



# REGULATORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

## Thursday 21 March 2019

11:00 am, Council Chamber  
Level 2 Philip Laing House, 144 Rattray Street, Dunedin

### **Membership**

Cr Bryan Scott

*(Chairperson)*

Cr Sam Neill

*(Deputy Chairperson)*

Cr Graeme Bell

Cr Doug Brown

Cr Michael Deaker

Cr Carmen Hope

Cr Trevor Kempton

Cr Michael Laws

Cr Ella Lawton

Cr Andrew Noone

Cr Gretchen Robertson

Cr Stephen Woodhead

### **Disclaimer**

Please note that there is an embargo on agenda items until 48 hours prior to the meeting. Reports and recommendations contained in this agenda are not to be considered as Council policy until adopted.

*For our future*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Apologies.....	3
2.	Leave of Absence .....	3
3.	Attendance.....	3
4.	Confirmation of Agenda.....	3
5.	Conflict of Interest .....	3
6.	Public Forum .....	3
7.	Presentations .....	3
8.	Confirmation of Minutes.....	3
9.	Actions .....	3
10.	Matters for Noting .....	5
	10.1. Enforcement Action.....	5
	10.2. Lagarosiphon management review .....	10
	10.3. Directors Report on Progress .....	17
	10.4. Consents and Building Control .....	23
	10.5. Plan Change 6A - The Good Water Programme .....	33
11.	Resolution to Exclude the Public.....	35
11.99.	Public Excluded Postamble .....	35
12.	Notices of Motion .....	36
13.	Closure .....	36

## 1. APOLOGIES

Cr Andrew Noone

## 2. LEAVE OF ABSENCE

## 3. ATTENDANCE

## 4. CONFIRMATION OF AGENDA

Note: Any additions must be approved by resolution with an explanation as to why they cannot be delayed until a future meeting.

## 5. CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Members are reminded of the need to stand aside from decision-making when a conflict arises between their role as an elected representative and any private or other external interest they might have.

## 6. PUBLIC FORUM

## 7. PRESENTATIONS

## 8. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

### Recommendation

*That the minutes of the meeting held on 30 January 2019 be received and confirmed as a true and accurate record.*

### Attachments

1. Minutes Regulatory Committee - 30 January 2019 **[8.1.1]**

## 9. ACTIONS

### Status report on the resolutions of the Regulatory Committee

11.3 Managing the use of coal for domestic heating in Otago and New Zealand ( <b>Technical Committee</b> )	31/1/2018	<i>That the matter of the ability to enforce the current Regional Air Plan AirZone 1 provisions be considered by the Regulatory Committee</i>	IN PROCESS
10.1 Review of Council's Consents Function	17/10/18	<i>Staff appoint a consultant/s to undertake the review.</i>  <i>That the Committee approves the brief attached as Appendix 1 for the Review of Council's Resource Consents Function, subject to the suggested edits outlined (Best Practise, shared services)</i>	IN PROCESS
11.1 Compliance Activity for 2017/18	17/10/18	<i>That a case study be undertaken on the</i>	IN PROCESS

		<p><i>Kaikorai Stream with a view to informing future work on urban waterways and other waterways of concern.</i></p> <p><i>That this paper be reframed and represented with analysis of trends and of highlights and issues governance should be address</i></p>	
11.2 Director's Report on Progress Lagarosiphon control – Lake Dunstan	17/10/18	<p><i>That an effectiveness review of lagarosiphon control on Lake Dunstan be brought to next committee round</i></p>	IN DRAFT
Wallaby Control	28/11/18	<p>Cr Scott requested that the action item for a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Environment Canterbury for wallaby control be reinstated to the action list.</p>	IN PROCESS

## 10. MATTERS FOR NOTING

### 10.1. Enforcement Action

**Prepared for:** Regulatory Committee  
**Report No.** EMO1849  
**Activity:** Regulatory: Consents and Compliance  
**Author:** Peter Kelliher, Legal Counsel  
**Endorsed by:** Peter Winder, Acting Director Environmental Monitoring & Operations  
**Date:** 28 February 2019

---

#### PURPOSE

[1] This report details Resource Management Act 1991, Biosecurity Act 1993 and Building Act 2004 enforcement activities undertaken by the Otago Regional Council during the period 17 January 2019 to 28 February 2019.

#### STAFF RECOMMENDATION

*That the Council:*

1) **Receives** this report.

#### RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991

[2] Resource Consents

Table 1. Infringement Notices

Details	Period – 17 January 2019 to 28 February 2019	Total – from 1 July 2018
Taking water in breach of resource consent conditions	0	1
Discharge of contaminants (treated wastewater) to land in circumstances which may result in those contaminants entering water - in breach of resource consent conditions	1	1
Discharge of contaminants to air in breach of resource consent conditions - odour	2	2
TOTAL	3	4

[3] Complaint Response

Table 2. Infringement Notices

Details	Period – 17 January 2019 to	Total – from 1 July 2018	Complaints Received <a href="#">[1]</a>
---------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------	--

	28 February 2019		
Discharge of contaminants to land in circumstances which may result in those contaminants entering water - sediment	1	4	5
Discharge of contaminants to air in breach of a regional rule – burning prohibited material	0	3	2
Discharge of contaminants to air in breach of a regional rule – odour	0	3	7
Discharge of contaminants to air in breach of a regional rule – outdoor burning	1	4	7
Disturbing the bed of a river - pugging	1	6	6
Disturbing the bed of a river – mechanical excavation	2	2	1
Discharge of contaminants to land in circumstances which may result in those contaminants entering water (Coastal Marine Area) – contaminants from a truck wash	1	1	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>29</b>

[1] Number of complaints received by Council for the matters that have been subject to enforcement action.

