

Whaka–Ora

Healthy Harbour, Ki Uta Ki Tai

Whakaraupō/Lyttelton Harbour Catchment Management Plan

Draft for consultation November 2017

Report of feedback received and response

December 2017

Report of feedback received and response

1. A draft Whakaraupō/Lyttelton Harbour Catchment Management Plan (*Whaka-Ora Healthy Harbour, ki uta ki tai*) was available to the public for feedback from 13 November to 4 December 2017.
2. Staff were available at information hubs to answer questions on the draft plan. The information hubs were held at the following locations:
 - a. Lyttelton Market
 - b. Cass Bay (Steadfast Community Centre, Governors Bay Road)
 - c. Governors Bay Community Centre (1 Cresswell Ave)
 - d. Charteris Bay Yacht Club (Marine Drive, Charteris Bay)
 - e. Diamond Harbour Community Hall (Waipapa Avenue, Diamond Harbour).
3. This report includes a table showing the feedback received on the draft catchment management plan and a brief response indicating how the feedback has been addressed in the final plan.
4. There was an online feedback form with the following questions:
 - a. Question 1: What aspects of this plan do you support?
 - b. Question 2: How would you like to participate and contribute to the implementation of projects?
 - c. Question 3: Are there any actions you would like to see changed or added to the plan?
 - d. Question 4: Do you think we have prioritised the right actions?
 - e. Question 5: What advice do you have on how this plan is implemented?

List of people/organisations who provided feedback

Submitter ID	Submitter	Contact Name
DF01	Keimpe Hofmans	
DF02	Nancy Vance	
DF03	Gina Waibl	
DF04	Summit Road Society	John Goodrich
DF05	Wendy Everingham	
DF06	Matt Parkes	
DF07	Sue Stubenvoll	
DF08	Peter Rough	

Table of feedback received and response

Feedback ID	Person/organisation ID	Question	Feedback Details	Response to Feedback
DF1001	DF01	Q1	Every aspect. Fighting to preserve and improve this area is a great idea.	None required
DF1002	DF01	Q2	I cannot see anything in need of reconsideration so far, but I think it is worth pointing out that the information provided is too lengthy, and too much for the average person to want to read through. If your aim is to get feedback from the public I would suggest making an easier-to-understand and simpler summary of what is going to take place. I think it is a great and wholesome initiative, but most people aren't going to read through the whole plan.	None required
DF1003	DF01	Q3	From what I could see, yes. This plan looks to be wholly and honestly focused toward the conservation of the Harbour.	None required
DF1004	DF01	Q5	I would love to do volunteer work (planting trees etc.) if I knew I was really helping. My Father is part of the Sunrise Rotary Club, and perhaps the Club would be willing to help organise an event as well.	None required
DF1005	DF02	Q1	Overall, the entire endeavour is worth the effort and future outcomes.	None required
DF1006	DF02	Q1	Mahinga kai (health and abundance) as the benchmark to harbour health is a good ecological "indicator" to cover all other environmental and cultural activities which occur (it is highest on a spectrum of indicators which is great)	None required
DF1007	DF02	Q1	The approachability of this plan – how it breaks down the issues, how it is written, what actions it identifies, etc. This is user-friendly.	None required
DF1008	DF02	Q1	The actions are great.	None required
DF1009	DF02	Q1	1.9 would be good to see so that there is some statutory 'legs' for this all to stand on.	Noting comment
DF1010	DF02	Q1	2.6 great. Include Hills & Lowlands as this is an urban issue too (roads, roofs, etc).	Agree. Is also coded to Hills & Lowlands zone. See Action 2.6.
DF1011	DF02	Q3	Pg. 10 It should be clear in the plan that CCC has 100% shareholding in LPC	Disagree - doesn't add value to the purpose of the CMP

