

Report of Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua Committee Workshop

23 November 2017, Wellington City Council

Summary

Contents

Overview	
Workshop Notes	
Session 1 – Welcome and getting started	
Session 2 – Water Allocation	
Session 3 – Information and engagement	
Session 4.1 – Urban Development and Te Awarua-o-Porirua: WCC	
Session 4.2 – Urban Development and Te Awarua-o-Porirua: PCC	
Session 4.3 – Considering urban development	
Session 5 – WIP structure and processes	
Session 6 – Any Other Business	
Appendix 1 – Chair’s Direction	
Appendix 2 – Groups’ discussions Considering Urban Development	

Overview

Workshop attendees **Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua Committee:**
Barbara, Diane, David, Hikitia, Jennie, John M, Richard, Sharli-Jo, Stu (Chair), Warrick

Apologies: John G, Larissa, Dale

Project Team:
Alastair (Project Manager), Suze, Jon, Grace, Keith, Shane, Kate

Facilitator: Isabella

Guests:

- David Mitchell - Senior Spatial Planning Advisor, Wellington City Council
- Torrey McDonnell – Principal Planner, Porirua City Council
- Peter Gilbert – special status observer (future Wellington-Hutt Whaitua committee member)
- Ryan Rose – Land Development Manager, Wellington Water
- Alice Bates, Policy Advisor, Wellington City Council

Workshop purpose The purposes of this workshop were to:

1. Make a decision about the water allocation bundle
 - a. and consider consensus decision-making in TAOPWC
2. Hear the latest on TAs’ urban development planning and see where

- TAOPWC's work may influence
3. Get a feel for the challenge of accommodating urban development within "maintain or improve", with reference to objectives
 4. Make a consensus decision on the process for WIP construction, specifically the overall level of TAOPWC involvement
 5. Be aware of the planned approach for combined information-gathering and engagement and to commit to participating in engagement events

With regards to purpose 1., four committee members were absent for this decision, so while consensus was reached by those present, the stance of these members will be ascertained ahead of the next committee meeting. All other purposes were achieved.

Committee Decisions and actions to do

- Committee Decisions**
1. 90% mean annual low flow (MALF) will be the default minimum flow for the whitua, and 30% MALF the default allocation limit by those committee members present
 2. Comfortable with the engagement activity as outlined in four one-pagers
 3. Stu, David, Hikitia, Warrick, Sharli and Barbara will support Diane at the Rural engagement on 12 February
 4. The overall outline proposed for the WIP is good.
 5. The WIP writing group will comprise Jennie, Hikitia, Larissa, Kate (WCC), Suze (GWRC).

- Actions**
1. Audience-specific talking points will be provided for Committee
 - a. Project Team to produce by 14th December
 2. One-pager summary of this meeting (and others going forward as decisions are made) for councillors to report back to their colleagues.
 - a. Project team to do this, by December 14
 3. Historic photos of Porirua Harbour from PCC presentation provided to Committee
 - a. PCC to provide to Committee, by next meeting [Done]
 4. Absentee members will be informed of Committee's decision about default water allocation limit and minimum flow, asked for their expressions of support or otherwise. Report back to Committee and PT.
 - a. Chair to do this, by December 14
 5. Summary of decisions to be made at Committee workshops in 2018
 - a. Project Team will produce this by December 14.

Workshop Notes

Session 1 – Welcome and getting started

Stu Farrant, Chair, and Jennie Smeaton

Jennie gave the karakia, and Stu welcomed and introduced the visitors. He made some reflections on the task before Committee this evening, drawing on themes from to his Chair's Direction (at Appendix 1).

Agenda:

- Welcome
- Water allocation decision
- TAs' urban development in Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua: WCC Dinner
- TAs' urban development in Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua: PCC
- Considering urban development – workshoping
- WIP structure and processes
- Information and engagement
- Any other Business

Session 2 – Water Allocation

The purpose of this session was to make a decision on the remaining elements of the water allocation policy package on which Committee had not found consensus at the previous meeting.

