

# WHANGANUI

## PORT

### REVITALISATION

#### ZONE 2 – RECREATION ZONE REFERENCE GROUP

#### AGENDA – Meeting 3

**Date:** 16<sup>th</sup> March 2017  
Room2

**Time:** 5:30pm – 7:00pm

**Location:** Committee Meeting

**Facilitators & WDC Staff:** Henry Crothers (LandLab), Phil Wardale (Wardale), Rowan McGregor (WDC), Bill Carswell (WDC)  
Minute/Note taker: Merle Benson

#### Apologies:

No.	Item	Lead by	Mins
1	Welcome, Apologies	Phil	5
2	Minutes of last meeting	Phil	5
3	The Port Revitalisation Project <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Progress to Date</li><li>- Reference Groups Meetings (March 17)</li><li>- Activity at the Port</li></ul>	Phil	5
4	Master Planning Process to date <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>o Public Briefing</li><li>o Recreation &amp; Marine Reference Group meetings</li><li>o Training &amp; Ferry Reference Group</li><li>o Public Release of the “Working Draft Masterplan”</li></ul>	Henry/Phil	10
5	Feedback to Masterplan <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Reference Group Feedback?</li><li>- Third Party Feedback – FB, Website, Written</li><li>- Open Discussion</li><li>- Masterplan Amendments &amp; Suggestions</li></ul>	Henry	30
7	Next steps - <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Rework of Masterplan</li><li>- Presentation of final Masterplan Plan</li></ul>	Phil/Henry	10

**Next meeting:** TBC – (Estimate 2 weeks)

**Whanganui Port Revitalisation – Zone 2 – Meeting 3**  
**Recreation Zone Reference Group**  
**Minutes**  
**Thursday 16<sup>th</sup> March 2017, 5:30pm**  
**Committee Room 2, Whanganui District Council, 101 Guyton Street,**  
**Whanganui**

**In Attendance:**

Phil Wardale (Wardale Marine Industry Consulting) Henry Crothers (LandLab) Rowan McGregor (WDC) Bill Carswell (WDC) Merle Benson (WDC) Lauren Tamehana (WDC) Peter Tantrum (WDC) Dave Kerwin (WDC) Dave Kenning (WDC) Garry Hawkins (Coastguard)	Bill Russell (Coastguard) Pam Gilligan (Coastguard) Brian Rhodes Barry Edwards Darrell Healey (Fishing Club) Paul Laugesen (Fishing Club) Ken Bradshaw (Wanganui Sailing Club) Bob Davies (Wanganui Sailing Club) Rory Smith (Chamber of Commerce) Cr Jenny Duncan Jamie Waugh
Apologies	Des Warahi (Castlecliff Community Charitable Trust)

<b>1. Welcome</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Phil welcomed everyone to meeting 3 of the Recreation and Community Reference Group and provided an overview of the agenda for the meeting.</li> <li>Phil introduced himself advising he is tasked with delivering the Port Revitalisation project and scoping the Masterplan. Out of the Masterplan will come a Business Case to take to government for funding under the Accelerate25 programme being administered by Horizons. The catalyst for the project is the re-location of Q-West.</li> </ul>
<b>2. Minutes of last meeting</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Phil provided a brief outline of the process to date and mentioning the various reference group meetings that have been held including the Marine Activity Reference Group, the Education and Training Group, the Commercial and Industrial group comprising mainly of business people from the Heads Road area and a special interest Ferry Service group. Good open meetings have been held with minutes from all meetings being available on Council's website at <a href="http://www.whanganui.govt.nz/port">www.whanganui.govt.nz/port</a> for all people to view and follow what has been happening at any other meetings.</li> </ul>

