

Report of Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua Committee Workshop

12 July 2018, 5.00pm – 9.00pm

Pataka Museum, Corner of Norrie and Parumoana Streets, Porirua City
Workshop (Closed to the Public)

Summary

This report summarises notes from a workshop of the Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua Committee held on Thursday 12 July at Pataka Museum.

Contents

These notes contain the following:

Overview

Workshop Notes

- Part 1: Introduction
 - Part 2: Confirmation of Economics Messaging and Committee Direction
 - Part 3: Exploration of Social Impact
 - Part 4: Conclusion
-

Overview

Workshop Attendees Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua Committee:

Present: Diane Strugnell, David Lee, John Gibbs, John McKoy, Stu Farrant (Chair), Dale Williams, Hikitia Ropata

Apologies: Barbara Donaldson, Larissa Toelupe, Warrick Lyon

No Apologies Received: Richard Cook

Greater Wellington Project Team: Tim Sharp (Project Manager), Alastair Smaill, Sheryl Miller, Brent King, Shane Parata, Ned Norton, Onur Okten (Wellington City Council)

Independent Facilitator: Kristy McGregor (Mitchell Daysh)

Notes prepared by Sheryl Miller and Kristy McGregor.

Workshop Purpose The purpose of this workshop was to:

- Confirm Committee direction on the key economic messages
- Consider the social impacts of the Committee’s draft objectives, develop some principled messages around the effects of these and explore possible mitigations that could assist with the development of policy packages

The purpose of the meeting was achieved.

Agenda	TIME	TASK	PURPOSE	WHO
Part 1: Introduction				
	5.00pm	Karakia		Hikitia
		Welcome <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apologies & introductions Chair’s Direction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purpose of meeting & agenda outline 	Establish purpose of meeting	Stu
		Housekeeping		Kristy
	5.10pm	Role of Tonight’s Workshop <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus of the workshop 	Clarify what we are doing tonight; where this fits in the decision-making process	Kristy
	5.15pm	Update on Ngāti Toa’s Involvement in the Whaitua	To update the Committee on conversations with Ngāti Toa and to allow for Committee to discuss this update	Tim & Shane
Part 2: Confirmation of Economics Messaging and Committee Direction				
	5.30pm	Introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why we are revisiting last week’s discussion 	Clarify the purpose of the economics discussion	Kristy
		Presentation & Discussion on Economics Messaging & Committee	Confirm Committee	Al & Ned

	Direction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overview of the key messages heard at the last meeting Discussion and confirmation of key messages 	direction on economics messaging	
6.15pm	Dinner		
Part 3: Exploration of Social Impact			
6.45pm	Introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What we want to gain from the social impact assessment How we are going to approach it 	Establish social impact conversation	Kristy & Al
7.00pm	Group Discussion: Exploration of the social impacts of Committee decisions & possible mitigations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Social equity 	Understand effects of decisions and possible mitigations	Kristy
Part 4: Conclusion			
8.20pm	Upcoming Committee ENgāgements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Porirua City Council Meetings – 26th July Rural Landowner Meeting – 9th August 	Confirm Committee direction on & participation in upcoming eNgāgements	Al, Diane & Kristy
8.35pm	Discussion on Timeline for WIP Development & Presentation to Council <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Timeline for Committee workshops 	Seek direction from Committee re timeline for future Committee workshops	Tim
8.50pm	Other Business <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report on Stu's Winston Churchill Fellowship trip - international trends in Water Sensitive Design Any other items 		Stu
	Thank yous		Stu
	Karakia		Hikitia

Key Decisions to be made The following key decisions were to be made:

- Adoption of recommendations from 'Rounding out the objectives' memo
- Confirmation of Committee consensus on economic messages

Committee Decisions The Committee provided a consensus on the economic messages. The recommendations from the 'Rounding out the objectives' memo were not adopted. Rather, it was noted that they would be circulated for review and that any objections would be sought by email.

