

**PRE-HEARING MEETING REPORT OF CHAIR PRESIDING PURSUANT TO SECTION 99 OF THE
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991 (RMA)**

**PŌRANGAHAU AND TE PAERAHI WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANTS RESOURCE CONSENT
APPLICATION**

INTRODUCTION

1. I was appointed by the Hawke's Bay Regional Council (HBRC) pursuant to s99 of the RMA to chair a pre-hearing meeting regarding the application made by Central Hawke's Bay District Council (CHBDC) for the Pōrangahau and Te Paerahi Wastewater Treatment Plants (WTP), application reference APP-126770.
2. This report sets out the key matters discussed by the parties attending the meeting, and the issues that were agreed and the issues that are still outstanding.
3. I was able to access the application materials, background information, s92 request and response and all submissions on the HBRC website prior to the pre-hearing meeting.
4. An agenda for the meeting was pre-circulated.

PARTIES ATTENDING

5. This meeting took place on Monday 27 June 2022 at the Council Chambers at CHBDC commencing at 0900 and concluding at 1600.
6. Present at the meeting were:
 - Mr Darren de Klerk – CHBDC (applicant)
 - Mr Hamish Lowe – Lowe Environmental Impact (Technical Advisor to applicant)
 - Ms Fiona Clark – CHBDC (applicant)
 - Mr Sven Exeter – Mott MacDonald (Consultant Consents Planner for HBRC)
 - Mr Paul Barrett – HBRC (Team Leader)
 - Mr Josh Lloyd – CHBDC (applicant)
 - Mr Reynold Ball – Hawke's Bay DHB (submitter)
 - Ms Jen Cruickman – Hawke's Bay DHB (submitter)
 - Mr Jeremy Tipene – submitter
 - Ms Morehu Smith - Ngāti Kere MACA Working Party (submitter)
 - Mr Jim Hutchinson – Ngāti Kere MACA Working Party (submitter)
 - Mr Anthony Tipene-Matua – Rongomaraeroa Chair and Te Tore o Puanga representative (submitter)
7. Present online were:
 - Ms Erin Petuha - Ngāti Kere MACA Working Party (submitter)
 - Shane Kelly – Coast and Catchment (technical advisor to HBRC)
 - Neeraj Pratap - Pattle Delamore Partners Ltd (technical advisor to CHBDC)
 - Hilary Lough – Pattle Delamore Partners Ltd (technical advisor to CHBDC)
 - Chris Moore – Beca (technical advisor to CHBDC)
 - Garrett Hall – Beca (technical advisor to CHBDC)
 - Nick Dempsey – Mott MacDonald (technical advisor to HBRC)
 - Oliver Hunt – Pattle Delamore Partners Ltd (technical advisor to CHBDC)

- Sam Morris – Lowe Environmental Impact (technical advisor to CHBDC)
- Mark Bellingham - Pattle Delamore Partners Ltd (technical advisor to CHBDC)

THE APPLICATION AND ACTIVITY PROPOSED

8. The application is for a staged resource consent to replace the existing consents and treatment ponds at Pōrangahau and Te Paerahi with a new combined wastewater treatment plant and land discharge scheme.
9. This wastewater treatment plant and land based discharge would be located at the Best Practicable Option (BPO), a property at 474 Beach Road, Pōrangahau. This is an existing rural property located in between the settlements at Pōrangahau and Te Paerahi.
10. The current wastewater systems involve:
 - A treatment pond and discharge direct to the Pōrangahau River that serves Pōrangahau township.
 - A treatment pond and discharge to land (into the coastal foredunes) at Te Paerahi.
11. The resource consent application is proposed to be staged as follows:
 - Stage 0 - allowing the continued discharges to occur at both sites for up to 6 years at Te Paerahi and 9 years at Pōrangahau.
 - Stage 1 – commencing within 4 years of the consent application being granted, the Te Paerahi discharge to land will cease and treated wastewater from Te Paerahi piped to the new wastewater treatment and discharge at 474 Beach Road.
 - Stage 2 – commencing within 6 years of the consent application being granted, the Pōrangahau treated wastewater to be piped to 474 Beach Road and discharged in the same manner as the Te Paerahi wastewater. Discharge to the Pōrangahau River to generally be linked to wet weather events with discharges occurring when flows in the river are above median flow. The treatment pond will not be removed.
 - Stage 3 – commencing within 9 years, the combined wastewater treatment system at 474 Beach Road will be operation and allow for 40ha of irrigation. The wastewater treatment pond at both Te Paerahi and Pōrangahau will cease to be used for treatment and the pond at Te Paerahi will be decommissioned.
12. The main driver behind this proposal is to remove the discharge of wastewater to the sand dunes at Te Paerahi and the Pōrangahau River, with the support of the community and iwi. This process is also heavily influenced by the Long Term Plan process that CHBDC must follow and the timeframes for the stages are in part constrained by the budget allocated to this project.

