Dartmoor Rd: Drainage Inspections</i></p>       |
| <p><i>Dartmoor Rd: Tree</i></p>                      | <p><i>Dartmoor Rd: Tree</i></p>                      |

*Dartmoor Rd: Debris call-out*



*Dartmoor Rd: Debris call-out*



*Dartmoor Rd: Clear Slip*



*Dartmoor Rd: Clear Slip*



*Endsleigh Rd: Drainage.*



*Endsleigh Rd: Drainage.*



*Glengarry Rd: Surface prep*



*Glengarry Rd: Surface prep*



*Glenogle Rd: Sight Rails.*



*Glenogle Rd: Sight Rails.*









*HDC Rural Network: Detritus Collection*



*HDC Rural Network: Detritus Collection*



|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p><i>Kereru Rd: Signs</i></p>              | <p><i>Kereru Rd: Signs</i></p>              |
| <p><i>Kereru Rd: Sign Maint.</i></p>       | <p><i>Kereru Rd: Sign Maint.</i></p>       |
| <p><i>Maraekakaho Rd W: Flooding</i></p>  | <p><i>Maraekakaho Rd W: Flooding</i></p>  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p><i>Ohurakura Rd: Drain Maint.</i></p>     | <p><i>Ohurakura Rd: Drain Maint.</i></p>     |
| <p><i>Pohokura Rd: Drainage</i></p>         | <p><i>Pohokura Rd: Drainage</i></p>         |
| <p><i>Puketitiri Rd: Signs Maint.</i></p>  | <p><i>Puketitiri Rd: Signs Maint.</i></p>  |
| <p><i>Ridgemount Rd: Scour</i></p>  | <p><i>Ridgemount Rd: Scour</i></p>   |





---

Monday, 8 June 2026

---

*Te Hui o Te Kaunihera ā-Rohe o Heretaunga*

**Hastings District Council: Hastings District Rural Community Board**

*Te Rārangi Take*

# Report to Hastings District Rural Community Board

---

*Nā:*  
From: **Lex Verhoeven, Manager - Strategy**

---

*Te Take:*  
Subject: **Annual Plan 2026/27 - Consideration of Submissions**

---

## **1.0 Purpose and summary - *Te Kaupapa Me Te Whakarāpopototanga***

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to bring before the Rural Community Board submissions of relevance to the rural area prior to Council consideration of submissions on 10 June 2026. Any feedback from the Board will be tabled at the Council meeting.
- 1.2 The Council have received a total of 431 submissions (primarily via its online submission portal). In addition, 280 responses have been received via the tear-off response form which was included in the Consultation Document distributed to residents' letterboxes. In total 710 pieces of feedback were received providing a reasonable level of community interest to help inform the decision-making part of the Annual Plan process.
- 1.3 In terms of the key consultation issue (the proposed rate increase) within the Council's consultation document the responses in total were as follows:
  - 5.9% option (69%, 461 responses)
  - 9.1% option (19%, 125 responses)
  - Other (12%, 78 responses)
- 1.4 The Council will be reflecting on the various themes within the submissions at their meeting on 10 June 2026.
- 1.5 Another key matter of interest to the Board relates to consultation on a proposed targeted rate for the Waipātiki Wastewater Scheme.

- 1.6 The Council have developed a proposal to upgrade the Waipātiki Wastewater system, to address the matter of the existing consent expiring and to address new environmental standards as they pertain to wastewater systems.
- 1.7 The Council has received feedback from 56 residents of the Waipātiki community which represents a significant response from that community. Those submissions are attached.
- 1.8 Officers are currently compiling a full response to the submissions in preparation for the Council meeting.
- 1.9 Finally, a submission has been received from Federated Farmers, who have been a long-time submitter to Council processes and advocate for the rural community and the Hastings District Council rating system. A key new point within their submission encourages Council to investigate a move to capital value rating on the general rate, which is currently set on the land value of property.

## 2.0 Recommendations - *Ngā Tūtohunga*

- A) That the Hastings District Rural Community Board receive the report titled Annual Plan 2026/27 - Consideration of Submissions dated 8 June 2026.
- B) That officers note and table any feedback from the Rural Community Board at the 10 June Council meeting.

