

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

THE WEST COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL

Notice is hereby given that a meeting of the **RESOURCE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE** will be held in the Offices of the West Coast Regional Council, 388 Main South Road, Paroa, Greymouth on **Tuesday, 14th December 2010**

B.CHINN
CHAIRPERSON

M. MEEHAN
Planning and Environmental Manager
C. DALL
Consents and Compliance Manager

<u>AGENDA NUMBERS</u>	<u>PAGE NUMBERS</u>	<u>BUSINESS</u>
1.		APOLOGIES
2.	1 – 4	MINUTES 2.1 Confirmation of Minutes of Resource Management Committee Meeting – 8 November 2010
3.		PRESENTATION
4.		CHAIRMAN'S REPORT
5.		REPORTS
		5.1 Planning and Environmental Group
	5 – 6	5.1.1 Planning & Environmental Manager's Monthly Report
	7	5.1.2 Proposed Land and Water Plan
	8	5.1.3 Regional Pest Plant Management Strategy for the West Coast
	9 - 20	5.1.4 Summary of the 2010 New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement
	21 - 28	5.1.5 Removal of RCA's from Regional Coastal Plan
	29	5.1.6 Aquaculture Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 3)
	30	5.1.7 Civil Defence & Regional Transport Report
		5.2 Consents and Compliance Group
	31 – 34	5.2.1 Consents Monthly Report
	35 – 38	5.2.2 Compliance & Enforcement Monthly Report
		6.0 GENERAL BUSINESS

THE WEST COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
HELD ON 8 NOVEMBER 2010 AT THE OFFICES OF THE WEST COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL,
388 MAIN SOUTH ROAD, GREYMOUTH, COMMENCING AT 10.30 A.M.****PRESENT:**

B. Chinn (Chairman), R. Scarlett, D. Davidson, A. Robb, A. Birchfield, T. Archer, I. Cummings,
F. Tumahai

IN ATTENDANCE:

C. Ingle (Chief Executive Officer), S. Moran (Planning & Environmental Manager), C. Dall (Consents & Compliance Manager), R. Mallinson (Corporate Services Manager), T. Jellyman (Minutes Clerk), The Media

Cr Chinn welcomed F. Tumahai to his first meeting representing Ngati Waewae and Cr Cummings to his first Resource Management Committee meeting.

1. APOLOGIES

Moved (Archer / Robb) *that the apology from T. Scott be accepted.*

Carried

2. MINUTES

Moved (Robb / Archer) *that the minutes of the previous Resource Management Committee meeting dated 14 September 2010, be confirmed as correct.*

Carried

Matters Arising

There were no matters arising.

3. PRESENTATION

There was no presentation.

LATE ITEM**COASTAL PLAN CHANGE 2 OPERATIVE**

Moved (Archer / Robb)

S. Moran advised that this matter was overlooked for the October meeting. He stated that this is the final part of the process when the Plan change is now made operative.

1. *That the Council make operative Plan Change 2 to the Regional Coastal Plan, under Clause 20 of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act.*
2. *That the Council set 16 November 2010 as the operative date for Plan Change 2 to the Regional Coastal Plan.*

Carried

4. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

Cr Chinn stated that he has nothing to report at this stage.

5. REPORTS

5.1 PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL GROUP

5.1.1 PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER'S MONTHLY REPORT

S. Moran spoke to his report and advised that 60 submissions have been received on the Proposed Regional Land and Water Plan. He reported that early in the New Year we would be inviting further submissions with the summary of submissions completed by the end of this year.

S. Moran reported that the appeal period for the Regional Pest Plant Management Strategy has now closed and he is not aware of any appeals having been received.

S. Moran reported that the Marine and Coastal Area (Takutai Moana) Bill impacts on this council are minimal. He advised that staff have been though this and there is nothing contained in the Bill that requires a submission from this Council. S. Moran invited the meeting to let him know if they felt there was anything they wished to make a submission on. Cr Davidson asked if there is any impact on customary rights. S. Moran responded that the Marine Protection Forum has dealt with this along with Makaawhio and Ngati Waewae who were looking at reserves that were separate to this. Cr Davidson asked F. Tumahai if customary reserves are identified areas on the maps. F. Tumahai confirmed that these areas are identified on maps but last time he saw them they were still in draft form. F. Tumahai offered to send these maps to S. Moran.

S. Moran advised that the key points to note in the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement are the requirements to identify where activities or developments might be inappropriate, this will require close consideration. S. Moran advised that the restricted coastal activity status has been removed. He reported that a timeframe has now been put in place for hazards and to assess risk over a one hundred year timeframe. S. Moran advised that a tougher line would now be taken for coastal settlements in terms of discouraging seawalls etc. Cr Archer passed on his appreciation of council staff and management for the submissions they made to the Coastal Policy Statement. He stated that the removal of restricted coastal activities from the regional plan is a significant and positive step for the future of the West Coast. S. Moran stated that it is pleasing to achieve some of the changes we were seeking.

S. Moran reported that a submission on the Proposed National Environmental Standard for Plantation Forestry was lodged to seek changes to land preparation and hazard prone areas.

S. Moran reported that the key point of the discussion document on reforming urban and infrastructure planning is investigating replacing existing regional strategic planning instruments such as the Regional Land Transport Strategy and the Regional Policy Statement with spatial plans to simplify the planning system. S. Moran advised that this is driven out of the Auckland reforming of the super city and is not really applicable for the West Coast. S. Moran advised that as this is worked through there will be a submission to the next council meeting that says if you want to do this keep it in Auckland and use it as a pilot but not to apply it to the rest of the country until issues that arise are ironed out. He stated it would be preferable if the West Coast did not see this at all.

S. Moran reported that the New Zealand Waste Strategy is not a legally binding document but when the Regional Policy Statement is redone this area will be looked at closely.

S. Moran reported that the draft of the Regional Land Transport Strategy will go to the next Regional Land Transport Committee meeting in December and publicly notified in the New Year.

S. Moran reported that the Coordinating Executive Group for Civil Defence met on the 28th of October. He advised that the MCDEM staff member attending this meeting made some interesting points relating to the Canterbury earthquake on what worked well during this event.

S. Moran reported that the building of the Weather Radar is still on track but may now not be built until towards the end of 2011. He advised that all access agreements for this are now in place.

S. Moran reported that Exercise Tangaroa, the national exercise based on a tsunami off the coast of Peru went well. He stated that this council participated in the exercise at a fairly low level and attended the national controllers teleconferences. He stated that Grey District Council were the local authority which activated to the greatest degree. S. Moran stated that although training is different to the reality of an event such as the Canterbury earthquake, it does provide a good opportunity to iron out little issues before an event which is a major part of being ready. Cr Scarlett asked that in such an event off the coast of Peru how long would it take for the wave to arrive. S. Moran advised that it would be about 17 hours before it hits the West Coast with the maximum wave arriving 20 – 24 hours from first impact. S. Moran stated that the whole situation was around 2 – 3 days long; with people requiring evacuation and welfare care. S. Moran explained the warning systems in place for the waves, he noted that the key factor is that it is not just the time that the wave arrives but the maximum wave could be 24 hours after the first wave then disturbed seas for three days after this and the whole event could last for up to a week.

S. Moran reported on the Resilience Fund Application. He advised that the four West Coast Councils have put in an application for satellite communications that can deal with data and will link us into Wellington to enable the transfer of information and will provide a more robust system for the linking with individual emergency operation centres located at the district councils. S. Moran advised that the funding application will be for ongoing operational funding for three years.

Cr Archer stated that he is concerned that contestable funding is likely to benefit the more affluent councils the most as they have more staff resources to make funding applications and this could be to the detriment of smaller less affluent councils. He stated that historically this is what happens with contestable funding. S. Moran stated that this has been a concern from the start as bigger councils have more staff or may engage consultants to assist with funding applications. S. Moran advised that a meeting is to be held this month with all the Chairs of the CEG's in attendance to thrash out the criteria might work. He advised that Stuart Gray from Buller District Council will be attending and will make sure that our concerns are aired. Cr Davidson stated that he hopes the funding allocation is made on a land base and not population based funding. Cr Scarlett stated that we have a good case to put in view of the alpine fault and is hopeful of getting more than \$3,000 out of \$1M. C. Ingle stated that he feels council has put in a good application and that there has been a move away from population based funding and he feels it is unlikely that they will swing back that way. He noted that communication is difficult on the West Coast and it is very likely that communication will be lost during a major event. In view of this, C. Ingle stated that he would be very surprised if the funding request is not granted.

S. Moran advised that there have been a few heavy rainfall events during this reporting period, he noted that this report covers September and October. He advised that the largest event was a 1 in 10 year and a 1 in 20 year event in the Karamea area which occurred on the 6th of September and resulted in surface flooding around the town.

Cr Archer drew attention to the Changes to the Public Works Act in relation to compensation. He asked if there were any incentives, which could link this Act to providing compensation for lack of permitted activity for land of significance under Section 6 of the RMA, or is the public works amendment a stand alone act in terms of taking land under the Public Works Act. S. Moran offered to look into this further as he is unsure of this.

Cr Davidson passed on his appreciation of N. Costley's article published in the Civil Defence Impact magazine reporting on her trip to Japan which was sponsored by MCDEM.

C. Ingle suggested a second recommendation to endorse the submission on the Proposed NES for Plantation Forestry.

Moved (Archer / Robb)

1. *That this report be received*
2. *That Council endorses the attached submission on the Proposed NES for Plantation Forestry.*

Carried

5.1.2 REGIONAL TRANSPORT COMMITTEE CONSTITUTION

S. Moran spoke to this report and advised that the reconstitution of the Regional Transport Committee is a requirement following the Local Body Elections. He advised that currently there is not a Cultural Interests representative appointed but once this appointment is made then the person's name will be brought to Council for approval.

Moved (Archer / Birchfield) *that the Council ratify the appointments for the Objective representatives to the reconstituted Regional Transport Committee.*

Carried

5.2 CONSENTS AND COMPLIANCE GROUP

5.2.1 CONSENTS MONTHLY REPORT

C. Dall spoke to this report. He advised that a large number of consents were issued during the reporting period as it was a two month period due to there not being an October Resource Management Committee meeting. C. Dall advised that MR and GG Ferguson Partnership consent application was a limited notified consent which went to a hearing for a proposed alluvial gold mining operation near Squatters Creek. C. Dall advised that the decision was released and the consents granted, he is unaware of any appeals being lodged on this application therefore it can now proceed.

C. Dall advised that Council has received and publicly notified the applications for a coalmine on the Denniston Plateau, which was lodged by L & M Coal Ltd. He stated that at the close of submissions 177 submissions were received with some late submissions that are likely to be accepted. He advised that he does not have a split of the number in opposition or support but he will supply this information to Councillors if they wish. C. Dall advised that a hearing date is yet to be set but a hearing will be required along with the appointment of commissioners. Cr Archer asked if this proposal is the one known as Bathurst. C. Dall confirmed this.

Moved (Robb / Archer) *that the November 2010 report of the Consents Group be received.*

Carried

5.2.2 COMPLIANCE & ENFORCEMENT MONTHLY REPORT

C. Dall reported that monitoring of dairy effluent discharges is being ramped up in view of the new dairy season. C. Dall reported that gravel extraction monitoring is continuing with no significant issues arising during the reporting period. C. Dall reported that the Taramakau and Wanganui Rivers have been visited by staff to monitor whitebait stands.

C. Dall reported that the noncompliance issue relating to Pike River Coalmine was not significant but follow up with the company is underway. He advised that monitoring results at OceanaGold are also been followed up on with some pikes in turbidity in Devils Creek being followed up. C. Dall reported that OceanaGold has undertaken a trial to try to accelerate the recovery of Devils Creek which has been affected by sediment discharges from the mine site. C. Dall stated that at this stage the trial looks fairly successful but the longterm effectiveness is still uncertain.

C. Dall reported that an increase in pH found in Rudolph Creek does not look as though it is associated with the Stockton Mine site at this stage but this is being investigated further.

C. Dall advised that 38 complaints were received during the two month reporting period. He advised that one infringement notice and two abatement notices were issued during the reporting period.

Cr Birchfield asked for an update on John Morris's bond. He stated that council had agreed to release this bond a couple of years ago but it was rescinded. C. Dall advised that council has been keen to resolve this matter and some of the desirable rehab has now taken place. There is a current mining operation on this site which is providing some overburden and fill that the depression needs. C. Dall advised that council is still working with both parties to try to get a mutual and acceptable outcome and they are now getting to the heart of the issues of what is required for this site to enable the bond to be released. Cr Birchfield asked if it is correct that the landowner is denying access to the miner to do the restoration? C. Dall stated that this was an issue early on but he is unsure if this is an issue at the moment. C. Dall advised that the key matter has been how to revegetate the site, as this was not successful in the first place. Cr Birchfield stated that this has gone on for too long and council needs to take a lead on this. C. Dall offered to bring a report to the next meeting on this matter.

Moved (Archer / Davidson) *that the November 2010 report of the Compliance Group be received.*

Carried

6.0 GENERAL BUSINESS

Cr Archer raised the matter of councillors, especially new councillors and Iwi Representatives, contacting management should there be any issues in the council agenda papers that they require more information on prior to the meeting. Cr Archer feels that by researching issues prior to the meeting this would then allow for the sharing of information especially if it is a technical matter that might require assistance from staff. C. Ingle welcomed councillors and Iwi representatives to contact him or other managers at any time either by telephone or email should they require any information or assistance prior to the meeting.

The meeting closed at 11.14 a.m.

.....
Chairman

.....
Date

THE WEST COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL

Prepared for: Council Meeting – 14 December 2010
Prepared by: Michael Meehan – Planning & Environmental Manager
Date: 2 December 2010

Subject: PLANNING & ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER'S MONTHLY REPORT

PLANNING**Environmental Protection Authority Bill**

The Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) Bill was introduced to Parliament on 16 November 2010 and has passed its first reading unaminously. The Bill establishes the new EPA as a Crown agency with regulatory and technical functions. The Bill has been referred to the Local Government Select Committee for report back by 28 March 2011, to ensure a smooth transition to the new Authority on 1 July 2011. The EPA has evolved from the government's reforms to the RMA over the last two years, and its role is to:

- Process matters for proposals of national significance and applications called in under the RMA;
- Provide advice and information on the development and implementation of national environmental standards developed under the RMA;
- Undertake all of the functions currently performed by the Environmental Risk Management Authority (ERMA) under the HSNO Act;
- Undertake administration of the Emissions Trading Scheme.

On request from the relevant Minister the EPA may:

- Provide technical advice on environmental regulation-making;
- Provide secretarial and administrative assistance to committees and advisory bodies;
- Contribute to, and co-operate with, international forums and carry out international obligations.

Draft Canterbury Regional Policy Statement 2010

Staff assessed the Draft Canterbury Regional Policy Statement 2010 (RPS). Due to the geographic boundary between the two regions there are few issues identified that has an effect on the West Coast. However, staff did make a submission regarding State Highway 73 and the importance accorded to this. A method was sought to be added to the RPS which will see the Canterbury Regional Land Transport Strategy give priority to upgrading existing strategic road links with neighbouring regions.

RESOURCE SCIENCE**Lakes Workshop**

Council hosted a workshop on lakes in conjunction with the Department of Conservation (DoC). NIWA's Principal Scientist presented at the workshop, along with Federated Farmers, DoC and Council staff, on a range of issues associated with lake health.

