

**Report on a pre-hearing meeting held on 10.04.2019
From 10.30am to 1.00pm at GWRC Offices**

**GWRC Flood Protection Department
Application for resource consents for river management
activities in the Waikanae River Catchment**

Present

- Jenny Grimmett – Independent Facilitator, Down to Earth Planning Ltd;
- Michelle Conland - Consultant Planner, GWRC Environmental Regulation;
- Jacky Cox – Engineer, GWRC Flood Protection;
- Sarah Bevin – Senior Planner, Tonkin & Taylor for GWRC Flood Protection;
- Libby Cowper – Solicitor, Buddle Findlay for GWRC Flood Protection;
- Tracy Berghan – Project Manager, GWRC Flood Protection;
- Natasha Petrove – Freshwater Ecologist, Department of Conservation;
- Katherine Anton – Solicitor, Department of Conservation;
- Ken Murray – Planner RMA, Department of Conservation;
- Mahina-a-rangi Baker – Pou Takawaenga Taiao, Te Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai;
- Te Rangimarie Williams - Environmental Consultant, Te Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai ;
- Phil Teal – Regional Manager, Fish & Game;
- Peter Wilson – Senior Planner, Fish & Game (by conference call on speaker phone)
- Malcolm Frances – Kāpiti Fly Fishing Club;
- Hugh Driver - Kāpiti Fly Fishing Club;
- Anna Carter – Environmental Consultant, Waikanae Christian Holiday Park.

1. Introduction

Facilitator Jenny Grimmett opened the meeting by welcoming everyone and explaining that the meeting was the third of a series of pre-hearing meetings (PHM) with the purpose to discuss submitters' concerns relating to the consent application for the Waikanae River.

Ms Grimmett explained that the Applicant had been working over a period of five years since the application had been lodged for consent to develop the draft conditions and Code of Practice circulated prior to and tabled at the meeting, and that GWRC Flood Protection (GWFP) officers were looking at identifying and addressing any outstanding matters that

submitters considered still needed to be addressed. The ultimate aim in this respect is to avoid the need to go to a hearing for the consent applications.

Tracy Berghan (Applicant) provided a summary of the development of the consent conditions and Code of Practice assisted by others in the GWFP team describing how the proposal for flood protection in the Waikanae River had been developed to achieve the version of documents tabled at this meeting.

In summary (paraphrased) the key points made are as follows:

- GWRC Flood Protection, in applying to GWRC for consents, wants to raise the bar to improve how river management in the river corridors is undertaken, taking into account all relevant river values and not just flood engineering, along with improving the quality and consistency of documentation and reporting processes, and ensuring a higher level of transparency.
- GWRC's existing flood management tasks and responsibilities were presented on a summary "Consenting Framework" flow chart (shown in blue) and the new items (everything else) based on the above-mentioned research process were added to the chart to create a comprehensive framework for the consents. The Operational Management Plan (OMP), Annual Work Plan (AWP), monitoring etc will all increase the transparency of GWRC's flood management functions and enable a wider audience to be involved. The areas highlighted in red show mana whenua involvement in the process.
- The "why" and "how" flood management works will be undertaken are set out in detail in the Code of Practice to inform the consent holder (GWFP) of the roles and responsibilities and methods and processes. The approach allows space for others to question and be involved in an ongoing way. The OMP identifies the specific values of the different reaches of the river. The AWP will help to decide how to address the issues in the OMP and will identify environmental enhancement opportunities and activities that require a SSEMP¹. So far, a lot of "good practice" checks and balances have been included in the Conditions and the Code of Practice through GWRC's work with DOC and Fish and Game to date. Feedback from mana whenua on these documents will be provided soon.
- Mana whenua involvement is identified separately rather than being one of several stakeholders, in recognition of their partnership role with GWRC. The values identified by mana whenua via kaitiaki monitoring and other processes need to be included in the final documents. To date, advice from Caleb Royal, Kara Puketapu-Dentice, and Turi Hippolite is that they support the inclusion of a kaitiaki group that supports the ongoing relationship both across iwi, and with GWRC. This approach has been incorporated into the consent conditions.

