

# Report of Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua Committee Workshop

4 October 2018, 5.00pm – 9.00pm  
Plimmerton Boating Club  
Workshop (Closed to the Public)

---

## Summary

This report summarises notes from a workshop of the Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua Committee held on Thursday 4<sup>th</sup> October 2018 at Plimmerton Boating Club.

---

## Contents

These notes contain the following:

### Overview

#### Workshop Notes

- Part 1: Introduction
  - Part 2: Community and Council Engagement
  - Part 3: Whaitua Implementation Programme
  - Part 4: Conclusion
- 

## Overview

---

### Workshop Attendees

**Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua Committee:**

**Present:** Diane Strugnell, Warrick Lyon, John McKoy, John Gibbs, Barbara Donaldson, Larissa Toelupe, Richard Cook (arrived 5.30pm) Stu Farrant (Chair)

**Apologies:** Dale Williams, David Lee, Hikitia Ropata

**Greater Wellington Project Team:** Tim Sharp (Project Manager), Brent King, Shane Parata, Suze Keith, Paula Hammond, Kat Banyard, Jane Clunies-Ross, Jon Gabites, Torrey McDonnell, Jo Fagan

**Invited Guests:** Ned Norton, Land Water People

**Independent Facilitator:** Claire Steele (Mitchell Daysh)

Notes prepared by Suze Keith and Claire Steele.

**Workshop Purpose** The purpose of this workshop was to:

- To communicate with the Committee the transparency of the policy development process and instil confidence in the Committee that the Project Team are cognisant of their intentions as they develop the policy packages, including why we have used the three ‘issues’ and the broader context of the Whaitua Implementation Programme (WIP)
- To take the Committee through the Issues Papers for *E. coli*, sediment and metals, and seek confirmation from the Committee that each Issue Paper articulates their intention/s
- Exploration of Committee’s comfort with the direction of the Draft WIP Introduction
- To gain the necessary feedback and input the policy writers require from having a captive audience, to prepare the materials necessary for the end of October deadlines
- To seek prioritisation from the Committee on issues and how they would like to allocate their time for the weekend workshop (27/28<sup>th</sup> October 2018).

	TIME	TASK	PURPOSE	WHO
Proposed Agenda	<b>Part 1: Introduction</b>			
	5.00pm	<b>Karakia</b>		Larissa
		<b>Welcome</b> Apologies & introductions <b>Chair’s Direction</b> Purpose of meeting & agenda outline	Establish purpose of meeting	Stu
		<b>Housekeeping</b>		Claire
	5.10pm	<b>Ngāti Toa Update</b>	To update the Committee on where Ngāti Toa is at with development of their Plan	Shane
	5.25pm	<b>Role of Tonight’s Workshop</b> Focus of the workshop	Clarify what we are doing tonight; where this fits in the decision-making process	Claire
	<b>Part 2: Community and Council Engagement</b>			
5.30pm	<b>Debrief of Recent Community &amp; Council Engagements</b>	Taking feedback from the	Committee members	

	Wellington City Councillors Workshop – 4 <sup>th</sup> October Porirua City Developer Focus Group – 21 <sup>st</sup> September – Tim Future Engagements planned: GOPI, Harbour Trust, Residents Association – last week of October / first week of November	presentations and using this in future engagements and to inform the Committee's work	Jon/Suze (Future engagements update)
<b>Part 3: Whaitua Implementation Programme</b>			
5.45pm	<b>WIP Overview</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overarching principles guiding the WIP development</li> <li>• Structure - why are there only three contaminants featured in the Issues Papers?</li> <li>• Process Project Team has undertaken to develop the policy packages i.e. from objectives to limits to policy - what's involved in developing the WIP?</li> <li>• What could the recommendations look like?</li> <li>• Where does what we are going to do tonight fit into the process? What are the next steps for the Issues Papers?</li> <li>• Questions the Committee have about the process</li> </ul>	To explain to the Committee the shape and nature of the WIP and the process the Project Team has undergone to develop the policy packages	Paula
6.00pm	<b>Issues Paper: Sediment</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction to paper</li> <li>• Questions of clarification</li> <li>• Committee confirmation of agreement with the intent of the paper, policies and recommendations and areas that are missing</li> </ul>	To seek Committee feedback on the direction/policy approach proposed in the papers	Paula
6.40pm	<b>Issues Paper: <i>E. coli</i></b>		Kat
<b>7.20pm</b>	<b>Dinner</b>		
7.50pm	<b>Issues Paper: Metals</b>		Tim
8.30pm	<b>WIP Introduction</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction process undertaken to prepare</li> </ul>	To gauge the Committee's level of	Suze