SUBMITTERS MATTERS DISCUSSED

13. Ms Erin Petuha spoke on behalf of the Ngāti Kere MACA Working Party and read through their submission. Hard copies of this submission were also circulated to members of the pre-hearing who attended in person.
14. Ms Petuha acknowledged the work the CHBDC has done to get the process to this point and that is appreciated by Ngāti Kere. Ngāti Kere have been waiting for a long time for these discharges to be ceased and have had assurances from CHBDC in the past that these discharges were going to cease by 2017.
15. The main points addressed by Ms Petuha included:

- The remediation of the pond sites should be planned with the Ngāti Kere Hapu Authority in relation to Pōrangahau township pond, and the Te Paerahi Puke Puke Tau Hinu Trust in relation to the Te Paerahi pond.
- Ngāti Kere have concerns about the location of the proposed wastewater treatment disposal area and want stricter conditions over the location of the plant in order to protect sites of cultural significance.
- Want assurances that the BPO is suitable for discharge to land, taking into account waahi tapu, soil type, flooding and climate change.
- Ngāti Kere want continual engagement with CHBDC on the proposed siting of the WTP.
- Have concerns about the ongoing access/lease agreements with the private owners of the BPO and CHBDC. A lot of money will be spent on the new system and Ngāti Kere are looking for reassurance that this will not end up in a situation where access to the land is not continually assured by the land owners.
- Final design plans have not been provided, a lot of what has been provided to date is conceptual. Details missing including storage size on site and the timeframes for how long it will take for the existing ponds to be decommissioned.
- Notes that there are other consents not yet applied for by CHBDC.
- Notes that the discharge from the existing pond in Pōrangahau is called a wetland, this is more like a drain. It will be appropriate for CHBDC to do some more work on this, with more planting, to act as a better filter in time.
- Ngāti Kere is looking for an appropriate monitoring and maintenance programme. Effective monitoring at the WTP. Understand that a number of conditions have been proposed to cover this.
- Very important to note that onsite training is important, and understand that the WTP will be a partnership between the owners of the land, the Stoddards, and CHBDC. Have suggested some conditions around the consent holder being trained and requiring compliance with conditions. A copy of this consent should be on site at all times.
- Important to Ngāti Kere is surface water quality, public health, ecological values, associated cultural values, the Pōrangahau River catchment.
- Ngāti Kere expect that the discharge to land at the new site will result in less contaminants entering the water compared to now. Would expect the contaminant levels to be less than what they currently are.

16. Ngāti Kere is supportive of:

- Improvements to the wastewater treatment system and the microbial risk assessment. Supportive of the implementation of UV filtration to minimise impacts on public health.
- The closed systems.

- Would like to hear more about anything else that will improve the treatment of the wastewater.
17. Mr Hutchinson also spoke on behalf of the Ngāti Kere MACA Working Party and expressed concern that they do not want a recurrence of what has happened in the past. There is concern about flooding on the BPO. How will CHBDC provide assurances to the community, as these promises have been made in the past. Important to have a partnership, to have this written into the consent.
18. Mr Tipene-Matua made comments that referenced the long history of this project with CHBDC and the ongoing work CHBDC has done with the community. Believes the site to be the BPO and supported the field trip the group took to Horowhenua to look at similar schemes. Supported ongoing partnership and engagement with all parties.
19. Mr Tipene spoke to his submission with the main points being:
- He is unsure of the exact treatment process, and would like more information on the process and system proposed.
 - Requested the current flowrates for the last two years. Would like more information on how growth rates have been determined.
 - Noted that there has been a noticeable change in the health of the river. Farming has also had an effect. Concerned that removing the effluent from the river won't have that much of an improvement, hence wanting the flowrate information.
 - Has concerns about discharging the effluent to land. In the summer there is very little grass on the land, how will nutrients be absorbed? If this was to runoff the land into the river next to the discharge site that is worrying as this is a part of the river used as by the community.
 - Believes that proposed consent timeframe of 35 years is too long.
 - What is the cumulative effect of the two treatment plants being located on one block of land?
 - Odour could be an issue, would like more information.
20. Ms Smith requested to speak further on behalf of the Ngāti Kere MACA Working Party, her main points being:
- Ms Smith has a long history with the area and community and has seen species of fish disappear from the area. While she likes the system that she saw as part of the field trip to Horowhenua, she is not convinced that this is the correct system for the community.
 - Agrees that moving the discharge out of the sand dunes is the right thing to do.
 - Concerns about flooding and correctly identifying surrounding streams and waterways.
21. Mr Ball from the DHB presented to his submission.

