

OTAGO REGIONAL COUNCIL

**Agenda for a meeting of the Policy Committee to be held in the
Council Chamber, 70 Stafford Street, Dunedin on
Wednesday 14 June 2017, following the Regulatory Committee**

Membership:

- Cr Gretchen Robertson** (Chairperson)
- Cr Michael Laws** (Deputy Chairperson)
- Cr Graeme Bell**
- Cr Doug Brown**
- Cr Michael Deaker**
- Cr Carmen Hope**
- Cr Trevor Kempton**
- Cr Sam Neill**
- Cr Andrew Noone**
- Cr Bryan Scott**
- Cr Stephen Woodhead**

Apologies:

In attendance:

**Please note that there is an embargo on agenda items until 10:00am on
Monday, 12 June 2017.**

CONFIRMATION OF AGENDA

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

PUBLIC FORUM

MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 3 May 2017, having been circulated for adoption.

ACTIONS

Status report on the resolutions of the Policy Committee.

Report No.	Meeting	Resolution	Status
2017/0679 Director's report on policy progress to March 2017	22/3/17	<i>Request legal clarification of appropriate mediation reporting to councillors</i>	CLOSED Report 2017/0770 3 May 2017.

PART A – RECOMMENDATIONS

Item 1

2017/0867 **Plan Change 1D: Flow Requirements for River Takes.** DPPRM, 09/06/17

The purpose of the report is to enable continuation of Plan Change 1D as it will provide clarification on the difference between residual and minimum flows, the affects on deemed permit replacement, issues identified with existing plan provisions, outcomes of a plan change and timeframes for plan change.

PART B - FOR NOTING

Item 2

2017/0820 **Director's Report on policy progress to May 2017.** DPPRM, 26/05/17

The report gives an overview of significant activities undertaken by the Policy section for the period 13 April to 26 May 2017, including: national policies, strategies and plans; ORC policy, plans and strategies; water quantity planning; regional transport

The report "*Otago Regional Council Home Heating Survey*", completed by Key Research, 2016, is circulated separately with the agenda.

OTAGO REGIONAL COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the Policy Committee held in the Council Chamber, 70 Stafford Street, Dunedin on Wednesday 3 May 2017, commencing at 1:05pm

Membership: Cr Gretchen Robertson (Chairperson)
Cr Michael Laws (Deputy Chairperson)
Cr Graeme Bell
Cr Doug Brown
Cr Michael Deaker
Cr Carmen Hope
Cr Trevor Kempton
Cr Sam Neill
Cr Andrew Noone
Cr Bryan Scott
Cr Stephen Woodhead

Apologies: Nil.

In attendance: Nick Donnelly
Scott MacLean
Caroline Rowe
Fraser McRae
Lauren McDonald (Committee Secretary)
Dale Meredith
Marian Weaver
Sylvie Leduc

CONFIRMATION OF AGENDA

A correction was noted for Item 1 – Director’s report, advising of appendices to the report as there were no appendices for this item.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

No conflicts of interest were advised.

PUBLIC FORUM

No public forum was held.

MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 March 2017, having been circulated were adopted on the motion of Crs Noone and Cr Hope.

Motion Carried

ACTIONS

Status report on the resolutions of the Policy Committee.

Report No.	Meeting	Resolution	Status
2016/1139 Terms of Reference for the Policy Committee	23/11/16	<i>That the Terms of Reference for the Policy Committee be considered a final version to be presented to the Council on 7 December 2016 for adoption</i>	Adopted at Council meeting 7/2/17. CLOSED
2017/0679 Director's report on policy progress to March 2017	22/3/17	<i>Request legal clarification of appropriate mediation reporting to councillors</i>	Agenda item 3 of Policy Committee – 3 May 2017 CLOSED

PART A – RECOMMENDATIONS

Item 1

2017/0751 **Director's Report on policy progress to April 2017.** DPPRM, 13/04/17

The report provided an overview of significant activities undertaken by the Policy section for the period 10 March to 13 April 2017.

It was noted that section 5 of the report was duplicated in error and that the matter was addressed at the 22 March 2017 Policy Committee meeting.

Discussion was held on preparation of ORC's submission to the MBIE Urban Development Authority discussion document.

Action:

1. The ORC draft submission to be circulated to councillors for their review and feedback.
2. The Policy Committee Chair and Council Chair to review ORC's final submission, prior to 18 May 2017.