Workshop Actions The following actions were agreed to:

1. Project Team to email paper to Committee detailing the measures in each scenario.
2. Project Team to report back to the Committee on the NESP during the policy package development phase, to assist in the development of policy for forestry activities.
3. Project Team to put some time to thinking and discussing with Ngati Toa the appropriate forum and means to better understand the impact of the Committee's objectives on Maori land aspirations.
4. Project Team to finalise the Summary of Draft Objectives by noting the link with the summary table of objectives and drawing out the level of effort required; and finishing the sentence in the urban contaminants section. Revised version to be circulated to the Committee and utilised for future eNgāgement meetings.
5. Project Team to circulate the Rounding out the Objectives Memo to the Committee, and seek that any Committee members who have points of concern to raise.
6. Rural mind map to be captured for the Rural Landowner Meeting.
7. Once objectives are complete the Project Team will work to develop ways of communicating the Committee's work in a more accessible language, including the benefits.
8. Project Team to put together a draft presentation to workshop with the Committee members who will be attending the PCC workshops.
9. Draft runsheet to be circulated to the whole Committee for feedback. Project Team to arrange a meeting with the Committee members attending the Rural Landowners Meeting prior to the 9th August to develop the presentation.
10. Project Team to circulate the timeline to the Committee.
11. Shane will follow up with Ngāti Toa to understand how they would like to eNgāge or have their eNgāgement recorded in the timeline.
12. District Plan timeframes to be added to the timeline, finalised and emailed to the Committee.

Part 1: Introduction

Karakia & Welcome

The meeting opened at 5.25pm. Shane opened with a karakia. Stu welcomed the Committee and the new Project Team members, Arpan, Onur and Tim. Stu provided an overview of the meeting, which was to look at the economics and social impacts of the objectives.

Role of the Workshop

Kristy explained that the workshop would be focused on looking at the decisions that the Committee has been making with an economics and a social lens. She explained that the meeting would include confirming the economics messaging and directions that came out of the previous meeting. Following this the evening would then explore some of the social impacts and discuss the social equity issues. Kristy noted that this discussion would start to set the scene for the policy package development, ensuring that both economic and social impacts were considered.

She noted the end of the evening would conclude with a discussion on the upcoming Committee Engagements and the Committee Workshops timeline.

Ngāti Toa Update

Tim and Shane provided an update on Ngāti Toa's involvement in the Whaitua process. Tim and Shane have been involved in a few conversations with Ngāti Toa in the last few weeks. Ngāti Toa are in the process of developing their own plan for the catchment, parallel to the same timeline, as they felt they needed to put their own sense on things and into a plan. There is a sense that the Whaitia Implementation Plan (WIP) and Ngāti Toa's plan will complement each other. Ngāti Toa's plan will not go into limit setting, but instead will be tikanga and kawa based for the rohe, and be in narrative form.

Ngāti Toa will receive all of the materials that the Committee are given during the process of compiling their plan. Ngāti Toa have offered to come and talk with the Committee, if the Committee are looking at areas involving mana whenua. Jennie expressed gratitude that the Committee has advanced their knowledge about mana whenua values.

The Committee clarified whether Ngāti Toa were receiving the same technical support as the Committee. This support is available should they wish; it was noted that Ngāti Toa are not interested in getting into the technical information as this distracts from the narrative.

The Committee expressed need for this to be a two way process; with reports so that the Committee can arrive at the end at the same time. Open dialogue is encouraged, primarily through Shane. Shane sits in on meetings with Ngāti Toa on fortnightly Tuesdays. Hikitia is involved in the process both in formulating the Ngāti Toa plan and with the Committee, so will assist with this dialogue.

Part 2 – Confirmation of Economics Messaging and Committee Direction

Economics Messaging & Committee Direction

Kristy introduced the economics messaging conversation noting this would be revisiting the discussion from the last Committee meeting. She noted this will help shape policy packages that deliver on the objectives set by the Committee. Whilst it is not the Committee's role to decide where pots of money will be spent, it is important the Committee are aware of where the cost burdens, and associated inequalities, will fall when making decisions. The Committee is able to make recommendations as to how the costs may be spread in the WIP.

Al spoke to the memo that was pre-circulated and provided a [short presentation](#) on the key messages. There was some discussion and questions that arose during the presentation.

Al emphasised that the final policy package won't necessarily be the same as the scenarios, and actual costs will differ. There are greater opportunities in the green fields areas. There are also opportunities for reducing loads in existing urban areas, but difficulty is lack of space. In areas, there is very little difference between improved and water sensitive. The Committee sought clarification on the measures included in each scenario.