	draft introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Committee feedback on tone, structure, content and other changes</li> <li>• Confirm process to progress the introduction</li> </ul>	contentedness with the draft introduction, to note changes required, and to plan around next steps to progress it	
<b>Part 4: Conclusion</b>			
8.45pm	<b>Planning for Weekend Workshop on 27<sup>th</sup> and 28<sup>th</sup> October</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prioritisation of issues and allocation of time</li> <li>• Identification of issues that have been missed</li> </ul>	Involve the Committee in developing and prioritising the agenda for the weekend workshop	Suze
8.55pm	<b>Other Business</b>		Stu
	<b>Thank you</b>		Stu
	<b>Karakia</b>		Larissa

---

**Key Decisions to be made**

- Agreement on intentions expressed in the Issues Papers
- Confirm next steps for progressing the WIP Draft Introduction

**Committee Decisions** The Committee provided feedback on the three Issues Papers. There was general agreement on the intentions expressed in each, and the project team were instructed to further develop the policy recommendations into WIP chapters with Committee feedback incorporated.

In terms of the draft WIP Introduction, direction was given on improvements and additional content needed. These suggestions will be incorporated into a new edition for consideration alongside the other WIP content.

---

**Workshop Actions** A number of actions were agreed to at this Workshop. Please refer to the table in Appendix 1 to find the list of actions.

The Committee were asked to read the draft introduction to the WIP again and email any further suggestions through to Suze Keith. The Committee were also asked to familiarise themselves further with the Ruamāhanga WIP in preparation for the workshop at the end of October.

---

## Workshop Notes

---

## Part 1: Introduction

---

### Karakia & Welcome

The meeting opened at 5.05pm. Larissa opened with a karakia. Stu welcomed the Committee. Stu provided an overview of the meeting.

---

### Ngāti Toa Update

Shane provided an update on Ngāti Toa. They have appointed a writer and are working in with the Committee timeline (which is the end of November). There was discussion as to whether the Ngāti Toa document would be included as a chapter of the WIP and how it would integrate with the other chapters.. Tim confirmed that Ngāti Toa will be writing their own document which will sit along side the Committee's WIP. It will be GWRC's task to integrate both documents into a plan change. The Committee would like clarity from GWRC on how the WIP will include mana whenua values and language.

*Action: Shane to put this forward at the Ngāti Toa meeting – as Committee need clarity on mana whenua voice in the WIP. Invite Ngāti Toa to attend/present at the October 27 & 28 workshop.*

---

### Role of the Workshop

Claire explained that the purpose of this workshop was to firstly communicate the transparency of the policy development process, then to have the project team take them through the three issues papers, and the draft introduction of the WIP. She explained that the overall objective for this next phase of work – the WIP writing – is to produce a WIP that the Committee are happy with. Claire explained that Kat and Rachel have been brought into the Whaitua WIP writing team to assist Paula and that they have used content from previous meetings in the preparation of their papers.

Claire noted that by the end of the meeting, the Project Team would like a steer from the Committee about the policy priority areas for the upcoming workshop.

---

## Part 2 – Community and Council Engagement

---

### Debrief of Recent Community and Council Engagements

Committee members attending each of the following engagements were asked to provide a report.

#### ***Porirua City Developer Focus Group – 21<sup>st</sup> September***

Stu and Tim attended this focus group meeting with seven developers. The focus of the meeting seemed to switch to stream reclamation in the Natural Resources Plan (NRP), but the focus group had a good understanding of the changing environment. Stu and Tim spoke about the opportunities of providing both housing and environment protection. Stu noted that they are going for a structure plan for Stebbings (WCC), involving two developers (Callander and Isthmus). Tim stated that some

comments were promising about protecting water features around Judgeford. Stu explained that the language is changing around density which is quite a different approach. Tim also mentioned that there was talk about turning Porirua around to face the harbour.

