

Meeting Notes

Meeting title	Whaka-Ora, Healthy Harbour – Governors Bay Targeted Feedback Meeting
Date	Wednesday 18th October 2017
Time	7.00 – 8.30 pm
Venue	Governors Bay Community Centre, 1 Cresswell Ave, Governors Bay
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: Helen Chambers (Governors Bay Community Association), Jenny Healey (Cass Bay RMC), Pam Richardson (BPCB), Paul Ensor (resident), Rebecca Parish (BPCT), Thomas Kulpe (BPZC), Tracey Adams (Cass Bay RMC), David Gregory (resident) Clair Finlay (BPZC), Douglas Couch (Rapaki), Gail Gordon (Rapaki), Ian Lloyd (BPZC), Jed O-Donoghue (BPCB)</p> <p>For the Whakaraupo Partnership: Matthew Ross (TRONT), Jill Atkinson (Ecan, director,) Christina Robb (Project manager), Gillian Ensor (Ecan), Bianca Sullivan (Ecan), Kim Kelleher (LPC)</p>

Meeting Notes
1. The meeting was opened by Douglas Couch from Ngati Wheke.
2. There was an introduction to the Whakaraupo Partnership by Jill Atkinson.
3. 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.

4. There was an informal discussion about the plan with questions and points raised by attendees as follows:
- a. There was a discussion around sediment contributions from farms.
 - i. An attendee acknowledged that the plan includes an action relating to the implementation of Farm Environment Plans (FEPS) for properties larger than 40 hectares in size (Action 1.4), but suggested that smaller lifestyle blocks also contribute sediment into waterways and that there should also be a focus on these properties in terms of best practice erosion and sediment control techniques.
 - ii. It was explained that we have acknowledged the contribution of sediment from a range of sources and Action 1.6 sets up a programme to better understand the different sources of sediment and their relative contributions, and to promote best practice erosion and sedimentation control techniques from a range of sources/sectors, including rural, residential, industrial, roading, agricultural, forestry and construction.
 - b. An attendee asked about revegetation along permanently flowing streams that go through reserves. There was a discussion around the fact that reserve land is owned and/or managed by various sub-committees of the CCC and the CCC are a partner organisation that has committed to undertaking actions to achieve the outcomes sought in the catchment management plan.
 - c. There was considerable discussion around erosion along the roading corridor and the contribution of sediment into waterways from roadside banks.
 - i. An attendee noted that we talk a lot in the document about stabilisation and revegetation along the banks of streams (there are many actions targeted at supporting riparian planting and education), but she would like to see 'stable banks alongside roads' having more priority.
 - ii. There was a discussion about the pilot study that the BPZC is undertaking through CCC and Ecan (Action 1.3) to trial different techniques for reducing erosion alongside the road corridor, what these trials involve, where they are and what is likely to happen as a result of the trials. There was confusion about where the pilot study is at and where the trials are occurring. It is noted that they are not occurring in Cass Bay, but at 4 various locations (Rapaki, Charteris Bay, Governors Bay and Alderson Street on the Christchurch side of the hill).
 - iii. An attendee asked about the CCC bylaws relating to managing stormwater and runoff from the roading corridor. This was noted as needing to be followed up by staff.
 - iv. There was discussion around the fact that the road trial looks at the bank on the uphill side of a road, but what about the discharges on the downhill side from the curb and channel overflow/dischARGE. There was discussion about CCC global consent application. Staff to follow up where this is at and what's included in it.
 - v. There was a discussion around the actions relating to stormwater management and infrastructure upgrades (actions 2.1, 2.2, 2.5, 2.6) and the role of CCC in this, especially with regards to timeframes. It was

suggested by an attendee that CCC should be included in the list of priority projects for reducing sediment from the roading corridor, particularly from alongside rural roads between residential areas.

- d. There was some discussion about targets and the importance of having targets to measure both whether we're doing what we said we would, and if we're achieving the environmental outcomes that we're seeking to achieve. They are important milestones for measuring change.
 - i. There was a discussion around how difficult it is to define targets and that we have to be able to monitor them over time. We discussed that for the marine environment, we're not in a position yet to set any targets as we don't have enough information to do so. A key action is to complete a state of the takiwa report (Action 5.1) in the first few years, and the outcomes of this will enable us to set measureable targets. There are actions to establish monitoring programmes to improve our understanding of species and habitats (Actions 5.2, 5.3). The actions will be reviewed every 3 years and this will provide the opportunity to amend actions as a result of ongoing monitoring and research information.
 - ii. It was noted by one attendee that we have a great aspirational document, but there are pressures on the environment and no targets so we don't know if we are making any progress.
- e. One attendee commented that he loved the concept and liked that the plan told a story.
- f. There was a brief discussion about regulatory documents, and general disappointment that the regional coastal environment plan is not being reviewed sooner.
- g. The ecological bands were briefly discussed.
 - i. Why is the 'high outcrops' band not called the 'rocky outcrops' band as this is the term that's used locally to describe those areas.
 - ii. The plan needs a good detailed map that shows where these areas are.
- h. Terrestrial biodiversity was discussed and there was general consensus among attendees that pest species and management should be given more priority.
 - i. There is no mention of gorse in the document but it is a significant issue.
 - ii. There was a discussion about pest management and that the landscape scale biodiversity plan (Action 3.4) includes pest management priorities and the development of guidelines and education material relating to this. Perhaps this could be given more priority.
 - iii. Copies of the Banks Peninsula Conservation Trust ecological vision were provided by an attendee.
- i. One attendee would like to see the english translation beside the statements at the front of the document as these are important statements.

Meeting Notes

- j. One attendee noted that there is no mention in the document of fires. What are the implications of the fires and could they be recognised in the document?
- k. There was a brief discussion around how the plan takes into account pollution of the marine environment from Port Activities, such as increasing shipping. It was explained that the relevant statutory plans still apply and consents are required for various activities relating to contaminants and discharges. This document is not a statutory document and does not regulate for those types of activities.
- l. There was a brief discussion about the plans status. It was explained that the document is not a statutory document, and that it is no longer under the earthquake recovery umbrella. In terms of continuation, there is a Memorandum of Understanding signed by the 5 partner organisations and an agreement to look beyond the first 3 years out to 2040. There is a funding commitment from LPC and Ecan for 3 years.
- m. There was a discussion around who's going to oversee/champion the plan. The Partnership have not fully landed that, it could be someone within the community.
- n. We were asked where the monitoring results were going to go. There is a suite of actions relating to monitoring and reporting and in particular Action 6.1 commits to continuing to develop the healthy harbour website and use it as a central information site for publicly available data, including research and state of the environment monitoring. It is intended that all monitoring information will be available for everyone to use. It's important that there is transparency around the data.
- o. There was a request that Christina's presentation and notes from these meetings are circulated to meeting attendees and available to the public for their information during the public consultation period in November.

5. The meeting closed at 8.30.