Action: Project Team to email paper to Committee detailing the measures in each scenario.

Rural mitigations show a differing cost between landowners, with costs driven by steeper ground where mitigations are harder to do. The scenarios were only modelled on a small range of mitigations, so there will be others which policy direction will require more investigation/research into. The Committee noted that the social perspectives of land use change need to be considered too. Not all landowners may want a change; are they being forced? It was questioned by the Committee whether the benefits of land retirement had been included in the scenarios; and clarified that the analysis included the cost of mitigations only. The Committee noted the recent Significant Natural Areas designation and whether there were opportunities for considering loss of value there. It was noted by the Committee that whilst there might be increased property value, if you are paying rates on an increase value you don't realise the value until you go to sell. Area retired have the potential to reduce the income potential of the property. It was noted that there are opportunities in retiring areas of erosion prone land for carbon sequestration forestry, however a big shift in behaviour is required for this.

The Committee noted that there has been little consideration of forestry economics in the scenarios thus far. This needs to be considered when thinking about the alternatives to pastoral land use. Within the Porirua Catchment there is forestry; Greater Wellington own land where forestry is planted on it. The new National Environmental Standards for Plantation Forestry were noted. The Committee expressed interest in better understanding the NESPF, and what they allow for; in order to consider whether stricter regulation should be sought for the Porirua Catchment.

Action: Project Team to report back to the Committee on the NESPF during the policy package development phase, to assist in the development of policy for forestry activities.

The Committee questioned whether multiple owned Māori land blocks have been considered in the analysis; these blocks still have to pay rates.

Action: Project Team to put some time to thinking and discussing with Ngāti Toa the appropriate forum and means to better understand the impact of the Committee's objectives on Māori land aspirations.

Wastewater mitigations are not a large additional cost, although significant for some people/householders. The Committee expressed the need to consider which ratepayers Councils are going to get their funding from, given that some costs are not insignificant. Some costs for ratepayers would be difficult to meet. It was noted that illegal connections and infiltration and inflow improvements are not costed. It was noted that further work was needed in this area; the Project Team are still working to gather data on this. The Committee asked to what extent an innovative approach can produce "better bang for buck" and the need to think about this. Al noted that the question was how to drive innovation, not curtail it? The policy doesn't need to tell people how to do it but rather the outcome desired. Discussed the need to prioritise implementation, for example, freshwater or harbour? Significant places vs. other places? Management of costs in terms of how costs are spread over time.

Committee's Comments on the Memo

A round-table for summary comments on the Memo was conducted, with the Committee noting:

- It was a good summary that reflects the conclusions, so far as a bunch of generalisations based on the modelling completed.
- Real question is where do the costs actually lie under the set of assumptions made? Need to build on the summary and go further in identifying the costs.
- About changing the mindset, for example for developers.
- Importance of messaging; we are not heading down a new pathway. Challenges with developer compliance at present.
- Rural sector and developers most affected by the desired objectives; along with those funding investment for replacement infrastructure.
- Need to be confident Wellington Water are factoring things into their modelling.
- Cheaper to get changes in early for developers.
- Everyone needs to make changes.
- People won't do anything meaningful if it incurs costs or extra compliance, unless required by regulation.
- Cost information doesn't lead us to consider relaxing or changing any objectives.
- Barrier to people making changes is cost. Need to ask people, if it didn't cost you to change things, what would you do better?
- Challenges of regulation driving an undesirable outcome, if it makes things too hard for people to engage in good practice. Regulation should help to drive good practice.
- If we are looking at best practice, the easy target is greenfield, with water sensitive urban design the new norm. Challenges in retrofitting; how do we tell this story?
- There are massive intergenerational benefits of this change, but it is hard to put a dollar value on them.
- Concerned re implications for Maori landowners.
- How directive will the rules be? Who are they directed at?
- Mechanisms for change not only incentives but rules, regulation and education.
- Everybody wants progress, nobody wants change. Issues around equity come from a socialist mindset. Does it all need to be equitable?
- Need to see the three Councils working together.
- Tension of need for new housing to meet population growth needs, with requirements for affordability and the NPSFM.

