

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

**Monday 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2018**

**5.00pm – 9.00pm**

**The Settlement, Level 1/1 Walton Leigh Avenue, Porirua**

**Workshop (Closed to the Public)**

---

## **Summary**

This report summarises notes from a workshop of the Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua Committee held on Monday 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2018.

---

## **Contents**

These notes contain the following:

### **Overview**

- Workshop Purpose
  - Proposed Agenda
  - Key Decisions to be Made
  - Workshop Actions
  - Workshop Notes
- 

## **Overview**

---

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

**Attendees**

Present: Stu Farrant (Chair), Barbara Donaldson, Larissa Toelupe, Warrick Lyon, John McKoy, Diane Strugnell, Hikitia Ropata, David Lee

Apologies: Dale Williams, John Gibbs, Richard Cook

Greater Wellington Project Team: Tim Sharp (Project Manager), Shane Parata, Brent King, Ned Norton, Suze Keith, Rachel Pawson, Jane Clunies-Ross, Paula Hammond, Jon Gabites, Keith Calder (PCC – from 8.50pm)

Independent Facilitator: Kristy McGregor (Mitchell Daysh)

Notes prepared by Suze Keith and Kristy McGregor.

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

**Purpose**

- To seek confirmation from the Committee that the various components of the Whaitua Implementation Programme (WIP) are on the right track, so that the Project Team can progress work and produce Version 4 of the WIP over December/January.
  - Receive advice on, and discuss the approach to, spatial grouping of objectives and water management units (WMUs), and timeframes for objectives.
  - Consider the Whaitua Thinking and Common Recommendations piece.
  - Discuss any significant changes made to the recommendations.
- Prepare for presentation to Te Upoko Taiao in order for it to be confidently delivered by the Committee.

All purposes set out to be achieved were met.

---

### Proposed Agenda

TIME	TASK	PURPOSE	WHO
<b>Part 1: Introduction</b>			
5.00pm	<b>Karakia</b>		Hikitia
	<b>Welcome</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Apologies &amp; introductions</li></ul>	Establish purpose of meeting	Stu
	<b>Chair's Direction</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Purpose of meeting &amp; agenda outline</li></ul>		
	<b>Housekeeping</b>		Kristy
5.10pm	<b>Role of Tonight's Workshop</b>	Clarify what we are doing	Kristy

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focus of the workshop</li> </ul>	tonight; where this fits in the decision-making process	
<b>Part 2: Whaitua Implementation Programme</b>			
5.15pm	<p><b>Spatial Grouping of Objectives/WMUs and Timeframes for Objectives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Process that has been undertaken to revise the spatial scales</li> <li>Suggested spatial groupings</li> <li>Resulting anomalies/changes to the original draft objectives</li> <li>Questions?</li> </ul>	Presenting suggested approach to groupings and timeframes for objectives; seek consensus	Brent & Paula
6.15pm	<p><b>Ngāti Toa Update</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plan development</li> <li>Wānanga</li> </ul>	To update the Committee on where Ngāti Toa is at with the development of their Plan and recent wananga	Hikitia, Shane & Turi
6.30pm	<b>Dinner</b>		
7.00pm	<p><b>Whaitua ‘Common Thread’ Thinking and Recommendations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Progress on common thread thinking and recommendations piece</li> <li>Committee feedback</li> </ul>	To consider the content and provide feedback	Suze & Tim
7.30pm	<p><b>WIP Recommendations &amp; Gaps</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Feedback received from the Committee and through engagement with stakeholders</li> <li>Confirm Committee direction for those areas</li> <li>Gaps?</li> </ul>	Discuss any significant changes made to the recommendations	Rachel & Jane
8.15pm	<p><b>Presentation to Te Upoko Taiao</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confirm Committee members attending</li> <li>Confirm key messages</li> </ul>	Prepare for presentation to Te Upoko Taiao in order for it to be	Stu & Committee Members attending

		confidently delivered by the Committee	
8.35pm	<b>Porirua City Council Executive Leadership Team &amp; Councillors Meetings</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Update on Porirua City Council ELT Meeting</li> <li>• Planning for Porirua Councillors Presentation</li> </ul>	Update on Porirua City Council ELT meeting and Councillor presentation; confirm attendances	Tim
<b>Part 3: Conclusion</b>			
8.45pm	<b>Next Steps</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Next steps for the Project Team &amp; WIP</li> <li>• Next steps for Committee engagement with the WIP</li> </ul>	Plan next steps for Committee engagement with the WIP document	Suze & Tim
8.55pm	<b>Other Business</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Large Rural Landowners Meeting (4<sup>th</sup> December) – update on planning; Committee members attending</li> <li>• Other items</li> </ul>	Update Committee on the Rural Landowners Meeting agenda	Stu Diane (Rural Landowners Meeting)
	<b>Thank yous</b>		Stu
	<b>Karakia</b>		Hikitia