Table 3. Abatement Notices

<b>Details</b>	<b>Period – 17 January 2019 to 28 February 2019</b>	<b>Total – from 1 July 2018</b>	<b>Complaints Received</b>
To cease discharging contaminants to air from a domestic heating appliance in	0	1	1

breach of a regional rule			
To cease discharging contaminants in breach of a regional rule - sediment	1	2	4
To remove a dead animal from a river	0	1	1
To cease discharging contaminants from a farm landfill in breach of a regional rule	2	3	3
To remove debris / slash from the bed of a river	0	2	2
To cease diverting water in breach of a regional rule	0	1	2
To cease diverting/ discharging water which is likely to cause an adverse effect on the environment.	0	1	6
To undertake routine inspections and stop any discharge of smoke/odour from the property	0	1	1
To cease discharging contaminants in breach of a resource consent	2	2	7
TOTAL	5	14	27

Table 4. Authorised Legal Proceedings

Details	Period – 17 January 2019 to 28 February 2019	Total – from 1 July 2018	Complaints Received
Discharge of contaminants to land in circumstances which may result in those contaminants entering water - sediment	0	1	3
1. Disturbing the bed of a river –	0	1	1

pugging; and 2. Discharge of contaminants in breach of a regional rule - sediment			
TOTAL	0	2	4

[3] Inspections

Table 5. Infringement Notices

Details	Period – 17 January 2019 to 28 February 2019	Total – from 1 July 2018
Discharge of contaminants to land in breach of a regional rule – effluent	0	3
Discharge of contaminants to land in circumstances which may result in those contaminants entering water - effluent	2	2
Discharge of contaminants to land in breach of a regional rule – silage	1	1
TOTAL	3	6

Table 6. Authorised Legal Proceedings

Details	Period – 17 January 2019 to 28 February 2019	Total – from 1 July 2018
Discharge of contaminants to land in breach of a regional rule – effluent	0	1
TOTAL	0	1

## INFRINGEMENT FEES

[4] Resource Management Act (“RMA”) infringement fees are set by the Resource Management (Infringement Offences) Regulations 1999. Under the Regulations, infringement fees range from \$300 to \$1,000, depending on which section of the RMA has been contravened.

[5] From 1 July 2018, Council has issued 33 infringement notices totalling \$18,800 in infringement fees.



## CURRENT PROSECUTIONS

Table 7. Current Prosecutions

<b>Matter</b>	<b>Next Appearance</b>
Northlake Investments Limited	Defended hearing – trial date 29-30 April 2019
Greg Cowley Limited and Greg Cowley	Sentencing date to be confirmed
Maruia Mining Limited and Alan Roberts	Defended hearing – date to be confirmed.

### Attachments

Nil

## 10.2. Lagarosiphon management review

**Prepared for:** Regulatory Committee  
**Report No.** EMO1851  
**Activity:** Environmental: Water  
**Author:** James Adams, Policy Analyst  
**Endorsed by:** Peter Winder, Acting Director Environmental Monitoring & Operations  
**Date:** 20 March 2019

### PURPOSE

- [1] To review lagarosiphon control effectiveness in Lake Dunstan.

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- [2] Lagarosiphon control in Lake Dunstan is part of a wider lagarosiphon management approach including Lakes Wanaka and Wakatipu, and the upper Kawarau River.
- [3] Land Information New Zealand (LINZ) manages the beds of these water bodies for the Crown and leads the lagarosiphon management programmes. LINZ, along with community and stakeholders, has established management plans for controlling lagarosiphon. The management plans are coordinated to make efficient use of the resources available for management activities. Broadly, the approaches are:
- a. Lake Wakatipu (currently lagarosiphon free): Exclusion;
  - b. Lake Wanaka: Sustained control, progressive containment and eradication;
  - c. Kawarau river: Progressive containment;
  - d. Lake Dunstan: Sustained control.<sup>1</sup>
- [4] The management approach for Lake Dunstan reflects the need to control lagarosiphon sources upstream in the Kawarau and Lake Wanaka. Upstream sources of lagarosiphon fragments mean that eradicating lagarosiphon in Lake Dunstan at present would be difficult, expensive, and unlikely to last.
- [5] Fourteen High Value Areas (HVAs) around Lake Dunstan are managed for amenity and use, with substantial biomass being removed. These areas have been established in collaboration with the community through ORCs Regional Pest Management Plan 2009 and reflect a range of uses and values.<sup>2</sup> In other areas, lagarosiphon is controlled to reduce chance of spread, rather than removed.
- [6] The current and proposed Regional Pest Management Plans support this approach.

---

<sup>1</sup> NIWA, Boffa Miskell, Land Information New Zealand (2017) *Lagarosiphon in Otago Region*, presentation.

<sup>2</sup> See: NIWA (2016) *Ten Year Management Plan for Lagarosiphon at Lake Dunstan: 2016 to 2025*; and ORC, *Pest Management Plan for Otago 2009, Appendix 4*.

- [7] The management plans for lagarosiphon management in Lakes Wanaka and Dunstan, and the Upper Kawarau River, contain project milestones and are due for review of progress in 2020.
- [8] While the current management approach is having positive results, there are potential options for ORC to change its approach to lagarosiphon management. If Council wishes to pursue these, they will require further exploration before a choice in approach can be made.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

*That the Council:*

- 1) **Receives** this report.

## **BACKGROUND**

### **Lagarosiphon**

- [9] Lagarosiphon is an invasive aquatic weed that adversely affects the values of Otago's iconic lakes and rivers by, among other things, smothering native aquatic vegetation, reducing amenity, and hampering many recreational uses. It has some positive value as a habitat for game fish.
- [10] The weed in New Zealand is a mono-culture. It reproduces asexually, from fragments of existing plants. It spreads readily along waterways, wherever it can access appropriate habitat.
- [11] Lagarosiphon is well established in the Clutha/Mata-au and upper Kawarau rivers, and Lakes Wanaka, Dunstan and Roxburgh. Lake Wakatipu is at risk, but surveillance and management efforts have so far prevented lagarosiphon establishing to any real extent. These efforts include education and advocacy, such as the Ministry of Primary Industries' (MPI's) Check, Clean, Dry programme.
- [12] Both ORC's current and proposed Regional Pest Management Plans (established under the Biosecurity Act 1993) list lagarosiphon as a pest. Control options, outcomes and approaches do not differ significantly between these two documents.

### **Organisations involved in management**

- [13] The Crown owns the lake and river beds, which are managed by Land Information New Zealand (LINZ). Accordingly, LINZ are the lead agency for managing lagarosiphon presence and new incursions. Funding for management works is provided mainly by LINZ, with support from Contact Energy and ORC. ORC also performs some surveillance and monitoring activities.