¹ Site Specific Effects Management Plan

- In response to an identified need to address cumulative effects, the Natural Character Index (NCI)/Habitat Quality Index (HQI) was developed. Massey University has been approached by GWRC to assist with this, and will be instructed to proceed once the resource consents for the rivers are determined.
- GWRC's commitment to ensure the 1:100 flood protection standard is maintained was confirmed, while noting that the management of the hazard risk is identified in Regional Policy Statement Policies 29 and 51, and that Policy 51(g) and Policy 29 references the need for reliance on District Plan provisions. The Proposed Natural Resources Plan doesn't have any rules or policies covering this standard as it is mostly implemented through avoiding inappropriate subdivision and development in areas at high risk from flooding. To facilitate the maintenance of this standard requires the consents that are the subject of this PHM.
- The Flood Management Plan (FMP) for the river was developed under the Local Government Act (LGA). However, the flood protection schemes were developed under the Soil Conservation and Rivers Control Act 1941 (Mr Wilson noted that there is also the Land Drainage Act 1908 that is still relevant). Ms Berghan noted that while it is not ideal operating under such old legislation, it is more flexible for some flood management functions than the Resource Management Act (RMA). If the Council has a scheme prepared under this older legislation it has to maintain it and to change the scheme requires a lengthy, consultative process under the LGA. GWRC seeks to balance the scheme requirements with the current RMA requirements, as it needs to have tools and provisions in place to act more quickly. This has resulted in the consent conditions and Code of Practice tabled at the meeting. Ms Berghan asked the submitters to provide feedback on these documents.

Following Ms Berghan's presentation, Ms Cowper noted that this discussion provides the history and framework of the consent applications but the consent applications relate to the maintenance works that will be undertaken in the river. The consent conditions and Code of Practice were developed to provide for this. Ms Cowper explained that the conditions are what GWRC has to do, and that the Code is the document that will be used by GWRC as a guide for how to do the things required by the conditions, and why.

A short break was taken between 11.00am and 11.15am.

Submitters and applicant representatives then discussed the documents tabled, with topics ranging between positive feedback on the documents being given by DOC, Fish and Game, and mana whenua, some matters of clarification and further changes requested by Ms Carter, and a summary of the specific issues and matters that mana whenua would like to see included in the final document versions. These matters are covered in the following sections in more detail.

Mr Teal (Fish & Game Council) left the meeting at 12.40pm.

Documents circulated prior to the meeting, and provided as hard copies at the meeting included:

1. Western Rivers: Consenting Framework;
2. Western Rivers: Consenting Framework with iwi involvement in the process highlighted;
3. Western Rivers: Conditions of Consent for River Management Activities (Draft dated 9 January 2019); and
4. Code of Practice for River Management Activities Version 19 dated 9 January 2019.

Note: Minutes of the previous PHMs for the Waikanae River (held 5 and 12 December 2018) had previously been circulated following those meetings.

General questions/advice at this stage of the meeting included: N/A.

2. Discussion of issues

Fish & Game Council: Mr Teal commented that, in terms of outcomes, the process for the Wellington Region rivers compared to what he has experienced with other councils to date has been quite progressive. He was complimentary about the inclusion of the NCI/HQI requirements into the consent documents and said credit was due to GWRC for including these.

Mr Teal confirmed that Fish & Game were comfortable with the way things were moving forward, but noted that there was further engagement and involvement to be had with iwi. Fish & Game were keen to see if everyone was on the same page and if anything is raised by Te Ātiawa that they might not have considered.

Mr Wilson noted that of the 10-15 consents he has been dealing with round the country, this one is the most progressive. Fish & Game will be able to give the final sign off once the details are finalised. He also confirmed that the letter prepared by Tracy Berghan following the last PHM at Ōtaki has been helpful in this respect.