It was confirmed that a Council workshop on Residual Flows (proposed Plan Change 1D) to be held on 18 May 2017.

Mr McRae confirmed the outcomes from the Council workshop on the proposed plan change would then be taken to the community for further consultation, prior to any public notification of a plan change.

Moved Cr Woodhead
Seconded Cr Kempton

That this report is noted.

Motion carried

PART B - FOR NOTING

Item 2

2017/0759 **Resource Legislation Amendment Act 2017.** DPPRM, 19/4/17

The report summarised the main legislation changes to the Resource Legislation Amendment Act 2017, and their implications for Council, effective from 18 April 2017.

The full report entitled “*Checklist for councils: New Mandatory actions form the 2017 Resource Legislation Amendments*” was provided in support of the report.

Discussion was held on: a new National Policy Statement for Natural Hazard Management; new provisions for administrative charges for monitoring of permitted activities; the MfE Minister to set new National Environment Standards (NES); impact of new regulations for stock exclusion from waterways, and implementing iwi participation arrangements.

Moved Cr Hope
Seconded Cr Kempton

That the report is received.

Motion carried

Item 3

2017/0770 **Environment Court Mediation.** DPPRM, 20/4/17

The report provided a response to Council request for a legal clarification of appropriate mediation reporting to Councillors.

Moved Cr Neill
Seconded Cr Laws

That the report is noted.

Motion carried

The meeting was declared closed at 2:05pm.

Chairman

REPORT

Document Id: A1011067

Report Number: 2017/0867

Prepared For: Policy Committee

Prepared By: Denise Anderson, Manager Water Quantity and
Marian Weaver, Resource Manager Procedures and Protocols

Date: 8/6/2017

Subject: **Plan Change 1D: Flow Requirements for River Takes**

1. Précis

Plan Change 1D: Flow Requirements for River Takes, addresses operative provisions for setting residual flows on new consents issued in replacement of deemed permits. Experience with the operative provisions shows issues with their administration.

2. Purpose

The purpose of this report is to clarify:

- The difference between residual flows and minimum flows.
- How residual flows affect deemed permit replacement.
- Relationship between residual flows Plan change and minimum flow plan changes.
- Issues identified with existing plan provisions.
- Outcomes of a plan change.
- Timeframes for plan change.

3. Difference between Minimum Flows and Residual Flows

Minimum Flows

Minimum flows are set on the main stems of flow and generally apply, as a condition, to permits taking water above where the minimum is set.

The plan change process inserts minimum flows in Schedule 2 of the water plan. This change process includes scientific, social, cultural, and economic analysis. Also, included is consultation with affected parties and the community.

Residual Flows

Residual flows apply in tributaries (not the main stems of rivers) and as a condition of consent they specify flow of water to be left in the river immediately downstream of a water take. A residual flow condition provides for natural character e.g. water flows in the tributary and ecology values.

Affected parties have a role in determining a specific residual flow as part of consent approval.

4. How Residual Flows Affect Deemed Permit Replacement

There is a total of 1220 surface water take permits in Otago and it is estimated that 280 of these are in main stems and 940 in tributaries. Of these, 400 are deemed permits which will expire 1 October 2021. Of the 400 deemed permits, 66 are in main stems and 334 in tributaries.

People who may be affected by this plan change.

People may be affected by this plan change if their water is taken:

- From a tributary and there is no residual flow condition on their permit.
- Downstream of a main stem minimum flow monitoring site.

People are not likely to be affected where their water is taken from:

- The main stem of a river that has a minimum flow.
- A tributary and their permit has a residual flow condition. It is noted that some existing residual flow conditions could be reviewed in group consent applications.

5. Relationship between Residual Flows Plan Change and Minimum Flow Plan Changes

This residual flows plan change is a parallel process to the catchment specific minimum flow plan changes. The residual flows plan change will have effect on water take consents over all of Otago and each minimum flow plan change effects those in a defined catchment.

6. Issues with the Existing Water Plan Provisions

Administrative experiences have identified issues in the Water Plan relating to residual flows.

Issue 1: Residual flow definition is narrow

The definition of residual flow is narrow in that it addresses only natural character and ecological values. Minimum flows have a wider list of matters for assessment.

Issue 2: Residual flow must be measured at the point of take

The residual flow must be measured at the point of take. The current Plan is not flexible enough for group situations where there are multiple points of take. It does not consider sites where water is taken that are not suitable for measuring flow, or collective residual flow sites.

