ORDINARY MEETING

OF

TAWA COMMUNITY BOARD

AGENDA

Time: 7:00pm

Date: Thursday, 8 June 2017 Venue: Tawa Community Centre

5 Cambridge Street

Tawa Wellington

MEMBERSHIP

Jill Day
Graeme Hansen
Richard Herbert (Chair)
Liz Langham
Margaret Lucas (Deputy Chair)
Jack Marshall
Robyn Parkinson
Malcolm Sparrow

Have your say!

You can make a short presentation to the Community Board Members at this meeting. Please let us know by noon the working day before the meeting. You can do this either by phoning 803-8334, emailing public.participation@wcc.govt.nz or writing to Democratic Services, Wellington City Council, PO Box 2199, Wellington, giving your name, phone number and the issue you would like to talk about.



TABLE OF CONTENTS8 JUNE 2017

Bus	iness	Page No.
1.	Meeting Conduct	5
	1.1 Apologies	5
	1. 2 Conflict of Interest Declarations	5
	1. 3 Confirmation of Minutes	5
	1. 4 Public Participation	5
	1. 5 Items not on the Agenda	5
2.	Oral Reports	5
	2.1 Police Update	5
	2.2 Tawa Volunteer Fire Brigade Fund Update	5
	2.3 Vibrant Tawa Update	5
	2.4 Tawa Community Patrols Update	5
	2.5 Proposed New Tawa Community Service Awards Update	5 - 5
	2.6 Members' Reports	5

TAWA COMMUNITY BOARD 8 JUNE 2017

3.	Repo	orts	7
	3.1	Te Awarua o Porirua Harbour Scorecard 2016 - Report back by Porirua Harbour and Catchment Community Trust	7
	3.2	Tawa Town Centre Upgrade Project - Plaza and Art	33
	3.3	Quarterly Report February 2017 to April 2017: Mervyn Kemp Library and Tawa and Linden Community Centres	37
	3.4	Report back on the 2017 LGNZ Community Boards Conference	41
	3.5	Allocation of remaining amount from Tawa Grants Funding Round for 2016/17 financial year	47
	3.6	Allocation of remainder of 2016/17 Tawa Community Board Discretionary Fund	51
	3.7	Ratification of Submission on the Draft Wellington Region Waste Management and Minimisation Plan	55
	3.8	Tawa Memorial Project	63
	3.9	Resource Consent Applications and Approvals for 26 April to 28 May 2017	67
	3.10	Current and Upcoming Council Consultations or Surveys	69
	3.11	Forward Programme	71

1 Meeting Conduct

1.1 Apologies

The Chairperson invites notice from members of apologies, including apologies for lateness and early departure from the meeting, where leave of absence has not previously been granted.

1.2 Conflict of Interest Declarations

Members are reminded of the need to be vigilant to stand aside from decision making when a conflict arises between their role as a member and any private or other external interest they might have.

1.3 Confirmation of Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 4 May 2017 will be put to the Tawa Community Board for confirmation.

1.4 Public Participation

A maximum of 60 minutes is set aside for public participation at the commencement of any meeting of the Council or committee that is open to the public. Under Standing Order 3.23.3 a written, oral or electronic application to address the meeting setting forth the subject, is required to be lodged with the Chief Executive by 12.00 noon of the working day prior to the meeting concerned, and subsequently approved by the Chairperson.

1.5 Items not on the Agenda

Any item not on the agenda may only be discussed if a motion to discuss the item is passed by a unanimous resolution of the meeting; and:

- 1. The item is a minor item relating to the general business of the local authority; and
- The Chairperson explains at the beginning of the meeting, at a time when it is open to the public, that the item will be discussed at the meeting but no resolution, decision or recommendation may be made in respect of that item except to refer that item to a subsequent meeting for further discussion; and
- 3. The Chairperson explains to the meeting why the item is not on the agenda and the reason why discussion of the item cannot be delayed.

2 Oral Reports

- 2.1 Police Update
- 2.2 Tawa Volunteer Fire Brigade Fund Update
- 2.3 Vibrant Tawa Update
- 2.4 Tawa Community Patrols Update
- 2.5 Proposed New Tawa Community Service Awards Update
- 2.6 Members' Reports

3. Reports

TE AWARUA O PORIRUA HARBOUR SCORECARD 2016 - REPORT BACK BY PORIRUA HARBOUR AND CATCHMENT COMMUNITY TRUST

Purpose

1. To provide the Tawa Community Board with the annual report back on the state of the Porirua harbour for 2016.

Recommendation

That the Tawa Community Board:

Receive the information.

Background

- 2. The Porirua Harbour and Catchment Community Trust (the Trust) was established in 2011 with representation from Greater Wellington Regional Council, Porirua City Council, Wellington City Council, Ngati Toa and community members.
- 3. The two key objectives are to advocate for the sustainable management of the harbour and its catchment and through research and education foster an understanding of the environmental issues that have an effect on the harbour and its catchment.
- 4. The Trust is required to report annually on the state of the harbour with reference to a number of indicators.

Discussion

Grant Baker, Chairperson of the Trust, will present the 2016 "State of the Harbour" scorecard which is the fourth scorecard for the Trust.

Attachments

Attachment 1. Fourth Annual Te Awarua o Porirua Harbour Scorecard

Page 9

Author	Helga Sheppard, Governance Advisor
Authoriser	Crispian Franklin, Governance Team Leader

Item 3.1 Page 7

Me Heke Ki Põneke

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Engagement and Consultation

There are no engagement and consultation requirements as a result of this update.

Treaty of Waitangi considerations

There are no Treaty of Waitangi considerations.

Financial implications

There are no financial implications as a result of this update.

Policy and legislative implications

There are no policy or legislative implications as a result of this update.

Risks / legal

There are no risks or legal implications as a result of this update.

Climate Change impact and considerations

N/A.

Communications Plan

N/A.

Health and Safety Impact considered

There are no health and safety implications arising from this update.

Item 3.1 Page 8



Te Awarua o Porirua Harbour Scorecard - 2016

Prepared by: Grant Baker Lindsay Gow John McKoy Clive Anstey

Te Awarua O Porirua Harbour Scorecard - 2016

Background

The two water systems of the harbour (the Pauatahanui Inlet and the Onepoto Arm) once supported a bountiful supply of fish and shellfish. In addition to the marine species, rich forests surrounded the harbour and provided valuable habitat for birds. Flax was abundant in the swamps.

From the 1820s Europeans began to settle in Porirua. From the 1850s onwards, major impacts on the harbour system were caused by forest clearance propelled initially by an increasing demand for timber. Forest clearance proceeded rapidly so that within some 40 years lowland Porirua was transformed from a mostly forested into a mostly pastoral landscape. Interestingly, there is more vegetation around the harbour system now than there was at the end of the 19th Century.

The progressive clearance for pasture resulted in a massive increase in sediment, which started filling the harbours at a rate of 2 - 4mm/year from a pre-European background inflow of 1mm/yr.

The next big effect was urban development. This increased sediment inputs to the harbour and subsequent deposition and, together with the effects of roads, railways and reclamations, dramatically altered the shoreline and the tidal prism (the amount of tidal water that could move in and out of the harbour system). Sedimentation rates increased substantially so that by the mid1970s the average rate was estimated to be between 6 and 9mm/yr. In parts of the Pauatahanui Inlet it may have been as high as 10-15mm/yr at some sites. If continued, these rates would result in the Inlet being in-filled and becoming a swamp in 145 - 195 years and the Onepoto Arm in 290 – 390 years. (Gibb, 2009, 2011).

In addition to sediment, urban development added chemical and biological contaminants and nutrients, together with toxins from urban run-off. Agricultural chemicals and industrial run off in the post Second World War era added further pollution which is now embedded in harbour sediments and affects its shellfish and fish stocks.

Fortunately, this legacy of contamination is now being addressed by the three authorities responsible for the harbour and it catchments – Porirua City Council (PCC), Wellington City Council (WCC), and Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC). Together with Ngati Toa and other organisations and agencies, these authorities have drawn up a Porirua Harbour and Catchment Strategy and Action Plan. This sets out directions, actions and targets designed to arrest the decline in harbour condition and return it to a healthy and resilient state. The Action Plan is the touchstone and guide towards a brighter future for the harbour.

On a further positive note, scientific surveys and research tell us that the harbour still has a solid foundation for a healthy ecosystem. Among these indicators are continuing large numbers of cockles; it is the southern-most nursery for rig

February 2017

(sand shark); resident and migratory birdlife use both arms of the harbour; apart from pathogens, no other harbour contaminants are occurring in fish or shellfish; spotless crake have re-established in the Pauatahanui Wildlife Reserve; and there are a host of other common fish and birdlife species that live in or use the harbour.

Te Awarua O Porirua Harbour and its catchment are significant to the people of Porirua City as well as those across the Wellington region.

- o It is the focal point and defining feature of Porirua City
- o It is a gateway to Wellington City from the Kapiti Coast and points north.
- o It is a much-valued recreational playground for the city and the region
- It is a regionally significant bird and fish habitat and includes a wildlife reserve of national importance
- o It is a significant resource for local iwi, Ngati Toa.

This scorecard serves to raise awareness and report on long term progress in meeting the objective of the Porirua Harbour and Catchment Strategy for "a healthy catchment, waterways and harbour".

The Porirua Harbour Trust

The Trust (*Porirua Harbour and Catchment Community Trust* but marketed as the *Porirua Harbour Trust*) was established in 2011 with representation from the three councils, Ngati Toa and community members. Two of our key objectives are to:

- Advocate for the sustainable management of the harbour and its catchment; and
- Foster an understanding of ecological and environmental issues within the harbour and its catchment through research, education and community awareness.

The Trust has undertaken to report annually with reference to a set of "State of the Harbour" indicators with the aim of tracking progress towards a healthy harbour. To this end a review panel of two Trust members and two independent observers has been established. The panel considers data available from the Councils as well as the Trust's own surveys and projects and uses this to report on five key indicators of the health of the harbour.

The review panel comprises:

Grant Baker, Chairperson of the Porirua Harbour Trust Lindsay Gow, Trustee of the Porirua Harbour Trust Dr John McKoy, Marine Scientist Clive Anstey, Landscape and Resource Planner.

The annual scorecard on the health of the Porirua Harbour will be available at the start of each calendar year.

Executive Summary for 2016

The 2016 "State of the Harbour" scorecard is the fourth for the Trust and reports against the baseline established for each of the five indicators being measured in our first report in 2013. While it is still too early to report on trends appearing across the five indicators our major concerns are the ecological health of the harbour, the increase of mud in the Pauatahanui Arm, and the quality of our streams and water quality at our swimming beaches.

Our key findings are:

Agency Action:

We are seeing a strong, coordinated and increasing commitment from councils and agencies for the harbour strategy programme and this indicator continues to receive a Good rating.

Sedimentation:

Sedimentation rates for 2016 are good within the harbour overall; the Onepoto Arm (subtidal) and Pauatahanui Inlet (intertidal) both receive a rating of **Excellent**. However, and as discussed in the comments section below, there is a growing concern about the deposition of fine mud in parts of the harbour and particularly in the Pauatahanui Inlet subtidal areas.

Education and Recreational Usage:

Recreational Water Quality at all of our major swimming sites in the harbour continue to be of concern with three of our top beaches at Plimmerton given a Poor rating - water quality is not always suitable for swimming.

Only the Karehana Bay beach which is outside the Harbour and Pauatahanui Inlet at the Paremata Bridge get a Good - being suitable for swimming for most of the time. There has been no improvement in the ratings at any of the sites in recent times, with most continuing to be rated "poor" even though considerable work has been carried out on the storm water and sewerage systems. This is a key concern over our summer months.

The Education programme provided by the Trust and the councils which targets schools across the catchment has received a <code>Good</code> rating having increased the number of schools using the resources from 26 schools out of the 51 schools in the catchment in 2015 to 39 in 2016. The wider education programme within the catchment run by the Trust and GWRC continues to achieve increases in school children engaged in catchment programmes.

