

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

**Saturday 27<sup>th</sup> October 9.00am – 5.00pm**  
**Ramaroa, Queen Elizabeth Park, McKay's Crossing Entrance, Paekakareki**

**Sunday 28<sup>th</sup> October 9.00am – 4.00pm**  
**Greater Wellington Regional Council, Shed 39, Fryatt Quay, Wellington**

**Workshop (Closed to the Public)**

---

## Summary

This report summarises notes from a two-day workshop of the Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua Committee held Saturday 27<sup>th</sup> and Sunday 28<sup>th</sup> October 2018.

These notes serve to provide the context for the Committee's decision-making and policy direction.

---

## Contents

These notes contain the following:

### Overview

- Workshop Purpose
- Proposed Agenda
- Key Decisions to be Made
- Committee Decisions
- Workshop Actions
- Abbreviations

Workshop notes for each day of the workshop

---

## Overview

---

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

1. To make a decision in regard to the two outstanding objectives (harbour enterococci & sediment metals)
2. To take the Committee through potential policies and methods to achieve water quality limits - these include polices and methods to help address all water quality issues the Committee has previously discussed and set objectives/limits for, including sediment, *E.coli*, metals, other toxicants, periphyton/macroalgae (+nutrients), peak flows, ecosystem health (macroinvertebrate community index, native fish) and water allocation
3. To seek consensus and identify gaps on the policy direction and content within the first draft of the Whaitua Implementation Programme (WIP), as developed by the Project Team since the previous Committee workshop
4. To update the Committee on Ngāti Toa’s chapter .

The first, second and third purposes of the meeting were achieved. Decisions were made regarding the two outstanding objectives; the Committee worked through all the policies and methods in the draft WIP with a direction received for each, and several gaps to be resolved identified. The fourth purpose was achieved in part; an update was provided by the Project Team however the Committee would still like to hear directly from Ngāti Toa.

### Proposed Agenda

Saturday 27<sup>th</sup> October

TIME	TASK	PURPOSE	WHO
<b>Part 1: Introduction</b>			
9.00am	<b>Karakia</b>		Hikitia
	<b>Welcome</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apologies: Dale</li> <li>• Introductions</li> </ul> <b>Chair’s Direction</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Purpose of meeting &amp; agenda outline</li> </ul>	Establish purpose of meeting	Stu
	<b>Housekeeping</b>		Claire
<b>Part 2: Whaitua Implementation Programme</b>			
9.15am	<b>Introduction / Role of Weekend Workshop</b> Focus of the workshop	Clarify what we are doing today; where this fits in the	Claire

		decision-making process	
	<b>Consensus Refresher</b>	To clarify the Committee's mandate with regards to the consensus process	Tim
9.35am	<b>Draft WIP Structure Update</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To provide context for how the weekend is carved up</li> </ul>	To briefly take the Committee through the suggested structure to place the discussions over the weekend	Paula
9.45am	<b>Managing Contaminants – Policy response</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Urban development – Greenfield and Brownfield</li> <li>High risk metal / legacy</li> <li>Harbour metal objective</li> <li>Rainfall capture and reuse</li> <li>Urban infrastructure</li> <li>Integrated Planning</li> </ul>	To reach consensus on the queries raised within the papers and clarify agreement with the direction/policy approach proposed in the papers	Rachel
<b>10.30am Morning Tea</b>			
10.50am	<b>Managing Contaminants – Policy response</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continued (from list of topics above)</li> </ul>	To reach consensus on the queries raised within the papers and clarify agreement with the direction/policy approach proposed in the papers	Rachel
<b>12.30 Lunch</b>			
1.15pm	<b>Earthworks &amp; Forestry</b>	To reach consensus on the queries raised within the papers	Paula

		and clarify agreement with the direction/policy approach proposed in the papers	
<b>2.15pm Afternoon Tea</b>			
2.30pm	<b>Water Allocation</b>	To reach consensus on the queries raised within the papers and clarify agreement with the direction/policy approach proposed in the papers	Paula
3.15pm	<b>WIP Introduction</b>	To agree on the draft introduction	Committee Member and Suze
<b>Part 3: Community &amp; Council Engagements</b>			
3.30pm	<b>Debrief of Recent Community &amp; Council Engagements</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wellington City Council Environment Reference Group (Stu)</li> <li>Residents Associations' Public Meeting (Committee Member)</li> <li>Rural Technical Workshop (Diane)</li> </ul>	Taking feedback from the presentations and using this in future engagements and to inform Committee's work	Led by committee Members – then staff
3.45pm	<b>Tomorrow's session</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Location: Greater Wellington</li> </ul>		Stu
	<b>Thank yous</b>		Stu
	<b>Karakia</b>		Hikitia

Sunday 28<sup>th</sup> October

TIME	TASK	PURPOSE	WHO
<b>Part 1: Introduction</b>			
9.00am	<b>Karakia</b>		Hikitia
	<b>Welcome &amp; Chair's Direction</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agenda outline</li> </ul>	Establish purpose of meeting	Stu

	<b>Housekeeping</b>		Claire
<b>Part 2: Whaitua Implementation Programme</b>			
9.10am	<b>Introduction / Part 2 of Weekend Workshop</b> Focus of the workshop	Clarify what we are doing today; where this fits in the decision-making process	Claire
9.15am	<b>Channel form and habitat</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Riparian shading</li> <li>• Fish pass barriers</li> <li>• Spawning areas</li> <li>• Ephemeral streams</li> </ul>	To briefly take the Committee through the suggested structure to place the discussions over the weekend	Jane
<b>10.30am Morning Tea</b>			
10.50am	<b>Erosion prone land and stock access</b>	To reach consensus on the queries raised within the papers and clarify agreement with the direction/policy approach proposed in the papers	Paula
<b>12.00 Lunch</b>			
12.45pm	<b>Wastewater section</b> With Wellington Water attending to be involved in policy discussions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cross connections</li> <li>• Network overflows</li> <li>• Septic tanks</li> <li>• Stock access to waterways</li> <li>• Enterococci objective</li> </ul>	To reach consensus on the queries raised within the papers and clarify agreement with the direction/policy approach proposed in the papers	Jerome Wellington Water representative
<b>2.30pm Afternoon Tea</b>			
<b>Part 3: Conclusion</b>			
2.45pm	<b>Summary of Weekend Workshop – and direction given as to where to from here?</b>	To understand how the	Tim / Suze

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overview of decisions made</li> <li>• Options on how to proceed</li> </ul>	Committee is feeling about how to finish and to agree on next steps	
3.30pm	<b>Future Community &amp; Council Engagements and Other Business</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Future Engagements: Large Rural Landowners Meeting; Porirua City Councillor's Whaitua Workshop; others required</li> <li>• Social idea of meeting with new Wellington/ Hutt Valley Whiatua?</li> <li>• Any items from floor?</li> </ul>	Taking feedback from the presentations and using this in future engagements and to inform Committee's work	Led by committee Members – then staff
	<b>Thank you</b>		Stu
	<b>Karakia</b>		Hikitia

**Key Decisions to be made**

The following key decisions were to be made:

- Confirmation of two outstanding objectives
- Consensus decisions made on the policy direction of all issues covered to enable a draft WIP to be developed in full post the workshop
- Decide what the next steps are / where to from here

**Committee Decisions**

The Committee confirmed the two outstanding objectives for harbour sediment metals and harbour enterococci.