When asked what Kenepuru Landing's development was like, Stu confirmed that it was an improvement on standard practice but still a fair to average development.

***Radio NZ Interview – with Alison Balance from Our Changing World, Radio New Zealand - 3<sup>rd</sup> October***

The interview was arranged by Warrick and Stu to discuss the work of the Whaitua Committee, and what they are aiming to achieve through their recommendations. It was also supported by Paula, Mark Heath and Megan Oliver (GWRC Marine and Freshwater team). The interview started in the bush in Elsdon then went through Kenepuru Landing and ended at the Semple Street outfall. It will be aired in approximately a month.

***Wellington City Councillors Workshop – 4<sup>th</sup> October***

The Wellington City (WCC) Councillors' Workshop was well attended and the Committee was represented by Stu, Barbara and Warrick. Feedback suggests that it was a positive meeting with everyone being engaged. They covered off Porirua, Ruamāhanga and Whaitua Te Whanganui-a-tara, in addition to discussing the implications for WCC.

***Future Engagements***

***WCC Environment Reference Group, 8<sup>th</sup> October***

At the WCC Environment Reference Group meeting on October 8<sup>th</sup>, Stu will be presenting a technical presentation.

***Residents Associations' Public Meeting October 16, 7pm, Mungavin Hall***

The Porirua Harbour Trust have decided to comment on the draft WIP rather than have a specific meeting. There has been a discussion with Guardians of Pauatahanui Inlet (GOPI) on the current state freshwater and harbour results and where the Committee have got to. There was discussion about the next steps with this engagement.

It was agreed that Porirua Harbour Trust and GOPI would be invited to the public meeting.

Regarding the Residents Association presentation, this will be developed via email for everyone to contribute to.

***Rural Technical Workshop, late October***

There is going to be a technical session with the rural community to give them capacity to monitor their own water on their properties. This is in response to a desire in the community to know more about the monitoring and science behind the issues. This will occur at the end of October at Battle Hill.

***Porirua City Councillors' Whaitua Workshop – November 1***

*Action: Suze to send out invite to the PCC Workshop on November 1<sup>st</sup> and will scope the presentation via email. It is expected that this will be a joint presentation between Committee and project team.*

---

### ***Large Rural Landowners Meeting, early November***

The session with the larger rural landowners will occur in early November. Jamie, Diane and Kristy met to design the runsheet, and this has been shared with William Beetham (Federated Farmers) and Richard Parks (Beef and Lamb), who are interested from a national level of what's happening with catchment communities. Stu enquired as to whether the Stream Health Monitoring and Assessment (SHMAK) kit session should have happened earlier. Diane said yes and no, because it doesn't measure *E. coli* and sediment very well. It gives you a good picture of the environment / macro-invertebrate community index (MCI) which is interesting, but you then need to connect it up with what people are seeing as their contribution. Warrick questioned if it could be better closer to their stream. Jon confirmed that the WIP is not the end of the discussion; it's about GW relationship building in the long term.

*Action: Jon to send through the details of the large rural landowners' session*

---

## **Part 3 – Whaitua Implementation Programme**

---

### **WIP Overview**

#### **PRESENTATION**

***Purpose of Session:*** To provide information on what the project team are aiming for in terms of creating the WIP, and where they are in terms of scope and approach to the document.

Paula took the Committee through a series of slides to demonstrate where we are currently and what is involved in preparing the WIP. There was discussion as to the various links between the various WIP subcategories. Paula explained how the subcategories would fit in within the various objectives. For example, several categories could fit into a 'natural character' section which would feed into objectives for MCI and native fish. The Committee questioned whether there was potential to cover water allocation issues under the urban section and Paula responded that this is something that they could include.

At the end of the session there was a discussion as to whether to proceed under an 'issues based' approach. Paula responded to this query and confirmed that this is something which can be explored at the upcoming workshop.

*Actions:*

- *To consider how water allocation in urban areas will be handled in the WIP*
- *To consider an issues based approach to the WIP Structure*

### **Issues Papers**

***Purpose of Session:*** To provide an explanation of the three Issues Papers that have been circulated to the Committee (including sediment, *E.coli* and metals) and to allow the chance for them to provide feedback.

