Hon David Parker_Minister for the Environment RPS21_0136



Proposed Otago Regional Policy Statement 2021

Information for Submitters

Submissions must be in the prescribed form (Form 5) specified by the Resource Management Act and must be received by Otago Regional Council **by 3 pm Friday 3 September 2021**

Privacy: Be aware that **all submissions are considered public**, including your name and address which will be uploaded to ORC website as part of this process. The Council and further submitters will use your name and contact details for correspondence in relation to the making of the Regional Policy Statement.

LODGE A SUBMISSION MANUALLY (USING FORM BELOW)

A template complying with the requirements of Form 5 is provided below. Once completed, please forward to ORC by one of the following:

Email: <u>rps@orc.govt.nz</u> Submissions in MS Word or other editable format are preferred, if possible Post: Otago Regional Council, Private Bag 1954, Dunedin 9054. Att: ORC Policy Team Hand Delivery at

Dunedin: Otago Regional Council Office, 70 Stafford St, Dunedin, Att: ORC Policy Team Queenstown: Terrace Junction, 1092 Frankton Road, Queenstown, Att: ORC Policy Team Alexandra: William Fraser Building, Dunorling Street, Alexandra. Att: ORC Policy Team

INQUIRIES

Email: <u>rps@orc.govt.nz</u> Phone: ORC Call Centre: 0800 474 082, Monday - Friday, 8am-5pm



NOTES TO PERSON MAKING A SUBMISSION

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in **trade competition** through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by <u>clause 6(4)</u> of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be **struck out** if the authority is satisfied that at least 1 of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):

- it is frivolous or vexatious:
- it discloses no reasonable or relevant case:
- it would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further:
- it contains offensive language:
- it is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

Go to Written Submission Form on next page

Written Submission on Proposed Otago Regional Policy Statement 2021

(Submissions must be received by Otago Regional Council by 3 pm Friday 3 September 2021

To: Otago Regional Council

1. Name of submitter (full name of person/persons or organisation making the submission. Note: The submissions will be referred to by the name of the submitter)

Hon David Parker, Minister for the Environment

- 2. This is a submission on the Proposed Otago Regional Policy Statement 2021.
- 3. I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission. (See notes to person making submission)
- 4. I am not directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that
 - a. adversely affects the environment; and
 - **b.** does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition (See notes to person making submission)
- 5. I wish to be heard in support of my submission
- 6. If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing
- 7. Submitter Details
 - a. Signature of submitter (or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)

Hon David Parker

b. Signatory name, position, and organisation (if signatory is acting on behalf of a submitter organisation or group referred to at Point 1 above)

Hon David Parker

Minister for the Environment

c. Date

3 September 2021

Address for service of submitter (This is where all correspondence will be directed)

d. Contact person (*name and designation, if applicable*)

Macaela Flanagan

e. Email:

Macaela.flanagan@mfe.govt.nz

f. Telephone:

022 023 4470

g. Postal address (or alternative method of service under <u>section 352</u> of the Act):

23 Kate Sheppard Place Wellington

To: Otago Regional Council From: Minister for the Environment Date: 03/09/2021

Submission on the Proposed Regional Policy Statement, Otago Regional Council

- 1. Pursuant to clause 6 of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA), I, Hon David Parker, Minister for the Environment, make the following submission in respect of the Proposed Otago Regional Policy Statement 2021.
- 2. Overall, the proposed regional policy statement (pRPS) is a positive step forward for freshwater management in the region, providing a stronger direction than the existing RPS that was notified in 2015.
- 3. The key points made in this submission are framed in the interest of improving freshwater outcomes in the region. The submission points within this submission are not exhaustive of my interests as Minister for the Environment.
- 4. This submission largely focusses on the approach to freshwater management in the pRPS, and the direction set for the development of a new Land and Water plan, expected to be notified in 2023.
- 5. The over-allocation associated with the continued abstraction from deemed mining permits is the central concern of this submission and the proposed relief seeks to ensure the RPS establishes a robust framework for the development of the Land and Water plan to ensure this over-allocation is phased out in a timely manner.
- 6. The deemed permit provisions were included in the Resource Management Act 1991 as a transitional arrangement with the expectation that the 30-year period would be used to establish minimum flows and transition into a RMA complaint framework that protected environmental values. As there is still a lack of clear and robust minimum flows in place for all catchments there is still degradation occurring despite these long transitional timeframes being provided.
- 7. The abstraction allowed under the deemed permits, and lack of clear direction to phase out overallocation in the operative planning framework, has also facilitated the expansion of intensive farming activities that are reliant on this water and have contributed to degrading water quality.
- 8. At my direction, Honorary Professor Peter Skelton undertook an investigation into ORC's freshwater allocation functions with a specific focus on how the council was placed to transition from the deemed permit regime in 2021. Note two of his findings below:
 - a. There is a lack of clear and robust minimum flows and a failure to address over-allocation.
 - b. The existence of the deemed permits has also limited the ability of the Water Plan to manage water quality and quantity.
- 9. Professor Skelton found that a new fit-for-purpose planning framework is required in Otago to assess applications to replace deemed permits that provides certainty for the community with clear timeframes and established minimum flows¹.
- 10. Both the Skelton Report and cases like the Lindis River Minimum Flow case and Proposed Plan Change 7 have considered the operative water plan is not fit-for-purpose.
- 11. To provide for sustainable management as required by the RMA, it is essential that a robust and fitfor-purpose planning framework is put in place in Otago in a timely manner. Further, it is critical that

