

BEFORE THE CANTERBURY REGIONAL COUNCIL

IN THE MATTER OF The Resource Management Act 1991 (**Act**)

and

IN THE MATTER OF an application by Christchurch City Council for a discharge permit to discharge water and contaminants to land and water, including coastal water, from

- the existing and future stormwater network;
- stormwater generated from roofs of individual existing sites, greenfield development sites and redevelopment sites and as discharged within the site; and
- stormwater generated from hard standing areas of individual existing residential sites, greenfield developments sites and redevelopment sites and as discharged within the site

**FOURTH MINUTE OF HEARING COMMISSIONERS ADDRESSING FURTHER
INFORMATION AND POTENTIAL STEPS TO ADVANCE THE HEARING**

Introduction

- 1 This Minute addresses a request for further information and matters to advance the hearing.

Further Information Requested Pursuant to s41C(3)

- 2 The hearing on this application commenced on 5 November 2018. We have sat for nine days, with the hearing being adjourned on 15 November 2018. The hearing remains open.
- 3 At the conclusion of the hearing day on 15 November Mr Pizzey for the applicant helpfully provided a brief summary of the “key takeaways”, and briefly addressed a question we had raised in relation to the complexity and value of rerunning the C-CLM with more specific Christchurch-based inputs. We had identified this issue with Mr Pizzey previously. The issue of the accuracy of modelling arising from the use of a number of Auckland-based inputs was raised by a number of submitters.
- 4 Having heard the relevant experts and having considered Mr Pizzey’s and the Reporting Officer’s comments on this issue, we are of the view, having regard to the purpose of the C-CLM, and the complexities of obtaining additional Christchurch-based inputs, that such further modelling is not necessary for the purposes of our decision making.

Further Information Sought – Stormwater Quantity

- 5 Stormwater quantity and potential flooding effects were matters that were addressed in a number of submissions, and in evidence before us. This was particularly so in relation to the Pūharakekenui / Styx River and the Huritini / Halswell catchments. We heard from a number of submitters in the Pūharakekenui / Styx River catchment, and representatives of the Halswell Drainage Committee.
- 6 We also heard from Mr Law from CRC, Mr Potts for A and K Rodrigues and Mr Harrington of the applicant. We record we heard from other CCC witnesses in relation to this issue, but Mr Harrington was the primary witness.
- 7 The matters on which we consider we would benefit from further information (or evidence if necessary) are as follows:

- (a) A concise explanation of why the various baseline years, ranging from 1991 to 2016, were selected. This appears to be particularly relevant to the Huritini / Halswell and Pūharakekemui / Styx River catchment given the level of development we understand has occurred in those catchments, both pre and post the Canterbury earthquake sequence.
- (b) The reasons for not specifying a volume limit in Schedule 7: Receiving Environment Attribute Target Levels for Water Quantity and what the effects of such a limit may be. If we are to conclude that volume limits are appropriate, what the limit or limits should be.
- (c) The assumptions in the water quantity model, particularly in relation to the Styx River channel. This is particularly requested given the considerable amount of evidence we have heard in relation to the changes to the Pūharakekenui / Styx River channel in recent years.
- (d) Should we decide that it is appropriate to include receiving environment attribute target levels for a 1 in 5 year event, what are the appropriate levels and attributes?

8 Mr Pizzey, in his comments at the conclusion of the hearing day on 15 November, raised the issue of the relationship between the stormwater discharge operation and river management. Mr Pizzey indicated that this was more an area which would benefit from further evidence rather than through submissions. We agree we would benefit from further information regarding the operation and river management. Whether that is by way of further evidence, or by way of further information is a matter for Mr Pizzey to address us on. We are conscious of our duties to deal with this application efficiently and of the statutory timeframes within which we are all working. We are also conscious, as Mr Pizzey properly identified, of the need to ensure that the principles of natural justice are met, and of the importance of the interests of the community in ensuring an adequate assessment of the effects.

9 We do not at this time set a specific period for the information to be provided, but we ask that Mr Pizzey, in consultation with CRC, provide us with a proposed timetable for our consideration. That is to be provided no later than 5 p.m. Monday 26 November 2018.

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "D Caldwell". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'D'.

David Caldwell

Chair

Dated: 21 November 2018