

Meeting Notes

Meeting title	Whaka-Ora, Healthy Harbour – Diamond Harbour Targeted Feedback Meeting
Date	Wednesday 11th October 2017
Time	7.00 – 8.30 pm
Venue	Diamond Harbour Community Hall, 2A Waipapa Avenue, Diamond Harbour
Invitees	Community members who attended previous workshops in 2016, Stakeholders and organisations with an established interest in the harbour, Banks Peninsula Zone Committee members, Banks Peninsula Community Board members.
In attendance	<p>Invitees: Gunther Hammer (Purau resident), Joan Blatchford (BPCB), Paula Smith (BPZC), Sarah Lovell-Smith (resident), Tim Coop (resident), Sarah Pritchett (resident & DHRC), Emma Kinnings (resident), Mereile Stoppel (Purau resident), Ian Lloyd (resident & BPZC), Felix Dawson (BPCB and resident)</p> <p>For the Whakaraupo Partnership: Yvette Couch-Lewis (Governance & Ngati Wheke), Matthew Ross (DH resident & TRONT), Christina Robb (Project manager), Gillian Ensor (Ecan).</p>

Meeting Notes
1. The meeting was opened by Yvette Couch-Lewis
2. There was a presentation by Christina Robb which outlined the process for developing <i>Whaka-Ora, Healthy Harbour</i> , its content and what we want feedback on.

3. There was an informal discussion about the plan with questions and points raised by attendees as follows:
- a. There was much discussion around sediment and other contaminants, where they're coming from and in what quantities and what tools there are to manage them.
 - i. Attendees asked for an example of where in the past, reducing sediment flows is working?
 - ii. Locally, work that has occurred in Orton Bradley Park along Te Wharau Stream was given as an example where quite a bit of the riparian margin is fenced and planted. While during heavy and prolonged periods of rain the stream does run brown, it cleans up much quicker than other streams in the catchment where riparian management tools have not been used to the same extent. There were several examples from outside the catchment that were discussed.
 - b. There was discussion around the fact that the harbour is naturally infilling but we need to quantify how much is human induced and there are actions in the plan aimed at understanding contributions of sediment from different sources and identifying erosion hotspots and how to reduce them.
 - c. There was acknowledgement that a larger proportion of the catchment is covered in vegetation now than in the 1960's.
 - d. There was quite a big discussion about contributions of contaminants other than sediment, which led to discussion around the importance of managing contaminant sources (sediment and other) at the top of the catchment as any remedial work or planting and fencing etc that occurs in the lower parts of the catchment could be wiped out during storm events. There is a big concern, for example, that we fence a stream in the lower part of the catchment, but upstream activities (ie forest harvesting) when combined with a large storm event result in a lot of debris coming down the creek and smothering and destroying downstream riparian fencing and plantings. This situation had recently occurred at Loudon Farm in Teddington.
 - e. Attendees highlighted that there are questions about how effective some of the tools are for managing sediment and other contaminants (such as planting and fencing). We need to be sure that we are using the right management tools for the right purposes in the right places.
 - f. It was noted that the assumptions in the plan that we know what to do about sediment make some people uneasy. There were questions about whether the greatest contributors are the permanently flowing streams or the ephemeral ones. It was highlighted that there's no point doing interventions if we don't know the main sources.
 - g. Attendees also highlighted that we need to be careful to distinguish between contaminant types (sediment and ecoli) and we really need to understand contaminant sources. They wanted to be sure that projects are included in the management plan that improve our understanding of contaminant sources and their relative contributions to problems in the harbour waters, so that we can target their management.

- h. The place based actions were discussed, particularly with regard to the Head of the Bays project that the Partnership has applied to MfE for funding for. Specifically, the attendees asked how we are going to do the project given that we don't own any of the land at the head of the harbour, where the raupo/harekeke reserve will be, and why Charteris Bay was not included in the project area.
 - i. A brief outline of the project was given by Ian Lloyd and he explained that he has met with most of the landowners in that area and while we haven't got agreement to undertake any of the specific aspects of the project on privately owned land there is a willingness to engage. The raupo reserve would likely be located on the seaward side of the road in the project area. It was explained that specific details of the project have not been scoped as we need to secure funding before any more work is undertaken. Charteris Bay was not included in the project area for no significant reason other than to limit the scope of the project and to better to match the funding requirements.
- i. Attendees expressed concern that the report '*indigenous ecosystems of the Lyttelton Harbour Basin*' has not met the need for an overall landscape plan. They highlighted that it's important not to waste money on projects that have already been done.
 - i. It was explained that the intention is that the CMP supports existing initiatives and builds on the great work that has already occurred and is ongoing in the catchment. If the actions around the landscape scale biodiversity plan (Action 3.4) need to be amended, this is what we need feedback on. The role of including some of these projects as priorities in a catchment management plan for securing funding through say LTP processes and in making submissions on plan development and plan reviews as well as resource consent applications was explained.
- j. There was a discussion around what a takiwa is. It means place or territory. State of the takiwa reporting is similar to reporting on the state of the environment.
- k. There was quite a bit of discussion around shellfish and contaminants and it was suggested that there is quite a bit of knowledge around this and additional monitoring is unnecessary.
- l. It was highlighted that there is a point that you know enough and you just need to stop monitoring and act.
- m. It was noted that the 2007 Urban Development Strategy states that there will be a catchment management plan for Lyttelton Harbour by 2010. It was acknowledged that it's great that we finally have one.
- n. The Partnership representatives restated what we want from attendees. We want feedback about the actions, will they do what we want them to achieve? If the actions don't reflect what we're wanting to achieve, they may need to be reworded and this is what we want feedback from attendees on.
- o. There was considerable discussion around the location and management of forestry and the relative contributions to sediment from this source. It was stressed that we need to start managing sediment contributions at the top of the catchment and that we need to learn from recent events i.e Loudon Farm and Waiaki Forestry.

Meeting Notes

- p. This led to discussion around the fact that we need to promote smaller pockets of forestry or forestry harvesting, so that entire forests aren't harvested at once with significant areas of exposed loess soil. The concept of a mosaic of landuses rather than monocultures (particularly of intensive landuses) was promoted.
- q. Overall, attendees liked the style of the document.
- r. Other minor detailed comments – the document references trout, but there aren't any in the catchment. It also highlights nitrogen as an issue when it isn't. It's sediment laden phosphorous that we're concerned about it.
- s. There was discussion around the importance of weed control and a suggestion that this should be identified as more of a priority than it currently is. The communities need more help for community work relating to weed management because they are such a big threat to everything that is planted. If we can manage the weeds, the native species that we plant will thrive. Weeding was raised in relation to planting – easy to get support and volunteers for planting but harder for subsequent weeding.

4. The meeting closed at 8.30 by Yvette Couch-Lewis.