

Whaka–Ora

Healthy Harbour, Ki Uta Ki Tai

Whakaraupō/Lyttelton Harbour Catchment Management Plan

Preliminary draft for consultation October 2017

**Report of feedback received and response
October 2017**

Report of feedback received and response

1. A preliminary draft Whakaraupō/Lyttelton Harbour Catchment Management Plan was circulated to a targeted group of individuals and stakeholders for feedback in October 2017.
2. This report includes a table showing the feedback received on the preliminary draft catchment management plan and a brief response indicating how the feedback has been addressed.
3. There were three meetings held to present the document, discuss its content and answer questions.
4. The meetings were held at the following locations:
 - a. The Board Room, 25 Canterbury Street, Lyttelton (10 October 2017)
 - b. Diamond Harbour Community Centre, Waipapa Avenue, Diamond Harbour (11 October 2017)
 - c. Governors Bay Community Centre, 1 Creswell Avenue, Governors Bay (18 October 2017).
5. A feedback form was provided to those who attended the meetings, asking for responses to the following questions:
 - a. Question 1: Do the three whāinga/goals – abundant, healthy and connected – incorporate your aspirations for a healthy harbour?
 - b. Question 2: Does the description of the future state aspirations of each band incorporate your knowledge and ideas? Is there anything that should be changed or added?
 - c. Question 3: Is the description of the current state of each band accurate? Is there anything that should be added?
 - d. Question 4: Are there any additional actions that you think will contribute to meeting the future state aspirations for each band?
 - e. Question 5: We have identified a suite of priority projects that we want to start first (page 24). Have we got these right?
 - f. Question 6: Do the four identified Key Focus Areas – erosion and sedimentation, pollution, indigenous terrestrial biodiversity, and indigenous marine biodiversity – cover the main issues with the health of the harbour?
 - g. Question 7: We have identified a range of actions for each of the four Key Focus Areas. Are there any additional actions that you think should be included or any amendments that should be made?
 - h. Question 8: We are still working to prioritise the actions and to confirm funding for them to ensure that they can be delivered. Do you have any comments relating to project timeframes and priority?

- i. Question 9: Are there any changes that you would recommend to the supporting actions in Tables V and VI?
- j. Question 10: Any other comments/feedback that you wish to provide.

List of people/organisations who provided feedback

ID	Person/Organisation	Contact Name
TF01	Sarah Pritchett	
TF02	Omar Seychell	
TF03	Tim Coop	
TF04	Paul Ensor	
TF05	Helen Chambers	
TF06	Mareile Stoppel	
TF07	Gunther Hammer	
TF08	Clair Findlay	
TF09	Mark Watson	
TF10	Pam Richardson	
TF11	Banks Peninsula Conservation Trust	Maree Burnett
TF12	Richard Hopkins	
TF13	Roger Allen	
TF14	Jenny Swaffield	
TF15	Herena Stone	

Table of feedback received and response

Feedback ID	Person/organisation ID	Question	Feedback Details	Response to Feedback
TF1001	TF01	Q1 - Part 1	Yes	None required
TF1002	TF01	Q2 - Part 2	These are beautiful visionary aspirations and I would love to see us making progress towards these future states in my lifetime	None required
TF1003	TF01	Q3 - Part 2	Heavily infested with invasive species i.e. climbing asparagus, banana passionfruit, elephant's ear, princly pear.	Actions amended to incorporate pest plant species management (actions 3.2, 3.5 and text in part 2)
TF1004	TF01	Q3 - Part 2	Doesn't mention the fact that houses have been built here that must be a major factor in state / lack or raupō etc	None required
TF1005	TF01	Q4 - Part 2	Restricting development of peninsula's such as Mansons/ Moeuku, Purau and so on - does anyone know who now owns Moepuku and what their plans are regarding pine trees, development and subdivision of land etc?	None required
TF1006	TF01	Q5 - Part 3	As Paula [Smith] said, identify sediment hotspots initially to focus on these first. In heavy rain sediment coming off roads (today all the way down Governors Bay a dirty brown river flowing down to Ohinetahi)	Erosion mapping and monitoring action covers this (Action 1.6) - no change required
TF1007	TF01	Q6 - Part 3	Pine forest management, such as harvesting, future plans for current pine forests such as above Loudon, on Moepuku etc..	Have inserted more information about forestry in Part 2
TF1008	TF01	Q7 - Part 3	I feel like alongside riparian planting we really need more help managing pest plant species - banana passionfruit & climbing asparagus are out of control in Diamond Harbour with community trying to eradicate/manage this with very little help from local government	Have amended actions to ensure pest plant species are addressed (Actions 3.2 and 3.5)
TF1009	TF01	Q8 - Part 3	include pest plant management/eradication alongside any mention of riparian planting. These pest plants will continue to threaten new riparian plantings if not prioritised	See changes to incorporate this (Actions 3.2 and 3.5)
TF1010	TF02	Q1 - Part 1	Yes	None required
TF1011	TF02	Q2 - Part 2	Yes, although it would be nice to see some specific reference made to Quail Island and the role this island plays for both the local community and for the works that the ecological trust are involved with.	Have inserted information about Quail Island in Part 2
TF1012	TF02	Q3 - Part 2	Just a thought, but how reflective of the stream ecological band is the Pūkeko? I would say the majority of the streams in Lyttelton harbour are ephemeral and I don't believe I have ever seen a Pūkeko in the upper stream reaches. Is there a bird that is more reflective for all stream types?	Will retain pūkeko
TF1013	TF02	Q3 - Part 2	Consider a map reference to delineate ecological bands.	A map will be included in the final document