The workshop was funded by an Envirolink grant to WCRC, and a contribution from DoC. The workshop provided an opportunity for a variety of lake users to understand some of the issues faced, and work towards strategies to improve lake health and share information.

Hydrology / Flood Warning

No floods that triggered any alarm levels occurred during reporting period.

Data Requests

2 Groundwater, 2 Rainfall and 2 Flow/Water Level data requests were processed during the reporting period.

RECOMMENDATION

That this report is received.

Michael Meehan
Planning & Environmental Manager

THE WEST COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL

Prepared for: Resource Management Committee
Prepared by: Katherine Glasgow - Planner
Date: 2 December 2010

Subject: **Proposed Regional Land and Water Plan**

Purpose

This report provides an update on the Proposed Regional Land and Water Plan and sets out the process from here on in.

Background

The Proposed Regional Land and Water plan combines three of the Council's Resource Management Plans, and was notified on 17 September 2010.

A total of 58 submissions were received on the Proposed Plan by the closing date of 15 October 2010. Two late submissions were also received.

Further submissions

The summary of submissions will be notified on 10 January 2011, and further submissions invited, in accordance with Clause 7 of the RMA First Schedule. Further submissions can be made by any person in support of, or in opposition to, any of the decisions requested in the summary of submissions. While the Act specifies 10 working days for the further submissions process a more generous timeframe to allow for the holiday period is recommended, with a closing date of 28 January 2011 suggested.

Staff recommending report

Once further submissions close, further submissions received on the Proposed Plan will be incorporated into a summary of submissions, and a staff recommending report will be drafted.

Hearings

The Council will hold hearings on the submissions received on the Proposed Plan in accordance with the First Schedule of the RMA. Every person who has made a submission will have the opportunity to be heard. The Hearing Panel will make decisions on submissions and release a decisions report.

Councillors need to consider their availability to serve on the hearings panel, given this commitment may span several days. The timing is not yet clear but will probably be in April or May 2011.

RECOMMENDATION

- 1. That the Council receive this report.*
- 2. That the Council accept the two late submissions.*
- 3. That the Council agree to further submissions being open until 28 January 2011.*
- 4. That the Council appoint all members of the Resource Management Committee as available, to hear submissions, make and release decisions on submissions on the Proposed Land and Water Plan.*

Michael Meehan
Planning and Environmental Manager

THE WEST COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL

Prepared for: Resource Management Committee
Prepared by: Nichola Costley, Regional Planner.
Dated: 25 November 2010

Subject: **Regional Pest Plant Management Strategy for the West Coast**

Purpose

To make operative the Regional Pest Plant Management Strategy for the West Coast 2010.

Background

The five year review for the Pest Plant Management Strategy for the West Coast was recently completed. The previous Strategy had some major success in achieving eradication of two of the four total control pest plants identified in the Strategy, within the timeframes set by the Strategy. Progress was also made in all progressive control areas identified in the Strategy.

The Regional Council reviewed the Strategy under Section 88 of the Biosecurity Act (the Act) in order to extend it by a further five years. Several amendments to the Strategy were proposed, to further improve the Strategy.

The Proposed Strategy was notified for public submissions at the July 2010 Council meeting and six submissions were received. A Summary of Submissions was prepared in accordance with Section 1 of the Second Schedule of the Act and was followed by a Hearing held in September 2010. Two submitters presented evidence at the Hearing. The Decisions Report was publicly notified in October 2010. There were no appeals.

With the process for review of the Strategy completed, the Strategy can now be made operative by affixing the Council seal as per Section 79F(2) of the Act.

Implementation of the Strategy

There are several tasks that are required to implement the reviewed Strategy. These include:

- Updating the information sheets on the Council website to address the new total control pest plants; and,
- Updating the information sheets on the Council website to address the new progressive control pest plants.

Recommendation

That Council adopt the Regional Pest Plant Management Strategy 2010 for the West Coast by affixing the seal of the Regional Council to the Strategy as per section 79F(2) of the Act.

Chris Ingle
Chief Executive

THE WEST COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL

Prepared for: Resource Management Committee Meeting – 14 December 2010
 Prepared by: L Sadler - Policy Analyst
 Date: 1 December 2010

Subject: **SUMMARY OF THE 2010 NEW ZEALAND COASTAL POLICY STATEMENT**

Purpose

To inform the Council of the main features of the 2010 New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS), and how the main points sought in our submission are reflected in the NZCPS.

Background

The Resource Management Act 1991 requires there be a national coastal policy statement at all times, prepared and reviewed by the Minister of Conservation. After a lengthy preliminary review, the 1994 NZCPS was revised and publicly notified for submissions in 2008. This Council made a substantial submission on the Proposed NZCPS 2008, and a further oral presentation at the Board of Inquiry hearing.

The Board of Inquiry reported and made recommendations to the Minister of Conservation in July 2009. The Minister released her decisions in October this year. The NZCPS 2010 has effect from 3 December.

Main features of the new NZCPS

Overall the new NZCPS is better structured and the policies are more specifically related to coastal issues. Some policies already covered by existing legislation or which are repetitive have been deleted. Others are made flexible with the addition of "where practicable". There are several requirements for matters to be identified in Regional Policy Statement's (RPS's) and Coastal Plans which may or may not involve additional costs to this Council above the usual cost of reviewing the Coastal Plan.

Giving effect to the NZCPS will be considered in more detail in the review processes for the RPS and the Coastal Plan. At this stage the main features of the 2010 NZCPS which are relevant to this Council are:

- Requirement to assess and/or identify the natural character and natural features and landscapes of the coastal environment by specified methods;
- Requirement to identify in RPS's and plans:
 - areas where particular activities are or may be inappropriate;
 - areas where preserving natural character and protecting natural features and landscapes requires objectives, policies and rules, and include those provisions;
- Provide in RPS's and plans (where practicable) control of activities which could have adverse effects by releasing or spreading harmful aquatic organisms;
- Requirement to assess and monitor sedimentation levels and impacts on the coastal environment;
- Requirement to identify areas that are potentially affected by coastal hazards over a 100 year timeframe, assess hazard risk, and avoid increasing the risk of harm;
- No longer a requirement to have Restricted Coastal Activity status (see other report on removing these from the Coastal Plan).

Some of the matters required in the new NZCPS may already be being done through consent processes or existing plan provisions.

Main points made in Council's submission

Attached to this report is a summary of the changes Council sought to the Proposed NZCPS 2008, and whether they were accepted or rejected. As discussed in a separate report, our request for removal of Restrict Coastal Activities was accepted. Many of the minor wording changes we sought to a range of policies were partly accepted, however most of our changes sought to the natural character policies to give more flexibility were rejected.

RECOMMENDATION

1. *That this report be received.*
2. *That Council notes the requirements for natural character and natural hazard assessments for next year's Coastal Plan Review.*

Michael Meehan
 Planning and Environment Manager

SUMMARY OF CHANGES SOUGHT IN WCRC SUBMISSION ON PROPOSED NZCPS, AND FINAL NZCPS – NOVEMBER 2010

Change sought to proposed NZCPS	New NZCPS
<p>General comment We requested all policies that take a more stringent stance than the RMA be reviewed with a view to providing a balanced approach between the environmental, economic, social and cultural needs of communities (as under the 2002 Local Government Act).</p> <p>Make the NZCPS policies more flexible, by making them subject to the overriding requirement of S32 when regional policy is being developed. All such policies should begin "Subject to Council's Section 32 analysis..."</p> <p>All policies that attempt to direct local government resourcing priorities, be re-worded to begin "subject to LTCCP processes.."</p> <p>We requested all policies that result in a cost to local councils be reviewed to make that cost subject to affordability. Otherwise, a new funding stream would have to accompany the new NZCPS in order to facilitate any additional work required by the new document.</p>	<p>New NZCPS There are some minor changes where a requirement to include something in a coastal plan or RPS is removed. However, policies for identifying and assessing outstanding natural features and landscapes, and natural character areas remain. These policies are more specific on what is required, and this will still be potentially costly and litigious for this Council.</p>
<p>OBJECTIVES</p> <p>General Comment Request that objectives are reworded to provide a reasonable balance with an appropriate number of enabling objectives and policies in the NZCPS.</p>	<p>Unclear. There are fewer objectives but they are considerably longer, covering more matters than the old ones under several bullet points each, and still appear to be more restrictive than enabling. While the enabling policy is more encompassing, it also has some restrictive matters in it.</p>

Change sought to proposed NZCPS	New NZCPS
<p>Objective 7 Water quality Request the deletion of the words 'natural state'.</p>	<p>Partly accepted. The objective still has the requirement to enhance water quality where it has deteriorated from its natural condition, but it is qualified by there being significant adverse effects on ecology caused by human activity-related discharges.</p>
<p>Objective 8 Coastal hazards Request the deletion of the word 'discouraging' (hard protection structures) and reword the objective to incorporate comments made in regards to policies 51 to 54.</p>	<p>Partly accepted. The reference to discouraging use of hard protection structures to manage erosion and inundation is removed from the Objective, but is retained in Policies 25 and 27.</p>
GENERAL POLICIES	
<p>Policy 1 The coastal environment Leave definition suitably broad, as each community has agreed a definition for coastal environment that is appropriate.</p>	<p>Partly accepted, a clause is added recognising that coastal environments vary from region to region. The criteria defining the coastal environment are retained and expanded.</p>
<p>Policy 3 Characteristics of special value to tangata whenua The identification, assessment and management of historic heritage significant to Maori should be included as part of this policy.</p>	<p>Accepted. Identification, assessment and management of sites of significance to iwi are incorporated into new Policy 2.</p>
<p>Policy 5 Precautionary approach Request retain word 'significantly' in policy for precautionary approach.</p>	<p>Accepted.</p>
<p>Policy 7 Conservation land Request that this policy be removed; it is unnecessary.</p>	<p>Rejected. Policy is retained and reworded. No further implications for WCRC.</p>
<p>Policy 8 Areas proposed for statutory protection Request that this policy be removed; it is unnecessary.</p>	<p>Rejected. Policy is retained and reworded. No further implications for WCRC.</p>

Change sought to proposed NZCPS	New NZCPS
<p>Policy 9 Biosecurity Retain the current wording requiring monitoring of coastal permits to be done by the consent holder as per the last sentence in the policy.</p>	<p>Partly accepted. The policy is reworded, and although the specific wording for monitoring in consent conditions is removed, the policy still requires conditions on consents which would include for monitoring biosecurity risks.</p>
<p>Policy 11 Monitoring of the NZCPS Clarify what reporting and monitoring information is required. If no further information over and above the section 35 reporting is required, then delete provision b) from policy 10.</p> <p>Add a provision requiring the Department of Conservation to report on their efficiency and effectiveness of managing the coastal environment under their administration.</p>	<p>Rejected: the policy is mostly retained as Policy 28.</p> <p>Partly accepted: a new clause is added for the Minister of Conservation to publish a report and conclusions on monitoring coastal resource management trends, issues and outcomes. The term "shall" at the start of the policy is replaced with "should".</p>
<p>Policy 12 Local authority monitoring Request deletion of policy 12.</p>	<p>Accepted. Incorporating council monitoring information into a national monitoring programme is now qualified in Policy 28 with "as far as practicable".</p>
SUBDIVISION, USE AND DEVELOPMENT	
<p>General Comment As national coastal policies, they are potentially discriminating against less developed areas. If these policies come into force, there should be some flexibility for less developed areas where the policies are less relevant.</p>	<p>Unclear. These policies give more recognition of infrastructure, energy transport, renewable energy, and minerals, but there appears to be little flexibility provided for less developed areas.</p>
<p>Policy 14 Location of subdivision and development Sought all clauses be deleted except for clause (d), and delete "other water bodies" in clause (d). The policy will unreasonably restrict activities in the West Coast where there isn't such pressure or scale of adverse</p>	<p>Partly accepted. "Other water bodies" is deleted, as well as clauses about encouraging mixed land uses and avoiding ribbon development along transport corridors. Remaining matters are retained and reworded in Policies 6 and 7.</p>

<p>Change sought to proposed NZCPS environmental impacts.</p>	<p>New NZCPS New Policy 6 lists a number of new or expanded matters to recognise or consider for activities in the coastal environment, including recognising energy, energy transport, and mineral extraction as important to social, economic and cultural wellbeing.</p>
<p>Policy 15 Form of subdivision and development Delete the whole policy.</p>	<p>Partly accepted. Most of the prescriptive land use planning matters are gone. Clause (e) is retained and carried over to new Policy 6.</p>
<p>Policy 16 Use and development of the coastal marine area Delete the whole policy, or reword to recognise each council's requirement to comply with S32(4)(a). The policy is too prescriptive for the West Coast, and would be difficult and costly to implement.</p>	<p>Partly accepted. Policy 7 is reworded so it requires that areas of inappropriate and possibly inappropriate subdivision, use and development be identified when preparing RPS's and plans, but the Policy does not specifically state these areas must be shown in coastal plans. The second part of Policy 7 requires areas under threat or at risk of adverse cumulative effects to be identified in policy statements and plans.</p>
<p>Policy 17 Crown interest in particular activities on land of the Crown in the coastal marine area Delete the policy.</p>	<p>Partly accepted. The focus of the Crown's interest is gone, and the policy matters for having regard to infrastructure and renewable energy generation are blended into new Policy 6.</p>
<p>Policy 19 Amenity values Delete the policy, or amend it to clarify what "natural sites" are in clause (a), and how clause (c) for recognising the character of a predominance of structures fits with Policy 25 to discourage proliferation of structures.</p>	<p>Partly accepted. Clauses (a) and (b) of the policy are gone, maintenance and enhancement of open space is carried over in new Policy 6(2)(b), and a separate new policy 18 on public open space is added. Clause (c) is deleted, the matter can be addressed under new Policy 6(1)(f).</p>
<p>Policy 21 Cumulative effects The word "significant" should be added in front of "...adverse cumulative effects...."</p>	<p>Rejected. No change to the intent of this policy. Identifying areas at risk of adverse cumulative effects is now part of new Policy 7.</p>

Change sought to proposed NZCPS	New NZCPS
<p>Policy 24 Coastal occupation charging Retain the terms: "...should, where appropriate...." Change the policy to provide more guidance on the matter of access, and increase the timeframe for councils to include a charging regime.</p>	<p>Partly accepted. The Policy is deleted, so there is no policy now requiring plans to have a coastal occupation charging regime.</p>
<p>Policy 27 Reclamation Amend clause (e) to require that public access only be provided where it is Crown land being reclaimed (not private land), or delete the clause. Delete clause (f).</p>	<p>Partly accepted. The clause requiring provision of public access is qualified with "where practicable". Rejected: Clause (f) is retained.</p>
<p>Policy 29 Financial contributions Clause (e): The term "natural feature" should be deleted, and the word "significant" needs to be added before "landscape,...."</p>	<p>Partly accepted. Whole policy is removed.</p>
NATURAL CHARACTER	
<p>Policy 30 Integrity and functioning Sought changes to wording of some clauses, as they are unnecessary, need flexibility to be balanced with community wellbeing, or need clarifying.</p>	<p>Partly accepted, clauses to maintain the resilience and productivity of indigenous ecosystems, and natural substrate composition are deleted. The focus of the policy to 'preserve and protect' is retained. However it is substantially reworded to include the requirement from proposed Policy 36 to assess the natural character of the coastal environment, and ensure that RPS's and plans "identify areas where preserving natural character requires objectives, policies and rules, and include those provisions".</p>
<p>Policy 31 Indigenous biological diversity Delete the policy, or if the policy is retained change the wording so it only applies to significant indigenous biodiversity. Also sought clarification of some terms: "at the limit of their natural range", and "indigenous</p>	<p>Rejected. Retained as Policy 11, and mostly the same as the proposed version. The policy has not been made more flexible except for clause (v) which previously required protection of regionally and nationally significant examples of indigenous community types; now it only refers to "nationally</p>