### **Management plans**

- [14] LINZ has a long-term approach in place for dealing with lagarosiphon in Lakes Wanaka and Dunstan, and the Upper Kawarau (which also includes surveillance for Lake Wakatipu). Management groups have been established for these water bodies. Each group has developed a 10-year management plan, with proposed management

methods, milestones and provision for adaptive management. All three plans contain a provision for reviewing progress against milestones in 2020.

- [15] The management plans canvas methods for lagarosiphon control, drawing on international research and best practice, and considering the context the control methods will be used in. The milestones in the plans provide for exploring emerging control methods, though new methods need thorough testing before implementation.
- [16] There are not management groups or plans in place for the Clutha/Mata-au or Lake Roxburgh. Lagarosiphon incursion in Lake Roxburgh is minimal because there is minimal appropriate habitat available. These waterbodies are not discussed further in this paper.

## ISSUE

- [17] There is community concern that lagarosiphon management in Lake Dunstan is inadequate.<sup>1</sup>

## DISCUSSION

### General approach

- [18] The management approach in Lake Dunstan reflects the wider ambitions of lagarosiphon control. It takes a pragmatic approach to the resources available and the effects that can reasonably be achieved with current control tools.
- [19] Each area where lagarosiphon is established has differing priorities, depending on its situation.
- a. Lake Wanaka has a variety of approaches in place. A containment zone is set up at the southern end of the lake, where established weed growth is under sustained control. An exclusion zone is set up in the north part, where weed is eradicated. A buffer zone is set up between the containment zone and exclusion zone, where weed biomass is steadily reduced. The long-term plan is to gradually reduce the containment area until lagarosiphon can be eradicated from the lake.
  - b. Upper Kawarau's management approach is to reduce and exclude weed from highest risk areas and manage lower risk areas to reduce risk of transfer. Current management is mainly focussed on the risk to Lake Wakatipu.
  - c. Lake Dunstan has focused on containment because eradicating lagarosiphon from Lake Dunstan is unlikely to be practical or efficient until Wanaka and the Kawarau River are free from lagarosiphon (or biomass in those water bodies is so low that its impact on Lake Dunstan can be easily managed).<sup>2</sup> The approach for now is therefore to manage weed biomass to reduce chance of transfer and remove weed from HVAs.

---

<sup>1</sup> See, for example: Pam Jones (1 July 2017) "Lagarosiphon Debate Heats Up" *Otago Daily Times*; Pam Jones (8 April 2018) "Lagarosiphon Sparks Petition" *Otago Daily Times*; and Mark Price (13 April 2018) "Lake Dunstan Becoming Septic Tank" *Otago Daily Times*.

<sup>2</sup> Note the Clutha/Mata-au main stem between Lakes Wanaka and Dunstan also has some scattered lagarosiphon presence.

- [20] Reports from LINZ<sup>1</sup> and in the media<sup>2</sup> indicate progress in lagarosiphon control, particularly in Lake Wanaka. The control method used depends on the biomass of lagarosiphon to be managed. The suite of control options includes cutting long weed beds, using herbicide (Diquat), suction dredging, weed matting to exclude light, and hand weeding small areas of growth or isolated plants.
- [21] Lagarosiphon management was uncoordinated and intermittent after its initial incursion, which has resulted in significant infiltration into several water bodies.<sup>3</sup> The current management regime is more rigorous and consistent and appears to be bearing results. The legacy of past management is that it will take a long time to reduce lagarosiphon to levels where its effect on Otago's environment is minimised, or to eradicate it altogether.

### Progress at Lake Dunstan

- [22] Lagarosiphon control work in Lake Dunstan will receive \$210,000 in funding in the 2018/19 financial year. This is an increase of \$60,000 over the 2017/18 year, and is comprised of:
- a. LINZ: \$125,000 (\$75,000 spent in 2017-1018)
  - b. Contact Energy: \$60,000 (\$50,000 spent in 2017 – 2018)<sup>4</sup>
  - c. ORC: \$25,000 (\$25,000 spent in 2017 – 2018).
- [23] The increased funding augments the existing control programme and allows more boat ramps to be included.<sup>5</sup> The management approach in Lake Dunstan aims at containment and amenity<sup>6</sup>. Biomass is only reduced in HVAs.
- [24] The High Value Areas in Lake Dunstan are:
- a. Bendigo
  - b. Pisa Moorings
  - c. Devil's Creek
  - d. Lowburn
  - e. Northburn
  - f. McNultys
  - g. Cromwell (Jetty)
  - h. Cromwell (beach)
  - i. South of Brewery Creek
  - j. Jacksons
  - k. Bannockburn Inlet
  - l. Champagne Gully
  - m. Dairy Creek
  - n. Weatherall Creek and Burton Creek.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> See LINZ Annual Report 2017/2018, p 18; and LINZ Biosecurity Control Programme 2017/18 Annual report, p 38.

<sup>2</sup> For example, see Guy Williams (20 October 2018) "First Step in Weed Control Operation" *Otago Daily Times*; Tom Kitchin (16 April 2018) "Spray Programmes Get Results" *Otago Daily Times*; and (10 April 2018) "Fight Against Lagarosiphon Going Well" *Otago Daily Times*

<sup>3</sup> NIWA (2016) *A Ten Year Lagarosiphon Management Plan for Lake Wanaka: 2016-2025*.

<sup>4</sup> Pam Jones (7 February 2019) "Extra funding for weed control" *Otago Daily Times*

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

<sup>6</sup> NIWA (2016) *Ten Year Management Plan for Lagarosiphon at Lake Dunstan: 2016 to 2025*, p.23.

## POTENTIAL OPTIONS

[25] If Council wishes to change its approach for lagarosiphon management, it could consider the following broad options (the status quo is included for comparison). Further work would be required to determine the costs, benefits, and practicalities of each approach.

### Option 1: Status quo

[26] LINZ has the responsibility, capability and authority to manage lagarosiphon on its land (i.e. the lake and river beds). The current management approach appears to be making progress. The 2020 review of management plans provides the opportunity for a full review of the issue and the options for future management.

[27] ORC assists by ensuring regulatory barriers to lagarosiphon management are minimised (so long as this is environmentally sound), by committing some funding to management in Lake Dunstan, advocating good management practices such as MPI's Check, Clean, Dry programme, and surveillance and monitoring. Again, the 2020 review provides the opportunity to reconsider the role that ORC plays.

### Option 2: Council takes a stronger leadership role

[28] ORC may wish to explore taking a stronger leadership role in lagarosiphon management.