TF1014	TF02	Q4 - Part 2	I would like to see a strong emphasis on sustainable recreational pursuits, where there are controls to limit potential impacts (for instance “fizz boats” and fishing with marine mammal species).	Recreation activities are outside scope of plan
TF1015	TF02	Q5 - Part 3	I think there is a general lack of understanding of the environmental sensitivities of Lyttelton Harbour. One of the priority projects that I see for a healthy harbour is to raise awareness of its value to both locals, works and visitors alike. There is a general inconsistency in signage across the harbour, and very little that talks about the unique environment and ways to safeguard it. We need to improve the cultural understanding of the harbour to all.	This is about education - there are actions that incorporate education in them
TF1016	TF02	Q5 - Part 3	I also believe that in some areas we are "loving the harbour" to death. I have seen a seagull still alive with its beak caught in disused fishing line. I have seen small fish caught in the harbour dumped on land rather than put back to sea because they are too small to eat. Areas of the foreshore are covered in graffiti or regularly vandalised. Dumped construction rubbish is used as sea walls along the foreshore areas. Vegetated areas are stripped to set up camp fires and tourists using the foreshore for disposal of human effluent. There is an endless stream of rubbish that washes up on our foreshore areas and there is general apathy from CCC to change the current status quo with waste management across our parks and reserves in Lyttelton harbour. We need to do better in this area, and I would like to see the “healthy harbour” banner extend to improving our waste management activities on site. For me, we need to get the basics right, and for this we need to have a priority catchment wide waste management plan to improve the current issues in the harbour.	Action 2.3 has been expanded to incorporate waste management
TF1017	TF02	Q6 - Part 3	Yes	None required
TF1018	TF02	Q7 - Part 3	Consider including an action to help landowners identify and manage tunnel gully erosion on their properties. Consider in Action 1.4 to separate out into 2 goals. One for >40ha and the other for an FEP and the other for all landowners, developers and contractors to implement best practice ESC techniques.	Actions adequately cover erosion already - tunnel gully erosion doesn't need to be specified separately
TF1019	TF02	Q7 - Part 3	The actions are too weak around waste management. Harbour clean up days do little to change the culture and address the poor waste management practices of many that use the harbour. The actions need to be more targeted and could fall under the establishment of a catchment wide waste management plan. We need a coordinated approach. Once locals start to ‘love’ the harbour and understand its value, this will go a long way to achieve many of the other goals (e.g. Kai Moana).	See new waste management action in KFA 2: pollution (Action 2.3)
TF1020	TF02	Q7 - Part 3	Consider opportunities to ‘liven up’ drains, and change the drainage focus that we have for many urban/rural catchment areas. There is reference to this made on page 20 where under wetlands and saltmarsh it states there are “straight drain ditches”	None required

TF1021	TF02	Q7 - Part 3	As per Action 3.6, there needs to be a focus on "Improving environmental awareness of both ecological and cultural sensitivities of the harbour" for the marine environment	Already included, no change required
TF1022	TF02	Q8 - Part 3	My thoughts are that priorities and targets should be made clear by the group, even if funding is not currently available. This helps add extra weight if there is the appetite for possible 'sponsorship' of projects by other potential partners	Have inserted explanation regarding targets at start of Part 3
TF1023	TF02	Q9 - Part 3	Consideration for research in establishing what management strategies are required to support sustainable marine mammal species in the harbour and healthy white flippered penguin populations. Are there any conflicts, issues that need to be resolved? For instance, dog owners are discouraged from bringing their dogs onto Quail island, however there is no way of enforcing this. Does this need to change? Also, will an increase in vessels over time in the harbour (e.g. through cruise ship activities, increase in capacity in marina and recreational boaters etc.) have a cumulative effect that we are not aware of on these populations	Outside scope, no change required
TF1024	TF02	Q10 - Overall	Targeted, budgeted and measurable actions/goals should be used wherever possible	Have included an explanation about what measures and targets are, why there are none in the document, and how we're working towards developing them (Part 3)
TF1025	TF02	Q10 - Overall	Glossary of Maori words used in the plan would be useful	Have inserted a glossary of maori words and terms used
TF1026	TF02	Q10 - Overall	Appendix with images of touchstone and indicator species would be of value	May insert this into an appendix
TF1027	TF02	Q10 - Overall	Sustainable recreational pursuits need to be explored and what numbers can be reasonably supported by the harbour to ensure we still maintain a healthy harbour. There are bound to be conflicts between jet skis, sailing boats, paddle boarders, port activities, dolphins etc...and there is little reference to how this gets addressed in the plan	Outside scope of document - dealt with in maritime safety bylaws and regional coastal environment plan rules
TF1028	TF02	Q10 - Overall	Opportunities to have "supporters" funding some of the actions/goals could be considered.	Agree, this is the intention. We have inserted additional text to make this clear in the funding section of the report
TF1029	TF03	Q1 - Part 1	Is abundant the right word for 'native plants will cover the landscape' - keep it realistic	Yes, it is appropriate. Retain 'abundant'
TF1030	TF03	Q2 - Part 2	I think they are very aspirational, but are they realistic? My feeling is some of the goals may be a little too unrealistic.	Disagree. No change required
TF1031	TF03	Q4 - Part 2	Forestry is one of the biggest threats to these aspirations because they take away all of the opportunity and create a great deal of the problems e.g. sedimentation	See amendments to reflect role of forestry in Part 2, already incorporated appropriately in Part 3
TF1032	TF03	Q5 - Part 3	Yes, but you have a problem. All these projects are lowland, if you don't address what happens in the catchment with forestry a lot of these initiatives will be ineffective	ki uta kū tai concept. This is clearly explained in the document. No change required
TF1033	TF03	Q6 - Part 3	Yes	None required