¹ Investigation of Freshwater Management and Allocation Functions at Otago Regional Council, Report to the Minister for the Environment by Professor Peter Skelton 2019

it address the over-allocation associated with deemed permits. The pRPS is the start of that process which will guide the development of the new Land and Water plan. The Land and Water plan, in turn, must include a full and now long overdue minimum flow regime to phase out overallocation which should be not only enabled but required by this pRPS.

- 12. I seek a number of amendments to the pRPS to ensure the framework will achieve this. The specific provisions of the pRPS that my submission relates to are set out in Attachment 1.
- 13. The amendments being sought include:
 - a) Context and discussion regarding the significant issue of over-allocation.
 - b) Further urgency and direction in the pRPS to address over-allocation and the resulting environmental degradation is required.
 - c) Strengthening the vision for the Manuherekia rohe to ensure over-allocation is phased-out and eliminated, and the catchment has a comprehensive system of environmental flows and limits that provide for ecosystem health and the other values in the NPS-FM. There should be interim steps to ensure progress is being made to the 2050 vision for the Manuherekia rohe.
- 14. I seek amendments to a number of provisions in the pRPS:
 - d) Amend LF–WAI–P1 Prioritisation to "in all decision making affecting freshwater"
 - e) Amend LF–VM–O2 Clutha Mata-au FMU vision to include a clear vision of the catchment that has phased out existing over-allocation and avoids future over-allocation
 - f) Amend LF–VM–O2 Clutha Mata-au FMU vision (timeframes) to include interim steps in a manner similar to the consultation version of the pRPS, (noting that a timeframe of 2040 for quality and flows may still be longer than reasonable)
 - g) Amend LF–FW–P7 Fresh water to read: "Environmental outcomes, attribute states (including target attribute states), limits, environmental flows and levels ensure that"
 - h) Amend LF–FW–M6 Regional plans to clarify that environmental flows and levels can be used to phase out over-allocation together and as part of take limits
 - i) Amend the objectives of LF–LS Land and soil, particularly LF–LS–O12 Use of land to pull out the land use and freshwater section into a separate objective from the soil quality aspect of the current objective
 - j) Amend ECO Methods to give ORC an explicit role of providing initial spatial data and expertise for identifying Significant Natural Areas
 - k) Amend or clarify UFD–P4 Urban expansion to ensure it clearly does not limit territorial authorities ability to give effect to NPS-UD Subpart 2 requirements
 - New policies to give effect to Policy 1 and 5 of National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD).

Hon David Parker

Minister for the Environment

8. My submission is:

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4
The specific provisions	I support or oppose	The reasons for my views are:	I seek the following decision from the
of the proposal that my	the specific		local authority:
submission relates to	provisions or wish to		
are:	have them		
	amended.		
(Please enter the	(Please indicate		(Please be as clear as possible – for
relevant objective,	"support" or		example, include any alternative wording
policy, method, or	"oppose" or		for specific provision amendments.)
'other' provision	"amend")"		
reference where			
possible. For example,			
'AIR-01'.)			
Full RPS	I support the pRPS	Overall, the pRPS is a positive step	
	but recommend	forward and provides a much stronger	
	minor amendments	direction for freshwater management	
		than the existing RPS and subsequent	
		plans.	
SRMR – Significant	Amend	There is not sufficient recognition of	Recommend adding in a discussion
resource management		over-allocation as a significant issue for	around the over-allocation and the
issues for the region		the region.	historic context of deemed mining
			permits.
LF-WAI-P1 -	Amend	The wording "in all management of	Amend LF – WAI–P1 – Prioritisation to "in
Prioritisation		freshwater" is unduly limiting and could	all decision-making affecting freshwater"
		be interpreted to exclude land use	
		decisions, which does not align with Te	
		Mana o Te Wai or the Objective of NPS-	
		FM.	
LF–VM–O2 – Clutha	Amend	The vision does not sufficiently capture	Amend LF–VM–O2 – Clutha Mata-au FMU
Mata-au FMU vision		a future state where over-allocation is	vision to include a clear vision of the
		addressed. Where it does touch on	catchment that has phased out existing