---

<b>Key Decisions to be made</b>	<p>The Committee reached consensus on the approach to spatial grouping of objectives and WMUs and timeframes for objectives.</p> <p>Re spatial groupings: Refer to the table in the workshop notes section on Spatial Groupings for the summary of decisions.</p> <p>Re timeframes: The Committee adopted all recommended timeframes. The Committee determined their preference for retaining the E. coli objective to be achieved by 2040, with a plan to be developed by 2021, with the view to being accounted for in the councils' 2021 – 2031 Long Term Plans.</p>
---------------------------------	---

---

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

**Actions**

1. The placeholder for the Te Upoko Taiao presentation be reissued as an invite – Suze.
  2. The Committee to consider more appropriate names for the WMU's – all.
  3. That a placeholder date is issued for the Committee meeting to review the whole document – Suze.
- 

**Abbreviations**

GW – Greater Wellington Regional Council  
PCC – Porirua City Council  
TAoPW – Te-Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua  
WCC – Wellington City Council  
WWL – Wellington Water

---

**Workshop Notes**

---

**Part 1 - Introduction**

---

**Karakia & Welcome**

The meeting opened at 5.10pm. Shane opened the meeting with a karakia. Stu welcomed the Committee. Stu noted Richard's apologies and that he would be moving to Auckland to commence a new work position from mid-January.

Stu outlined the purpose of the workshop; to seek confirmation that the Whaitua Implementation Programme (WIP) is on the right track and to prepare for the presentation to Te Upoko Taiao. The workshop sought to reach consensus on the approach to spatial grouping of objectives and WMUs, and timeframes for objectives.

---

**Role of the Workshop**

Kristy explained that the focus of the workshop was on the various parts of the WIP needing completion to accompany the recommendations. The workshop would not delve into the recommendations in detail – other than significant changes occurring as a result of Committee feedback – but rather assist the Project Team with the various other components needed to shape up the full WIP. Kristy noted that the Committee would receive advice on, and make a decision on, the timing of the objectives and the spatial grouping of objectives and WMUs; and consider the Whaitua Thinking and Common Recommendations piece. Recent and upcoming engagements would also be discussed.

---

---

The Committee sought that the presentation to Te Upoko Taiao be confirmed and the meeting invite reissued, not just as a placeholder.

*Action: The placeholder for the Te Upoko Taiao presentation be reissued as an invite.*

---

## **Part 2 – Whaitua Implementation Programme**

---

### **Spatial Grouping of Objectives/WMUs and Timeframes for Objectives**

---

#### **Spatial Groupings – [Presentation can be found here](#)**

A [memo](#) was provided to the Committee prior to the workshop setting out the proposed changes to the spatial scale for each of the objectives. Brent spoke to these proposed changes at the workshop.

They noted agreement with the rationale for fewer WMUs.

The Committee sought to understand whether there were significant differences in actions required within the newly formed WMUs?

When discussing the proposed groupings, the Project Team noted that the policy approach which aims to achieve the objectives won't be contained to certain WMUs – but rather by activity/land use type.

Discussion was had regarding whether, in rural slopes, the flatter lowland streams were considered differently to the hill parts – however it was noted this was provided for through the policy response.

The demarcation between the northern and western hills was discussed. The Committee expressed intent that streams are seen in their entirety – not to be separated into parts based on land use. The Committee sought that likewise with Hukarito and Mahinawa, the Taupo Stream be placed in one WMU. The Committee discussed daylighting and the need for areas to be prioritised for daylighting. The associated recommendation needs to be amended to reflect that.

The Committee sought that a recommendation be included in the WIP for an online interactive mapping tool to be developed with a GIS layer identifying the WMUs, so people can locate their place in relation to the boundaries, and see it spatially. This will help people understand the implications for them, and in a wider education capacity.

*Action: Project team to add recommendation for GW to develop an interactive mapping tool which identifies the WMUs and raises awareness of water quality issues and actions for landowners.*

The Committee noted that the changes to the names meant the new names of the WMUs had little meaning; they would like for these to be more representative and specific to the catchment.