Ecological Health of the harbour:

All of the streams monitored in the catchment show that the macroinvertebrate health is lower in the streams measured with only one of the four measuring points receiving a <code>Good</code> rating over the last three year period. Three of the four measuring points received only a <code>Fair</code> in this year's result and a decline in ecological health over time. Our streams continue to languish toward the bottom

of the list for water quality compared against all streams in the Greater Wellington region.

The ecological health of the harbour is Fair to Good and while there continues to be an increase in mud, particularly in the upper Pauatahanui Inlet, the sand-dominated habitats appeared to be in good (healthy) ecological condition. The concentrations of metals, particularly lead, copper and zinc, found in the soft muds of the Onepoto Arm of the harbour remain elevated.

Waste:

The result for Waste, large rubbish items collected from the Porirua Stream area of the Onepoto Arm, continues to be rated as Fair with little change in the last three years on the number of large items, predominantly tyres still getting into the harbour. PCC needs to provide an incentive to users to take tyres to the landfill rather than dump these in our harbour.

Reported below are the full results and the commentary for the five indicators.

The Scorecard for 2016

This scorecard for the 2016 year is the fourth in an annual series that PHT will produce. The scorecard assesses five indicators related to the harbour and catchment using a five-point scale for each one. (5 being excellent and 1 being poor).

The scores highlight changes in key aspects of harbour and catchment quality, and give an indication each year of progress on the *Strategy and Action Plan*.

The five indicators are:

- 1 Agency Action a review of local authority and agency progress with implementing the Strategy and Action Plan;
- 2 Sedimentation a summary of data from the GWRC's sedimentation records from 18 recording plates in the Onepoto Arm and Pauatahanui Inlet;
- 3 Education and Recreational Usage feedback from recreational groups using the harbour waters, water quality records from key beaches and the number of schools involved in the catchment education programme;
- 4 **Ecological Health** a summary of data from GWRC's records on the quality of major streams entering both arms of the harbour and on harbour quality;
- 5 Waste assessment of the changing volumes of large rubbish items collected from the harbour at the Porirua Stream mouth by the Trust.

An education component was added to the third indicator (Education and Recreational Usage) in our 2015 report which now also measures the uptake of the Porirua Harbour Trust catchment education programme across the 51 schools in the catchment.

The review panel recognizes that data collection in the harbour and catchment has been underway for many years, but only recently has a more comprehensive set of data been collected. The review panel has taken the approach of only reporting on matters with at least three years of comparable data available. This is because data gathered for just one or two years might result in one off events overly influencing the longer-term average.

The review team acknowledges the strong and helpful support received from the environmental science team at GWRC in making the data available.

The criteria for each indicator being measured, the five-point scale explanation and the full results are included in Appendix 1.

1. AGENCY ACTION

What is being measured:

An Annual Review of progress by all agencies against the Porirua Harbour Strategy and Detailed Action Plan

This includes a comparison of what was stated in the Detailed Action Plan with what was funded and planned and achieved through outputs and outcomes.

Rating	Rating	Rating	Rating						
2013	2014	2015	2016						
3	3	4	4	In the 2016 year, the Trust notes there continues to be a generally strong and coordinated commitment from councils, and agencies for harbour strategy programme projects and activities					

Comment:

The *Te Awarua-o-Porirua Harbour and Catchment Strategy and Action Plan* has been in place since March 2012 and councils and agencies have continued to include in their annual and long term planning the funding required to carry out the work identified in the plan. The long term, 10 year plans were reviewed in 2015/16 and we are now in the second of the three year cycles.

The Trust was pleased to see affirmative actions by Porirua City and Greater Wellington Regional Councils in their recent 10 year plans and related activities.

Wellington Water is an increasingly important agency in achieving harbour and catchment outcomes. It manages water treatment and supply, storm water and wastewater service delivery in the Wellington region. It says, on its website wellingtonwater.co.nz that "an important part of our work is promoting water conservation and sustainability." The Harbour and Catchment Action Plan includes a number of specific projects for which Wellington water is responsible.

The catchment based "Whaitua Committee" has been in place for two years. This committee is working to collate community, scientific, economic and geographical information to gain an understanding of the current state of water in their catchment area. The Whaitu process will end up modelling the entire catchment and harbour, and setting limits for water *quality* and *quantity* in the streams and harbour.

The purpose of the Whaitua Committee is to develop a set of environmental goals or a vision for their catchment area which might include setting targets or limits for water as suggested by the National Policy Statement for Freshwater. Some of these recommendations might be included in the Natural Resources Plan for the Wellington Region.

The Te Awarua-o-Porirua Joint Harbour Committee has overseen the first three year review of the Harbour Strategy. The Committee has affirmed the original objectives, priorities, targets and timeframes. It is also responsible for directing a coordinated cross agency strategy and work plan that sets out harbour and catchment related activities, responsibilities, priorities and budgetary commitments for the next two years

Over the 2015-16 year, the Harbour Committee chair notes that there is "a much greater prominence of our harbour in decision making for the Porirua and Greater Wellington Regional Councils."

In its Annual Report, the Harbour Committee sets out some highlights, as follows:

- Completion of a catchment-wide Sediment Reduction Plan
- Completion of consents, planning and preparation for the Porirua Stream Mouth Estuary Enhancement Plan Project
- Porirua City Council adoption of a Stormwater Bylaw
- Greater Wellington Regional Council's appointment of the harbourcatchment's first dedicated Land Management Officer
- Commencement of a Drains to Harbour street drain labelling and education programme
- Porirua City Council's reorganisation to give greater emphasis and support to strategic priorities, including the harbour programme.

While these and other deliverables mentioned in the Annual Report show commitment and consistent activity by all agencies, there is no available reporting on the status of each of the projects set out in the Action Plan.

The Trust considers that, as part of its Annual Report, the Harbour Committee should produce an itemised status report against each of its project-activity areas. The absence of such information makes it impossible to meet our intentions of reporting on "a comparison of what was stated in the Detailed Action Plan with what was funded and planned and achieved through outputs and outcomes".

The Trust is seeing a generally strong, coordinated commitment from councils and agencies for the Harbour Strategy programme. But, as mentioned above, we want to see more specific project-activity reporting with a particular emphasis on priority deliverables and outcome-based results. For these reasons, we have kept the overall rating for the 2016 year at 4.

The Trust will continue to engage with the councils, the Joint Harbour Committee, Ngati Toa and agencies to ensure work is planned, implemented and delivered as set out in the *Strategy and Action Plan*.

2. SEDIMENTATION

What is being measured:

2.1 Harbour Sedimentation. Indicates the Mean Annual sedimentation rate from the 18 sedimentation plates, (9 in the intertidal and 9 in the sub tidal) in the Onepoto Arm and Pauatahanui Inlet. A separate rating is shown for subtidal and intertidal in each inlet and for the harbour as a whole.

Results for each year: Our rating

Rating 2013	Rating 2014	Rating 2015	Rating 2016	Comment
5	5	5	5	Onepoto Arm subtidal
1	5	3	3	Onepoto Arm intertidal
3	4	5	3	Pautahanui Inlet subtidal
3	5	5	5	Pauatahanui Inlet intertidal
-	4	5	4	Harbour Overall

Data used:

To measure sedimentation rates, GWRChas buried concrete plates at 18 sites throughout Porirua Harbour over which annual measurement of sediment deposition are taken, (Subtidal means harbour areas always covered with water; intertidal means areas that are exposed at low tide but covered with water at high tide)

It is important to note that the sedimentation rate in any single year does not necessarily reflect the overall pattern of sedimentation in the harbour. For this reason, the review panel has taken the approach of only using data where a minimum of three years is available to ensure that one off events do not overly influence our reporting.

For example, the sedimentation rate on the intertidal flats of Onepoto Arm near the Paremata Railway Station (Site no. 1) was 14.3 mm in 2012/13 (Table 1), -4.3mm in 2013/14, 1.5mm in 2014/15 and 0.5mm in 2015/16, indicating that there can be large inter-annual variation.

Table 1: Mean annual sedimentation rates for selected locations in Porirua Harbour (Source: Oliver MD. 2016. Coastal state of the environment monitoring programme: Annual data report 2015/16.)

rotatee. Offer ind. 2010. Goddar state of the christianent monitoring programme. Annual data report 2010/10.																		
Indicator		Onepoto Arm				Pauatahanui Arm												
	In	tertid	al		Sub	tidal				Inte	rtida	1				Subtic	lal	
Site no.	1	2	3	S6	S7	S8	S9	6	7	8	9	10	11	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5
Sedimentation rate (mm) (2012/13)	14.3	12.3	4.3	-	-	-	-14	3.5	9.3	2.0	-0.8	-3.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sedimentation rate (mm) (2013/14)	-4.3	-0.3	1.8	0.0	-6.0	-8.0	0.0	-2.0	-4.0	-2.5	4.5	14.8	-30.0	6.6	26.4	8.0	11.0	9.2
Sedimentation rate (mm) (2014/15)	1.5	2.3	2.3	5.0	-92.0	-93.0	4.0	-3.0	-2.0	1.3	-2.5	-5.5	4.0	2.0	18.0	-12.0	-4.0	-10.0
Sedimentation rate (mm) (2015/16)	0.5	7.8	5.0	-16	-2.0	10.0	7.0	-3.5	-5.8	0.0	-5.0	1.8	1.0	8.0	10.0		5.0	-2.0

From the data, the review team has taken the measurements for the intertidal and subtidal areas of each harbour arm and averaged these each year to arrive at a mean sedimentation rate to indicate what is happening in each part of the harbour on an annual basis. This is then rated using the criteria as defined in Appendix One to provide an index of risk/condition. The overall target is to have sedimentation at a mean annual rate of less than 1mm per year.

Table2: Sedimentation Index for each part of the Porirua Harbour Rolling mean of 3yrs for sedimentation data

Indicator	Onepo	to Arm	Pauataha	Total Harbour	
	Intertidal	Subtidal	Intertidal	Subtidal	
Sedimentation Index rate (mm) (2010/13)	10.3	-14.0	2.2	-	-
Sedimentation Index rate (mm) (2011/14)	-0.9	-3.5	-3.2	12.2	1.2
Sedimentation Index rate (mm) (2012/15)	2.0	-44	-1.3	-1.2	-11.3
Sedimentation Index rate (mm) (2013/16)	4.4	-0.25	-2.0	2.2	1.1

Our Comment:

The sedimentation rates vary considerably on a year to year basis but in the main the news is good with the mean sedimentation rate for the 2013/16 year being 1.1mm for all sites monitored, with slight reductions in the Onepoto Arm subtidal and Pauatahanui Arm Intertidal and increases in the Onepoto Intertidal and Pauatahanui Subtidal.

The sedimentation rate for the Onepoto Arm (subtidal), and Pauatahanui Inlet (intertidal) are rated as Excellent, and are below the desired sedimentation rate of 1mm per year.

The measurements in the subtidal areas of the Pauatahanui Arm show both increases and decreases across the measuring points and it will be interesting to see how these continue to change as we move further into the Transmission Gully project construction period. However, with only three year's data collected, it is too early to say how deposition rates will vary. The predicted land disturbance, particularly from Transmission Gully construction, forest harvesting and urban development is likely to have further impacts on the harbour in the years ahead. The flood which arrived in November is not included in these results so it will be interesting to see what impact this and other weather events have on future measurements.

There is a large increase in mud in the Pauatahanui Arm with the mean mud content of subtidal sediments increasing from 40%, to 49%, to 59% and now 62% in the last four years.

February 2017

Mud causes problems for harbour life as it creates conditions where oxygen and nutrients are reduced. The result is a smelly, unhealthy sediment layer that reduces diversity of plants and sea life. Soft mud also gets moved around the harbour and causes noticeable reductions in water clarity and quality.

Strategy partners have produced a Sediment Management Plan outlining how they will address ways to reduce the sediment inflows and to work on achieving the long term target set in the Harbour Strategy of less than 1mm/year on average. Reducing the fine-grained mud component from catchment run-off is important, and this will be a particular challenge given the potential impact of the predicted land disturbances that will occur in the immediate years ahead.