The Committee agreed to adopt the objectives, limits and targets put forward by the Project Team within the memos dated 18<sup>th</sup> October 2018.

The Committee agreed to set the harbour enterococci objectives with both shorter and longer term timeframes, at the simple spatial scale, as follows:

Onepoto Arm: Shorter term - C, Longer term - A  
Pauatahanui Inlet: Shorter term - B, Longer term - A  
Coast: Shorter term – B, Longer term - A

The Committee discussed the recommendations provided for each of the issues and made decisions on the direction of the recommendations. The Committee agreed in principle with all of the recommendations, however in some cases the discussion led to amendments to the recommendations or additional recommendations being proposed. The detailed outcomes of these discussions are provided in Appendix 1: Recommendations Summary Table.

The Committee provided direction for the next steps of the process; that the Project Team would complete further work on the recommendations and

accompanying narratives, with the next Committee workshop set down for early December.

---

**Workshop Actions** The following actions were agreed to:

1. Project Team to re-examine the methodology students will use over the summer considering the objectives (Jane).
2. Project Team to follow up with Wellington Water Limited (WWL) for the recreational use assessment report (Suze).
3. WWL to provide outline of WCC investment in the network (Suze to follow up).
4. Barbara and Project Team to reintroduce the English titles for the values alongside the Ngāti Toa titles (Suze).
5. Project Team to update the Committee with respect to the timeline for WIP development following the planning meeting on 29<sup>th</sup> October (Suze).

---

## Workshop Notes – Saturday 27<sup>th</sup> October

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

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

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

**Greater Wellington Project Team:** Tim Sharp (Project Manager), Sheryl Miller, Brent King, Ned Norton, Suze Keith, Rachel Pawson, Jane Clunies-Ross, Paula Hammond, Keith Calder, Porirua City Council (PCC)

**Invited Guests:** Sharli-Jo Solomon, Kristy McGregor

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

Notes prepared by Suze Keith and Kristy McGregor.

---

## **Part 1: Introduction**

---

### **Karakia & Welcome**

The meeting was opened at 9.10am with a karakia from Larissa . Stu welcomed all attendees.

---

### **Role of the Weekend Workshop**

Claire explained that the role of the weekend workshop was to provide a chance to work through the first draft of the Whaitua Implementation Programme (WIP). The Project Team had listened to the Committee's feedback from the last workshop and developed this into the draft. She noted the sessions were designed to ensure that the policy responses for each phase were discussed with the Committee before the Project Team further developed the recommendations. She explained that the Project Team were particularly interested to hear whether the Committee felt the proposed policy responses were appropriate to achieve the objectives and deliverable by their community, so that this could be captured within the background narratives.

---

### **Consensus Refresher**

Tim provided an overview of the consensus method for decision making. He noted the expectation that Committee members would speak up if they weren't happy with the direction of the discussion.

The Committee sought clarification on how the consensus approach would apply to those Committee members that weren't present at the workshop, noting the absence of the Wellington City Council (WCC), PCC and Te Upoko Taiao (Greater Wellington's Natural Resources Plan Committee) representatives. It was noted that the WCC and PCC representatives had provided their support for decisions the Committee made over the weekend, and that it would be up to any Committee members not present at the workshop to speak up prior to, or following the workshop, if they had any concerns with the policy direction presented in the draft WIP document.

It was noted that a formal workshop is to be held with Te Upoko Taiao and Greater Wellington (GW) Councillors on 11<sup>th</sup> December. In addition, an update on recommendations is to be provided to both groups in the third week of November, pending progress with the recommendations.

Tim advised that Ngāti Toa are preparing an iwi management plan, which will contain a chapter on the whaitua. It will not set out detail on loads and limits but rather be a narrative.

---

### **Draft WIP Structure Update**

Paula provided an overview of the structure of the draft WIP Version Two, noting it is an evolving process and that a draft Version Three would likely be developed following the weekend. Paula noted that themes would be captured throughout the weekend, which could be included in their own chapter within the WIP. The Committee immediately identified some of the themes that needed to be acknowledged in the WIP, including adequate monitoring and enforcement, and education. Other themes emerged organically during the weekend and those collated are set out in



Appendix 2: Overarching Themes. The Committee noted that the WIP is the community's plan, that must be delivered by the community.

The WIP structure for draft Version Two is set out in the presentation, [attached here](#).

---

## Part 2 – Sediment Metals Objectives

---

Prior to the session Committee members were provided with a memo setting out further advice and recommendations for the harbour sediment metals objective. The pre-circulated memo can [be found here](#), and presentation delivered during the workshop [here](#). Brent presented on the additional harbour metal objectives provided to the Committee, and the additional recommendations for total metal load limits and reduction targets.

The Committee questioned why the objective was only to maintain; and noted that Ngāti Toa would likely not find that acceptable.

The dynamics between metals and sediment were discussed. The Committee sought clarification on what was being considered – dissolved metals, metals in sediments, and the dynamics of metals in sediment – questioning aren't they largely set and don't disperse? The ability for the Committee to only control what was coming into the harbour, as a receiving environment, was noted. However the Committee recognised that metals in sediments in freshwater, whilst harder to measure the deposition zones, affects the ecology of the streams via both deposits and also dissolved metals. The Project Team explained that the reduction of dissolved metals is very important for freshwater and therefore the objective is set in the streams. Meanwhile, total metals become more important in the context of sediment metal concentration in the harbour, and therefore both objectives are required.

Means of measuring the sediment metals were discussed, with the Committee emphasising the need to be able to practically measure against any objective set to assess progress towards the objective. The Committee also sought clarification on how metals in freshwater would be monitored, and sought that the WIP set out the general principles and themes for monitoring. The spatial distribution of the current regime for monitoring harbour sediments with respect to metal concentrations was noted as a possible area to revisit.

The Project Team clarified that the objectives related to what was in the sediment core in the harbour. Hot spots were discussed, and it was noted that the streams in the hot spots could be prioritised for action, to capture large loads.

The combination of 'clean sediment' without metals (from uncontaminated rural land) with sediment with metals leads to the concentration of metals within the sediment the metals being diluted. The Committee noted the potential, given the drivers and objectives to reduce sediment, that if the amount of clean sediment is reduced and not the metals this may lead to an increase in the concentrations of metals because of lack of dilution. Once the metals are in the sediment, some will be flushed out over time, but a considerable amount are buried with a top layer of sediment, which is the most important layer for aquatic life.

Legacy issues with regards to sediment were discussed, and accordingly the Committee raised the need to take a precautionary approach with objectives because of the uncertainty with the data. The Project Team acknowledged that the setting of objectives is based on our current knowledge which does have uncertainties and assumptions. There is likely future research that will increase the

collective understanding and which may change the numbers. At the point of a plan review, in the ten year cycle, that would be an opportunity to revisit the objective with new findings, to allow for adaptive responses. The Committee sought clarification as to whether this required setting a definitive number. It was acknowledged that in the WIP a number could be set along with an explanation of what the Committee expects will be achieved. The importance of the narrative description in terms of level of protection and reasoning was acknowledged. It was noted that the WIP should identify some of the key assumptions so that people reading the WIP have an understanding of the role of monitoring data and modelling; perhaps in the context section? It was noted also that the WIP should provide certainty around how the monitoring can be improved to best serve the review process.

### **Limits and Reduction Targets**

Brent explained the current load as the limit, and the target as the reduction over time. He noted a percentage had been used, recognising the degree of variability with the current load. The percentages have been determined based on the Committee's desired objectives for the harbour.