### Attachments:

- 1 [↓](#) Annual plan - Submissions 2026/27 - Submissions - CP-01-27-1-26-0374  
374 Rhea Dasent (Federated Farmers)

HDC - Draft Annual Plan 2026/27

COMPLETE

#374

CREATED



PUBLIC

May 15th 2026, 1:44:04 pm

IP ADDRESS



\* Name

Rhea Dasent

Address

New Zealand

\* Contact phone number

021501817

\* Email

[rdasent@fedfarm.org.nz](mailto:rdasent@fedfarm.org.nz)

Please indicate whether or not you wish to speak to Council in regard to your feedback on 10 June 2026. Note: If your feedback relates to a rural matter, it will also be discussed at a Rural Community Board Meeting in June.

Yes

Tick the box below to indicate your preference for the proposed rates increase:

Option 1: Set a rates increase of 5.9%, which would involve borrowing \$4.8M this year and returning to a balanced budget in 2027/28.

What are the main topics you wish to feedback on?

please see attached submission from Federated Farmers

Please tell us your views below

please see attached submission from Federated Farmers

Attach a File

ffnz\_submission\_hastings\_ap\_2026.docx

Attach a File

# SUBMISSION

TELEPHONE 0800 327 646 | WEBSITE [WWW.FEDFARM.ORG.NZ](http://WWW.FEDFARM.ORG.NZ)



To: Hastings District Council

Submission on: **Draft Annual Plan 2026-2027**

Date: 15 May 2024

Submission by: Hawke's Bay Federated Farmers

**ANTHEA YULE**  
HAWKE'S BAY PROVINCIAL PRESIDENT  
Federated Farmers of New Zealand  
E [anthea@paranui.co.nz](mailto:anthea@paranui.co.nz)

Address for service: **RHEA DASENT**  
SENIOR POLICY ADVISOR  
Federated Farmers of New Zealand  
Ph 021 501 817  
E [rdasent@fedfarm.org.nz](mailto:rdasent@fedfarm.org.nz)

## INTRODUCTION

Hawkes Bay Federated Farmers welcomes the opportunity to submit to Hastings District Council on its *Annual Plan 2026-2027 Consultation Document*.

Federated Farmers has submitted on Hastings Annual Plans and Long-term Plans every year since at least 2008, which is as far back as our electronic records go, and we likely have been submitting for longer. We have great respect for long serving Hastings staff member Lex Verhoeven who has a fantastic knowledge of rating systems.

Federated Farmers' feedback represents the views of farming members and rate payers from the Hastings District.

We acknowledge any submissions from individual members of Federated Farmers.

Federated Farmers is focused on the transparency of rate setting, rates equity and both the overall and relative cost of local government on rural ratepayers. Rates are a significant expenditure for our members and value for their money is paramount.

Federated Farmers requests the opportunity to discuss this submission with the Council during the hearing process.

**SUBMISSION SUMMARY**

1. Federated Farmers prefers option 1 for a 5.9% average rate increase for the year ahead.
2. More needs to be done to reduce spending or even cancel non-core activities to ensure the financial resources available can cover core functions.
3. Federated Farmers strongly supports the two Rating Areas plus land use differentials that Hastings District Council employs for its General Rate.
4. These General Rate differentials provide better alignment between costs and benefits; an accurate reflection of land use impacts on council services; are less vulnerable to big valuation changes; and provide excellent transparency so ratepayers know where their money is going.
5. We submit that the Council investigates a swap from land value to capital value as a basis to strike the General Rate to ensure that all properties are paying more proportionality towards district services on their capital asset which more closely aligns with their use and benefit derived.

**AVERAGE RATES INCREASES**

Last time we submitted to Hastings District Council on its 2024 Long Term Plan, we expressed great concern at the astronomical and unacceptable 24% average rates increase for farms in Rating Area 2. At that time, it appeared that this 24% rates increase was attributed to a combination of the 2023 revaluations and the massive district-wide 58% CV increase coming into effect and impacting the General Rate, and the new Cyclone Gabrielle rates. That year, Hawkes Bay Regional Council rates were also going up an average of 19.6% so ratepayers were facing a double-whammy from both councils in 2024 - pushing the limits of affordability, especially when services are signalled to remain the same or even decline.

Federated Farmers is therefore more amenable to the option 1 of 5.9% average increase over option 2 at 9.1%. With the Regional Council applying a similar 5.2% average rates increase for the 2026-27 year rather than the 8.5% that was forecast in the Long Term Plan, ratepayers will be relieved that their councils are putting in some effort to respond to financial pressures and not further fuelling the inflation fire.

**Submission:**

1. Federated Farmers prefers option 1 for a 5.9% average rate increase for the year ahead.
2. More needs to be done to reduce spending or even cancel non-core activities to ensure the financial resources available can cover core functions.