3. EDUCATION AND RECREATIONAL USAGE

What is being measured:

3.1 Recreational usage of the Harbour.

Feedback from recreational groups on the quality of the harbour in satisfying their recreational expectations.

Rating	Rating	Rating	Rating	Comment
2013	2014	2015	2016	
4	4	NA	3	

Comment:

A survey was carried out across recreational users of the Porirua Harbour. This survey was sent to the yachting, boating, rowing, outrigger canoeing and kayak clubs.

The survey provides a rating for their overall experience in the past year and their experience on the water quality. Recreational groups rated their experience on the water as good, however water quality received a lower rating of fair. Overall we have rated the recreational usage as Fair.

The main concerns from recreational users is; the increase in sedimentation and the shifting and growth of sand banks which means they have to be alert in respect of the areas they use in the harbour; the water quality especially after storm events; and the amount of debris around the shoreline.

What is being measured:

3.2 Recreational Water Quality

Recreational water quality results from weekly summer monitoring of six sites in Porirua Harbour

Rating 2013	Rating 2014	Rating 2015	Rating 2016	Sites	Comment		
4	4	3	4	Pauatahanui Inlet at Paremata Bridge	suitable for swimming most of the time		
3	3	4	4	Karehana Bay at Cluny Rd	suitable for swimming most of the time		
3	3	3	3	Pauatahanui Inlet at Water ski club;	generally suitable for swimming with care		
3	3	3	2	Plimmerton Beach at Bath Street	water quality is not always suitable for swimming		
2	2	2	2	South Beach at Plimmerton	water quality is not always suitable for swimming		
2	2	2	2	Porirua Harbour at Rowing Club	water quality is not always suitable for swimming		

Data Used:

GWRC and PCC jointly monitor microbiological water quality at 10 coastal sites in Porirua, six of which are located either within the harbour or on its outer margins. The monitoring programme comprises weekly water sampling for 20

weeks between mid-November and the end of March (monthly sampling also occurs outside of this period).

Table 3 below lists a summary of compliance with the surveillance, alert and action levels of the national microbiological water quality guidelines for recreational waters (MfE/MoH 2003) for data collected over summer 2015/16, as reported by Morar and Greenfield (2016). It also lists the current Suitability for Recreation Grade (SFRG) assigned to each site. This grade describes the general condition of the water at any given time from a public health perspective.

Table 3: Summary of microbiological water quality data for the 2015/16 summer at selected coastal monitoring sites in Porirua

(Source: Morar & Greenfield 2016 $\overline{\text{Is}}$ it safe to swim? Recreational water quality monitoring results for the 2015/16 summer.)

Bathing site		No. sample	results (Ent fu/100mL)	erococci	Beach grading (2008/09-2014/15 data)			
		Surveillance (≤ 140)	Alert (141–280)	Action (>280)	SIC Grade	MAC Grade (95th%-ile value)	SFRG	
Karehana Bay at Cluny Rd	20	20	0	0	Moderate	B (125)	Good	
Plimmerton Beach at Bath St	20	17	1	2	Moderate	C (530)	Poor	
South Beach at Plimmerton	20	18	2	0	Moderate	D (825)	Poor	
Pauatahanui Inlet at Water Ski Club	20	20	0	0	Moderate	C (205)	Fair	
Pauatahanui Inlet at Paremata Bridge	20	20	0	0	Moderate	C (175)	Good	
Porirua Harbour at Rowing Club	20	19	1	0	Moderate	D (820)	Poor	

Comment:

The results from the sampling leave much to be desired and there is little to no improvement since the first report in 2013. As is shown in the table above, most sites sampled rate only a "poor". One of those rated "poor" is South Beach at Plimmerton – which is popular as a swimming beach. Effectively, this rating means it is not always suitable for swimming. Water quality at South Beach was expected to show significant improvement following work by Porirua City Council during 2015 to find and repair broken sewer pipes in the Taupo Stream, however this year's results show the problem still exists.

The only "good" rating is for Karehana Bay at Cluny Road which is in the outer harbour and the Paremata Bridge area near the entrance to the Pauatahanui Inlet.

What is being measured:

3.3 Education Resource Usage

Engagement with schools in the catchment through the PHT Education programme

Rating	Rating	Number of Schools in the catchment engaged in the PHT
2015	2016	programme
2	4	39 of 51 schools in the catchment engaged in the programme after
3	7	two years.

Comment:

The PHT has produced a curriculum based resource for teachers based on the *Living Waters* series of short documentaries.

The programme commenced in November 2014 and is now well supported by schools in the catchment. The resource is presented in three themes, each with a specific curriculum focus including ecology of the harbour with a science focus; the harbour as a taonga with a social studies focus, and the human impact on the harbour with a focus on both science and social studies.

Each theme includes a field trip that focuses on aspects of the harbour and catchment. While the "Living Waters" documentaries bring learning to life for students, experiencing the harbour first hand will add enormous value to their understanding and appreciation.

During 2016 at least 39 schools in the catchment (out of total of 51 schools) are aware of the education resource and Living Waters documentaries and further workshops are planned to cover the other schools in the catchment. A significant number of these schools are actively using the resources as part of their learning programme, or planning to use them during the year.

The Trust has also released a 25 minute DVD "Maota I le Talafatai - Home to Harbour" in the Samoan language and this has been made available to schools in the catchment.

Further education programmes provided during the year included a puppet show *Nan and Tuna – a story about long finned eels* which was presented to over 1200 students at various schools in the catchment and a very successful art competition across schools in the programme culminating in a Porirua Children's Art exhibition held in the in the Porirua CBD at the end of Term 4 with over 300 students participating.

Over 1900 students across 80 different classes have taken part in *The Whitebait Connection, Experiencing Marine Reserves* and *Healthy Harbour Porirua* programmes in 2016.

The Trust is keen to see additional school involvement in this programme and its educational benefits.

4. ECOLOGICAL HEALTH

What is being measured:

4.1 Ecological health of streams

Uses the Macroinvertebrate Community Index (MCI) for the three main streams with the mean score for the last three years.

Rating 2013	Rating 2014	Rating 2015	Rating 2016	Sites
4	4	4	4	Horikiri Stream at Snodgrass
4	4	4	3	Porirua Stream at Glenside
3	3	3	3	Porirua Stream at Wall Place
4	3	3	3	Pauatahanui Stream at Elmwood Bridge

Data Used:

The indicator we have used for stream health is the Macroinvertebrate Community Index (MCI) which measures the abundance of organisms like worms, insects, flies, beetles and snails. It is a nationally accepted index of macroinvertebrate health which accounts for the sensitivity of invertebrates to environmental stressors .

Macroinvertebrate sampling was undertaken at four sites in the Porirua Harbour catchment in 2016 as part of GWRC's Rivers State of the Environment (RSoE) monitoring programme. The MCI scores derived from this sampling are listed in Table 4. Under the RSoE programme a single macroinvertebrate sample is collected at or adjacent to each RSoE water sampling site during late summer/early autumn. The timing of sampling is determined at random, although macroinvertebrate sampling is, where practicable, avoided within two weeks of any flood event (ie, flows greater than three times the median river flow).

We have included the MCI mean score for the last three years and have used this rolling three year mean in determining the MCI Mean Quality Class.

Table 4: MCI scores for RSoE sites in the Porirua Harbour catchment sampled between 2013 and 2016 $\,$

(Source: Morar SR, Perrie A, Greenfield S. 2016. Rivers State of the Environment monitoring programme: Annual data report, 2015/16).

Site no.	Site name	MCI 2013	MCI 2014	MCI 2015	MCI 2016	MCI Mean 2014 -16	MCI Mean quality class
RS13	Horokiri Stream at Snodgrass	116.5	115	98.3	109.6	107.6	Good
RS14	Pauatahanui S at Elmwood Bridge	100.0	105.6	92.5	90.9	96.3	Fair
RS15	Porirua Stream at Glenside	118.6	104.4	94.4	100.0	99.6	Fair
RS16	Porirua Stream at Wall Place	93.7	87.0	80.9	80.7	82.9	Fair

 $\label{eq:exact_exact_exact_exact} \text{Key to quality classes (Stark \& Maxted 2007): Excellent} \geq 120, \, \text{Good } 100-119, \, \text{Fair } 80-99, \, \text{Poor} < 80 \, \text{Model} = 1000 \, \text{Model} = 10000$

Comment:

Two sites (Pauatahanui and Porirua Stream at Wall Place) have a lower MCI compared with previous years.

Horokiri Stream is the only one of the four monitored sites that has a good rating. Of concern is the MCI approaching a lower quality class across the whole of the Porirua Stream, not just at Wall Place but now at Glenside as well.

The three Porirua Catchment streams are recorded as being in the Fair category of the Water Quality Index for streams in the Greater Wellington region and in the lower third of all streams in the region.

What is being measured:

4.2 Ecological health of the Harbour

Harbour condition based on the GWRC nutrient enrichment (eutrophication) measures for each inlet until 2015. These include RPD and low and high density macroalgal cover.

What is being Measured	Rating 2013	Rating 2014	Rating 2015	Rating 2016	Sites
Ecological Health of the harbour <i>RPD</i>	3	3	3	4	Onepoto Arm – intertidal
Ecological Health of the harbour RPD	3	3	3	3	Pauatahanui - intertidal
Ecological Quality Rating of the harbour for macroalgae	-	4	4	4	Porirua Harbour - EQR

Data Used:

GWRC assesses the ecological condition of the intertidal habitat within each arm of Porirua Harbour using a combination of broad and fine scale measures that target the common estuarine issues of sedimentation, eutrophication (nutrient enrichment) and toxic contamination. As sedimentation is already included separately in our scorecard, the review team has based the harbour estuarine health assessment on measures relating to eutrophication.

Increased nutrient enrichment (eutrophication) in estuaries can stimulate the abundance of fast growing green and red macroalgae. The resulting blooms can have significant effects on water and sediment quality. Annual indicators of eutrophication include a broad scale assessment of the change in the area of nuisance macroalgal growth and measurements of sediment oxygenation (as determined by the depth of the redox potential discontinuity (RPD) layer)*. This is the layer below which oxygen is severely reduced, as a result of which the diversity of life reduces.

It is important to note that the method for assessing the macroalgae condition has changed from simple percentage cover (density) estimates used in previous years, to an Ecological Quality Rating (EQR) for macroalgae. This rating incorporates a more comprehensive assessment of parameters such as macroalgae biomass, the degree to which the algae are found growing deep in the sediment (entrainment) and the area of available habitat (see Stevens & Robertson 2016 for more detail).

Table 5: Eutrophication indicator results for selected locations in Porirua Harbour assessed in early 2016 (subtidal RPD data also included for completeness). RPD cells shaded in light green and yellow equate to rankings of moderate and low risk, respectively (Source: Oliver 2016 Coastal Water Quality and Ecology Annual Data Report, 2015/16)

Indicator		(Onep	oto A	rm (R	PD)				1	Paua	taha	nui A	rm (RPD))		
	In	tertia	lal		Sub	tidal				Inter	tidal				Sı	ubtid	al	
Site No.	1	2	3	S6	S7	S8	S9	6	7	8	9	10	11	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5
RPD (cm) 2014	1.5	3	1	1	3	5	5	3	2	1	1.5	3	3	1	1	1	3	3
RPD (cm) 2015	1	2	1	2	2	2	3	1	1	1	1	3	3	1	1	1	1	1
RPD (cm) 2016	3	5	1	2	2	2	3	3	1	1	1	3	5	1	1	1	1	1

Ecological Quality Rating for	Porirua
macroalgae	Harbour
EQR 2014	<0.5
EQR 2015	0.58
EQR 2016	0.61

Metal Contaminants in Storm water discharges:

Contaminants in urban storm water discharges have been identified as a potential medium to long-term risk to the health of the marine organisms living in our harbour, largely through the accumulation of these contaminants in the sediments. Metals which tend to bind to the mud fraction of sediments have been measured since 2004 at five subtidal sites within the harbour and the results will be included in future reports.