The Plan could work in a way that with one or more residual flow sites all users could share to ensure that the appropriate flow is met.

Issue 3: There are different views on how residual flows are calculated

At present, there are different views on how residual flows are calculated.

Clarity around the methods for calculating residual flows will help improve certainty, reduce costs of consent processing and the likelihood of ending up in Environment Court processes.

7. Outcomes of the Plan Change

Outcomes of the plan change are:

- Increased certainty for water users when replacing deemed permits.
- Provision for consideration of downstream users and values.
- A clear method to calculate residual flows.
- Group water management support.

8. Community Feedback and Response

An initial series of consultation sessions resulted in a range of community feedback. A brief summary of typical feedback and our response to that feedback follows:

Feedback

The plan change isn't needed as the current provisions are working fine.

It should be done later, and if so, in a more comprehensive plan change which includes other changes to the water plan.

Things are going to be worse for us.

I've already got a residual flow on my permit and you are going to review it and take water way from me.

Economic and use values should be able to be considered alongside ecosystems and natural character so as to ensure a range of matters of relevance are taken into account.

Response

- We have noticed that the residual flow provisions could be better.
- There is already disagreement with affected parties on residual flows for some applications and this leads to a more expensive process.
- The changes are needed in time for deemed permit replacement and group applications.
- The residual flow parts of the plan will be more transparent and certain.
- The BPSFWM requires avoidance of allocation.
- We have no intention to review permits that already have a residual flow condition.
- Existing residual flows may be reviewed in group permit replacement applications.
- The plan change process requires public consultation and assessment of social, economic and ecological matters.

9. Next Steps and time frames for Plan Change

The next steps in the plan change process would be to develop draft options for the plan change and undertake further consultation with the community. The feedback would then be considered and a consultation draft plan change would be developed along with social and economic analyses for further consultation with the community. The Plan Change would then be notified and hearings held if necessary.

From now until a decision on the Plan Change, (assuming there would be hearings) is likely to be 18 months.

10. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council:

Resolve to proceed with Plan Change 1D: Flow Requirements for River Takes.

Fraser McRae

Director Policy, Planning and Resource Management

REPORT

Document ID: A1007170
Report Number: 2017/0820
Prepared For: Policy Committee
Prepared By: Director Policy, Planning and Resource Management
Date: 26 May 2017

Subject: **Director's Report on Policy Progress May 2017**

This directorate report contributes towards:

Strategic Plan Goals:

1. Active resource stewardship
2. Active regional partnerships
3. Realisation of new opportunities

Annual Plan Projects

- G: Governance & Community
- L: Land
- P: Policy Development
- T: Transport
- W: Water

Proposed Regional Policy Statement:

1. Resource management is integrated

1. POLICY RESPONSES

1.1 National Policies, Strategies and Plans

The following were received over the six week period to 26 May 2017:

Agency	Number	Document
Ministry for the Environment	1	National Planning Standards Feedback is sought by 31 July 2017.
Ministry for the Environment/Ministry for Primary Industries	1	Proposed regulations for charging to monitor permitted activities in the National Environmental Standards – Plantation Forestry. This consultation focuses on the ability to charge for monitoring permitted activities. Further input is sought as cost recovery was raised by many councils in the original submission round for the NES Plantation Forestry. The NES is still in draft form.

The following responses were made over the six week period:

Proposal	Response Type	Issues
Urban Development Authorities (Ministry of Business, Employment and Innovation)	Submission	ORC noted its support in principle for making regulatory processes more efficient. However, ORC raised significant concerns with the proposed limited role of regional councils in initial site considerations and standard of urban development; the accountability of any such authority, including how risk is transferred to the community when the authority no longer exists; and RMA reform by stealth.
Clean Water 2017	Submission	ORC noted its support in principle for the target of swimmable water and that Otago's expectations extend beyond just that goal. ORC advocated for change to proposed monitoring requirements and repeated concerns about the applicability of the stock exclusion provisions in the Otago context.

1.2 Territorial Authority and Regional Authority Plan Changes and Resource Consent Applications

The following were received over the six week period to 26 May 2017:

Agency	Number Received	Document type
CODC	1	Resource Consent application
QLDC	6	Resource Consent application
CODC	1	Plan Change
DCC	3	Resource Consent application

While no new responses were made over the six week period, staff had ongoing involvement with proposals by Longshot Ltd, Shotover Country Ltd, Skyline Developments Ltd and the Richmond Street appeal. They also provided further assistance to Dunedin City relating to activity classification and natural hazard management in the development of the city district plan review "2GP".