22. Requested that the submission be taken as read and made the following points:

- Is there a better option, was there more suitable land? Would like to understand in more detail how the BPO was chosen.
- Agrees with other submitters that the specifics of the system are not known.
- Considers 9 years to stop the discharge in Pōrangahau is too long.
- Considers the 35 years for the consent term is too long. Acknowledged the financial input from CHBDC.
- Requests constant review, monitoring and auditing of the proposal. Expect that CHBDC will be reviewing this consent consistently.

23. Mr Tipene-Matua provided final comment on his submission:

- Commended CHBDC for their work so far and has concerns that other submitters seem to be changing their mind and not supporting the BPO as previously.
- The BPO has good mitigation measures on site, such as the sand dunes in front of the awa.
- Whole coastline is waahi tapu as it has a long history of settlement and occupation. Would like to see more young people come back to the area to get involved with this korero and help to protect the land.

HBRC RESIDUAL ITEMS

24. Mr Exeter has spoken to the CHBDC team about this, the following points are outstanding:

- Potential for water quality to still be diminished in the Pōrangahau River by combining two systems as set out in the PDP review (March 2022).
- Classification of wetlands, site 8.
- Fine tuning the consent conditions.
- Mr Dempsey noted the potential for WTP, network and pump station wastewater overflows which have not been included in the consent application package. CHBDC replied noting that this is under the 'other consents' and other overflows. Mr Dempsey noted the inflow and infiltration (I/I) in the network needs to be addressed.
- Mr Cressey noted that the QMRA assessment of human health risks, feel that a couple of decisions in the modelling that may underestimate the risks, another look taken at that.
- Mr Kelly requests tweaks to the conditions for monitoring, some further work required here.
- Mr Exeter also noted the WTP, higher nutrient concentrations and RMA scope implications.

SUMMARY OF TOPICS TO DISCUSS

25. The Chair provided a list of topics that the pre-hearing meeting could now cover based on the submissions:

- Details
- Location of site
- Funding
- Timeframe
- River health
- Cultural sensitivity
- Communication
- Management and Monitoring
- Other consents

RESPONSE FROM CHBDC AND MR LOWE - DETAILS

26. Mr De Klerk noted that there is a draft set of conditions, and some conditions have been left vague, there is further work to be done. Section 7 of the application provides information on volumes and flowrates.

27. Mr Lowe: Proposed plant will be a biological trickling filter.

28. Challenge is how to build, build for 35 year growth, or build for 10 years and add on. Challenges with the timing of communities coming on line. Decision has been made for Te Paerahi to go first.

29. Storage pond will allow for buffering, if conditions not right for irrigation, can hold back some of the treated wastewater until the right conditions exist. Still a lot of detail to be worked through which is common to infrastructure projects of this type. CHBDC are investigating a district wide overflows strategy and biosolids strategy.

30. Considers that the scope of the consent is how CHBDC will meet the discharge and monitoring requirements of the consent conditions, not the specifics of the details of treatment plant option.

31. Reiterated the stages of the consent:

- Stage 0: Allow CHBDC to continue with current activities
- Stage 1: Line from Te Paerahi, set up irrigation on site and use existing site. Use existing pond for treatment and new pump station. Once complete will cease discharge onto sand dunes. 4 years.
- Stage 2: Within 6 years, pipe from township, pump station and first stage of the treatment system. Does not remove all of the discharge from Porangahau River.
- Stage 3: Wetland site 8, storage pond 35,000m³ to hold all flows in times when can't irrigate.
- Some restoration and remediation proposed. While discharging up to 9 years, a UV filtration system will be installed.

32. CHBDC will acquire the land that the storage plant and treatment plant will go on. Remaining land will be an access track. Currently undetermined how the pond will be built and installed.

33. Mr Tipene asked if the biological trickling filter was chosen as it removes nutrients? And would it include “ion” treatment?