Table 6: Mean concentrations of metals in sediments of five subtidal sites sampled in Porirua Harbour in Nov/Dec 2015. Values in amber exceed the ARC ERC amber criteria. (Source: Oliver 2016 Coastal Water Quality and Ecology Annual Data Report, 2015/16)

Total Metals	Fraction	PAH 1	PAH 2	PAH 3	POR 1	POR 2
(mg/kg)	analysed					
Arsenic	<500 μm	9.1	6.4	8.5	9.4	10.2
Cadmium	<500 μm	0.033	0.051	0.041	0.147	0.053
Chromium	<500 μm	18.2	14.0	15.1	19	21.7
Copper	<500 μm	11.0	9.5	8.0	20.5	18.2
Lead	<500 μm	21	17.6	16.0	38	37.3
Mercury	<500 μm	0.086	0.069	0.050	0.122	0.106
Nickel	<500 μm	11.7	9.1	9.8	11.4	13.0
Zinc	<500 μm	73	63	62	179	139

Comment:

The RPD results for 2016 show that the sediments were generally well oxygenated despite their often muddy nature. Throughout the estuary, sediment was relatively well oxygenated, had a low total organic carbon and sulphur content, and did not support nuisance macroalgal growths. These results provide a preliminary indication that Porirua Harbour sediments were in the "low" to "moderate", rather than "high" (or poorly oxygenated) category, and likely reflect the combined influence of relatively low organic content, and the process of currents or wave action pumping oxygenated water into the sediments. Overall,

the sand-dominated habitats appeared to be in good (healthy) ecological condition.

The concentration of opportunistic macroalgae near the mouth of major streams entering the estuary (e.g. Porirua, Pauatahanui, Horokiri, Kakaho) suggest catchment nutrient inputs are the most likely driver of the observed growths. Combined with ongoing mud deposition both macroalgal growth and increasing muddiness remain continuing concerns within Porirua Harbour.

The concentrations of stormwater-derived metals are of concern especially copper, lead and zinc. Copper enters the harbour from vehicle brake pads, lead from paint products and zinc from galvanized iron roofs and car tyres.

5. WASTE

What is being measured:

5.1 Record of large items of waste collected in the intertidal and tidal area

Number of large items of rubbish collected each year in the Porirua Stream area of Onepoto Arm and an assessment in January of large items still to be collected.

Rating	Rating	Rating	Rating	Comment
2013	2014	2015	2016	
2	3	3	3	

Data Used:

Information is collected by the Porirua City Council and an annual inspection is carried out in early 2017 at low tide of the area from the mouth of the Porirua Stream across the harbour from Wineera Point to the railway line on the east.

Comment:

The Porirua Stream mouth at the south end of the Onepoto Arm is a collection point for refuse coming down the Porirua and Kenepuru Streams. Over the years there has been a concentrated effort to remove large items from the tidal area of the stream bed. Some 400 plus tyres, road cones, shopping trolleys and other material was taken out of this part of Onepoto Arm by the Porirua City Council in 2009.

In recent years, various groups normally coordinated by Ngati Toa and Porirua City Council, have carried out tidal and intertidal clean ups of the Onepoto Arm with the emphasis on removal of large rubbish material in the intertidal zone of the Porirua Stream.

Over the years there has been an improvement in the reduction of large items removed from the Onepoto Arm. In 2009 there were 400 plus items, in 2012 there were over 260, in 2013 there were172 large items, mainly car tyres (132) and road cones (35), in 2014, 89 large items mainly car tyres (85) with a small number of road cones (3) and in 2015 85 -90 items predominantly car tyres were removed from the area.

The number of large items collected in the 2016 year was similar to the last few years at around 90 large items. This is of concern as it shows a continuing pattern of disposal of these items into the waterways.

While the reduction from the peak of 400 in 2009 is commendable it is still of major concern that tyres continue to find their way into the stream and harbour rather than being disposed of in an appropriate manner. PCC needs to find a solution to large items, particularly tyres from being dumped in the harbour rather than taken to the land fill.

6. Acknowledgements:

The Porirua Harbour Trust acknowledges the strong support from the staff of Greater Wellington Regional Council, Porirua City Council and Wellington City Council in the provision of data and reports to assist the review team in preparing this scorecard.

The review team recognize that in supplying the environmental information Greater Wellington Regional Council has exercised all reasonable skill and care in compiling the contents of the information provided.

7. References

Oliver MD. 2016. *Coastal Water Quality and Ecology Monitoring programme: Annual data report 2015/16.* Greater Wellington Regional Council, Publication No. GW/ESCI-T-16/83, Wellington.

Morar SR and Greenfield S. 2016. *Is it safe to swim? Recreational water quality monitoring results for the 2015/16 summer.* Greater Wellington Regional Council, Publication No. GW/ESCI-T-16/33, Wellington.

Morar SR, Perrie A and Greenfield S. 2016. *Rivers State of the Environment monitoring programme: Annual data report, 2015/16*. Greater Wellington Regional Council, Publication No. GW/ESCI-T-16/81, Wellington.

Stevens L and Robertson B. 2016. *Porirua Harbour: Sediment plate monitoring 2015/16.* Report prepared for Greater Wellington Regional Council by Wriggle Coastal Management, Nelson.

Stevens, L.M. and Robertson, B.P. 2016. Porirua Harbour: *Intertidal Macroalgal Monitoring 2015/16*. Report prepared by Wriggle Coastal Management for Greater Wellington Regional Council.

Appendix One - What is being measured and our rating system.

I tem 3.1 Attachment 1

	Sedimentation	Community and Recreational Usage	Ecological Health	Waste
An Annual Review of progress by all agencies against the	Harbour Sedimentation. Utilising the Mean Annual sedimentation	Recreational usage of the Harbour. Feedback from recreational groups	Regular Testing of ecological health within streams and the	Annual Record of waste collected in the intertidal and tidal area Number of large itoms of subhigh
Action Plan	rate measurements from the 10 sedimentation plates, in the	on the quanty of the narbour in providing their expectations.	Uses the annual measurement of	collected each November in the
This includes a comparison of	Onepoto Arm and Pauatahanui	Recreational water quality	Macroinvertebrate Community Index	Porirua Stream area of Onepoto
what was stated in the Detailed	Inlet.	monitoring results from weekly	(MCI) for the three main streams.	Arm.
Action Plan vs what was funded and nlanned and achieved	Separate rating for subtidal and intertidal areas in each estuary	sampling carried out between December and March each vear	Harbour health based on the GWRC nutrient enrichment feutrophication	
through outputs and outcomes.		Education success, number of schools	measures and risk ratings developed	
	Ratings based on those developed by Stevens and Robertson 2016	in the PHT education programme	by Stevens and Robertson 2016.	
All planned actions in the	Very Low	Very Good - For all current and	MCI - Excellent	Very Good
Action Plan funded and all	Increase of 0 to 1mm for the year.	anticipated future activities		
agreed outputs and outcomes	Measure for each estuary.	Water Quality Very Good - Suitable	Harbour Health - Very Good	Large items removed <25
achieved and delivered on.		for swimming)
		45+ schools in the programme	RPD - Excellent	
All planned actions in the	Low	Good - For current activities	MCI - Good	Pood
Action Plan funded and most	Increase of 1 to 2mm for the year.	Water Quality Good - Suitable for		
agreed outputs and outcomes	Measure for each estuary	swimming most of the time	Harbour Health - Good	Large items removed <50
delivered on.		35+ schools in the programme		
			RPD - Good	
Most planned actions in the	Moderate	Fair - For current activities	MCI – Fair	Fair
Action Plan funded and most	Increase of 2 to 5mm for the year.	Water Quality Fair - Generally	Harbour Health - Moderate	1 arrae itams ramovad <100
delivered on	recours for each colour y	25+ schools in the programme	anianoli maning maning	nate manual current and and
			RPD - Fair	
Most planned actions in the	High	Poor - For current activities	MCI - Poor	Poor
Action Plan funded and some	Increase of 5 to 10mm for the year.	Water Quality Poor - Not always		
agreed outputs and outcomes	Measure for each estuary	suitable for swimming	Harbour Health - poor	Large items removed <150
delivered out.		131 schools in the programme	RPD - Poor	
Some planned actions in the	Very High	Very Poor - For current activities		Very Poor
Action Plan funded and some	Greater than 10mm increase for the	Water Quality Very Poor -	RPD - Very Poor	.
agreed outputs and outcomes	year. Measured for each estuary.	Unsuitable for swimming		Large items removed >150

February 2017

Absolutely Positively Wellington City Council

Me Heke Ki Pōneke

Appendix Two - Measurement Methodology

Item 3.1 Attachment 1

Agency Action	Sedimentation	Community and Recreational Use	Ecological health	Waste
An Annual Review of progress	Harbour Sedimentation.	Recreational Usage of the	Regular Testing of ecological	Annual Record of waste
by an agencies against the Porirua Harbour Detailed	sedimentation data from the 18	Obtain feedback from the	Harbour	tidal area
Action Plan	sedimentation plates, (9 in the	recreational users of the harbour,	Uses the Macroinvertebrate	Number of large items collected
This includes a comparison of	intertidal and 9 in the sub tidal)	Water Quality monitoring of	Community Index (MCI) for the	each November in the Porirua
what was stated in the Detailed Action Plan vs what was funded	in the Onepoto Arm and Pauatahanui Inlet.	beaches using the national recreational water quality	three main streams.	Stream area of Onepoto Arm.
and planned and achieved		guideline.	Harbour condition based on the	This would include a count of large
through outputs and outcomes.	Separate rating for subtidal and		GWRC nutrient richness	items tyres, road cones and
,	intertidal in each inlet.	Schools utilizing the PHT	(eutrophication) measures for	shopping trolleys to indicate the
		education resource for the catchment	eacn injet.	trend toward less rubbish entering the harbour.
Assessment of the work carried	Utilising the Annual GWRC	Survey once a year in December	Fresh water in the Wellington	Each year in November as part of
out against the Detailed Action	Porirua Harbour Intertidal	of the Harbour recreation user	region is highly valued for a	the Love your Coast campaign the
Plan taking into account the	Sediment Monitoring report.	group.	variety of uses, including water	PHT will carry out intertidal and
annual report provided to the			supply, irrigation, recreation and	sub tidal clean ups around the
three councils on the Porirua	Using the 2008 data as the base		aquatic ecosystem health. The	Porirua Harbour.
Harbour Action Plan, the annual	where available and a minimum	Use weekly summer monitoring	Macroinvertebrate Community	
plans and budgets for the next	of two years data for each site.	as provided by GWRC of indicator	index measures the health of the	The Porirua Stream mouth is the
year and the long-term plan		bacteria levels at harbour	streams through an assessment of	main collection point for rubbish in
commitments of the councils and	Information to be averaged	beaches and measure against the	the health of the macro	the Onepoto Arm and will be used
agencies compared to the	separately for the Onepoto	national recreation grade.	invertebrate community in each	as the key indicator of rubbish in
Strategy.	Arms and Pauatahanui Inlet for		stream.	the harbour.
	both sub tidal and inter tidal	Evaluate the PHT education		
Will require a pre and post	zones and each inlet to be	programme at the end of each	The Harbour condition rating	The number of large items
discussion with the Harbour Co-	reported separately.	year and identify the number of	takes into account nutrient	removed in the month (tyres, road
ordinator to ensure full		schools (primary, intermediate	enrichment, (organic and nutrient	cones, trolleys bikes etc) will give
understanding of what is	The result to include	and secondary) - out of the 50	content, sediment oxygenation,	the annual measure of rubbish.
included and excluded from the Detailed Action plan each year.	commentary on each estuary and granular size as well as	schools in the catchment who are utilising the PHT education	nuisance algae cover).	
•	mud impacts.	programme.	There will be separate scores for	
			each estuary.	