Stu opened the session by reminding Committee that at the last TAOPWC workshop the members had found consensus on the permitted activity takes, but failed to do so on the minimum flow and allocation limit. He also reminded Committee that there had been a suggestion that five minutes be taken to have the decision at this meeting.

He invited Committee to give their position on the proposed minimum flow and allocation limit that the project team had presented at the last meeting: 90% MALF and 30% MALF respectively.

There was no consensus.

Following this, Alastair reminded Committee that if they could not reach consensus on any decision required for the WIP, that would revert to Te Upoko Taiao to make.

There was then about 25 minutes of conversation at the Committee table, which ran instead of the water allocation consensus activity. Key themes are below.

Representative members and decision-making mandate

- One theme of the discussion was the extent to which Committee members formally representing partner organisations (GWRC, PCC, WCC, Ngāti Toa) needed to seek their organisations' endorsement before making decisions at the TAOPWC table.
- Members observed the characteristics of the WIP process: build it (mainly TAOPWC work), turn planning elements into policy language (mainly GWRC work) and then it becomes a plan change with RMA Schedule 1 process of notification, formal submissions etc.
- There should be no individual criticism of TAOPWC members because Committee's decisions are collective.
- Committee members have a mandate to make decisions shaping the WIP without binding their organisations, however
- Also a need to maximise stakeholders' support of the fledgling WIP so when it's notified there's maximum support, and maximum buy-in / willingness to implement it.
- Two kinds of engagement done by and around Committee members:
 - Engagement to get stakeholders' input (asking) – to inform Committee, and shape the substance of the WIP
 - and
 - Engagement to inform stakeholders (telling, about content and process), to build buy-in and reduce eventual opposition
- Partner organisations with a formal representative at the table can support or

oppose any aspect of the WIP when it is a Plan Change and notified (the submissions stage)

Role, purpose of TAOPWC vs other decision-makers

- Members observed that TAOPWC’s reason for being is to exercise decision-making powers (create a WIP) at the richer level of detail than any partner organisation’s decision-maker could exercise.
- There were observations that re-explaining and re-debating specific provisions with external decision-makers would be incredibly difficult. Committee members have acknowledged the topics’ complexity and their own arduous progress to the current level of understanding.
- Members observed it would be a Herculean task to replicate this with stakeholders or communities, so a balance must be found so that the Committee can do its job and external decision-makers can do theirs.
- Members expressed concern at the prospect of all future decisions being as difficult as this one has been, highlighting the need to smooth the consensus decision-making process so the effort Committee members put in won’t be wasted (with decisions having to revert to GWRC).

Partner representative members vs community representatives

- There was a challenging question about how members were talking to “their communities”, questioning representativeness and the legitimacy of members to make decisions at this table.
- This discussion featured some confusion about the distinction between members formally representing partners vs those representing the wider community as citizens.
- This was not clarified on the night but Committee are referred to [Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua Terms of Reference](#).
- Clause 5 differentiates between members who are appointed representatives of partner organisations (TROTR, PCC, GWRC (Te Upoko Taiao), WCC) and those whose presence at the table is as a member (not a representative) of the wider whaitua community - “community members”.
- People recalled that partner organisations have people on the Whaitua Project Team, feeding into the process and feeding back to their organisations, as well as formal representatives on Committee.
- Some complexities of Committee membership were canvassed, including the subtleties of wearing several “hats” formally or informally. There are analogies throughout the Committee, such as having affiliations with a particular group or sub-community of the whaitua while also being a whaitua community member
- One universally acknowledged observation was that there is no one Māori Voice, notwithstanding that there may be extensive shared values and correlations between positions on different issues.
- There were some criss-crossing discussions between TAOPWC members associated with Ngāti Toa and other iwi personnel which were taken to caucusing and addressed.

pNRP defaults and TAOPW WIP

- Several people recalled the process whereby the proposed Natural Resources Plan was prepared. (Committee were reminded that the NRP’s provisions will be the default unless a whaitua has different policy applied through a WIP process.)
- 90% MALF minimum flow and 30% MALF allocation limit is the pNRP default, which is at the conservative end of the spectrum as appropriate for a default that applies across the region in the absence of expensive stream-by-stream investigation. This, and the slightly more environmentally conservative 100%+20%, are both legally defensible.