Change sought to proposed NZCPS community types".	New NZCPS significant.....".
<p>Policy 32 Outstanding natural features and landscapes Delete clauses (b), (c), (d), and (e), as they are too complex and subjective to be useful for identifying outstanding natural features and landscapes.</p>	<p>The terms submitted on are retained with no clarification.</p> <p>Rejected. These 4 clauses are retained, and others are added from old Policy 34.</p> <p>New clauses are added for RPS's and plans to map or identify Natural Features and Landscapes (NFL's), and include any objectives, policies or rules for their protection. The Policy also requires using minimum techniques for identifying NFL's of land typing, soil characterisation and landscape characterisation.</p>
<p>Policy 34 Natural areas and features Delete the policy as it is over-restrictive, could be applied to much of the West Coast, and unsustainably restricts any resource use.</p>	<p>Rejected. Most of the criteria in this policy have been added to Policy 15 for Natural features and landscapes. Clause (d) "wild or scenic" is added to Policy 13 as an aspect of natural character.</p>
<p>Policy 35 Restoration of natural character Add to Clause (a) the word "significant" before "indigenous habitats and ecosystems....", and specify who is responsible for funding the restoration.</p>	<p>Rejected. The word "significant" is not added.</p> <p>Partly accepted. Clause (c) of Policy 14 says where practicable, impose or review consent conditions to promote restoration and rehabilitation. This implies consent holders would fund restoration work.</p> <p>The policy also includes a new clause to promote restoration or rehabilitation by providing policies, rules and other methods in RPS's and plans.</p>
<p>Policy 36 Assessment and protection of natural character Delete the whole policy, as assessing the natural character of the whole West Coast region will be potentially difficult and costly for this less resourced council.</p>	<p>Rejected. Policies 30 and 36 are combined into Policy 13 Preservation of natural character. The new policy is more specific on what is required to be assessed. Councils must assess natural character by mapping or otherwise identifying at least areas of high natural character, and ensure RPS's and</p>

<p>Change sought to proposed NZCPS</p>	<p>New NZCPS</p> <p>plans have relevant provisions to preserve these values.</p>
<p>Policy 37 and Schedule 1 - Restricted Coastal Activities</p> <p>Delete RCA's as this activity status requires unnecessary additional time, effort, and costs, and is not efficient at all. These activities can be adequately assessed as discretionary activities.</p>	<p>Most of the criteria from old Policy 30 are in the new policy, as well as some new matters, including "the natural darkness of the night sky", and "experiential attributes....".</p>
<p>Policy 39 Walking access as a national priority</p> <p>Sought that clauses (a), (d), (e) and (f) are deleted, or the words "where practicable" be added, as the requirements to enhance walking access are outside the RMA, impractical, or already provided for in consent processes.</p>	<p>Accepted. Restricted Coastal Activity status requirements are removed by Policy 29. These activities are to be either discretionary or non-complying, depending on what additional status they have in the Coastal Plan.</p>
<p>PUBLIC ACCESS</p>	
<p>Policy 41 Access enhancement</p>	<p>Clause (a): Partly accepted. Clauses in Policy 19 retain references to recognising and providing "free of charge" access. Clause (4) requires consideration and provision, "where practicable", of alternative access.</p> <p>Clause (d): Partly accepted. Identifying public access points is reworded to identify how information on access point locations will be made publicly available.</p> <p>Clause (e): Rejected. Clause for identifying opportunities to enhance or restore public access is retained and expanded with examples.</p> <p>Clause (f): Rejected. The clause is replaced with the proposed Policy 43 Restrictions on access (with 3 minor changes).</p>
<p>Policy 41 Access enhancement</p>	<p>Partly accepted. The requirement to identify in policy statements and plans</p>

Change sought to proposed NZCPS		New NZCPS	
Delete Policy 41, it is not appropriate and impractical.		where it is a priority to enhance access is removed.	
Policy 42 Vehicle access Change wording to make it optional to identify in plans where the use of vehicles in the CMA is and is not appropriate. Also change the focus from identifying areas to controlling vehicle use.		Clauses (a) to (f) listing priority criteria for where access could be enhanced are retained and combined into Policy 19 for walking access.	
Policy 44 Maintaining water quality Delete Policy 44, it is unclear about maintaining "high" water quality.		Partly accepted. The requirement to identify vehicle use areas in plans is removed, leaving scope for councils to implement the policy by whatever means is appropriate. Policy 20 still requires certain types of access to be identified and provided for, and now directs control of vehicle use where a range of adverse effects might result.	
WATER QUALITY			
Policy 45 Enhancement of water quality Retain the words "where practicable". Clarify what standard water quality would need to be enhanced to under this policy and re-notified for submissions.		Partly accepted. New Policy 21 is reworded to be more specific about the circumstances where priority is to be given to improving water quality. However, it doesn't include a water quality standard, and it has new clauses requiring identification in regional plans of areas of poor water quality where significant adverse effects are occurring.	
Policy 46 Mixing zones Delete Policy 46 (b), it is unrealistic.		Partly accepted. Clause (b) is amended to "minimise" (instead of "avoid") adverse effects on the life-supporting capacity within a mixing zone.	
Policy 48 Discharge of human sewage Delete Policy 48, the first part is unclear, and the clauses are covered by the RMA.		Rejected. The policy is retained and amended to remove the reference to sewage discharges "passing through land". Clauses for considering alternatives and consulting with tangata whenua are amended and retained.	

Change sought to proposed NZCPS	New NZCPS
<p>Policy 49 Stormwater discharges Replace the words "Adverse effects...shall be reduced...." with "...shall be no more than minor".</p>	<p>Partly accepted/rejected. The words "adverse effects...shall be reduced...." are replaced with "...take steps to avoid adverse effects...". The intent appears to remain restrictive, and the policy is still not qualified by the scale of adverse effects.</p>
NATURAL HAZARDS	
<p>Policy 51 Identification of hazard risks Change the requirement to identify coastal hazard areas to make it optional, and remove the requirement to include them in both RPS's and plans, to avoid duplication. Add a provision requiring a hazard assessment from developers for development within 100m of the CMA.</p>	<p>Partly accepted. The policy still requires coastal hazard areas to be identified, but the requirement to include them in RPS's and plans has been removed. Rejected. No provision added.</p>
<p>Clarify how "areas at high risk of being affected" are to be identified, for consistency between councils.</p>	<p>Rejected. No clarification included, and the requirement to give priority to identifying "areas at high risk of being affected" is retained. A new clause is added for assessing hazard risk: "influences that humans have had or are having on the coast".</p>
<p>Policy 52 Subdivision and development in areas of hazard risk Sought amendment to the requirement that in areas of coastal hazard risk, "...local authorities shall..." implement the policy; this should be replaced with "policy statements and plans". Wording changes sought to clarify the level of risk being referred to, and a definition added in the Glossary.</p>	<p>Partly accepted, the statement "...local authorities shall..." is removed. Partly accepted, clause (a) is reworded to refer to "...avoid increasing the risk of...harm...". A definition of risk is added to the Glossary which refers to AS/NZS "Risk Management – Principles and guidelines", November 2009.</p>

Change sought to proposed NZCPS	New NZCPS
<p>Sought removal of reference to the term 'abandonment' in (c)(i).</p> <p>Opposed the bias against the use of hard structures where they are consistent with the purpose of the Act.</p>	<p>Partly accepted, "abandonment" retained but reworded so it applies to abandoning structures only "in extreme circumstances....".</p> <p>Partly accepted. Clause for discouraging hard protection structures and promoting alternatives to them is retained, but new clauses (c) and (d) are added to Policy 54 which recognises social wellbeing aspects of protecting infrastructure and buildings with hard protection structures.</p>
<p>Policy 53 Natural defences against hazards</p> <p>Sought removal of the requirement for councils to "provide" protection of natural features which protect land uses from hazards, and other minor wording changes.</p>	<p>Partly accepted. Policy 'softened' by removing reference to councils, and reworded to "Provide where appropriate....".</p>
<p>Policy 54 Protection structures</p> <p>Remove provisions requiring councils to promote alternatives to hard protection structures, as council does not have an advocacy role.</p> <p>Sought several wording changes to clauses.</p>	<p>Partly accepted. This policy is changed to focus on reducing hazard risk for significant existing development. Most clauses are removed and replaced with ones to evaluate risk reduction options. The second part of the policy retains clauses about reducing the need for hard protection structures, and considering their location if they are considered necessary.</p>
HISTORIC HERITAGE	
<p>Policy 55 Historic heritage identification and protection</p> <p>Delete Policy 55, these matters are already provided for in the RMA and the HPT Act.</p>	<p>Partly accepted. The requirement for councils to assess and record historic heritage is removed. Subclauses (a)-(d) are replaced with other clauses, including that plans have policies, rules and other methods to protect heritage from inappropriate development.</p>
<p>Policy 56 Historic heritage of significance to Maori</p> <p>Delete Policy 56 or incorporate into Policy 3 Characteristics of special value to tangata whenua.</p>	<p>Accepted. Policy 56 is included in Policy 2 for tangata whenua matters.</p>

Change sought to proposed NZCPS	New NZCPS
<p>Policy 57 Collaborative management of historic heritage Delete Policy 57 or include in Policy 6 Integration.</p>	<p>Partly accepted. Collaboration between agencies is incorporated into Policy 17 for historic heritage identification and protection.</p>

Prepared for: Resource Management Committee Meeting – 14 December 2010
Prepared by: L Sadler, Policy Analyst
Date: 17 November 2010

Subject: **REMOVAL OF RCA'S FROM REGIONAL COASTAL PLAN**

Purpose

To inform the Council of the new New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS) directive to remove Restricted Coastal Activities (RCA's) from the Regional Coastal Plan, and seek Council approval to make the amendments operative.

Background

The old 1994 version of the NZCPS required regional coastal plans to have rules for RCA's. A RCA consent application has additional requirements, that it must be publicly notified for submissions, have a Minister of Conservation representative as a Hearing Commissioner, have a Hearing, and have the Minister of Conservation's sign-off on the Hearing Panel's decision.

When the old NZCPS was reviewed, the West Coast and other Regional Councils submitted seeking the removal of the requirement for RCA's, as they take unnecessary, additional time and costs to process, and add no value. RCA consent applications can be adequately assessed and processed as discretionary activities.

The new NZCPS took effect from 3 December, and Policy 29 requires regional coastal plans to be amended to remove RCA's. This will improve the efficiency of the Coastal Plan and consent processing.

Removing RCA's from the Coastal Plan

Deleting rules from an operative coastal plan would normally have to go through a plan change process under the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA), and involve a public submission process.

The new NZCPS Policy 29 and accompanying notes provide for removing RCA's from coastal plans without having to go through the First Schedule process. Policy 29 directs local authorities under section 55 of the RMA to amend their Coastal Plans "as soon as practicable". This involves the Council approving the amendments being made operative, and publicly notifying the operative date at least five working days prior to the operative date.

Attached are all the parts of the Regional Coastal Plan which make reference to RCA's. NZCPS Policy 29 states that "any activity specified as a discretionary activity and a restricted coastal activity becomes a discretionary activity only;....". This applies to all the RCA rules in our Coastal Plan, and makes the amendments straightforward.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1. That this report be received for information.*
- 2. That the Council set 14 January 2011 as the operative date for removing the Restricted Coastal Activity provisions from the Regional Coastal Plan for the West Coast.*

Michael Meehan
Planning and Environment Manager

AMENDMENTS TO REMOVE RESTRICTED COASTAL ACTIVITY PROVISIONS FROM THE REGIONAL COASTAL PLAN FOR THE WEST COAST

The following provisions from the Regional Coastal Plan for the West Coast are deleted or amended in accordance with section 55 of the Resource Management Act 1991, and the new New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement, which no longer requires Restricted Coastal Activities in regional coastal plans.

Text to be removed from the Plan is shown with a line through it. Text to be added for grammatical reasons or renumbering is shown as bold, italic, underlined text.

Chapter 2 Legislative and Policy Framework **2.5 STATUS OF ACTIVITIES**

~~Restricted Coastal Activity~~

~~A restricted coastal activity is an activity for which the Minister of Conservation is the consent authority. The Minister is able to either grant or decline the application. Where an activity is specified as being a restricted coastal activity, an application is still made to the WCRC and that application is considered by a Regional Council hearings panel which has one Ministerial appointment to it. That panel makes a recommendation to the Minister of Conservation who makes the final decision.~~

~~The WCRC is responsible for administration and enforcement of coastal permits issued through this process.~~

~~Cross Reference: Schedule 4~~

Chapter 7 Public Access and Occupation of Space

7.5 RULES

7.5.1 Occupation of the coastal marine area

Any activity specified in this section as a discretionary or ~~restricted~~ coastal activity requires a resource consent. Chapter 15 of this Plan specifies the information that must be submitted to the WCRC with a resource consent application.

~~7.5.1.4 Any activity involving occupation of the coastal marine area is a discretionary activity and a restricted coastal activity if it:~~

- ~~a) Would exclude or effectively exclude public access from areas of the coastal marine area over 10 hectares (except where such exclusion is required in commercial port areas for reasons of public safety or security); or~~
- ~~b) Would exclude or effectively exclude the public from more than 316 metres along the length of the foreshore; or~~
- ~~c) Would involve occupation or use of areas greater than 50 hectares of the coastal marine area and such occupation or use would restrict public access to or through such areas.~~

~~Note: The difference between (a) and (c) is that (a) excludes public access while (c) restricts public access.~~

~~7.5.1.5 7.5.1.4 Except as provided for by 7.5.1.1 - 7.5.1.4 3 any activity involving occupation of land of the Crown within the coastal marine area is a discretionary activity.~~

Principal reasons for adopting the Rules in Section 7.5.1

~~S1.9 of the First Schedule of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement requires that the occupation of space, as specified in Rule 7.5.1.4, is a restricted coastal activity.~~

~~In accordance with Rule 7.5.1.5, any other occupation of space requires a resource consent pursuant to S12(2)(a) of the Act.~~

Chapter 8 Structures

8.5 RULES

Any activity specified in this section as a controlled; *or* discretionary ~~or restricted coastal~~ activity requires a resource consent. Chapter 15 of this Plan specifies the information that must be submitted to the West Coast Regional Council with a resource consent application.