<p><b>3. The Port Revitalisation Project</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Progress to Date</li> <li>• Reference Group Meetings</li> <li>• Activity at the Port</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Phil informed the group that a period of public submission has now been concluded with very positive results. He added he was very pleased with the involvement of the community through social media, Facebook and the Castlecliff community. This enabled the team to respond quickly to questions as they were received. The submissions have been grouped into a summary form to be viewed later in this meeting.</li> <li>• Phil commented that Mayor Hamish has made a public statement around the port upgrade and Midwest Ferries proposal.</li> <li>• Phil added that the project team have tried to address what is now a “competing use” of the wharf area, but to be successful, we all need to know what is happening with Midwest Ferries Ltd.</li> <li>• The Kaikoura earthquake has created even more activity at the port. However, the port was closed for 2 weeks due to a rare weather event which caused a build-up of sand on the bar, so much so that the Anatoki was unable to access the port. This was disappointing, and of course poor timing, but fortunately it is not a regular occurrence and the depth on the bar has now returned to normal and the Anatoki is able to access the port again.</li> <li>• Due to a Council staff restructuring, Allan MacGibbon has now been appointed to the Port Manager’s role.</li> <li>• The project team have been meeting regularly in order to complete the Masterplan and Stage 1 of the business case to be presented to government. However a business plan cannot be completed until the project team is sure everything has been catered for in the Masterplan.</li> <li>• In response to a question regarding the Harbour Master’s role, Rowan McGregor informed the group that a full time Harbour Master’s role was no longer a requirement every time a ship comes in to the port. The Harbour Master role will now have more of a Health and Safety practice to administer and report to Council twice yearly.</li> </ul>
<p><b>4. Master Planning Process to Date</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public Briefing</li> <li>• Recreation and Marine Reference Group meetings</li> <li>• Training and Ferry Reference Group</li> <li>• Public Release of the “Working Draft Masterplan”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Phil advised that the project team has been tasked with creating a working draft Masterplan for the Port Revitalisation project.</li> <li>• There has been a lot of different initiatives suggested with some “competing”, some “mixing of colours” from the earlier zones plan, but generally the initiative’s have been the same.</li> <li>• Tonkin Taylor have been contracted to provide a number of studies on the lower reaches of the Whanganui river and have now issued advice that closing the hole in the training wall will increase the sedimentation along wharf 3 and have signalled that dredging will be required.</li> <li>• So this raises the question that if the recreational area is of such importance then dredging costs will need to be taken into account with an estimate of costs being around \$200k per annum. Phil added however, that no immediate decision needs to be made on this advice as it will be part of the staging process and may become part of the 3-5 year staging, the 5-10 year staging or 10-15 year staging plan. Dredged material from this area could be used in other areas to keep costs down.</li> <li>• In response to a question as to whether a groyne further up the beach had been considered to stop sand drift, but Phil advised that no groyne had been considered but Tonkin Taylor have looked at the re-instatement of the Tanae bank as this would reduce wave swell action</li> </ul>

	<p>further up towards the boat ramp. The Tanae bank could be created using a timber base and then apply dredged material.</p>
<p><b>5. Feedback to Masterplan</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference Group Feedback</li> <li>• Third Party Feedback – FB, Website, Written</li> <li>• Open Discussion</li> <li>• Masterplan Amendments &amp; Suggestions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Henry Crothers provided a presentation on the Masterplan as available on Council’s website.</li> <li>• Henry referred to the overall vision for the project, which is about creating a “place”, having a “collaborative” approach and making the project “successful,” where the waters edge and recreational areas come together in “blue and green”. Allowing good public access; it needs to be “sustainable”, “authentic”, and “complementary” and not detract from other projects such as the Castlecliff rejuvenation project and the Mainstreet regeneration project. There needs to be “mixed use” of the area, “curated” and “flexible. The plan is about managing the proposed access to the current coastal edge, inclusive of the M2C cycle trail and north mole. There needs to be “links” to the water with “view shafts” and “site lines” which create connections of land to sea. Re-establishment of the harbour basin and working port, but also creating a recreational opportunity to remediate the environment.</li> <li>• Henry added, that the development needs to be using what we have to retain the identity of the port, the history, and the stories while maintaining the links with Castlecliff.</li> <li>• Henry suggested that any recreational area is an opportunity to launch cluster organisations.</li> <li>• Any future expansion of the port area could focus on the eastern area, the sheds although old could provide other opportunities and be re-purposed.</li> <li>• Wharf 1 and the centre of the port is recommended for heavier operations and berthage opportunities for fishing boats, tourist operators.</li> <li>• Henry said land resource could be used more efficiently for the balance of the site.</li> <li>• There have been many iterations on this plan and there will be many more, but the challenge is how to manage the Midwest Ferry Ltd proposal in a staged process which may occur over the next 5-10 years or 10-15 years.</li> </ul> <p><b>Midwest Ferries Ltd</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Phil continued the conversation providing information that Midwest Ferries Ltd have been given the opportunity to use Wharf 1 for their operation.</li> <li>• The project team have therefore requested from MidWest Ferries Ltd, boat lengths and draft for the ferries, noting that the draft at Wharf 1 is 4 m. Phil indicated on a map that a marshalling yard area in Morrison Street has also been offered to Midwest and if a ferry service eventuates and expands in the future, then wharf 1 could be extended to cater for any growth.</li> <li>• Phil added that recent media publications from Midwest Ferries Ltd has said that the Masterplan does not provide for a Ferry Service to operate. This is not the case and the Masterplan has given consideration in the plan drawings as to what may or could happen for a Ferry Service to operate from Wharf 1.</li> <li>• However, Maritime NZ have advised Midwest Ferries Ltd that Wharf 1 is</li> </ul>