- The pNRP also provides for permitted activity takes as a default
- The pNRP provisions were approved by Te Upoko Taiao (including iwi representatives) and developed with GWRC's partners including iwi. Ngāti Toa did not make a submission on the 90:30 provision.
- TAOPWC have already decided to do away with permitted activity (PA) takes in this whaitua, so if the WIP is approved and becomes part of the pNRP there will be no PA takes in this catchment.

Translating, revisiting and adjusting

- The percentage flow approach will get translated into a number (in litres/sec) for each stream so they represent an actual flow. This is based on GWRC monitoring data for streams.
- Consents are for much longer periods than Natural Resources Plan review periods, so there is a risk that a future GWRC Committee may decide to change these. All that can be done is to make sure people understand the rationale for the minima and ensure any decision-makers are properly informed.
- This Committee will be "revisiting" the water allocation decision but only insofar as it needs to fit with the rest of the WIP's policy package and contribute to achieving whaitua objectives.
- This will mean once the WIP is more complete, looking across the whole suite of policy methods Committee decides to use, and checking that the water allocation component is complete and appropriate. We will not be reconsidering it in depth.

Stream health, flow and methods

- There was some brief but unresolved discussion about the relationship between water in a stream (including MALF) and holistic stream health.
- Members clarified that it's not a linear relationship "more water = healthier", it's more complex
- There was a challenge as to why we couldn't be more conservative with the flow management tool. What harm would it do to choose 100%+20%? Members noted that iwi members may favour this approach.
- Members cited the additional restrictions on people using water in production / commercially and the impact on local economies and communities, while others cited the century or so of worsening degradation of the whaitua (against which, it was implied, an extra week of restricted commercial use paled into insignificance)
- Alastair reminded people that flows are more and less important for different species and attributes for different values. Flows are generally considered with fish in mind, rather than other players in stream ecosystems, but even different fish species' flow needs are different (e.g. relatively sensitive native finfish vs more resilient tuna)
- Sound levels of stream flow are necessary but not sufficient for ecological health and mahinga kai: providing in-stream habitat, bankside / riparian quality, natural character and access for gatherers are all important non-flow methods
- These have not been discussed in much depth during the minimum flow conversations.

Difficulties of segmented decisions

- Some members highlighted how difficult it was to make decisions on specific elements of the WIP, or of the catchment, in isolation from directly related elements.
- The present example of this was deciding on flow-specific methods (minimum flow and allocation limit) in isolation, rather than on a package that included methods for managing other related human effects
- Members emphasised how antithetical this is to the Māori worldview, and also to integrated catchment management principles.

- There were observations that this is how the whole process is being done – segmented up for specific discussions, with assurances that it'll come together later

After around 30 minutes, it was suggested that this decision be shelved until the end of the night, to allow time for caucusing during dinner. This was agreed and Committee decided to bring forward the engagement item on the agenda.

Session 3 – Information and engagement

(Jon Gabites, GWRC)

See [Presentation](#) and [Engagement information](#) on the Waitua webpage.

Session purposes:

- Committee are aware of the planned engagement activities between this and the next TAOPWC meeting
- Members indicate their commitment to participating in these

Jon outlined the reasons for engaging the Waitua's different stakeholder and catchment communities:

1. to develop relationships with them and enhance support for (or minimise opposition to) the eventual WIP
 2. to get insights from them for Committee about the practical feasibility of improving water quality
- This information will be part of a "decision support pack" that Committee will use to make decisions about objectives and limits. It will include modelling information, information from community and stakeholder engagement, information from mana whenua engagement, policy advice, and other information.
 - With input from Suze, Jon informed the Committee about other engagement activity with partner organisations:
 - at officer level (taking place in the background on an ongoing basis, but will also generate insights that need to be brought to Committee)
 - at governance levels (Committee will be asked to attend some meetings with councillors)
 - There was discussion about developers, including the need to understand what they saw as the "buts" or barriers to adopting good/best practice, and various desires to enable them engage efficiently ("surgically") with specific provisions and have lots of time to start internalising costs. This will be part of the decision support information to Committee.
 - There were observations that mostly WCC and PCC are dealing with the same few developers

