

From: nzempowered@gmail.com
Sent: Sunday, 5 January 2025 6:50 pm
To: wayne.guppy@uhcc.govt.nz; hellen.swales@uhcc.govt.nz; dylan.bentley@uhcc.govt.nz; matt.carey@uhcc.govt.nz; chris.carson@uhcc.govt.nz; blair.griffiths@uhcc.govt.nz; bill.hammond@uhcc.govt.nz; emma.holderness@uhcc.govt.nz; heather.newell@uhcc.govt.nz; tracey.ultra@uhcc.govt.nz; dave.wheeler@uhcc.govt.nz; geoff.swainson@uhcc.govt.nz; mayor@porirua.govt.nz; mike.duncan@porirua.govt.nz; kathleen.filo@porirua.govt.nz; izzy.ford@porirua.govt.nz; moze.galo@porirua.govt.nz; geoff.hayward@porirua.govt.nz; kylie.wihapi@porirua.govt.nz; tracy.johnson@porirua.govt.nz; ross.leggett@porirua.govt.nz; josh.trlin@porirua.govt.nz; nathan.waddle@porirua.govt.nz; themayor@swdc.govt.nz; melissa.sadlerfutter@swdc.govt.nz; rebecca.gray@swdc.govt.nz; colin.olds@swdc.govt.nz; aaron.woodcock@swdc.govt.nz; martin.bosley@swdc.govt.nz; alistair.plimmer@swdc.govt.nz; pip.maynard@swdc.govt.nz; kaye.mcaulay@swdc.govt.nz; aidan.ellims@swdc.govt.nz; mayor@wcc.govt.nz; laurie.foon@wcc.govt.nz; nicola.young@wcc.govt.nz; nikau.wineera@wcc.govt.nz; iona.pannett@wcc.govt.nz; tony.randle@wcc.govt.nz; teri.oneill@wcc.govt.nz; nureddin.abdurahman@wcc.govt.nz; john.apanowicz@wcc.govt.nz; ben.mculty@wcc.govt.nz; rebecca.matthews@wcc.govt.nz; Tim.Brown@wcc.govt.nz; sarah.free@wcc.govt.nz; diane.calvert@wcc.govt.nz; ray.chung@wcc.govt.nz; geordie.rogers@wcc.govt.nz; janet.holborow@kapiticoast.govt.nz; glen.cooper@kapiticoast.govt.nz; Martin.Halliday@kapiticoast.govt.nz; Sophie.Handford@kapiticoast.govt.nz; lawrence.kirby@kapiticoast.govt.nz; rob.kofoed@kapiticoast.govt.nz; liz.koh@kapiticoast.govt.nz; Jocelyn.Prvanov@kapiticoast.govt.nz; kathy.spiers@kapiticoast.govt.nz; shelly.warwick@kapiticoast.govt.nz; nigel.wilson@kapiticoast.govt.nz; campbell.barry@huttcity.govt.nz; glenda.barratt@huttcity.govt.nz; josh.briggs@huttcity.govt.nz; keri.brown@huttcity.govt.nz; brady.dyer@huttcity.govt.nz; simon.edwards@huttcity.govt.nz; tui.lewis@huttcity.govt.nz; andy.mitchell@huttcity.govt.nz; karen.morgan@huttcity.govt.nz; chris.parkin@huttcity.govt.nz; naomi.shaw@huttcity.govt.nz; tony.stallinger@huttcity.govt.nz; gabriel.tupou@huttcity.govt.nz; richard.teone@huttcity.govt.nz; media@wellingtonwater.co.nz; editor@uhconnection.co.nz; newstips@stuff.co.nz; news@rnz.co.nz; C.Luxon@ministers.govt.nz; Winston.Peters@parliament.govt.nz; D.Seymour@ministers.govt.nz; green.party@parliament.govt.nz; greenparty@greens.org.nz; chris.hipkins@parliament.govt.nz; carmel.sepuloni@parliament.govt.nz; enquiry@oag.parliament.nz
Cc: 'Heather Blissett'
Subject: Community members Views, Concerns and Questions on Local Water Done Well.

Kia ora,

As members of our Upper Hutt and Wellington Regional community we wish to understand more about where our city and region is going with Local Water. This email is to voice our views, concerns and ask questions for clarification.

We have created a [website \(www.nzempowered.com\)](http://www.nzempowered.com) which has a specific [page](#) on Local Water Done Well to further explain the commentary and questions below and other areas of Local Water Done Well as we understand it. As always we can only work with the information that has been provided and what we have been able to find. To be honest as members of the public it is of concern that such a vital and transformational topic appears, we feel, to have inconsistent and disjointed information at best. Even to the point that some of our own councillors are calling this out.