- Need to encourage others to see the value in doing a better job, not just the minimum standard.
- Read as observations, not directions.

Al explained that the Memo provided general directions, with the actual directives to fall from the objectives the Committee set to reduce loads. These will lead to rules that require a change in behaviour to meet those loads. The details will consider where the costs lie, and how they are spread.

In summary, the Committee were generally content to adopt the messages, noting that further specificity would be needed as the policy packages are refined.

Summary of Objectives

Kristy noted the summary of objectives Memo prepared by Hayley, which was intended to summarise the freshwater objectives in a way that is more understandable than the summary table.

The Committee noted support of the draft objectives. However, the Committee felt the section on what it might mean they felt was too high level to offer value and did not relate to a scale of effort or capture the ease with which the objectives could move. Ned noted that the context was to summarise in very few words the draft objectives expressed by the Committee, in a simpler way than the table. Ned noted that the use of the term high effort was referring to bringing practice to a water sensitive level in most places, and improved in a few.

The second paragraph of the urban contaminants section was noted to be missing the end of the sentence.

Action: Project Team to finalise the Summary of Draft Objectives by noting the link with the summary table of objectives and drawing out the level of effort required; and finishing the sentence in the urban contaminants section. Revised version to be circulated to the Committee and utilised for future engagement meetings.

Rounding Out the Objectives Memo

There were no printed copies of the Rounding out the Objectives Memo so it was difficult for the Committee to recall the conversation from 21st June.

Action: Project Team to circulate the Rounding out the Objectives Memo to the Committee, and seek that any Committee members who have points of concern to raise them via email.

Part 3: Exploration of Social Impact

Introduction

Kristy introduced the social impact discussion noting that social impact is not new and the Committee have been considering social impacts as they go. The Committee already have a good understanding of the social demography. Kristy noted the baseline profile as a report still in draft form, and will be finalised further down the track, but available in the meantime for the Committee

should they like to read it. She noted however, that it was a shift from the technical results and analysis, and would be looking to draw back to the people who are at the heart of the whole process. Kristy noted that the discussion would assist with the upcoming stakeholder engagement, and that the local knowledge of the Committee would help to inform the implementation of the objectives – which areas should be prioritised; timeframes for this.

Al discussed where the social impact work may be used. He noted that usefully the Committee has already discussed matters such as equity, highlighted where costs lie, and how to spread them. For activities such as urban development it is clear there are not a lot of options. Whilst not the case in Wellington, it is common for Councils to regulate initial earthworks, discharges and land use in terms of what is built there and analyse the impact on water quality. Some Councils have a development contribution to offset in a small way ongoing maintenance costs. The cost impact usually falls on the first purchases of the land. There are however other ways of managing costs, and whilst it is not the decision of this Committee of Greater Wellington, the Committee may like to make recommendations to the City Councils. For example, some infrastructure could be paid for by the wider ratepayer; and in the rural area it will need to be considered who will pay for the costs of improvements.

Mind mapping the social impacts

Kristy noted that consideration of effects can look at both positive and negative effects, with each effect having a social consequence. The Committee then workshoped together the social impacts of the objectives on kids and young people, as a group of people living or visiting the catchment. The responses included:

- Young people will benefit the most because they will be around for the longest
- Where can I swim? Catch fish?
 - Users of resources, opportunities e.g. recreational use
 - Kids currently disconnected – effect on mental health
 - Improve health outcomes – people using/eating food harvested from the water
 - Swimmability increases, keep kids occupied and out of trouble
 - Lot of kids don't have access due to area live in or social background (e.g. can't afford to pay for pool use) that can't afford to get to the harbor
 - So many other activities provided, why make use of environment - competing
- There is greater education for young people so kids are more aware; exposed to consistent messages about the environment; and have the potential for better buy in.
- Why should I pay for the 'sins of my father'? Previous generations trashed it so why should I pay for it? Is there anything we can do about this inequity? We're still thinking from older person perspective – still justifying our position we screwed up, you inherit and have to pay for it. Shifts will occur over next three or so generations so no question kids will pay as do current generations.
- Access to streams is currently very limited and in places, access to the harbour is also limited. There are physical barriers to accessing the waterways, and it's not safe to go there.