Decisions:

1. Committee are comfortable with the process outlined for engagement activity (as per four one-pagers)
2. Stu, David, Hikitia, Warrick, Sharli and Barbara will support Diane at the Rural engagement on 12 February

Actions:

1. Committee also requested audience-specific talking points. Project team will do this, by our next gathering (14 December).
2. GWRC and WCC councillor members requested a one-pager summary of this meeting to report back to their colleagues. Project team will do this, by December 14
3. Project Team will send out dates for meetings with councillors with as much notice as possible.

Session 4.1 – Urban Development and Te Awarua-o-Porirua: WCC

David Mitchell, Senior Spatial Planning Advisor, Wellington City Council

See presentation [Urban Development and Te Awarua-o-Porirua: structure planning for Upper Stebbings Valley and Marshall Ridge, David Mitchell, Senior Spatial Planning Advisor, Wellington City Council](#) on the [Whaitua](#) webpage.

This session was the first of two opportunities to hear the latest on TAs' urban development planning and see where TAOPWC's work may influence.

Essentials of structure planning

- David's presentation introduced the concepts of spatial planning and structure planning, the reasons why these processes are needed, and the role they play in pre-RMA processes (slide 9).
- Structure planning is a way that councils provide for building communities, as they are not in the business of just providing housing.
- In structure planning, councils work with a wide range of social infrastructure stakeholders such as the Ministry of Education, as well as traditional infrastructure providers such as Wellington Water.
- The National Policy Statements impose statutory obligations on councils to provide both for urban development (NPS-Urban Development Capacity) and for maintaining or improving freshwater quality (NPS-Freshwater Management)
- Wellington City has significant population growth projected

There was a brief Q&A period before dinner. Questions included:

- How is Stebbings development and storm water going to affect the Stebbings Dam?
- Ryan Rose replied WCC and WWL have been working to see how much impact more houses will have on storm water flow. This has been accounted for in the storm water network upgrade plan and may involve a storage tank
- Is there a basic principle that Stebbings' new development will be water-sensitive?
- No because WCC haven't yet consulted on whether that is what the public want
- Is there a basic policy alignment between the two TAs?
- No (David) and Yes (Torrey McDonnell) – there are planners' working groups to get consistent policy on common issues such as biodiversity.

DINNER

Session 4.2 – Urban Development and Te Awarua-o-Porirua: PCC

Torrey McDonnell, Principal Planner, Porirua City Council

See presentation [Urban Development, Porirua District Plan Review and Te Awarua-o-Porirua](#) on the [Whaitua](#) webpage.

This session was the second of two opportunities to hear the latest on TAs' urban development planning and see where TAOPWC's work may influence.

Torrey cut his presentation short to help the meeting run to time, and members are recommended to see the full version of his presentation.

Essentials of structure

- Torrey talked through the interconnected drivers of change in Porirua, and how structure planning and PCC's current engagement fit into the planning process.

- planning** He referred Committee to slide 6 (skipped in the presentation) that shows the relationship between the pNRP, Whaitua and District Plan processes
- PCC’s process is running alongside the development of the government’s new template for District Plans. PCC’s plan will ultimately be an e-Plan (presented using GIS and searchable online by property).
 - PCC and WCC are modelling together to assess the demand for different types of housing and where it could go
 - This stage of the planning is about getting Porirua communities’ vision and intentions, so council can set a course that will achieve the city’s outcomes
 - Engagement on the six interrelated themes is “What matters to you about [how we move]?”
- Direction-setting and change**
- Some geographic areas are more malleable than others – e.g. the Northern Growth Area has not been zoned yet, while Aotea is not only zoned but is also highly covenanted preventing much change to land use.
 - The District Plan can only influence some things (see slide 17)
 - PCC is also working on other fronts such as infrastructure investment and planning with Wellington Water, and on the implications of Transmission Gully’s opening and State Highway 1’s revocation to a local road
 - Business and commercial land use is complex and PCC has been advised to get existing areas working better rather than start new ones. However Transmission Gully will likely create opportunities for industrial activity near it (given its heavy freight carrying)
 - Porirua is not very resilient to our several natural hazards and this is a big (expensive) challenge. Amenity and “how we play” offer lots of scope for improvement with elementary changes (e.g. incorporating better design principles around water and green space)
- Next steps**
- PCC is finishing off its “what matters to you” engagements and will start running “go deep” groups with certain sectors. Whaitua project team and PCC staff are liaising to get the most out of these engagements for both District Plan and Whaitua processes without exhausting or confusing people.