DF1012	DF02	Q3	Pg. 12 "We describe the health of these species and the way we would like to see them reassert themselves within the harbour" this implies that these species can do it themselves, perhaps reword.	Agree - change "reassert themselves" to "established". See page 12.
DF1013	DF02	Q3	Pg. 13 Current state of High Outcrops and Forests has grazing animals too	Agree, in small numbers – have made no change.
DF1014	DF02	Q3	Pg. 14 "Infrastructure, waterway margins, forestry and subdivisions are well maintained and continually adapted to make sure that all steps are taken to reduce pollutants entering our harbour" What does "well maintained" mean? This presumably refers to the need for these developments to be issued with conditions to their consents which ensure/enhance harbour health; perhaps reword.	The plan is intended to go beyond consent requirements. No change to text required.
DF1015	DF02	Q3	Pg. 14 final paragraph could also refer to all existing jetties (and their maintenance), which provide universal accessibility (for all ages and abilities) to the waterfront.	Out of scope.
DF1016	DF02	Q3	Pg15 While these actions are great, it is difficult to see that these will make as much difference in the short-term as simply redirecting the spoil from Evans Pass road blasting away from the harbour would make. This is an enormous amount of sediment permitted to enter the harbour, and frankly, does generate cynicism of a truly collaborative approach to the healthy harbour goals.	Relates to implementation. No change required to CMP.
DF1017	DF02	Q3	Pg. 15 Channels for storm water runoff from roads are steep and bare (even paved with concrete in places) increasing water velocity, scouring and carrying sediment – add an action (perhaps I missed it?) where storm water best management practices are implemented in the catchment area (refer to CCC Waterways Wetlands and Drainage Guide)	Action 2.5 includes storm water practices. No change required to address this.
DF1018	DF02	Q3	Pg. 16 a description of what kinds of "Contamination" here would be helpful; is it fertilizer, or animal faecal contamination, or other, or all?	It is included in following paragraph. No change required.
DF1019	DF02	Q3	Pg. 18 "raupō will grow thick within the extensive, re-established wetlands and saltmarsh" Raupō is a wetland plant and incredibly invasive, requiring regular maintenance for the huge biomass it creates and sediment it traps. While effective planted at future constructed wetlands, it should not be planted anywhere near the tidal flat/saltmarsh areas, it will outcompete the rushes/grasses, glassworts and coastal ribbonwood. The Head of the Harbour is a Christchurch District Plan Site of Ecological Significance. Please re-assess this description/aim.	Added "wetland" to describe ecosystem for raupō. See page 18.
DF1020	DF02	Q3	Pg. 20 Oyster reefs, little blue penguins and shags are found in the foreshore area as well.	Have amended text to incorporate penguins and shags. See page 20.

DF1021	DF02	Q3	Pg. 20 “Despite some pollution issues” should be addressed in this section of the document. These issues include: leaking/broken sewerage waste pipes, ship ballast water, wetting log dust runoff, wetting coat dust runoff, pasture fertilizer runoff, and sedimentation smothering foreshore aquatic species. The actions address some of these. NZ Phormium species (Harakeke/Flax) planting goes a long way to help with sedimentation issues and could be incorporated into the actions.	Have inserted some examples. See page 10.
DF1022	DF02	Q3	Pg. 22/23 Terns, albatross, seals, orca whales also found here.	Have amended text to incorporate some of these species. See pages 22 and 23.
DF1023	DF02	Q3	Pg. 42-43 the Taihua/foreshore lines the entire harbour (and not just the low tide mud flats) - attention to this zone and the line of dots on the map should follow the entire foreshore of the harbour from Te Piaka/Adderley to Awaroa/Godley Head.	Have amended ecological band map to ensure the taihua/foreshore area is clear. See map on page 43.
DF1024	DF02	Q3	3.1 Factor in future maintenance of constructed wetlands as well. Partnerships should include business owners as well – LPC. Remove “re-establish raupō in Whakaraupō”, or be clear that it is contained in wetlands and not in tidal flats.	The project detail will be fleshed out during scoping of project and key outcomes sought. No change to text required here.
DF1025	DF02	Q3	4.4 Not sure experimental dredging is a good idea.	Rāpaki has confirmed it is doing pilot trial. No change is required.
DF1026	DF02	Q4	Yes, great! While decreasing opportunities for erosion is always best, mass plantings of selected species goes a long way to reduce sediment reaching watercourses and the harbour - this should be a major priority as well (and can meet goals of biodiversity, create bird/gecko habitat and food sources, and provide shade/insects for watercourses).	This is a supporting comment. No change required.
DF1027	DF02	Q5	The stakeholders, including the communities, would also all have a vested interest in the effects of climate change (more extremes of wet and dry seasons) and rising sea levels within the harbour as well. There is potential here for these two issues (being a healthy catchment and future proofing for environmental change) to be moved forward together in the future.	Have added to the paragraph before Table V.

