

Candidates	Develop Ocean Beach	Build regional sports park	Extend airport runway	Reduce wood burner pollution	Ban pitbulls
Tremain	I believe that development at Ocean Beach should be allowed on a limited scale. Development is currently allowed under the district plan by the subdivision of multiple lifestyle blocks across the face of the beach. Rather than allowing profligate development, I favour a managed development in one location at the southern end of the beach and on a scale which is empathetic to the unique environment. There are specialists who are far more experienced than I who can make assessments regarding the size of the development.	I favour the building of a regional sports park as long as it does not duplicate the fantastic facilities already available at Park Island, at McLean Park and at the Pettigrew Green Arena. The fact is that Hastings needs to invest in the Park to ensure that it provides enough sports facilities for the growth of its own population, for the replacement of Nelson Park and the replacement of the Windsor Park Netball facilities. Regional or national facilities which are built at the Park must stack up economically.	The important issue is ownership, not whether the runway should be extended. A 50% stakeholder, Central Government is beholden to a range of lobby groups not interested in the development and growth of the HB Regional Airport. Hawke's Bay needs to be able to decide for itself whether to invest in the airport infrastructure without the negative influence of central government. National have agreed to allow a process of ownership transfer. National are not prepared to invest money into the airport but are happy for the region to progress investment in the airport as it sees fit.	I do believe that Hawke's Bay should have to meet national air quality standards, but we don't need to ban all burners to reach the air quality standards required for just 9 days of the year. The cost is enormous and would have a huge impact on the lower socio-economic citizens of the Bay. A local solution to the problem can be found. This could entail a subsidy to encourage a transfer of homes to either cleaner burning wood burners or to heat pumps. This could be done voluntarily and would reach the necessary air quality standards over time and without the ridiculous position of banning all wood fires.	I'd ban the breed.
Fairbrother	Opposed to this or any development of the Ocean Beach landscape and seascape.	On the record as a committed supporter.	On the record as the political driving force to make this happen.	Reduction should be encouraged, but Hawke's Bay's climate and natural resources make them a viable, cost effective, heating option.	As the owner of 2 dogs, I can find no justification for anyone owning a vicious dog of any breed. Strong evidence suggests dogs reflect the personalities of their owners, including violence characteristics.
Stansfield	Personally, I oppose the development on the grounds that it is an iconic landscape to be enjoyed by all members of the public. It reduces our great escape spaces where people are free to roam unimpeded by private property.	A big fat waste of money, we have plenty of sports parks in the Hawke's Bay Region. Surely we could use this money towards upgrading our downtrodden shopping complexes like Maraenui and Flaxmere, we owe it to our people, these communities pay rates too! We can't even get decent footpaths in Hastings CBD.	I have seen no economic justification for this to occur. All I hear is "oh wow and there's going to be a rugby world cup and maybe just maybe if this extension goes ahead, people will treat us seriously and the whole world will come to visit Hawke's Bay because of it." Sorry but this is small town provincialism gone crazy. It didn't work in Invercargill or in Palmerston North and it may not work in Rotorua, so why should it work here? To top it off, the existing runway is built on an ecologically sensitive wetland - do we really want to destroy more habitat for some of the worlds most magnificent migratory birds?	The intent of eliminating wood burners from Hawke's Bay is to reduce PM10 emissions, which are known to cause respiratory illness. We need to be careful how this is done as we do not want to end up with cold damp houses resulting in further respiratory illness. We need to insulate our houses properly to reduce our reliance on burning fuels or electricity to heat houses.	It's not the dogs we should be banning, it's the practice of breeding and training these dogs specifically for fighting. Responsibility must lie with the owner as well as the dogs.