[29] The introduction of the "good neighbour" rules in the Biosecurity Act 1993 make this approach difficult.<sup>2</sup> A good neighbour rule is the only way Council can cause the Crown to become liable to meet obligations or costs.<sup>3</sup>

[30] Good neighbour rules are not applicable in the case of lagarosiphon management because lagarosiphon will not spread beyond the waterbody, and there are no "neighbours" managing lagarosiphon.<sup>4</sup>

[31] ORC would need to build internal capability to either perform or purchase lagarosiphon management. It is not clear what additional benefit ORC could bring to lagarosiphon management over the approach LINZ already has in place.

### Option 3: Council commits more resources to lagarosiphon management

[32] The management plans in place for Lakes Wanaka and Dunstan and the Kawarau River note the risk of unexpected reductions in funding and having a narrow funding base for lagarosiphon management.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> ORC, *Pest Management Plan for Otago 2009, Appendix 4*.

<sup>2</sup> "Good neighbour rule" is defined in the Biosecurity Act 1993 section 2, with further direction in the National Policy Direction for Pest Management 2015 (NPD) clause 8, pursuant to section 56(3) of the Act. A good neighbour rule applies to an occupier of land and a pest that is present on that land, where the pest could spread to a neighbour's land and cause them unreasonable costs. Under such a rule, the occupier can be compelled to take pest management actions but, for the rule to take effect, the neighbour must be taking reasonable measures to manage the pest on their land in the first instance.

<sup>3</sup> Biosecurity Act 1993, s69(5).

<sup>4</sup> National Policy Direction for Pest Management 2015, clause 8.

<sup>5</sup> For example, NIWA (2016) *Ten Year Management Plan for Lagarosiphon at Lake Dunstan: 2016 to 2025* p.38. Note that ORC has committed some funding to lagarosiphon management in Lake Dunstan since this management plan came into effect.

- [33] It may be that increased funding could hasten lagarosiphon eradication in Lake Wanaka and the Kawarau River, and by extension Lake Dunstan. Further work could be done to examine what different levels of funding could achieve. Such work could inform ORC's next Long-Term Plan if the Council wished to explore a more aggressive programme with significantly increased funding.

## **CONSIDERATIONS**

### **Policy Considerations**

- [34] Lagarosiphon is listed as a pest under the current and proposed Regional Pest Management Plans. The existing approach to lagarosiphon management is consistent with both, though rules in the proposed Regional Pest Management Plan are broad enough to accommodate some change in approach.
- [35] The approach to lagarosiphon management is also consistent with policies in the Partially Operative Otago Regional Policy Statement 2019, and with policies and rules in the Regional Plan: Water.

### **Financial Considerations**

- [36] ORC contributes \$25,000 towards management of lagarosiphon in Lake Dunstan. The financial impact of the lagarosiphon management on ORC is relatively minor, as LINZ is the lead agency and funder.
- [37] ORC also performs some surveillance and monitoring of lagarosiphon. Costs over the previous 5 financial years (2013/14 to 2014/15) average around \$38,000 and range from \$23,619 (2014/15) to \$55,886 (2013/14). ORC has spent \$7,458 in the 2018/19 year to date.

### **Significance and Engagement**

- [38] If a change in ORC's approach to Lagarosiphon management is desired, several aspects of ORC's Significance and Engagement policy may be triggered:
- a. Changes for lagarosiphon management that will affect the way people interact with iconic waterways.
  - b. There is regional public interest, especially from the Queenstown-Lakes District.
  - c. Depending on the options to be explored, there could be consequences for ORC's work programme, and financial implications.
- [39] The scale of potential change has not been explored. If change is to occur, a communications and engagement plan will need to be developed commensurate with the scale of that change.

### **Legislative Considerations**

- [40] The Otago Regional Council develops Regional Pest Management Plans under the Biosecurity Act 1993, s13(1), and, under the same section, has power to cause monitoring and surveillance of pests to be carried out within its region. Council may also act as a management agency under a pest plan, in accordance with section 14 of the Biosecurity Act. However, ORC has limited ability to direct the Crown in relation to pest management on Crown land.

**NEXT STEPS**

[41] In the absence of further direction from Council, LINZ is due to review the management programme next year. This will provide an opportunity for ORC to input if the review indicates a change in approach is warranted.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Nil



### 10.3. Directors Report on Progress

**Prepared for:** Regulatory Committee  
**Report No.** GOV1824  
**Activity:** Governance Report  
**Endorsed by:** Peter Winder, Acting Director Environmental Monitoring & Operations  
**Date:** 6 March 2019

---

#### PURPOSE

- [1] To update the Committee on regulatory activity undertaken during the period 8 January 2019 to 28 February 2019.

#### STAFF RECOMMENDATION

*That the Council:*

- 1) **Receives** this report.

#### COMPLIANCE

##### Consent Inspection Audits

- [2] The Manuherikia Catchment continues to be a priority focusing on irrigation water take permits. Issues identified include:
- Flood irrigation practices with possible contaminants entering races.
  - Incorrect set up of water measuring devices, or devices installed in such a way, that it does not measure all water taken under consent.
  - Storage dams which may need consenting. In some instances, it has been difficult to determine compliance when irrigation water from irrigation schemes is mixed with consented water through the same measuring device. Information obtained during consent auditing is being used by the Science team as part of their CHES modelling.
- [3] Water discharge permits in the Omakau, Teviot and Lower Waitaki were audited with no issues identified. Wastewater discharge permits in the Gibbston area and Skifields have also been audited. Issues identified during the audits include poor effluent quality and a lack of attention to consent details requiring the submission of documents to demonstrate that the system is well maintained and installed as per the application. Appropriate communications with TLA's regarding wastewater discharges from small sub divisions may be required as issues have been identified, with inconsistent information being provided to the ORC and QLDC for one site in particular.
- [4] 83 Consent inspections were conducted over this period. 27 permits were graded as compliant, or minor non-compliant with no environmental effects. 18 received 0 compliance grade as the consents were not being exercised or had lapsed or been cancelled. 23 permits were graded as non-compliant with minor potential or actual effects of which 21 were water permits.

- [5] 3 permits received grades of non-compliant with significant potential or actual effects. Recommendations for enforcement action have been made where appropriate.