DF1028	DF03	Q3	The Healthy Harbour Plan currently reads like a story with a dream for the future, plus a list of projects. While these aspirations are admirable, it seems like it is missing a middle, which would include policies etc that act as a bridge between the vision and the projects. Is this because this function is covered by existing plans such as the Canterbury Water Management Strategy and Banks Peninsula Zone Implementation Programme? If so, more reference to these other guiding documents, and how Healthy Harbour fits in, would help.	Have added to the paragraph before Table VI.
DF1029	DF03	Q3	In a related note, the projects listed appear to be quite narrow in their focus, as there appear to be many issues not covered or planned to be addressed. For example, water quantity and the effect of abstraction on low flows (including permitted takes that don't require resource consent), especially given that more droughts are expected through climate change; as well as other stream and harbour biodiversity projects/actions that could be taken e.g. fish passage through culverts. Again, more links to other documents, and perhaps some information on how the focus of the projects may evolve over time could help.	Changed action 5.19 to be broader than sea level rise and to include effects on flows.
DF1030	DF03	Q3	Similarly, more mention of regulation around harvest/fishing quotas may help make the ultimate vision around mahinga kai come across as more realistic.	Noted, but no change made.
DF1031	DF03	Q3	The Plan states that it has been developed through collaboration between five groups Ecan, CCC, two rūnanga, and Lyttelton Port Company, but no general local community representatives seem to have been included in this group. It would be good to know if there was also significant input from someone representing the wider community in developing this plan e.g. input from the Community Board or Water Zone Committee.	Have strengthened the text explaining the contribution/involvement of the zone committee and community board in the development of the catchment management plan as well as consultation undertaken. See executive summary, introduction and Supporting Actions.
DF1032	DF03	Q3	Related to the topic of the groups that were involved in developing the plan, while I understand why Lyttelton Port would be involved, it does seem that the plan relies on the Port acting in the best interests of the environment and in good faith. No mention is made of oversight or controls put on the Port. Also, why would the Port be the one to educate people about the environment? Surely there are other organisations better placed to do this without the risk that self-interest will result in biased education.	Implementation comment - no change required

DF1033	DF03	Q3	On page 30 Action 2.4, fencing of streams is mentioned, but no details are given. Is there a policy or other legislation/guidance relating to fencing? What parts of a stream are proposed for fencing? Fencing all sections, including the headwaters of streams may not be the optimal policy. An outcome based policy may be better. For example, it may be possible to manage grazing around the headwaters of streams so that vegetation cover around streams and water quality are maintained or improved. In the Banks Peninsula ZIP recommendation 4.15 states: "Alternative ways to prevent stock entering waterways other than fencing to be investigated." It should also be recognised that different types of stock have different effects on waterways and bush. Farm Environment Plans could be one way to manage stream protection on individual properties with guidance around appropriate types of protection or management for different types of waterways.	Have changed Action 2.4 to ensure this document does not dictate that fencing should occur everywhere - preventing stock access is the purpose but fencing may not be the most effective tool to do this. See Action 2.4.
DF1034	DF03	General	Karakia: include an English translation to be more inclusive of non-maori speakers	There is no direct English translation for the karakia. No change is required.
DF1035	DF03	General	Executive Summary: explain what mahinga kai is a bit more clearly and simply e.g. food gathering. The same applies to the meaning of the term ki uta ki tai	It is included in glossary and other places in the text (Part I) - have added mountains to sea words into glossary. See updated glossary on page 44 and Part I text.
DF1036	DF03	General	Introduction: environmental, cultural, and social concerns are listed – economic concerns should probably also be included in this list	This is a quote from the Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan (CERA, 2015) and the text cannot be changed
DF1037	DF03	General	P10: description of Ecan's role – should this description include enforcement in its role	Yes, have amended wording to include. See page 10.
DF1038	DF03	General	Effect of development - shouldn't develop if can't manage effectively or if presence of further development has unacceptable adverse effects.	Agree - but there are rules in the regional and district plans to control development. This is outside the scope of this document therefore no changes are made