The Committee requested that the WIP recognise the interrelationships between objectives within the overarching themes, so that the links between sediment and other attributes are outlined, as are the links between freshwater and the harbour environment.

The Committee questioned the rationale for the reductions and whether the percentage reductions were achievable, noting the significant practice change that would be required. Some attributes are more difficult to shift than others. The Committee questioned the timeframes that applied to the targets. The Committee otherwise expressed general agreement with the limits and targets as recommended by the Project Team.

*Committee Decision: That the objectives as put forward by the Project Team be adopted by the Committee.*

---

### **Part 3 - Managing Metals**

---

Rachel explained that there were five high level policy areas identified to manage metals within the whaitua. For each she explained the current approach; provided an overview of the draft recommendations; and identified points for discussion. The presentation can be [found here](#).

#### **Planning for Urban Growth (Integrated Planning) – Page 14 of the Draft WIP**

##### *Recommendations 1 & 2*

The Committee agreed that the wording of the recommendations be strengthened, so that instead of reading "should work together" they are amended to read "it is recommended that...". The importance of partnerships and working together was discussed, and more broadly identified as a theme across the whole WIP, if progress is to be made in achieving the objectives.

Discussion was had regarding whether the recommendations should be merged into one; however, it was agreed that working together would be the overall banner, with two key outcomes as articulated in recommendations 1 and 2, each focusing on different areas.

---

---

The Committee noted that it was important that the WIP acknowledge metals have been used as a proxy, and therefore the recommendations are about addressing all contaminants.

---

## **Effects of Urban Greenfield Development and Brownfields Redevelopment (Land Use Effects) – Page 16**

### *Recommendation 1*

The Committee noted that hydrological neutrality needs to be defined in the WIP. There are risks with it being defined either too low or too high – could consider a retention depth or mean annual volume approach. The Project Team will prepare a definition for the Committee’s consideration.

With regards to b) the Committee discussed the recommendation noting other contaminants, however it was agreed that objectives cannot be set for all contaminants. By managing zinc and copper the WIP is managing others.

The Committee discussed the option of endorsing the proposed proposed Natural Resources Plan (PNRP) rule regarding paint to drain.

### *Recommendation 2*

Rachel explained the hierarchy of the resource consent activity status, from permitted activity through to non-complying and prohibited. The ability to sharpen the term *less than minor effects* was raised by the Committee, however it was acknowledged this is a commonly used RMA term. The Committee clarified the threshold at which new urban development becomes subject to the rules within the PNRP - currently 3000m<sup>2</sup>. The Committee questioned the origins of this size threshold and recommended that this threshold be reviewed, noting that in brownfield development the lots are likely to be much smaller, but a collection of small developments may have more than minor effect. The Committee sought to understand what other protections could be introduced for new developments.

The relationship of the recommendations to the content of the PRNP and past GW influence on the placing of proposed new growth areas were discussed, including the differing role of district and regional councils in managing discharges and land use. Traditionally land use has been managed by territorial authorities. However, where there are water quality effects, GW can engage. It was acknowledged that currently GW has little role in determining the locations of proposed new growth areas, but greater involvement is likely with the future direction.

The Committee discussed opportunities for a rule that encourages developments which over a certain threshold, to implement water sensitive design measures in order to achieve a lower activity status.

The impact of Recommendation 2 on the ability for the area to provide for housing was discussed however the Recommendation was seen as providing an opportunity to renew/revive existing urban areas.

### *Recommendation 3*

The importance of education including around roofing practice was noted, given that people do not connect with what enters streams and harbours from hard urban surfaces such as roofs and

driveways. The Committee noted potential for a controlled use of roofing cover or approved handling certificate. This would need to be implemented by another body, and thus the importance of engaging with MFE and other organisations such as Ministry of Building, Innovation and Employment (for the building code), Building Research Association of NZ and Water NZ was noted.

---

## **Discharges – Page 19**

### *Recommendation 1*

Rachel took the Committee through the draft recommendation and noted that there was still work to be done with WWL on developing this recommendation.

The Committee noted that the water sensitive urban design modelled was a massive step change and needs to be ensured that this is now not lost on the delivery agencies. The Committee noted an expectation that there is a level of continuity between WWL and GW and that the continued working together should be reflected in the language used in the recommendation. The recommendation should reference the global consents that WWL is currently progressing.

---

## **Incentivising Stormwater Mitigations in Existing Urban Areas Including Brownfield Development – Page 20**

### *Recommendation 1*

It was noted that some District Plan rules tried to provide incentives for developers to buy grouped pieces of land and intensify; the method not being all that successful. WWL are looking at opportunities for wetlands. It was noted that there are many opportunities for brownfield development in Porirua City and that the council were wanting to encourage development in the central business district. It was also noted that Housing New Zealand owned a lot of property (houses and land) in the whitua, creating another potential opportunity for achieving good water quality outcomes.

The Committee noted that developers should bear the costs of stormwater treatment and other devices in their developments and discussed developer contributions. The opportunity for public-private partnerships were discussed, however the Committee were apprehensive with the notion of providing public investment into infrastructure within new developments and sought that the phrasing of a) be amended accordingly. The Committee discussed the need to encourage brownfield development over greenfield development through the WIP.

The Committee considered that the recommendation should apply to both brownfields and infill development, and that the recommendation be brought forward to sit between sections 4.3.3 and 4.3.4.

---

---

## Existing Urban Footprint (High Risk Metal Sources, Industrial and Commercial Areas, Major Roads) – Page 21

### *Recommendation 1*

The Committee provided support for reducing the footprint of zinc roofs and cladding. They also sought that the recommendation seek to reduce the copper guttering and heavy metals utilised in other building materials.

The Committee discussed opportunities for an incentive scheme to encourage reduction in zinc roofs; acknowledging that the response will be different for managing or driving change for existing roofs versus new roofs. A spatial focus on the Porirua Stream was noted. The Committee noted support for greater education regarding the spraying of roofing, and engagement with Ministry for Environment, Building Research Association NZ, WaterNZ and lobbying for changes to the building code.

### *Recommendation 2*

The regularity of street sweeping was discussed. In PCC, it is undertaken three times per year in high use areas. The Committee discussed the benefits of undertaking street sweeping prior to high rainfall events, and prioritising hotspots areas. How this was placed, and the priority it requires compared with other mitigations was discussed.

### *Recommendation 3*

The lack of line of sight and knowledge about the receiving environment for stormwater was noted, with people unaware of where stormwater pipes are located.

The Committee identified methods to better connect people with their waterways including an the addition of an environmental water zone to Land Information Memorandum reports, and placing agreed stream names on signs at the Council and WWL pipe network, harbour street outlets and drain covers for streams within the catchment that have been piped. The Committee were keen to see the naming of the streams led by or undertaken with Ngāti Toa.

It was noted that there is an existing pollution programme (GW's Take Charge), and this should be acknowledged within 3d) by framing such as "reintroduce and improve".

*Committee Direction: The Committee agreed with the recommendation; noting amendments to acknowledge the existing programme and that an education component be included in the WIP with methods such as those identified above.*

---

## Vehicular Sources – Page 22

### *Recommendation 1*

There are a number of initiatives looking at vehicular sources of copper. Environment Canterbury has conducted a communications campaign on the impacts of copper brake pads. There are alternative brake pad sources people could consider; the Committee noted the need to look at the positives and negatives of the alternate sources. This issue is also understood to be part of MFE's

recent work on Good Management Practice. The Committee sought that GW work with PCC and WCC to advocate collectively to central government.