### **Forestry**

- [6] 5 Forestry sites were inspected over the reporting period, with one site raising concerns over lack of sediment and storm water controls, areas where river crossings have occurred without adequate controls, and slash deposited in a way which may cause issues should a flood event occur.
- [7] Staff have been in communications with District Councils regarding their own forestry operations and operations within their districts. Waitaki District Council are planning a training session with foresters in the Waitaki area in March. This is a good opportunity for both Regional and District Councils to provide information on the requirements of the National Environment Standards and answer any questions that may arise.
- [8] Staff have also been collating information that forestry operators will need access to such as the location of significant natural areas, drinking water sources, Regionally Significant Wetlands. This information is required for operators to complete Management Plans specific to the activity that they intend to undertake and will be available on the Forestry Information page on the ORC website.

### **Dairy**

- [9] 61 dairy inspections were conducted over this period with the focus on properties identified as high risk due to insufficient infrastructure, being in a poor water quality catchment, and drainage risk of effluent reaching water. 60 of these were found to be compliant on the day of the inspection. One property was graded non-compliant minor, due to ponding of effluent with no discharge to water. Enforcement action is underway for this property.

### **Contaminated Sites**

- [10] A site inspection of the Humber Street Gasworks site in Oamaru took place on 11 February 2019. This site is subject to severe coastal erosion and it is evident waste from the site (tar and cyanide complexes) is entering the coastal marine area. Discussions are being held with DOC, WCD and Kiwirail over this historic issue.
- [11] The next step would be to engage a contaminated land consultant to complete additional investigations at the site to assist in determining off-site soil disposal options for surplus material. The contaminated land consultant would need to work in conjunction with the coastal engineer to develop a remediation action plan.

### **HARBOUR MASTER ACTIVITY**

#### **Navigational Safety Bylaws**

- [12] A Hearing is set for 13 March 2019, to hear the bylaws and the panel has been appointed. Stakeholder Engagement are working up the schedule and attendance.

#### **Harbour Safety**

- [13] One near miss to report in this period involving a local fishing vessel and the LPG tanker Bougainville. The fishing vessel crossed ahead of the LPG tanker at close quarters.

Reports have been received from the pilot and master of the fishing vessel. A lesson learned email has been sent to the local commercial operators. Potential enforcement action is being considered by Maritime New Zealand.

- [14] We have had a few reports of jet ski's speeding in some areas. Until the Harbourmaster vessel is available the Harbourmaster has no effective means of conducting on the water investigations or follow up of reports or problems in a specified area. This period we have received concerned calls from members of the public in Brighton, St Bathans, Vauxhall and Broad Bay. New signage and buoyage is being considered in all areas to help with this issue
- [15] The national 'No Excuses' campaign has now commenced. The 'No Excuses' campaign will see a maritime office from Maritime New Zealand spend 5 days alongside the Harbourmaster at designated locations to interact with recreational users on our waterways. This is an education and enforcement campaign targeting boat operators that do not have enough lifejackets aboard their vessels and those that speed in excess of any speed restriction. This will be undertaken between the 9<sup>th</sup> March and 16<sup>th</sup> March 2019.
- [16] The Maritime NZ officer will have ability to issue infringement fines through the common maritime compliance tool. The 'No Excuses' campaign will end 30<sup>th</sup> March 2019.

#### **Harbourmaster General**

- [17] Construction of the new Harbourmaster vessel is underway and coming along nicely, delivery is set for 29<sup>th</sup> April 2019. A communication strategy is being worked on for an event to launch the vessel. Naming of the vessel is proposed to be through a community process.
- [18] Advertising for a Deputy Harbour Master will commence soon.
- [19] The Harbourmaster presented a council workshop, during this period. An update was provided to council on work progress and looking forward at what we may need to address.
- [20] The Harbourmaster gave a general presentation to the Maritime Society on 28th Feb 2019.
- [21] Emergency exercises have been attended both internally for Oil Spill and externally for a table top exercise considering hazardous substances issues at Ravensdown.

#### **BIOSECURITY**

##### **Freshwater Biosecurity**

- [22] The bulk of the Check Clean Dry Programme has been completed. Staff attended the Ruby Island swim, (400 plus competitors) on 26 January 2019 and Challenge Wanaka events on 14 and 16 February 2019, (650 swimmers). The Mototapu Challenge in March 2019 will be the final event. Decontamination stations have been set up at all events for didymo and lake snow.



Ruby Island swim on 26 January 2019

- [23] A separate Lagarosiphon report has been prepared by staff to update Council on the current status for Lakes Wanaka, Wakatipu and Dunstan.

### **Wallaby Control**

- [24] Two sightings of wallabies have been reported to ORC relating to wallabies being seen in Canterbury territory but relatively close to the regional boundary. The sightings were near Danseys Pass, and near Livingstone. ORC staff have followed these up with Environment Canterbury.
- [25] A further sighting was reported on S/H 87 at Deep Stream. This is still being investigated. Staff have sent a faecal sample for analysis to confirm whether some sign found is wallaby or not. We are still awaiting the results.
- [26] The Acting Director met with Environment Canterbury staff on 5 March to progress the draft MOU relating to Wallaby control.

### **Rabbit Programme**

- [27] There are several areas where staff are actively involved in planning for the upcoming poison season. Meetings with stakeholders are planned in some areas and direct landowner meetings will be held in other areas. These areas include:

- Waianakarua
- Moeraki
- Gibbston Valley/Arrow Junction
- Roxburgh/Ettrick
- Chatto Creek
- Bannockburn
- Lowburn
- Maniototo
- Middlemarch
- Cardrona
- Luggate
- Becks

[28] We are currently awaiting the results of fly trap monitoring for RHDV which was undertaken late December 2018/early January 2019. These results should provide an indication of which RHDV variants are circulating in the environment.

[29] There have also been results received of rabbit samples that were sent for analysis for RHDV. These results indicate that RHDV2 is established in Otago, with 19 samples positive for RHDV2.

#### **Biocontrol**

[30] Broom gall mite was first released in November 2012 to attack broom. It was slow to establish but now staff are finding the incidence of the mite to be quickly increasing and spreading into areas up to 30km away from release sites. Staff will continue to monitor areas and where it is not present, continue to make releases. The impact at some sites is rather dramatic with the mites often killing bushes in their entirety.



The effects of Broom Gall Mite damage on a broom bush.