#### **Sedimentation Paper - Paula**

Paula outlined the paper on sedimentation and referred to informative slides.

There was in-depth discussion on various technical matters relating to sedimentation. For example, explanations were provided on whether average sedimentation rate should be the net rate and how the quantum of change related to the recommended reduction percentage.

It was noted that the Ruamāhanga recommendations relates objectives to a 2040 timeframe and Paula explained that the 2040 timeframe applies for rivers to be swimmable under the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM), but that other timeframes can be explored in terms of achieving other objectives.

There was discussion about the measurement of net average sedimentation rate as the Committee wanted to understand certain aspects so that they can make the policy defensible. This included discussion on the model sediment budget and how much sediment stays in the harbour.

Options for reducing sediment on erosion prone land were explored, ranging from regulation to education and voluntary mechanisms. Financing mechanisms were also discussed and it was suggested to the Committee that there were various options in terms of approach. For example, they could focus on the top five steep catchments / erosion prone sites, requirement of Farm Management Plans (FMP) or they could recommend investment in land management resources in erosion prone catchments. There was discussion of the phasing in of FMPs. The retirement of land was also discussed as if this is required then that would be a significant cost to those land owners.

It was noted by the Committee that in terms of rural engagement, there has only been a short history of this by GW in Te Awarua-o-Porirua compared with regions such as the Wairarapa. Paula suggested that they could recommend in their WIP that GW should invest more in relationship building and education with rural landowners in the Whaitua.

There was discussion over the regional parks and what options they had to look at policies relating to them. There was also commentary about the potential for blocks that GW own to be sold to fund the retired slopes, and also whether GW could review the need to farm on their parks.

The Committee were asked if they still favoured mapping the high risk land uses, and it was confirmed that they were happy with this approach but that any policy proposed needed to plan for the change over time.

There was discussion over the issues around stream bank erosion and the difference between natural processes of sediment running to the beach. Potential policy responses were explored including riparian planting, starting at the headwaters, engineering solutions, maintenance programmes and the opportunity to initiate changed practices at point of sale timing. Issues such as legacy erosion and the need for cost effective solutions were acknowledged. The need to recognise different parts of different streams where there are riparian planting and other practices was also acknowledged as being necessary.

*Actions:*

- *To check on net average sediment rate – and how measured in a dynamic environment*
- *On graphs change draft reduction target to something like an acceptable load / objective – work on the language used*
- *To investigate suggestions regarding retirement of land mechanisms and identify erosion prone land; relating to GW owned farms; how to fix the issues around stream based erosion, when there are existing consents*
- *To have a glossary of terms*



## ***E. coli* Issues Paper**

Kat outlined the paper on *E. coli*.

Clarifications of the paper were firstly provided including; confirmation that the modelling used applied dilution factors for the wastewater overflow, clarification of how much *E.coli* comes from road run off and the approach to use instream concentration versus a target of number of overflows. The opinion of mana whenua on any overflow was noted.

There was discussion over the existing management of wastewater with the PCC onsite wastewater management bylaw (septic tanks), and how this is being monitored. This will be investigated by PCC and reported back on.

There was a conversation on the benefits of source tracking to know where the *E.coli* was coming from e.g. human, animal or wildfowl. It was discussed how there may be an argument to split urban and rural influenced parts of the catchment but to go further may not have many benefits.

It was commented that from looking at the tables in the papers, that it isn't clear which ones are WCC responsible areas and it would be useful to have the areas under WCC authority collated for the WIP.

There was discussion about the Wellington Water pumping stations, and the challenges in going from an E band state to a C. There was also some commentary on greater resourcing for connection checks for new builds.

### **Actions:**

- *Investigate the monitoring of the septic tank WOF and report back*
- *Add in monitoring points to the tables*
- *Check on dilution rate in the assumptions*
- *Check on approach to look at overflow in terms of concentrations rather than limits*
- *Consider greater resourcing / education to check cross connections on compliance of new builds*
- *Separate WCC responsible areas in all three papers*

## **Metals (Zinc and Copper) – Urban Contaminants**

Tim outlined the paper on metals and referred to informative slides.

