

## Summary of Submissions received by Greater Wellington Regional Council for WGN130303 - Waikanae River

General Position of Submission	Total
Oppose	9
Support	2
Conditional	4
Submissions that are neutral	2
<b>Total submissions received</b>	<b>17</b>

Sub ID	Name of submitter / Organisation	Support / Neutral / Oppose application	Wish To Be Heard?	Summary of submission
1	Kotuku Parks Limited	Support	No	Support for GWRC river management programme for the Waikanae River
2	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Conditional	Yes	The submitter is neutral to the application and seeks to ensure that there are no adverse effects on the ongoing operation, maintenance and upgrading of its existing transmission lines where these cross various rivers and river corridors within the application area, and that any river management measures around the assets are carried out safely. The submitter seeks that suitable conditions be imposed to ensure that the lines and towers remain accessible for maintenance, operation and upgrading; safe clearance distances between the ground and conductor (wires) are maintained; excavations do not destabilise towers and poles; and that mobile plant/machinery and people must always maintain minimum safe separation distances from the lines.
3	Isobel McBeath	Neutral	Yes	Submitter is affected as the Waimeha Stream runs through her property and considerable damage is done during flooding. The submitter wishes to be informed regarding what plans are to be considered in the control over this stream.
4	Don Frampton	Oppose	Yes	The submitter specifically opposes the reduction of natural sediment supply to the beach and notes that the beach is a precious resource and should neither be starved of sediment nor knowingly eroded by an unnatural river process. He objects to the consent being granted unless the overdue river mouth cut is made a mandatory action to be undertaken no later than when the river mouth migration reaches the current southward trigger point (to partly offset the reduced sediment supply and resultant increased dune erosion – further exacerbated by undue river mouth proximity and consequentially higher wave energy from the Northerly aspect); and the river sediment extraction from the closed river system is not permitted.
5	Kapiti Fly Fishing Club Inc	Oppose	Yes	The submitter recognises the need for flood control activities to continue on this river; however the primary concern is the health of the entire ecosystem, from source to sea. The submitter has concerns that trout are often seen only for recreational characteristics, rather than as an indicator species for the health of the overall river. The submitter has some specific recommendations to mitigate ecological issues such as sedimentation and loss of natural character. The submitter suggests the use of a single wrap-around consent for up to 35 years that governs the multitude of subsidiary land-use, water permit, discharge permit, and coastal permits for individual rivers in order to enable work planning, on-site consultation, and river-specific environmental bottom-lines and

				precautionary periods within the overall context of adaptive management. They would be supportive of a river advisory committee to improve relationships between river users and the Council, as well as use experience and ideas of iwi, anglers and others in practical river design. The submitter has a keen interest in the works that come within a one metre band from the instream channel and works that involve the loss of habitat associated with loss of bankside or instream vegetation that overhangs or is immediately adjacent to the instream channel. The submitter also seeks specific instream works restrictions (maximum length of disturbance) and time restrictions to provide for migrating fish.
6	Director-General of Conservation	Oppose in part	Yes	The submitter recognises the importance of maintenance of the Council's flood protection infrastructure, the requirement to replace infrastructure, and supports Council's ongoing riparian planting program to reduce the risk of floodwaters damaging property. However, in relation to other activities proposed such as sand and gravel extraction, constructing new rock rip-rap and recontouring gravel beds of rivers, the submitter considers that the applications lodged have insufficient information to determine the potential effects of the proposed activities on the values contained within the rivers and their margins. The submitter opposes the application on the basis that it does not adequately identify the actual and potential adverse effects of gravel removal from the active river beds, and including from flowing water, on their significant indigenous biodiversity values; it lacks information on the cumulative effects of sediment supply to the open Kapiti coastline and its stability; it fails to protect and restore the wetland, freshwater, estuarine and braided river bird values and fails to avoid any more than minor adverse effects on the significant indigenous biodiversity values contained within the river and margins; and it does not consider other methods for managing flood flows on the flood plain.
7	David Steele	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application due to the effects on recreational human use, particularly windsurfing. Notes that the river in its present state is an exceptional location for windsurf speed sailing which will be impacted by the cutting of a direct route of the Waikanae River to the sea. Also notes that the river mouth is a beautiful area with many locals and visitors regularly walking and enjoying the area. The submitter suggests that a river revetment of some kind at the southern end would be a better option.
8	Goodman Holdings Limited	Conditional	No	Supports the application, however requires that the Rule 35 Entry or Passage is not repealed or revoked such that it would prevent heavy machinery crossing the river between the GHJ yard and the Gold Coast Building Removal yard. Should passage across the Waikanae River between the true right and left banks be restricted or cancelled by this application, the submitter would oppose any change.
9	Laurence Petherick	Oppose	Yes	Opposes application in relation to the realignment, cutting and recontouring of the Waikanae River Mouth in the Coastal Marine Area. Notes that the cutting of the river mouth significantly reduces the length and area of the spit accessible from the Waikanae side, which has detrimental effects on the length of the river banks available for whitebaiting, severely affects the long flat beach in front of the spit utilised by kite boarders and other beach users, and it reduces the recreational use of the river by many other groups. The submitter requests that a compromise cutting procedure is permitted instead of being cut straight out from between the groynes adjacent to the river mouth carpark.
10	Te Āti Awa ki Whakarongotai	Oppose	Yes	The submitter states that the Waikanae River and Waimeha Stream are waterbodies of high significance to Te Āti Awa and they consider the proposed activities to have the potential to produce significant adverse effects on this waterbody and surrounding environment. The submitter opposes the application as: it does not promote the sustainable management of resources now and for future generations; it does not achieve the purpose and principles of the RMA; it does not safeguard the life-supporting capacity of water; it does not avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of the application on the environment; the consideration of alternatives has been inadequate; it is contrary to the National Policy Statement on Freshwater Management 2010; and it is contrary to or inconsistent