### RATING AREAS

Federated Farmers strongly encourages the Council to retain its unique and sophisticated differential system with the two rating areas plus land uses within those areas.

We frequently uphold Hastings as a good example for other district councils to follow.

Federated Farmers is a strong supporter of the two rating areas because this system enables the Council to better match who pays with where costs are generated. This strengthens the “benefit principle” and transparency of general rating

Urban areas typically demand more intensive services such as urban-quality roads, stormwater, drinking water, and footpaths. Rural areas receive fewer network services like water, wastewater, household rubbish and recycling collection. Rural rating area two also has different infrastructure cost drivers such as length of roads rather than their density.

Using distinct rating areas that ring fence the rates collected from each area to be spent in that area, reduces cross-subsidisation between urban and rural. This also assures ratepayers that their rates are going towards services they directly benefit from and see operating in their neighbourhoods and communities.

The land use categories within the rating areas also have distinct advantages. The type of land use places very different demands on council services and generates different levels of traffic, stormwater runoff, and different demands on council compliance and regulation.

Federated Farmers considers that the Hastings District Council has an innovative and advanced method of striking the General Rate that provides benefits for both the Council and ratepayers.

#### Submission:

3. Federated Farmers strongly supports the two Rating Areas plus land use differentials that Hastings District Council employs for its General Rate.
4. These General Rate differentials provide better alignment between costs and benefits; an accurate reflection of land use impacts on council services; are less vulnerable to big valuation changes; and provide excellent transparency so ratepayers know where their money is going.

### GENERAL RATE

If the Council is looking for methods to improve on the General Rate, we suggest a change to capital value as the basis instead of land value. Land value may be justifiable for regional councils to rate on because most of their activities are based on land and natural environment management, but a territorial authority’s functions are firmly on infrastructure and public services that benefit people and the capital asset component of their property.

We note that this year, the cents in the dollar that the general rate for Rating Area Two farming has been bumped up to 0.179084 cents in the dollar after experiencing a regular fall since 2021. We

assume this increase is due to the revaluations reducing the overall capital value of rating area 2. This is an example of the better flexibility that the rating area differentials can provide.

2021 LTP:

| Differential Rating Area Two       |      |          |
|------------------------------------|------|----------|
| Residential                        | 0.85 | 0.201821 |
| Lifestyle / Horticulture / Farming | 1    | 0.237436 |
| Commercial                         | 1.65 | 0.391770 |

2023 AP:

| Differential Rating Area Two       |      |          |
|------------------------------------|------|----------|
| Residential                        | 0.85 | 0.137376 |
| Lifestyle / Horticulture / Farming | 1    | 0.161619 |
| Commercial                         | 1.65 | 0.266672 |

2024 LTP:

| Differential Rating Area Two       |      |          |
|------------------------------------|------|----------|
| Residential                        | 0.85 | 0.136185 |
| Lifestyle / Horticulture / Farming | 1    | 0.160218 |
| Commercial                         | 1.65 | 0.264360 |

2026 Draft Annual Plan:

| Differential Rating Area Two       |      |          |
|------------------------------------|------|----------|
| Residential                        | 0.85 | 0.152222 |
| Lifestyle / Horticulture / Farming | 1    | 0.179084 |
| Commercial                         | 1.65 | 0.295489 |

Hawkes Bay Regional Council switched to capital value for the General Rate in 2024, which Federated Farmers supported. We suggest the Hastings District Council take a look at the advantages of capital value rating too.

Using a capital value rating model has the advantage of ensuring that the improvements on a property are incorporated in the rates assessment. Demand on most council's services tends to be generated by more intensively developed properties rather than bare land.

We see a number of advantages for CV rating:

- It's the broader tax base, so less subject to distortions; Council is more likely to capture the value of growth within the district.
- CV captures the value of buildings. Buildings generally relate to people and vehicles, and therefore the primary elements of consumption of council services.
- CV captures the developed value of a property; the more developed, the more likely the demand on council services.

- CV, while still hopelessly inadequate, is a better reflection of a ratepayer's actual ability to pay.
- Differentials are still needed to protect rural areas from being punitively rated. While better than land value, CV yet retains all of the problems of simply taxing property value to pay for public services.

There is a clear trend across local government toward the adoption of capital value as a rating basis, rather than land value. Capital value recognises that a highly developed property such as a McDonalds restaurant will create more demand on council services, and should therefore pay more rates, than the same property that is undeveloped bare land.