				to address this here
DF1039	DF03	General	P12: Are upper gullies suitable for forestry? What does "sustainable forestry" mean? E.g. no clear felling?	This document isn't the place to say whether the gullies are suitable for forestry - see Action 1.5 to facilitate engagement with foresters - no change made
DF1040	DF03	General	P13: Bare rock outcrops pose a higher risk to residences located below, as well as walking tracks and anywhere that people have access to.	Agree - have amended so that walking tracks now only one of rock fall risks. See page 13.
DF1041	DF03	General	Housing in the upper band also contributes to erosion through cut and fill both for the house footprint and accessways + farm tracks and roads also.	Added comment in current state under 'rocky outcrops and indigenous forests'. See page 13.
DF1042	DF03	General	P16: Future state - expect more than just stock free waterways will be required for confidence that mahinga Kai in streams are healthy and free from pollutants. This is consistent with the current state which states that stream headwaters are generally uncontaminated but that issues arise further down the streams. This suggests that stock exclusion may not be necessary particularly for stock other than cattle, which typically don't like to stand in streams or in bush areas e.g. sheep)	Agree - have amended text to reflect this. See page 16.
DF1043	DF03	General	P17: steps taken need to include education as the general public are often not aware that erosion and sediment are an issue or why, and the same applies to how storm water systems and septic tanks work.	Agree - have included some text about this. See page 17.
DF1044	DF03	General	P18: possible typo? - "As sea level retreat occurs" - should this be "sea level increase".	Yes - change made. See page 18
DF1045	DF03	General	P20: Swimming should be included in the list of activities locals enjoy while at the beach. Swimming does often occur between the high and low tide marks and it doesn't seem to be mentioned when discussing the harbour zone.	Yes - swimming added. See page 20
DF1046	DF03	General	Should recreation activities be mentioned in the future state e.g. people enjoying the harbour swimming and	Yes - added. See

			using watercraft.	harbour section on page 22.
DF1047	DF03	General	P27: Four permanent streams are mentioned but earlier in the document, where they are listed, five are mentioned.	Agree - see amended map and text in document. Page 27.
DF1048	DF03	General	P42 & 43: It would be good if the maps shown have more stream names labelled, especially the five permanent streams	Agree - have amended maps. Page 43 and 44.
DF1049	DF04	Q1	The Summit Road Society supports all aspects of the plan.	None required.
DF1050	DF04	Q3	No	None required.
DF1051	DF04	Q4	Yes	None required.
DF1052	DF04	Q5	Keep the relevant communities of interest informed and engaged in the ongoing process.	Implementation comment. No change required.
DF1053	DF04	Q2	The Society's main focus in the harbour basin is the ongoing management of Ohinetahi Reserve above Governors Bay. We will continue to work to encourage regeneration of the native forest by planting, the control of invasive weeds and predator control. We hope that this will continue to prevent run-off and to help maintain and increase the quality of the streams in the reserve. We would welcome the opportunity to learn more about current water quality, and whether there is anything specific we could do to maintain or improve this. The Society would also be prepared to be involved in any educational and community programmes to contribute to the implementation of the plan.	Implementation comment. No change required.
DF1054	DF05	Q1	I really like the vision presented. This is how I want our harbour to be. I fully support a community approach. People on the ground understand our area best and have a vested interest to make things happen.	No change needed.
DF1055	DF05	Q3	I would like to see ecological planting further defined. The harbour is divided into 2 ecological zones. The Southern slopes of the Port Hills and the Northern slopes of Diamond Harbour. I think any ecological planting should be sourced from remnant stocks in these areas. Problems exist now and many professionals are happy to source plants from the northern slopes of the Port Hills. These plant stocks are not as resilient as the ones that we can source from our own remnant areas. With such small numbers of existing remnant stocks we should be doing all we can to increase these scarce resources.	Added bullet point to Action 3.4. See Action 3.4.
DF1056	DF05	Q3	I think we should promote community nurseries for community planting projects. There is one in Diamond Harbour and one in Lyttelton. Some more resources for these for community planting teams would be really beneficial. Currently DOC can't supply many of the plants needed for our ecological district.	Added bullet point to Action 3.4. See Action 3.4.