The Committee also referred to research completed by Kiwirail on copper in the railway corridor.

The Committee noted that there are other contaminants, and questioned whether they were all satisfied that the recommendations within the WIP are treating all sources of heavy metals? It was noted that there might be still unknowns, much of which is a national issue. The Committee sought these be dealt with through the inclusion of assumptions within the WIP which recognised that the WIP was prepared with the information available at the time; and by identifying a review process that would allow for the ability to update a plan and methods of achieving objectives based on new information.

The committee questioned where in the WIP other chemicals such as cigarettes, littering, micobreads are captured, not seeking to be confined or limited to these items.

The importance of treating stormwater as a means of dealing with contaminants such as those from vehicular sources was discussed. There was a discussion on the value of car wash options that properly collect and dispose of wash water through the wastewater system. The importance of the ability to recycle contaminated items such as paint and batteries at a depot was emphasised by the Committee.

#### *Recommendations 2 & 3*

No specific discussion was had with regards to Recommendations 2 & 3.

---

#### **Part 4 - Earthworks and Forestry**

---

Paula presented on earthworks and forestry provisions for the purpose of managing sediment in the whitua, as outlined in [this presentation](#). She provided a recap of the sedimentation and muddiness rate objectives, that the Committee had set at a previous workshop.

There was a discussion about muddiness and sedimentation objectives, and the inclusion of the deeper basins in muddiness and indicators of ecological health. The Project Team noted that the issue can be acknowledged however setting an objective would be difficult, both to measure and to achieve. The Committee sought that the objectives chapter explain why an objective cannot be set, noting that whilst muddiness causes changes in biodiversity and function it is not the significant problem (however the objectives seek to prevent the extent of muddiness increasing to look after the ecology of those areas). The Committee questioned what methods were offered to directly address muddiness? The Committee sought that muddiness be discussed in relation to ecological health and the health of the harbour, all of which are interlinked.

Paula then took the Committee through recommendations for each of the sources of sediment, starting with earthworks and forestry (with erosion prone land and stream bank erosion identified for Sunday's workshop).

## **Earthworks – Page 27**

The Committee sought to understand what percentage of earthworks can be attributed to earthworks and forestry, and the sources of the sediment within the largest sediment generating catchments. It was discussed that is quite dependent on the catchment; in some cases contributors are small scale but high risk.

It was identified that at present there is a gap in permitted activity standards for small earthworks, allowing for small earthworks which collectively may have an impact.

### *Recommendations 1 & 2*

The Committee discussed the importance of monitoring and building inspectors being aware of the current PCC Silt and Sediment Control Bylaw. It was noted that WCC only have guidelines, which are not as directive as a bylaw or rule in a plan, and the merits of a bylaw compared with guidelines and rules in a district or regional plan were discussed. The Committee noted the need for the bylaws to be firm and clear, with mechanisms for them to be enforced and education for people to be made aware. The ability to have one bylaw with consistency across the whole whitua was raised, as was consideration of appropriate permitted activity standards.

The Committee identified that the WIP needs to include monitoring, education and compliance as separate themes; education being distinct from monitoring.

The Committee noted the need to consider extreme flood events, and the need for policies to be reviewed in light of climate change and it's impacts.

### *Recommendation 3*

No specific discussion was recorded on Recommendation 3.

### *Recommendation 4*

The Committee had a discussion on the ways to manage the amount of land that could be open within the whitua at any one time. The need to consider the standards that sit alongside the 3000m<sup>2</sup> permitted activity thresholds were discussed. The Committee considered that the same rules should apply regardless of size of site. There were concerns raised with the equity of setting a limit that could be open at any one time within the catchment and the difficulty with how this rule would work in practice – who would get to open where? The Committee felt that each consent needed to be looked at on its own merits. Concern was raised with the word *open*. The Committee noted that in addition to sediment there were other water quality benefits from not disturbing land and leaving the existing environment protected. The threshold for a sediment and erosion control plan was discussed, these not being required at small sites. Such plans are also required within the district plan.

The Project Team acknowledged more work was required on this recommendation, and this would be undertaken, incorporating the Committee's feedback.

---

## Forestry – Page 29

It was noted that 13% of the whitua is in plantation forestry. The Committee were interested to see a plan for where forest growth within the whitua is currently at. The Committee noted that internal audits already occur within forestry operations often by way of a site visit. The Committee discussed the addition of a recommendation which would see a forestry compliance role appointed; a role that understands the rule framework, is able to look at where the biggest impacts are likely to be in the catchment and would be able to work with forest owners across the entire Greater Wellington region to work with landowners on potential barriers to good management.

The Committee discussed the threshold of a 2ha harvest in any three-month period, the size at which a harvest plan is required under the National Environmental Standard for Plantation Forestry (NES-PF). They considered that the impact of this amount of harvest could be significant if done within a short period of time, compared with the same area harvested over a longer period. The Committee questioned whether there was a way to capture the areas of harvest under 2ha within the whitua – this being an opportunity to revisit.

The Committee discussed the NES-PF as it related to the catchment, including the mapping of zoned areas, and questioned whether the NES-PF is enough for the catchment? It was felt by some that there is a need to give people the confidence to run a successful practice with appropriate training and equipment. Setbacks for planting and spraying were discussed; as dictated within the regional plan. The Committee were asked whether there were parts of the whitua where it would be better to leave some of the forest to reduce surface runoff risks, and therefore should incentives be designed to retain it? It was noted that the economic value of the land is almost worthless if the crop cannot be harvested.

The Committee questioned how much of the forestry in the catchment was owned by GW. The Committee questioned whether there were opportunities to stagger the harvest within the whitua.

The effects of central government initiatives such as the billion trees program, carbon sequestration and Emissions Trading Scheme were briefly discussed, as was the likelihood of forestry increasing in the catchment. Given the price of land and lack of workforce the Committee considered it was not likely for forestry to grow excessively. Of that that is planted, not all will be for commercial harvest, for example there are opportunities with manuka.

The assumptions of retirement in the modelling work undertaken were discussed. The Committee sought to relate the forestry recommendations back to the necessary retirement needed to drive change required to meet the objectives. The terms best and good practice were discussed as an intent to achieve the best outcome possible and the Committee expressed a preference for consistency with Council language.

During the discussion the Committee compared the forestry recommendations and efforts to achieve these with that required for other areas that were of perhaps higher priority or having greater impact. For example, the Committee sought to weigh up the benefits of monitoring forestry versus other areas such as cross connections. The Committee sought to compare the 2ha forestry threshold with the 3000m<sup>2</sup> earthworks threshold applied in an urban development context.

### *Recommendation 1*

The Committee requested that Recommendation 1 refer to barriers to “good management practice”.



## *Recommendation 2*

The Committee expressed support for the receipt of a harvest plan in line with the NPSPF.

## *New Recommendation*

That a new recommendation is added regarding a forestry compliance officer being established.