Te Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai (TAKW): Mahina-a-rangi Baker commented that she liked the positive way the consent applications had been progressed so far, and noted that iwi had limited resources and would have liked to be engaged more. She noted her appreciation of the patience and consideration towards TAKW so they could properly engage. Ms Baker noted that the Waikanae River has special values for mana whenua / Māori and the wider community, and these overlap to a certain extent. She wanted to identify changes in the planning process, and how things are structured so TAKW can be involved. Ms Baker noted that TAKW is a strong advocate for adaptive management approaches and that it is necessary to get the partnership arrangement with GWRC (not just for flood management) right – and acknowledged that this requires a broader perspective (including consultation outside this consent process).

Ms Baker said that the consenting framework is looking really good so far and covers lots of matters around iwi expectations. She said she can provide more comment once she receives an assessment report commissioned by TAKW on the consent documents and how the Code will work, EMP, how monitoring will be done, and any changes in management practices that will need to occur. Ms Baker noted this report would need to be worked through and that her main focus is on ensuring monitoring data is used efficiently and effectively in terms of time and costs.

Ms Baker then went on to note that there are references to mana whenua and cultural values in the documents and she prefers to use “iwi values” as these encompass economic, social and cultural values. She wanted to ensure that monitoring is undertaken to ensure iwi values are protected and integrated as whole. In her view, she said, a lot of the important iwi values are similar to others raised by submitters so it would be cost effective to maximise the way data is used. For example, kaitiaki monitoring and the Environmental Monitoring Plan (EMP) shouldn't be developed separately from one another.

Ms Baker also said it was good that GWRC is talking about roles as partners and then asked Mr Teal if what she had said was what Fish and Game Council were wanting to hear.

Ms Cowper and Ms Berghan noted that following a request by Mr Caleb Royal (Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki), the information shown in red on the Consenting Framework document highlights iwi involvement in the process in terms of the draft consent conditions Code of Practice. Ms Berghan stated that there has been a step change in the Council's relationship with iwi, and that GWRC will engage separately with iwi before the other stakeholders. Ms Cowper further confirmed that other stakeholders are also included in the process and this is also shown in the Consenting Framework document.

Gravel Extraction Workshop: There was a brief discussion about the separate workshop that had been held last month to discuss gravel extraction in the Waikanae River which is proposed to be undertaken following the granting of this river management consent application, and the roles of OMPs, and the NCI/HQI. The appropriateness of a 35-metre wide channel near the Waikanae Christian Holiday Park (WCHP) was covered as part of this meeting's discussion, together with problems of gravel build up and the risk of the Waikanae River jumping out of its channel. Ms Berghan noted that how the iwi partnership was progressed was a matter that must also to be discussed at a higher level.

Ms Carter (WCHP) said that she has not been at the gravel extraction workshop. She asked about the integration of iwi values in Appendix 7 of the Code. Ms Baker said that, depending on how dynamic the river is, there will be different key values at different times. She said iwi want to see a framework that provides for management and protection of dynamic values, and noted that she sees that is where the consent documents have gone. Ms Baker said she wanted a process that identifies the specific values of a reach, which is better than high level generic information. Ms Baker considered that such a process lets the Waikanae community look at values in a particular reach at a particular time.

Mr Driver (Kāpiti Fly Fishing Club, KFFC) said that his understanding of the OMP is that it states what values need to be addressed, and then the SSEMP implementation covers how those values will be provided for. Ms Berghan and Ms Cowper agreed.

Ms Berghan mentioned that the Department of Conservation (DOC) is considering whether works in the Waikanae Scientific Reserve be included as part of this consent. If this happened, there would be the ability for gravel to be extracted from this area if needed, but it would require a SSEMP among other information (to be determined by DOC) as well as Reserves Act permission from DOC, so essentially it would be like a mini consent within a consent.