### **Proposed Regional Pest Plan Review Update**

[31] Submissions closed on the RPMP review on 14 December 2018. 331 submissions were received by 14 December 2018. Of these 89 have asked to be heard. There have also been a number of late submissions. 16 have been received specifically on the Biosecurity Strategy. Staff are currently working through the submissions which are available on the Yoursay website. It is intended to when the panel meets, they will minute the acceptance of the late submissions and reasons why.

### **CONSIDERATIONS**

#### **Policy Considerations**

[32] There are no policy considerations arising from this report.

#### **Financial Considerations**

[33] Discussion of the funding of the Pest Plan to be included

#### **Significance and Engagement**

[34] No matter in this report trigger the Council's significance policy or require additional or specific consultation.

#### **Legislative Considerations**

[35] There are no legislative considerations arising from this report

### **ATTACHMENTS**

Nil

## 10.4. Consents and Building Control

**Prepared for:** Regulatory Committee  
**Report No.** PPRM1875  
**Activity:** Governance Report  
**Author:** Joanna Gilroy, Manager Consents  
**Endorsed by:** Andrew Newman, Acting Director Policy Planning & Regulatory Management  
**Date:** 1 March 2019

---

### PURPOSE

- [1] The purpose of this report is to give Committee a high-level overview of the consents and building control activity of Council and the deemed permit replacement progress for the period 1 January 2019 to 22 February 2019.

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- [2] This report aims to summarise the regulatory activity of the Consents Team.

### STAFF RECOMMENDATION

*That the Council:*

- 1) **Receives** this report.

### CONSENT PROCESSING

#### Public Notification

- [3] There have been no publicly notified consents during this period.

#### Limited Notification

- [4] There have been no limited notified consents during this period.

#### Objections

- [5] There is one objection to consent conditions that has been received during this reporting period. This has been investigated and a recommendation has gone back to the Objector for their review. If they agree with this recommendation, then it will be signed off under delegation. If not, it will go to the Objections Committee for a decision.
- [6] The objection to consent costs that was received in this reporting period has been resolved. Processing costs for the application were determined to be reasonable and in line with similar applications. The Objector has been advised of this outcome and is satisfied with the explanation provided.

## **APPEALS**

### **RM17.229 – Peter Ronald Graham**

- [7] This is an application to occupy the coastal marine area with a pontoon for operating a 'Hole in one' golf challenge.
- [8] The appellant is an unincorporated society comprised of submitters on the application. They are appealing the decision to grant the consent for a wide variety of reasons.
- [9] The applicant and appellant have been corresponding prior to any formal mediation process. They have reached agreement and have prepared a Consent Order for the Environment Court to uphold the decision with the agreed changes. A copy of the Consent Order has been circulated to Council for agreement and has been sent to the Environment Court for approval. The Director Policy Planning and Resource Management agreed to the suggested changes under delegation, ensuring they do not impact on Council's functions and jurisdiction. Once the Order has been finalised by the Environment Court the Coastal Permits will be reissued. It is hoped to have this finalised over coming weeks.

### **RM17.084 - Kyeburn Catchment Limited**

- [10] An application to take and use surface water from various locations on the Swinburn and Kyeburn for the purposes of irrigation, storage, stock water, firefighting, curling and hydro-electricity generation.
- [11] The appellant is appealing the decision to grant the consents for a wide variety of reasons.
- [12] Mediation has occurred, and the applicant and appellant have been corresponding since to reach agreement. They are currently preparing a Consent Order for the Environment Court to uphold the decision with the agreed changes. A copy of the Consent Order will be circulated to the Council for agreement prior to sending it off to the Environment Court. The Director Policy Planning and Resource Management has the delegation to agree to the suggested changes, ensuring they do not impact on Council's functions and jurisdiction.

## **CONSENT STATISTICS**

- [13] For the reporting period, all decisions, except one application with two consents, were given within Resource Management Act 1991 (the Act) mandated timeframes. The exception exceeded the timeframes by one working day. 34% of the decisions made during the reporting period utilised a timeframe extension; in most cases this was to enable the applicant to review the proposed conditions.
- [14] For the year to date all decisions on consents, except two applications with two consents, each granted, were given within the Act mandated timeframes.
- [15] The current number of consent applications in the system for processing is 156. For context, in the same period in 2018 there were 127 in the system. With this number of consents in the system staff workloads remain high, but statutory timeframes are generally being met.



[16] The number of applications lodged during this reporting period is 69, which is the same number lodged as the previous reporting period. The median number of consents lodged per week for during this reporting period is 8.6.

[17] The summary of consents statistics is set out in Appendix 1 to this report.

#### **DEEMED PERMIT REPLACEMENT**

[18] There were originally 795 deemed permits that included 'paper' or unexercised permits. There are currently 347 deemed permits that are current or possibly live. This figure includes:

- deemed permits that are likely to be replaced;
- deemed permits that are not likely to be replaced; and
- deemed permits that have obtained a replacement consent but have not yet surrendered their deemed permit. If the deemed permit is not expired, it will remain current until 1 October 2021.

[19] It is estimated that approximately 2/3 (i.e. approx. 230) of the current deemed permits are yet to apply for a replacement consent.

[20] During the reporting period no replacement applications for deemed permits were received. One replacement consent for a deemed permit was granted during this period. One deemed permit was surrendered, cancelled or expired during this reporting period. Overall, fourteen deemed permits are currently being processed for replacement consents.

[21] The breakdown of deemed permits per catchment are set out in Appendix 2 to this report.

#### **CONSENT ADMINISTRATION**

[22] 32 transfers (to transfer ownership of a resource consent) were received, with 31 issued during this reporting period. The median number of transfers per week for the year to date is 4.

[23] The summary of consents administration statistics is set out in Appendix 3 to this report.

#### **BUILDING CONSENT AUTHORITY (BCA) ADMINISTRATION**

[24] In the year to date very little activity has occurred in the building consent application arena. Council has only received one application for a new permit and one application for a minor variation to an existing permit.

[25] The summary of BCA statistics is set out in Appendix 4 to this report.

#### **PUBLIC ENQUIRIES**

[26] 244 enquiries were received during this reporting period. The median number of public enquires per week for the year to date is 30.5.

[27] Details are set out in Appendix 5 to this report.