TF1034	TF03	Q7 - Part 3	Address the areas with forestry in their catchments and collaborate with them on ways to prevent damage to those areas below them. i.e. no harvesting near waterways.	See amendments to elevate visibility of forestry in Part 2. Actions already address forestry.
TF1035	TF03	Q10 - Overall	As above. Every other land use other than forestry is able to be integrated within the aspirations of the plan. The harvesting methods of forests and then mass planting of exotic species do not add to any of the plans aspirations. This must be address in those catchments where forestry is in the catchment zone before any work can begin.	Forestry is already included as a priority project but we will amend text where appropriate to ensure that forestry land uses and erosion and sediment management are clearer
TF1036	TF04	Q1 - Part 1	Great draft plan, congratulations.	None required
TF1037	TF04	Q2 - Part 2	All good	None required
TF1038	TF04	Q3 - Part 2	Yes, no additional suggestions	None required
TF1039	TF04	Q4 - Part 2	Try to rehabilitate Allandale dump site	Outside scope
TF1040	TF04	Q5 - Part 3	Yes, but suggest elevation to keystone status - the head of the harbour initiative - endeavour to acquire all flat land (or at least seaward of the road) and establish harakeke/raupō/wetland and use as an initiative to promote the management plan and its integrated, cooperative context	It is already a priority project. No change required
TF1041	TF04	Q6 - Part 3	Yes	None required
TF1042	TF04	Q7 - Part 3	All good	None required
TF1043	TF04	Q8 - Part 3	Attempt to start, as soon as possible, the Teddington keystone project as above	No change required, this is a priority project
TF1044	TF04`	Q9 - Part 3	All good	None required
TF1045	TF04	Q10 - Overall	The former dump infill site at Allandale totally destroyed a substantial (0.5ha) area of pristine raupō. Although part of the dump site has been modified as a carpark, the remainder (about 0.5ha) has been abandoned. As a demonstration of the responsiveness of the healthy harbour initiative it is timely to develop a sensitive rehabilitation plan for this very prominent, formerly splendid, supra-littoral zone, now a disgraceful wasteland.	Landfills are included in Action 2.5. Remediation of this landfill site cannot be a priority project at the moment.
TF1046	TF05	No question	The draft plan overall is a good start. I am particularly interested in sediment and note that although streams are seen as needing stable banks (page 17) I would also like to see roadsides also have stable banks	Have inserted another action in Part 3 around short-term solutions to erosion and sediment from roadside cuttings (Action1.9)

TF1047	TF05	No question	<p>Ditches on roadsides. At the moment much sediment comes from ditches on roadsides and flows down to the sea -not only at new road cuttings but along old corridors where ditches empty on to land and flow across paddocks down to the sea and into ditches which do the same. There are no sumps to collect the sediment- in most cases- and the sea around Governors bay is highly polluted with sediment.</p> <p>In some areas sediment has to be removed from the road after heavy rain. This is in areas where crumbling banks are not able to be planted because banks are more or less perpendicular. Some of These banks are sprayed at ground level several times a year when spraying is used to clear the ditches. This may be accidental but happens nevertheless. Now after much spraying the roots have been poisoned and the soils is now crumbling. The bank above now being undercut tends to collapse.</p>	See new action regarding sediment from roadside cuttings
TF1048	TF05	No question	<p>CCC. It seems important that the plan includes the CCC to the number of groups to be worked with. Roading and drainage. They are not included in the plan. The sediment comes off the land above and it is difficult to arrest this but some planting on roadsides might help and planting above the road too.</p> <p>The most important thing is to provide sumps which could catch the sediment. MONEY SET ASIDE FOR OUR PROJECT SHOULDN'T BE USED TO PAY FOR WORK THAT CCC SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR.</p>	See new action regarding sediment from roadside cuttings
TF1049	TF05	No question	<p>Rules and bylaws. If there are no bylaws controlling the sediment in water coming off the land then laws should be introduced or things will not improve.</p>	Rules and bylaws are outside scope of this document.
TF1050	TF06	No question	<p>My concern regarding the erosion caused on the higher slopes by new subdivisions. For instance, in our neighbourhood in Purau a new developer has started excavations for a new subdivision and has caused a massive slip. There is no control by Environment Canterbury and he has been allowed to carry on.</p>	Enforcement is an ECan responsibility - covered in ECan Partner Commitments (Part 1)
TF1051	TF06	No question	<p>In regard to biodiversity and healthy soil and waterways. Christchurch is still allowing contractors to spray round-up in our rural areas of the Peninsula despite a massive growing evidence of its danger for the environment. How can this be part of our healthy harbour future?</p>	Have amended Action 2.5 to include 'pest plant control techniques' in KFA2 - Pollution section (Part 3)
TF1052	TF06	Q1 - Part 1	<p>Yes, they do when read the explanation!!!!</p>	No change required
TF1053	TF06	Q2 - Part 2	<p>Very much in line with key ideas, but needs to be more precise e.g. high outcrops/forests needs prime attention as the start of erosion. Legal enforcement of forestry being either native habitat reforestation or sustainable forestry, corridors of wildlife, small stream source fencing and planting</p>	ki uta kū tai concept. This is clearly explained in the document. No change required