Ms Cox noted that everything GWFP does will be in the Annual Works Plans (AWP), and this means all discussions brought to the table in AWP development get considered. The main change in the consents from existing practice is the approach of targeting high impact instream activities and addressing these through SSEMPs (Site Specific Environmental Management Plans). Ms Cox also noted that the issue of the 35-metre channel has been referred back to the Gravel Workshop for further discussion, and that the beach ripping issues need to be addressed in the Environmental Monitoring Plans.

Dealing with Disputes and Conflicting Values in Process: Ms Carter (WCHP) queried how conflicting values, should they arise, be addressed in the development of the various consent documents (OMP, AWP and the FMP. She asked do these get noted in the SSEMP and queried what it means in the consent document advice that “where there may be conflicting values, there will be a recommendation in the SSEMP and that final decision will be made by the Manager of EReg”².

Ms Cowper explained that EReg’s (GWRC Environmental Regulation) role is to make sure relevant matters listed in the consent conditions are included in the SSEMP, not to address the nitty gritty details such as conflicting values etc. Ms Cox explained that the FMP feeds into the OMP and then AWP’s are prepared based on these to describe all works for the year ahead. This process allows the high impact activities to be identified, be run through the criteria set out in the Code, and the outcome is a decision as to whether an SSEMP is needed. If so, then the requirements set out in condition 4.6 will be included in the SSEMP. This will ensure the various values, effects, work to be done, monitoring required before, during and after the works, specific measures to remedy or mitigate adverse effects and reporting are taken into account and set out in the SSEMP. The triggers for requiring an SSEMP are in Appendix 2 and the conditions (condition 4.3), and Ms Cox noted that some activities are specifically listed as high impact activities.

Ms Berghan noted that OMPs have to be completed within one year, so issues and conflicts (if any) will be addressed in that timeframe.

Mr Driver (KFFC) asked “What is the process if there is a dispute in the development of the OMP, and hence the ultimate decision-making?”

² This wording has been superseded in later versions of the consent documentation.

Ms Cox explained that ranking of values had been deliberately left out of the process to avoid starting the process with a presumption that there will be a conflict. She also advised that flood protection values were also deliberately not included as GWRC would not do the work if it was not needed. Ms Berghan commented that the process to date had developed a level of trust between the people involved and that there was an associated assumption that this relationship would mean conflicts could be resolved among the stakeholders and iwi.

Ms Baker (TAKW) commented on how to embrace conflicting values, and that the key thing is how those conflicting values are resolved. She noted it was important to know how the monitoring data gathered is to be used to assist in making decisions, and that all values are monitored to show how changes occur, and then the information need to be weighed up so it can be understood how future works should be done. She said the Scientific Technical Advisory Group recommendations noted that there will always be effects, but there needs to be a scientific process to quantify these effects where it has been identified that they will occur.

Mr Teal (Fish & Game) said that in the past the Council's flood management focus was just on flood management and there had been a huge step forward to now where it was considering other values.

Ms Baker noted that in the past there was a lot of reference to the District Plan, and she considered it was important to avoid this and focus on improving planning. Ms Berghan noted that the GWRC policy was not to support protection of land use within the river corridor with new hard development (structural) measures. For example, the Waikanae Christian Holiday Park (WCHP) is located within the river corridor and stopbanks. If proposed now it would be located outside the river corridor. Ms Berghan also confirmed that there will be no change to the 1:100 year standard of flood protection for residential property. She noted that this is clearly covered by existing policy, in terms of river management, planning and strategic policy.

A general discussion followed about "resilience" versus "protection of water values" and whether there were conflicts within the current documentation in this respect. Ms Carter (WCHP) said the process needs to be responsive enough to ensure there are no delays if flood protection works need to be done. Ms Cox responded by saying that the process can't be stymied if there is a conflict, as there is a responsibility to prepare OMP and get it certified. Ms Berghan added that the independent audit process provides a safeguard to ensure GWRC does what it said it would do.

Ms Baker noted that flood management works are required to be done, and that it is not an either/or situation. Ms Berghan added that there is a need for the flood works, and it is about 'how' or 'why' that is to be determined by this process. Ms Berghan advised that the concept of ensuring that the "river has more room" has currency and acknowledged that there is no conflict resolution process.