February 2017

Appendix Three: Results for 2016

I tem 3.1 Attachment 1

The control between decreasing and between decreasing the National Recreational requirements and the One-poor Arm and an interredial in each inject or subtidial and interredial in each inject or subtidial and interredial in each inject or subtidial Recreational requirements and decreational recreational requirements and decreational requirements and decreated and decreational recreational requirements and decreational requirements a	RESULTS FOR 2010 Agency Action	Se	Sedimentation	ion			Commi	Community and Recreational Usage	Recrea	tional L	Isage		+		Eco	logical	Ecological Health		Waste
Onepoto Sub tidal Sub tidal Sub tidal Cusage Pauatahanui Paratahanui Paratahanui Paratahanui Inlete Pauatahanui	Annual Review of inst the Porirua inst the Porirua rhour Detailed Action n sincludes a comparison what was stated in the aliel Action Plan vs it was funded and a think and ough outputs and comes.	Harbour S. Utilising the sedimentat sedimentat intertidal an in the Onep Pauatahanu Separate rai intertidal in intertidal in	edimenta Mean An ion data fr ion plates, nd 9 in the oto Arm a ii Inlet. tting for su	nual om the 18 (9 in the subtidal) nd btidal and	Recrea Feedbaa providi Water (quality	tional u	sage of the recreation recreation recreation to our beau ing.	ne Harbo nal group nal requii ches using	ur. s on the rements g the Nar cation p	quality (of the har	rbour in al water	8 8 2 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	regular 7	Testing Teams : Teams	of ecol ind the wertebr ie three n based (eutro)	pgical he Harbou ate Com: main str on the 6 hication	alth nunity eams. WRC measure	
Inter tidal		Onepoto		atahanui	Usa	ge		×	ater Qu	ality		Ь	нт	Stream	n Healt	_	Hai	bour	
dactions			labit tidal	lsbt) du?	Опероtо	Pauatahanui		Bath St	Pauatahanui Inlet	Pauatahanui Inlet	AulD gaiwoA	Road	гре едисяцоп		Porirua at Glenside	Porirua at Wall Place		тиобтьн Вагроиг	up9mo cannu faccuon
	st planned actions											ň	6						
	vered on.																		>85 large items
																			D

February 2017

23

TAWA TOWN CENTRE UPGRADE PROJECT - PLAZA AND ART

Purpose

1. Update on progress and programming for the Tawa Town Centre plaza upgrade including the Main Road Pedestrian Crossing and mural art in the rear laneway.

Summary

- 2. Developed design underway and specialist consultants appointed (traffic/lighting/engineering/landscape architecture);
- 3. Quantity Surveyor briefed and engaged to cost the design before starting detailed design phase;
- 4. Traffic report received in relation to the proposed configuration of the pedestrian crossing across Main Road;
- 5. Cherry tree relocations likely to take place this winter;
- 6. Mural art options have been shortlisted and a decision on the way forward is pending;
- 7. Propose another stakeholder governance meeting is held in Tawa in June 2017 to update the wider group on the project and to present imagery on the plaza and art for information purposes; and
- 8. WCC staff attended an informal BID meeting with two representatives from the Business Association. Urban Design staff due to meet WCC BID staff member mid-June and will report back to the Tawa Business Association following.

Recommendation

That the Tawa Community Board:

Receive the information.

Background

- At the previous stakeholder governance meeting held in March 2017, one design concept was selected by the group for WCC to move forward into developed and detailed design.
- Further site investigations have taken place with specialist consultants from Opus and the findings are being worked into the designs for the furniture, garden and lighting elements.
- 11. Some of the damaged paving in the plaza may be remedied as part of this project pending how this fits into the budget.
- 12. WCC intends to work with the two residents (Janette Taylor and Lindis Taylor) from the last stakeholder meeting and the arborist to select a site for the Cherry Trees in Grasslees Reserve. WCC are putting together a communications plan around this and will update the stakeholder governance group on the process prior to the work happening. The Cherry Trees will relocate better if moved in winter.
- 13. The Pohutukawa tree near new world may also be relocated. We are confirming a site for this tree.

Item 3.2 Page 33

Me Heke Ki Põneke

- 14. A cost check from our project Quantity Surveyor (QS) is due in mid-June 2017;
- 15. Detailed design is due for completion in July 2017;
- 16. Prior to procurement of a main Contractor, WCC will check in with key stakeholder governance group and key business stakeholders to provide information on the process. At this stage, no design changes are anticipated.
- Main Contractor tender and procurement including tender evaluation and contract negotiation will likely continue until mid-September 2017 following completion of detailed design.
- 18. Construction can start from September 2017. WCC have noted the 18 October 2017 Spring into Tawa event and also recognise that the lead up to Christmas is a key time for local business trade. WCC staff intend to meet with each of these businesses separately to understand their trade during the likely construction months of end September through to February 2018.
- 19. Further input was provided to WCC on the mural art from the Tawa Business Association and Residents Association. Foodstuffs and New World have also provided input as well as the Arts Panel in addition to input from the Tawa Community Board and Northern Ward Councillors. At the time of writing this report, WCC staff were compiling all the feedback and working towards a solution for how to move the mural art project forward.

Discussion

20. N/A

Options

21. N/A

Next Actions

22. Set a date for the stakeholder governance meeting in June 2017 in Tawa.

Attachments

Nil

Author	Amy Hobbs, Senior Urban Designer		
Authoriser	Trudy Whitlow, Urban Design & Heritage Mgr		
	David Chick, Chief City Planner		

Item 3.2 Page 34

Item 3.2

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Engagement and Consultation

Stakeholder Governance meetings occurred on 25/10/2016, 13/12/2016 and 07 March 2017 with minutes circulate after each meeting. The Stakeholder Governance group consists of representatives from the Tawa Community Board; Northern Ward Councillors; Business Association; Residents Association; some local residents and local business owners. Prior to the WCC Urban Design team's involvement from October 2016, the WCC planning team ran a comprehensive community consultation process which identified the plaza in the Tawa Town Centre as a key area for revitalisation.

Two calls for artists were publicly released in early 2017. 9 artist submissions were put forward in the first call and 22 in the second call. The shortlist was presented to the Tawa Community Board representatives and the three Northern Ward Councillors. Feedback provided was then sent to the shortlisted artists and revised proposals were put forward.

Treaty of Waitangi considerations

No Iwi or hapu groups have been approached as part of the process to date. Councillor Jill Day has been actively involved in the process and WCC staff have also been keeping our internal treaty relations staff in the loop with project progress. There are plans to engage with Iwi and archaeologist as part of the developed and detail design phase.

Financial implications

A Carry forward paper was prepared by WCC staff to roll the project funding forward to 2017/2018 financial year.

Policy and legislative implications

N/A

Risks / legal

Construction programme around key events in Tawa and the lead up to Christmas.

Climate Change impact and considerations

N/A

Communications Plan

WCC staff have prepared one for the whole project. WCC staff will also prepare specific communications plans for the relocation of the Cherry Trees and the mural art work.

Health and Safety Impact considered

WCC staff have prepared a Hazard and Risk Register. A Safety and Design register has also been prepared as part of the design process. The successful Main Contractor will be required to submit a site specific health and safety plan prior to construction starting on site.

Item 3.2 Page 35

QUARTERLY REPORT FEBRUARY 2017 TO APRIL 2017: MERVYN KEMP LIBRARY AND TAWA AND LINDEN COMMUNITY CENTRES

Purpose

1. To provide the Tawa Community Board with an update on the activities of the Mervyn Kemp Library, Tawa Community Centre and Linden Social Centre.

Recommendation

That the Tawa Community Board:

1. Receive the information.

Background

2. Mervyn Kemp Library offers circulation, information, outreach, class visits, preschool story times, holiday programmes and Baby Rock & Rhyme sessions. Tawa Community Centre and Linden Social Centre provide community spaces for event and meeting bookings, as well as recreational drop-in space.

Discussion

Tawa Library Facebook

- 3. A Tawa Library Facebook page has just been launched. The purposes of this page include promoting library programming and events, notification of library news and new books, and enhancing community connections.
- 4. The page can be found at www.facebook.com/tawalibrary/

Health and Safety

5. A quote has been requested for a crash bar to be installed at the library emergency exit.

Programmes and Events

- 6. Child and Youth
 - a. **Baby Rock & Rhyme** this is held every Friday morning at 9.30am and is aimed at babies aged 0-2 years. An average attendance has grown from 3333 in 2016 to 447 in 2017.
 - b. **Pre-school story time** held every Monday morning at 10.30am and aimed at children aged 2-5 years. Attendance has grown from 162 in 2016 to 227 in 2017.
 - c. **School visits** 183 students attended library sessions.
- 7. **@ Six Programming** community-led programming occurs each Thursday evening from 6pm. Current programming includes sessions on writing, knitting, genealogy and a community story time. Highlights include a Ukulele evening attended by 39 participants, and a Zine Fest evening. Attendance has grown from 99 in 2016 to 166 in 2017.
- 8. **Movie nights** Tawa Library now holds a licence to play movies. These are currently being shown one a month as part of the @Six Programming, with a family film focus.

- 9. **Tea & Tales** the monthly book club is run on the first Tuesday of every month at 10.30am. An average attendance of 8 people at each session. Staff are visiting groups/clubs in the area to promote these sessions.
- 10. **IDEAS Literacy** weekly sessions for adults who attend the Tawa branch of IDEAS.
- 11. **iPad Borrowing Programme –** six iPads are now available for clients to lend from the Tawa Library at a cost of \$5 for three weeks, and half price for Community Card holders.
- 12. **Home-school support** planning is underway to deliver half day support sessions for local home-schooled families in the final two terms of the year.
- 13. **Race Relations Event** 20 people attended a demonstration of Tai Chi, Japanese Calligraphy and sample Chinese tea.

Statistics

14. These figures represent the children's attendance at Baby Rock & Rhyme, Pre-school story time, school visits and holiday programmes:

	Issues	Visitors	New borrowers	Children's attendance
Quarterly figures:				
Feb 2016 – April				
2016	32,943	N/A	157	955
Feb 2017 – April				
2017	33,463	N/A	177	958
Variation	1.6%	N/A	12.7%	0.3%

15. Self-check use in Tawa is high when compared with other WCL libraries, reaching 78% of all issued items in April 2017.

Tawa Community Centre

- 16. Tawa opened for business again at the end of January having been closed to the public since the November 2016 earthquake. Three bookings were lost
- 17. Through the next couple of months we held a few different Council and community meetings:
 - WCC Business Continuity Management a recap with various business units in Council to discuss what went well and what could have been done better over the time the units were occupying the centre, including discuss of what the process would be around Council occupying the building in the event of an emergency.
 - Other Council meetings included an Urban Design meeting, a Libraries discussion group and regular Tawa Community Board meetings.
 - There was also a "Meet the candidates" evening held for the vacancy on the Tawa Community Board.
 - The Tracey Odell Dance Group had an open day, which was well attended.
 - The Onslow Historical Society had an afternoon tea stop at the Community Centre.
 - The Spring into Tawa Committee have started meetings again at the Community Centre.
- 18. Two new groups, the Mana Embroidery Guild and the Tawa Arts and Crafts Society have started meeting weekly at the Community Centre.

TAWA COMMUNITY BOARD 8 JUNE 2017

19. LANDsar are also holding several meetings in the centre. Karen King, secretary of LANDsar, is keen to connect local organisations.

Linden Social Centre

- 20. There have been no Tawa Community Theatre productions held at the Linden centre for some time.
- 21. A new craft group meets at the Centre every Thursday.
- 22. A second Indian Dance Group has started using the Centre every week which is great to see.
- 23. A new church group is using the Centre three times per week.
- 24. Kiwi Rail used the hall for a community workshop regarding the Linden rail crossing.
- 25. The Spring into Tawa Committee also meet regularly at the Doris Mills Lounge.
- 26. The Tawa College Adult Education use the Centre for an additional Pilates class on a Friday.
- 27. There have been a number of children's birthday parties at the Centre on the weekends.