1.3 Other Proposals

Proposal	Response Type	Issues
None		

1.4 Regional council role re natural hazard risk and territorial authorities

Recently, ORC has submitted on a number of notified subdivision and development proposals with respect to natural hazard risk. The decisions exemplify the emerging tensions created by recent changes in legislation, and mean that it is becomingly

increasingly difficult for ORC to advocate for appropriate management of natural hazard risk.

Two examples relate to the Queenstown Lakes District Council, which has recently released its decisions on resource consent applications by Longshot Limited and Shotover Country Limited. Both were applications for residential development projects adjacent to the Shotover Delta.

ORC opposed both these applications due to the dynamic nature of the risk of flooding in the Shotover River catchment and delta area.

The Shotover Country Limited decision was made under the Housing Accord and Special Housing Areas Act, consequently ORC is unable to lodge an appeal.

Staff considered appealing the Longshot decision, which was for a simple subdivision, but decided that the value of lodging an appeal did not warrant the cost, given the scale of the proposal and the uncertainty around the risk. ORC's evidence noted that the Lower Shotover Delta is a dynamic environment and the extent of the risk is uncertain and not necessarily low but the consequences high. ORC does not presently provide flood protection here and has no plans to provide such protection in future.

Staff propose to write to the QLDC reinforcing ORC's concerns. ORC will reinforce to QLDC it considers the increase in risk through these developments is intolerable to the public, and that ratepayers should not be expected to fund protection works here in future, given that no such risk to people or property currently exists.

It is important that ORC is able to advocate that regard is given to natural hazard risk before land is rezoned, subdivided or developed. Appropriate management of natural hazard risk is essential to protect human health and safety, and property. With the recent RMA reforms and with all of QLDC being identified as a 'high' growth area under the National Policy Statement for Urban Development Capacity and being able to use the special housing legislation, opportunities to have effective input to decision making are being curtailed. This is making ORC's effective delivery of its statutory functions under the RMA increasingly difficult and reinforces the need for ORC to maintain strong lines of communication with our city and district councils.

1.5 Marine and Coastal Area (Takutai Moana) Act 2011 Applications

Applications for the recognition of customary rights of iwi, hapū and whānau in the common marine and coastal area under the Marine and Coastal Area (Takutai Moana) Act 2011 (the Act) closed with the Ministry of Justice on 4 April 2017, six years following commencement of the Act.

This Act repealed the Foreshore and Seabed Act 2004, restoring customary interests within the coastal environment and giving legal through recognition and protection of those interests. Recognition of customary marine title and/or protected customary rights is made in agreement with the Crown or by application to the Court.

Where customary marine title is granted, ORC must consult with the relevant iwi, hapū or whānau when preparing policy statements and plans. For any consent application, written consent from the relevant protected customary rights groups will be required. At the moment, iwi are recognised as being an affected party for any application in the coastal marine area.

Note that public access to the common marine and coastal area is guaranteed by the Act.

ORC has received a copy of two applications, lodged by:

- Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, which covers the entire Otago coast and extends over most of the South Island
- Cletus Maanu Paul, of Ohope, which relates to the entire marine and coastal area of Aotearoa New Zealand.

ORC does not intend to submit on this matter.

1.6 Proposed NES Plantation Forestry regulations

The Ministry for Primary Industries has released a Discussion Document on 'Council charging to monitor permitted activities in the National Environmental Standard for Plantation Forestry' (NESPF) which sets out how councils may recover the costs of the monitoring required to give full effect to the NESPF. Note that the NESPF, which ORC has consistently opposed, has not yet been gazetted, and that the regulations are being assessed against a draft version of the NESPF.

The regulations propose that councils determine what monitoring would be required for plantation forestry activities, and what charges should be set. The forester would be expected to pay for the reasonable costs of monitoring. Charges would be set in the usual way, through the Schedule of Fees and Charges which is consulted on as part of the annual planning process.

ORC remains concerned about the approach being taken in the NES Plantation Forestry as it is based on managing risk rather than adverse environmental effects. The environmental bottom-line set is less stringent than that set in the Water Plan, and will create substantial additional costs, for ORC and foresters, from forestry plan, monitoring and consenting requirements that are not currently required in Otago. There is also likely to be overlap between regional and territorial authority functions, creating inefficiencies and additional costs for all parties involved.

