



Napier Parish Consult Report

Introduction

At the Diocesan Synod in 2024, the following motion was passed, initiating a canonical process of consultation and reporting to explore potential ministry partnerships in Napier.

“That Synod approve the instigation of the amalgamation of the parishes of Taradale, the Cathedral and Westshore, plus the sub-districts of Puketapu and Napier South in order to facilitate mission and ministry within the boundaries of the amalgamated parish: i.e., Napier, Taradale and Westshore.”

On behalf of the Standing Committee, ‘The Napier Parish Consultation’ aimed to gather perspectives from various parishes on potential structural and governance changes to enhance the sustainability and mission of the Anglican Church in Napier. The consultation process explored four possible options: (1) Amalgamation into a single Napier Parish, (2) Establishing a new Napier Parish with an independent Cathedral, (3) Retaining the status quo, and (4) Exploring alternative ideas. This report summarises the methodology, the key positions of each parish, and the general trends observed, concluding with recommendations for the Diocese.

Options Proposed

Option 1 – Amalgamation as one Napier Parish.

Option 2 – New Napier Parish, independent Cathedral

Option 3 – Status Quo

Option 4 – Your ideas

Questions Posed

Hopes

What could a flourishing Anglican Church look like in Napier? Does this option, in your opinion, aid this?

Concerns

What is the biggest challenge you foresee with this option? What worries you?

Values

Does this option reflect the heart of who you are as a parish?

Impact

How do you think this option might affect your experience of worship and belonging?

How might it also affect your mission and communication to your local community?



Methodology

Engagement was conducted through separate hui for each parish, ensuring open discussion, all parishes had the same questions and options proposed and the same methodology used. It was made clear that this was a genuine consultation, and the options were only there to spark thinking. The point of the exercise is to gauge the appetite for change and lean into imagination at a strategic level initially.

No one option was promoted above the others.

Peter Block's "Community of Belonging and Designed Learning " approach guided small group discussions allowing for genuine feedback, dissent, and commitment. Groups of 3-4 people ensured the topics could be talked about freely without fear or grandstanding and encouraged active participation and the expression of diverse perspectives. Attendees explored each option's hopes, concerns, values, and impacts. Responses were recorded in each small group and were faithfully recorded verbatim at the end of this report. There was also feedback from each group and the floor to allow for broader debate, which has likewise been faithfully recorded and included at the end of this report. Written submissions were also asked for.

These are synthesised and categorised for clarity and ease for the reader.

Summary of Parish Positions

Napier Cathedral Parish

- **Option 1 (Amalgamation)**
 - *Hopes:* Efficient resource use, wider ministry vision, intergenerational appeal, and a stronger collective impact.
 - *Concerns:* Financial and ministry distribution, identity loss, sustainability risks, and reluctance from smaller churches.
 - *Values:* Collaboration and tradition.
 - *Impact:* Increased coordination but risks of fragmentation and reduced autonomy.

- **Option 2 (Independent Cathedral & New Napier Parish)**
 - *Hopes:* Parish life maintained without the Cathedral burden, clearer staffing structure, and outreach potential.
 - *Concerns:* Pastoral care gaps and facility constraints.
 - *Values:* Emphasis on wider engagement and inclusivity.
 - *Impact:* Potential for more focused ministry but dependency on effective governance.



- **Option 3 (Status Quo)**
 - *Hopes:* Maintaining a local Anglican identity and renewal for modern relevance.
 - *Concerns:* Ageing congregation, financial instability, limited outreach capacity, and infrastructural challenges.
 - *Values:* Retaining Cathedral presence and tradition.
 - *Impact:* Current decline would likely continue, requiring substantial revitalisation efforts.
- **Option 4 (Alternative Ideas)**
 - Suggestions included relocating or redeveloping the Cathedral, experimenting with diverse worship styles, and strengthening community and civic engagement.