Mr Lowe responded that it is primarily to reduce the organic matter, so that it doesn't produce a negative impact. Nutrients are a lot less than what you'd get from fertilizer. Nitrogen and phosphorus limits will be set by consent conditions. What will be discharged probably about half of that limit.

The biological trickling filter is not intended to take nutrients out, but will put in a form that when irrigated will be able to be used by plants. Also reduce the pathogens in the water, salmonella, campylobacter etc, need a reasonably clear liquid to do that. Harder to treat if not clear liquid. Clarifier will allow solids to take out.

Pōrangahau is isolated. The treatment plant has to be robust enough to withstand any outages. Some plants require a worker on site daily and a regular power supply. MCA (multi criteria analysis) – score the desires for what you want to achieve. Biological trickling filter came out on top, as it has resilience and not needing an operator input. Want to minimise how much solids is trucked to landfill. **Outcome:** MCA WTP Options Report to be provided to submitters and HBRC.

34. Mr De Klerk talked through the map and different soil types identified. Confirmed that the stream (coloured green on the map) is the Waipaoa Stream. Considered to be of significance. Different soils identified. Don't have to irrigate the whole farm, only need 40ha for the 35 year timeframe. Two forms of irrigation proposed, yellow area will be sprinklers on posts, will be able to turned on and off remotely. In purple area, irrigation proposed is more flexible, pod irrigation systems, impact systems and can be moved around the paddock. Purple – about 100 days a year. Yellow – used throughout the year. Storage pond provides buffering.

Mr Barrett asked who decides how irrigation happens?

Mr Lowe - two parts to the system, one is receiving and one is discharging. Ultimate responsibility is with the CHBDC. Relationship with the farmer, agreements sets out who does what.

Mr Hutchinson – is there stock and farming being undertaken on the site at the same time?

Mr Lowe - yes, will need a gap between when you irrigate and when you put the stock back in the paddock. Management of the farm and fencing needs to change to accommodate this. Farmer looks after the irrigation themselves, within the rules. One of the outcomes of this process is the consent conditions, part of this will relate to the management. Monitoring as well. Decisions made by the farmer.

Mr De Klerk - could turn off the flow if farmer doesn't comply with the consent. There will be mechanisms for getting out or selling the land.

Mr Lowe - animals on silty soils will result in compaction, on the sand not so much. Idea is that when the soil is wet and there could be compaction, don't irrigate. One of the reasons why this property was selected, variance of soil type that would allow the range of irrigation options. Good soakage options. Difference between the soils, measured the texture and the infiltration within the soil. Purple area – will have limitations in winter, will get compaction

from stock and will have a runoff risk. Runoff is a no, if there is a runoff the system is failing. Yellow soils can have infiltration all year.

35. Mr Hutchinson asked about how the discharge and system will be monitored.

Mr Lowe - A lot of instrumentation. SCADA allows an overview through a lot of different monitoring gadgets. Remote monitoring and activation. Have monitored through bores and monitoring points. There is a control system to be able to turn the system on and off and also what parts of the system to turn on and off. Builds a record as well. Stoddard's cannot overapply, the system will shut down and if they reach maximum application they will not be able to override that. Reporting undertaken in conjunction with the farmers. Change practices accordingly.

Discussion between submitters and the CHBDC confirmed that the HBRC will be required to undertake monitoring and CHBDC will provide annual monitoring to HBRC.

36. Mr Lowe addressed concerns about flooding – In 2004 there was a flood on the property. The flat land between the road and the stream and hayshed doesn't flood. Where the treatment plant will go, high dune ridge doesn't go underwater.

LOCATION OF THE SITE

37. Mr Ball asked about why the site was chosen as the BPO.

Mr Lowe - in terms of developing options and looking at sites. Standard process – look at criteria that you want. Characteristics:

- Property size
- Soil types
- Slope
- Depth to groundwater
- Then look at whether land actually available, the Stoddards land was the most favourable due to size and sand dunes.

Technical process at looking at suitability of land, balance with other factors such as the acceptability for tangata whenua, there are many known waahi tapu sites. Need to avoid those locations.

Mr Tipene noted that the soil type being a sandy loam is ideal, but concern is the nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus) draining and leaching into the river which is a key outstanding issue. Conceptually it is fine to spray treated wastewater onto the land but there is no significant buffer from the river and Mr Tipene is not convinced about the proposed WTP technology.

Mr Lowe responded that the soil acts as a big filter. At a high rate, water can pass straight through. Want to ensure that the rate doesn't leach through to the ground water system. Having stock come along and grow grass is an important part of the system.