Capital value recognises that urban properties have a proportionately higher aspect of their value in their buildings and assets rather than their land value. This means that for a farmer with a land value of \$1,200,000, and a capital value of \$1,600,000, only 25% of their total property value consists of improvements such as buildings. This can be compared with an industrial-commercial property with a land value of only \$46,000 and a capital value of \$115,000. 60% of their total property value consists of capital development, with land value only 40%.

The observant will notice that the farmer's property value is still much higher than the industrial-commercial property, so the farmer will be paying a much higher general rate struck on CV. This is why differentials are necessary, in order to flatten the discrepancy. And the Hastings rating areas plus land use categories already provide the differential framework for a change from LV to CV.

**Submission:**

5. We submit that the Council investigates a swap from land value to capital value as a basis to strike the General Rate to ensure that all properties are paying more proportionality towards district services on their capital asset which more closely aligns with their use and benefit derived.

---

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.



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.



---

Monday, 8 June 2026

---

*Te Hui o Te Kaunihera ā-Rohe o Heretaunga*

**Hastings District Council: Hastings District Rural Community Board**

*Te Rārangi Take*

# Report to Hastings District Rural Community Board

---

**Nā:**  
**From:** Tania Sansom-Anderson, Environmental Planner - Policy

---

**Te Take:** National Environmental Standards for Commercial Forestry - 2026  
**Subject:** Amendment update

---

## **1.0 Purpose and summary - *Te Kaupapa Me Te Whakarāpopototanga***

### **1.1 Purpose**

The purpose of this report is to provide an overview of the recently announced changes to the National Environmental Standards for Commercial Forestry (NES-CF), which come into effect on 4 June 2026. This report will also note the implications these changes may have for the Heretaunga Hastings District.

### **1.2 Key changes**

- Clarification on when councils can have more stringent rules than the NES-CF
- Replace prescriptive slash regulations with a risk-based approach
- Remove duplication in afforestation/replanting planning requirements
- Fix minor wording issues that created confusion
- Updated documents incorporated by reference

### **1.3 Implications for Heretaunga Hastings District**

The changes to the NES-CF are more likely to impact on Hawkes Bay Regional Council and their duties than they are to impact on HDC. HDC has a lesser role in managing plantation forestry than the regional council with the principal effects being considered related to earthworks and the impacts on significant natural areas and landscapes. These aspects are not being altered by the updated regulations. What is changing is the ability for the Council to have controlled the location of afforestation. This will no longer be possible with Councils only being able to control location and

have stricter rules based on certain criteria e.g. severe erosion risk. The aim of the changes is to reduce regional variation around the rules for afforestation.

Changes to the slash management regulations (including the introduction of Slash Mobilisation Risk Assessments) could positively impact on access roads and downstream council managed roads due to potential slash management improvements.

## 2.0 Recommendations - Ngā Tūtohunga

- A) That the Hastings District Rural Community Board receive the report titled National Environmental Standards for Commercial Forestry - 2026 Amendment update dated 8 June 2026.
- B) That the Board receive the report as information and provide any guidance deemed necessary.

## 3.0 Background – Te Horopaki

- 3.1 On 3 November 2023, the National Environmental Standards for Commercial Forestry (NES-CF) came into effect, replacing the existing National Environmental Standards for Plantation Forestry (NES-PF) 2017. Under this change, the scope of the standards was extended to cover exotic continuous-cover forests (also known as ‘carbon forests’) as well as traditional plantation forestry that the standard also covered. It also increased the power of local councils to control the location of afforestation (new forests) through inclusion in district and regional plans.
- 3.2 Regional and district councils both have responsibilities under the NES-CF. However, they are responsible for regulating different parts of forestry activities. Regional councils focus on land, water, and environmental effects, whereas district councils focus on land use (eg setbacks for shading etc), earthworks, and local amenity effects. HBRC have dedicated resources being two full-time equivalents (FTEs) who are responsible for compliance and monitoring of forestry operations from HBRC’s point of view.
- 3.3 An opportunity for submissions was provided by the government on proposed changes to a collection of national direction instruments. HDC did not specifically submit on the proposed changes to the NES-CF but did consult with HBRC regarding their submission as we felt this area fell more under HBRC’s jurisdiction than HDC’s. HDC supported the comments and suggestions made by HBRC. The key changes proposed to the NES-CF 2023 were,
- Being more specific when councils can have more stringent rules than the NES-CF
  - Repealing the regulation that allowed councils to control aspects of afforestation including the location
  - Removal of ‘one size fits all’ slash size/volume limit replacement with a risk-based assessment
  - Removing the requirement for a replanting plan and keep streamlined afforestation plans
  - Fix minor wording issues.