TF1054	TF06	Q3 - Part 2	Yes, clarify that the main cause of sedimentation is deforestation, plantation forestry management and unprotected waterways	There is a range of actions around the contribution of sediment from different sources. Changes made to Part 2 to reflect this.
TF1055	TF06	Q4 - Part 2	Government subsidies to fence off land above a specific steepness grade and to fence off all waterways and sources, incentives to plant and maintain natural habitats linked to each other	Outside scope of what we can do
TF1056	TF06	Q5 - Part 3	The focus needs to be on action. In 2017 we do not need to keep on focusing on evidence finding via research. The evidence is obvious similar national and international catchments show us the way. We need to start from the stop down.	Agree. Insert more information about what individuals can do
TF1057	TF06	Q6 - Part 3	Yes, immediate need to enforce erosion control via regulated and supported planting at the top will support marine health	Ki uta kū tai concept. This is clearly explained in the document. No change required
TF1058	TF06	Q7 - Part 3	Put pressure on government to regulate protection of our high outcrops and steep slopes and enforce sustainable forestry and biodiverse habitat restoration, waterway and source protection	Regulation outside scope
TF1059	TF06	Q8 - Part 3	Prioritise from the top down plus waterways protection, offer community adoption plans for waterways from source to sea, encourage local planting and management initiatives	Ki uta kū tai concept. This is clearly explained in the document. No change required
TF1060	TF06	Q9 - Part 3	Identify that there is no place for Pinus Radiata plantations due to erosion issues, lack of biodiversity and fire risks. Encourage sustainable forestry with selective harvests over hundreds of years	Disagree, no change required
TF1061	TF06	Q10 - Overall	Please focus on the need to establish a Healthy Harbour for our mokopuna children, no place for short term greed.	This is well reflected in the document, no change required
TF1062	TF06	Q10 - Overall	Rethink our sewage system, instead of pumping nutrients via the ocean, pump them up to the top of our hills where sprinkling systems feed new sustainable forestry.	Infrastructure upgrades within the catchment are underway, no change required to reflect this (see Action 2.1 and 2.5)
TF1063	TF07	Q1 - Part 1	Yes, they do - great vision	No change required
TF1064	TF07	Q2 - Part 2	Great vision	No change required
TF1065	TF07	Q3 - Part 2	This could be put into a bigger context and the urgency that is attached to this (further reduction in biodiversity = depletion of species = irreversible damage	Agree. No change required
TF1066	TF07	Q4 - Part 2	Local communities and land owners taking responsibility and are held to account (!) for the state of the local environment.	No change required
TF1067	TF07	Q5 - Part 3	Yes - well laid out	No change required
TF1068	TF07	Q6 - Part 3	Cluster 'working with landowners' include land developers and subdivisions	No change required - these could already be included in Actions 1.6
TF1069	TF07	Q7 - Part 3	Who?? Ongoing abuse and negligence regarding the laudable goals laid out here?	No change required

TF1070	TF07	Q8 - Part 3	It needs a multilevel approach to implement and own these actions by local communities e.g. liaison people, public meetings back up by from rules	This relates to governance and implementation
TF1071	TF07	Q9 - Part 3	Ban the use of round up and other toxic pesticides in the harbour basin	See changes to KFA 2: pollution (Action 2.5) regarding contaminants
TF1072	TF07	Q10 - Overall	Give this management some teeth and make it a statutory document	Cannot do this
TF1073	TF07	Q10 - Overall	provide a roadmap of how this will be resourced	This is a resourcing and priority question - the draft document will include this information
TF1074	TF07	Q10 - Overall	freeze the level of commercial/industrial activity at current output levels to prevent further degradation of resources	Cannot do this as part of this process, no change required
TF1075	TF08	Q1 - Part 1	I support “well-connected” but have some concerns with “connected” and would rather the concept of “interconnected” is adopted as it is appropriate for both the natural and also for the social/human environment. This would embody the greater complexity (with feedback loops) inherent in natural and social communities, and their interactions. In contrast, “connected” can be very one-way/“extractive”, beneficial to a “power agency” and not always to the benefit of either the wider or the local environment and communities.	Have amended document to include 'interconnected' instead of 'connected' (Part 1 and 2)
TF1076	TF08	Q1 - Part 1	The supporting information on p.7 is fine but an issue has been and remains the partitioned responsibility between agencies with their various interests. A huge value in the current document is to get engagement across the various agencies who claim responsibilities in the harbour basin but who are considered in the document to be separate from the community.	Have made amendments to incorporate the community role alongside Partner and other agencies (all parts of document)
TF1077	TF08	Q1 - Part 1	Another really significant achievement is starting to address the local marine issues which have largely been neglected (extraordinary in one of the worlds' most oceanic' and coastal dwelling countries)!	No change required
TF1078	TF08	Q2 - Part 2	Yes, many of these have been long held by local community members and community groups, with many physical achievements already happening - with or without agency support. The bands are largely consistent with other relatively recent but earlier works including the major initiative taken by Governors Bay with its 1998 (and 2005) <i>Indigenous Ecosystems of Lyttelton Harbour Basin (with stream guide)</i> , and the many projects of the Lyttelton Harbour/Whakaraupō Issues Group.	No change required
TF1079	TF08	Q2 - Part 2	I would like to see more emphasis placed on the carrying capacity, soils, and land capability – especially for addressing a future with more extreme weather events. There is reference to “thriving communities living within the carrying capacity of the harbour...” in the Hills and Lowland band (p.15) but this is not developed	This is already reflected in the actions (see Action 5.12)