8.5.1 Erection or placement of a structure

~~8.5.1.7 Any activity involving the erection or placement of a structure or structures in the coastal marine area is a discretionary activity and a restricted coastal activity if:~~

- ~~a) It would impound or effectively contain 4 hectares or more of the coastal marine area, excluding submarine or sub-aqueous cable, or floating or open piled structures which can be demonstrated to not impede water flows; or~~
- ~~b) It is solid (or presents a significant barrier to water or sediment movement) and when established on the foreshore or seabed would extend 300 metres or more in length more or less parallel to the line of mean high water springs (including separate structures which total 300 metres or more contiguous), excluding submarine or sub-aqueous cable, or floating or open piled structures which can be demonstrated not to have adverse effects; or~~
- ~~c) It is solid (or presents a significant barrier to water or sediment movement), and it is sited obliquely or perpendicular in horizontal projection to the line of mean high water springs, and is in horizontal projection 100 metres or more in length), excluding submarine or sub-aqueous cable; or~~
- ~~d) It is for the storage or containment of any petroleum, petroleum products, or contaminants, in quantities greater than 50,000 litres.~~

~~Note: For the purposes of this rule, overhead lines, including telecommunication lines are not a Restricted Coastal Activity. This activity is a discretionary activity pursuant to Rule 8.5.1.8.~~

~~8.5.1.8 8.5.1.7 Except as provided for by 8.5.1.1 to 8.5.1.4 6, any activity involving the erection or placement of a structure or structures in, on, under, or over any land in the coastal marine area is a discretionary activity.~~

~~S1.2, S1.3, S1.4, S1.5 of the First Schedule of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement require that the activities identified in Rule 8.5.1.3 are restricted coastal activities.~~

Chapter 9 Alteration of the Foreshore and Seabed

9.5 RULES

Any activity specified in this section as a discretionary ~~or restricted~~ coastal activity requires a resource consent. Chapter 15 of this Plan specifies the information that must be submitted to the WCRC with a resource consent application.

9.5.1 Reclamation or draining of the foreshore or seabed

~~9.5.1.1 Any activity involving the reclamation of foreshore or seabed is a discretionary activity and restricted coastal activity if:~~

- ~~a) It equals or exceeds 1 hectare; or~~
- ~~b) It extends 100 metres or more in any direction; or~~
- ~~c) It is an incremental reclamation connected to, or part of, another reclamation which:

 - ~~i. Was commenced or received a resource consent after 5 May 1994, and~~
 - ~~ii. The sum of the existing and proposed reclamations exceed the dimensions in (a) or (b).~~~~

~~Except as provided for by Rule 9.5.1.1, a~~ny activity involving the reclamation or draining of foreshore or seabed, for the purpose of reclamation, is a **discretionary activity**.

Principal reasons for adopting the Rules in Section 9.5.1

~~S1.1 of the First Schedule of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement requires that the activities identified in Rule 9.5.1.1 are restricted coastal activities from the gazettal date of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement.~~

Any ~~other~~ activity involving the reclamation or draining, for the purpose of reclamation, of the foreshore or seabed is a discretionary activity in order that any adverse effects can be assessed.

9.5.2 Removal of sand, shingle, driftwood or other natural material from the coastal marine area

~~9.5.2.3 Notwithstanding 9.5.2.2 and excluding maintenance dredging, the removal of sand, shingle, driftwood or other natural material from the coastal marine area in any 12 month period is a discretionary activity and restricted coastal activity if:~~

- ~~a) It is in volumes greater than 50,000 cubic metres; or~~
- ~~b) It is extracted from areas equal to or greater than 4 hectares; or~~
- ~~c) It extends 1,000 metres or more over foreshore and seabed.~~

~~Note: Maintenance dredging is a discretionary activity in accordance with Rule 9.5.2.4.~~

9.5.2.4 ~~3~~ Except as provided for by 9.5.2.1 and 9.5.2.2, ~~or 9.5.2.3~~ the removal of sand, shingle, driftwood or other natural material from the coastal marine area is a **discretionary activity**.

Principal reasons for adopting the Rules in Section 9.5.2

~~S1.6 of the First Schedule of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement requires that the activities identified in Rule 9.5.2.3 are restricted coastal activities.~~

Any other activity involving the removal of any sand, shingle, driftwood or other natural material is a discretionary activity as specified in Rule 9.5.2.4-3, in order that any adverse effects can be assessed.

9.5.3 Disturbance

- ~~a) 9.5.3.6 Any disturbance of foreshore or seabed in the coastal marine area, in any 12 month period, and excluding maintenance dredging, is a discretionary activity and restricted coastal activity if:~~
- ~~b) It is in volumes greater than 50,000 cubic metres; or~~
 - ~~c) Material is extracted from areas equal to or greater than 4 hectares; or~~
 - ~~d) It extends 1,000 metres or more over foreshore and seabed.~~

~~Note: Maintenance dredging is a discretionary activity in accordance with Rule 9.5.3.7.~~

9.5.3.7 6 Except as provided for by 9.5.3.1 to 9.5.3.6 5 any disturbance of foreshore or seabed is a **discretionary activity**.

Principal reasons for adopting the Rules in Section 9.5.3

~~S1.6 of the First Schedule of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement requires that the activities specified in Rule 9.5.3.6 are restricted coastal activities.~~

Any other activity involving disturbance of the foreshore and seabed is a discretionary activity under Rule 9.5.3.7 6, in order that any adverse effects can be assessed.

9.5.4 Deposition of sand, shingle, or other natural material

- ~~9.5.4.1 Any activity involving the depositing of any material on the foreshore or seabed in quantities greater than 50,000 cubic metres in any 12 month period in the coastal marine area is a discretionary activity and a restricted coastal activity.~~

- 9.5.4.2 9.5.4.1 Except as provided for by 9.5.4.1, a 1 any activity involving the deposition of sand, shingle, or other natural material in the coastal marine area is a **discretionary activity**.

Principal reasons for adopting the Rules in Section 9.5.4

~~S1.7 of the First Schedule of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement requires that the activities described in Rule 9.5.4.1 are restricted coastal activities.~~

Any other activity involving the deposition of sand, shingle, or other natural material is a discretionary activity under 9.5.4.2 9.5.4.1, in order that any adverse effects can be assessed.

Chapter 10 Discharges

10.5 RULES

Any activity specified in this section as a controlled, ~~or~~ discretionary ~~or restricted~~ coastal activity requires a resource consent. Chapter 15 of this Plan specifies the information that must be submitted to the WCRC with a resource consent application.

10.5.2 Discharge of human sewage, except from ships

~~10.5.2.1 The discharge of human sewage to the coastal marine area, except from ships, which has not passed through soil or wetland, is a discretionary activity and a restricted coastal activity.~~

10.5.2.2 10.5.2.1 Except as provided for by 10.5.2.1, ~~a~~any discharge of human sewage, except from ships, to the coastal marine area, is a **discretionary activity**.

Principal reasons for adopting the Rules in Section 10.5.2

~~Due to the cultural concern over the discharge of human sewage directly into the coastal marine area, the First Schedule of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement makes the discharge of human sewage that has not passed through soil or wetland a restricted coastal activity (S1.10 of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement). The discharge of sewage that has passed through soil and wetland needs to be considered within the same policy framework because of the potential adverse effects arising from those discharges.~~

10.5.4 Discharges in exceptional circumstances

10.5.4.1 A discharge to the coastal marine area that would not meet the requirements of section 107(1) of the Act, on the basis of exceptional circumstances, as provided for by section 107(2)(a) of the Act, is a **discretionary activity**. ~~and a restricted coastal activity.~~

Principal reasons for adopting the Rule in Section 10.5.4

~~S1.10 (b) of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement's First Schedule requires the inclusion of this rule. It means that any Any discharge to the coastal marine area in which the applicant wishes to rely on section 107(2)(a) of the Act will be a restricted coastal discretionary activity.~~

10.5.6 Hazardous substances

10.5.6.2 Except as provided for in ~~Rule 8.5.1.7 (d) and~~ Rule 10.5.6.1, the storage of hazardous substances in the coastal marine area is a **discretionary activity**.

Chapter 11 Taking, Use, Damming or Diversion

11.5 RULES

Any activity specified in this section as a discretionary ~~or restricted coastal~~ activity requires a resource consent. Chapter 15 of this Plan specifies the information that must be submitted to the WCRC with a resource consent application.

Chapter 13 Exotic Plants

13.5 RULES

13.5.1 Introduction of exotic or introduced plants

13.5.1.2 The introduction or planting of any exotic or introduced plant (which is not a pest plant) in the coastal marine area ~~where the plant is not already present~~ is a discretionary activity. ~~and a restricted coastal activity.~~

~~13.5.1.3 The introduction or planting of any exotic or introduced plant (which is not a pest plant) in an area where the plant is already present is a discretionary activity.~~

Principal reasons for adopting the Rules in Section 13.5.1

~~S1.8 of the First Schedule of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement provides that the introduction or planting of any exotic or introduced plant in the coastal marine area where the plant is not already present is a restricted coastal activity.~~

Chapter 15 Information Requirements

15.1 BACKGROUND

Without limiting the requirements of Section 88 of the Act, or of the Fourth Schedule to the Act, any application for the following activities will be required to supply information as specified in this chapter of the Regional Coastal Plan:

- (a) Any activity which this Regional Coastal Plan specifies as being a discretionary activity; or a controlled activity; ~~or a restricted coastal activity;~~ and

SCHEDULE 5: RESTRICTED COASTAL ACTIVITIES

Delete the whole chapter.

GLOSSARY

~~Restricted coastal activity*~~ ~~Any discretionary activity or non-complying activity—~~

- ~~(a) Which, in accordance with section 68, is stated by a regional coastal plan to be a restricted coastal activity; and~~
- (b) For which the Minister of Conservation is the consent authority.

THE WEST COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL

Prepared for: Resource Management Committee Meeting – 14 December 2010
Prepared by: L Sadler, Policy Analyst
Date: 3 December 2010

Subject: **AQUACULTURE LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL (NO. 3)**

Purpose

To inform the Council of the Aquaculture Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 3), and seek their approval for a brief submission on the Bill.

Background

The current aquaculture legislation has been in place since 2004, and it requires that marine farming can only take place in defined areas called Aquaculture Management Areas (AMA's), and an AMA must be shown in the Regional Coastal Plan. For the West Coast, apart from the Jackson Bay marine farm, the lack of demand for aquaculture has meant there is little justification in spending ratepayer's money identifying AMA's or adding them to the Coastal Plan.

The Bill

The main feature of the new Bill is that it removes the requirement that aquaculture only takes place in AMA's. This will enable prospective applicants to apply for a coastal permit in any part of the coastal marine area, subject to coastal plan provisions. Other main features are:

- It provides for a minimum consent term for aquaculture consents of 20 years, unless a shorter period is required to ensure that adverse environmental effects are adequately managed;
- The Minister of Aquaculture can recommend the making of regulations that amend the provisions in regional coastal plans in relation to aquaculture where such changes are considered to be of regional or national significance.

Submission on the Bill

Overall, the Bill is not expected to have major implications for the West Coast. Our mostly exposed coastal environment is not conducive to conventional aquaculture which requires reasonably sheltered inshore water. However, if technology or other factors change in the future, this may create potential marine farming opportunities on the West Coast, and the new Bill will enable a more straightforward process for considering any proposals. I therefore suggest that the Council makes a brief submission supporting the removal of the requirement for aquaculture to take place only in AMA's identified in coastal plans.

Submissions close 11 February 2011.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Resource Management Committee approve making a brief submission on the Aquaculture Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 3) supporting the removal of the requirement for aquaculture to take place only in AMA's identified in regional coastal plans.

Michael Meehan
Planning and Environment Manager

THE WEST COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL

Prepared for: Resource Management Committee Meeting - December 2010
Prepared by: Nichola Costley, Regional Planner
Date: 6 December 2010
Subject: **CIVIL DEFENCE & REGIONAL TRANSPORT REPORT**

Civil Defence Emergency Management UpdatePike River Coal Incident

Following the Pike River Mine Incident, staff provided assistance to support Grey District Council Civil Defence involvement in this event.

Resilience Fund Application for Satellite Communications

The West Coast CDEM Group has been successful in their application for satellite communications to a total of \$60,500. This funding will cover the purchase and installation of equipment in all four Councils, plus several additional civil defence sites throughout the West Coast. The next round of funding applications for projects are due in March 2011. The CEG will be reviewing possible projects for submission.

EMIS (Emergency Management Information System)

The EMIS developers have advised that Phase 1 (approximately 65% of functionality) has been released in November. Phase 2 (full functionality) is now expected to be released in February/March 2011, with training to be held in February.

Monitoring and Evaluation

The Monitoring and Evaluation project which was postponed after the Canterbury Earthquake has been rescheduled for the 19th – 21st of January 2011. The programme centres around the 'CDEM Capability Assessment Tool' which is a set of nationally consistent performance indicators and measures organised in an assessment tool format.

The tool can be used at any time by a CDEM Group to evaluate their own capability. It is also designed to support a national assessment cycle which is now nearing completion. The West Coast CDEM Group undertook a Capacity and Capability Assessment in 2008. Because of this the Monitoring and Evaluation will be slightly downscaled.

West Coast CDEM Group Meeting

The West Coast CDEM Group is scheduled to meet on the 13th of December to coincide with the Mayors and Chair meeting. The CDEM Group is required to elect a new chairperson. The Constitution of the Group has also been reviewed, following the adoption of the Group Plan, and will have the seal of each Council affixed to it.

Regional Transport Update

The Road Safety Coordinating Committee met on 29 July. One of the primary tasks was to develop the Action Plan for activities to be undertaken throughout the West Coast to improve road safety during the next financial year. These include activities around Safer Speeds, Safer Road Use, Safer Road and Roadsides, and Safer Vehicles.

RECOMMENDATION

That this report be received

Chris Ingle
Chief Executive

THE WEST COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL

Prepared for: Resource Management Committee
 Prepared by: Colin Dall - Consents & Compliance Manager
 Date: 3 December 2010

Subject: CONSENTS MONTHLY REPORT

CONSENTSConsents Site Visits from 27 October – 30 November 2010

DATE	ACTIVITY, NAME & LOCATION	PURPOSE
29/10/10	RC10191 – Whataroa Dairy Farm Partnership, Humping & hollowing, Whataroa	To investigate the site to gain a better understanding of the proposed humping and hollowing.
11/11/10	RC09006 – Westreef Services Ltd, Gravel extraction, Little Grey River	To investigate the site to assess the gravel resource.
16/11/10	RC10254 – Granite Developments Ltd, Land clearance, Waitaha River	To investigate the site to help determine any impacts and affected parties.
16/11/10	PA10043 – KNK Ltd, Onsite sewage discharge, Matai	To assess the proposed onsite sewage treatment system against Rules 6 (RPDL) and 77 (PRLWP).
18/11/10	PA10042 – G & W Williams, Onsite sewage discharge, Maori Creek Road	To assess the proposed onsite sewage treatment system against Rules 6 (RPDL) and 77 (PRLWP).
25/11/10	Gravel extraction, Taramakau River	To meet with staff from the Department of Conservation to discuss consents for the extraction of gravel from the Taramakau River downstream of the State Highway 6 bridge.

Non-Notified Resource Consents Granted from 27 October – 30 November 2010

CONSENT NO. & HOLDER	PURPOSE OF CONSENT
RC09006 Westreef Services Ltd	To disturb the dry bed of the Little Grey (Mawheraiti) River for the purpose of extracting gravel.
RC09163 Amalgamated Mining Ltd	To undertake earthworks associated with alluvial gold mining activities at Dobson. To discharge sediment-laden water to land in circumstances where it may enter water in the Grey River.
RC10103 Solid Energy New Zealand Ltd	To discharge biosolids to land in circumstances where contaminants may enter water at Stockton Coal Mine.
RC10142 Ussher Holdings Ltd	To discharge dairy effluent to land where it may enter water (Puzzle Creek) near DS360, Bell Hill.

