

Minutes of Whakaraupō / Lyttelton Harbour Catchment Management Plan Partners Working Group

Tuesday 17th January 2017
ECan 200 Tuam Street

Meeting title	Whakaraupō Partner Working Group
Date	Tuesday 17 th January 2017
Time	12.30 – 2.30 pm
Venue	ECan, 200 Tuam Street
Invited	Kim Kelleher, Clive Appleton, Terri Young, Matthew Ross, Bianca Sullivan, Lesley Woudberg, Ian Lloyd, Tania Butterfield, Donald Couch, Jed O’Donoghue
In attendance	Kim Kelleher, Clive Appleton, Terri Young, Lesley Woudberg, Ian Lloyd, Donald Couch
Apologies	Matthew Ross, Jed O’Donoghue, Tania Butterfield, Bianca Sullivan

Item	Action
1. Apologies	
2. Confirmation of minutes / matters arising <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Outstanding action items to be completed for the next PWG meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. BS – to work with MR to set up a meeting for drafting group in Jan. ii. BS – To organise date for GG meeting iii. MR – to submit their additions to the existing initiatives table ASAP. iv. BS - to identify available budget and put together a 1 pager on role for Phase 1 by Jan 17th meeting. v. TY – to start thinking about structure for ‘Action plan’ sessions and circulate for comment 	Please complete any outstanding actions against your name
3. Status of existing initiatives table <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The table is complete with the exception of input from Ngāi Tahu 	MR – to submit any additions to the existing initiatives table ASAP.

4. Vision / objectives / targets session

- a. Agreement that the Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan (2015) directive for the catchment management plan should be used as a basis for the vision, *“to restore the ecological and cultural health of Whakaraupō / Lyttelton Harbour as mahinga kai. It will also address other environmental, cultural and social concerns, including the needs of recreational users, as well as the needs of a working port”*.
- b. The question was raised as to whether to keep the second half of the second sentence, *‘including the needs of recreational users, as well as the needs of a working port’*.
- c. It was pointed out that keeping the wording in question reflects the harbour as a working land/seascape and offers a balance of uses and needs in the future.
- d. It was suggested that economics and recreation were covered by the term ‘social concerns’.
- e. It was pointed out that a vision should be aspirational, and therefore the current structure of the directive needs to be altered.
- f. A white board session was undertaken to try and identify scope:
 - i. What is in:
 1. Balancing/recognition of competing interests
 2. Ecological health
 3. Cultural health
 4. Mahinga kai
 5. The provision of a healthy environment appropriate for recreation to occur
 - ii. What is maybe:
 1. Both Ngāti Wheke & European heritage
 2. Economic
 - iii. What is out:
 1. Removal of coastal development
 2. Recreational/tourism planning
- g. A question was asked re. what the term ‘culture’ means in relation to cultural health in the directive. Does it just refer to Maori or the wider harbour community groups? How was the directive developed?
- h. There is differing opinions on whether recreation should be included in the vision/objectives – needs more discussion.
- i. Issues:
 - i. Hazards – should/can we address natural hazards?

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. The PWG is not ready to recommend the key 'issues' of focus and would like more time to work through them before looking at objectives. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Any other business <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Donald presented two papers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Proposal – to increase access to Pioke ii. Proposal – to close the harbour to commercial fishing b. These papers were noted and will be discussed further when the partnership starts working on the CMP Action Plan. 	

Next meeting: Date: 31st January 2017

Location: 200 Tuam Street