



## MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

**Date:** Monday 10 December 2012

**Time:** 2.30pm

**Venue:** Council Chamber  
Hawke's Bay Regional Council  
159 Dalton Street  
NAPIER

**Present:** K Brown  
A J Dick  
T Gilbertson  
T Hopmans  
N Kirikiri  
R Maaka  
E McGregor  
K Rose  
C Scott  
R Spooner  
E von Dadelszen  
T Waaka  
F Wilson - Chairman  
WW Wilson

**In Attendance:** H Codlin – Group Manager Strategic Development  
EA Lambert – Group Manager External Relations  
S Daysh – Environmental Consultant  
L Hooper – Governance & Corporate Administration Manager

## 1. Welcome/Apologies/Notices

The Chairman welcomed everyone present to the meeting.

### Resolution

RPC24/12 That the apologies from Councillor Remmerswaal for absence and Ms Kirikiri for lateness be received.

**Scott/Waaka  
CARRIED**

## 2. Conflict of Interest Declarations

There were no conflict of interest declarations.

## 2012

### RPC25/12 Resolutions

Minutes of the Regional Planning Committee held on Wednesday, 7 November 2012, a copy having been circulated prior to the meeting, were taken as read and confirmed as a true and accurate record as amended.

**McGregor/Wilson  
CARRIED**

## 4. Matters Arising From Minutes of the Regional Planning Committee Held on Wednesday 7 November 2012

There were no matters arising from the minutes.

## 5. Action Items From Previous Regional Planning Committee Meetings

Ms Lambert advised that the person at MfE responsible for the 'Making Good Decisions' programme has given Mr Ide an undertaking to advise HBRC of the successful tenderer as soon as this is decided. Mr Ide will then contact the successful company regarding holding a programme in Hawke's Bay early in 2013.

### RPC26/12 Resolution

1. That the Committee receives the report "Action Items from Previous Meetings".

**Gilbertson/Spooner  
CARRIED**

## 6. Call For General Business Items

There were no items of General Business

## 7. Tukituki Choices - Responses

Ms Codlin introduced the item, which had been the subject of presentations and discussions at a workshop.

In response to a query, Ms Codlin advised that the water users in the lower Tukituki were being considered in relation to providing water from storage via the river during

low flow periods and that a study into this had been commissioned.

It was noted that 1.6 was more of an explanatory note rather than a key approach.

It was queried whether frost risk had been examined as a limitation for some types of crops in the Ruataniwha Plains area. Ms Codlin advised that frost risk had been examined and informed the studies into appropriate land uses for the area.

Following discussion, the key approaches the Committee endorses are:

1. *Setting water quality limits to maintain the mauri and life supporting capacity of freshwater bodies and associated ecosystems.*
2. *Setting water allocation limits as generally outlined in the Tukituki choices discussion document.*
3. *Setting minimum flow limits based on 90% habitat protection for longfin eel for Waipawa River at SH 2 and Tukituki at Tapairu Rd, transitioning from current over a 3-5 year period.*
4. *Setting minimum flows for Tukituki at Red Bridge based on 90% habitat protection for trout, transitioning from current over a ten year period.*
5. *Allowing applications to be lodged to take water for community irrigation schemes over and above the core allocation limits.*
6. *Setting in stream phosphorus targets as a means of reducing periphyton growth.*
7. *Managing nitrogen for nitrate toxicity based on a 95% ANZECC protection threshold for zone 1, and the 90% ANZECC protection threshold for zones 2, 3 and 5. The 90% species protection level correspond to a very low risk of a minor effect on trout and a negligible risk of insignificant effect on native fish and invertebrate species and are thus considered environmentally conservative.*
8. *Setting nitrogen and phosphorus limits based on current in-stream nitrate and phosphorus levels for Zone 4.*
9. *Reviewing land management policies and practices and regulatory approaches.*

*Explanatory note: Recognising that managing nitrogen for controlling periphyton would at best deliver marginal additional environmental benefit compared to those resulting from a reduction in phosphorus and would require such a large reduction in existing nitrogen leaching levels and that it would have an attendant unacceptable level of economic impact on the landowners, and the district.*

## RPC27/12 Resolutions

That the Regional Planning Committee:

1. Agrees that the decisions to be made are not significant under the criteria contained in Council's adopted policy on significance and that Council can exercise its discretion under Sections 79(1)(a) and 82(3) of the Local Government Act 2002 and make decisions on this issue without conferring directly with the community and persons likely to be affected by or to have an interest in the decision due to the nature and significance of the issue to be considered and decided.
2. Receives the report on Tukituki Choices – Responses.
3. Endorses the key approaches for the development of the Tukituki Plan Change as:

- 3.1 Setting water quality limits to maintain the mauri and life supporting capacity of freshwater bodies and associated ecosystems.
  - 3.2 Setting water allocation limits as generally outlined in the Tukituki choices discussion document.
  - 3.3 Setting minimum flow limits based on 90% habitat protection for longfin eel for Waipawa River at SH 2 and Tukituki at Tapairu Rd, transitioning from current over a 3-5 year period.
  - 3.4 Setting minimum flows for Tukituki at Red Bridge based on 90% habitat protection for trout, transitioning from current over a ten year period.
  - 3.5 Allowing applications to be lodged to take water for community irrigation schemes over and above the core allocation limits.
  - 3.6 Setting in stream phosphorus targets as a means of reducing periphyton growth.
  - 3.7 Managing nitrogen for nitrate toxicity based on a 95% ANZECC protection threshold for zone 1, and the 90% ANZECC protection threshold for zones 2, 3 and 5. The 90% species protection level correspond to a very low risk of a minor effect on trout and a negligible risk of insignificant effect on native fish and invertebrate species and are thus considered environmentally conservative.
  - 3.8 Setting nitrogen and phosphorus limits based on current in-stream nitrate and phosphorus levels for Zone 4.
  - 3.9 Reviewing land management policies and practices and regulatory approaches.
4. Recognises that managing nitrogen for controlling periphyton would at best deliver marginal additional environmental benefit compared to those resulting from a reduction in phosphorus and would require such a large reduction in existing nitrogen leaching levels and that it would have an attendant unacceptable level of economic impact on the landowners, and the district.

**Maaka/McGregor  
CARRIED**

**8. General Business**

There were no items of General Business.

**Karakia** – Mr W Wilson brought the meeting to a close with a karakia.

**Closure:**

There being no further business the Chairman declared the meeting closed at 3.20pm on Monday, 10 December 2012.

Signed as a true and correct record.

**DATE:** .....

**CHAIRMAN:** .....