The Committee broke out into three groups and mind mapped the social impacts on different groups within the catchment, including Pasifika Peoples, Māori, the elderly, urban dwellers, new urban dwellers (on greenfields), and rural people.

During the group work concern was noted with the use of the term Pacific Islanders; the Committee considered it to be inappropriate. The term Pasifika peoples was preferred, encompassing all cultures other than Maori.

Following time in the breakout groups completing the mind map, the groups each took turn to report on their discussions. Diane requested that a copy of the rural mind map be captured for the Rural Landowners Meeting, as it captured the thinking and awareness of the Committee.

Action: Rural mind map to be captured for Rural Landowner Meeting.

Discussion on management of social impacts

Kristy led a group discussion, posing the question of which effects or social equity issues the Committee need to consciously think about and respond to.

The issues that were raised included:

- Balance of who should pay?
- Beyond developer contributions is it different models
- Alignment between councils within the Te Awarua-o-Porirua catchment e.g. development contributions, planning, practice
- Do we have to allow for future changes in methods? Flexibility/innovation? Want things that can move/be dynamic
 - Learning for what you've done, prepared to change.
 - Auckland's real time water quality monitoring (<https://safeswim.org.nz/>) – shows state of environment
 - Economic value, community health has big \$\$ savings
 - Has to be monitoring/implementation/enforcement/compliance. Councils need to have responsibility to provide information to support, based on more than hunches
 - Ways to tell whether or not what you are doing is working. Has to be adequate. All equals costs. Diane bought up *E. coli* and that it doesn't move from D band so have to look outside box/what will move it but need measures that will tell us if working. Brent explained that there are four matrix behind *E. coli* and is typically only one that holds us back (often peak concentration). Need to get down to where sources are and how we can mitigate??
- Social grouping – e.g. dirty dairying - social issue in terms of setting one group against another in community not necessarily fact based.
 - Targeted rating
 - Strong message nationally (due to lobbyists). Important point catchments we have in TAoPW vastly different to catchments elsewhere where landowners are problem.
 - Hard to turn to a user pays, difficult to come to terms with. Should be a fairer system (David mentioned insurance (earthquake risk) as example – should we apply that sort if system?)
- Clarify, in terms of modelling – reducing overflows
- Mechanism – rate funding depreciation – PCC started this

- Rating relief e.g .new industries and tertiary institutions
- Rating practices – does this cover multiple landowners?
- Housing affordability?
 - Challenge. Anything that increases value, will also increase housing costs. Nanny state to market place deregulation.
- Free choice – it’s my land, I’ve paid for it! Private ownership, my right! Challenging property rights and entitlement. Address by saying ‘you can do what you like provided it doesn’t impact neighbours/community. Erode some of your ‘rights’. Al – rights to land are different to rights of what you can discharge (need permission, no rights to discharge). Diane – thinking about car washing – impinging on rights of where can wash car – lack of understanding. Struggle to articulate to people what their rights are due to their perception my land I can do what I want. But no rights over water.
- Incentives for developers so cost not passed on to property owners.
 - Social benefits, social health and wellbeing. Run risk of cost taking precedence. Costs for greenfield easier to identify as opposed to retrofitting
- People will ask what issue here? Will focus on costs.

The Committee noted the story to tell about the characteristics of the catchment and challenges, and importantly, the positive benefits of aiming for the objectives. Benefits included:

- Health – mental health, community
- Access
- Recreation
- Economic benefit – further down the track

Action: Once objectives are complete the Project Team will work to develop ways of communicating the Committee’s work in a more accessible language, including the benefits.

Part 4: Conclusion

Committee Engagements

The two upcoming engagements were discussed, including the Porirua City Council and the Rural Landowners Meeting.

Porirua City Council Workshops

The Porirua City Council workshops are an opportunity for the Committee to articulate where the Committee is heading and what it might mean for PCC, the community, and District Plan. The District Plan Reference Group is a good opportunity to find out what PCC need/want.

Attendees:

- Morning workshop confirmed as Diane, Stu, John M, John G and David. David noted he would present.

- District Plan Reference Group: David, Dale and John M. Hikitia is interested but needs to confirm availability. Diane will be present as part of the Reference Group. John M noted he would lead the Committee's presentation.

