

## Environmental Reference Group Minutes

Monday, 1<sup>st</sup> August 2016 | 5.30pm – 7.30pm

Wellington City Council, 101 Wakefield St, Committee Room 2

**Chairperson:** Mark Fenwick

**Members in Attendance:** Sophie Mormede, Paula Warren, Mark Fenwick, Martin Payne, Hamish McGillivray, Lynn Cadenhead, Shenagh Gleisner, Stu Farrant, Graham Sawyer

**Councillors:** Iona Pannett, Helene Ritchie

**Staff:** James Mather

**ELT member:** David Chick

<b>1.</b>	<b>Welcome &amp; Apologies   Mark Fenwick</b>  Apologies received:  Chris Watson Mark Higham Iona Pannett  Apologies for being late: Stu Farrant Graham Sawyer  Absent without apology: Helene Ritchie	<b>5.30pm</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Conflicts of Interest   All</b>  No conflicts of interest declared; Hamish reiterated his ongoing potential for infrastructure conflicts	<b>5.35pm</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Previous Minutes Confirmation   All</b>  Drought in water resilience needs to be addressed in the minutes Minutes carried as true and correct	<b>5.37pm</b>

<p><b>4.</b></p>	<p><b>Moana's Updates</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Moana to provide work stream updates</li> <li>2. ERG invited to question</li> </ol> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Moana's memo tabled</li> <li>- ERG members to provide queries to James for collation and response</li> </ul>	<p><b>5.38pm</b></p>
<p><b>5.</b></p>	<p><b>LGWM   Sarah Ropata</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. LGWM to provide an update on their process</li> <li>2. Discussion of principles and next steps</li> </ol> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Discussion is tabled for ERG on Dropbox</li> </ul> <p>Floor opened to ERG for queries;</p> <p>Q – What do you mean by scenarios?  A – It could look like a range of things. Likely to distil down to a map which displays a range of interventions. It will pull together solutions based on the principles suggested. We can test our scenarios against each other to show trade-offs.</p> <p>Q – So a trade-off might be more parking against cycling lanes?  A – Yes. Some core assumptions exist, such as the CBD being the main employment local. There will be trade-offs between accessibility and amenity we predict.</p> <p>Q – It would be sensible to look at the grade separation in the tunnels by the park, now the fly-over is off the table  A – that is something we are looking at. Cut and cover could be desirable.</p> <p>Q – How do you balance looking for bold solutions whilst keeping the principles in mind? The balance is interesting between those two tensions.  A – It's the last principle of a wider view, that value isn't a dollar figure as such. Scenarios can also be temporal, incremental changes and not just 'now'.</p> <p>Q – Sometimes you are dealing with the unforeseen, yes?  A – That's the resilience argument. We know autonomous vehicles are coming, but we don't know when or what that will look like – or even if that's a good or a bad thing intrinsically.</p> <p>Q – When it comes to parking, some parts of town are having reductions in requirements on the assumption that cars are going out. But we could go</p>	<p><b>5.50pm</b></p>

	<p>the other way with electric vehicles.</p> <p>A – I think these things are interrelated; Council is looking at medium density housing near transport nodes. Our typography also limits us, there is only so much physical space. Just because you can do something, doesn't mean you can do it – if that makes sense.</p> <p>Q – You have heritage on your list, is it part of your role that these sites need to be identified? I don't think Council does – at least not systematically.</p> <p>A – The District plan has items listed; the heritage list also contains lists.</p> <p>A – This project is related to Urban Design, so we are keeping all those listed concerns in mind.</p> <p>A – The principles we've listed have 3 major agencies behind them and alignment where there might not have been before.</p> <p>Q – Jumping ahead, do you have some key indicators for trade off decisions?</p> <p>A – We will develop criteria from the principles; these will feed into a preferred scenario. We are currently developing these and will be publishing them and sharing them publicly as we did with the principles – looking at early September.</p> <p>Q – Are you weighting the principles?</p> <p>A – We are not currently weighting them, as you can end up with some imbalanced solutions.</p> <p>Q – You could solve congestion by banning things, but that would shift the issue.</p> <p>Q – Getting down to the numbers would be very valuable, very interesting for the dialogue around transport modes.</p> <p>LGWM to return to come back with measure and criteria if and when they pop up.</p> <p>Feedback to be developed as a memo, due with LGWM by end of August – preferably in the next week or two.</p>	
6.	<p><b>ERG Policy Feedback Methodology   All</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. James to demonstrate proposed ERG method</li> <li>2. ERG to provide feedback</li> </ol> <p>Feedback noted, James to update on how portfolio leads and officer relationship is to function</p>	6.20pm