Submissions on the proposed regulations close on Friday 16 June 2017.

1.7 Proposed National Planning Standards

The Ministry for the Environment is now consulting on National Planning Standards. The Standards seek to:

- help achieve the purpose of the RMA
- set out requirements or other provisions relating to any aspect of the structure, format, or content of RMA policy statements and plans to address any matter that the Minister for the Environment considers:
 - requires national consistency

- is required to support the implementation of a national environmental standard, a national policy statement, a New Zealand coastal policy statement, or regulations made under this Act
- is required to assist people to comply with the procedural principles set out in section 18A of the RMA

The Standards are broad in range and it is envisaged that more will be added in time. The first sets of Standards are likely to relate to:

- plan structure and form
- spatial layers
- definitions
- incorporation of national direction
- metrics
- administrative provisions
- mapping
- accessibility of plans online

Mandatory standards are proposed to be incorporated within one year, while discretionary content is proposed to be incorporated within 5 years. This would mean changes to the Regional Policy Statement and regional plans possibly having to be made between April 2019 and April 2024.

A preliminary scan of the MfE proposal raises issues about:

- The simplistic nature of the analysis of policy statement and plan structure, being based on form rather than content
- Analysis being based on many first generation plans, which may now be over 20 years old
- The two structural options proposed being variations on one option, rather than setting out true options
- The lack of integration between the options of topics or themes being reinforced;
- The suggestion that the RPS should preface a single regional plan effectively isolating district plans which need to give effect to the RPS
- The analysis dismisses the structure of Otago's Proposed RPS, without recognising that Otago's RPS structure draws from both the purpose of the RPS, as set out in Section 5 of the RMA, and the Ministry of Health's 'Health in all Policies' framework. The latter framework provides a useful way of looking at the natural environment, the built environment and the activities that people undertake from both a holistic and an individual perspective

Notwithstanding, Otago's Proposed RPS could be re-presented by theme to fit the second option proposed in Discussion Paper E, without need for substantial modification.

Regional councils are currently discussing the possibility of having a shared platform for any ePlan that may be required.

The timeframes proposed to comply with any standards would bring forward plan review work that is already planned in the ORC Long Term Plan 2015-2025.

A RMA practitioners meeting is being held in Dunedin on Tuesday 20 June.

The suite of papers prepared can be found on <http://www.mfe.govt.nz/rma/legislative-tools/national-planning-standards>.

A submission will be prepared as this proposal has significant implications for the development and implementation of all RMA plans at regional and district levels.

2. ORC: POLICY, PLANS AND STRATEGIES

2.1 Review of Regional Policy Statement

Twenty six appeals have been received on the proposed Regional Policy Statement. In addition to most of these parties lodging an interest in becoming party to another appellant's appeal, a further 18 new parties have joined in, as provided for under Section 274 of the RMA.

Two weeks of Court assisted mediation have now been completed, and good progress is being made. One appeal has been resolved, subject to sign off by the Environment Court. A number of other matters have been resolved, subject to how the balance of changes unfolds. Discussions with the various parties are ongoing. A further three and a half days of mediation will be held in the week commencing 19 June.

2.2 Comprehensive Water Quality Strategy

On 26 and 27 April 2017 the Urban Water Quality Strategic Workshop was held at the Dunedin Public Art Gallery, bringing together councillors, key stakeholders and technical experts. Over 60 people participated over the two days, sharing a wealth of ideas and opportunities for working together to achieve good water quality outcomes.

Notes from the workshop have been circulated to Councillors, all participants and placed on the ORC website. The Strategy and Tactics Tree is being further refined, as more parties input to the strategic approach being proposed.

The timeline to complete the Strategy, showing how councillors will be involved, is set out in the table below.

Table 1: Timeline to complete urban water quality strategy

Action	Who	By
1 st draft of strategy prepared for key stakeholders consideration	Urban Water Quality Reference Group	Wed 14 June
1 st draft released to ORC councillors and key stakeholders [city and district councils, iwi, NZ Transport Agency]	Staff	Fri 16 June
Key stakeholders consider 1 st draft	Key stakeholders	Thurs 20 July
ORC councillors feedback to UWQ Reference Group	ORC councillors	Thurs 20 July

1-day workshop with key stakeholders [at Alexandra]	ORC & key stakeholders	Fri 21 July
Finalise strategy	UWQ Reference Group	Wed 26 July
Proposed Strategy considered by Policy Committee	Policy Committee	Wed 2 Aug
Council adopts Strategy	ORC	Wed 16 Aug

2.3 Biodiversity Strategy

Wildland Consultants Ltd and Beca are continuing to progress the draft Ecosystems and Biological Diversity Strategy material. Following the workshop held with councillors in May adjustments are being made to this work programme, to enable engagement with a number of agencies as potential partners, including the city and district councils, iwi and the Department of Conservation. Further time will also be factored in to enable councillors to consider the role of ORC in biodiversity. Table 2 sets out how these matters are to be progressed.