	<p>not an appropriate place to load a ship. The project team have requested a copy of the Maritime NZ report but to date this report has not been received.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Phil commented that there is now competing use of the area with Cloudy Bay Clams wanting berthage further along wharf 1. The Masterplan has been re-worked to accommodate this with a proposed marshalling area on the previous plan for a Ferry Service being moved to allow for Cloudy Bay Clams to operate from the Morrison Street area.</li> <li>• The project team is meeting regularly with Midwest Ferries Ltd who now have advisers producing a Feasibility Study to assess whether the ferry service is a viable proposition.</li> <li>• The project team is meeting with Midwest Ferries on Monday 20<sup>th</sup> March to advise what the project team would like to see, such as size of ships and the area required for a marshalling yard.</li> <li>• Phil added Cloudy Bay Clams have two vessels at this stage but may increase the number to 10. 160 lineal metres of berthage is available along wharf 1.</li> <li>• A question was raised if Midwest Ferries Ltd come up with a viable business plan, then will their plan fit into the Masterplan?</li> <li>• Henry presented an overlay of Midwest Ferries proposed plan showing the marshalling yard area for the ferry service moved from Morrison Street to the present Q-West yard. This area would need to be re-purposed to a staging area. Midwest’s plan that a very large area is required for a marshalling area and this is why the project team want details in the feasibility study document.</li> <li>• The discussion turned to reclamation which Phil stated is difficult and even daunting considering the new status of the river. He added that Midwest Ferries plan takes away some of the recreation amenities from the original Masterplan so we need to know what impact traffic going on and off boats will have on Heads Road.</li> <li>• Midwest Ferries Ltd is meeting every two weeks, but we don’t want the proposed Ferry Service to be a distraction to this project. We want details around Midwest’s viable plan that will fit in the Masterplan.</li> </ul>
<p><b>6. Comments and Feedback</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Henry and Phil provided an overview of the comments received from submissions and some of the answers to the questions asked. The submissions have been grouped into specific issues such as traffic, recreation, community and culture.</li> <li>• The Masterplan will be reviewed again after receiving Midwest Ferries Ltd’s feasibility study.</li> <li>• Conversations are ongoing with Iwi who are supportive of the plan.</li> <li>• Reports are feeding back to WDC Holdings Ltd on a regular basis.</li> <li>• A discussion evolved around boat parking and the distance from the ramp which could make launching and retrieving too lengthy.</li> <li>• In response to a question regarding boat launching fees, Rowan explained that Council is supportive of some type of pay and display for parking or launching.</li> <li>• A concern was raised about the M2C trail ending at the North Mole and asked if there was a plan to upgrade the area from Wharf 1 to the mole or will there be some indication that “this is the north mole” you have “reached your destination”. It was felt that there needs to be</li> </ul>

	<p>something to mark the end of the trail.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rowan responded advising that a conceptual plan to upgrade from Wharf 1 to the North mole has costs at around \$16.5m. Council has discussed this with Horizons with question being raised as to who pays? Rowan added that any upgrade would be a staged process.</li> <li>• Tonkin and Taylor have provided a report on the South Mole and they have noted that the sea is breaking through in parts. There is a programme to repair the South mole over a ten year period in order to protect the port area.</li> <li>• Phil advised there is no justification to re-engineer the port to exit by the airport.</li> <li>• In response to a question regarding the railway lines, Phil advised the old Q-West site is an appropriate location for a railway terminus/container port as there are two lines available. He suggested to have the railway extended into the port area, further engineering would be required as the port infrastructure would require major upgrading to enable this to happen. Also with the M2C trail meandering through the port area, this would not be able to happen if rail was also part of the working port area.</li> </ul> <p><b>Priorities:</b></p> <p><b>When asked what the groups preferred priorities were, the following suggestions were made:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Provide a jumping/diving platform away from boat launching facilities in order to deter swimmers from diving into the water near the boat ramp;</b></li> <li>• <b>Close the hole in the wall and start the reclamation for the recreational area;</b></li> <li>• <b>Tidy up what's at the port now;</b></li> <li>• <b>Increase the water depth with dredging;</b></li> <li>• <b>Put the wheels in motion to re-instate the Tanae bank.</b></li> </ul>
<p><b>7.</b></p>	<p><b>The meeting closed at 7:27 pm.</b></p>