

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Glenn Conway [mailto:Glenn.Conway@hnzc.co.nz];

**Sent:** 13/09/2016 5:47:26 PM

**To:** EXT Nicola Grigg [mailto:Nicola.Grigg@parliament.govt.nz];

**CC:** Cassandra Rivers [mailto:Cassandra.Rivers@hnzc.co.nz];

**Subject:** Re: Cost of meth contamination for Housing NZ

Hi Nicola the honest answer here is that the rising costs of paying for meth decontamination DOES impact on our budgets and arguably that's money that could be spent on more housing

I wonder if we need to be up front about this and point to the fact the meth use is an insidious invasion into all communities - not just social housing - and the cost is met by taxpayers

This sends the strong signal that the stance we've taken and continue to take in the fight against its use etc is the right thing to do

There are wiser costs to society too of course - depriving people on the waiting list of a house that's unavailable because of contamination, impacts on family makeup (many families torn apart because of its prevalence) the health system to deal with addiction and rehab etc etc

This isn't just a social housing problem but the costs are real and they are stopping us spending this money in much more useful and acceptable ways We can't really say the budgets aren't impacted but we can harden our resolve to reduce the money going into meth with this upfront proactive approach we take to it

Thoughts?

Glenn Conway

Manager, Communications and Stakeholder Relationships (South Island)  
Housing New Zealand

> On 13/09/2016, at 4:26 PM, Nicola Grigg wrote:

>

> Hi again

>

> I realise this guy has come to you for a response but was wondering if you had any suggestions as to how to explain that the cost of decontamination doesn't affect the social housing budget, but costs the taxpayer elsewhere/ in other ways?

>

> From: Simon Hendery [mailto:simon.hendery@fairfaxmedia.co.nz]

> Sent: Tuesday, 13 September 2016 3:31 p.m.

> To: Nick Venter ; Nicola Grigg

> Subject: Cost of meth contamination for Housing NZ

>

> Hi Nicola & Nick,

>

> I'm following this up with HNZN, but would also be keen on a comment from the Minister ...

>

> The attached OIA response shows HNZN's costs for chemical contamination have jumped from \$2.9m to \$21m in a year.

>

> Does this raise concerns for the Minister that a significant number of houses, and a significant budget is not available for social housing because of the need to decontaminate?

>

> Regards,

> Simon

>  
> --

>  
>

> Simon Hendery

>

> Hawke's Bay Reporter

>

>

s9/

> s9(2)(a)

>

> Hawke's Bay Office, Level 1, 124 Hastings St, Napier, 4110, New Zealand

>

> PO Box 222 Napier 4140

Released under the Official Information Act 1982