DF1057	DF05	Q3	I think planting outside of the townships should be quite limited. Streams, running and ephemeral and fire breaks.	Will be addressed in landscape plan - no change required. See Action 3.4.
DF1058	DF05	Q3	I don't think an ecological planting master plan is necessary for LPC's non operational hill slope land. This land should be left to regenerate naturally. Natives have regenerated in Urumau underneath the pines. Let the same thing happen on port land. To re vegetate their land will take 1000's of plants. With DOC Reserves all around nature will do its own thing better than we can achieve. DOC did not support native planting on LPC land as remediation for the Sumner Road Project. The current DOC philosophy is do nothing but weed and pest control.	Have removed word 'planting' so now is just an ecological plan (doesn't assume planting). See Action 3.4.
DF1059	DF05	Q3	This plan needs to focus more on weed control. Effective weed control will enable new natives to flourish. Focus species should be Old Mans Beard, Sycamore, Bone Seed and Karo. Broom and gorse should not be sprayed on LPC land as it has been in the past. These "weeds" should be used to incubate new natives just like Hinewai Reserve.	Noted, but funding is limited - working to link more with BPCT and Doc over weeds. No change to text required.
DF1060	DF05	Q3	I would place weed control as a priority project all around the harbour. Land owners should also be encouraged not to spray as well.	Noted, but funding is limited - working to link more with BPCT and Doc over weeds. No change to text required
DF1061	DF05	Q3	I think our area should be promoted as a "Sensitive Zone" NOW.	Noted, have split Action 1.9 so that promotion of catchment as 'sediment sensitive is a priority project (Action 1.7) that will commence within first year. See Action 1.7.
DF1062	DF05	Q3	There is already an indigenous planting guide for our harbour. It was produced by the Governors Bay Community Association many years ago. What is needed is clear guidelines on where plants are sourced from for each ecological district. I think the whole philosophy of planting also needs to be challenged. No plastic guards, no spraying for weeds, etc. Take a look at Urumau Reserve and see the success we have had.	Yes, we are hoping to build on this - have added it into text before Table 3.
DF1063	DF05	Q4	I think many of the actions are fine. Weed Control needs higher priority.	Noted, but funding is limited - working to link more with BPCT and Doc over weeds. No change to text required.

DF1064	DF05	Q5	Don't let lack of money stop projects. There are many people in the community who will step up to make things happen.	Implementation comment. No change required.
DF1065	DF05	Q2	I am currently involved improving the biodiversity of Urumu and Whakaraupō Reserves. I will continue to work on these reserves showing leadership in planting, propagation, maintenance and weed control. This compliments some of what you are trying to achieve,	Implementation comment. No change required.
DF1066	DF06	Q1	Recovery/ regeneration of native habitat, flora, fauna + mahinga kai	Noted - supportive comment.
DF1067	DF06	Q3	Yes, you have the right actions	None required.
DF1068	DF06	Q5	continued active consultation with, and participation by, community	Implementation comment. No change required.
DF1069	DF06	Q2	I have a school group whose services I would like to volunteer for restoration work! (I'll be emailing separately)	Implementation comment. We have been in contact.
DF1070	DF07	Q1	Working together, getting good information, setting clear goals.	Noted - supportive comment.
DF1071	DF07	Q3	6 days for feedback isn't a great start. I've read it twice and don't get a warm feeling that it can deliver good results - or even if 'good' is clearly understood.	Implementation comment. No change required.
DF1072	DF07	Q3	I'd like to see historical sites and purposes explicitly recognised as taonga and given a place in the plan.	Noted - outside scope.
DF1073	DF07	Q3	I'd like to see visitors' satisfaction (by ship or land) be considered - many visitors understand a lot about biodiversity and conservation and, if we are building a great marina to draw them in then we have to understand their needs to anchor in odd places - just where someone else is watching waders or fishing. The overall health aim is great but understanding priorities across time and season need to be understood and woven into this work of art.	This is incorporated within 'recreation' on page 22.
DF1074	DF07	Q3	I'd like to see geckos specifically mentioned and protected	No change required.
DF1075	DF07	Q3	ECan and LPC may be great at calling for effort and coordination but I would ask if all three parties have consulted with the people who know most about the current biodiversity etc. ie the specialist groups who have been doing hard, restoration work for years. Those smaller organisations have a wealth of knowledge to add BEFORE setting all these grand targets.	Noted.