Session 4.3 – Considering urban development

This session was about getting a feel for the challenge of accommodating urban development within “maintain or improve”, a challenge Committee will face in the new year setting whaitua objectives.

Alastair introduced the session, highlighting several points:

- Even the world’s most sophisticated water-sensitive urban development (WSUD) will add contaminants to the water.
- Therefore if nothing else is done, even 100% world’s-best-practice WSUD will worsen water quality in Porirua (and it’s highly unlikely we’ll even get 100% NZ best practice)
- Notwithstanding this, we need to make some big improvements in water quality in our harbours (below national bottom lines) and maybe also in some other WMUs
- Need to consider role of small degradations / offsetting. How do we feel about this?

Following Alastair’s introduction, the Committee broke into two with project team and visitors mixed in. Groups discussed a series of questions (at Appendix 2) with scribes note-taking (focussed on the final three questions).

After approximately twenty minutes in groups, Committee reconvened and shared their conversations’ highlights.

Groups' flip-chart notes are at Appendix 2. Some themes from the discussion are below.

- Offsetting**
- This will be a big feature of the discussion in 2018. People will need to think about what scales we're intending to "maintain or improve"
- Time scales**
- This will be a big feature of the discussion in 2018. People will need to think about what scales we're intending to "maintain or improve"
 - Another big feature of next year's conversation will be scale in time: how much improvement / change in practice should we expect in a given time?
 - How much is reasonable given historic water quality degradation, and historic change in land use and human activity in Porirua?
- Committee decision-making**
- Values will need to come forward in discussions: if someone's position is that a particular human activity or natural process must be provided for in a particular spot, why that is, and why that's important
 - It's important to bring the consensus decision-making process up front in the WIP so people understand how difficult it is
 - It's also need to be clear how this process relates to iwi decision-making.
 - Members informed the Committee that at the recent Te Upoko Taiao meeting iwi reps raised the opportunity to have a collective of iwi reps (Wellington-Hutt whitua included) to review and critique the whitua process the process from an iwi perspective
 - Picking up on the concerns raised in the first round discussion about water allocation (that TAOPWC would be handicapped if members could not make decisions without detailed reference to outside decision-makers), Committee was advised that Ngāti Toa members will be coming to TAOPWC meetings with consensus going forward. This does not mean there will be agreement behind by the Board.

Following this, the Chair invited Committee members to show their position on the proposal of 90% MALF minimum flow and 30% MALF allocation limit. There was consensus support for this for those present. Absentee members will be informed of Committee's decision about default water allocation limit and minimum flow, asked for their expressions of support or otherwise. Report back to Committee and PT.

DECISION: 90% MALF will be the default minimum flow and 30% MALF will be the default allocation limit for Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whitua.

The Chair expressed the Committee's thanks to Ngāti Toa for their intensive work during the evening. He acknowledged that all members knows and feels consensus is hard and it will continue to be hard; it's important that we all roll our sleeves up and engage with each other's ideas and motivations.

There was a brief discussion about how to get absentee committee members' position on the decision, noting that this wasn't covered in the Committee's decision-making document.

DECISION: on this occasion, Stu would call absent members Dale, Larissa, John G and David, and tell them the Committee's decision and ask whether they agreed or at least could live with it.