Ms Cox said that there would always be conversation and an ability to work through disagreements, compromise where required, and she was positive this could occur based on the relationships developed over the past five years of working together.

Mr Wilson (Fish & Game) said that the SSEMPs are quite substantially constrained by the OMP under condition 2.2, which sets out what OMPs have to meet before the Council can consider SSEMP preparation (if any). If these conflicts arise these will be dealt with at the OMP stage.

Mr Wilson noted that if something doesn't work, section 128 of the Resource Management Act 1991 allows for review of conditions and this, if necessary, could be used to cover the preparation of the OMP.

Ms Baker said that the current consents have no method to identify or provide for conflicting values and that the proposed consenting framework provides for that, and it is preferable to GWRC having to get a new consent for each flood management works on a case-by-case basis. She said the preparation of the OMP will involve input from iwi and other interested groups, enabling values to be identified and weighed up, and noted that iwi are currently designing a way to work on any conflicting values. She said that the proposed method that she will advise on in due course is not likely to be controversial, and that the subsequent monitoring based on those identified values will help to inform decision making in terms of the need for and the content of SSEMPs.

Ms Berghan advised that the FMP may be replaced with something else in the future, but this doesn't affect the consenting framework proposed by this consent application.

There was a discussion about wider monitoring undertaken for the Waikanae River, data sharing and reducing duplication. Ms Berghan acknowledged there will be different monitoring that will take place for the river for different purposes, and said that it doesn't matter who does the monitoring as GWRC can tap into this data as required for development of the OMP. Ms Baker said the monitoring needs to be cost effective, and it all needs to be integrated but that the details of this can be worked out. Ms Cowper noted that the obligation to do the monitoring set out in the consents is on the Consent Holder.

Department of Conservation, DOC: Ms Anton advised that she was feeling comfortable about the process to date and that a lot of progress had been made. The documents acknowledge kaupapa and she has seen some really good changes being made to the documents across her desk. Ms Anton confirmed that funding has been approved for her team to review whether or not / how to include the Waikanae Scientific Reserve in the consents.

Ms Anton said that there was a fair amount of work to do to address the inclusion of the Waikanae Scientific Reserve in the consents, including at a technical and process level. She noted that the consent is very process heavy and that it is a really important theme for DOC "to identify the need for work in the estuary". Ms Anton said her team will need to consider any parameters that might need to be added to the consent criteria for working in

the reserve/estuary and this will require technical input to address monitoring of relevant effects that need to be considered as part of this. Ms Anton also commented that it would be very difficult to get permission under the Reserves Act.

Ms Berghan noted that the reserve had originally been included in the consents, then was removed, and is now back up for consideration. The proposed reintroduction was suggested to DOC in discussions at the last PHM as Ms Berghan wants to be sure that if there is a possibility that gravel extraction would be deemed necessary in the future, that it had been addressed as part of this consent process. This discussion on whether to include the reserve as part of this consent application now will assist with future community pressure to do the work. If the channel does move at some stage in the future, then it would be advantageous for GWRC to know what it can do to address this at that time. Ms Berghan further noted GWRC had no current proposal to extract gravel or do works in the reserve and acknowledged that any such work would require separate prior approval under the Reserves Act from DOC.

Ms Berghan explained that the OMP is developed to include the aspirations of landowners, taking into account the existing FMP framework. In this respect, for Waikanae, the 35-metre channel may need to be revisited. She noted that the M2PP bridge across the river had some gravel build up after its construction was completed and GWRC was trying to rectify this via a short-term measure. She said the question of whether maintaining a 35-metre wide channel is appropriate has been raised and even if it is “required” in the FMP it can still be addressed in the OMP process to reflect current information.