---

## **Part 5 - Water Allocation**

---

### **Water Allocation – Page 36**

Paula presented the current policy direction for flows and water allocation in the whitua, including limits within the PNRP. Paula outlined what these limits mean for users in terms of the number of days per year flow in the stream is below the proposed minimum flow. [The presentation can be found here.](#)

The Committee enquired as to the current amount of water allocated within the catchment, of which there are four current allocations in the longer term, with others for Transmission Gully ending in 2022. For the remaining four users, the Committee questioned what the minimum flows mean in terms of restricting their take? The Committee discussed the viability of the current takes with the whitua having a range of between 14 and 32 days of mean annual low flow. Options for those that would be affected by the shut off and require water for keeping plants and root stock alive were discussed. The Committee requested that an explanation be added to better explain allocation amounts within the WIP.

There was a question raised regarding the allocation amount for the Porirua Stream, and whether Kenepuru should be treated within this or not, as it affects the minimum flow and allocation amount.

## *Recommendation 1*

The Committee sought to understand the limits on water use that are placed on residents in urban areas. In Recommendation 1 this is stated as domestic use within the household. The Committee noted that new rural residential zoning will put pressure on water resources.

The Committee sought that the term “Committee decided” be removed from the recommendation and that this form part of the narrative setting the context for the recommendations.

There was a brief discussion on water metres, with the national regulation only applying to takes over 5L/second. The Committee noted the possibility of including a recommendation that if taking from a stream, a water meter must be installed for it to be a permitted take, no matter what the size of the take. The Project Team noted the need to do a cost benefit analysis of requiring metering of all takes from all streams, including domestic takes, not just those requiring a consent. The Committee commented that they felt there was an opportunity to be bold given there are few operations dependent on large takes currently and as such the new rule would not have a massive economic impact, and for the small streams in the whitua there is potential for the take to be a

significant proportion. The Committee raised the possibility of creating a stepped approach to implementation of the water allocation recommendations, so that people had time to adjust.

The Project Team resolved to give more thought to metering, urban restrictions, defining domestic use, and monitoring.

#### *Recommendation 2*

The question of 'reasonable' was discussed as deriving from learnings from the Ruamāhanga whitua.

#### *Recommendation 3*

The Committee indicated support for incentivising storage mechanisms at an individual property scale.

#### *Recommendation 4*

The Committee supported the notion of gaining a better understanding of current takes, including the volumes and uses of these takes.

---

## **Part 6 - WIP Introduction**

---

### **WIP Introduction**

Suze and Larissa spoke to the progress on the WIP Introduction chapter. Refinements to the WIP introduction are being led by Larissa and Barbara. The importance of illustrative maps was discussed, with two categories identified – one which depicts the region and city boundaries, the streams, landuse etc and one which is more of an infographic which encompasses the values, Ngāti Toa sites of significance, the solutions etc. It was also discussed that the introduction would be partially informed by the rest of the WIP, and as such, may come together in its final form once the other chapters have been drafted.

It was agreed that Larissa and Barbara would continue to lead this work, with the option open for others to provide feedback as it evolves.

---

## **Part 7 - Debrief of Recent Council & Community Engagements**

---

### **Wellington City Council Environment Reference Group (ERG)**

The ERG was attended by Warrick and Stu. The ERG expressed concern that the whitua process was taking too long and being used as a deferring tactic and are concerned in the potential for delays to implement. The ERG sought confirmation that the Whitua recommendations will be strong enough to drive a change in practice.

## Residents Association Public Meeting

The Committee members able to attend this event agreed that positive feedback was received. There was concern that the meeting was sought by Pukera Bay, Plimmerton and Paremata residents and that the choice of venue in a central location may not have garnered as many northern people as were interested. About 30 people attended; there was good questioning and debate amongst those that attended. The residents expressed a sense of nervousness about the severity of the water quality situation, and the Committee noted the need for greater education and information dispersal.

Future engagements were discussed. The Committee noted the benefit of structuring the talk with local examples, relevant to the specific part of the whitua and attendees at the meeting.

The Committee discussed the possibility of public meetings in other locations and noted the need to plan and strategise around how this is to be completed. Would it be Residents Associations or catchment groups? The Committee enquired as to whether there would be an opportunity for them to present an update to Ngāti Toa on their progress.

The Committee considered that the WIP needs to state when Ngāti Toa departed from the whitua Committee, with the long term values the WIP is founded on being developed with Ngāti Toa at the table. It was agreed that forward planning would be done on the conclusion of the weekend.

## Rural Technical Workshop

The Rural Technical Workshop is being planned for 8<sup>th</sup> November, for larger rural landowners, by invitation only. [Please see the since updated timeline in Appendix 3]

---

## Part 8 - Conclusion

---

Stu thanked everyone for attending and advised of meeting details for the next day's workshop.

---

## Workshop Notes – Sunday 28<sup>th</sup> October

### Workshop Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whitua Committee:

#### Attendees

**Present:** Stu Farrant (Chair), Barbara Donaldson, Larissa Toelupe, Richard Cook (until 1.30pm), Warrick Lyon, John McKoy, Diane Strugnell, John Gibbs

**Apologies:** David Lee, Dale Williams, Hikitia Ropata, Jo Fagan (Greater Wellington)

**Greater Wellington Project Team:** Tim Sharp (Project Manager), Sheryl Miller, Brent King, Ned Norton, Suze Keith, Rachel Pawson, Jane Clunies-Ross, Paula Hammond, Keith Calder (Porirua City Council), Kara Dentice (Wellington Water)

**Invited Guests:** Jamie Preyer (GW Land Management Advisor), Stewart McKenzie (Wellington Water), Jerome Wyeth (4Sight), Kristy McGregor

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

Notes prepared by Suze Keith and Kristy McGregor.

---

## **Part 1 - Introduction**

---

### **Reflections from Saturday's Workshop**

The Committee noted additional thoughts that had occurred following the discussion on day one of the workshop. One issue raised was how small volume one off takes such as weed spraying would be provided for considering Recommendation 1 which removes permitted activity takes in the whitua. The opportunity to allow for small takes when streams are not at low flows was discussed, including potentially allowing for these where they are part of a farm management plan which is restricted by the timing and size of the property; or merging water take for spraying with the permitted activity rules for spray discharge.

---

## **Part 2 - Channel Form and Habitat**

---

Ned and Jane presented on channel form and habitat, which forms one of three components of ecosystem health, alongside water quality and quantity. The presentation can be found [here](#). Reminding the Committee of the ecological health objectives they had set, it was acknowledged that these would be turned into numeric values.

It was highlighted that flow hydrology is still a work in progress.

---

### **Riparian Shading – Page 31**

#### *Recommendation 1*

The Committee supported the recommendation but sought that the nature of riparian planting be detailed within the WIP.

#### *Recommendation 3*

There was a discussion on the prioritisation of streams for stream planting, noting that there needs to be a strategy regarding timeframes and targets for planting. The Project Team noted that some catchments might have greater opportunities than others to make sediment reductions and develop fish habitat. A criterion for prioritising was discussed, including questions such as whether planting the headwaters would be a greater priority. It was acknowledged that riparian planting by its very nature lends itself to site specific responses, not binary rules within a plan. Any direction needs to be functional and meet the purpose of what is trying to be achieved by the objectives. The challenge of meeting both biodiversity/ecological health and flood management outcomes through planting were discussed, and the Committee considered that existing policies such as the GW Biodiversity strategy should align.

---

The Committee discussed including a recommendation for the maintenance of riparian planting areas, including spraying for weeds. It was noted that contractors generally have a higher standard than landowners for planting and spraying, but outcomes differ between rural and urban areas, and there may be a lack of awareness of the purpose of the planting which reduces its potential effectiveness.