Statistics for the Tawa Community Centre and Linden Social Centre

28. Visitor and occupancy figures for the two centres are as follows:

Tawa and Linden Community Centres	Tawa Visitors	Linden Visitors	Tawa Occupancy	Linden Occupancy
Quarterly figures:				
Jan 2016 -Mar 2016	1632	14543	24.56%	24%
Jan 2017 – Mar 2017	6511	2500	49.29%	37.32%

Note: January 2017 figures for Tawa incorporate WCC use of the facility post the November 2016 earthquake. This use ceased at the end of January 2017.

Other Business

- 29. **Community Engagement**: Work has begun in making contact with more local schools and education providers.
- 30. Work has begun on a framework for community engagement in Tawa.

Next Actions

31. The next quarterly report will be submitted to the Tawa Community Board in September 2017.

Attachments

Nil

Author	Chris Pigott, Team Leader Libraries and Community Spaces - North
Authoriser	Barbara McKerrow, Chief Operating Officer

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Engagement and Consultation N/A.

Treaty of Waitangi considerations

There are no Treaty of Waitangi considerations.

Financial implications

There are no financial implications associated with this report.

Policy and legislative implications

N/A.

Risks / legal

N/A,

Climate Change impact and considerations

N/A.

Communications Plan

N/A.

Health and Safety Impact considered

Due consideration will be given to any health and safety impacts.

REPORT BACK ON THE 2017 LGNZ COMMUNITY BOARDS CONFERENCE

Purpose

1. To provide the Tawa Community Board with the report back from the Chair and Deputy Chair on the 2017 LGNZ Conference held in Methven in May 2017.

Recommendation

That the Tawa Community Board:

1. Receive the information.

Background

- 2. The LGNZ Community Boards Conference is held biennially. The 2017 conference was held in Methven from 11-13 May 2017.
- 3. At is meeting held on 09 March 2017, the Tawa Community Board nominated Richard Herbert (Chair) and Margaret Lucas (Deputy Chair) to attend the conference, and also resolved that the attendees provide a report back on the conference.

Discussion

4. The theme from this year's conference was "Making 1+1=3". The report back from the Chair and Deputy Chair covers the key lessons and takeaways from the conference.

Attachments

Attachment 1. LGNZ 2017 Community Boards Conference Report back

Page 43

Author	Helga Sheppard, Governance Advisor
Authoriser	Crispian Franklin, Governance Team Leader

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Engagement and Consultation

There are no engagement or consultation requirements as a result of this update.

Treaty of Waitangi considerations

There are no Treaty of Waitangi considerations as a result of this update.

Financial implications

There are no financial implications to be considered as a result of this update

Policy and legislative implications

There are no policy or legislative implications to be considered as a result of this update.

Risks / legal

There are no risks or legal implications to be considered as a result of this update.

Climate Change impact and considerations

N/A.

Communications Plan

N/A

Health and Safety Impact considered

N/A/

Report Back on Conference Attendance by M Lucas and R Herbert

New Zealand Community Board Conference 2017 Making 1+1=3

11-13 may 2017, Methven, Canterbury

Thanks for the privilege of attending this year's Community Board Conference. We experienced a line-up of thought provoking speakers, great food, closer ties with the two Makara Ohariu Board members, and many interesting discussions with community board members from around the country.

Lessons and takeaways

- 1. After ANZAC ceremony create options for I hour of Community Service
- 2. Empowering our youth eg Skate path/park
- 3. Wendy McGuiness to speak to the Board on tackling poverty
- 4. Do we want to develop our suburb brand in combination with the Ratepayers
- 5. There needs to be balance in our work on facility projects and social events
- 6. Develop the Tawa Resilience plan
- 7. Consult, Consult, Consult

Provoking thoughts and hyperlinks to speakers pages

- 1. David Rutherford Chief Commissioner NZ Human Rights Commission. His presentation's was on the importance of home ownership for the health and wellbeing of the members of that community a healthy home is the primary health care provider. Another challenge he discussed was the importance to co-design solutions with the community in projects. Community Boards were the grassroots of democracy in NZ. For peace in a community there needs to be respect for each other and defending each other's dignity. We are all born equal in dignity and rights. So we need to respect each other and defend each other's dignity. A natural disaster reminds us about what is important. Increasing mental health issues is contributed to by a feeling that we don't have control of your live any more. If we leave one sector of the community behind then eventually social unrest will occur eg those in poverty, racial inequality and the status of families. The bottom line in all work is compassion. Singapore is a model where leaders aimed for 90% homeownership and this has resulted better health economic and educational outcomes. One last thought from his research NZs main blind spot is attitudes of males towards woman.
- 2. Sam Johnson Student Volunteer Army. His thesis is to question the process of "how things are done" and that all things you do can be completed differently. He stated when projects are developed Who owns success? and Who takes responsibility for failure? are important considerations. Another thought from his presentation is technology is changing ownership and enabling sharing of resources. eg Kaibosh The role of SVA was seen as: Enabling sharing, not consumption; Shifting perception, #getoutoftheway; Inter / co-generational; Addicted to social media; to provide a different way of looking at problems e.g. Upliftconnect.com; and to grow movements for impact, not empires for ego.

Ideas that will change the world will come from unlikely sources 50% of the disasters we know could occur haven't yet happened. His latest projects

- a) Working with schools, teaching younger students the joy of volunteering within the community. Could discretionary funding be used to support a school project?
- b) Matching energy with knowledge ... "Serve For NZ" community service after <u>ANZAC day service</u> for one 1 hour of service. How do we mobilise neighbourhoods to keep people caring.
- c) "With campaign" <u>WE VISIT</u> matching a student to meet regularly with an older member of the community to do things with each other and not for. Not disabling people but connecting generations
- d) His next dream how to reduce student debt If you do community service can there but a reduction in student debt.
- 3. Jacqui Dean Issues as associative minister she is dealing with future pressures on 3-waters infrastructure expected to require a \$20 billion investment over the next 10 years while also improving water quality and infrastructure resilience, supporting pressures from tourism and freedom camping with infrastructure and promoting responsibility; e.g. the responsible freedom forum, making people safe from the risk of dog attacks, enhancing resiliency of communities. Scientists stated that the major fault will erupt not if but when so hence the need for preparation. The latest LG Amendment Bill "Better Local Service Bill" is not expected to impact on Community Boards.
- **4. Eyal Halamish A Social Entrepreneur** Our say. Described himself as an activist in a suit. His presentations based on "How to get sustained engagement" and "how to think like an entrepreneur". Ideas are motivated from our frustrations gave techniques that he would lecture on within his business. His formula is

IDEA - ideas design evaluate and action

Need diversity of personalities within in the team for success.

Philosophical Assumptions are based on - **Why -** tacking unmet human needs, **Where**Stand in someone else's shoes, **How -** don't over think it

Also provided an example from google.ex To Learn Fast rather than Fail Fast using the Rapid Prototyping technique – Try Measure Learn Try again.

- **5. Malcolm Alexander LCNZ** Three big issues that need consideration and are their focus 1. Water 2050 project (water quality is under stress and is also driving quality of life outcomes how does LG deal with the huge future investment required in infrastructure) 2. Climate Change and Sea level rise (Doing nothing doesn't cut it anymore) 3. Introducing the Council Mark Quality Award (4 concepts) a. leadership and governance, b. financially in good shape, c. stewards of asserts, d. community engagement
- **6. Peter Briggs Chair of the Wellington Regional Economic Development Agency** -What is the New Zealand Brand and how can we contribute to it? Every city is competing for liveability. In the future nationhood will decline but it will be cities competing /connecting with each. In the future a network of cities will drive economic growth. Different ways of providing services are demerging; eg uber and air bnb, what will be next? It is predicted

that single person households will be 30% of households In the future. People want to be close and connected but stats don't indicate this is occurring, eg A community goal ... How to get a community to read together ... How to engage boys in reading... A utube clip of working together.

Surveys indicate that our local community social binds may not be a close we would expect. What is the role the Local Government can play in enabling community? Local Government should focus on ways to get to know each in the community – supportive communities feel safer and are healthier and more resilient. First responders are often neighbours. Local Government should provide communities with local amenities where people can meet and socialise.

- **7. Workshop:** LGNZ Zone 4 (Wellington Regional Council area). The zone 4 rep is Christine Papps, chair of the Otaki Community Board and she is planning to host a Zone 4 gathering on the Kapiiti Coast around July 2017. All Community Board members are welcome to attend. She would welcome ideas on topics members would like to hear about to christine.papps@kapiticoast.govt.nz.
- **8. Workshop:** Wendy McGuinness Tacking Poverty McGuinness Institute Inspiring work with young adults workshopping for solutions. Also completing city surveys aligning with Maslow theory of needs and then producing data on a cities /towns need of support for their vulnerable people. www.mcguinnessinstitude.org
- 9. Workshop: Sam Johnson and Eyal Halamish Responding on Community Feedback An interesting perspective but not quite what I was expecting. The workshop focused upon how to manage outrage from the community. Outrage can be good in that it may highlight an otherwise unperceived community issue, but it can also be bad in that it can represent a small vocal minority and overwhelm the silent majority. In both cases in managing projects it is important to listen to the outrage view and satisfy their viewpoint if possible as not doing so can often lead to even more outrage and the project being derailed and a lot of time and money wasted.
- 10. David Hammond Nothing less than equal Put the local back into Local Government. How will we as a board "Place shape our suburb" the need to grow our community and not what the direction from the CC might be, allow our community to find solutions for our issues. Develop resilient, not dependent suburbs. Build on natural strengths. We need conversations of equals between Community Boards and Council. Eg Coromandel district council.
- 11. Donald Riezebos Local Government Commission update (standing in for Commissioner Janie Annear) Reviewed recent Commission activity. Most important upcoming event is the 3-yearly 2018 Representation Review that includes Wellington in 2018. Important for Community Boards to participate in the process and have their views heard, to clearly articulate the value of the Board for their community and to demonstrate widespread demand. Decisions on Community Boards are based (as defined in the LG Act) on providing fair representation, promoting local government, better for the community, and whether there are the support resources available.

 Noted Society of Local Government Managers forum coming up on June 23.

12. Workshop: Nick Williamson - Using civic technology and geo design in community engagement

<u>TedX Christchurch 2014</u> - Premise as a town planner is thousands of people watch on House renovation TV people gib board being fitted in homes therefore how can technology be used to engage the public with town planning?

13. Workshop: A panel of younger Board Members – Engaging Youth into local government – Panel spoke about their individual experiences, initial lack of awareness, timidity in engaging with older people, having a mentor or supporter that encouraged then to stand for LG. Need to engage youth at younger levels to participate in community projects, to create awareness, support youth councils, support youth scholarships. Get youth award/grant winners to report back to Board. Benefits of youth engagement include fresh and more diverse ideas, better outcomes for community projects, better respect for community, higher diversity of engagement, improves intergenerational and co-generational learning.

General observations

- A. A cool skate path Omokoroa
- B. A strong feeling that resiliency needs to be community driven. Dissatisfaction with Civil Defence but often dependent on the personnel dealing with the area.
- C. Methven is a great compact small town that has amazing community facilities and community infrastructure for its size.
- D. There are 110 Community Boards around NZ and a record over 200 attendance at this conference. Great to talk to our Makara-Ohariu colleagues – we should do it more often.

ALLOCATION OF REMAINING AMOUNT FROM TAWA GRANTS FUNDING ROUND FOR 2016/17 FINANCIAL YEAR

Purpose

1. For the Tawa Community Board to approve the remaining available amount of \$500 from the Tawa Community Grants Fund for the 2016/17 financial year.

Recommendations

That the Tawa Community Board:

- 1. Receive the information.
- 2. Agree to allocate the remaining amount of \$500 to the following organisation as recommended by the Chair of the Tawa Community Board Grants Subcommittee:

	Organisation	Project	% from Tawa rate paying area	Amount requested	Recommended Amount	Comments
17	Tawa Squash Rackets Club Incorporated	Outdoor Security Lights	75	\$800	\$500	Contribution to safety initiative. Officers will work with club to ensure they have good advice about safety measures in the area.