38. Mr Tipene asked if there was a green belt from the river?

Mr Lowe - Yes, a buffer applies to the estuary. Setback was 30m and now increased as estuary considered to be a wetland, NESFM requires no discharges within 100m. There is plenty of room but don't want to only consent 40ha get too constrained. There is a riparian margin already, the Stoddards will continue to own this and this is already partially planted.

Mr Hutchinson noted that Ngāti Kere have not had a chance for buy in with this riparian strip, would like the opportunity to be in charge of it.

Mr De Klerk responded that the buy in with Ngāti Kere is through the upskilling of rangitahi. CHBDC cannot commit to any third party involvement with the riparian strip.

Mr Lowe – could be an agreement outside of this consent.

Mr Hutchinson – that would make hapū a stakeholder in the venture. Mr De Klerk agreed that cultural monitoring, scientific monitoring and planting along the stream could sit in a partnership agreement.

39. Mr Tipene asked about odour, could this be a problem? Mr De Klerk responded that there will be a buffer zone between the site and the road. A weather station will be installed on the site to inform of weather conditions, further details to be worked out. Reminded submitters this is not raw sewage pumped onto the site, it is treated.

Mr Lowe reiterated that if there is an odour the system is not working properly. Part of this process is to choose the right plant options. Consent conditions will limit the discharge of objectionable odour beyond the property boundary.

40. Mr Ball asked the submitters if they thought that the chosen site was the right site. Mr Tipene-Matua confirmed he believed it was. Mr Hutchinson believed that the questions were answered in this session and this is the right piece of land. Mr Tipene did not believe it is the ideal spot given the proximity to the river.

Mr Tipene requested that the discharge is kept as far back from the river as possible and wanted consideration of a wetland system. Mr Lowe confirmed knowledge of wetlands in Hunterville, Fielding, Ōtāne, Waipawa and Waipukurau that have all failed as they are not managed properly. Mr De Klerk confirmed CHBDC wish to stick with proven methods as much as possible and use a trusted process. Mr Lowe confirmed that the discharge will be at least 100m from the estuary.

FUNDING

41. Mr De Klerk expressed concern from CHBDC that if the consent duration was shorter than 35 years it is a lot of money for CHBDC to prepare the consent materials, then build the WTP and acquire the necessary lease for the land. CHBDC have approved the funding in the LTP for the capital expenditure for the first 9 years. CHBDC will have first rights of refusal on the land if Stoddards wish to sell.
42. Mr Tipene-Matua asked if it would take 9 years before the marae at Pōrangahau can connect to the system. Mr De Klerk announced that CHBDC have been successful in getting \$300k from the tourism infrastructure fund to help with this, hopefully connection within 12-18 months. This connection agreement can be in the side agreement to this consent.

TIMEFRAMES

43. Mr De Klerk reiterated that the length of the consent is very important to CHBDC, an expectation that the consent life is as long as possible to justify the expense. Monitoring and

review conditions are expected to ensure that if further capital investment is needed in the future this is known.

44. Mr De Klerk stated that the 9 year time frame to cease discharge in Pōrangahau is realistic, as CHBDC don't want to over promise, there is a lot to do in between now and then. Doing it faster will cost more and the funding has already been set in the LTP.
45. Ms Petuha asked why the ponds needed to be used, could everything not be piped to the new system and cease the use of the ponds?

Mr De Klerk – the Te Paerahi pond will not be needed. Pōrangahau pond will be needed as a capture in high rain events only. The alternative is to have significant underground chambers next to the pump station which will be expensive.

Ms Petuha stated that the issue with this is that it is difficult where decisions not made on details. Those two ponds are in waahi tapu areas, these sites need to be remediated. Can't see any other way to avoid having to go through this process again if you can't achieve what you want to in the timeframes set out. When the 6 year and 9 year consents expire you have the opportunity to apply to renew as long as those ponds exist - this is the problem that the submitters see.

Mr Lowe – Te Paerahi pond will be decommissioned probably within the next 4 years if not sooner. The question is Pōrangahau, and what is that pond going to be used for in the future. One option is to decommission, other option is to repurpose, still wastewater, used as a calamity pond to capture and avoid overflows from pump station to river. If it was used, discharge would be back into the pipeline.

Ms Petuha said that the submitters understand that is the intention, just don't want to be put in a position where CHBDC seek to renew the consent. Other than remediating both pond sites, can't see how this stops this reapplication risk. Very happy to hear Te Paerahi pond will be remediated in 4 years, this can be worked into conditions. What we are looking for is the Pōrangahau pond to be remediated before the consent expires.