Foss	I don't want to see, nor do I think we will ever see, 1,000 houses at Ocean Beach. The work already carried out to preserve and enhance the environment on and behind the beach should be acknowledged. The wild life "island" behind the beach is fantastic. If there is to be any development, I would prefer that it is partnered with strict areas and caveats of non-development.	I am fully in favour. It is one of those projects that, when completed, we will look back on and wonder what the fuss was about. It will provide a springboard for excellence and provides our region with a facility that people of all ages and ability can enjoy.	The important issue is ownership, not whether the runway should be extended. A 50% stakeholder, Central Government is beholden to a range of lobby groups not interested in the development and growth of the HB Regional Airport. Hawke's Bay needs to be able to decide for itself whether to invest in the airport infrastructure without the negative influence of central government. National have agreed to allow a process of ownership transfer. National are not prepared to invest money into the airport but are happy for the region to progress	I do believe that Hawke's Bay should have to meet national air quality standards, but we don't need to ban all burners to reach the air quality standards required for just 9 days of the year. The cost is enormous and would have a huge impact on the lower socio-economic citizens of the Bay. A local solution to the problem can be found. This could entail a subsidy to encourage a transfer of homes to either cleaner burning wood burners or to heat pumps. This could be done voluntarily and would reach the necessary air quality standards over time and without the ridiculous position of	First I want an assurance that all current rules and laws are being enforced properly or toughened up where necessary and that owners are held responsible as well as the dogs. After that, I would then be in favour of banning.

			investment in the airport as it sees fit.	banning all wood fires.	
Barker	My number one priority is the preservation of the beach, one of the last classic New Zealand beaches on this coast; it's very special to the people here. Any development needs to be secondary to that objective. Profit from development should not be at the expense of our beach.	I want to see our young people engaged in sport and I am generally in favour of developing good sports facilities. We are pouring an awful lot of investment into bricks and mortar, we need to be asking if this is absolutely the most effective use of those resources. I also want to be convinced that that this facility will actually translate into more kids playing sport.	Although he has been accused of it, Trevor Mallard has not said the land is not available. What he has said is that there are alternatives for the land such as recreation and conservation, so if the land is to be made available, a case has to be made. A case to justify the land use has to also justify the investment by ratepayers. I want to see the figures that show that if the runway is extended the jets will come, not to build a runway and hope.	If woodburners are putting pollution into the air and having a detrimental effect on people's health then we need to be concerned. We already put too much carbon into the atmosphere, climate change is a reality. We need a good debate about both issues, health and the environmental effects should of woodburners and make decisions that protect both.	There are two problems with such a ban. Recent dog attacks were by other breeds so the ban would not have prevented that. Banning them would be complicated to enforce because they are already here and as they have already been interbred, defining which dog was and wasn't banned would be a legal nightmare. This government has already made significant changes to the laws and regulations for dog owners, for example now you have to provide open access to your front door, and we can require dogs to be muzzled or kept in certain ways. If there are further enhancements to the law that we can make, I support that. Ultimately though, people need to take more responsibility for the treatment and control of their animals.
Duthie	I oppose this development, and hope that the Coastal Policy Statement currently under review will raise the bar for coastal development and pollution. Our wild public places are irreplaceable.	This is a local issue for the local community to debate, as they have been rather animatedly. The Council process has been less than perfect, and there are arguments for and against. I do not have a strong opinion on the best solution at this stage.	I am most concerned at the bull-headed attitude of the National and Labour MPs, and Mayors, who seem to believe that international tourists will come flocking if we build it. The economic argument for better domestic flight access is stronger, but also not entirely convincing. I am not implacably opposed to the extension, provided there is little or no impact on the wetland, but the public debate needs to be tempered with some serious economic and environmental realism rather than blind parochialism and populism.	The Greens support the air quality standard because the pollution contributes to 1,100 cases of people dying earlier than they would have otherwise, as well as numerous other negative health effects, costing an estimated \$1.14 billion per year. However, the way communities go about transitioning to clean heating systems must be fair to low-income households – we must not replace ill-health from pollution with ill-health from cold damp homes. The Greens \$1bn fund for insulation and clean heating will be available to HB homes. The Greens are concerned that the standard overlooks the air pollution from vehicles.	I support the banning of dangerous breeds and the control of menacing dogs in the current Dog Control legislation. American pitbull terriers are already banned from import. Pitbull crosses are popular dogs, so a ban would be a challenge. I support the powers in the new Dog Control Bill where the Government can require neutering of specific breeds such as pitbulls.