

Canterbury Regional Council

Proposed Plan Change 6 (Wairewa)

to the

partially operative Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan

MINUTE OF HEARING COMMISSIONERS

on further preparations for hearing of submissions

[Minute 3]

INTRODUCTION

The hearing commissioners have had the opportunity of reading Proposed Plan Change 6, the supporting material, the submissions and the evidence. Two matters have arisen out of this material.

S42a REPORT QUESTIONS OF HEARING PANEL

First, we have some questions for the council and attach a question table prepared by Commissioner Kitson as Appendix 1. We request the Council to provide answers in writing at the hearing.

PLANNING EXPERTS CAUCUSING

Second, we note that the provisions as proposed by the Council are sought to be amended in a number of respects by Mr Bryan McGillan, the planning witness for Ngai Tahu. It seems apparent from reading the documentation that the objectives sought are similar but the planning pathways to achieve those objectives diverge at times. We are of the view that there would be considerable benefit for the planning witnesses to meet or caucus in an endeavour to narrow the issues.

We accordingly request the planning witnesses to meet and prepare an expert witness statement setting out the matters on which they agree and the matters on which they disagree, with the reasons why. The statement is to be made available by Tuesday 19 April 2015.



Gordon Whiting for and on behalf of the Panel

11 April 2016

Appendix 1

Proposed Plan Change 6 (Wairewa) to the Land and Water Regional Plan

Hearing Panel Questions on s42A Report

Paragraph #	Section	Question background	Questions
Overall comment		Schallenburg and Schallenburg 2013 notes the importance in managing for N & P in ICOLLs.	How has the council identified and discounted any issues with managing just Phosphorous loads and not Nitrogen?
Overall comment		Schallenburg & Schallenburg 2013 highlights the key role that the opening regime plays on the ecology of ICOLLs.	How have the effects of opening on the ecology of the Lake and has this been incorporated into PC6?
2.7	Improving WQ & Ecosystem Health w/in Lake Forsyth/Te Roto o Wairewa	There is a statement that PC 6 sets limits for Total P, TN, Chla, ammoniacal nitrogen and <i>E.Coli</i> that meet bottom lines for lake ecosystem health	<p>TLI is an outcome in table 10(b) could the officers please elaborate on the certainty that setting FW Outcome for the Lake of TLI 6 (supertrophic) will meet the bottom lines set for TP & Chla (as set out in Table 10(e)).</p> <p>To my understanding the bottom line for TN in the Lakes table in appendix 2 (NPSFM 2014) does not apply to ICOLLs. How was the bottom line for Lake Forsyth/Te Roto o Wairewa calculated?</p> <p>What are the current Nitrogen concentrations in the Lake? And how do they compare to the N target in Table 10 (e)?</p>

8.68	NZCPS	NZCPS Ob1 (Policy 11)	<p>How were the effects of the discharge of the Lake into the CME considered when developing PC6?</p> <p>Did this include kai moana, the Banks Peninsula is a Marine Mammal Sanctuary, and the coastal Statutory Acknowledgement Te Tai o Mahaanui (Selwyn-Banks Peninsula Coastal Marine Area)?</p>
10.18 - 10.22, 10.24	10 Freshwater Outcomes and Limits	<p>Aquatic plant cover is recognised as important in ICOLLs (nationally and internationally) - and some researchers have cited that monitoring of macrophyte cover is needed in addition to assess trophic status of shallow lake, rather than physical, chemical and chl a variables alone. Southland has done a bit of work in this area (as noted the Schallenburg 2013 report)</p>	<p>Is there are reason why aquatic plant cover was not considered as an outcome indicator in PC6?</p> <p>Does recommendation 10.24 in relation to macrophytes define the outcome sought with enough certainty that the desired trophic status has been achieved?</p> <p>What length of time would a trend need to be calculated and how will it account for variability between seasons/years and the potential effects due to openings?</p>
8.125-8.126	Tangata whenua roles and interests/Objective D1		<p>Does the consultation for PC6 constitute what is meant by the Objective D1 (and policies) and does this differs from RMA Schedule 1 consultation?</p>