Mr Driver (Kāpiti Fly Fishing Club, KFFC) noted that he had walked the river the previous Monday and observed the same issues due to gravel as seen at Hokitika recently. He said the estuary has an influencing role in flood control. He also discussed gravel build up above State Highway 1. He noted that gravel in the river channel has effects on migrating fish and their ability to move up the river. Both Mr Driver and Mr Francis (KFFC) noted the huge gravel build up in the Waikanae River, that the river does not have much farmland to flow through, and that it doesn't flood often, so this may not clear the gravel. They queried whether it would be 12 months before the gravel could be removed. Ms Berghan noted that the consent application would need to be granted before instream gravel removal can occur in the Waikanae River.

In relation to the Waikanae Scientific Reserve, Ms Berghan said if there is a known problem now, it may be appropriate to plan and provide for it now by including it in the consent, even if GWRC still has to get separate approval to do the work under the Reserves Act.

Mr Murray explained his concerns about doing any such work. He said the sea level is rising on the Kāpiti coast and if gravel is removed the sea water will move inland further. With inland storm surges and astronomical tides, this will be even worse. He asked what would happen to flooding or hydraulic salinity interaction. He said the sea will break through anyway, and GWRC may regret opening up the estuary, noting that currently the sedimentation in the estuary reduces the heights of the high tide, and stops seawater from

going inland. Mr Murray said that potentially the estuary provides protection from flooding but that more modelling is needed.

Ms Baker commented that she had viewed GWRC's 1950s works archive and observed that works were undertaken to open up the estuary and that this caused more flooding, and resulted in further works to reduce and restore the opening.

Ms Berghan asked DOC if the reserve was included in the consents what monitoring would DOC require? Ms Cox asked DOC to present a package of the research they would like to see done in the lower reaches, including things such as hydraulic modelling, and any other recommendations. She also asked DOC to advise GWRC what would happen if the reserve was not included in the consents and then works are needed.

Ms Baker said there needs to be a vulnerability assessment done.

Ms Cowper suggested leaving the reserve out of the consents, given there would still need to be a separate Reserves Act process. Ms Cowper and Ms Anton discussed that it may be better to go through the consent process at the time that any works in the reserve are required, as information and consultation would be more up to date, and it was acknowledged that the timeframe for the works is uncertain. Ms Berghan noted that a robust, reasoned decision was needed. Ms Berghan asked Ms Anton and Ms Cowper to discuss this further and make a decision whether to leave the reserve in or take it out of the consent application. Ms Cowper said if the policy environment is such that work would not be likely to be approved by DOC, there is no disadvantage of keeping it in the consents.

Ms Anton reiterated that DOC will look at whether the reserve should be included in the consents, and if so, what additional monitoring would be needed. Mr Murray confirmed he would ensure feedback was provided as quickly as possible, and ideally before Easter.

Mr Murray said he would like to be provided with the final set of conditions and the Code, at which time he could then report his recommendation to the decision maker at DOC to withdraw the right to be heard.

Ms Cowper and Ms Conland both confirmed that the final versions of the documents would be sent out once the agreement had been reached. They estimated this would be at least 1-2 months away.

Waikanae Christian Holiday Park – Anna Carter (Planning Consultant): Ms Carter stated her understanding of the consent documents in terms of the OMP, and that “it must give effect to the Code of Practice and Principles in the Conditions of Consent”. She noted that at the last PHM she had asked for an amendment to be made and thought that this was about existing constraints through urban areas.

Ms Cowper responded that the word “maximum” had been deleted from Principle 5 to address Ms Carter's request at the previous PHM.

Ms Carter noted that she is also concerned about the ability to comply with Principle 3 ‘Rivers need room to move’ and noted that this was not possible in all reaches. Ms Cowper and Ms Conland questioned whether the words in conditions 2.2 and 2.3 should refer to ‘having regard to’ rather than ‘giving effect to’.

Ms Baker said she did not want to revert back to the failed approach of human life above all other values. She said that flood management has now shifted to focus on a wide range of values, but if we make each value conditional to health and safety we effectively move back to the old regime.