RC10157 Grey District Council	To take groundwater from the gravels of the Grey River for the purposes of a community water supply for Taylorville/Dobson/Stillwater/Kaiata.
RC10192 G T Liddell Contracting Ltd	To discharge contaminants to air in the CMA associated with abrasive blasting activities, Taramakau Road/Rail Bridge. To take groundwater, within 50m of the CMA, from the bed of the Taramakau River.
RC10194 Roa Mining Company Ltd	To undertake land disturbance, vegetation removal and earthworks associated with an opencast coal mine of CMP 41793. To discharge water containing contaminants from a coal mining operation to land in circumstances where it may enter water (Waterfall Creek).
RC10196 Hokitika Airport Ltd	To construct a stopbank in the bed of the Waiho River. To divert water in the Waiho River associated with a stopbank.
RC10204 Westreef Services Ltd	To disturb the dry bed of Landing Creek for the purpose of extracting gravel.
RC10215 PF Olsen Ltd	To disturb land within the Greymouth Earthworks Control Area associated with the harvesting of exotic forest and land preparation, constructing new sections of road, constructing log processing sites and hauler pads, Boddytown. To discharge stormwater containing sediment to land from roading; construction of log processing and hauler sites, harvesting and land preparation, Boddytown.
RC10225 Ball Developments Ltd	To disturb the dry bed of the Taramakau River, downstream of the State Highway 6 Bridge, for the purpose of extracting gravel.
RC10226 Ferguson Brothers Ltd	To disturb the dry bed of the Totara River for the purpose of extracting gravel.
RC10228 Westroads Ltd	To disturb the dry bed of the Karangarua River below the State Highway 6 Bridge for the purpose of gravel extraction.
RC10230 MTP Ltd	To disturb the dry bed of the Haast River for the purpose of gravel extraction. To disturb the dry bed of the Okuru River for the purpose of gravel extraction.
RC10233 LJ Donaldson	To disturb the dry bed of the Inangahua River for the purpose of gravel extraction.
RC10237 Fulton Hogan Ltd	To disturb the dry bed of the Little Grey (Mawheraiti) River for the purpose of gravel extraction.

RC10241 Canaan Farming Ltd	To disturb the bed and banks of an unnamed tributary of the Haupiri River to construct a diversion channel. To divert water through a diversion channel from an unnamed tributary of the Haupiri River.
RC10248 Grey District Council	To disturb the bed and banks of Sawyers Creek to install a stormwater outlet structure and associated rock protection works.

Changes to Consent Conditions Granted from 27 October – 30 November 2010

CONSENT NO. & HOLDER	PURPOSE OF CHANGE
RC98024 Alluvial Mining NO 2 Ltd Nemona Forest	To allow an increase in the maximum unrehabilitated area and consequently increase the bond amount.
RCN98213 Department of Conservation Welcome Flat	To allow for changes to the sewage disposal system.
RC06291 D Lucas & D Beatson Barrytown Beach	To allow stockpiling of sand in the Coastal Marine Area.
RC10112 McKay Mining Ltd Maruia	To allow an additional water take point.

Limited Notified or Notified Resource Consents Granted from 27 October – 30 November 2010

CONSENT NO. & HOLDER	PURPOSE OF CONSENT
RC10079 Kelly Dairy Farm Ltd	To undertake river protection on the bed and banks of the Whataroa River. To divert water in the Whataroa River.

Notified Consents Updates

The Environment Court released its latest decision on the J Groome and TrustPower Limited appeals relating to the consents granted by the Council for the proposed Arnold Valley Hydro Power Scheme on 22 November. The Court declined the Groome appeal and granted the TrustPower appeal on conditions of the consents in part. It has proposed some amended conditions of consent that the parties have up to 13 December 2010 to comment on.

All appeals on the consents granted to Hydro Developments Limited for its proposed Stockton Plateau Hydro Power Scheme have been resolved and so the Minister of Conservation can now make her decision on the Restricted Coastal Activity component (occupation of the Coastal Marine Area by the proposed discharge pipeline and outfall) of the Scheme.

The issues relating to the remaining appeal on the refusal of consents for Solid Energy New Zealand Limited's (SENZ) proposed Stockton Plateau Hydro Power Scheme have been refined. It is expected the mediation of the appeal will commence in the near future after SENZ has provided the parties involved in the appeal with additional information that addresses the issues.

Public Enquiries

63 written public enquiries were responded to during the reporting period. 47 (74.6%) were answered on the same day, 10 (15.9%) the following day, and the remaining 6 (9.5%) no more than 10 working days later.

RECOMMENDATION

That the December 2010 report of the Consents Group be received.

Colin Dall
Consents & Compliance Manager

THE WEST COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL

Prepared for: Resource Management Committee
 Prepared by: Colin Dall – Consents & Compliance Manager and Phil McKinnel – Senior Compliance Officer
 Date: 1 December 2010
 Subject: **COMPLIANCE & ENFORCEMENT MONTHLY REPORT**

Site Visits

A total of 63 site visits were undertaken during the reporting period, which consisted of:

Activity	Number of Visits	Fully Compliant (%)
Resource consent monitoring	10	90
Dairy shed inspections	18	61
Complaint response*	21	57
Mining compliance & bond release	14	100

*Note that some of the complaint response visits were to mining and dairy farming sites.

Specific Issues

Dairy Effluent Discharges: Dairy shed inspections are now beginning to increase with farmers having finished calving.

Gravel Extraction: A number of gravel extraction sites were inspected during the reporting period, including Donnelly Creek, Ruby Creek, Organs Island (Buller River) and the Mokihinui River.

Formal enforcement action was taken against a contractor for unauthorised gravel extraction at Donnelly Creek, after previous warnings for the same offence.

Organs Island proved to be the most problematic with gravel resources found to be significantly depleted. The Council has since advised current Consents Holders to cease further gravel extraction from this site until gravel resources are replenished.

Whitebait Stands: The whitebait season finished during the reporting period. The focus for Compliance staff will now be to ensure that stands have been taken down and materials removed where appropriate. Council staff will be working with District Councils and the Department of Conservation during this process.

Oceana Gold Limited (OGL) – Globe Progress Mine: During the last reporting period Compliance staff undertook an investigation into possible sources of sediment from upstream of the Oceana Gold compliance monitoring point due to issues raised by the Company and results of water sampling showing elevated levels of sediment at the upstream monitoring point.

As a result of these investigations only one likely source of sediment was found – this was an area of four wheel drive activity on the Big River Road. This site will be inspected on a regular basis and especially during sampling rounds when elevated levels of sediment are noticed at the upstream point.

Solid Energy New Zealand Limited (SENZ)/Stockton Alliance – Stockton Coal Mine: There were no reported incidents at the Stockton opencast coal mine during the last reporting period.

However, the Ngakawau Coal Handling Facility was the subject of a dust complaint which concerned the dust management practices at the site and the generation of dust during the drier months.

Council staff met with the concerned parties and with Stockton Alliance staff. The Alliance is currently reviewing the dust management plan associated with the resource consent that covers dust discharges from the site.

During the inspection of the site, Council staff witnessed the sprinkler systems in action and did not see any noticeable discharge of dust beyond the subject boundary.

Stockton Alliance staff will be addressing the dust issues at the next community consultative group.

Complaints/Incidents between 28 October and 30 November 2010

The following 22 complaints/incidents were received during the reporting period:

Activity	Description	Location	Action/Outcome
Dairy	Offal pit installed too close to a waterway	Rotomanu	Site visit undertaken – farmer required to move the offal pit
Sewage	Sewage discharging from septic tank system	Franz Josef	Site visit undertaken – owner of system to remediate area affected by discharge
Discharge to air	Dust being discharged beyond the boundary of the subject property	Greymouth	Operation compliant at the time of inspection
Discharge to air	Discharge of smoke beyond the boundary of the subject property	Hokitika	Site visit undertaken and parties provided with relevant rules
Coal Mining	Discharge of coal fines to water	Atarau	Still under investigation
Gravel extraction	Unauthorised gravel extraction	Taramakau	Operator directed to stop, subsequent variation to resource consent obtained to allow gravel extraction to continue
Earthworks	Vegetation clearance in the Greymouth Earthworks Control Area	Greymouth	Resource consent obtained for the activity
Diesel Spill	Diesel spilt in the Blaketown Lagoon	Greymouth	Source not found
Sandblasting	Dust discharge from a sandblasting operation	Greymouth	Operation compliant at time of inspection
Discharge to water	Complaint about the Grey River being dirty	Greymouth	Site visit undertaken by no issues substantiated
Discharge to air	Discharge of smoke from an outdoor cooking fire	Cobden	Compliant at time of inspection
Whey disposal	Discharge of whey to land causing an odour issue	Mahinapua	No nuisance odour detected during site inspection
Discharge to land/water	Milk spilt at Hokitika dairy factory – milk entered the Hokitika River	Hokitika	Site visit undertaken – further action being considered
Sewage discharge	Sewage discharge to the Grey River	Greymouth	Complying with consent
Coal Mining	Ford Creek affected by coal fines.	Blackball	Still under investigation
Riparian margin damage	Damage to the banks of the Kaniere River reportedly caused by cows	Hokitika	Still under investigation
Discharge to water	Discharge of white substance to Hokitika River	Hokitika	Still under investigation

Coal mining	Complaint regarding Ford Creek running dirty	Blackball	Still under investigation
Car accident/ petroleum spill	Notification of a car in the Buller River at Hawks Crag	Westport	Still under investigation
Earthworks	Complaint about section clearing and dumping of spoil into a creek	Greymouth	Still under investigation
Spray painting	Complaint about paint spraydrift damaging cars	Greymouth	Still under investigation
Earthworks	Complaint about earthworks being undertaken in a wetland	Ross	Still under investigation

Formal Enforcement Action

The following two abatement notices and three infringement notices were issued during the reporting period:

Notice	Activity	Location
Abatement	Discharge of sediment to land where it may enter water (gold mining)	Hokitika
Abatement	Discharge of sediment to land where it may enter water (gold mining)	Dunganville
Infringement	Riverbed disturbance (gravel extraction)	Ross
Infringement	Riverbed disturbance (gold mining)	Dunganville
Infringement	Discharge of sediment to land where it may enter water (gold mining)	Dunganville

Sentencing hearings were held by Judge McElrea in the Environment Court, Christchurch, on 15 November for the Council's prosecutions against Oceana Gold (New Zealand) Limited (OGL) and Bowater Farms Limited (BFL).

OGL was convicted for the unauthorised discharge of sediment to Devils Creek from its Globe Progress Mine (single charge) and fined \$23,000 and Court costs. BFL was convicted for the unauthorised discharge of dairy effluent from its farm at Whataroa (single charge) and was fined \$12,000 and Court costs. The Court reduced the fine from \$17,000 under Section 40 of the Sentencing Act 2002 taking into account the Company's "financial capacity". The Council receives 90% of these fines under Section 342(2) of the Resource Management Act 1991.

MINING

Work Programmes

The Council received the following 7 work programmes during the reporting period, 4 of which were processed within the 20 working day target by the end of the reporting period, with the remaining work programmes shown in italics requiring further information or a site visit to aid in the sign off of the work programme:

Date	Mining Authorisation	Holder	Location
<i>1/11/10</i>	<i>CML37159</i>	<i>Solid Energy NZ Ltd</i>	<i>Strongman</i>
<i>1/11/10</i>	<i>CML37175</i>	<i>Solid Energy NZ Ltd</i>	<i>Spring Creek</i>
<i>10/11/10</i>	<i>CML37150</i>	<i>Solid Energy NZ Ltd</i>	<i>Stockton</i>
19/11/10	RC07208	B F C Group Ltd	Fox Creek

22/11/10	RC04161	Hardrock Mining & Development Ltd	Greenstone
23/11/10	RC99001	Goldsouth Ltd	Greenstone
26/11/10	RC02259	Birchfield Minerals Ltd	Grey River

Bonds Received & Bond Releases

The following bond was received during the reporting period:

Mining Authorisation	Holder	Amount
RC04161	Hardrock Mining & Development Ltd	\$6,000

It is recommended that the following bond can be released:

Mining Authorisation	Holder	Location	Amount
RC09092	Amalgamated Mining Ltd	Cape Terrace	\$18,000

Council staff have visited the site to ensure that all rehabilitation requirements have been satisfied and land lessee approval of the rehabilitation works has been obtained.

OIL SPILL RESPONSE

No significant spills were reported or responded to during the reporting period

RECOMMENDATION

1. *That the December 2010 report of the Compliance Group be received.*
2. *That Council release the bond held for Resource Consent RC09092.*

Colin Dall
Consents & Compliance Manager

COUNCIL MEETING

THE WEST COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL

Notice is hereby given that an **ORDINARY MEETING** of the West Coast Regional Council will be held in the Offices of the West Coast Regional Council, 388 Main South Road, Greymouth on **Tuesday, 14th December 2010** commencing on completion of the Resource Management Committee Meeting.

A.R. SCARLETT
CHAIRPERSON

C. INGLE
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

<u>AGENDA NUMBER</u>	<u>PAGE NUMBERS</u>	<u>BUSINESS</u>
1.		APOLOGIES
2.		PUBLIC FORUM
3.		MINUTES
	1 – 6	3.1 Minutes of Council Meeting 8 November 2010
4.		REPORTS
	7	4.1 Planning & Environmental Manager's Report on Engineering Operations
	8 - 10	4.2 Corporate Services Manager's Report
	11 - 21	4.2.1 Four Month Performance Review
		4.2.3 Audit Management Report for the Year Ended 30 June 2010 (to be circulated prior to the meeting)
5.		CHAIRMAN'S REPORT (VERBAL)
6.0	22 - 26	CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S REPORT
7.		GENERAL BUSINESS

THE WEST COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL HELD ON 8 NOVEMBER 2010,
AT THE OFFICES OF THE WEST COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL, 388 MAIN SOUTH ROAD, GREYMOUTH,
COMMENCING AT 11.14 A.M.****PRESENT:**

R. Scarlett (Chairman), A. Robb, T. Archer, D. Davidson, B. Chinn, A. Birchfield, I. Cummings

IN ATTENDANCE:

C. Ingle (Chief Executive Officer), R. Mallinson (Corporate Services Manager), S. Moran (Planning and Environmental Manager), C. Dall (Consents & Compliance Manager), T. Jellyman (Minutes Clerk),
The Media

1. APOLOGIES:

There were no apologies.

2. PUBLIC FORUM

There was no public forum.

3. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Moved (Davidson / Archer) *that the minutes of the Council Meeting dated 14 September 2010, be confirmed as correct.*

Carried

Matters arising

There were no matters arising.

Moved (Davidson / Robb) *that the minutes of the Triennial Council Meeting 26 October 2010 be confirmed as correct.*

Carried

Matters arising

Cr Archer drew attention to Cr Birchfield's comments in the minutes where he stated that council needs to go in a different direction and the West Coast cannot carry on with the number of councils and councillors it currently has and that there needs to be some reform. Cr Archer stated that a number of people may share this view but there has never been a paper presented to this council to share this view or elaborate on the advantages or disadvantages. Cr Archer feels it would be helpful to receive a paper so that there can be an open debate so that there is an overview instead of comments being raised without any supporting information or the opportunity for debate.