ACTION: Stu to call absentee members, and report back.

There was also a request that Committee receive a schedule of what decisions will be made when. Alastair advised that as a rule of thumb, every Committee gathering in the new year will have decision-making.

ACTION: Project Team will produce list of decisions and circulate, by December 14.

Session 5 – WIP structure and processes

(Hikitia Ropata, Committee member, and Suze Keith, GWRC)

See presentation [TAOPW Whaitua Implementation Programme - draft process for content development and publication](#) on the Whaitua webpage.

Session purposes:

- To make a consensus decision on the process for WIP construction, specifically the overall level of TAOPWC involvement

Hikitia, with support from Suze, spoke to the proposed outline for the WIP created by the small group (volunteers from 26.10 workshop, except for unavailable Larissa and Barbara).

- There was brief discussion about the foreword, with members variously raising ideas of the community voice, whether there was “a community voice”, the whaitua Committee voice, a mihi from Ngāti Toa, the sequence of these two.
- Other members clarified the context, noting that the WIP is a document that goes to GWRC first and foremost, for all that it does need some kind of consultation on it before that stage.
- The front section (narrative foreword) can be more of a communication tool but there was general agreement that the WIP should be the clearest best document for the Council.

Ideas for distribution will be up to the Council.

DECISION: The overall outline proposed for the WIP is good.

Committee were then invited to commit to helping write the WIP.

The writing group will be comprised of Jennie, Hikitia, Larissa, Kate (WCC), Suze (GWRC).

ACTION: Suze to follow up with the WG.

Session 6 – Any Other Business

- Sharli informed Committee that there was a GOPI Shellfish Survey this Saturday and Sunday 7am and Ngāti Toa’s Marine Cultural Health Assessment work (see the write up in the latest [Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua Newsletter](#)).
- There was general support for the 14th December meeting being a celebration rather than substantive meeting, noting that modelling information will be available in the new year but not before.

Hikitia gave the karakia, and the meeting closed at 9pm.

The next meeting of Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua Committee is 14 December, time and location to be advised.

Appendix 1 – Chair’s Direction

Chair’s direction

Following the discussion around decision making at the last meeting I have been pondering a few things with regards to the challenging months ahead. It is clear that consensus decision making will not be simple so it is important that we respect the process and ensure that our final WIP recommendations fairly represent the process of the Whaitua. Thought the following points may help;

- As the process gets closer to completion there is increasing attention from stakeholder groups across the broad spectrum of water management. I am certainly seeing this in the Engineering/Storm water sphere where consultants and private developers are starting to understand this process and take notice of the decisions which may be made. We each bring different perspectives and experience to the committee and these will likely become more apparent as we progress in the next few months. It will be important to be open about any ‘difficult conversations’ any of us are having and try to ensure that the whole committee understands the range of different viewpoints and any challenges that committee members have in voicing the perspective of any particular interests.
- Many decisions will seem like they are being evaluated in isolation when in practice they will be part of a full package. We need to understand the big picture at the final WIP stage and be comfortable that we are happy with the recommendations as part of this package. An example of this is with the allocation discussion where we were intentionally only discussing the flow metric when in practice the future metrics around riparian quality and water quality must also be part of the picture. Across a range of decisions there will need to be some prioritisation and potentially compromises made which will be based on consideration of other recommendations which may have other direct/indirect effects.
- All of the decisions which we have to make will have significant implications for both the receiving environments and a wide range of stakeholders. These decisions will be difficult to make and some will be more confronting for different members of the committee depending on the interests which they may have. It will be increasingly important to try our hardest to understand all of these viewpoints within the committee and try to support each other through the decision-making process. It is perfectly acceptable to raise concerns on issues which are important to you (but may not be shared by the rest of the committee) and then hopefully we can all work through these concerns to get consensus.
- It is important to not focus solely on the ‘saleability’ of different management options at the expense of making well informed recommendations which may rock the boat. Whilst we need to consider the likely push back from certain sectors and stakeholders the key premise of this process is that decisions are based on a sound understanding of the benefits (or otherwise) of the various options being considered and not the vested interests of stakeholder groups. We must therefore make decisions on the information provided by the PT, Modellers and other experts and if we are not comfortable then seek further info rather than defaulting to the most conservative option which will not ruffle feathers. This conservatism is part of the reason why the Wellington Region has historically been slow to adopt change in this area. We will be making recommendations which we are confident are based on due consideration of probable implications. We will need to stand behind these decisions and be able to justify them based on the process we have followed.