Taradale Parish

- **Option 1 (Amalgamation)**
 - *Hopes:* Strengthened community mission, shared resources, and leadership.
 - *Concerns:* Loss of Taradale's identity, outreach weakening, and governance complexity.
 - *Values:* Commitment to youth, aged care, and local mission.
 - *Impact:* Greater connections, but risk of overburdening existing resources.
- **Option 2 (Independent Cathedral & New Napier Parish)**
 - *Hopes:* Diocese ring-fencing the Cathedral's financial liability and increasing inter-parish collaboration.
 - *Concerns:* Equitable representation and financial burdens.
 - *Values:* Commitment to broader Anglican engagement.
 - *Impact:* Potentially minimal for Taradale, but administrative burdens may increase.
- **Option 3 (Status Quo)**
 - *Hopes:* Maintaining age-diverse worship, missional engagement, and community outreach.
 - *Concerns:* Risks of stagnation and limited growth potential.
 - *Values:* Strong sense of local community.
 - *Impact:* Continued commitment to mission but limited adaptability.



Westshore Parish

- **Option 1 (Amalgamation)**
 - *Hopes:* Strong preference for the status quo, valuing the local nature of their community.
 - *Concerns:* Clergy and congregation prefer remaining separate, have concerns over financial management, and have doubts about the necessity of change.
 - *Values:* Autonomy and self-sufficiency.
 - *Impact:* Rejection of this option due to concerns about governance complexity and financial management.

- **Option 2 (Independent Cathedral & New Napier Parish)**
 - *Hopes:* Preservation of local identity and ministry, as well as connection to the community via the Op shop.
 - *Concerns:* Loss of control over parish decisions, clergy availability, and questions about joint vestry effectiveness.
 - *Values:* Strong sense of belonging at the local parish level.
 - *Impact:* Preferred over amalgamation but still cautious about change.

- **Option 3 (Status Quo)**
 - *Hopes:* Self-sufficiency and no immediate need for change, with openness to review in 5-10 years.
 - *Concerns:* Lack of identified issues requiring immediate intervention.
 - *Values:* Independence and sustainability.
 - *Impact:* Currently functional and preferred over structural change.

- **Option 4 (Alternative Governance Model)**
 - *Hopes:* A representative body meets several times yearly to coordinate strategy, ministry, and mission without altering local governance.
 - *Concerns:* Ensuring relational collaboration without imposing structural changes.
 - *Values:* Maintaining local identity while engaging in strategic dialogue.
 - *Impact:* Seen as a balanced approach that allows for mission collaboration while preserving local autonomy.



General Summary

Across parishes, there was a shared desire for sustainability, growth, and mission-driven engagement. However, concerns about identity, governance, and financial allocation were consistent. Amalgamation was seen as a strategic move for resource efficiency but faced resistance due to fears of losing local identity and autonomy. The independent Cathedral model received mixed feedback, with support for a renewed focus on outreach. The status quo was widely viewed as unsustainable long term, highlighting the need for change, but in the case of Westshore, this was seen as 5-10 years. Alternative ideas emphasised adaptability and inclusivity.

There is a current lack of appetite for amalgamation, and there would be resistance if this were forced structurally. However, there is a desire for more imagination in mission and ministry. With the challenge of the Cathedral building, the Cathedral Parish is poised to explore new forms of mission and ministry, building on its existing strengths, particularly in the CBD and civic spaces. Westshore is content to continue with what is already working for them, with an awareness that things will change in the coming years. Taradale has a desire to serve more and help where needed.

Recommendation

After careful consideration, we recommend that no parish amalgamation take place between the parishes of Napier at this stage. While collaboration and shared resourcing remain essential priorities, there is currently no compelling strategic or operational necessity to proceed with a formal amalgamation. Each parish has unique strengths, identities, and community connections that should be preserved and nurtured rather than consolidated prematurely. Instead, we propose focusing on strengthening cooperation between the parishes through shared initiatives, ministry opportunities, and administrative efficiencies where appropriate. This approach will allow for a more organic and contextually responsive pathway forward while maintaining the integrity and mission of each parish.

Some Possible Ways Forward

With the Parish of Taradale being piloted as a Resourcing Parish, this provides some of the benefits of amalgamation without the need for structural change, change management and community angst that would occur if amalgamation were to take place.