Background

- 2. The Tawa Community Grants Fund is designed to provide assistance for local Tawa community projects and has a total amount of \$15,000 available in this grants fund for allocation in the financial year.
- 3. The Tawa Community Board Grants Subcommittee met on 06 April 2017 to consider the 20 applications received to the Tawa Community Grants Fund, and agreed on which organisations to fund.
- 4. Of the 20 applications received, only 4 applicants were not awarded any funding.
- 5. The minutes from this meeting are available online at http://wellington.govt.nz/your-council/meetings/committees/tawa-community-board-grants-subcommittee/2017/04/06

Discussion

- 6. Following the meeting, the Funding team contacted each applicant to advise them of the amount that was allocated to them by the subcommittee from this fund.
- 7. The four organisations that were not granted any funding are as follows:

	Organisation	Project	% from Tawa rate paying area	Amount requested	Recommended Amount	Amount granted
5	Rotary Club of Tawa Charitable Trust	Tawa Business Centre Hanging Flower baskets 2017 funding	80	\$3,200	\$1,500	\$0
8	Tawa Bowling Club	New flag with Tawa Bowling Club emblem	90	\$279	\$0	\$0
17	Tawa Squash Rackets Club Incorporated	Outdoor Security Lights	75	\$800	\$500	\$0
20	Wellington Red Hackle Pipe Band Inc	Wellington Red Hackle Reeds and Ties	40	\$2,323	\$0	\$0

- 8. The Rotary Club of Tawa Charitable Trust received funding through the Tawa Community Board's discretionary fund.
- 9. Officers were advised in early May that one of the organisations awarded a grant chose to decline the grant of \$500 and instead requested that the amount be used as a contribution for another project which was not submitted on as part of this grants funding round for Tawa.
- 10. As the Tawa Community Board Grants Subcommittee does not meet again until April 2018 and is a subordinate decision making body of the Tawa Community Board, the decision to allocate the remaining amount in the Tawa Community Grants Fund needs to be made before the end of the financial year (which falls on 30 June) by the Tawa Community Board.

Options

11. N/A.

Next Actions

12. The recipient will be notified by Council officers once the decision has been made.

TAWA COMMUNITY BOARD 8 JUNE 2017

Absolutely Positively **Wellington** City Council Me Heke Ki Pöneke

Attachments

Nil

Authors	Helga Sheppard, Governance Advisor Mark Farrar, Team Leader Funding and Relationships
Authoriser	Crispian Franklin, Governance Team Leader

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Engagement and Consultation N/A.

Treaty of Waitangi considerations

There are no Treaty of Waitangi considerations.

Financial implications

N/A.

Policy and legislative implications

N/A.

Risks / legal

N/A.

Climate Change impact and considerations

N/A.

Communications Plan

N/A.

Health and Safety Impact considered

N/A.

ALLOCATION OF REMAINDER OF 2016/17 TAWA COMMUNITY BOARD DISCRETIONARY FUND

Purpose

1. To agree to allocate the remaining funds in the Tawa Community Board Discretionary Fund for the 2016/2017 financial year.

Recommendations

That the Tawa Community Board:

- 1. Receive the information.
- 2. Confirm the purchases made in 2016/2017 are accurate and that there are no remaining invoices to be paid or be accrued at the end of the 2016/2017 financial year.
- 3. Agree to allocate the remaining amount of approximately \$3700 in the Tawa Community Board Discretionary Fund (which may be subject to change after any accruals or expenditure) for the 2016/2017 financial year.

Background

2. The Tawa Community Board Discretionary Fund is a standing item on the Board's agenda. The Board holds the delegation to determine expenditure of funds held in the Tawa Community Board Discretionary Fund according to the funds criteria.

Discussion

3. The amount remaining in the fund for the 2016/2017 financial year is operational expenditure and needs to be allocated before the end of the financial year.

Next Actions

4. Once the Board has agreed how the funds are to be allocated, the relevant recipient/s will be notified.

Attachments

Attachment 1. Tawa Community Board Discretionary Fund Criteria

Page 53

Author	Helga Sheppard, Governance Advisor
Authoriser	Crispian Franklin, Governance Team Leader

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Engagement and Consultation

There are no engagement or consultation requirements.

Treaty of Waitangi considerations

There are no Treaty of Waitangi considerations.

Financial implications

There are no budget implications arising from the allocation of the funds. The funds are operational expenditure.

Policy and legislative implications

There are no policy or legislative implications.

Risks / legal

There are no legal or risk implications.

Climate Change impact and considerations

There are no climate change impacts or considerations.

Communications Plan

No communication plan is required.

Health and Safety Impact considered

There are no health and safety implications.

Criteria for payments to beneficiaries of the Tawa Community Board Discretionary Fund¹

- 1. The applicant/ beneficiary is based in Tawa and the project directly benefits residents in the Tawa Ward.
- 2. The beneficiary group must not have excess reserve funds.
- The preference is for projects to be completed within 12 months and the beneficiary group is required to report back on project outcomes and deliverables.
- 4. There is a preference for new or expanded activities.
- Payments from the Tawa Discretionary Fund will not be made for purposes that the Tawa Community Board considers to be subsidising subscriptions, rent or debt - except in exceptional circumstances.
- 6. Payments may be made for charitable, educational, welfare, community development, cultural, recreational, sporting, activity development, equipment or training programmes.
- 7. Preference will be given for projects that help develop economically or socially disadvantaged groups.
- 8. Applications for individuals representing New Zealand in a recognised sporting, cultural or other approved event may be considered.

-

¹ Note: the criteria applies where a payment to any beneficiary/applicant is \$1000 or more

RATIFICATION OF SUBMISSION ON THE DRAFT WELLINGTON REGION WASTE MANAGEMENT AND MINIMISATION PLAN

Purpose

1. To seek the Tawa Community Board's retrospective approval of its submissions made on the Draft Wellington Region Waste Management and Minimisation Plan.

Recommendation

That the Tawa Community Board:

- 1. Receive the information.
- 2. Retrospectively approve the submission made on the Draft Wellington Region Waste Management and Minimisation Plan.

Background

- 2. Wellington City Council consulted on its Draft Wellington Region Waste Management and Minimisation Plan. The consultation period ran from 18 April 2017 to 19 May 2017.
- 3. The Board, at its meeting held on 13 April 2017, agreed to submit its ideas and proposals and noted that feedback 19 May 2017.

Discussion

4. The Tawa Community Board resolved at its meeting held on 04 May 2017 that the submission would be retrospectively ratified by the Board at its June meeting.

Attachments

Attachment 1. Tawa Community Board Submission to the Draft Wellington Page 57
Region Waste Management and Minimisation Plan

Author	Helga Sheppard, Governance Advisor
Authoriser	Crispian Franklin, Governance Team Leader

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Consultation and Engagement

The views expressed in these submissions are that of the Tawa Community Board.

Treaty of Waitangi considerations

There are no Treaty of Waitangi implications.

Financial implications

There are no financial implications arising from these submissions.

Policy and legislative implications

There are no policy or legislative implications.

Risks / legal

There are no risks or legal implications arising from these submissions.

Climate Change impact and considerations

There are no climate change impacts.

Communications Plan

N/A.

Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2017

Submission by Tawa Community Board to Wellington City Council 15 May 2017

Introduction

The Tawa Community Board is a Community Board under the Local Government Act and Wellington City Council with elected members representing the northernmost suburbs of Wellington City comprising Tawa, Takapu Valley and Grenada North.

We welcome the opportunity to provide a submission on the Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2017. We wish to make an oral submission to the Councillors.

Tawa is noted for its strong sense of community, and its high regard for the natural environment, shown by the high level of active support recently shown in the acquisition of the Forest of Tane.

The Tawa Community Board endorses the three goals - Waste-free: Working together: Benefit our communities - as values that reflect those of our community.

Proposed primary regional target

Tawa Community Board supports the target to reduce waste sent to municipal (*class 1*) landfills from 600 kg per person per annum to 400 kg per person per annum by 2026.

We note that the proposed target is less likely to be achieved by Tawa residents without territorial councils working together, in particular.

Southern Landfill is a 25 kilometre, over 40 minute drive, from Tawa. Tawa residents tend to use the closer Spicer Landfill and its associated recycling / diversion facilities. Any kerbside collection would also seem to be more efficiently processed by whichever facility is geographically closest, rather than according to territorial authority divisions.

Proposed regional actions

The Board supports the proposed regional actions.

We welcome more collaboration between the region's local councils around waste minimisation and management.

We note in particular, concern from Tawa residents expressed to the Board regarding the following waste items. We expect greater collaboration would greatly encourage local residents to reduce waste of these kinds that requires specialised recycling:

- Household batteries: the option to drop these at Southern Landfill is of little use to Tawa residents. The Porirua City Council website for Spicer Landfill is difficult to find information on and does not appear to address the issue of household batteries.
- Polystyrene. The closure of Poly Palace at Spicer Landfill has left residents with nowhere to send this waste other than landfill.

We note that the Greater Wellington Regional Council website directory still lists Poly Palace in its recycling directory [http://www.gw.govt.nz/Polystyrene] and has not responded to an online feedback by a Tawa resident last year. This is a good example of the need to properly resource and manage a regional directory to ensure that it stays up to date and accurate.

Energy-saving light bulbs that contain mercury: as for batteries, the Southern Landfill
is not an optimal solution for Tawa residents. Information on alternative drop-off sites
is difficult to obtain.

For some of these items the Board may be able to facilitate local initiatives to address these specific waste problems. However they are examples of the kind of improvements hoped for in future under a more regional approach to waste reduction.

Proposed local actions by Wellington City Council

More comprehensive kerbside collections

The Board carried out a poll on the Neighbourly website to ask Tawa residents their views. Over one week, 181 votes and comments from more than 10 residents were received (total Tawa Neighbourly membership is currently 3550 residents). The poll was repeated on a Saturday morning outside Tawa New World by two Tawa Community Board members [69 total votes, including 5 from residents of surrounding suburbs] for a total of 250 votes. Comments were also received on the Board's Facebook page.

The poll asked the following: [Neighbourly total / street poll]

Would a Council green bin reduce your trash? [181 / 69 total votes]

Yes, our house would use a green waste bin [67.4% / 56.5%]
We'd use a small food waste bin, not a green bin [5% / 0%]
We have no room for any more bins [2.2% /3%]
We already compost most or all our green and food waste [21% /24.6%]
We already pay for a green bin service [2.8% / 7.2%]
We would not use a green bin for other reasons [1.7% / 7.2%]

Comments generally were in strong support of having an organic waste kerbside collection.

A notable proportion (around 20%) of Tawa residents reported that they already compost 'most or all' or their organic waste. The Board notes however that the continuing trend to reduced section sizes by infill and new development may reduce the ability or desire of householders to carry out home composting, thus increasing the need for a kerbside collection in future.

Several residents who compost at home went on to comment that they supported, and some would also use, a green bin service. For example, one resident commented that green bins would be useful for organic material that home composters find difficult to manage, such as Tradescantia.

The Board also notes evidence of a strong desire by residents and businesses to have the ability to make more sustainable use of their food waste.

Tawa Community Garden reports that several residents have approached them over the last 18 months wanting to provide food waste to their compost bins, as well as a local catering business. The Community Garden lacks the capacity to deal with this. The local business resorted to a commercial option for diverting its food waste. Recently, even a major hotel in the CBD approached the Garden for diversion of their coffee grounds waste (the Garden declined as it already diverts approximately 45 kg of used grounds per week from a local cafe).

Tawa Community Board, 15 May 2017

page 3

A small number of resident expressed concerns around the kerbside collection idea, even though largely supportive of the idea in principle.

Concerns noted were:

- the safety issues of existing bins (such as the need for clips);
- the number of existing bins and their impact on pedestrian safety;
- the impact of reduced organic waste on sludge levels, and therefore, landfill odour;
- cost.