Hopefully these points are useful. No denying we’re going to have plenty of challenging meetings ahead so good to all consider these different perspectives and understand the value (and difficulty) with consensus.

See you all Thursday.

Cheers, Stu

Appendix 2 – Groups’ discussions Considering Urban Development

Questions for discussion:

1. Think back to the last time we heard about the TAs’ urban development plans. What was new information tonight? What was the same?
2. Thinking about the national statutory requirement to maintain or improve water quality in this whaitua.
 - a. What did you hear from Torrey and David that made you feel hopeful about achieving this goal?
 - b. What did you hear from Torrey and David that made you feel apprehensive about achieving this goal?
3. The main task ahead of you in the new year is to set objectives for water quality that maintain or improve it in this whaitua. This must be achieved as well as providing for urban development to occur in the whaitua.
 - a. How could the Committee use objectives to achieve this?
 - b. What or where are the main opportunities to accommodate urban development within “maintain or improve”?
 - c. What or where are the main barriers to accommodating urban development within “maintain or improve”?
4. What information will you need in order to set good objectives when we return next year?
 - a. Consider information or insights from: Science, History, Policy, Mana whenua, Stakeholders incl. TAs, WWL, GWRC, Communities / public
5. What will you need to bring to the decision-making yourselves?

Notes: (NB scribes focussed on questions 3-5).

1. New info

- PCC appears more structured than WCC
- Clarification: consultation should not have pre-conceived proposals. WSUD are certainly in mind.
- WWL developing ^{regional} WSUD guidelines to operationalise WSUD.
- Shouldn't expect communities to come up w/ answers. Need to inform them of realities eg. law, biophysical etc.
- (* ACTION FOR PT: send link to WSUD survey on PCC website)

2.

- ⊖ Constraints of existing development impacts which are ongoing.
- ⊕ Can identify priority areas eg Taupo Swamp.
- ⊖ Trade offs must be made. Options for mitigation, dev. etc. are not black & white.
- ⊕ Can't influence where development goes but can influence how.
- ⊕ Change in housing market from 1/4 acre → medium density. Status quo is off the table.
- ⊕ Offsetting b/t different areas is a tool that can be used & may allow for more overall improvement.
- ⊖ Equity issues w/ offsetting - who pays & who lives w/ consequences.

5. What you need to bring to decision-making

- Think about water quality in grades or bands eg NOF
- Cohesive river mgmt plan which incorporates all aspects of WQ
- Have clarity over what is meant by WQ & attributes.
- Be tolerant, patient, flexible, prepared to make hard decisions

SK No. 1 Skipped

Hopeful

- water on agenda
- planning for good env. outcomes
- water security + sustainable water supply on agenda.

SK No. 2

Apprehensive

- scale + conservative?
- indigeneity not mentioned. eg. native endemic plants
- water + env. left until later in the planning (WCC)
- initial site analysis missing eg. cultural mapping.
- popⁿ growth numbers low?

from dining

a. Objectives

- assess water body by water body (incl. upper + lower catchments)
- by cultural value ... (see Reg'l Plan)
- > where really sensitive?

SK No. 3

b. opportunities

- development contributions too?
- new funding models

c. barriers

- lack of momentum
- inertia
- conservative practice
- not forced to address water supply ^{if}
- lack of innovation

SK
4.

- current conditions for development
 - what are they faced with eg sediment control.
- what degradation does 10,000 homes bring.
- better v. standing of low NT's values will interact with this UPDATE.
Kathibanga A.F. work D-making process
- role of monitoring/enforcement. - what do they need (e.g. people) - resource going into monitoring + how + maintenance regimes.