1. **Status Quo:** More intentional relationship between parishes for mission and ministry. Taradale, as an emerging Resourcing Parish, could help facilitate this.
2. **Administrative Amalgamation with Local Autonomy:** A partial amalgamation approach that maintains local identity while consolidating administrative and financial functions into Shared Services and or shared administration.
3. **Strengthening Governance & Leadership:** At the current rate, there will come a time when governance and leadership at a local level will become harder to fill. The time is not yet. Preparing for this does require some forward thinking and ongoing exploration. The idea of joint governance or a joint vestry at this stage would be resisted if forced. Westshore's ideas of the three parishes meeting through the year to discuss mission, ministry and strategy based on relationship and mutuality could be a helpful model. Participation in The Leadership Collective run as part of the Archdeaconry of Hawke's Bay is also recommended to build capacity and increase the pipeline of those equipped to serve in leadership and governance positions.



4. **Mission-Centric Resource Allocation:** Prioritising and encouraging outreach initiatives, youth engagement, and intergenerational worship models. Westshore has Koru ministry, which could be strengthened. The Cathedral likewise indicated a desire to lean more into the city. The diocese and Resourcing Parish could help enhance these.
5. **Sustainable Cathedral Role:** Exploring ways to maintain the Cathedral's civic and diocesan significance while ensuring financial viability and parish life. Ongoing discernment is needed.
6. **Ongoing Community Engagement:** Continued dialogue with parishes to ensure any transition or change is collaborative and mission focused. To continue to come alongside parishes to help fulfil their aspirations.



Appendix – Unredacted Notes from each hui.

Napier Cathedral Hui Saturday 22 Feb 2025

Attendance:42

| Option One Amalgamation | G1 | G2 | G3 | G4 | G5 |
|----------------------------|---|---|---|--|---|
| Hopes | To Survive as Anglican. Efficient use of resources | Hope current parishioners want to stay on new parish. Have a wider vision other than treading water and standing still. Less pressure on people to give. More service roles | Better coordination across the city. Options for all Anglican styles. Growth Greater shared resources. | That all parishes would continue to attend Attractive to people with young families Attract a wider generation than the elderly. More people bigger impact | Sharing love and ideas of all We would survive as a reflection of the Anglican faith. Efficient use of resources. We would have to be committed to work together and work through the use of resources. |
| Concerns | How finances and ministry would be distributed | We are not flourishing under the current model. We are currently in a palliative state. Would amalgamation help this or not? How does this help manage the building (cathedral)? Sustainability? | Loss of civic connection at the Cathedral level. Loss of identity/ownership Failure – what happens if it doesn't work? | Congregations would not support Those from smaller churches would not like bigger church. Loss of tradition: Cathedral choir. Still have the same parishioners Will there be room for different styles? Who do we belong to? | Local issues – will everyone have to be the same. Will issues be sorted. Individuals dominating |



| | | | | | |
|---------------|---|--|---|---|---|
| Values | Surviving as Anglican Sharing of ministry amongst each parish | Providing choral/traditional styles of worship | | Tradition | Working together for the good of all |
| Impact | Combined ministry to the outside world Parishes would retain autonomy (or not) | The need to provide other styles of worship rather than just Cathedral style | Like starting afresh Hidden plans! Reassess commitment. | Probably would not attend Want the choral music. Tradition could be lost. | Equitable distribution of resources and skills. Hope for youth and families Fragmentation |



| Option Two New Napier Parish, Independent Cathedral | G1 | G2 |
|--|--|---|
| Hopes | Parish life can be maintained and not burdened by the Cathedral | Like the idea of the donut but leave Taradale as an independent parish one parish needs to have 8 am as now, 10 am formal worship as now at Cathedral. Perhaps another one has 9am but not as formal. One parish need more staff. Do more outreach |
| Concerns | What about pastoral care? | The cathedral has no hall and facilities |
| Values | Wider engagement inclusive evangelical/traditional | Our connection to the Diocese is fundamental. |
| Impact | Better resources Bigger connections More people more possibilities of worship and connections. Significant resources. | Westshore may not continue for much longer due to age of the clergy. Outreach and families |



