

# Minutes of Meeting

Subject: Huia Water Treatment Plant (WTP) Upgrade Meeting

Date: 4 February 2016

Time: 6.30pm

Location: Glen Eden Community House, Glen Eden

Attendees: Katherine Russell (KR) (Waitākere Ranges Protection Society), Mels Barton (MB) (Titirangi Ratepayers and Residents Associations), Bruce Harvey (BH) (Waitākere Community Liaison Group ), Janet Clews (JC) (Glen Eden “The Trust”) Karen Baverstock (KB) (Tonkin & Taylor Ltd), Sarah McCarter (SM) (Tonkin & Taylor Ltd), Alastair Stewart (AS) (Watercare Services Ltd) and Simon Greening (SG) (Watercare Services Ltd )

Matters discussed	Action points
<p><b>General</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apologies:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Dr Peter Maddison (Forest &amp; Bird)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Huia WTP Replacement – Stakeholder Engagement Workshop #2: Evaluation methodology presentation was tabled.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Introduction</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AS opened meeting and welcomed those in attendance.</li> <li>• Brief overview of where WSL is at with process.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Site Selection Process</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KB explained site selection process and principles approach</li> <li>• AS elaborated on fatal flaws and how these dropped out</li> <li>• MB queried the colour coding and AS explained the GIS mapping analysis work and site visit purpose.</li> <li>• AS explained that siting a WTP is only part of the package which also included connecting pipes in and out of the WTP.</li> <li>• BH noted the configuration is obviously complex and that would need to be made clear to community.</li> <li>• KB detailed process from long-list to refinement of long-list, followed by MCA and short-listing.</li> </ul>	

<p><b>General Discussion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MB asked if WSL could use Public Works Act 1981 (PWA) to acquire land and when WSL would go to the community. KB noted after landowners were advised. AS noted landowners would be notified early for a no-surprises approach before the community is notified, but PWA was an option for WSL. MB noted it could be major problem if a landowner becomes disgruntled and publicly disagrees with WSL's approach e.g. on social media. Key is to consider timing of community notification to take sting out of potential rumour mill. BH asked why WSL are considering other sites if WSL own land already. AS noted WSL already have concept design for Manuka Rd, but need to consider alternatives. SG explained that vegetation clearance could have significant effects and RMA requires consideration of alternatives.</li> <li>• BH noted the HNZPT is not involved in meeting. SG noted they will be included and the heritage of existing sites are part of the 'story'.</li> <li>• BH raised the point that WSL could collaborate with AT etc. to rearrange roads which could be positive for the community. Particularly a Huia Rd, Atkinson Rd diversion. Especially considering Scenic Dr is gateway to Waitakere. Or moving School crossing from Atkinson Rd 100 yards away.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Site Criteria</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KB discussed each criteria as follows:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cultural                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- KR noted the Local Board is undertaking a cultural heritage study (contact Sandra Coney or Glen Boyd).</li> <li>- BH queried whether Mana Whenua/HNZPT will be consulted. SG confirmed they will be.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Environment                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- MB emphasised the whole area is Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area Act 2008 (WRHAA)</li> <li>- AS noted that beneficially, most flat land (meeting WSLs slope principle), is as a rule grassed, with little bush.</li> <li>- KR queried whether specialists will be involved at shortlist. AS confirmed this.</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Landscape                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- MB highlighted ridgelines in district plan. WSL</li> </ul> </li> </ol> </li> </ul>	

<p>acknowledged these existed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- KR queried whether wider social implications would be considered (i.e. integration of existing site for community benefit and use of public vs private land)</li> <li>- JC noted the existing WTP should be retained and maintained, not like Nihotupu. It is a public asset so should be utilised as part of Waitakere history/story.</li> <li>- All stakeholders agreed some form of “give-back” to community would be well received.</li> </ul> <p>4. Social</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- As per 3 above. In particular, consider wider social implications/community cohesiveness. Suggestion that mothballing the existing site could be perceived as a negative while retaining/enhancing the heritage aspects of the existing site could be a community benefit.</li> <li>- One of the key messages could be that WSL is “our water company” i.e. ownership in project is important.</li> </ul> <p>5. Consenting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- MB drew attention to the fact that any Kauri clearance would not go down well with community members, regardless of mitigation proposed. AS acknowledged that WSL are very conscious of this fact, but cannot discount that this won’t happen.</li> <li>- KR questioned the scoring of consenting risk i.e. how likely is it that an option will not be publicly notified? Agree this is reasonably unlikely.</li> </ul> <p>6. Property (no specific comment was made on this criteria)</p>	
<p><b>General Discussion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BH queried treatment process in light of advanced technology and whether footprint could be reduced. AS responded that worsening water quality that occurs as the catchment matures means the current advanced treatment proposed is what is required and that this is only marginally smaller than existing footprint due to this water quality envelope.</li> <li>• MB asked whether WSL considered putting the WTP underground. AS replied that WSL had not, because it would be cost prohibitive. In saying this, a WTP must be built for 100 year lifespan and is a significant investment.</li> <li>• MB confirmed there is no real opposition to the process provided specialists are used to score criteria.</li> </ul>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• BH agreed but noted it would not be until sites are made available for consideration that any real comment on site selection can be made.</li><li>• BH asked if there is a budget. AS confirmed there is but was based on construction at Manuka Rd.</li><li>• MB queried when next meeting is. KB noted as per schedule will be in March pending how the work progresses.</li><li>• AS thanked everyone for coming and closed meeting.</li></ul>	
---	--