DF1076	DF07	Q4	I think more work is needed to establish the right actions before prioritising them.	Noted but hard to respond to without specifics.
DF1077	DF07	Q2	By understanding what is needed, being kept informed succinctly (with detailed backup) and having a mechanism to allow me to offer help when I have resources available.	Implementation comment. No change required.
DF1078	DF08	Q1	Firstly, I think that the plan is great. I like the way it is structured and addresses six ecological bands. I fully support this approach and the list of actions.	Supportive comment.

DF1079	DF08	Q3	<p>A specific matter I wish to address concerns pollution coming from storm water in Lyttelton township. In 2002 my landscape architectural practice (Peter Rough Landscape Architects Limited, which has now become Rough and Milne Landscape Architects Limited) was a finalist in the Chaffers Park (now Waitangi Park) Design Competition concerning a substantial area of land adjacent to Te Papa Museum. A brief of the competition project was to provide for a wetland that would filter all the storm water in the urban catchment behind Te Papa (which is a considerable area) The wetland that has been constructed is virtually identical to one that was a feature of my company's design. For our wetland design we received assistance from NIWA in Hamilton who had experts in designing and selecting plant species to filter and treat storm water. The water from the catchment passes through a 'rubbish collection' structure, which removes all physical items, before it passes through a series of wetland plant beds at different levels and eventually enters the sea in the vicinity of Chaffers Marina. Boardwalks for pedestrians pass through and across the stepped wetlands and apart from having a functional purpose the wetlands have a measure of visual amenity value in Waitangi Park. About a year ago I contacted a person at the Wellington District Council to inquire if the wetlands were doing their job properly. I was advised that generally they work well but from time to time there have been management problems. It occurs to me that since 2002, when the wetland was designed, better solutions may have been developed and things can no doubt be learned from the likes of the wetland in Waitangi Park. As a resident of Lyttelton for some 30 years and having often observed how discoloured the inner harbour gets after rain events (perhaps principally from sediment runoff from the surrounding hillsides) I have often thought that wetlands to treat storm water runoff would be worth considering for Lyttelton. It is a concept that may also be worth considering for all urban areas around the harbour where water is collected off roofs and roads and is no doubt discharged into the sea. In Lyttelton a wetland could possibly be constructed on Port Company land, say between the railway line and Norwich Quay, if that land became available for such a use following construction of the new port hardstand areas as a result of reclamation in the vicinity of Gollans Bay. In essence, I would like to suggest that constructed wetlands for treating storm water be considered as part of Action 2.2 - "Develop a storm water management plan for Lyttelton Harbour settlements and public land." I understand that the vegetation in the Waitangi Park wetland gets harvested from time to time and it could be that some of the species used in a wetland in Lyttelton, and in others around the harbour, could have value for cultural purposes when harvested. I have photographs of the Waitangi Park wetland and would be happy to supply those. It doesn't seem possible to include photographs in this email.</p>	<p>Actions 2.2, 2.5 and 2.6 address storm water management - no change required</p>
--------	------	----	--	---