## **REVIEW OF COUNCIL'S RESOURCE CONSENTING FUNCTION**

[28] A separate paper has been prepared on this matter.

## **CONSIDERATIONS**

### **Policy Considerations**

[29] There are no policy considerations.

### **Financial Considerations**

[30] There is budget in the 2018/19 Annual Plan for the Consent Department functions.

### **Significance and Engagement**

[31] The Council's Significance and Engagement Policy is not relevant to this item.

### **Legislative Considerations**

[32] The Consents Department is following the Resource Management Act 1991 and Building Act 2004 statutory requirements.

## **NEXT STEPS**

[33] The next steps are to continue the regulatory functions as required. A stocktake will be undertaken when the review of Council's Resource Consent Function report is received.

## **ATTACHMENTS**

Nil

## Appendix 1: Consents Statistics

**Table 1: Consents Statistics Summary**

Reporting Period	Lodged			Rejected	Decision Given		
	Consents	Variations			Consents	Variations	
		Regular	Water reporting date*			Regular	Water reporting date*
1/1/2019 to 22/2/2019	69	9	0	4	48	6	0
<b>18/19 YTD</b>	<b>307</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>230</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>2</b>

\* Means the date water metre and/or flow records are to be provided to the Council.

**Table 2: Breakdown of Granted Consent Type**

Notification Group	Consent Type	Without Hearing			Total
		S37 Extention	Within Timeframe	Total	
Non Notified	☑ Certificate	-	1	1	1
	☑ Coastal Permit	1	-	1	1
	☑ Discharge Permit	6	5	11	11
	☑ Land Use Permit	3	23	26	26
	☑ Water Permit	4	5	9	9
<b>Total</b>		<b>14</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>Total</b>		<b>14</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>48</b>

**Appendix 2: Deemed Permits Breakdown Per Catchment up to 22 February 2019**

Catchment Name	Original number of Deemed Permits	Number of Replacement Applicants Currently Being Processed	Number of Current or Possibly Live Deemed Permits
Quartz Creek	1	0	1
Manuherikia Catchment	189	3	71
Crook Burn (2)	4	1	2
Camp Creek (1)	3	0	2
Taieri Catchment	209	2	75
Long Gully (1)	4	1	1
Unnamed Trib's of Clutha River above Tuapeka Mouth	20	0	8
Lowburn Creek	18	1	13
Waikerikeri Creek	6	0	3
Arrow River	16	0	12
Bendigo Creek	3	0	2
Five Mile Creek (1)	3	0	1
Coal Creek	8	0	7
Toms Creek	3	0	2
Unnamed Trib's of Kawarau River	3	0	2
Lindis River	41	4	19
Cardrona River	40	0	14
Stony Burn	2	0	0
No GIS data or specified catchment	41	0	18
Luggate Catchment	13	1	12
Teviot River	2	0	2
Unnamed Trib's of Lake Hawea	5	0	2
Shingle Creek	13	0	10
Unnamed Trib's of Clutha River above Lake Dunstan	6	0	3
Basin Burn	4	0	4
Tinwald Burn	4	0	3
Tima Burn	3	0	0
Albert Burn (1)	5	0	4
Schoolhouse Creek	1	0	1
Kidd Creek	1	0	1
Nevis River	2	0	2
Bannock Burn	23	0	9
Pipeclay Gully	4	0	1
Butchers Creek (1)	2	0	2
Chapmans Gully	1	0	1

Fraser River	10	0	8
Mt Pisa	1	0	0
Roaring Meg	6	0	4
Amisfield Burn	9	0	5
John Bull Creek	2	0	1
Poison Creek	1	0	1
Black Jacks Creek	2	0	1
Goat Camp Creek	2	0	0
Wye Creek	1	0	0
Beaumont River	1	0	1
Unnamed Trib's of Lake Wanaka	1	0	0
Cambells Creek	1	0	1
Park Burn	7	0	3
Washpool Creek (1)	5	0	4
Ripponvale Road	2	0	2
Rees River	2	0	1
Devils Creek	2	0	0
Quartz Reef Creek	4	1	1
Kakanui Catchment	2	0	0
Unnamed Trib's of Lake Whakatipu	1	0	0
Donaldsons Creek	4	0	0
Unnamed Trib's of Lake Dunstan	3	0	1
Pomahaka River	3	0	3
Lake Hayes Catchment	2	0	0
Wanaka Township	3	0	2
Shotover River	1	0	1
Frankton Arm	1	0	0
Burn Cottage Creek	5	0	5
Unnamed Trib's of Clutha River above Lake Roxburgh	2	0	1
Franks Creek	2	0	2
Leaning Rock Creek	1	0	0
Elbow Creek	1	0	0
School Creek	1	0	0
Waitahuna Catchment	1	0	1
Totals	795	14	359

### Appendix 3: Consent Administration

**Table 3: Consent Administration Statistics**

<b>Reporting Period</b>	<b>Transfers Received</b>	<b>Transfers Issued</b>	<b>s417 Certs Received</b>	<b>s417 Certs Issued</b>
1/1/2019 to 22/2/2019	32	31	0	0
<b>18/19 YTD</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>

#### Appendix 4: Building Consent Authority (BCA) Administration

**Table 4: Building Act Statistics**

Reporting Period	Building Permits		Certificate of Acceptance		Code Compliance Certificate	
	Received	Issued	Received	Issued	Received	Issued
1/1/2019 to 22/2/2019	1	0	0	0	0	0
<b>18/19 YTD</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

## Appendix 5: Public Enquiries

**Table 5: Public Enquiries Statistics**

Period	Number of Enquiries
<b>17/18</b>	<b>2415</b>
1/1/2019 to 22/2/2019	244
<b>18/19 YTD</b>	<b>1,335</b>

**Table 6: Resource Consent Public Enquiries Report for Period 1 January 2019 to 22 February 2019**

Type of Enquiry	No	% of Total
Current Consents	92	38
Other	29	11
Permitted Activity	50	20
Pre-application	33	14
Property Enquiries	32	13
TLA Enquiries	2	1
Transfers	6	3

Method of Enquiry	No	% of Total
Counter	11	5
E-mail	131	54
Letter	3	1
Telephone	99	40

Enquiry Location	Total	% of 244
Central Otago DC	82	34
Clutha DC	28	11
Dunedin CC	35	14
Queenstown Lakes DC	51	51
Throughout Otago	7	3
Unspecified	29	12
Waitaki DC	12	5



## 10.5. Plan Change 6A - The Good Water Programme

<b>Prepared for:</b>	Regulatory Committee
<b>Report No.</b>	CEO1813
<b>Activity:</b>	Governance Report
<b>Author:</b>	Sarah Gardner, Chief Executive
<b>Endorsed by:</b>	Sarah Gardner, Chief Executive
<b>Date:</b>	5 March 2019

---

### PURPOSE

- [1] To confirm the principles and key areas of focus for the implementation of Plan Change 6A – the Good Water Programme.