| Option Three Status Quo | G1 | G2 | G3 |
|-------------------------|---|--|---|
| Hopes | No hope in Napier City as we are. | <p>A place of refuge, peace, calm</p> <p>A local option – very Anglican</p> <p>A 'renewal' process to make us relevant in today's world</p> <p>Central city opportunity for outreach – shops, homeless, surrounding suburbs.</p> <p>Need for visioning</p> | <p>To grow disciples, people's faith in the city</p> <p>We have people willing and keen to do.</p> |
| Concerns | Lack of finance and people. Unlikely to attract new people. | <p>Too much in our comfort zone – we would have to break out, requiring effort and resources.</p> <p>Ageing congregation and not many younger new people</p> <p>Thin on the ground</p> <p>Finances and work required on the building.</p> <p>The Type of service we offer doesn't appeal to everyone (music?)</p> <p>How does the status quo affect people who are not like 'us'?</p> <p>Building restraints do make things difficult to change.</p> | <p>Ageing parishioners</p> <p>Limited volunteers</p> <p>Lack of facilities for youth, outreach, and older people</p> <p>Lack of ability to serve central city and businesspeople.</p> <p>We are in leg irons, with no ability to spread out.</p> <p>Our people are good at making do.</p> |
| Values | Retain a Cathedral Building | It does reflect who is attending services currently. | <p>Excellent worship</p> <p>Welcoming – do a good job.</p> <p>Being open in the week</p> <p>Not as participatory, not a range of worship styles</p> <p>People willing to support</p> |



| | | | |
|---------------|---|---|---|
| Impact | Nose diving as a parish. Even a local taxi driver did not know where the Cathedral was. | We could improve practical inner-city outreach with the status quo. We know what to expect and know most of the people. Comfortable but sustainable Belonging and wider mission could be enhanced with a better hospitality space. | We don't have the ability to build on what we've got. Hard to have volunteers, meetings. Going around in circles Hard to invite more people in Parking, toilets, no hospitality hall. |
|---------------|---|---|---|

Option 4

- Move the cathedral out of Napier.
- Taradale left separate.
- Explore different styles of worship.
- The need to lean into the future.
- More connection into community.
- All join with the Cathedral to meet and work as one.
- Possibly a rebuilt or redeveloped Cathedral in another location where all ages.
- Those who belong to Napier parish could worship at the Cathedral - with the Cathedral being a mother church to all the parishes.



General Feedback from Groups and the Floor

| | Option 1 | Option 2 | Option 3 |
|----------|--|--|---|
| Hopes | <p>Would we survive?</p> <p>More attractive</p> <p>Intergenerational</p> <p>Options for different styles.</p> <p>Better options for growth.</p> <p>Shared resources.</p> | <p>Something still at the centre.</p> <p>Draw on more resources and people.</p> <p>Parish not burdened by the building.</p> <p>Worship style available to all.</p> <p>Choices.</p> | <p>Grow faith and disciples in the city.</p> <p>Place of refuge/peace/calm.</p> <p>Renewal and relevance.</p> <p>Mission to homeless and businesspeople.</p> |
| Concerns | <p>Loss of identity.</p> <p>Loss of mission to local CBD.</p> <p>Loss of civic connection.</p> <p>Loss of tradition.</p> <p>Where would Cathedral choir fit?</p> <p>What if it doesn't work?</p> | <p>Pastoral care</p> <p>Belonging and identity</p> <p>How will it be staffed?</p> <p>Diversity?</p> | <p>Volunteers fatigue.</p> <p>Ageing.</p> <p>Lack of facilities and impact on hospitality and mission.</p> <p>Inability to build and grow.</p> <p>Comfort zone.</p> <p>Need for more resources.</p> <p>Issues of long-term sustainability.</p> <p>We have a specific demographic.</p> |
| Values | | <p>Wider engagement.</p> <p>Broader worship styles</p> <p>Inclusivity, diversity, local context.</p> | <p>Welcome and worship.</p> <p>Open during the week.</p> |
| Impact | <p>Wider vision.</p> <p>Central administration.</p> <p>Stronger governance.</p> <p>Palliative state – will it help it?</p> | <p>Resources.</p> <p>Thriving.</p> <p>Connecting to city and more people.</p> | <p>Decline.</p> <p>Lack of relevance.</p> |