Table 2: Actions to complete biodiversity strategy

Action
Develop draft strategy and potential role of ORC in biodiversity
Initiate strategic partnerships
Further develop strategy with partners
Community consultation on draft
Adopt strategy
Review Pest Management Plan [Project L5 2017-18 year]
Prepare Pest Management Strategy [Proposed RPS Method 6.5]

2.4 Air Strategy

A draft Air Strategy is being prepared which sets out the desired effects of managing air and the tactics for achieving those effects. It will address air management in general, and include specific focus on how ORC intends to work with key stakeholders and the wider community to ensure good quality air and achieve the requirements of the NES Air Quality.

The initial draft will be prepared in a style similar to that for the Urban Water Quality Strategy and will be presented to Council for discussion in the near future, prior to engaging with key stakeholders.

A 'Home Heating Survey' was undertaken by Key Research last winter, to assess perceptions of air pollution and better understand home heating methods in central Otago towns. A total of 400 people were surveyed in July and August 2016, giving a 95% confidence level in survey findings. A copy of this report is included as Attachment 1 to this report.

Some of the findings were:

- Quarter of the respondents considered there is no air pollution problem
- Cost is the biggest barrier to changing home heating to reduce air pollution

- Electricity is the most popular heating source in Otago (65% of households), followed by wood/multi-fuel burners (62%)
- Those living in uninsulated homes spend approximately \$70 per month more on heating than those with insulated homes
- When setting up a new home, an enclosed wood/multi-fuel burner is still the heating source most seriously considered and mostly likely to be selected, followed by electricity
- Convenience is the most important performance attribute associated with using electricity, while affordability is associated with enclosed burners
- Safety, health, warmth, affordability and convenience were more characteristics for home heating than being good for the environment

2.5 Lower Waitaki Aquifer Water Quality

A proposed plan change is being developed to set water quality limits for the Lower Waitaki Aquifer. This project follows from an agreement made with the Lower Waitaki Irrigation Collective (LWIC) as part of the mediation agreement on Plan Change 6A (Water Quality).

At this stage, the proposed plan change is likely to amend Schedule 15.3 by setting water quality limits for the aquifer covering nitrogen and *E Coli*. Such limits would recognise the importance of the aquifer as a source of drinking water for people and stock and the Water Plan's objective of maintaining water quality at its current state or better.

Because of the unique characteristics of this aquifer, with the aquifer draining to the ocean rather than into the Waitaki River and virtually all of the land above the aquifer being under the control of LWIC, a case may be made for nitrogen and *E coli* discharges within the LWIC command area to be managed directly in relation to the aquifer limit, rather than indirectly through the OVERSEER rule, Rule 12.C.1.3.

The timeline in Table 3 sets out how this plan change is planned to progress.

Table 3: Timeline to prepare Lower Waitaki Aquifer plan change

Action	When
Staff meet LWIC members re policy/rule changes	26 June 2017
Resource Science report on aquifer water quality study completed	Feb 2018
Draft proposed plan change	Mar 2018
Consult on proposed plan change	Apr 2018
Notify proposed plan change	Jun 2018

3. WATER QUANTITY PLANNING

3.1 Proposed Plan Change 5A Lindis: Integrated water management

Council received 1 appeal on Proposed Plan Change 5A Lindis: integrated water management, while a further 15 Section 274 parties to the proceedings notices have been lodged.

Environment Court-assisted mediation was held on 8 and 9 December 2016, with some 25 people attending. Further hydrological, cultural, and ecological investigations and a social impact assessment have been undertaken as a result of this mediation.

The parties reported back to the Court on 28 April 2017 on progress and potential dates for reconvened mediation. The appeal was referred back to mediation and court facilitated expert conferencing. Court facilitated expert conferencing will be on 6 June 2017 and mediation will continue in early July pending a date that suits all the parties.