TF1080	TF08	Q3 - Part 2	Better value our ephemeral streams. It is not only the 4-5 permanent streams that have habitat value. Many ephemeral streams run for most of the year and are important habitat for fish (with their ability to 'hunker down' in 'dries') and other biota. Develop and include an appropriate action. Additionally, water discharge from roads could be re-valued to recognise their potential vertical corridor habitat value (i.e. with appropriate planting) and assist with (i.e. not accelerate) soil/land stabilisation.	Amend Part 2 to better reflect role of ephemeral streams.
TF1081	TF08	Q3 - Part 2	many road systems drain toward the 'v' of the harbour's many gullies and this is also where motorized vehicles brake heavily. Are the receiving waters likely to be receiving higher levels of heavy metals? And if so what is the likely impact (ref ChCh research)? If relevant, consider an appropriate action.	See changes to actions regarding road cuttings and erosion and sedimentation (Actions 1.9 and 1.10)
TF1082	TF08	Q4 - Part 2	Respect, empower (through knowledge) and recognize the community's intense passion and concern for their harbour environment, and acknowledge that they are the local eyes and ears for monitoring (for all bands). Much knowledge is handed down and retained in communities who tend to be more stable (over multiple decades and across generations) while agency mandates and personnel increasingly change frequently (even annually). To date, many programmes have engaged with community members and communities with some very happy to 'mine' local knowledge to suit their programmes and individual agenda but are quick to abandon as governance, management, and personnel change. Healthy relationships are respectful relationships!	See amendments to include community lead research and monitoring programmes (Action 5.17)
TF1083	TF08	Q4 - Part 2	The document is upfront about being aspirational. However, as with other aspirational works, it needs to be more than yet another document to sit on shelves. It has positively achieved key agencies agreeing to discrete courses of action. Two immediate needs now seem to be: 1) to ensure these agencies continue to work together long term to realize identified and important outcomes (and that they don't revert to earlier modes of operating); and, 2) to better 'ground' and engage the agencies in the local community to help with achieving the outcomes and to assist in maintaining continuity as agency mandates and personnel change	This a question for governance and implementation

TF1084	TF08	Q5 - Part 3	It is good to see the road cuttings project has survived through to 2017, having been initiated in the LHWIG Reducing Sediment Action Plan 2004 (but somewhat sidelined as other commitments were attended eg LHWV, HoH wetland project, AE project, LPC Recovery Plan, etc)! However, despite both projects being budgeted for, this project's partner project appears to have not survived – but should as it does not make sense to better manage sediment on the up side of the road while continuing or increasing erosion and sediment transfers on the downside! The partner project was to trial different methods of reducing the effects of road water discharges on the downhill side of rural roads (which are increasingly being side channelled) in order to reduce land failures and resulting sediment transfer down-slope. Reintroduce this project to find the most cost-effective method of reducing and mitigating the effects of rural road water discharges to land/water and for incorporating into future operating plans (as Good Management Practice) – it could be as simple as planting a minimum number of flax for a big saving in land failures, erosion and sediment loss/loading while at the same time enhancing habitat values!	See changes to roading actions (Actions 1.9 and 1.10 are new)
TF1085	TF08	Q5 - Part 3	Expand 2.4 to be explicit about the other, non-permanent streams – possibly through prioritising those streams which run almost permanently and/or have recognized habitat value	Already covered in Action 3.8. No change required
TF1086	TF08	Q5 - Part 3	Head of the bays project initiated by LHWIG is fully supported. While it is obvious to many of us, there are still many people who do not understand the role of wetlands. Consequently, some interest and gains could be made through increased information on the role they play and their values.	No change required
TF1087	TF08	Q6 - Part 3	I remain concerned for the resilience of the remaining parts of the harbour under the status quo in the face of increasing prevalence and intensity of extreme weather patterns and events and with little address to building the health and holding capacity of our soils. Fires and increased rainfall have been experienced this year, winds are also forecast to increase (in intensity and prevalence). The health of the whole harbour needs to be considered and addressed as the effects of intense winds, rainfall and fire do not respect property boundaries (even with measures in place).	No change required
TF1088	TF08	Q7 - Part 3	All supported but see also comments in above where additional actions are either indicated or would arise out of attending to points raised. Time constraints prevent me providing a more comprehensive response.	No change required
TF1089	TF08	Q9 - Part 3	Positively consider and value the role of community members in assisting with research and monitoring and value their role in being engaged with and educated about their environment – for reporting, advocacy, shared learning etc Example: community members can and have assisted with sample collections, spotlight monitoring etc according to agreed protocols An educated community can better help with promoting needs (eg to LTPs etc) and securing funding for more scientific research and monitoring!	See new action regarding role of community/individuals for monitoring and research (Action 5.17)