Mr de Klerk said that more work would be needed to give that assurance. Mr Exeter stated that a condition could be crafted around that. Mr Lowe believed that condition would be ultra vires as it is out of scope, this was not agreed to Ms Petuha.

RIVER HEALTH

46. Mr Hall shared some images of the monitoring sites. One of the existing conditions is to have upstream and downstream monitoring. Ecology sampling did not show any adverse effects on the discharge. The bridge is the boundary between upstream and downstream monitoring. Discharge can be year-round, no discharge to overland flow path. Some opportunity to remove further nutrients from the soil given the soils in the area. Confident around the improvement in the water quality and ecological health.

Mr Lowe - The monitoring has been undertaken for 15-20 years, the monitoring shows that there is minimal change between the upstream and downstream health. Upstream is influenced by range a contributors to the river.

Mr de Klerk – this is within a catchment management process, the discharge is one of many contributors to river health.

Ms Petuha noted that this is a good point, that there are a number of upstream contributors, but this does not give the wastewater discharge a pass, it must be looked at as part of the cumulative impacts. Mr Exeter agreed – cannot say that there is no effect from the current discharge.

Mr de Klerk – CHBDC agrees, regardless of the effect the current discharge is having, CHBDC committed to putting in UV and filtration for the time this discharge remains.

47. Mr Tipene-Matua asked if cultural factors have been taken into account as well, as the cultural indicators would show that this isn't the case at all that there is no effect, the river is in dire straits.

Mr Hall – understands that there has been a cultural values assessment done and understands why there is a cultural offence from the discharge. Would like kaumatua involvement to understand the history of the area.

Mr Lowe – this can be part of the side agreement.

Ms Petuha - Mātauranga Māori assessment hasn't been done, so looking at cultural monitoring. If there is a problem found, where in the consent is there an opportunity to make changes?

Mr de Klerk - we envisage this in a 5 yearly system review, we will provide these updated consent conditions.

48. Ms Petuha – any levels for the contaminants been set yet? This is in reference to the question marks in the consent conditions.

Discussion was had between Mr Exeter, Mr Lowe and Mr Hall about nutrient loads. Mr Exeter stated that based on the PDP review, the nitrogen and phosphorus loads to Pōrangahau River are expected to increase. Legislation requires maintain or reduce. Would be down to population growth, so more mahi to be done in the technical space and in the background relative to what the scheme can actually achieve.

Further discussion on the nutrient mass load comparison, as the numbers will be going up due to Te Paerahi being bought into the catchment, as currently discharging to the coast. Mr Exeter wants CHBDC to look at how this will meet the intent of the legislation and Mr Exeter will investigate this too.

This was not agreed on and a separate experts meeting will be needed to discuss these matters.

COMMUNICATION

49. Mr Tipene-Matua – Ngāti Kere Hapū will want a communication strategy.

Mr Lowe – this will be expanded on in conditions, some conditions drafted:

- Condition relating to land disturbance – prior to any land disturbance, consent holder to notify Ngāti Kere Hapū Authority.

- Design plans and reports to be provided to Ngāti Kere Hapū reps prior to the confirmation of these plans.

Ms Petuha reminded Mr Lowe that 10 days will not always be practicable, the timeframes need to be able to allow for everyone to be involved.

FURTHER POINTS

50. Ms Petuha – would like to see the list of consents applied for.

Mr Lowe – this can be provided, along with a timeline and feedback for the design.

51. Mr Exeter – potential overflows for the entire scheme, making sure there is no potential wastewater overflows in any time that isn't an emergency.

Mr Lowe – work being done on this.

52. Ms Petuha – would like more information on the system design. Mr Lowe to provide.

53. Mr Tipene-Matua requested another site visit with MACA, David Tipene-Leach and CHBDC.

54. Mr Barrett – a late submission was received yesterday from David Tipene-Leach from the Ngāti Kere Hapū Authority. HBRC recommend that this be accepted.

Ms Clark confirmed CHBDC happy to accept this submission.

55. Mr Lowe – number of conditions being worked on and draft consent conditions will be circulated to submitters before providing them to HBRC.

COMPLETION OF MEETING

56. Agreed between all parties that it was likely a further pre-hearing meeting would be likely, and/or an experts conference. The chair understood that a further meeting between CHBDC and the Ngāti Kere MACA Working Party was to be held on Wednesday 29 June 2022.



Alison Francis
Pre-hearing meeting chair
07/07/2022