Further detail of these changes is outlined in section 3.7 of this report.

- 3.3.1 The submission by HBRC supported the minor wording amendments as well as the proposed amendments to Regulations 69(5-7) relating to slash management. HBRC supported the concept of risk-based slash assessment but noted that the way it has been proposed is too complex – raising liability concerns around consistent and accurate implementation of the assessment (especially with regard to technical capacity and ability to undertake the assessment). HBRC preferred the option of requiring a resource consent for managing sites of high risk of slash mobilisation, noting that the resource consent process provided the option to impose clear conditions for compliance.

- 3.3.2 The submission by HBRC raised concerns on the narrowing of regulation 6(1)(a) (relating to more stringent rules being allowed by Council if receiving environments are susceptible to significant adverse effects), noting that it could create tension between national direction and desired local environmental outcomes.
- 3.3.3 They also noted concerns about the removal of regulation 6(4A) which relate to afforestation rules being more stringent or lenient than the regulations stated in subpart 1 (Afforestation) or Part 2 (Regulation of commercial forestry activities). They note that this could reduce councils' ability to capture local concerns through community consultation and engagement processes. The Regional Council was unsuccessful in having the points raised in relation to regulations 6(1)(a) and 6(4A) recognised in the amended NES-CF.
- 3.4 The aim of the NES-CF is to provide consistent regulations for commercial forestry activities on areas of one hectare or more to manage the effects of commercial forestry across the country. However, it eventuated that some parts of the previous standards were in fact resulting in increasing costs and uncertainty for forestry owners and operators – often in a scale that was disproportionate with the environmental risks they were required to manage.
- 3.5 Furthermore, there were also concerns regarding variable interpretation of regulations and that some recent additions (such as slash removal standards and additional planning requirements) were difficult and expensive to apply in practice.
- 3.6 Therefore, the changes have been made to
- Improve national consistency
  - Reduce compliance costs
  - Remove duplication of regulations
  - Provide greater certainty for operators,
- in order to
- Boost productivity
  - Ensure environmental risks are appropriately managed.

### 3.7 Key Changes

The following paragraphs outline the key changes to the NES-CF that will come into effect on 4 June 2026.

#### 3.7.1 *More stringent rules than NES-CF*

Amendments have been made to the NES-CF regarding when both regional and district councils can have rules that are more rigorous than the national standard. The scope of when this applies has been narrowed to remove reference the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM), with the intention that this will increase consistency across the country. It still allows councils to change their plans in order to address high-risk situations, matters of national importance and environments that are unique and sensitive.

Regulation 6(1)(a) has been amended to enable councils to have stricter rules in specific, high-risk circumstances, especially in areas where there is a risk of severe erosions that would result in significant adverse effects. These effects could be on downstream infrastructure, property, or receiving environments (including coastal environments).

The amendments also repeal Regulation 6(4A) which had provided councils with the ability to control aspects of afforestation, including where new forests can be planted. Regional variation provided uncertainty for landowners which undermined the purpose of having a national standard and therefore has been repealed.

The aim of these changes is to increase certainty while reducing costs for forestry operators and still providing councils with the ability to respond to severe erosion risks.

### 3.7.2 *Replace prescriptive slash regulations with a risk-based approach*

The ‘one-size-fits-all’ approach to slash removal has been replaced with new requirements that are based on risk. A Slash Mobilisation Risk Assessment<sup>1</sup> (SMRA) will be required for higher-risk land and must be prepared and completed by the forestry operator or harvest planner at the time of forest harvest as part of the harvesting management plan. These assessment tools will be submitted to and administered by regional council. A SMRA will be site specific to individual sites and the result of the assessment will determine what action is required. For example, a result of low risk of slash moving from the harvest area means the slash would be managed through the harvesting plan and permitted activity conditions. However, a result of higher risk of movement would require a resource consent to tailor the mitigations to the site and any potential downstream impacts. The consenting process would determine if and what conditions are imposed.

The aim for this amendment is reducing cost and consenting for those areas of low risk, while also enabling more tailored conditions for those areas that could pose higher downstream harm. A risk-based approach would benefit small scale farmers who wish to plant forestry on a small erosion prone portion of their land as it focuses on the actual conditions of the land rather than enforcing blanket rules that treat all forests the same.