*Action: The Committee to consider more appropriate names for the new WMU's.*

The following outcomes were discussed and agreed on:

Freshwater WMUs and associated	Commentary	Committee decision
--------------------------------	------------	--------------------

<b>objectives</b>		
Hongoeka to Pukera and Pukera	Support amendments.	Endorse the splitting of sub catchments within the Hongoeka to Pukerua and Pukerua into the Western headwaters, Northern hills and Urban WMUs.
Hukarito and Mahinawa	<p>The change in WMU boundaries changes the objectives for small streams around Takapuwahia and Elsdon a lot.</p> <p>It is a significant area to the marae and settlement. WMU should go to the harbour edge because of iwi values.</p>	<p>Move the four lower sections of these catchments into the Western Headwaters WMU.</p> <p>Include recommendations in the WIP that acknowledge the need for additional work around Takapuwahia as a priority area, including increased investment in daylighting streams where possible, and habitat improvements.</p>
Upper Duck Creek	Support amendments to go with the continuity of the land.	Endorse the inclusion of Upper Duck Creek in the Eastern hills WMU.
Lower Duck Creek	<p>The objectives are beyond what the modelling was able to achieve – need to think about what it's going to take to achieve that; will need extra effort.</p> <p>Noted that objectives were set based on a lot of change around Pauatahanui.</p> <p>Seek for it to be included in the Eastern Hills WMU, so it is in the same WMU as the rest of the stream and given the mana whenua values, even though it will be hard to achieve.</p>	Endorse the inclusion of lower Duck Creek in the Eastern Hills WMU.
Stebbins Valley	<p>Noted that the current state may not be as good as it's thought to be.</p> <p>Support amendments to the boundary as long as policies for greenfield development seek enough change – to deliver an improved outcome.</p>	Endorse the inclusion of Stebbings Valley in the Urban WMU.
Small urban and urban fringe catchments	It was noted that the map shows streams running to the harbour when many streams are filled in at the coastal end.	Endorse the inclusion of small urban and urban fringe catchments in the Urban WMU.
Ammonia toxicity and current state objectives	Support proposed amendments.	Endorse the updating of the Ammonia toxicity current state and associated objectives to maintain current state.
Nitrate toxicity current state and	Support consistency where possible.	Endorse the updating of the Nitrate toxicity current state and

objectives		associated objectives to maintain current state. Endorse the attribute state objective for the Urban WMU to be A attribute state.
------------	--	---

### Timeframes for Objectives

[A memo](#) on the Timeframes for objectives was circulated prior to the workshop, and Paula spoke to the proposed objectives for each of the five freshwater and three coastal WMUs.

The Committee noted the recommended timeframes for the objectives, where change is sought, of 2040. The focus of the discussion was on the objective for *E. coli*, with members of the Committee noting they did not think it should take that long, and that *E.coli* was the most important objective the Committee are responsible for setting.

The ability to have a stepped approach was discussed, either by bands or by place. How aspirational 2040 is as an objective was discussed, given it takes time to see the results once work is completed, and the investment that is required, including choices about where to prioritise that investment.

The Committee noted they wished to send a strong message to all Councils concerned that real effort and authority in working towards the objective needs to start to happen now, including for human health reasons, and that cost should not be a concern. The Project Team noted that WWL is about to undertake a process to determine the cost of the work, and develop a work programme, so setting limits for *E.coli* now might be arbitrary. In a practical sense it means considerable work. Could the financial implications be spread out over coming years? The role the Committee have in understanding the how – as opposed to just setting the outcome – was discussed.

The Committee noted the need for the narrative to include the obvious neglect of the wastewater system and the need to address legacy issues. The Committee also noted the need to consider the private wastewater network, including a warrant of fitness for wastewater systems. Concern was raised should another Whaitua come and set the objectives at a 2030 then that work may be prioritised over the Porirua catchment upgrades required.

*Committee decision: The Committee adopted all recommended timeframes. The Committee determined their preference for retaining the objective to be achieved by 2040, with a plan to be developed by 2021, with the view to being accounted for in the councils' 2021 – 2031 Long Term Plans.*

---

### Ngāti Toa's Update

---

Hikitia provided an update on behalf of Ngāti Toa. Ngāti Toa has held two hui with iwi which have been co-construction sessions, and have been well attended. In January they are planning to hold a two day noho to develop the Ngāti Toa statement which will accompany WIP.

The Committee enquired as to how Ngāti Toa's document will sit alongside the WIP. It will be an accompanying document, which the WIP could refer to. Ngāti Toa's document will be more narrative in form, with statements about their expectations. Hikitia explained the aspirations set by the

Committee sit very comfortably with Ngāti Toa and however there will be more work to do with Councils and WWL to meet Ngāti Toa's ideas about what work needs to be completed to meet these aspirations. Hikitia noted that while the Committee and Ngāti Toa's values are the same, the way that they see it might be different and they'll have a more holistic approach. The Committee noted that they would like to think the WIP reflects mana whenua values and that it was very important that it's clear in the WIP. The Committee noted the need to explain in the introduction Ngāti Toa's withdrawal from the Committee within the WIP.