<https://www.nzempowered.com/post/local-water-done-well>

We understand and empathise with councils with respect to the reduction in funding from central government and government agencies and how this restricts what councils can provide to their communities. For example the reduction on roading funding etc and now Councils are stretched to what they can deliver and we appreciate that. On the other side of the coin, Councils do seem to have been spending on non-essentials and some might say vanity projects for years. Now the pocket money has been lessened they need to both take responsibility and not just throw it on the community.

Below is a brief summary as commentary and related questions.

Item 1.

Commentary: Upper Hutt's Gibbon St water pipes were deemed to be able to handle Brewtown when it was constructed. Since then many areas which require that infrastructure on top of those using Gibbon St already and many like Gibbons St have now been zoned High Density Residential. We believe the additional volume will put extra pressure on already pressured infrastructure.

Questions: Has this extra pressure of High Density Residential Zoning been taken into account when designating this zoning?

Where are the results of this assessment is it has been done?

Item 2.

Commentary: We feel that the information in the public realm regarding private vs public leaks is not consistent and this concerns us. It makes us concerned that other information is also inconsistent. Information from the Wellington Water meeting on the 13th of Dec vs RNZ article with respect to the private leaks do not seem to line up. The stats that we have found indicate there is a back and forth between public and private leaks and how many are in the backlog but nothing on severity of leaks, just the numbers.

Question: How can the public have confidence that the information which is being provided to the public on Local Water Done Well and current water delivery is correct and true? Especially when there is conflicting information from media, current water suppliers and the information what is available for Local Water Done Well?

Item 3:

Commentary: From accounts at Upper Hutt council meetings the Local Water Done Well Consultation with the communities in 2025 will include 2 viable options consulted on. From the 3 options initially tabled, which 2 of had been dismissed by council, to now 2 options which are effectively the same.

We have had one councillor state that "going it alone is not an option" and "The options we will present is either the status quo (Wellington Water) and a joint venture (CCO) which is being investigated now". Then at the 11th Dec UHCC meeting Cr Carson highlighted the fact that from all accounts the 2 options which were to be put to the public for consultation we, in effect, "the same".

The public should be seeing all options with justification's for the viability of the option or not. This would be true consultation and provide a democratic approach to the city selecting a viable and community backed option.

People from the community were advised on the 21st October Community Hui at Orongomai Marae.

"You can send letters to the ministers to voice that communities don't have a voice within the Local Water Done Well process and what you would like to see happen. Upper Hutt Council pushed that local representation should be on the board but it's unknown if that will be a council officer, community person or councillor. "

Questions: Why does it seem that Upper Hutt Council will be putting 2, effectively the same, viable options to the public for consultation in Upper Hutt?

How does the Upper Hutt Council deem the term consultation when offering 2 similar/identical options?

Why does it seem that there will be no inclusion of any of the communities ideas or solutions to assist with water delivery within Upper Hutt and maybe in other regions?

Item 4:

Commentary: The implementation of water meters seems to be a requirement for the new entity which is likely to be put in place to manage Water Delivery in the Wellington Region. It seems that councils are putting into their long-term plans to either investigate or install water meters. E.g. \$500k put in the budget for Upper Hutt Council to investigate water meters and an estimate of \$35m or more to install these meters. Wellington Water stated at the 13th Dec meeting that even if it was to install 1 water meter every 4 minutes it would take the next 6 years to have them all installed.

If the \$35m+ from Upper Hutt was invested into renewals of pipes and the water entity continued fixing leaks, surely the only requirement for water meters would be to charge dwellings for water. According to water statistics. Private residential water usage is not far off the world wide average once water loss from leaks are taken into account. So, in Upper Hutt, from the information provided this does not seem like it would be a great revenue gatherer or deterrent for over use of water.

Question: What is the benefit of water meters for our water supply, if water meters are to be installed at this early stage, over using funds to continue fixing and replacing our infrastructure?

If there is a tangible benefit, who will fund the installation and management of water meters, councils/ratepayers or new water entity?

Item 5:

Commentary: When checking into how businesses in Upper Hutt pay for water we found it is paid through water metered usage and via their rates.

Questions: What do businesses in Upper Hutt pay for their metered water?

How is this structured?

Item 6:

Commentary: The Upper Hutt Council does not have a publicly available glossary of terms and definitions. This is a point of contention when the public is attempting to understand terms that council uses and in what context they are being used. UHCC CEO Geoff Swainson has assured us that this would be looked into.

Questions: When will this Glossary of Terms and Definitions be made available and what will the process be around keeping it up to date?

Thank you for taking the time to read, understand and respond to this information request. These are a few of our views, concerns and questions but it is a starting point.

Nga Mihi,

The NZ Empowered Team.