TF1090	TF08	Q10 - Overall	Please better value, respect and engage with the community! The current Plan incorporates new actions and these are welcomed, but, within a 10-year period, much of it duplicates work identified in the ZIP and/or work already in train by LHWIG.	The CMP aligns well with the zip and the intention is not too duplicate existing work but to support and build on it. No change required
TF1091	TF08	Q10 - Overall	Our youth are an investment (and provide access to other family members) but they frequently move away for a period of their lives. In contrast older community members have frequently lived many decades/lifetimes in the area and have a wealth of knowledge, skills and active participation and these should be better recognized and valued for the immediate future – including huge commitments to date, their citizen monitoring value, and effort should be made to re-engage and empower their contributions. See 3.6 but also other actions.	The role of citizens as scientists should be explored. A new action in the 'research and monitoring' section is added to support community lead research and monitoring (Part 3)
TF1092	TF08	Q10 - Overall	Recognize the significance of pests for our recovering indigenous ecosystems – plants (e.g. escapees from increasingly subdivided properties etc), as well as predators	Pest plants and pest animals - have amended text to make clear what we're talking about and amended Action 3.2, 3.4, and 3.5 to ensure pest management is also a priority as well as planting
TF1093	TF09	Q10 - Overall	I like the way the document has been presented, I'm supportive of the aims and key areas to focus the remediation. There are a lot of proposed actions, so I guess there will need to be prioritising of the actions at some point soon. Well done to all who have worked so hard on this so far. This is really exciting, it's great to see the beginnings of a plan that will see the regeneration of Whakaraupō. Let's do it :-)	No change required
TF1094	TF10	Q10 - Overall	I do need to say for a document to be accepted and 'taken up' by the community - the community will need to see that all parties are supporting 'happily and respecting each other'- we need to see real collaboration and partnership even before this plan comes out for consultation.	No change required
TF1095	TF10	Q10 - Overall	All the parties should be contributing funding to show that they really mean business and want to see good positive outcomes.	All Partners are contributing to resourcing the plan development and implementation. Funding statement has been amended to better reflect this (Part 3)
TF1096	TF10	Q10 - Overall	Some of the plan is not good reading eg P13 tracks of exotic grasses. It paints almost everything as being damaged or degraded everything seems to be out of place - stand in a landowner's shoes what do they do / how do they continue to farm. Why would they want to buy in and be a part of the process. Land purchase may need to be considered	Have amended text to ensure the role of farming in the catchment is clear and inclusive.
TF1097	TF10	Q10 - Overall	We need to see communities looking at the document and saying what project can I get in behind and progress. We need to see simple steps and steps for change being progressed. Citizen science needs to be a real part of the programme.	Have amended document to ensure the role of individuals and communities is more visible (all parts of document)
TF1098	TF10	Q10 - Overall	This document needs to be seen as a living document and as new information is known that information is shared between all parties for all our benefit.	Actions are reviewed every 3 years. No change required
TF1099	TF10	Q10 - Overall	Change will only happen when there are things that we see make sense.	No change required

TF1100	TF10	Q10 - Overall	I believe that there should be more about 'our place ' an introduction that talks about formation / geological information and a bit more about people and communities. How the Peninsula was formed is impacting today and we need to understand that It is also people that will make the changes and we need to all fit together. This is a place based plan that needs to guide and assist us all. We will always have a port roads and a number of small connecting communities historical and cultural sites recreation opportunities sea /water activities conservation etc and need to plan and work together. We live here.	No change required
TF1101	TF10	Q10 - Overall	The next step moving the plan along really needs some special focus and lots of innovative thinking and I believe that there should be some mention of this in the plan. The co governance group sounds a bit too formal and not people / community friendly enough.	This is about community engagement and involvement (governance question)
TF1102	TF10	Q10 - Overall	Far too often we see these sort of plans sitting on the shelf. We will need an inspirational champion to oversee manage the whole project etc We may need to find an appropriate charitable trust to umbrella the project apply for funds for a range of groups and be accountable for the spending hold public liability insurance have health and safety plans etc	Governance question - to be dealt with as part of implementation
TF1103	TF10	Q10 - Overall	If we are sediment sensitive catchment - we will need a specialist team to work alongside individuals and communities specialist land managers river engineers specialists in sediment control etc Some of these services should be free to ensure buy in maybe a catchment getting together to fund . We will have to be innovative in how to get some payment for services being requested. Paying for a costly resource consent will not get the outcomes that are hoped for.	Governance question - to be dealt with as part of implementation
TF1104	TF10	Q10 - Overall	We might need a specialist team to organise carry out the plantings and manage the areas following planting etc North Canterbury has a company that does this ensuring that what is done is well done and managed. Weeds are going to be real problem. Management of riparian strips will be vital. Any retired land will need intensive weed and pest control - wildings eg pines escaped garden plants are already major issue and will almost escalate.	Governance question - to be dealt with as part of implementation
TF1105	TF10	Q10 - Overall	The Port hills area has already had a fire and so we need to focus on a fire fighting and protection plan. We may need a number of firefighting ponds throughout the area.	Outside scope of this project. See Port Hills Regeneration Plan
TF1106	TF10	Q10 - Overall	Those involved in the programmes will need to have the 'right approach to the job' and be well informed trained where necessary. The people involved are going to make or break progress forward. It will be about people and getting the best out of our communities. Advice and education is just going to be so vital and important that we provide exciting interactive opportunities to become involved.	Agree. No change required

