

STAFF REPORT

TO: Environment & Planning Committee

FROM: D C Bush-King, Environment & Planning Manager

REFERENCE: S611

SUBJECT: **MANAGER'S REPORT- REPORT EP09/07/14** - Report Prepared for Meeting of 16 July 2009

1. WHAT'S HAPPENING

As we come to the end of another year there is a fair bit on with deliberations on Richmond West still to complete, public meeting on the Cultural Heritage and Part VI plan changes are underway. Good progress is being made on preparations for Building Consent Authority Accreditation (due November), hearings are soon to be held to consider submissions on the Dog Control Bylaw. The Dog Pound is emerging from its foundations (we can arrange a visit for Councillors if interested), and consents and permits continue to be granted albeit with numbers slightly down on previous years. We are preparing the Annual Report and will report back when complete. We are also to release some State of the Environment report cards on monitoring results.

Legal proceedings have been lodged against Council and two other parties concerning a subdivision in Mapua although overall our appeal workload on consents is down to four at present.

2. NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL STANDARDS REVIEW – AIR QUALITY

The Minister for The Environment has announced that he is undertaking a review of the Air Quality national Environmental Standard. Specifically the review will determine the following.

- How much are the regulations relating to PM₁₀ costing? This should include economic costs (i.e. costs of implementation), and health and social costs both prior to and post 2013.
- Who is bearing these costs?
- What are the benefits of the regulations relating to PM₁₀ prior to 2013 and post 2013 (including economic, health and social benefits)?
- Who is experiencing these benefits?
- How do the actual costs and benefits differ from the original cost-benefit analysis? Why?

- Are the regulations relating to PM₁₀ effective? This could include, but not be limited to:
- What difference have they made?
- Were they necessary?
- Are the resource consent restrictions working? (i.e. have they been an effective driver of regional policy to improve air quality since the introduction of the standards). If not, what can/should central government do about it?
- Is the 2013 deadline appropriate? (The standards limit consent for industrial discharges but the primary source of pollution is domestic heating in most urban areas). If not, what are the alternatives?
- Should we extend the deadline to some future date (with associated analysis of costs and benefits)? This could include increasing the number of permitted exceedances of the PM₁₀ ambient standard (e.g. five exceedances). NB: The actual ambient standards (i.e. concentration thresholds) are not under review.
- Should we amend the 2013 deadline and use other methods to encourage regional councils to meet the standards? For example:
- Should there be fines for non-achievement of ambient standards based on estimated health impacts.
- Should there be in place sanctions and Minister approved action plans for areas of non-attainment similar to US approach.

The Minister has appointed a Technical Advisory Group that must report back by October 2009. It is expected public input will be sought. Does Council wish to take a position on any of the above questions?

3. CAPITAL BUDGET CARRYOVER

We have two loan funded budgets which have unspent balances and I seek Committee approval to carry over to the 2009/2010. There is no affect on proposed rates as loan repayments already accounted for. The details are as follows:

Project	Funding Source	Annual Plan Budget	Carryover	Reason for Carryover
Rainfall Runoff Model	Loan	\$158,454	\$148,486	Contract signed but deliverables still to be received after full roll out of model
Plant Account	Loan	\$100,000	\$25,000	Deferred replacement of HM boat motors to get an extra season out of them

Recommendation

That the Environment and Planning Committee approve the carry over of \$173,486 loan funded expenditure into the 2009/2010 year.

4. AGRICHEMICAL UPDATE

We completed in June the collection of redundant agrichemicals from the last of the farmers from the district wide collection we started in 2007.

We collected 3 tonnes from the last batch of farmers and had planned to store it for two to three years until we had budget to export it. When we heard that one of the other council hadn't used their quota of export tonnage allocated by MfE, we managed to step in and secure the three spare tonnes for TDC.

So as of this week we have empty sheds and completed our list of farmers registered for a pick up, which is great news!

From July 2009 there is a Producer Responsibility initiative being managed by AgRecovery, on the back of their successful agchem container collection service. From now on farmers wanting their redundant agchems collected will be directed to an 0800 number and register their specific chemicals with AgRecovery who will organise the collection in this district once they have enough to make it worthwhile. The farmers will have to bring their chemicals to a collection facility, at a particular time and pay for some of the cost. Council's only involvement will be providing space at the Richmond and Takaka RRC for the collection on that day.

5. WATER PERMIT VARIATIONS – WAI-ITI

When water from the Kainui Dam was allocated through resource consents there were a number of permit holders that obtained an allocation but did not have pump tests done. We have an instance, which will undoubtedly be replicated, where the actual take is proposed in a form and location different from previous advice; a new authority is legally required. However, staff would advise that in such situations we should treat the amendments and recover staff costs as if it were a site to site transfer rather than a new application. The current charge is \$112.50 and as it is less than the scheduled charge no change to the schedule is needed

6. RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that this report be received.



D C Bush-King
Environment & Planning Manager