There was in-depth discussion on the practicalities of enforcing changes such as roofing with infill developments. For example, would someone need to upgrade when they propose an addition to their house (and how big did that addition or change need to be), or do you pay a development contribution? It was noted that even with water sensitive greenfield development 100% of the metals cannot be removed so it is necessary to look at offsetting (finding reductions elsewhere) on roads, infill or elsewhere.

There was a discussion about what the most harmful pollutants were. The graph on page 4 of the Issues Paper was explained, with reference to the 95% percentile, and also noting the anomaly in the tables which occur as there is a more acute effect during rainfall. There was an explanation given as to why the project team used reference to dissolved (as opposed to totals) for toxicity in freshwater

whilst in the harbour they are looking at the metals in the sediment. It was noted that there is potential for a rule to tackle both but captured within different objectives.

An explanation was given as to why you can't get zero runoff with greenfield development. There was discussion on how to approach this, as other areas and countries have used offsetting to balance these effects with improvements.

There was a discussion over the effects from existing industry and high risk practices. This included highlighting that they will have existing consent conditions to work within.

There was a side conversation on whether brake pads without copper were available for purchase in New Zealand and whether advocacy was necessary. It was explained how a high percentage of contaminants were flushed away during rainfall events, however, there are options to grab the metals along the way with rain gardens, street sweeping and emptying sumps. It was noted that most new developments will have a requirement for colour steel style roofs.

There was a discussion in regards to instream limits with reference to the Australian case study where they have thrown out Australia and New Zealand Environment and Conservation Council (ANZECC) guidelines and utilised a load based limit instead. This would involve reducing load by a certain percentage compared with having done nothing. It was clarified that there is no agreed model.

There was general agreement to the policies within the paper. There was discussion in terms of potential limits to greenfield development and what that would mean in terms of zoning. It was acknowledged that there would need to be good reasons for taking this stance as councils are under pressure to increase housing. There was discussion as to whether higher density would assist in meeting their objectives. It was noted that PCC are currently looking to set up a framework to enable more medium density development in Porirua, including increase in height limits in the city centre.

There was a question posed to the project team regarding the effect of metals runoff from railway lines. Paula confirmed that there was an investigation in terms of this effect and would check on this.

At the end of the discussion it was highlighted that the big issues are sediment from rural and wastewater from urban.

*Actions:*

- *Paula to investigate outcome from research into effect from railway lines*
- *To consider offsetting options to help manage greenfield development*
- *To consider whether it is possible to enforce things such as replacing roofs, incentivising brake pad alternatives (or is it too far away), or funding more street sweeping*

**Workshop 27/28<sup>th</sup> October**

The Committee requested an update from Wellington Water on network design development. It was noted that the wastewater treatment plant consent is up for renewal in 2020 (being led by Beca) and that Wellington Water are about to publically engage about upgrades to network.

**WIP Introduction**

**Purpose of Session:** *To check if the draft Introduction sets the right tone and to check if there were additions/modifications.*

The Committee expressed the need for a new clean copy of the draft Introduction. It was noted that there was a need to understand the relationship with Ngāti Toa and to be upfront about it in the Introduction.

The Committee discussed how it's best to adapt the good model of Ruamāhanga for their Introduction, but that it needed to be tailored for this Whaitua.

It was questioned as to whether the Introduction should state how much of a role GW has.

Some Committee members voiced concern over being named in the Introduction and for the recommendations to be directly the Committee's recommendations as opposed to the Whaitua.

There was a discussion over the need to cover the background of the reasons for choosing this model to come up with a WIP. E.g. to be clear about who it is for and what the main outcome is. It could explain further who are these people, what they were given to do and what the constraints and opportunities were.

It was noted that having a te reo quote at the beginning of the Introduction in quotes could be deemed inappropriate.

It was agreed that the content and style of the Introduction was important, rather than the exact details. It was suggested that an Executive Summary may be useful up front.

*Action: To create clean copy of the draft introduction including checking in with Ngāti Toa; to express more context of the process – why GW took this approach; include recommendations in principle.*

---

## **Part 4: Conclusion**

---

### **Planning for WIP Workshop**

The next Committee workshop is the 27<sup>th</sup> and 28<sup>th</sup> October.