Cr Archer drew attention to page 7 of the minutes where the Deputy Chairman has always been the Chair of the Resource Management Committee. Cr Archer stated that historically this has been the case and he agrees with the continuance of this arrangement, but despite Cr Chinn advising council that he was certified as a Hearing Commissioner, he is not, as his certificate expired in June 2008. Cr Archer stated that he finds it difficult to understand how Cr Chinn can consider himself to be certified when he participated in a re-training course and failed. Cr Archer stated that the only conclusion he can come to is that Cr Chinn has intentionally misled the council and on this basis Cr Archer asked what confidence can council have in Cr Chinn as a deputy chair who is now statute barred from chairing RMA hearings as he has been found by Auckland University, acting for the Ministry for the Environment not competent to

chair such hearings and therefore someone else will have to undertake this function on Cr Chinn's behalf. Cr Archer stated that Cr Chinn does not appear to know if he is an accredited RMA Hearing Commissioner or not. Cr Chinn responded that he did fail and was phoned by the Auckland University and told that he got the questions right but when the exam asked for seven paragraphs to be answered he only answered one. Cr Chinn was asked by Auckland University to re-sit the exam, they phoned him this year and asked if he would like to re-sit the exam again and he declined. Cr Archer stated that this does not answer his question. The question is what confidence can council have in the Deputy Chairman on the basis that he appeared to intentionally mislead the council. Cr Chinn stated that he did not intentionally mislead council and he has nothing to hide and had Cr Archer let him know of his questions prior then he would have had the exact dates for him. Cr Scarlett stated that the question might be that Cr Chinn had a certificate at the present time but does not intend to renew it. Cr Scarlett said that the question is did Cr Chinn know that he did not have a certificate when he gave that answer. Cr Chinn stated that the letter from Auckland University advised him that his certification would expire in December and asked would he like to sit it again, he declined. Cr Scarlett stated that the question is whether Cr Chinn knew at the time of the last meeting that he was not certified, and that he had been phoned by Auckland University and informed that he had failed the re-certification. Cr Scarlett asked Cr Chinn that at the time of the last meeting on the 26th of October, did Cr Chinn know that he did not have a certificate. Cr Chinn stated that he was not quite sure of the date that his certification expired and he knew that the exams were coming up. Cr Chinn stated that he had no intention of misleading anyone. Cr Chinn confirmed that at the time of the last meeting he was of the belief that he was still certified. Cr Chinn confirmed that he did not take up the offer from the Auckland University to complete his exam in more detail. Cr Archer clarified the certification process and advised that on completion the certificate illustrates the date of issue and the date of expiry. Cr Scarlett asked Cr Chinn if he has a certificate. Cr Chinn confirmed he has a certificate but he has not looked at it lately. Cr Davidson stated that it was quite clear at the meeting that having a certificate was not a requirement for the position of Deputy Chairman. Cr Scarlett agreed but the question from Cr Archer is whether or not Cr Chinn has misled council by saying he was accredited when he was not. Cr Chinn stated that this was a mistake on his part. Cr Archer still feels his question has not been adequately answered. Cr Birchfield stated he has every confidence in Cr Chinn, he would be an excellent deputy chair and there is no requirement to be a qualified commissioner and he does not know what all the fuss is about. Cr Scarlett responded that on page 7 Cr Chinn stated that he is certified at the present time but does not intend to renew his certification. Cr Scarlett stated that was not the case, he was not certified. Cr Scarlett advised that Cr Chinn has stated he had been contacted by the examiner and informed that he had failed and this was a long time prior to the meeting on 26th of October and might have been in 2008. He was given the option to re-sit and declined and therefore Cr Chinn would surely have known that he did not have a certificate when he gave this answer last month. Cr Chinn stated that this was a mistake on his part. Cr Cummings stated that Cr Chinn had said he was not going to renew his certification and therefore he would not be chairing any hearings. Cr Cummings stated that someone who is qualified would have to be appointed to chair any hearings. Cr Scarlett agreed with Cr Cummings but stated that it is a different question when asked if you are certified and the answer is yes when in fact Cr Chinn was not certified. Cr Scarlett stated that the point of this discussion is that given what is written in the minutes, was Cr Chinn aware that he was not certified. Cr Chinn stated that he believes he stated that he thinks he is certified at the meeting on 26 October.

Cr Archer stated that his other concern is that the deputy chair's almost exclusive role in the council is an RMA role. Cr Archer stated that his personal view is that if the council determined that the deputy chair should also be the chairman of the RMC committee, then Cr Archer feels that the chairman of the RMC committee would have some competence in chairing RMA hearings and conducting RMA meetings. Cr Archer stated that we now have a situation where Cr Chinn was elected as deputy chair on the basis that he was certified but this is not the case. Cr Birchfield stated this is wrong as all councillors said Cr Chinn was not qualified and they put him in as deputy chair and this did not make any difference to the voting. Cr Archer stated he accepts Cr Birchfield's view but he feels that the deputy chair should be certified so that the deputy chair has some level of competence. Cr Scarlett stated his main concern was that Cr Chinn had misled council, but there has been an explanation now and he feels that the matter should now rest.

Cr Archer drew attention to item 9, rating district liaison committee arrangements, he would like an amendment to the resolution as he feels the Greymouth Joint Floodwall committee is being linked to rating district liaison committees. C. Ingle advised that the Greymouth Floodwall is a rating district and this is an exception. It was agreed that the status quo would remain.

REPORTS:**4.1 ADOPTION OF MINUTES FROM THE RATING DISTRICT ANNUAL MEETINGS**

S. Moran spoke to his report. Cr Archer asked various questions around the action points and processes following on from rating district meetings. C. Ingle explained the internal system in place regarding action points and how they are prioritised and kept track of. Cr Scarlett agreed with Cr Archer regarding the process for action points so that whichever councilor chairs the meeting is aware of what is likely to come up at the meeting. S. Moran stated that it would be good practice for whoever chairs the meeting to also keep an ear out for what they consider to be an action point and ensure that requests are minuted at the time. Cr Archer stated that this would be a very worthwhile process.

Cr Archer asked if standing orders still apply to rating district liaison committees, for the purpose of future chairing of meetings, could a unified approach be adopted and be based on standing orders applying. Cr Scarlett stated that a way forward could be that normal standard meeting procedures apply and the chairman could advise the meeting of this. Cr Davidson stated that he feels these are good meetings and he would like to see them stay the way they are. C. Ingle advised that these meetings are public meetings and the communities appreciate the local members of council chairing the meetings. He advised that the most common issue is people attending the meeting who are not ratepayers in the rating district, he noted they are entitled to attend the meeting but it needs to be made clear at the outset of the meeting that it is only the ratepayers that get to vote on motions as it is their money that is being spent. C. Ingle advised that staff bring a list of the ratepayers to each meeting and the chairman should ask those present if there is anyone in attendance who is not a ratepayer, then remind that person that they do not have voting rights but they can speak in general business.

Moved (Archer / Robb) *that the report be received.*

Carried

4.2 CORPORATE SERVICES MANAGER'S REPORT

R. Mallinson spoke to his report advising that this is the quarterly financial report to the end of September. He stated that five ratepayers have advised the council in writing of their intention to withhold payment of their Tb rate. R. Mallinson has responded to these people in writing advising them that normal procedures will be followed with regard to overdue rates.

R. Mallinson reported that the surplus for the three months is approximately \$1.3M which includes the realised profit from the 2010 / 2011 aerial contracts. R. Mallinson reported that the investment portfolio rallied strongly during September and there are also net positive budget variances in the general rate funded activities. R. Mallinson stated that this is an extremely satisfactory result for the first quarter. Cr Scarlett agreed. Cr Chinn asked how the procedure works for landowners who are withholding their Tb pest management rate which is being collected on behalf of the Animal Health Board. R. Mallinson clarified that the Tb pest management rate is being collected on Council's own account and this is used by Council to fund the Animal Health Board regional share expenditure. R. Mallinson has pointed out to those withholding their Tb pest management rate that this is not a lawful course of action and normal debt collection procedures apply.

Moved (Robb / Archer) *that this report be received.*

Carried

4.2.1 ANNUAL REPORT BY TBFREE (ANIMAL HEALTH BOARD) REGARDING WEST COAST OPERATIONS

Cr Scarlett asked Cr Robb for comment on this report. Cr Robb confirmed that good progress is being made and the key is to keep the pressure on so that progress continues. It was noted that there are 38 Tb infected herds as at 30 June with the target being 48. Cr Archer drew attention to the comment in the report that notes the importance of maintaining an adequate and stable contractor workforce in light of the proposed strategy. Cr Archer noted that this matter had arisen lately.

Moved (Archer / Robb) *that the report be received.*

Carried

4.2.2 COUNCILLOR EXPENSES & ALLOWANCES POLICY

R. Mallinson spoke to this report advising that there are some areas of concern with one being the Remuneration Authority's approach to vehicle mileage reimbursements to councilors. R. Mallinson drew attention to the 5000 km limit per councilor per year which ignores the distance councilors on the West Coast travel. R. Mallinson stated that this is not sensible for any councilor living in Haast or Karamea and in view of this he will seek a dispensation, as this is not at all logical for the West Coast. Cr Archer asked the meeting if the policy on international air travel should be amended in case a particular circumstance arose and international travel was required. R. Mallinson stated that in the past council has not supported international travel or conference attendance councilors but if councilors wish to change this then the expense policy could be amended and approved by the Remuneration Authority. Cr Scarlett stated that as it stands there is no international travel. Cr Archer feels it might be more realistic to change the policy to "overseas travel, including the class of travel, may only be approved by specific resolution by council prior to the travel being undertaken". He feels this would be more reasonable. Cr Scarlett stated that it would be sensible to have some flexibility around this. Cr Robb stated that if a similar situation arose when this council supported Mayor Pugh's overseas visit, and contributed financially, then the policy should be changed so that if someone from this council is invited to an international event then they can attend. R. Mallinson advised that it is up to council to recommend to the Remuneration Authority what they want the Reimbursement Policy to be, as they do not set it for us. Cr Archer moved an amendment to the international air travel section of the reimbursement policy.

Moved (Archer / Robb) *that overseas travel including the class of travel may only be approved by specific resolution to council before the travel is undertaken.*

Carried

Cr Archer drew attention to section 9, Professional Development, "are any expenses reimbursed or allowances paid in respect of members attendance at professional development courses, conferences and seminars"; Cr Archer advised that the answer is no to this and he thinks this should be changed to "registration attendance fees may only be met by council with the prior Chair approval. Cr Scarlett agreed with Cr Archer. Cr Archer used the example of hearing commissioners travelling and should this have to be put before council.

Moved (Archer / Davidson) *that registration attendance fees may only maybe met by council with the prior approval of the Council Chair.*

Carried

Moved (Archer / Robb)

- 1. That Council adopt the attached policy with regard to Councillor Expenses and Allowances.*
- 2. That the Remuneration Authority be advised of our concerns with regard to restricting km reimbursements to those in excess of 30 km per event.*
- 3. That the Remuneration Authority be advised of our concerns with regard to the 5000 km limit per Councillor per year, given the large distance of 600 km from the northern to southern boundaries of the region.*

Carried

4.2.3 REMUNERATION AUTHORITY DETERMINATION

R. Mallinson spoke to this report advising that the Remuneration Authority advises council what the remuneration pool will be for the six councilors not including the Chair, this will be \$162,100. The reconfirmation of payments for the deputy chair and councilors is a requirement by the Remuneration Authority. Cr Robb confirmed that this is exactly the same arrangement as prior to the election.

Moved (Robb / Birchfield) *that that above division of the remuneration pool be confirmed to the Remuneration Authority.*

Carried

4.2.4 INVESTMENT PORTFOLIO ASSET CLASS BENCHMARKS

R. Mallinson spoke to this report and advised that council at a workshop considered this matter on the 26th of October.

Moved (Robb / Birchfield) *that Council agree to the change in benchmarks for its Investment Portfolio as recommended by its Investment advisors, Forsyth Barr Ltd.*

Carried

5.0 CHIEF EXECUTIVES REPORT

C. Ingle spoke to his report. He advised that he was unable to attend the LGNZ Zone 5 meeting on 5 November as his flight was cancelled on the morning of the meeting. Cr Scarlett attended this meeting and lodged an apology for C. Ingle. C. Ingle advised that he has been busy recruiting for a new Planning and Environmental Manager in view of S. Moran's resignation. C. Ingle advised that Michael Meehan, the Compliance Team Leader has been appointed to this position and will commence duty on the 15th of November. The recruitment process for a new Compliance Team Leader is now underway.

C. Ingle advised that it has been a busy part of the year with the completion of the rating district meetings. He suggests that a workshop be held early next year to discuss all the investigations that are going on for all of the rating districts so that all councillors can be aware of what is happening up and down the region. C. Ingle suggested that the action points from these meetings are discussed at this workshop, as it is important that the requests from the communities are actioned. C. Ingle advised that staff resourcing in the engineering area would also be discussed at the workshop.

C. Ingle advised that he sent a letter to the Local Government Commission relating to the proposed union of Tasman District and Nelson City Councils.

Cr Cummings asked C. Ingle what was the purpose of Sir Kerry Bourke's visit on the 13th of October. C. Ingle responded that Sir Kerry is keen to do some hearing commissioner work for this council. C. Ingle advised that he advised Sir Kerry that some of this council's councillors are qualified hearing commissioners. He noted that Sir Kerry is familiar with the West Coast as he was a former Member of Parliament for the West Coast and has property here.

Cr Chinn asked C. Ingle how the meeting went with Jan Wright, the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment. C. Ingle responded that S. Moran took Ms Wright and her entourage for a tour of Lake Brunner. C. Ingle stated that the three points of interest for the visit were Lake Brunner, mining on conservation land and the use of 1080. C. Ingle advised that the Ms Wright has been asked to prepare a report for Parliament on the use and the risks around 1080. Ms Wright was interested in the work being done in the Lake Brunner catchment and the new plan change.

Moved (Robb / Cummings) *that this report be received.*

Carried

7.0 CHAIRMANS REPORT (VERBAL)

The Chairman reported that he attended the Zone 5 meeting in Christchurch last week. He stated that Mayor Bob Parker, the Waimakariri Mayor and the Selwyn Mayor gave an interesting talk on the Christchurch earthquake, they spoke of the huge amount of damage to infrastructure which will take up to two years to repair. Cr Scarlett advised that Dame Margaret Bazley gave an update on Ecan at the Zone 5 meeting. She advised that good progress in being made, the Commissioners are very focused and she has enjoyed working with them. Cr Scarlett spoke of the survey of staff that Dame Margaret carried out which asked staff how they found commissioners versus elected councilors to deal with. It was revealed that staff loved dealing with commissioners as they don't come with any political agendas and they get things done quickly. Cr Scarlett reported that the proposed Cycleway was discussed at the Zone 5 meeting with the person in charge of the Cycleway advising that there will be a very big return on investment and things are progressing well with the St James Cycleway due to open towards the end of this month.