### 3.7.3 *Reducing duplicative requirements for afforestation and replanting plans*

Changes through this amendment seek to reduce duplication in terms of what is required for replanting plans. Under the amended standard, afforestation plans are still required but less information is needed than previously. Conditions are still required to manage the environmental risks associated with replanting a harvested forest. However, with the amendment, information on long-term predicted effects (based on assumptions that may become invalid) will no longer be required. Certain conditions such as showing compliance with afforestation requirements (eg property details and setback mapping) are still required.

These changes aim to reduce unnecessary tasks and costs, while still keeping compliance requirements that check for key matters.

### 3.7.4 *Fix minor wording issues*

A number of minor wording issues were addressed. Phrases such as “forest quarry” and “harvest plan” were changed to “forestry quarry” and “harvesting plan” respectively. These changes are minor, make no significant changes to meaning and have been done for clarification purposes.

### 3.7.5 *Updated documents incorporated by reference*

A number of documents have also been updated and incorporated for clarification purposes.

## 3.8 **HDC Commercial Forestry Monitoring and Compliance Resourcing**

3.8.1 In November 2025, HDC made the decision to disestablish the forestry compliance position within its Compliance team – a position that was split between HDC and HBRC to manage forestry complaints and issues. The decision for this was based on the relatively low number of issues raised with HDC while still contributing to a substantial financial outlay for the position. The role of slash management, sediment discharge, erosion issues, and the wider environmental effects predominately sits within the functions of HBRC under the RMA rather than of the Territorial Local Authority (HDC).

3.8.2 Since its disestablishment, any work that comes through has been absorbed by the existing Compliance team without any major issues. Forestry activities are still monitored through

---

<sup>1</sup> The Slash Mobilisation Risk Assessment (May 2026) can be found:

<https://www.mpi.govt.nz/dmsdocument/71752-Slash-mobilisation-risk-assessment>

notifications sent to the relevant councils concerned. HDC's consent monitoring officer is currently recording any NES notifications received into HDC's system.

- 3.8.3 Any matters that fall within the jurisdiction of HDC under the NES-CF and the district planning framework, and any complaints received (e.g. dust and noise), are managed by the Compliance team. The largely environmental side of forestry regulation still sits with HBRC.
- 3.8.4 Since 2019, 264 NES-CF notifications have been received by the HDC Compliance team. A very small number of complaints have been received in this same 7-year period and these related to dust and noise caused by forestry activities. In the last six months, no complaints have been received by the Compliance team relating to forestry operations.
- 3.9 Roads**
- 3.9.1 Public roads are not part of commercial-forestry activities and therefore fall outside of the NES-CF. However, some of the changes to the NES-CF may affect how road-related activities are assessed or consented – especially those in higher risk erosion areas.
- 3.9.2 Changes made to the NES-CF relating to more stringent council rules where there is higher erosion risk and subsequent adverse receiving environment effects could result in tighter controls impacting forest access roads. This may be in the form of stricter earthworks controls, larger setbacks from waterways, more robust culvert and drainage design, additional sediment control measures.
- 3.9.3 The change to slash management with introduction of the Slash Mobilisation Risk Assessment (SMRA) could impact access roads, particularly in terms of location and scale. Roding placement and design may be impacted by SMRA as the location and scale of roads and landings will often influence slash pathways and movements. The inclusion of SMRA could positively impact on public roads by reducing the amount of slash that in turn impacts on culverts and bridges in the receiving environment.
- 3.9.4 In short, the 2026 amendments have not rewritten the regulations in terms of forestry access road requirements. The amendment changes may however indirectly affect the activities related to roding especially in high-risk or erosion prone areas.

#### **4.0 Summary – *Te Whakarāpopoto***

- 4.1 The changes to the NES-CF are intended to improve national consistency for forestry while also reducing costs and duplication of regulations, with the intention to provide greater certainty for operators. The aim of these changes is that productivity will be boosted and to ensure environmental risks are appropriately managed.
- 4.2 The impact and management of forestry activities fall largely within HBRC's jurisdiction, with HDC's role in forestry activity being a more non-substantive one.
- 4.3 The amendments to the NES-CF include the introduction of Slash Mobilisation Risk Assessments which influence the way in which slash will be monitored, and as such assessments that result in a high-risk will require a resource consent where conditions will be able to be imposed. These conditions are likely to be monitored by HBRC, with details to be established on how this will be managed.
- 4.4 SMRA risk-based approach, regulated by HBRC, still ensures environmental effects will be managed, reducing costs to operators. Impacts on roads will still be monitored and regulated under the new framework.

#### **Attachments:**

There are no attachments for this report.