				with relevant regional and district policy statements and plans. The submitter is specifically concerned with the short-term reactive approach to river management activities and considers that a solution which reduces the long-term need for river management activities should instead be adopted. The submitter opposes the 35-year consent term sought as they believe this will reduce the likelihood of sustainable practices being adopted, subsequently increasing significant adverse and cumulative environmental effects. The submitter supports an adaptive management approach, but not to the extent where they are excluded from the management of river activities which could have significant environmental effects on the Waikanae River and Waimeha Stream. The submitter also notes that there are significant effects to the relationship the submitter holds with Waikanae River due to the adverse effects on the most significant species that lives in the river, that being inanga. The submitter believes that the application does not reflect a partnered approach to management of flood protection.
11	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	Conditional	Yes	Supports the application. The submitter seeks a condition to ensure that the integrity of KiwiRail assets are not physically undermined, as well as ensuring that appropriate safety measures are in place to protect both the contractor undertaking the works and the rail network. Supports the application. The submitter seeks a condition to notify KiwiRail's Wellington Metro Network Services Manager at least 10 working days prior to any physical works commencing within 200m of a KiwiRail bridge, to ensure that the integrity of KiwiRail assets are not physically undermined, as well as ensuring that appropriate safety measures are in place to protect both the contractor undertaking the works and the rail network.
12	Caleb Royal	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Notes that each of the associated consents have overlaying material which compromises the ability of each consent to get a free and fair hearing, and that the consents contravene the RMA, PNRP, NPSFW, MOP and other planning and legislative documents.
13	Ngā Hapu o Ōtaki	Oppose	Yes	Hei tautoko te kaupapa o nga whanau o te upoko o te ika a Māui. Kia puawai nga whakaaro o te tino rangatiratanga me te kawanatanga. Kia puta mai te rereketanga o nga whakaaro o nga iwi o te rohe nei, me te whakaaro kotahi hoki.  To support the families of Wellington (Te Upoko o Te Ika a Māui). For their ideas of self-determination (tino rangatiratanga) and authority/rule (kawanatanga) to come to fruition. That the tribes of this region will be able to work through their differences, and become united.
14	Hutt Valley Angling Club Inc	Support	Yes	Supports the move away from a pragmatic engineering approach to flood control work, to one informed by science before engineering. The submitter sees good monitoring and research as the way forward in helping to mitigate the consequences of flood control on the intrinsic values of the overall river ecosystem. The submitter seeks specific changes to the Code of Practice to provide for the intrinsic values of the watercourses, monitoring of MCI and the hyporheic zone, an acknowledgment that the hyporheic zone and the safety of recreational users may be compromised by river management activities, and the inclusion of other opportunities for environmental enhancement. The submitter seeks changes to the Event Monitoring of habitat mapping at impact and reference sites to include the hyporheic zone, so that any changes to the hyporheic zone as a consequence of river works can be recorded.
15	Waikanae Christian Holiday Park Inc	Neutral	Yes	The submitter neither supports nor opposes the proposed application but instead is seeking confirmation that the proposed works will not result in adverse effects on their property in terms of flood hazards; or that it will result in loss of land. The submitter is also seeking a change to the consent area to extend over the River Corridor zone within their land.
16	Wellington Flyfishers Club Inc	Conditional	No	The submitter is broadly supportive of the need for flood control activities to continue on this river and understands the level of complexity involved in balancing and managing rivers with multiple and often

				<p>competing values. However, the submitter notes that the river systems hold important trout species which are essential to the submitter's activities. The submitter's primary concern is the health of the entire ecosystem not only for trout but for native fish as well and the ability of the public to use the waterways for recreational purposes. The submitter seeks conditions in relation to the use of a single consent that governs all water use activities and takes account of recreational users; the formation of a river advisory committee to improve relationships between river users and the Council; regular reporting of all proposed works and the opportunity to comment prior to the works commencing; flexibility to provide for emergency works; and a review every 10 years.</p>
17	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Oppose	Yes	<p>The submitter recognises the need for flood control activities to continue on this river; however the primary concern is the health of the entire ecosystem, from source to sea. The submitter has concerns that trout are often seen only for recreational characteristics, rather than as an indicator species for the health of the overall river. The submitter has some specific recommendations to mitigate ecological issues such as sedimentation and loss of natural character. The submitter suggests the use of a single wrap-around consent for up to 35 years that governs the multitude of subsidiary land-use, water permit, discharge permit, and coastal permits for individual rivers in order to enable work planning, on-site consultation, and river-specific environmental bottom-lines and precautionary periods within the overall context of adaptive management. They would be supportive of a river advisory committee to improve relationships between river users and the Council, as well as use experience and ideas of iwi, anglers and others in practical river design. The submitter has a keen interest in the works that come within a one metre band from the instream channel and works that involve the loss of habitat associated with loss of bankside or instream vegetation that overhangs or is immediately adjacent to the instream channel. The submitter also seeks specific instream works restrictions (maximum length of disturbance) and time restrictions to provide for migrating fish.</p>