Cr Cummings voiced his concern that the local part of the Cycleway is going to be run by Hokitika and financed by the Westland district. Cr Scarlett stated that he understands that there has not yet been approval from Development West Coast for funding for the local share of the Cycleway. Cr Scarlett believes that the return on investment will come from accommodation and tourist spending and the

speaker at the Zone 5 meeting advised that on average tourist's daily spend while cycling is around \$140. C. Ingle advised that he was coordinating the Cycleway project last year and he understands that the Westland Wilderness Trust is coordinating the Greymouth and Westland part of the Cycleway. They have representatives from the Greymouth trust for this section of the Cycleway that comes down from the Greymouth Floodwall to the Taramakau area. Cr Cummings stated that the Greymouth Mayor is not in favour of assisting with funding of the Cycleway as he feels that Greymouth is missing out. Cr Robb asked Cr Cummings to expand on his comments. Cr Cummings responded that the Cycleway is to be administered in Hokitika and he believes that further clarification is required prior to people putting their money into this. Cr Robb stated that most of those who will use the Cycleway will not cycle more than 30 or 40 kilometres a day, and that as long as the Cycleway passes through the town then this will be where the big benefit comes from. Cr Robb feels that the administration required for the Cycleway would not be significant. C. Ingle stated that the district councils are to fund the segments of the Cycleway that lay within their districts. He stated that the dispute with the Mayor might be related to Grey District Council being asked to fund some of the Cycleway on the south side of the district.

Moved (Scarlett / Archer) *that this report be received.*

Carried

GENERAL BUSINESS

There was no general business.

Cr Scarlett thanked S. Moran for his contribution to Council. Cr Scarlett spoke of the pleasant experiences he has had dealing with S. Moran and noted that S. Moran has been a great advocate for the West Coast and his relationship with the general public has lifted council and he has been very impressed with this. Cr Scarlett stated that S. Moran has been very competent and a breath of fresh air to this council. Cr Scarlett wished S. Moran and his family well with the move to Southland.

The meeting closed at 12.17 p.m.

.....
Chairman

.....
Date

Prepared for: Council Meeting – 14 December 2010
 Prepared by: W. Moen & M. Meehan – Planning & Environmental Manager
 Date: 23 November 2010

Subject: **ENGINEERING OPERATIONS REPORT**

1. RIVER AND DRAINAGE INSPECTIONS

- Camelback Quarry - Inspection
- Taramakau RD – Inspection
- Vine Creek RD Inspection
- Nelson Creek – Gravel Inspection
- Redjacks Creek RD - Inspection

2. WORKS

- a) **Wanganui Rating District – Maintenance**
 This work involving the placing of 1,540 tonnes of rock was completed by Arnold Contracting Ltd at a cost of \$ 35,765.00 (G.S.T. Exclusive).
- b) **Vine Creek Rating District- Cleanout of Channel**
 This work involving the excavation of 31,500 m³ of gravel, the installation of 3 new culverts was completed by G.H. Foster Contracting Ltd at a cost of \$ 50,628.00 (G.S.T. Exclusive).
- c) **Taramakau Rating District – Emergency Works**
 This work involving the placing of 600 tonnes of rock was completed by MBD Contracting Ltd at a cost of \$ 10,627.00 (G.S.T. Exclusive).
- d) **Redjacks Creek Rating District – Maintenance Works**
 This work involving the placing of 200 tonnes of rock was completed by G.H. Foster Contracting Ltd at a cost of \$ 3,600.00 (G.S.T. Exclusive).

3. FUTURE POTENTIAL WORKS

- a) Okuru Rating District – Maintenance
- b) Matainui Creek Rating District – Flood Damage
- c) Lower Waiho Rating District – Flood Damage
- d) Franz Josef Rating District – Possible Upgrade
- e) Raft Creek Rating District – Channel Cleanout
- f) Punakaiki Rating District – Maintenance
- g) Karamea Rating District – Flood Damage
- h) Kongahu Rating District – Maintenance
- i) Mokihinui Rating District – Flood Damage
- j) Wanganui Rating District – Possible Upgrade

4. QUARRIES

All quarries have a reasonable stockpile on the floors
 Whataroa and Camelback Quarries have been drilled and “blown”

RECOMMENDATION

That this report is received.

Michael Meehan
 Planning and Environment Manager

THE WEST COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL

Prepared for: Council Meeting
 Prepared by: Robert Mallinson – Corporate Services Manager
 Date: 6 December 2010

1. Financial Report

FOR THE FOUR MONTHS ENDED 31 OCTOBER 2010	ACTUAL	YEAR TO DATE BUDGET	ACTUAL % ANNUAL BUDGET	ANNUAL BUDGET
REVENUES				
General Rates	649,860	647,333	33%	1,942,000
Rates Penalties	29,662	25,000	40%	75,000
Investment Income	478,439	273,333	58%	820,000
Regulatory	241,829	354,099	26%	930,898
Planning Processes	81,914	34,700	79%	104,100
Environmental Monitoring	0	0	0%	0
Emergency Management	13,684	13,333	34%	40,000
River, Drainage, Coastal Protection	440,379	362,465	40%	1,087,395
Regional % Share Controls	218,653	216,667	34%	650,000
VCS Business Unit	1,839,688	1,316,667	47%	3,950,000
	3,994,108	3,243,598	42%	9,599,393
EXPENDITURE				
Representation	123,885	128,015	32%	384,044
Regulatory Activities	544,982	575,817	33%	1,673,900
Planning Processes	191,401	206,605	31%	619,814
Environmental Monitoring	237,434	246,026	32%	738,077
Emergency Management	41,815	44,900	31%	134,700
River, Drainage, Coastal Protection	430,163	394,512	36%	1,183,535
Regional % Share Controls	280,988	266,667	35%	800,000
VCS Business Unit	731,343	1,145,488	21%	3,436,463
Portfolio Management	30,148	0		0
	2,612,159	3,008,028	29%	8,970,533
SURPLUS / (DEFICIT)	1,381,949	235,569		628,860

BREAKDOWN OF SURPLUS (-DEFICIT)	Variance Actual V Budgeted YTD	ACTUAL	BUDGET Year to date	ANNUAL BUDGET
Rating Districts	965	42,658	41,693	125,080
Quarries	41,809	48,206	6,397	19,190
Regional % Share of AHB Programmes	-12,335	-62,335	-50,000	-150,000
Investment Income	174,957	448,291	273,333	820,000
VCS Business Unit	937,166	1,108,345	171,179	513,537
General Rates Funded Activities	3,817	-203,218	-207,033	-698,947
TOTAL	1,146,379	1,381,949	235,569	628,860

Net Contributors to General Rates Funded Surplus (-Deficit)	Net Variance Actual V YTD	Actual	Budet ytd	Annual Plan
Rates	2,526	649,860	647,333	1,942,000
Rates Penalties	4,662	29,662	25,000	75,000
Representation	4,130	-123,885	-128,015	-384,044
Regulatory Activities	-81,435	-303,153	-221,718	-743,002
Planning Activities	62,418	-109,487	-171,905	-515,714
River, Drainage, Coastal Protection (excl.	-511	-80,648	-80,137	-240,410
Environmental Monitoring	8,592	-237,434	-246,026	-738,077
Emergency Management	3,436	-28,131	-31,567	-94,700
	3,817	-203,218	-207,033	-698,947

STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL POSITION @ 31 OCTOBER 2010

	@ 31/10/2010	@ 30/06/2010
<u>CURRENT ASSETS</u>		
Cash	255,418	70,406
Short term Deposit - Westpac	2,113,286	995
Accounts Receivable - Rates	520,135	308,868
Accounts Receivable - General Debtors	163,109	3,077,712
Prepayments	279,290	276,291
Sundry Receivables	443,755	101,014
Stock - VCS	20,044	17,066
Stock - Rock	96,242	89,727
Stock - Office Supplies	17,518	17,518
Accrued Rates Revenue	0	0
Unbilled Revenue	103,109	126,817
	<u>4,011,906</u>	<u>4,086,414</u>
<u>Non Current Assets</u>		
Investments	11,060,367	10,598,000
Fixed Assets	4,057,565	4,092,960
Infrastructural Assets	49,007,111	49,007,111
	<u>64,125,043</u>	<u>63,698,071</u>
TOTAL ASSETS	<u>68,136,949</u>	<u>67,784,485</u>

CURRENT LIABILITIES

Bank OD	0	0
Accounts Payable	271,084	1,885,994
GST	236,804	0
Deposits and Bonds	511,582	446,552
Sundry Payables	408,939	374,313
Accrued Annual Leave, Payroll	282,285	284,054
Other Revenue in Advance	578,588	823,679
Rates Revenue in Advance	590,535	59,145
	<u>2,879,817</u>	<u>3,873,737</u>

NON CURRENT LIABILITIES

Future Quarry restoration	56,700	56,700
Greymouth Floodwall	2,095,362	2,100,000
Inchbonnie	98,545	100,000
Punakaiki Loan	235,568	248,003
Lower Waiho Loan	0	6,768
Office Equipment Leases	79,923	90,193
	<u>2,566,098</u>	<u>2,601,664</u>

TOTAL LIABILITIES	<u>5,445,915</u>	<u>6,475,401</u>
--------------------------	------------------	------------------

EQUITY

Ratepayers Equity	18,157,524 }	18,157,524
Surplus Tsfrd.	1,381,949 }	
Rating District Equity Mvmts	-167,791 }	
Rating Districts Equity	<u>1,529,252</u>	1,361,459
Tb Special Rate Balance	-34,554	-34,554
Revaluation	32,316,638	32,316,638
Quarry Account	302,017	302,017
Investment Growth Reserve	9,206,000	9,206,000
TOTAL EQUITY	<u>62,691,035</u>	<u>61,309,084</u>

LIABILITIES & EQUITY	<u>68,136,949</u>	<u>67,784,485</u>
---------------------------------	-------------------	-------------------

2. Investment Portfolio

PORTFOLIO @ 31 October 2010 Summary & Reconciliation		Cash	Bonds	Australasian Equities	International Equities	Property Equities	Alternative Asset Classes	Total
Portfolio Value @ Start	01 July 2010	\$ 2,547,549	\$ 3,016,744	\$ 1,841,113	\$ 1,958,120	\$ 529,331	\$ 673,961	\$ 10,566,819
Contributions		\$ 119,402		-\$ 8,824	-\$ 8,741	-\$ 30,000	-\$ 71,838	\$ -
Withdrawals								\$ -
Realised Gains/(Losses)		-\$ 485	-\$ 469	-\$ 39,800	\$ 8,955	-\$ 4,540	\$ 31,911	\$ 4,427
Unrealised Gains/(Losses)		\$ 11,666	\$ 2,873	\$ 206,047	\$ 70,271	\$ 45,512	\$ 37,305	\$ 373,674
Unrealised Hedging Gains/(Losses)		\$ -	\$ -	-\$ 24,831	-\$ 25,625	-\$ 2,326	-\$ 9,860	-\$ 62,643
Mgmt Fee					\$ 476			\$ 476
Income		\$ 25,720	\$ 22,202	\$ 35,329	\$ 8,851	\$ 9,730	\$ 3,023	\$ 104,855
Accrued Interest		\$ 2,482	\$ 47,949					\$ 50,431
Portfolio Value @ End Period	31 October 2010	\$ 2,706,335	\$ 3,089,299	\$ 2,009,035	\$ 2,012,307	\$ 547,707	\$ 664,502	\$ 11,029,185
ytd return for 4 months		1.56%	2.40%	9.60%	3.26%	5.88%	9.38%	4.40%

Asset Allocation %'s @ 31 October 2010	Benchmarks	Tactical asset allocation range
Cash	25%	10% - 50%
Bonds	28%	10% - 50%
Australasian Equities	18%	0% - 20%
International Equities	18%	0% - 20%
Property Equities	5%	0% - 10%
Alternative Asset Classes	6%	0% - 20%
	100%	100%

3. General Comment

These financial results are very similar to those reported to the October meeting. The reported surplus for the four months amounts to \$1.382 million dollars. This VCS result includes the profit realized from the 2010/11 aerial contracts. Quarries are generating a good surplus. The Investment Portfolio again rallied strongly during October. Net positive budget variances in the general rate funded area amounted to \$3,817

RECOMMENDATION

That this report be received.

Robert Mallinson
Corporate Services Manager

4.2.1

THE WEST COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL

Prepared for: Council Meeting – 14 December 2010
Prepared by: Robert Mallinson – Corporate Services Manager
Date: 6 December 2010

Subject: **FOUR MONTH REVIEW - 1 JULY 2010 – 31 OCTOBER 2010**

Attached is the Four Month Review of the 2010 /2011 Annual Plan.

This report shows Achievements/Progress measured against the performance targets.

RECOMMENDATION

That this report be received.

Robert Mallinson
Corporate Services Manager

Governance (Corporate Services Manager)

Performance Measure	Performance Targets	Achieved / Progress
Number of public meetings held and individual Councillor attendance	Conduct eleven monthly meetings of Council and the Resource Management Committee, plus other scheduled meetings and scheduled workshops during the year with 80% attendance by all Councillors.	Council and Committee meetings were held in July, August, September and the Triennial meeting in October. All Councillors have 100% attendance rate at Council meetings, in the year to date.
Compliance with statutory timeframes	Prepare and notify the Council's Annual Plan by 31 May 2011 in accordance with the procedures outlined in the Local Government Act 2002.	Not yet due.
Compliance with statutory timeframes	Prepare and notify the Council's Annual Report by 31 October 2010 in accordance with the procedures outlined in the Local Government Act 2002.	Achieved. Audited annual report was adopted by Council on 26 October 2010.
Timing and number of newsletters	Publish an informative Council newsletter twice a year to be circulated to all ratepayers, with their rate demand, in March and September.	Achieved. First issue of the newsletter was circulated with the rates instalments in September 2010.
Website is kept up to date	Maintain the Council website up-to-date at all times, as the Council's primary information transfer point and an information resource for the community.	Achieved. New information has been posted related to special rating districts.
Attendance of Iwi appointees at Resource Management Committee meetings	Continue to invite attendance of Makaanhio and Ngati Waewae representatives as appointees to the Council's resource management committee, to enable Maori participation in resource management decision-making.	Council has continued to invite representatives from Makaanhio and Ngati Waewae. Ngati Waewae have appointed a new representative.

Resource Consents Processing (Consents and Compliance Manager)

Performance Measure	Performance Targets	Achieved / Progress
Percentage of total consents processed within statutory timeframes (93.6% in the 2009/10 year)	Process at least 95% ¹ of non-notified resource consent applications within the statutory timeframes	Achieved: 100% (162/162) of non-notified consents were processed within the statutory timeframes.
Number of section 92 additional information requests per year (14 requests in the 2009/10 year)	Work with consent applicants to seek to reduce the need for formal requests for further information under Section 92 of the RMA	In progress: 10 Section 92 requests were made in relation to the consent applications being processed in the reporting period.
Timing of report preparation for notified consents	Complete staff reports for all notified consent applications within 10 working days of receipt of all required information	Achieved. 3 out of 3 notified consent applications met the statutory timeframes.
Timing of responses to enquiries	Respond to written enquiries on resource consent processes and requirements within 10 working days and LGOMIA requests within 20 working days.	98.3% (177/180) of written enquiries were responded to within 10 working days.

¹ A 100% target is not considered to be realistically achievable given the Council operates a small team of consents officers and the workload is highly variable. Spillover work can often be allocated to consultants, but this is not cost or time effective in the case of minor consents.