For landowners, the concern is with the management of strips particularly weeding. Opportunities such as working closely with environmental care groups to align these efforts with the water quality objectives being sought, riparian management plans, and increasing funding for riparian planting protection. It was noted in urban areas, erosion hot spots as identified with developers likely to pay for the impacts caused downstream.

The question of where the costs should lie for rural land that is taken into riparian planting was discussed. It was noted that riparian planting can add to the asset value of the farm, by retaining soil moisture and plant growth. It was also noted by the Committee that the value may not be seen now but may be realised in the longer term – the perception of loss amongst landowners needing to be shifted. In regions such as Waikato and Taranaki where planting programmes have been implemented, regional councils have contributed to funding planting and fencing costs, in partnership with landowners. To engage landowners, education and methods of positive engagement are required. The concept of ‘with rights comes responsibilities’ was discussed, with the Committee wanting to engender private landowners to contribute to public outcomes, and how barriers to achieving this might be removed. The principle of the landowner as the temporary caretaker or kaitiaki was also discussed. It was noted that in the lowland areas this will involve working with lifestyle block owners, and in these areas riparian planting would potentially take most of the land. It was noted that the recommendations are written to encourage and support co-operation between the city councils, GW and private landowners. Rights were discussed in the context of the RMA which places an obligation on landowners regarding the entry of contaminants to waterways.

#### *Recommendation 4*

An amended recommendation was presented titled “Channel form and physical habitat”.

With regards to the recommendation and project to complete fish passage mapping, the Committee requested inclusion of a watercourse assessment with PCC and WCC prior to reconstruction of channels, identifying where the issues are and areas to be prioritised. Interns could be utilised to assist with this assessment. The Committee considered that Porirua and Kenepuru streams should be prioritised. The Committee asked if watercourse assessment could be added to the State of the Environment monitoring programme (SoE).

*Action: Project Team to re-examine the methodology students will use over the summer considering the objectives.*

#### *Recommendation 6*

The ability to waiver consent fees to incentive and promote riparian planting through the consenting regime was discussed.

A question of riparian planting in relation to greenfield development was raised. In the GW PNRP riparian planting is required, with respect to water protection. The Committee raised that this currently doesn’t specify how wide, and therefore some prefer to do the bare minimum, with less

than ideal outcomes. It was discussed that site-specific responses are required, to be balanced with setting a minimum width such as 20m, which is best practice and routinely applied in other parts of NZ. The Project Team will consider options for sharpening the recommendation.

The Committee noted that we are trying to push the functioning of the ecosystems to suit ourselves, and in doing so, missing the costs of the changed hydrology. One of the objectives of riparian planting should acknowledge all functions of riparian planting, including nutrient recycling, bank stability, macroinvertebrate community index, along with the meandering nature of the stream. Accordingly, the Committee sought a title that was broader than riparian shading for the suite of recommendations.

#### *Recommendations 2 & 5*

The Committee provided general support for the incentivisation of riparian planting programmes.

---

#### **Fish Passage – Page 32**

The Committee sought that a recommendation includes the removal of waa stops/tide valves from streams and outfalls in the catchment. The impact of their removal during king tide events were discussed. The mapping identification should provide some understanding of where these areas remain, provided the assessment includes pipe outlets.

The Committee sought consistency of language in the recommendations regarding endorsement or support of PNRP policy.

---

#### **Spawning Areas – Page 32**

##### *Recommendation 1*

It was acknowledged the draft recommendation is quite broad and could be more specific about a catchment plan, which identifies priority areas, potentially as a subset of riparian management. The Committee identified an opportunity to identify Ngāti Toa's traditional knowledge of spawning locations, as a way to strengthen the connection. There is also research and mapping that has been done by scientists within the whaitua that could help to inform selection of these priority areas.

---

#### **Ephemeral Streams – Page 33**

There was a discussion on the definition of a stream, and the Committee asked this be included as one of the themes for further education as people are unclear with where the rules apply. Discussion was had on the scope of the PNRP with regards to streams, covering perennial and intermittent but not ephemeral. The Committee sought a firm recommendation on ephemeral streams. The Project Team noted that ephemeral streams can be managed through the consenting process for urban development of greenfield sites. In rural areas ephemeral streams are a lot more difficult to identify and apply a rules framework to. With regards to filling in of streams and their headwaters, the Committee acknowledged that some headwaters are more critical than others and should be prioritised.

---

There was a brief discussion on the use of the term critical source areas, a commonly used term in farm planning which will need to be defined in the WIP if it is to be used in a recommendation.

### *Recommendations 1, 2 & 3*

It was considered that the three recommendations could be best recognised in other chapters, with tweaks to acknowledge the above issues.

### **Part 3 - Erosion Prone Land and Stock Access**

Paula presented on the recommendations for erosion prone land and stock access. The presentation [can be found here](#).

### **Management of Erosion Prone Land – Page 28**

The Committee discussed key contributors to erosion loads, including why the Kenepuru catchment has such high loads.

#### *Recommendation 1*

The varying methods of identifying and mapping land use classification were discussed. Brent noted the difference in the classifications of land use, with the Land Use Classification (LUC) based on suitability for pastoral use not necessarily representing suitability for forestry activity, as is the focus of mapping in the NES-PF. The Project Team suggested that as noted within Recommendation 1, it may be that a hybrid of mapping system is used to identify focus areas for farm plans, and then work can be completed at a property scale, thereby working with a landowner on a site scale to manage risk. Further work will need to be done to explore this. The Committee considered that Recommendation 1 apply to properties regardless of land use (pastoral, forestry or other) and be determined based on a size threshold.

With regards to forestry, whilst the NES is in place for forestry, management plans can complement the introduction of the NES. The need to marry assessments and planning with monitoring was also discussed.

The Committee considered the Project Team's question regarding whether the recommendation should apply across the whitua or just in the top five sediment producing water management units (WMU). Targeting sediment loads and sources would target hillslopes and land at risk of landslides. The Committee noted that whilst there was modelling data available, more prioritisation research needs to be completed. There wasn't appetite for choosing the top five WMUs, as Committee members felt that it was fairer to identify priority areas where there might be immediate gains able to be achieved.

Discussion was had regarding the degree and urgency of change - providing time for response in a non-regulatory manner before a recommendation of this sort is introduced as regulation through a permitted activity standard, or whether farm plans should be mandatory. The Committee discussed a size threshold or erosion prone land triggering the need for a farm plan. Prioritisation would be required.

With regards to farm management plans, it was considered that these should seek to include all aspects of environmental management such as riparian planting, addressing contaminants,

discharges and erosion management within one plan. Rather than being termed farm management plans, to capture all land uses the Committee suggested there could be reference to an erosion control plan, which farmers could incorporate into their farm management plans, and other landowners could have as a standalone document. The various farm plans that industry bodies have developed were identified and it was agreed that efficiencies should be maximised. The need to identify tools for lifestyle blocks to manage their land was also raised by the Committee.

#### *Recommendations 2 & 3*

No specific discussion was recorded on Recommendations 2 & 3.

#### *Recommendation 4*

The need for GW to provide greater resource for land management within the catchment was discussed. The Committee acknowledged this is critically a relationship building role, with the narrative to the recommendation needing to recognise that there has been little history of relationships between GW and landowners within the catchment – in contrast to the lengthy relationships established in the Wairarapa. This means there is a lack of information that there is a service available to landowners. It is recognised that demands on the service are likely to increase because of other recommendations within the WIP, thus leading to a further imbalance of resources and needs.