In terms of timeframes for completion, Hikitia noted that the community engagement process was really important for Ngāti Toa in completing their work and there were workshops scheduled for January and February, with the plan not expected until after that. Their earlier timeframes have been pushed out.

The Committee enquired as to whether Ngāti Toa's work will acknowledge the work of the Committee and what the Committee wants to achieve alongside Ngāti Toa? Hikitia advised that it acknowledges the Whaitua initiated a lot of deeper thinking about what Ngāti Toa wanted to achieve as an iwi, and increased the energy in Ngāti Toa. Their document will refer to the Whaitua process; that the process allowed them to think about it differently.

---

### **Design of WIP Document**

---

Jon noted that a graphic designer had been engaged to design the document. The designer has prepared two options based on the brief provided, and that these are now in a storyboard. Jon sought feedback from the Committee over dinner as to the two different options.

---

### **Whaitua Common Thread Thinking and Recommendations**

---

Suze spoke to the [Common Thread Thinking and Recommendations piece](#) that had been prepared to capture the Committee's approach that has informed the WIP.

There was general support for the draft piece as a good addition to the WIP. The Committee raised the following points with respect to the piece:

- The 'Environmental Water Zone' should be called the catchment name
- A separate comment is required for enforcement/compliance – not to be merged with monitoring – noting a commitment to resourcing adequate compliance beyond the current amounts.
- Innovation recommendation bullet point three – finish the sentence after approaches as the remainder of the sentence is obsolete.
- In the continuous improvement section, take out references to Section 2 of the WIP in bullet point 1, and in bullet point 3, amend to read "adopt innovative practice to address all water quality issues".
- In the future proofing section, shift the second part of the sentence to the continuous improvement section.
- Include valuing water as a precious resource, and the need to reuse with scarcity of resources, within the education section.
- Use of the term best practice is not in line with GW practice.

The need to strategically identify where the piece will fall in the WIP was noted. It was considered that it should sit near the front of the WIP.

---

#### **WIP Recommendations and Gaps – [Presentation can be found here](#)**

---

Prior to the workshop a table containing draft recommendations with significant changes was prepared and circulated to the Committee. Rachel and Jane spoke to these recommendations at the workshop.

<b>New or amended recommendation</b>	<b>Committee decision</b>
Emerging technologies and innovative solutions	Support inclusion.
Further investigations - 3.6.2.1 and 3.6.2.2	<p>This policy is about further investigations that are going to improve understanding of good management.</p> <p>The Committee recognise investigations will need to be carried out in future as new questions arise, however do not wish to prioritise these investigations within the recommendation (therefore the final sentence of 3.6.2.1 should be deleted).</p> <p>Monitoring and data collection is important not only for compliance but for ongoing improvement and to determine whether achieving the objectives set, and as part of the policy cycle.</p> <p>Add to the narrative as important questions for GW to think about: assumptions of modelling – noting that there may be a need for further investigations; potential sources of contaminants from railway lines, surface water runoff of state highways, closed landfills; lack of knowledge regarding sources of <i>E.coli</i>; absence of data on first flush stormwater.</p>
Vehicular sources – 4.3.6.3	Support deletion.
Public wastewater network – 4.4.3.1	Support changes. Timeframe to be put on the development of the wastewater strategy (carry to other recommendation).
Private wastewater network – 4.4.3.6	Support inclusion.
Private wastewater network - 4.4.3.7	Discussion on use of term leaking laterals – Project Team to review the terminology. Includes not just Housing NZ but Ngāti Toa and others. Discussed the need for consistency of language re recommendations for organisations to act.
Stock and riparian planting – 4.4.5.1	Significant discussion was had on the stock exclusion provisions – the commentary is set out below this table.
4.4.5.4	Support amendment.
4.4.5.5	Support shifting to Common Thread chapter.
Stream bank erosion - 5.3.1.1	Should apply to both rural and urban streams.