### STAFF RECOMMENDATION

*That the Council:*

1. **Receives** this report.
2. **Endorses** the Principles and Priorities for the Good Water Programme Implementation of Plan Change 6A

### BACKGROUND

- [2] Plan Change 6A has been in place for some time. It is now imperative that a concerted effort is made by Council to ensure the maximum uptake of its Permitted Activity rules before 2020 when key components of the policy framework become live.
- [3] The intent of 6A is that water quality in rural environments be managed through effects-based regulation. This means landowners have a set of standards they must meet, but how they meet them is for them to determine.
- [4] Council now has less than 18 months to support landowners to comply with the Permitted Activity rules of 6A before 2020 when consenting will be required where those rules are not met.

### DISCUSSION

- [5] The attached document sets out the principles and priorities by which implementation of 6A is proposed to be supported. Importantly the target is for landowners to comply, thus avoiding the need for resource consent for rural water quality discharges. A comprehensive effort is planned by ORC to ensure that landowners have the clarity and support to make compliance possible.
- [6] The approach will be to focus on the worst catchments first – those catchments where there are significant known water quality issues. The intent is that by working with landowners, helping them to understand why it is important to comply and ensuring they are clear about their responsibilities, the need for resource consenting of activities that do not comply with Permitted Activity rules will be minimised.

- [7] Plan Change 6A has become a piece of policy that has generated internal and external uncertainty – resulting in patchy implementation to date and variable uptake across the rural sector. Our role is to be consistently clear about what this policy requires, but not to advise landowners on how to achieve compliance. Council endorsement of the Principles and Priorities for the Good Water Programme will empower leadership and staff inside ORC to confidently engage on 6A with clarity.
- [8] The roles of catchment groups, NGO's and others will be important as we work to ensure compliance with Permitted Activity rules. We will focus on partnering and on leveraging existing initiatives and programmes to support compliance e.g. Dairy NZ's Farm Plan programme and our own Water Plan Review.

### **ORGANISATIONAL PREPAREDNESS**

- [9] To support the implementation of 6A the organisation is establishing a programme management approach where the work of various teams will be coordinated, tracked, risk managed and driven through a newly established position of Good Water Programme Manager. The Good Water Programme Manager will sit in the Operations Group of Council. The Programme Manager will ensure that the implementation plan is delivering results. They will provide focus on the work required across various teams in the organisation to realise the greatest level of compliance with Permitted Activity rules before 2020.
- [10] The teams with responsibilities for implementation sit across the organisation. They are the Compliance Teams, Consents Team, Science Team, Rural Liaison and Support Team and Communications Team. Each team has draft plans in place to support the priorities and the operate within the principles outlined in the attached document.
- [11] Existing budget allocated to Water Implementation will support these activities until 30 June 2019 and a reallocation of that same budget will support these activities in the 2019/2020 financial year.

### **NEXT STEPS**

- [12] The next steps are:
- To complete the recruitment of the Good Water Programme Manager
  - Finalise draft plans
  - Refocus the work of the Rural Liaison and Support Team
  - Identify the first catchment of focus
  - Map key stakeholders and diary engagement
  - Establish key messaging for winter, including stock management

### **ATTACHMENTS**

1. Good Water Implementation Programme - 6 A **[10.5.1]**

## 11. RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

That the public be excluded from the following parts of this meeting, namely:

- *Approval of the minutes of the 31 January 2019 Public Excluded Regulatory Committee meeting.*
- *2.1 EMO1850 Enforcement Action*
- *2.2 PPRM1880 Comments on Function Review*

### 11.99. PUBLIC EXCLUDED POSTAMBLE

The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under [section 48\(1\)](#) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

General subject of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
<i>Approval of the minutes of the 31 January 2019 Public Excluded Regulatory Committee meeting.</i>	That the exclusion of the public from the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting is necessary to enable the local authority to deliberate in private on its decision or recommendation in any proceedings to which this paragraph applies – Section 48(1)(d)	Section 48(1)(a); Section 48(1)(d)
<i>2.1 EMO1850 Enforcement Action</i>	LGOIMA Section 6 (a) to prejudice the maintenance of the law, including the prevention, investigation, and detection of offences, and the right to a fair trial;	Section 6(a)
<i>2.2 PPRM1880 Comments on Function Review</i>	To protect the privacy of natural persons 7(2)a; to protect information which is subject to an obligation of confidence or which any person has been or could be compelled to provide under the authority of any 7(2)(c)(i) and 7(2)(c)(ii); and, to maintain legal professional privilege, 7(2)(g).	Section 7(2)a; 7(2)(c)(i); 7(2)(c)(ii); 7(2)(g)

This resolution is made in reliance on [section 48\(1\)\(a\)](#) of the [Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987](#) and the particular interest or interests protected by [section 6](#) or [section 7](#) of that Act or [section 6](#) or [section 7](#) or [section 9](#) of the Official Information Act 1982, as the case may require, which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows:

*Approval of the minutes of the 31 January Public Excluded Regulatory Committee Meeting -*  
That the exclusion of the public from the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting is necessary to enable the local authority to deliberate in private on its decision or recommendation in any proceedings to which this paragraph applies – Section 48(1)(d)

*2.1 EMO1850 Enforcement Action* - to prejudice the maintenance of the law, including the prevention, investigation, and detection of offences, and the right to a fair trial;

*2.2.PPRM1880 Comments on Function Review* - To protect the privacy of natural persons 7(2)a; to protect information which is subject to an obligation of confidence or which any person has been or could be compelled to provide under the authority of any 7(2)(c)(i) and 7(2)(c)(ii); and, to maintain legal professional privilege, 7(2)(g).

## **12. NOTICES OF MOTION**

## **13. CLOSURE**