The Committee discussed how they would like the workshop to be prioritised. The Committee stated that they would like a session with Ngāti Toa to understand their thinking and progress on their draft. The Committee stated that they would also like an update from Wellington Water on consents, network capacity planning and the wastewater treatment plant upgrade.

It was also suggested that they would like the opportunity to tidy up the objectives.

The projec team enquired as to whether they would want papers for each of the topics not covered at this meeting, and it was suggested that perhaps it would be better to read by the issues rather than the location.

There was a discussion regarding engagements that may be necessary, particularly with the larger rural landowners, and that there was no mention of that in the timetable. There were comments about how it's important for the Committee to reach a consensus that they are happy with, but

noted that when comparing urban to rural the implications on the rural will be on a relatively small amount of people.

---

### **Thank-you and Close**

Stu asked if there was any other business. It was noted by the Committee that it might be useful to have part of the WIP structure drafted out for the upcoming workshop.

Larissa closed the meeting with a karakia.

The meeting closed at 9.07pm.

DRAFT

## APPENDIX ONE – ACTIONS Following from TAoPW Committee Workshop 4 October 2018

WORK AREA	DETAIL	WHO	BY WHEN
ENGAGEMENT	Get clarity on what the mana whenua voice will be in the WIP at the next Ngāti Toa meeting. Invite Ngāti Toa to the upcoming workshop	Shane	Update October 9
ENGAGEMENT	Send through the details of the larger rural landowners session to project team and committee	Jon	Update October 9
ENGAGEMENT	Send out invite to the PCC Workshop on November 1 <sup>st</sup> to project team and committee	Suze	Update October 9
POLICY DEVELOPMENT – WATER ALLOCATION	Consider how water allocation in urban areas will be handled in the WIP	Paula	For weekend workshop
WIP CONTENT	Consider issues based approach to the WIP Structure	PT	For weekend workshop
TECH	Check on net average sediment rate – and how you measure that in dynamic environment	Brent	For weekend workshop
ENGAGEMENT	On graphs change draft reduction target to something like an acceptable load / objective – work on the language used	PT	For public engagements
POLICY DEVELOPMENT - SEDIMENT	Investigate suggestions regarding retirement of land mechanisms & id erosion prone land	Paula	For weekend workshop
POLICY DEVELOPMENT	Investigate questions relating to GW owned farms	Paula	For weekend workshop
POLICY DEVELOPMENT - SEDIMENT	Investigate how to fix the issues around stream based erosion, when there are existing consents	Paula	For weekend workshop
WIP CONTENT	Glossary of terms	PT	Ongoing
POLICY DEVELOPMENT – E.COLI	Investigate the monitoring of the septic tank WOF regime and report back	Torrey / Kat	For weekend workshop
WIP CONTENT	Add in monitoring points to the tables	PT	For weekend workshop
TECH	Check on dilution rate in the assumptions	Brent	For weekend workshop
POLICY DEVELOPMENT – E.COLI	Check on approach to look at overflow in terms of concentrations rather than limits	Kat	For weekend workshop
POLICY DEVELOPMENT - EDUCATION	Consider greater resourcing / education to check cross connections on compliance of new builds	Kat / Jo F	For weekend workshop
POLICY DEVELOPMENT – E.COLI	Consider the urban versus rural contribution to <i>E.coli</i> issues (to avoid putting effort into stock exclusion when it might not be the problem)	Kat	For weekend workshop
WIP CONTENT	Separate WCC areas from tables – in all three issues papers	PT	Ongoing
POLICY DEVELOPMENT – METALS/UD	Research into effect of runoff from railway lines	Paula	For weekend workshop

POLICY DEVELOPMENT – METALS/UD	Consider offsetting options to help manage greenfield development	Rachel	For weekend workshop
POLICY DEVELOPMENT – METALS/UD	Consider whether it is possible to enforce things such as replacing roof, incentivising brake pad alternatives (or is it too far away), or funding more street sweeping	PT	For weekend workshop
WIP CONTENT	Create clean copy of the draft introduction. Checking in with Ngāti Toa re: introduction; express more context of the process – why GW took this approach; include recommendations in principle	Suze	For weekend workshop

DRAFT