TF1107	TF11	Q1 - Part 1	We congratulate the five partners who have led the development of the Catchment Management Plan. BPCT believes that conservation is about people. The Plan provides the community with a vision about their place – a story of how their place can be, and how they are part of that story.	No change required
TF1108	TF11	Q1 - Part 1	The Plan has been well drafted with supportive aspirational goals to achieve a healthy harbour. Although the Trust’s Ecological Vision goals are broader, being based on the intrinsic values of the natural environment, we recognise that those goals can be achieved in different ways in each part of Banks Peninsula. The emphasis on mahinga kai in the Catchment Management Plan is a good example of this. It has a firm foundation in Maori tradition, which is likely to draw support and of course an abundance of edible species can be seen as an indicator of overall ecological health.	No change required
TF1109	TF11	Q1 - Part 1	Although the Catchment Management Plan acknowledges that the goals will take a long time to achieve, the monitoring proposals may be setting up expectations that potentially are unrealistic. The Trust recognises that it is going to be difficult to show results and indicators of improvement in the short-term.	Have included an explanation about what measures and targets are, why there are none in the document, and how we’re working towards developing them (Part 3)
TF1110	TF11	Q5 - Part 3	BPCT supports the prioritising of research on hydrodynamics and sediment transport. Sediment is rightly identified as the main cause of the greatly degraded biodiversity supported by the harbour, but what is actually happening with the balance between inflow and dispersal of sediment, and the mechanisms of this need to be better understood. This is the foundation for effective action. The management plan acknowledges this to some extent, seems to put this research on the same level as other investigations. All of the actions described in the plan, such as riparian planting are worthwhile, but if choices have to be made about the allocation of effort, it is important to have a better understanding of what is happening with sediment in the harbour.	Agree. Adequately addressed already so no change required
TF1111	TF11	Q5 - Part 3	The Catchment Management Plan suggests priority is given to improving the catchments of the five permanent streams entering the harbour. This is possibly a good policy, but it must be remembered that at the times when most sediment is being transported by waterways to the harbour, all the streams (and constructed stormwater drainage systems) are flowing, not just the permanent streams.	Will include more information in Part 2 about ephemeral streams. Action 3.8 covers these waterways.
TF1112	TF11	Q5 - Part 3	BPCT strongly supports the proposal to promote enhancement of wetlands at the head of the harbour. These important ecosystems are underrepresented in protected areas on the Peninsula, such as reserves and areas in covenants administered by the Queen Elizabeth II Trust and the BPCT. They deserve more recognition, research, and protection.	No change required
TF1113	TF11	Q2 - Part 2	BPCT supports a greater level of priority to the ecological recovery of the “head of the harbour”.	No change required

TF1114	TF11	Q5 - Part 3	The Management Plan is silent on reclamation and dredging activities within the harbour and offers very little detail on Port activity. Much emphasis is placed on individual responsibilities for sediment control by private landowners. The Plan should include greater detail of how the Port activities and the responsibilities of local and regional authorities will impact the harbour catchment.	Will insert more information about the Port to increase its visibility in the plan.
TF1115	TF11	Q10 - Overall	Banks Peninsula has become a national leader for conservation on private land with a passionate and engaged community driving biodiversity protection initiatives. The benefits of this proposal are for the whole Peninsula community who have already worked cooperatively over a sustained period to improve biodiversity on both private and public land. The Banks Peninsula Conservation Trust has covenanted over 1100ha of private land with 62 covenants completed at a cost of over \$1M. A healthy inner harbour is a significant investment in biodiversity protection. A healthy harbour is consistent with, and necessary to achieve, the Banks Peninsula Ecological Vision 2050. It is also consistent with the Government's predator-free New Zealand by 2050 vision.	No change required
TF1116	TF12	Q1 - Part 1	Very much so	No change required
TF1117	TF12	Q2 - Part 2	It is a realistic interpretation/application of research previously carried out	Yes. No change required
TF1118	TF12	Q3 - Part 2	This is a living document and there will be further refinement as the process evolves	No change required
TF1119	TF12	Q4 - Part 2	As above, this is a good start point. Future projects will become self-evident	No change required
TF1120	TF12	Q5 - Part 3	Definitely	No change required
TF1121	TF12	Q6 - Part 3	The 4 KFA's are the basic building blocks of a healthy harbour. They do cover the main issues with the health of the harbour	No change required
TF1122	TF12	Q7 - Part 3	Again, taking this as a living/evolving process additional actions which may take priority will reveal themselves as data is collected	Dealt with in three-yearly action plan review. No change required
TF1123	TF12	Q8 - Part 3	Ensure that timeframes and priority are realistic	See updated information regarding timeframes and resourcing
TF1124	TF12	Q9 - Part 3	There are no changes that I would recommend to the supporting actions, other than emphasising that this is probably the most important part of the whole document. Good research and data analysis is the key "rubbish in-rubbish out" the best intentions in the world are no use without a sound factual basis on which to plan and measure change (good and bad)	No change required
TF1125	TF12	Q10 - Overall	Overall this is an excellent document and provides a framework for participation for the harbour communities including commercial/industrial/agricultural	No change required
TF1126	TF13	Q1 - Part 1	The goals are well thought out and should be achievable with the co-operation of the community	No change required