3.2 Development of Proposed Plan Change 5D Cardrona: Integrated water management

Preliminary work is being undertaken to resume the development of an integrated water management plan change for the water resources in the Cardrona catchment and the Wanaka Flats (the Cardrona River, Cardrona Alluvial Ribbon Aquifer and Wanaka-Cardrona Aquifer).

Project management materials (including Terms of Reference, Project Execution Plan, Programme Gantt chart, Risk Register) have been prepared, and existing technical reports are being updated.

The next consultation round on the options for managing water quantity in the catchment is tentatively scheduled for mid-late 2017.

3.3 Development of Proposed Plan Change 5C: Manuherikia Catchment: Integrated water management

Community consultation on options for the plan change occurred on 21-23 March in Oturehua, Omakau and Alexandra. Drop-in sessions were held from 1:00-3:00 pm and 6:30-8:00 pm at each location. At the drop-ins the community had the opportunity to discuss the options with council staff, take information on the options home with them, and provide feedback. Feedback could also be provided via a feedback form, an online feedback form or via email. Feedback has been received from 120 individuals/groups. This feedback is being summarised and the summary made available on the council website.

Along with receiving community feedback, a Social Impact Assessment, Cultural Impact Assessment, and an Economic Assessment are being commissioned. These reports are anticipated to be received in the third quarter of this year.

We will be going back to the community, but not until after the economic and social reports are available. We are continuing to work with the wider community.

A draft plan change will then be developed, using all technical and scientific investigation to date, all consultation feedback, and the economic, cultural, and social reports. The draft plan change will then be workshopped with councillors and consulted with the community for feedback later this year, before a proposed plan change is formally notified.

3.4 Development of Proposed Plan Change 1D: Flow Requirements for Water Takes

The first series of community consultation related to the development of Plan Change 1D: Flow Requirements for Water Takes took place during March 2017. A policy committee workshop held on 18 May 2017 included discussion on the background and likely scope of the plan change. The conclusion from that workshop was that a recommendation to continue to develop the plan change should go to Council. Refer separate report.

3.5 Proposed Plan Change 3E: Arrow catchment and Wakatipu Basin Aquifer

Preliminary work is being undertaken on development of a minimum flow plan change for the surface water in the Arrow catchment, and the connected Arrow Bush Creek Ribbon Aquifer and the Wakatipu Basin aquifers.

Project management materials (including Terms of Reference, Project Execution Plan, Programme Gantt chart, Risk Register) have been prepared and existing technical reports are being updated.

The first stage of consultation is tentatively scheduled for 26-27 June 2017, plus there will be a key stakeholder workshop on 29 June 2017. Letters will go out to the directly affected community in the first two weeks of June. There will also be advertising in the press, information on our website and on radio stations in the Arrowtown/Frankton area as well as posters around the community.

4. REGIONAL TRANSPORT

NZ Transport Agency briefing

Cr Kempton and Dr Turnbull (Manager Strategic and Transport Planning) attended a briefing by NZ Transport Agency CEO and Board member Nick Rogers about the Agency's future direction (Dunedin, 26 May 2017).

Topics discussed included the *Mobility as a Service* (MAAS) pilot, the first of its kind in New Zealand, to be run in Queenstown later this winter. This pilot will trial a solution to traffic congestion that utilises digital, rather than physical roading, infrastructure. MAAS provides information about transport system and travel choices in real time. Customers use digital technology to plan and pay for their travel. For this pilot, NZTA is partnering with QLDC, ORC, and a software company, and is bringing transport providers on board.

Shaping our Future: Queenstown report

The Queenstown Transport Taskforce has sent ORC a copy of its final *Shaping Our Future* transport report. *Shaping our Future* is a community-driven process looking at long term visioning and preferred outcomes for various topics or communities. A taskforce of community volunteers prepared this report, with input from transport experts and consultation with over 300 members of the Queenstown community through two public forums and online feedback.

The report recommends that QLDC lead the establishment of a single transport entity made up of QLDC, NZTA and ORC. Other key recommendations on the following subjects relate to ORC:

1. Integrated strategic planning for transport across the district
2. Research and analysis
3. Public transport
4. Community culture

5. RECOMMENDATION

- a) *That the report on home heating is received.*
- b) *That this report is noted.*

Fraser McRae

Director Policy Planning and Resource Management

Attachment: 'Otago Regional Council Home Heating Survey', by Key Research, 2016