	Amend wording of bullet point 2 – measures isn't the right word.
--	--

With regards to stock exclusion, the draft recommendation and associated maps were examined and discussed, with the following comments made by the Committee:

- It's difficult to get people's buy in when they cannot see the difference on the ground; areas for exclusion need to be ground truthed for people to buy into it
- The Committee's focus should be on achieving outcomes, with management strategies applied to make it work
- Maps need to be accurate and accessible
- The rule is clear but the map is an interpretation of which streams it would apply to – what criteria should be used in terms of where it applies?
- Would it be better to have the size of the farm unit?
- Size of the property impacts the cost but does not necessarily affect the outcomes i.e. Small properties can have a greater impact than some large ones
- When does the 1m width apply? Summer or winter?
- Timeframes – option to revert to the PNRP timeframe of 7 years
- Opportunity to be aspirational here but over time – acknowledging stock exclusion provides really good benefits but takes time to do so
- There is the ability for landowners to explain why they are not able to meet the requirements and to prove that the same outcomes have been met by alternative means through the individual environment plan process
- What funding/resources will be available for assistance with stock exclusion?
- Why is there a lack of consistency between the stock exclusion and the wastewater network timeframes, and the objectives? In response, it was noted that for the Committee's objectives to be reached, action needs to be taken sooner so that the results can be seen in time
- Outcome is to reduce *E.coli*, sediment and create habitat outcomes
- Opportunity for a staged approach?
- Stock exclusion rules need to capture animals such as horses and alpacas
- Greater detail for the rule to be provided in the plan change process
- Opportunity for bands – particular slopes have particular timeframe for the rule to be implemented?

Overall it was acknowledged that the rule captured the intent of the Committee to limit stock access in more sensitive environments, such as the lowland areas, however the detail needs to be worked out. The Project Team will complete more extensive work on the references to mapping in combination with the environment plan recommendations.

During the discussion, the Committee raised the question of who was championing the recommendations – who would they be handed over to? It was noted that in the Ruamahanga some of the Committee members had decided to stay on in an advisory capacity for the implementation – they have met with the team writing the plan change and GW is planning to go back to the Committee with the plan changes. It was noted that the elected members' role is to champion the WIP within their respective organisations.

---

The Committee's upcoming presentation to Te Upoko Taiao and GW Councillors on 11<sup>th</sup> December was discussed.

The following Committee members confirmed their attendance: Barbara, Hikitia (as Co-Chair of TUT), Stu, John M, David, Diane and Larissa.

Hikitia and Barbara provided the Committee with guidance based on their understanding of TUT – to stick to key messages regarding the recommendations and implications, including the ‘why’ behind the current state and the need to shift to the desired state. The need to start with values was noted. The Committee discussed ensuring the presentation was punchy, emphasised the need to be ‘in this together’, and the need for behaviour change. The nature of the workshop, as interactive, means there will be ample time for questions and discussion following the presentation.

Stu agreed to take the lead on the presentation with Diane in support.

---

### **Porirua City Council Executive Leadership Team & Councillors Meetings**

---

Tim noted the recent meeting between GW and PCC’s Executive Leadership Teams. The presentation was well received.

Attendance at the PCC Councillors workshop was confirmed, with Diane, John and Dale to attend.

---

### **Part 3 - Conclusion**

---

### **Next Steps**

---

The next steps process proposed by the Project Team was agreed upon. That being, following the workshop and the Rural Landowners Group meeting, the Project Team have a firm steer from the Committee on the content of the recommendations. The Project Team will take the draft WIP and shape it into a final document. If in doing this work we find elements which need Committee confirmation, the Project Team will consult with Stu and seek his guidance as to whether the Committee should be reconvened to confirm the direction. The Project Team will aim to get the final polished WIP to the Committee by 11<sup>th</sup> February, with a meeting scheduled for the end of February.

Warrick noted he was away from 10<sup>th</sup> February and would need a hard copy prior to review. Agreed to issue this to Warrick on 9<sup>th</sup> February.

*Action: Suze to send a placeholder date for the Committee meeting to review the full document.*

It was noted that Catherine Knight had been contracted by GW to assist with writing and that she will be at the TUT meeting to meet some of the Committee.

One Committee member enquired as to whether there would be any more public discussions before the WIP was finalised. The rest of the Committee did not express appetite for more engagements.

---

## **Other Business**

---

The Rural Landowners Meeting scheduled for 4<sup>th</sup> December was briefly referenced. Diane will be chairing the meeting, with John, Richard and Warrick also attending.

Stu invited all Committee members to a wind up BBQ in March.

Two media pieces were noted: a write up of the Residents Association meeting in the Whitby news, and an opinion piece from Dale in the Kapiti Mana News.

Stu noted that Suze was moving into the role of Climate Change Advisor at GW in the New Year and Keith was finishing up at PCC this week.

Shane closed the meeting with a karakia at 9.05pm.