TF1127	TF13	Q2 - Part 2	The foreshore and harbour are particularly important and access for all should be a priority. Small groups and clubs should not be granted sole right to these areas and access should be free	Access is outside scope of this project
TF1128	TF13	Q3 - Part 2	The state of the bands are described accurately. Over recent years there has been regeneration of flora but not enough. It is so vital to encourage the native fauna back.	No change required
TF1129	TF13	Q4 - Part 2	I am certain there are large number of the population who support regeneration. Sympathetic groups should receive the utmost encouragement to walk the tracks and enjoy the foreshore and water. These people should be encouraged to educate those who are not so aware of our natural heritage schools should be encouraged to use these places for outdoor education and science. Camping spots should be developed for overnight stays (not freedom campers)	Community role in education - this is reflected in text and Actions
TF1130	TF13	Q5 - Part 3	The priorities are admirable and appropriate. It would seem the overarching objective would be to get the wider public supportive and take ownership of the principles and in so doing protect the developments.	Ensure visibility of role of individuals and communities is clear. See amendments.
TF1131	TF13	Q6 - Part 3	Somehow there should be strict control of the environment to prevent vandalism and exploitation of the various species.	See Partner commitments. Enforcement and regulation outside scope
TF1132	TF13	Q7 - Part 3	The focus areas are great but these could be hard to uphold unless there are suitable public amenities e.g. composting toilets and rubbish receptacles, very necessary in the prevention of pollution.	Outside scope. CCC function - see partner responsibilities. No change required
TF1133	TF13	Q8 - Part 3	Pollution and erosion are the two priority areas. The physical and engineering aspects are very important but so is public education.	No change required
TF1134	TF13	Q9 - Part 3	The project is well thought out. Perhaps there should be programmes where the general public are made aware of the objectives.	Insert action around public education and awareness and promotional campaign
TF1135	TF13	Q10 - Overall	I am concerned there are some relatively small groups and organisations who would like to restrict access to their members, especially the foreshore and surrounding areas. Point is a very good example. This area is unique and thousands of people enjoy facilities it provides often for passive recreation. The disastrous marina development of the 2000's reduced access to the area to about 100 metres of the access. There is at least 800 metres of foreshore which should be available to all.	Access. Outside scope
TF1136	TF14	Q1 - Part 1	Yes	No change required
TF1137	TF14	Q2 - Part 2	Yes, no change	No change required
TF1138	TF14	Q3 - Part 2	Yes	No change required
TF1139	TF14	Q4 - Part 2	Not sure	No change required
TF1140	TF14	Q5 - Part 3	mostly but there is a lot of sediment runoff from vertical loess edges to the main road around the harbour - this needs to be addressed	See new actions and amendments relating to short-term and long-term solutions at road cuttings

TF1141	TF14	Q7 - Part 3	treatment of road edge, as mentioned in question 5	See new actions and amendments relating to short-term and long-term solutions at road cuttings
TF1142	TF14	Q8 - Part 3	riparian stream planting is essential	This is covered in existing actions - no change required
TF1143	TF14	Q9 - Part 3	runoff from vertical loess faces needs to be addressed	See new actions and amendments relating to short-term and long-term solutions at road cuttings
TF1144	TF15	Q1 - Part 1	Yes, great whāinga	No change required
TF1145	TF15	Q2 - Part 2	Don't really understand the questions and insufficient knowledge about the vegetation to comment although support the concept of supporting the reversion to native flora and fauna and wildlife	No change required
TF1146	TF15	Q3 - Part 2	it is confusing talking about bands without a clear definition what is meant by 'bands'	This is quite clear, will insert a map
TF1147	TF15	Q4 - Part 2	the future state aspirations are fine but disappointed that actions aren't included - however reading further along I see these are included in the tables	No change required
TF1148	TF15	Q5 - Part 3	the reference to P24?? It is confusing to talk of 'key focus areas' does this mean priority project?	KFA description is appropriate and so is the description of what a priority project is. No change is required to address this
TF1149	TF15	Q6 - Part 3	I think these KFA comprehensively cover the main issues with the health of the harbour	No change required
TF1150	TF15	Q7 - Part 3	None that I can think of	No change required
TF1151	TF15	Q8 - Part 3	it looks like a lot of work and resources will be required and of course the sooner it is done the better and time framing and prioritising is essential to ensure these get done	No change required
TF1152	TF15	Q9 - Part 3	perhaps provide an explanation of 5.3 "ki uta ki tai integrated catchment management"	There is an explanation in Section 1
TF1153	TF15	Q10 - Overall	overall this draft plan appears to be comprehensive and I like the analogy of weaving a korowai but the yellow colouring in the diagram is hard to read. It is great to see some concrete planning being done but the important part is getting this actioned! Kia kaha!	No change required