The Parish of Taradale Hui, Saturday 22 Feb 2025

Attendance:28

Small Groups – Feedback on the cards

| Option One Amalgamation | G1 | G2 | G3 |
|----------------------------|--|---|---|
| Hopes | Could work | Carefully thought through Excellent leadership to steer amalgamation through Someone with no agenda Flourishing could look like going out more in the community. A missional focus. Using the different talents of an amalgamated Napier Church to support the mission (local community) | All ministries covered throughout Napier More people involved. |
| Concerns | Would a large vestry get bogged down in detail? Will Cathedral flourish? Will Taradale feel loss of purpose? Where will outreach to Pirimai, Maraenui and Onekawa come from? We feel need for outreach, but will this weaken present energy in Taradale? Taradale need to retain core parishioners. | Is there a central place? Would Taradale Anglicans lose their identity? How are different worship styles to be catered for? Sun is always busy 8am – 10am – Methodist Samoan | Challenges – Leadership and pastoral care. Rest homes covered? |
| Values | | Taradale has a heart for mission e.g. youth, aged and people on the margins, so yes it does reflect our care for wider community. | Who we are – Community |



| | | | |
|---------------|--|--|---|
| Impact | | <p>Longing to connect with parishioners from different congregations.</p> <p>Stretched more elderly to care for</p> <p>Some may vote with their feet</p> | <p>Experience</p> <p>Leadership.</p> <p>Belonging</p> |
|---------------|--|--|---|

| Option Two New Napier Parish, Independent Cathedral | G1 | G2 | G3 |
|--|--|--|---|
| Hopes | <p>The Cathedral building should be ring-fenced by the Diocese so other parish districts are not liable.</p> | <p>Attracting a new generation of parishioners.</p> <p>Believe this would aid this hope.</p> | <p>That the parish amalgamation will be an attraction for future generations to become involved and committed to and strengthen the area as a community.</p> <p>All parishes kept up to date and informed of progress and how the process will affect them.</p> |
| Concerns | <p>The Enid Lemmon money, bequeaths, donations for each parish?</p> <p>What will happen to Crownthorpe? Will it be under Hastings or Napier?</p> <p>Balance at Vestry is even for each parish.</p> | <p>Would Taradale be taking on a burden?</p> <p>Would other parishes feel they were dominated by Taradale?</p> | |
| Values | | <p>Risk that there would be difficulty in reflecting the heart of the parish.</p> | |
| Impact | | <p>Limited impact for Taradale, although the demand on human resources might be a burden.</p> | <p>No impact, as Christian beliefs are the same.</p> <p>Assuming the Order of Service will remain the same as in identity.</p> |



| Option Three Status quo | G1 | G2 |
|----------------------------|---|---|
| Hopes | <p>Congregation representing all age groups. Worshipping in several venues with a variety of worship styles.</p> <p>A church that is missional out looking.</p> <p>A church that is welcoming to all.</p> <p>We believe Taradale is aiming towards this. Some of us are unsure what the Cathedral and St Andrews are doing. Some of us don't think the above two parishes are doing as well as us in Taradale</p> | <p>Resource church has the potential to develop Anglican life throughout Hawkes Bay.</p> <p>The region could flourish and community enhanced.</p> |
| Concerns | <p>We need all 3 parishes to be</p> <p>Age representative. Growing in number Variety of worship styles To spread the gospel Welcoming to all</p> <p>Worried that with the status quo this may not happen</p> | <p>Personnel ordained, paid and volunteers workload.</p> <p>Ageing parish community</p> |
| Values | <p>The desire for the above reflects us at Taradale</p> | <p>Yes, it strengthens our sense of community.</p> <p>The Resource Church strengthens our obligations to the wider Anglican Community</p> |
| Impact | <p>The experience of worship and belonging won't change.</p> <p>Mission and connection will stay the same</p> | <p>Enhances our ability to serve our local Taradale community. Provide leadership and support other parishes.</p> |



General Feedback from Groups and the Floor

| | Option 1 | Option 2 | Option 3 |
|----------|--|---|--|
| Hopes | Stronger together Using our combined talents Joint mission Pushes Cathedral outwards. More involvement from people. Joint identity? | Future generations/strengthen. Better communication. Church will continue. Younger people and new people. Broader mission. More impact. | Keep moving forward. The Anglican church in the region flourishes. The region flourishes. All age groups, multi-venues. Welcome and inclusive. |
| Concerns | Would we lose our identity? Would we keep our worship style? Mission to the neighbourhood? Pastoral care? Leadership? Do we lose our focus? | Makeup of vestry? Not wanting to be saddled with the Cathedral building issues. Would Taradale have to carry the weight? Would other parish's mana be diminished? | Are the other parishes on the same missional page? Ageing parishes. Resourcing People resources. |
| Values | | Identity worship styles | Desire to help other parishes and broader impact. |
| Impact | Strengthen our impact but some might walk. | Taradale will be least impacted culturally but most impacted in terms of human resources. Taradale has a heart for the local. In options one and two, do we lose the heart of the local neighbourhood's mission and impact? More visibility of the Anglican Church in Napier. | Worship and belonging stay the same. Mission and community connection remain. Can still provide leadership and support to others. |