		allocation it is limited by statements such as "wherever possible", while such	over-allocation and avoids future over- allocation.
		limitations are not put on other visions.	
		Omitting reference to an environmental issue as significant as over-allocation from these visions may not be giving effect to NPS-FM requirement for long term visions to be informed by an understanding of the history and environmental pressures on the FMU.	
LF–VM–O2 – Clutha	Amend	The timeframes, particularly 2050 for	Amend LF–VM–O2 – Clutha Mata-au FMU
Mata-au FMU vision		the Manuherekia rohe, should provide	vision (timeframes) to include interim
(timeframes)		interim timeframe steps to recognise	steps in a manner similar to the
		that addressing overallocation cannot	consultation version of the pRPS,
		be left until close to the 2050 timeframe.	although 2040 for quality and flows may still be longer than reasonable.
LF–FW–P7 – Fresh	Amend	The phrase "Environmental outcomes,	
water	Amenu	attribute states (including target attribute states) and limits ensure that" could be interpreted as excluding the use of environmental flows and levels.	Amend LF–FW–P7 – Fresh water to read: "Environmental outcomes, attribute states (including target attribute states), limits, environmental flows and levels ensure that".
LF–FW–M6 – Regional plans	Amend	The separation out between (4) which requires flows and level regimes and (5) which requires limits to be set puts phasing out over-allocation in the limits section. This could result in an interpretation that flows and levels cannot be used to phase out over- allocation.	Amend LF–FW–M6 – Regional plans to clarify that environmental flows and levels can be used to phase out over-allocation together and as part of limits.
LF–LS – Land and soil	Amend	The impacts of land use of freshwater is too mixed with the soil health objectives and it has resulted in	Amend the objectives of LF–LS – Land and soil, particularly <i>LF–LS–O12 – Use of land</i> to pull out the land use and freshwater
		provisions that appear to favour soil	section into a separate objective from the

		health objectives to the detriment of land use provisions to protect freshwater.	soil quality aspect of the current objective.
ECO – Methods	Amend	Methods could be strengthened, especially around the role of the regional council. For example, the regional council could give itself the explicit role of providing initial spatial data and expertise for identifying Significant Natural Areas.	Amend ECO – Methods to give ORC an explicit role of providing initial spatial data and expertise for identifying Significant Natural Areas.
UFD – Urban form and development	Amend	The pRPS does not contain any policy direction giving effect to Policy 1 of NPS-UD, specifically for well-functioning urban environments to include a variety of homes types and prices and there does not appear to be any recognition of Policy 5 of NPS-UD which requires regional policy statements to enable heights at density commensurate with accessibility and demand.	Add new policies to give effect to Policy 1 and 5 of NPS-UD.
UFD–P4 – Urban expansion	Amend	Policy 4 of the pRPS appears to be contradictory with the requirements of Subpart 2 of NPS-UD setting out a need for responsive planning and specifically requiring councils to be responsive to out of sequence plan changes that will contribute to urban development.	Amend or clarify UFD–P4 – Urban expansion to ensure it clearly does not limit territorial authorities' ability to give effect to NPS-UD Subpart 2 requirements.

RPS

From:	Macaela Flanagan <macaela.flanagan@mfe.govt.nz></macaela.flanagan@mfe.govt.nz>
Sent:	Friday, 3 September 2021 1:04 p.m.
To:	RPS
Subject:	Submission on pRPS
Attachments:	Minister for the Environment-submission-on-proposed-otago-rps-2021.pdf
Follow Up Flag:	Follow up
Flag Status:	Flagged
Categories:	Submission - Central Government

Tēnā koe

Please find attached the Minister for the Environment's submission on the proposed regional policy statement.

Ngā mihi Macaela

Macaela Flanagan (she/her)

Senior Policy Analyst | Kaitātari Kaupapa Here Matua Policy Implementation Delivery and Oversight

Ministry for the Environment | Manatū Mō Te Taiao 022 023 4470 | macaela.flanagan@mfe.govt.nz | mfe.govt.nz

Ministry staff work flexibly by default. For me, this means I work 8.30-2.30.