Mr Murray was concerned that ‘have regard to’ was not as strong and asked whether Principle 6 provided for Ms Carter’s concerns. Ms Petrove considered that the wording ‘give effect to’ could be problematic if it weren’t for the wording of Principle 6. Ms Berghan noted that she prefers ‘give effect to’ and agreed with the concerns of Ms Baker. Ms Carter noted that the acknowledgement that it is not always appropriate to allow room for the river to move where there are established communities, is implied. She wanted this to be specified. Ms Cowper suggested that she could look at the wording to improve clarity and allay Ms Carter’s concerns.

Ms Berghan noted that the Waikanae River (which is constricted) is different from the other rivers covered by the consents and has to be addressed as such in terms of existing development, compared with future development.

Ms Berghan went on to talk about the new language being used in flood management and that the original “river being given its voice” was amended in the consent documents to “river being given room to move”. She said that, in adopting this philosophy, GWRC manages the river margins and not the actual river. Ms Berghan explained that the GWRC is trying, in the consent documents, to talk about the river’s perspective. She acknowledged that at the Waikanae Christian Holiday Park there were issues related to the river containment on their side – which has no natural barriers - as trees die, and there are safety issues for children playing.

Ms Carter said she was not entirely comfortable with the Principles but was pretty happy with the draft conditions. Ms Berghan offered an advice note or a letter from GWRC covering the relationship, and to take on board input from Ms Baker.

Ms Carter asked for a copy of the final code to be sent to the WCHP.

Kāpiti Fly Fishing Club (KFFC) – Hugh Driver and Malcolm Francis: - In addition to the comments recorded in the previous sections, Mr Driver and Mr Francis said that the way the consent has been going forward is great. They said they valued listening to everyone, and hearing the insights from DOC, and that the process was very forward thinking. They walk the river once a week and can see why gravel extraction is needed. They asked that GWRC try to do a better job in this respect compared with the work done to date in the Ōtaki River. They explained that the “fly” is the life force of the river. Without the insects, there are no fish etc. They said they considered that taking the river by river approach in

the overall consents process was very valuable as each river is very different, as is the life around each river – in terms of geckos and skinks, for example. They said they considered lizard rescue is essential prior to works commencing and that it was good to see that this had been included in the consent documents.

They also asked what needs to happen for KFFC to sign off the process.

Other Matters:

At the end of the meeting, Ms Baker commended Ms Berghan and Ms Cox, advising that they were really getting there, the work was really challenging, and they truly deserved credit as others would have walked away. Ms Baker noted that there was still work for TAKW to do covering some technical matters, and GWRC/TAKW relationship matters. She said she was feeling pretty good about it all. Ms Cox confirmed that GWRC needed the information from TAKW to fill in the gaps in the consent documents.

Ms Anton and Mr Murray (DOC) said that they echoed Ms Baker's comments, and that the contributions from everyone were valuable and that DOC would get on with the work on the estuary and provide feedback.

3. Issues in agreement

It was agreed that:

1. DOC will proceed with review of whether or not to include the Waikanae Scientific Reserve in the consents, and if so what other technical information etc would be required to also be covered in the consents. The feedback would be provided to GWRC as soon as possible and hopefully prior to Easter;
2. Ms Cowper and Ms Carter will continue to discuss the matters raised by Ms Carter relating to the principles and see whether amending the wording can provide some clarity and assurances for existing development while still providing for the other values of the river;
3. Ms Baker would work with TAKW advisors and provide any feedback to GWRC to fill in the gaps requested by Ms Cox/Ms Berghan³; and
4. Fish & Game will be able to give the final sign off once the details of the documents are finalised.

4. Issues remaining outstanding

There are no outstanding matters to be addressed relating to this PHM.

³ To avoid delays in the process, this feedback would ideally be provided within the next month.

5. Further information provided following meeting

N/A.

6. Close of Meeting

It was noted that a report of this meeting (under Section 99 of the RMA) would be circulated to all submitters in due course.

Jenny Grimmett thanked everyone for their attendance and closed the meeting at 1.00pm.