It was recognised that it will require both a combination of the land management advice and the work programme team to deliver. The Committee sought that the recommendation be amended to read “increase resource to provide sufficient resources to deliver land management advice, expert input into farm plans and deliver on the work programmes identified”.

#### *Recommendation 5*

The role of GW in their management of the regional parks was discussed by the Committee. There was discussion on whether the regional parks should ‘lead by example’ and provide an opportunity as case studies to demonstrate the ability to combine grazing with protecting against sediment and run off or whether stock should be completely removed from the regional parks. It was acknowledged that different approaches may be required for each regional park. It was agreed that GW in any case would need to follow the recommendations applying to all regional parks, completing an erosion control plan.

---

### **Stream bank erosion – Page 28**

#### *Recommendation 1*

No specific discussion was recorded with regards to this recommendation however the Committee expressed general support for improving consenting processes where environmental gains are to be derived.

---



## **Stock Access to Waterways - Page 29**

### *Recommendation 1*

The Committee enquired as to the rules in the PNRP. In this whitua, stock are able to access waterways so long as permitted activity standards around pugging, stream discoloration are met. Committee members had differing views on the merits of this, considering the low intensity of farming in the whitua.

The Committee noted they would like to see GW expertise involved in developing solutions to exclude stock, rather than an adversarial approach. The origins of 15-degree slope within the recommendation were discussed, as was the potential to determine stock exclusion based on stocking rate. The Committee also identified another option where the WIP adopts a version of the PNRP approach to Category 2 waterbodies, of which there are none in the whitua, by mapping low land areas such as Horokiri to Battle Hill, and within these areas the same stock exclusion rules as apply to Category 2 waterbodies would apply.

The Committee noted that stock exclusion was also identified in recommendations on Page 26 of the Draft WIP and provisions need to be considered cohesively. In all, stock exclusion was identified to be a complex matter and requiring more thought in order to be well executed.

---

## **Part 4 – Managing Wastewater**

---

Kara Dentice and Stewart McKenzie of Wellington Water, and Jerome Wyeth of 4Sight who had prepared the draft wastewater policy packages, attended the session.

### **Objectives for Enterococci**

The current state and Committee's freshwater and harbour objectives were noted, as set out in the [attached presentation](#).

The harbour enterococci objective was discussed, with options presented for the Committee to consider, including whether a spatial scale is used, whether short term and longer term timeframes are applied, and levels to set objectives. This follows receipt by the Committee of further advice and recommendations for the harbour enterococci objectives ([see Memo here](#)).

The Committee noted that for a spatial objective it depends on what's measured. Currently only a few places are measured – is that the same measure that will be used going forward to monitor progress? The Committee identified a preference for the simpler spatial scale objective. The Committee sought that a recommendation regarding monitoring be added to the WIP.

A discussion was had on the interrelations between the subtidal and intertidal areas, between which there are complex movements in water and behaviours of pathogens. The edges of the harbour where streams input are harder to shift in quality, however the management options do not differ between areas of the harbour. A couple of discrepancies were identified between the modelling results and conditions within the harbour, such as Browns Bay, which will mean even more effort is required to achieve the objective than the modelling results have implied.

---

The Committee noted that this was the first time they'd seen an objective split by timeframe and sought to reconcile this with the timeframes for the other objectives. The difference between the Committee's aspirations for the place, and the realistically achievable objective were discussed. The Project Team noted that the narrative could be used to speak to the longer-term objective that cannot be shown through the C band objective. The Committee indicated strong support for the use of short- and long-term objectives, noting the WIP needs to indicate what sort of timeframes are being referenced by the terms short and long. Within the narrative it will need to articulate that the short-term objective is based on what we know at the moment, with the policies in the WIP designed to meet those objectives and acknowledging that meeting the longer term objectives would require going beyond what is known and possible in the current setting. As in, currently there are no methods of achieving those long-term objectives. The Committee reiterated the importance of acknowledging how they got to the bands including what it would take, and what inputs were drawn upon, such as the modelling.

The Committee questioned why the coast is a B band and sought that this be examined given that if there is going to be an aspirational element this should be for the open coast. There was a strong desire by the Committee to achieve an A band across all freshwater and harbour areas in the long term.

The Committee identified an opportunity to revisit the *E. coli* objectives and ensure that the modelled approach is reasonable, and the extent to which it allows for innovation. It was identified as the top issue for the community that merits extra time.

The Committee agreed to set the harbour enterococci objectives with both shorter and longer term timeframes, at the simple spatial scale, as follows:

Onepoto Arm: Shorter term - C, Longer term – A  
Pauatahanui Inlet: Shorter term - B, Longer term – A  
Coast: Shorter term – B, Longer term - A

---

## **Presentation from Wellington Water**

Stewart McKenzie presented on the Porirua Wastewater Programme that WWL is leading. This includes a consent for the operation of the Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) that expires in 2020 and improvements across the network. The Programme involves a collaborative group. The presentation can be [found here](#).

Issues with the network include wet weather overflows, due to growth and high inflows, and dry weather leaks, due to ageing public and private networks and cross connections. Whilst volume is greater during rainfall events; the effects tend to be worse in dry weather. WWL is increasingly building their understanding of data on the network. The Committee enquired about consented wastewater overflows. WWL explained that these are classified as a new wastewater discharge to freshwater which is a non-complying activity under the PNRP, which can be very difficult to consent. . The nature of the Porirua WWTP system compared to others within the GW region were raised, with Porirua considered the worst due to the neglect of the system but also being located in one of the most sensitive receiving environments and with challenging topography. The number of cross connections on private land are unknown. The Committee noted that new entries to the system should not be making it worse; it's the condition of the downstream network that is the problem.

---

Iwi view of the shoreline outfall pipe was asked; it's understood that the harbour is a stronger priority for Ngāti Toa and there's a recognition that prioritisation of investment is required.

WWL noted the recent completion of a recreational use assessment, completed by Rob Greenaway, that may be useful for the Committee.

*Action: Project Team to follow up with WWL for the recreational use assessment report.*

The Committee enquired as to the focus on consenting the network versus the WWTP, with WWL noting the expiry of the WWTP consent means they are focusing on the consent for the WWTP with the upcoming deadline. Consideration of funding mechanisms were also asked about. For WWL the whaitua recommendations help inform the developments required to complete the gaps in service delivery and seek appropriate funding from the Councils. WWL noted that if there's a storage and conveyance response this can be levied through the Long Term Plan, once approved. The Committee noted that current expenditure on wastewater infrastructure and improvements is too low and the upgrade of the network must happen before the population growth occurs, so funds need to be invested immediately.

*Action: WWL to provide outline of WCC investment in the network.*

With regards to a policy response to meet the Committee's objectives, WWL noted that dry weather overflows require replacing leaky pipes; which simultaneously creates the opportunity to increase capacity. Even if dry weather improvements are implemented, it will not achieve the E band when it rains.

WWL is working on a clear directive from PCC to accommodate expected growth in the region. Within WWL's storage and capacity scenario, 2 overflows per annum were expected.

With regards to stormwater, WWL are working toward a global stormwater consent for the Wellington region.