Action: Project Team to put together a draft presentation to workshop with the Committee members who will be attending the PCC workshops.

Rural Landowners Engagement Meeting

Diane noted she will do some of the presenting. Kristy noted the intention for the content to cover an update from the Committee on the process, what the objectives are shaping up like, and to get their feedback and input through drop in style stations. She sought feedback from the Committee on this planned agenda. The Committee noted that there was less interest in the proves, and more about what it means to them, with plenty of opportunity for the rural landowners to provide feedback.

Attendees:

- Confirmed as Diane, John G, Warrick and Stu.

Action: Draft runsheet to be circulated to the whole Committee for feedback. Project Team to arrange a meeting with the Committee members attending the Rural Landowners Meeting prior to the 9th August to develop the presentation.

Timeline for WIP Development and Presentation to Council

Tim explained the revised draft timeline which has been prepared in response to the need for more time to bring together the final technical inputs and policy packages. The suggested timeline would see no Committee meetings held in September, with the engagement meetings considered the best use of the Committee's time during this period.

The Committee expressed interest in having a copy of the timeline. This was intended to be printed and circulated at the meeting but there was a mistake with the printing.

Action: Project Team to circulate the timeline to the Committee.

Iwi engagement in the timeline was discussed. Tim noted that Ngāti Toa were going to advise when they want to engage in the process, rather than it being formally set in the timeline. There was discussion on where the usual engagement Greater Wellington would undertake with iwi would sit? Ngāti Toa are organising their own wananga but could also have a role helping to facilitate GW's engagement with iwi. It was noted that the process, up until now, has been different to the standard policy process as iwi have been sitting at the table, and Te Upoko Taiao involved.

Action: Shane will follow up with Ngāti Toa to understand how they would like to engage and have their engagement recorded in the timeline.

A discussion was also had on the intersection of the WIP with the draft Porirua District Plan (PDP), the Wellington City Council District Plan review at the end of the year, and development areas within Wellington City Council. It was noted that Stebbings is currently being utilised as a case study, to consider what the Whaitua process may mean, possible constraints and changes. There are learnings from the Whaitua that can feed into the PDP however there is a tight timeframe for this. The PCC engagements on 26th July were noted. A question was raised re where stream reclamation - through

earthworks for subdivision and development - fits in to this given it is currently outside of the Proposed Natural Resources Plan? The Committee questioned how much opportunity there was for the workshops with stakeholders to feed into the development of the WIP, and it was noted that they would have an active role in shaping the policy in the WIP. There did not seem to be interest from the Committee to help with the writing process, but it was acknowledged there will be opportunities for the Committee to have an active role in the engagement phase. It was asked when the WIP would be being presented to Te Upoko Taiao. This will be confirmed in an updated version of the timeline that will be distributed to the Committee.

Action: District Plan timeframes to be added to the timeline, finalised and emailed to the Committee.

Other Business

Stu reported on his recent international trip as part of his Winston Churchill Fellowship. He visited Germany, Denmark, Stockholm and Portland USA, meeting with developers. He described the insights as seeing what can be done if you put mind to it. The focus of his research was on the enabling factors to implement change. Stu's finding was that political will has the legacy impact. In the USA, there was evidence of a strong attachment and connection to catchment, with retrofitting common. Widespread adoption of what happening can be seen, and people are learning and adapting along the way.

Stu noted the change in regulation at a national level, where the utility can dictate what happens on road e.g. Copenhagen – can say lower road. Innovative funding and delivery models are delivering cost savings for tenants and occupiers, including off grid wastewater and stormwater. There are positive examples of incentives, for example, buildings with green roofs can build to five stories, not four, enabling good outcomes for the environment and better income for developers. Stu noted a general willingness to go beyond requirements because it's the right thing to do, with social benefits of affordable living. Stu will be preparing a report on his trip, as well as speaking at a number of engagements over the next few months. His trip demonstrated Australia not an isolated case, the USA are doing well too, and in NZ there is a lot we can do better.

Thank you and Close

Stu thanked Al for his work, enthusiasm and wisdom throughout the Whaitua process, given this was likely his last Committee meeting.

Shane closed the meeting with a karakia.

The meeting closed at 9.05pm.

Appendices: Mind mapping breakout exercise