<p><b>7.</b></p>	<p><b>Portfolio Discussion   All</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Graeme's Portfolio Discussion</li> <li>2. ERG members to work through portfolio assignment</li> </ol> <p>Graham tables his 1 pager on Urban Growth &amp; Open Space ERG members invited to feedback</p> <p>Graham notes his potential bias</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Adding biodiversity loss</li> <li>- When meetings were held in Khandallah, it was noted there were no heritage or biodiversity checks detailed on the consultation documents</li> <li>- ERG applauded Grahams efforts</li> <li>- It was noted that the genesis of the document is raising of the issues that are important with a view to move toward a more objective list of criteria.</li> <li>-</li> </ul>	<p><b>6.40pm</b></p>
<p><b>8.</b></p>	<p><b>Wellington Water Discussion   All</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. ERG to discuss Wellington Waters proposals as per last meeting</li> <li>2. ERG to determine actions to be taken</li> </ol> <p>Comments from the table</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Drought is operational in their view, not as part of the resilience package</li> <li>- Presentation looked like it was a strengthening of the pipelines and how quickly those could be fixed</li> <li>- Very much about what Wellington Water could do, not about what everyone could do</li> <li>- No integration, or discussion of, of types of water (waste/storm) resilience</li> <li>- They did encourage private water storage</li> <li>- Resilience isn't just acute events, its also constant tensions</li> <li>- Smart rain water tanks would be great</li> <li>- Smart tanks used for clothes and toilets ideally</li> <li>- Smart tanks clear prior to high levels of rainfall, implemented overseas to great success</li> <li>- Still hanging on to the centralised model, the costs for WW are in the reticulation of water</li> <li>- WW need to charge for water, but it's a vote loser</li> <li>- Water meters lead to reduction in use, tanks get installed and the benefits are huge</li> </ul>	<p><b>6.50pm</b></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The meters could be installed and the option could be given, pay per L or keep the current system. Would also give data to be used.</li> <li>- All these systems talk about growth, but the environment isn't getting any bigger</li> <li>- The cost of installing water meters is huge, and other things could be done with those funds</li> <li>- Retrofitting houses and tanks is hard and expensive</li> <li>- People do build the cost of water into their lives, so we will see an initial dip in use and then a resurgence</li> <li>- There is no incentive to build smart houses, no financial gains to be made. In Auckland/nelson there are huge incentives</li> <li>- Influencing the community by installing smart technologies on large projects (ASB stadium)</li> <li>- There may be public health concerns regarding water tanks, MoH could be concerned about the implications.</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> </ul>	
<b>9.</b>	<b>Matters Arising   All</b>	<b>7.15pm</b>

**Action Points:**

- 1) ERG to pass on queries regarding Moana's memo if required, James to answer any queries and distribute
- 2) James to table LGWM presentation on Dropbox
- 3) James to update methodology to incorporate portfolio lead and Council officer relationship
- 4) Graham to send his principles paper to James to be posted on Loomio for discussion
- 5) James to update all existing Loomio groups into themed subgroups.
- 6) Water thread to be commenced on Loomio, points from minutes to be discussed. 2018 discussion on the LTP, get a list of the 70 projects that are being developed.

## Portfolio groups

Working group	ERG lead	Council officer
Transport	Paula Warren	Jane Black (LGWM)  Pete Whiting,  Transport Engagement
Climate Change	Chris	Moana Mackey,  Programme Manager Sustainability
Waste	Martin Payne	Adrian Mitchell,  Waste Operations Manager
Urban Growth/Open Space	Graeme Sawyer	Trudy Whitlow,  Urban Design & Heritage Manager
Water	Paula Warren	Yon Cheong Manager,  Regional Strategy and Policy Wgtn Water
Resilience	Lynn Cadenhead	Mike Mendonca,  Chief Resilience Officer
Urban Design Agency	Shenagh Gleisner & Mark McKenzie	Baz Kaufman,  Manager Strategy And Research
Manawhenua iwi & Treaty Relations	Mark Fenwick	Trevor Himona,  Senior Advisor, Treaty Relations
Biodiversity	Stu Farrant	Myfanwy Emeny, Team Leader Biodiversity & Urban Ecology