Summary

From the responses received, Tawa residents strongly support a green bin kerbside collection and would reduce their landfill waste as a result.

We also note with interest that a large private sector firm is moving towards the first electric-powered pickup truck in New Zealand (https://youtu.be/UZh-uEkrVag), and suggest that the Wellington City Council consider such options.

Tawa as a community would support, and benefit from, a more integrated and well-resourced regional approach to waste minimisation and management.

Robyn Parkinson, Member, Tawa Community Board

rparkinson.nz@gmail.com 027 8058334

For the Tawa Community Board:

Richard Herbert (Chair)
Margaret Lucas (Deputy Chair)
Graeme Hansen
Jack Marshall
Liz Langham
Robyn Parkinson
Councillor Malcolm Sparrow
Councillor Jill Day

Tawa Community Board, 15 May 2017

page 4

Appendix: Comments received

Comments in favour of an organic waste kerbside collection:

"We do regular trips to green waste disposal area at the dump. We would absolutely use it!"

"We would definitely use this."

"Yes bins [are] an excellent idea"

"Absolutely"

"Brilliant idea"

"It would be great to create something of practical value from something of negative value, if we can manage that by separation. Before we had plastics and electronic waste, rubbish dumps became fertile areas. By disposing of mixed waste, we just end up with large contaminated areas; it would be great to reduce this problem while producing useful byproducts."

"Green waste bins sound a good idea - how and when would they be collected? Presumably they would be like the current wheelie bins."

"Chch has red yellow and green ones. I think it would be great idea for wellington."

"Absolutely, we have a compost bin but as you know we can't put everything in it. Would the green bin take everything, like bones, potato skins (as they grow out of your compost bin other wise) fish, egg shells, as those are the things that go in our rubbish at this stage to avoid attracting rodents to the property."

"No room at my flat... but I support it in principle"

"That is great idea. However our family is on the next level. We turn all of our green waste into rich compost that feeds our little garden. We have half of the supermarket bag of waste and a bit of recyclables".

"I would find a green bin useful. Have a very small garden and even if I made compost have no where to use it."

"We already compost all of our food waste and part of this waste goes into our worm farm. All of our compost goes back on the garden and the worm farm liquid is diluted and sloshed around the plants. I do think it is a good idea for the WCC to consider some sort of organic (food waste) collection. The type of collection is done in some towns and cities in England using plastic buckets (about 20L)and they are put on the curb on the same day as other recycling.

It is the PCC and WCC interests to reduce the amount of stuff dumped as planning and establishing new landfills will cost millions. And of course no one wants a new landfill anywhere near their house."

Tawa Community Board, 15 May 2017

page 5

Item 3.7 Attachment 1

Comments largely in favour, but with concerns or issues noted:

"As long as it was a wheeli type bin rather than an open small green bin like the ones for glass."

"I'm half in favour and half not. We compost all our vege food scraps. We pay to dispose of other green waste (tree cuttings etc) ourself - and a lot of that would not fit in a bin - a completely full caged trailer last weekend.

I am also concerned about yet another bin on the footpath. I look out my window some days and there are bins for Africa - the WCC bins and then the private bins etc - often just blowing in the wind. I would rather the council first considered clips for existing wheelie bins so the contents stay secure."

"....waste management at landfills is a tricky business as many of us who have been affected by landfill odours know. Less waste at the landfill means lower waste:sludge ratio (sludge is the by-product from the waste water treatment plant). If the waste:sludge ratio drops other problems begin.

So reducing the amount of green waste is good, however it is only good if sludge issues are being addressed at the same time."

"Would it cost extra?"

Comments not in favour of organic kerbside collection:

"How about a simple No...Bins for Africa. Iv'e got some they could have. Whens the collection date?"

TAWA MEMORIAL PROJECT

Purpose

 To provide the Tawa Community Board with a final update regarding the Tawa Memorial.

Recommendation

That the Tawa Community Board:

1. Receive the information.

Background

- 2. Eight years ago, the Tawa Historical Society proposed that a war memorial be built in Tawa at the northern end of Oxford Street adjacent to Grasslees Reserve.
- 3. The project has been a community effort led by a number of organisations in Tawa with the Tawa Historical Society taking a lead on the project.
- 4. The Chair of the Tawa Historical Society, Bruce Murray, has provided numerous updates to the Tawa Community Board over the course of the project.
- 5. In 2014, Wellington City Council provided approval in principle for the project to proceed based on a number of conditions being met.
- 6. Work commenced on site from Monday, 23 January 2017 and was completed in early April 2017.

Discussion

- 7. The Tawa Historical Society wishes to thank the Tawa Community Board for the recent approval of a grant which allowed them to complete the Tawa Memorial.
- 8. The official opening of the Tawa Memorial took place on the Saturday morning before ANZAC Day. The Tawa ANZAC Day parade proceeded along Oxford Street to the new Tawa Memorial before the service was held at the RSA quarters.

Attachments

Attachment 1. Thank you letter - Tawa Historical Society 21 April 2017

Page 65

Author	Helga Sheppard, Governance Advisor
Authoriser	Crispian Franklin, Governance Team Leader

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Engagement and Consultation

Not applicable.

Treaty of Waitangi considerations

Not applicable.

Financial implications

Not applicable.

Policy and legislative implications

Not applicable.

Risks / legal

All risks and legal implications have been considered and all conditions have been met. The project has been completed.

Climate Change impact and considerations

Not applicable.

Communications Plan

N/A.

Health and Safety Impact considered

Consideration was given to all the health and safety impacts – the project is now complete.



21 April 2017

The Chairperson Tawa Community Board Cambridge Street TAWA

Dear Richard,

TAWA MEMORIAL PROJECT

It is my pleasure to write on behalf of the Tawa Historical Society, who have had the privilege of coordinating and taking a lead role, in conjunction with Tawa RSA, in bringing this project to fruition, and record our grateful thanks to the Community Board for the recent approval of a grant towards the completion of the Memorial.

The project has been contemplated for a number of years, and the Community Board has made a number of grants which were instrumental in our being able to engage an Architect, getting plans drawn, and other initial preparatory work. It is pleasing to see the Memorial has come to fruition and record another aspect of Tawa's history.

Siting the Memorial on Council land adjacent to Grassless Reserve, has proven to be an ideal location, and it sits well within the surrounding environment.

Yours sincerely

Ken Woodgate Secretary

Tawa Historical Society Inc

Aims of the Tawa Historical Society

- to encourage study of the history of the Tawa district
- to foster an appreciation of the achievement of all
- to encourage research into the history of the district
- to advocate for the conservation of sites or

RESOURCE CONSENT APPLICATIONS AND APPROVALS FOR 26 APRIL TO 28 MAY 2017

Purpose

In accordance with an agreement reached with the Tawa Community Board, the
purpose of this report is to advise the Board of all resource consents lodged, along with
decisions made by Officers acting under Delegated Authority, on Land Use and
Subdivision resource consent applications.

Recommendation

That the Tawa Community Board:

Receive the information.

Background

2. This report advises the Community Board of resource consents lodged and decisions made during the period 26 April 2017 to 28 May 2017.

Discussion

3. For the period from 26 April 2017 to 28 May 2017, there were six applications lodged with the Council.

Service Request	Address	Applicant
384405	1 William Earp Place	First Gas
Land Use: Gas delivery point extension		
384763	18 South Street	Alecia Koenigsberge
Subdivision: Two lot fee simple		
385480	4 William Earp Place	Sean Murrie
Subdivision: 24 lot fee simple subdivision of a previously consented multi-unit development		
385707	18 Ranui Terrace	SL Rentals
Subdivision and Land Use: Two lot fee simple and new dwelling		
385916	24A Chastudon Place	Epic Homes
Land Use: Earthworks for a new dwelling		
385577	529 Takapu Road	Greater Wellington Regional Council

Land Use: Earthworks

For the period from 26 April 2017 to 28 May 2017, there were four applications approved under delegated authority. 4.

Service Request	Address	Applicant
382725	282 Takapu Road	Stuart Woodman
Subdivision: three lot fee simple		
356481	Multiple Sites	Wellington Water Ltd
Land Use: Earthworks for sediment traps for the public storm water system		
372344	6 Court Road	Peter Kerr
Land Use: New dwelling		
378862	10 Olivia Crescent	Rock Homes
Subdivision and Land Use: Three lot fee simple and multi-unit development		

Attachments

Author	Jacqui Austin, Executive Support Officer
Authoriser	Bill Stevens, Resource Consents Team Leader
	David Chick, Chief City Planner

Item 3.9 Page 68

CURRENT AND UPCOMING COUNCIL CONSULTATIONS OR SURVEYS

Purpose

 To provide the Tawa Community Board with an update on the current items Council is seeking public feedback on and to advise the Board on upcoming items for consultations or surveys the Council is undertaking.

Recommendation

That the Tawa Community Board:

1. Receive the information.

Discussion

Survey

- 2. Council is currently trialling the use of electric bikes (e-bikes) on selected tracks within our open space network.
- 3. To understand the impact of the trial, Council is conducting a survey and the feedback received will help Council make a final decision as to where e-bikes will be allowed to be used in the open space network.
- 4. The survey closes at 5.00pm on Friday, 30 June 2017.

Upcoming consultations/community engagement

- 5. The Brooklyn Trail Builders, along with Council, have prepared some proposals for changes to tracks in Polhill Reserve. This includes three new tracks and the closure of two short track sections.
- 6. Consultation on this item is expected to start on 06 June 2017.
- 7. Further information is available on Council's website: http://wellington.govt.nz/have-your-say/consultations

Options

- 8. Should the Board wish to participate in the on-line survey, there is no requirement for the Board to formally ratify this.
- Should the Board wish to make a submission on proposed changes to the Polhill Reserve; the Board will need to retrospectively approve its submission at its next meeting scheduled for August 2017.

Attachments

Nil

Author	Helga Sheppard, Governance Advisor
Authoriser	Crispian Franklin, Governance Team Leader

Item 3.10 Page 69

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Consultation and Engagement

All relevant supporting information and documentation relating to these items are available on Council's website and community input is being sought.

Treaty of Waitangi considerations

Any Treaty of Waitangi considerations will be taken into account.

Financial implications

Any financial implications will be considered.

Policy and legislative implications

Any policy and legislative implications will be considered.

Risks / legal

Any legal implications and risks will be taken into account.

Climate Change impact and considerations

Climate change impacts (if any) will be considered.

Communications Plan

Further information will be communicated once feedback has been analysed and considered.

Item 3.10 Page 70

FORWARD PROGRAMME

Purpose

1. To provide the Tawa Community Board with a draft work programme for its amendment and approval.

Recommendations

That the Tawa Community Board:

- 1. Receive the information.
- 2. Amend the work programme if necessary.

Discussion

2. Below is the draft work programme for the Board's approval and amendment where necessary:

	Thursday, 10 August 2017			
•	Standing Items:			
	0	Policing in Tawa		
	0	Review of Resource Consents process		
	0	Upcoming Areas of Consultation, engagement or surveys (if any)		
	0	Tawa Community Board Discretionary Fund Update		
	0	Tawa Community Board Members reports		
	0	Forward Programme		
	0	Update on the Tawa Community Resilience Plan		
	0	Update from WREMO		
	0	Youth Council update		
	0	NZ Post Presentation		
	0	Officer response to Tawa Skate Park Petition		
	0	Rail Safety Wek – Update from TrackSafe NZ		

Attachments

Nil

Author	Helga Sheppard, Governance Advisor
Authoriser	Crispian Franklin, Governance Team Leader

Item 3.11 Page 71

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Consultation and Engagement

No consultation or engagement is required.

Treaty of Waitangi considerations

There are no Treaty of Waitangi considerations associated with this report.

Financial implications

There are no financial implications associated with this report.

Policy and legislative implications

There are no policy or legislative implications associated with this report.

Risks / legal

There are no risks or legal implications associated with this report.

Climate Change impact and considerations

N/A.

Communications Plan

N/A.

Item 3.11 Page 72