The Committee sought to understand the best programme that could identify issues and then serve notice that it needs to be fixed. This may take a long time to achieve but lead to a favourable outcome, for example, methods such as at every point of sale there's a cross connection check, or a warrant of fitness scheme for houses. The Committee felt efforts should be made to make it easy for private homeowners to get their pipes checked, such as via a rates relief mechanism, at point of sale, or as part of their LIM report. The Project Team are to consider the best methods to engage private homeowners in checking their pipes.

---

## **Recommendations – Page 24 -26**

The recommendations were discussed.

The Committee sought recommendations to address private issues as well as network wide issues and identified a recommendation which sees developers completing developments with onsite wastewater storage and stormwater treatment. The Committee identified a recommendation that all new developments must manage their wastewater in consideration of the wastewater network otherwise they have to wait for increased network capacity.

---

Discussion was had on the lack of integration between Councils in the Wellington region for growth planning and spatial plans.

WWL recommended that to reach a C band, dry weather overflows be prioritised.

The Committee agreed that WWL address replacement of pipes as a priority. The Project Team noted the requirements of the NPS-FM regarding improvements to fourth order streams and rivers, which would mean Porirua/Kenepuru, Horokiri and Pauatahanui streams be prioritised. However, the Committee felt that it shouldn't be the NPS-FM alone that determines priorities; some streams within the whitua have high value but are in poor state, and should be prioritised accordingly. The Project Team sought that the Committee provide prioritisation around the work programme. The Committee questioned whether this was more about what rather than where?

WWL also raised non-asset solutions, such as reducing water consumption and water tanks. Education regarding professional practice with plumbers, pipe cleaners and tree removal was also discussed; as was education surrounding septic tanks.

---

## **Part 5 - Summary & Where To From Here**

---

### **Engagements**

Further to the discussion at the previous day's workshop, the Committee discussed the need for future engagements. The Ruamāhanga Whitua considered they needed more public engagement once recommendations were completed, and these were focused on areas of key public interest, in their case water allocation. For the whitua, this could be sediment and erosion?

The need to engage with the large rural landowners who will potentially be the individuals most greatly affected by the WIP was discussed and it was agreed that this is an important focus group. The Committee are looking to them for solutions, to ground truth the policy direction and provide validity for their recommendations.

There was consideration of who else would have the knowledge to provide detailed feedback on specific sections of the WIP, such as those most concerned about the sediment and *E.coli* in the harbour, or urban development. Drawing on the recent experience of the residents associations meeting, the Committee felt that the benefit to be gained with the wider community can be achieved after the recommendations have been developed.

---

### **Timeline for WIP Development**

The next steps for WIP development were identified as including making amendments to the recommendations with the Committee's direction, adding in the urban hydrology section, the narrative commentary, and completing the introduction and objectives chapter.

The Committee requested that for the values, the Ngāti Toa interpretation be used alongside the English names.

*Action: Project Team to reintroduce the English titles for the values alongside the Māori titles.*

The Committee were asked to contribute to the timeline for the remainder of the year, with the Committee expressing an interest in receiving the revised recommendations as soon as possible. A tentative next meeting date was set down for early December.

Dates for progressing the work was discussed, as were formal engagements.

The Project Team agreed to further discuss the timeline at their planning meeting on Monday 29<sup>th</sup> October. The outcome of that discussion is attached as Appendix 3: Timeline through to December.

*Action: Project Team to update the Committee with respect to the timeline for WIP development following the planning meeting on 29<sup>th</sup> October.*

---

## **Thank you and Close**

Stu thanked the Committee for their attendance and engagement over the weekend.

All attendees had an opportunity to provide a reflection of the weekend, with many positive sentiments shared. The Committee noted how beneficial the weekend was for working through the content, when compared with the shorter evening meetings. The Project Team acknowledged the value of the discussion in providing a personal voice and narrative to what, entering the weekend, was largely a technical policy document. The Project Team noted they would now revise the draft WIP considering the discussion.

Larissa closed the meeting with a karakia. The meeting closed at 4.20pm.

---

## **APPENDICES**

### **Appendix 1: Draft Recommendations Master Table**

Can be found on the 'Presentations & Reports' page of [Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua website](#)

### **Appendix 2: Overarching Themes & key commentary for inclusion in the WIP**

Items to be included in the WIP

- List of how the freshwater and harbour areas are monitored & recommendations on future monitoring
- Enforcement
- Education
- Key assumptions including modelling and the plan review cycle
- Numerical and narrative objectives
- Metals (Cu, Zn) have been used as a proxy for other contaminants in the urban context
- Connectivity between attributes and objectives
- Emerging contaminants/plastics/other sources
- Stream names & streams gazetted

- Resourcing
- Implementation
- Farm Management Plans – how to use? To deal with erosion prone land, contaminants, discharge to land
- Timeframes - short and long term; think about what timeframes are; use timeframes for other objectives, not just Enterococci
- Riparian Management Plan or holistic approach of a Waterway Management Plan
- Prioritisation and criteria – balanced approach; trade-offs; cost
- Explanation of linkages between different parts of the WIP

#### Principles held by the Committee

- Objectives need to be practical – consider costs and practicalities
- Perversity of outcomes/conflicts
- Future proof/review
- Working with partners (PCC, WCC, WWL) and integrated management
- Tighten/strengthen language of recommendations
- Value of ecosystem services – maintain and protect
- Economic lens?
- Bylaws versus guidelines

#### **Appendix 3: Timeline though to December**

The table below sets out the work programme post the 29<sup>th</sup> October planning session.

**Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua Committee Work Programme – November – December 2018**

WEEK OF:	NOVEMBER 5	NOVEMBER 12	NOVEMBER 19	NOVEMBER 26	DECEMBER 3	DECEMBER 10	DECEMBER 17
<b>WIP Content Development</b>	<p><i>By 2/11</i></p> <p>Contents order agreed V3</p> <p><i>By 9/11</i></p> <p>Recommendations Draft 2 complete for review by PT</p> <p>Objectives Chapter drafted</p> <p>Overarching themes drafted</p> <p>WMU lumping complete</p> <p>Nutrients policy drafted</p> <p>Map requirements identified</p>	<p><i>By 12/11</i></p> <p>WIP Draft 2 to PT</p> <p><i>By 14/11</i></p> <p>WIP Draft 2 to committee for feedback on intent/gaps</p> <p><i>By 16/11</i></p> <p>Numeric objectives, loads and limits agreed</p>	<p><i>By 19/11</i></p> <p>Receive committee feedback</p> <p>Introduction drafted</p> <p>Overarching themes drafted</p>	<p><i>26/11</i></p> <p>Objectives chapter (including timeframes), introduction and overarching themes chapter to committee</p>	<p><i>3/12</i></p> <p>Committee Workshop</p>		
<b>Engagement</b>	<p><i>Rural Tech Session November</i></p> <p><i>Rural Large Landowners November</i></p>	<p><i>GW ELT Update</i></p> <p><i>Ongoing discussions with WWL, PCC, WCC officers</i></p> <p><i>Ongoing discussions with Ngati Toa</i></p> <p><i>Ongoing discussions GW internal</i></p>	<p><i>GW ELT &amp; PCC, WCC, WWL ELT Updates</i></p>	<p><i>Wgtn / Porirua City Councillors Meeting or Update</i></p>	<p><i>By 7/12</i></p> <p><i>Whaitua Update to Te Upoko Taiao &amp; GW Council</i></p>	<p><i>11/12</i></p> <p><i>1pm – 3pm</i></p> <p><i>Draft WIP Workshop with Te Upoko Taiao &amp; GW</i></p>	