The Anglican Parish of Westshore Hui, Sunday 23 Feb 2025

| Option One Amalgamation | G1 | G2 |
|----------------------------|---|---|
| Hopes | <p>Very strong desire for the status quo at the moment. Smaller is better.</p> <p>If circumstances change, we want the opportunity to decide then what we do.</p> <p>We value the local nature of our community and worry we would lose that.</p> <p>In favour, we hope there would be greater ministry resources e.g. for youth work</p> | <p>Westshore is willing to participate in the discussion.</p> <p>Ageing clergy and congregation will necessitate change sometime in the future for St Andrews.</p> |
| Concerns | <p>Our clergy are not interested in working in other areas.</p> | <p>If it isn't broke (St Andrews) why fix it?</p> <p>The proposed structure is cumbersome, too much detail, for one vestry group to manage.</p> <p>The present management of finances works better than the proposed system. We have a carefully planned system of raising funds and mission spending which works.</p> <p>From St Andrew's position, what is the problem we are trying to solve?</p> <p>The proposed structure seems to be reverting to where we came from.</p> <p>We reject this option.</p> |
| Values | N/A | N/A |
| Impact | N/A | N/A |



| Option Two New Napier Parish, Independent Cathedral | G1 | G2 | G3 |
|---|---|--|---|
| Hopes | <p>To keep being us.</p> <p>We connect to the community through the Op shop</p> <p>Probably won't change.</p> <p>We are ok now – but!!</p> | | <p>Compatibility</p> <p>Sharing of strengths</p> <p>Continue ministry.</p> <p>Youth growth</p> <p>Sharing of identity</p> <p>Good pastoral care</p> |
| Concerns | <p>Questions of how a joint vestry would work – but it makes sense.</p> <p>The loss of local shared ministry has helped the depleting of ministry resources. That depleting has happened on the recent watch!</p> | <p>Lose control of our own destiny and our own specific parish needs may not be met.</p> <p>One vestry for all would not work.</p> | <p>Loss of identity</p> <p>Loss of pastoral care</p> <p>Finances?</p> <p>Available clergy</p> |
| Values | | <p>We feel we belong more at a local parish level.</p> | <p>No. Because we are different.</p> <p>Need to look after neighbours.</p> <p>Share our differences.</p> |
| Impact | | <p>Doing mission together as one parish would be good.</p> <p>We can then reflect the needs locally.</p> <p>Better of the other options.</p> | |

| Option Three – Status Quo | G1 |
|---------------------------|--|
| Hopes | <p>We are currently self-contained.</p> <p>We are not a drain on others' resources.</p> <p>Ok to review the situation in 5-10 yrs.</p> |
| Concerns | <p>Currently, there are no problems – would need to analyse/identify any problems. SWOT analysis or strategic plan required.</p> |
| Values | - |
| Impact | - |



Option Four

- A representative body meets several times a year to outwork strategy, ministry, and mission.
- Relational not structural.

General Feedback from Groups and the Floor

| | Option 1 | Option 2 | Option 3 |
|----------|--|---|--|
| Hopes | Willing to engage in process. Would like status quo and reject option one. Would like to opt in the future. More ministry resources for things like Koru. | Compatibility. Continuation of ministry. Maybe better than option one if it had to happen. | We love local shared ministry. Self-contained. Self-sufficient. No big issues it works. Good for now let's look at it again in five years. |
| Concerns | Capacity issues and availability to other parishes. Cumbersome structure. \$\$ - is this a money grab? Why change what is working? | Loss of identity. Clergy availability? Lose control of specific identity and local needs are missed. Against the idea of one vestry. | |
| Values | Convinced smaller is better. | Would it reflect us? Fear of local identity being lost. Neighbours. | |
| Impact | | "We are ok but...." Doing mission together. | A lot of energy for local but not a lot of capacity for outer. |