Compliance Monitoring (Consents and Compliance Manager)

Performance Measure	Performance Targets	Achieved / Progress
Percentage of mining work programmes processed within a set timeframe (100% achieved in the 2009/10 year)	Process at least 95% of mining work programmes ² within 20 working days of receipt	Achieved: All 7 valid work programmes received were processed within the timeframe. 2 other 'work programmes' were also received but were not processed because they were considered to be invalid as they did not meet resource consent requirements.
Percentage of bond releases processed within a set timeframe (100% achieved in the 2009/10 year).	Release 100% of bonds within four months of the surrender, forfeiture or expiry of the corresponding mining licence or permit, provided that rehabilitation requirements have been met	Achieved: 2 bonds were released in the reporting period, both of which within the 4 month timeframe.
Meeting 2011 deadline set for bond reviews.	Review bond levels for all large-scale mines ³ by 2011 and set new bond levels to better reflect the environmental effects/risks of those mines.	In progress.
Number (proportion) of mine site inspections (145 mine site visits occurred in the 2009/10 year)	Inspect every consent and/or mining licence for operating mining activities at least once annually, and where problems are identified follow up to ensure compliance is achieved and/or environmental effects are reduced.	In progress: 36 mining inspections were undertaken during the reporting period.
Number (proportion) of site inspections	Inspect all new consents that involve major ⁴ construction works after completion of those works, and follow up to ensure compliance is achieved.	In progress: The completed works for the Wanganui River Bridge underpinning (RC09124), Tunnel 19 Kiwi Point daylighting (RC09149) and 10 Mile Creek Bridge replacement (RC09091) were inspected during the reporting period.
Number (proportion) of site inspections	Inspect all consents for whitebait stands on the Little Wanganui, Taramakau, Hokitika, Wanganui, Paringa and Waiaoto Rivers annually and the remaining rivers with whitebait stand consents at least once every three years to check consent compliance and ensure that any environmental effects are no more than minor.	In progress: Whitebait stands on the Taramakau, Hokitika, Wanganui and Paringa Rivers were inspected during the reporting period.
Number (proportion) of site inspections (all dairy farms were inspected in the three year period 2007/08 – 2009/10)	Inspect every dairy shed effluent discharge at least once every three years, depending on compliance, and work with farmers so that consent compliance is achieved and environmental effects are managed.	In progress: A total of 55 dairy shed inspections were undertaken during the reporting period.

² This target assumes the work programme is submitted with all necessary information provided.

³ Large Scale in this case means with a current bond exceeding \$100,000.

⁴ Major, in this situation, means the project costs more than approx. \$200,000.

Performance Measure	Performance Targets	Achieved / Progress
<p>Regularity and number of site inspections</p>	<p>Assess farm compliance in the Lake Brunner catchment annually, in recognition of the need for stricter environmental management in this sensitive lake catchment, and follow up to ensure compliance is achieved.</p>	<p>In progress.</p>
<p>Number of complaints reported to Council (224 incident/complaints were received in the 2009/10 year)</p>	<p>Operate a 24-hour complaints service, responding to all complaints and report all complaints to the monthly Resource Management Committee.</p>	<p>Achieved: 93 complaints were received and responded to during the reporting period.</p>
<p>Number of notices issued (20 abatement notices and 27 infringement notices were issued, and prosecutions were laid in relation to 4 illegal activities the 2009/10 year)</p>	<p>Respond to breaches of the RMA, regional plan rules or resource consents by taking enforcement action through abatement notices, infringement notices or recommend prosecution in accordance with Council Enforcement Policy.</p>	<p>Achieved: 6 infringement notices and 2 abatement notices were issued in the reporting period, and prosecutions were laid in relation to one illegal activity.</p>

Hazardous Substance Spill Response (Consents and Compliance Manager)

Performance Measure	Performance Targets	Achieved / Progress
Number of trained staff	Maintain a team of at least 25 Maritime NZ trained personnel at all times to deal with marine oil spills and terrestrial hazardous substance spills.	Currently there are 24 trained personnel with some staff leaving the area in recent months, and 1 Regional On Scene Commander. Staff will be trained in early 2011 to ensure that there are adequate numbers of trained staff.
Timing of responses	Respond within 4 hours to all terrestrial hazardous substance spills, and where necessary use Council or MNZ spill equipment to manage containment and clean up to minimise adverse environmental impacts.	Achieved, no major spills occurred during the reporting period.
Regularity of spill equipment maintenance	Ensure response equipment is maintained quarterly to a level ready to respond to a Tier 2 marine oil spill response.	Achieved: The equipment was inspected during the reporting period.
Timing of Plan reviews	Contribute to four yearly reviews of the Tier 2 Marine Oil Spill Response Plan within statutory timeframes in 2009/10, and 2014/15, or as agreed with MNZ.	Achieved: The Tier 2 Plan is current.
Timing of Plan reviews	Review the Contingency and Procedure Plan for terrestrial hazardous substance spill responses in 2009/10 and 2014/15.	Review yet to be commenced.

Planning Processes (Planning and Environmental Manager)

Measure	Performance Targets	Achieved/Progress
Timing of consultation commencing and notification of Variation	Notify the Variation merging the Land and Riverbed, Water, and Discharge to Land Plans by December 2010.	Achieved. The Variation merging the Land and Riverbed, Water, and Discharge to Land Plans was notified on 17 September 2010
Timing of commencing review	Commence a full review of the Pest Plant Management Strategy by August 2010	Achieved. The Strategy was notified prior to August 2010 and is now complete.
Timing of report release Release of best practice information	Commence a full review of the Regional Coastal Plan by February 2011	In Progress. The review has effectively commenced and will be formally commenced in February.
Number of submissions made to other agencies	Prepare and disseminate information for resource users on rules, and best practice, as detailed in the annual communications programme. Investigate and respond where appropriate to central government policies or plans that may impact on West Coast interests, within required timeframes, and provide ongoing policy advice to Council as and when needed.	In Progress. Staff currently updating pest strategy information for land occupiers.
		Achieved. Council made submissions on the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement, the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, and the Aquaculture Legislation Amendment Bill this month alone.

Quarry Administration (Planning and Environmental Manager)

Performance Measure	Performance Targets	Achieved/Progress
Delivery of each plan's action points, and timing of plan review	Oversee implementation of the quarry management plans, and review those plans by 2011.	In progress - Action points are being completed as demand for rock allows.
Number of site inspections to monitor contractor health and safety performance	Monitor and review quarry contracts and permits and visit sites to ensure Health and Safety and other legal requirements are met.	In progress - Health and Safety plans updated annually and completed. Three site visits have been undertaken.
Timing of acting upon requests.	Obtain rock from quarries to facilitate river protection works within two weeks of any request, and at a cost in line with the relative operating cost of each quarry without subsidy from general rates.	Achieved. Stockpiles are maintained in most quarries to meet this target.

Environmental Monitoring (Planning and Environmental Manager)

Performance Measure	Performance Targets	Achieved/Progress
Completion of sampling and timing of publishing reports (the current surface water quality report was published in 2008)	Complete all regular water sampling programmes and prepare State of the Environment reports for surface water quality by June 2011; plus an annual Lake Brunner summary report every December, for Council's web site.	In progress - State of the Environment water quality monitoring is up to date. Lake Brunner monitoring was reviewed and Lake Haupiri will be sampled bi-monthly until a detailed data record is established.
Regular reporting to Council	Report monthly summer contact recreation results to Council, and to media, and complete any follow-up investigations required by Council as they arise.	In progress. Contact recreation information will be reported to Council, the media and other agencies as it becomes available.
Regular reporting to Council	Continue wintertime ambient air quality monitoring in Reefton and provide monthly summary reports to Council during winter months.	Achieved for the 2010 winter months.
Number of funding applications	Maintain the 'Sites Associated with Hazardous Substances' (SAHS) database, ensure District Councils and land buyers have access to up to date information and assist landowners to securing external funding to investigate or remediate high priority SAHS sites, where landowners are interested and funding is available.	Achieved. The database is maintained with all SAHS classifications updated according to the recently reviewed WCRC Contaminated Land Strategy.
Availability of information about high flow events and the staff response to those.	Provide a continuous flood monitoring service for the five rivers monitored and respond in accordance with the flood-warning manual and ensure real time data on river levels is available on the Council website and Info line (data is updated 12 hourly, and during floods 3 hourly at least).	Achieved.
Timing of flood manual review	Review the flood-warning manual annually and liaise with work groups as required.	The manual was updated in early-mid 2010, and will be updated at the same time in 2011.

Rating District Administration (Planning and Environmental Manager)

Performance Measure	Performance Targets	Achieved/Progress
Meeting timeframes for plan review	Review Rating District Asset Management Plans where information indicates a significant change from what is stated in the asset management plan or where communities support an early review of the service levels of existing infrastructure.	Achieved. All Asset Management Plans have been reviewed and are available to view on the Council's website.
Completion of rating district works and annual meetings, and proportion of schemes performing to their agreed service level.	Organise and oversee maintenance of all rating district infrastructural assets to the service level consistent with the Asset Management Plan of each Rating District, or whatever level the community and the Council decide on as an acceptable risk.	Achieved. Inspections carried out, discussed with the rating districts, including works to be carried out. All rating districts are maintained in line with the service levels stated in the LTCCP.
Completion of rating district works and annual meeting.	Complete all annual maintenance works identified in the adopted annual works report for each rating district, and complete all rating district meetings by November 2010.	In progress, minor tasks are required to be completed on the Greymouth floodwall including the spraying of Cobden Island which will be completed December 2010. Following this works a final walk over will be undertaken.
Number of loans secured and promptness of loan money availability	Assist with organising and securing infrastructure loans for major capital works as and when required.	No loans required so far this financial year.
Number of advice items provided compared to number of requests for advice	Provide civil engineering advice on Council's behalf for consent applications and compliance matters within statutory timeframes.	Achieved. Advice has been sought and provided for consent applications and compliance matters in a timely manner.

Regional Transport Planning (Chief Executive)

Performance Measure	Performance Targets	Achieved/Progress
Number of public meetings held	Facilitate at least two public Regional Transport Committee meetings per year and arrange working group meetings as requested by the Committee.	In progress. The next Regional Transport Committee meeting is scheduled for 3 February 2011. The working group met on 12 October.
Timing of Strategy review (the current RLTS was approved in 2006).	Complete a review of the RLTS within the timeframe set under Transport legislation, to a standard acceptable to the Regional Transport Committee	In progress. The Regional Land Transport Strategy is currently being reviewed and will be taken to the next Regional Transport Committee meeting for approval to be released for consultation.
Number of road safety meetings hosted and description of projects delivered	Participate, with the three district councils, NZ Police, and others in the West Coast Road Safety Co-ordinating Committee.	The Road Safety Coordinating Committee met on 23 November 2010. Projects have commenced in the Road Safety Action Plan which has been designed under the Safer Journeys national direction.
User satisfaction (100% of users rated the overall service as good, very good or excellent in the 2007/2008 year).	Implement the total mobility programme where taxi services exist, ensuring at least 90% of users rate the overall service and value for money as good, very good or excellent	To be measured in June 2011.

Emergency Management (Chief Executive)

Performance Measure	Performance Targets	Achieved/Progress
Number of public information activities	Prepare and organise the distribution of public information linked to the development and release of the national public information programme.	In progress.
Headquarters is properly equipped	Maintain a ready-to-operate headquarters in preparation for potential emergencies, in accordance with the Group Plan and Group Controllers Guide.	Achieved. The Group Emergency Operations Centre is ready to operate for potential emergencies.
Number of trained staff (currently over 30 staff are properly trained)	Train at least 30 Council staff as EOC personnel so that we have three shifts of EOC staff trained and exercised in case of a regional emergency.	Achieved. There are currently 32 staff trained as EOC personnel.

Vector Control Services Business Unit (Vector Control Business Unit Manager)

Performance Measure	Performance Targets	Achieved/Progress
Achievement of budgeted financial return	Tender for, and win, sufficient contracts to provide or exceed the annual budgeted return to Council.	Achieved. Budgeted surplus will be achieved or exceeded.
Number of blocks passed or failed	Meet the performance objectives and contractual obligations set by the Animal Health Board for ground and aerial pest control contracts.	Achieved. 9 out of 10 blocks passed, one re-monitor required on one block.
Number of recorded complaints and responses to assist the review of the Strategy	Keep sufficient pest plant work records to assist the review of the Pest Plant Management Strategy.	In progress. Records kept to all responses.
Availability of trained staff	Have staff available as a response unit for marine and terrestrial pollution spill events as per the MOU between the Council's Compliance section, Maritime New Zealand and Vector Control Services dated 11 November 2005.	Achieved. Six staff trained to meet this target.
Compliance with Tier 2 oil spill response plan requirements	Maintain oil spill response equipment to the level required in the West Coast Tier 2 Oil Spill Response Plan.	In progress. Quarterly inspections and maintenance programme are carried out.
Number of new business areas	Develop new business areas as appropriate, complementary to existing roles.	In progress - providing increasing research assistance, operational management, GIS services and consent processing to Landcare Research; Providing monitoring services to DOC; Provided operational management services to the Department of Natural Land; New Caledonia; conducting 3 North Island aerial possum control operations.

THE WEST COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL

Prepared for: Council Meeting 14 December 2010
Prepared by: Chris Ingle – Chief Executive
Date: 3 December 2010
Subject: **CHIEF EXECUTIVES REPORT**

Meetings Attended

The key meetings I have attended since my last report include:

- I attended a coal mine research meeting on 17th November in Christchurch. This is the regular meeting for a coal research project (funded by Government) that Council has been involved in at governance level for six years.
- Attended Envirolink meeting on 18 November allocating government funding for science advice.
- I met with Matthew Hall from AHB on 24th of November.
- I attended the first RAC meeting of the new triennium with the Chairman on 25th and 26th of November.
- I attended the Pike River Mine Memorial Service on 2nd December with the Chairman.

Management Training

I attended a one day workshop in Wellington on 16 November that explored the differences between governance and management roles in local government. It was led by a very experienced British academic who has studied the topic for many years. He offered a useful and interesting perspective.

Annual Leave

I took two days leave on 30 November and 1 December to attend to family matters. I intend taking leave in early January to return on the 17th.

Disestablishment of the Varroa Agency Inc.

The attached letter from Marlborough District Council requests that Council sign off the disestablishment of the Varroa Agency, which has now become redundant. It is recommended that Council signs the document.

RECOMMENDATION

- 1. That this report be received.*
- 2. That Council agrees to disestablish the Varroa Agency Inc.*

Chris Ingle
Chief Executive



MARLBOROUGH DISTRICT COUNCIL
PO BOX 443
BLENHEIM 7240
NEW ZEALAND

TELEPHONE (0064) 3 520 7400
FACSIMILE (0064) 3 520 7496
EMAIL mdc@marlborough.govt.nz
WEB www.marlborough.govt.nz

MARLBOROUGH
DISTRICT COUNCIL

File Ref L135-V09C
Ask For: Tony Quirk

3 November 2010

Chris Ingle
Chief Executive
West Coast Regional Council
PO Box 66
Greymouth 7840



Dear Chris

Disestablishment of the Varroa Agency Incorporated

The purpose of this letter is to outline procedures for the formal disestablishment of the Varroa Agency Incorporated. As you will recall the Agency was formed to implement the Varroa Pest Management Strategy in an attempt to prevent the spread of the beekeeping varroa mite from the North Island.

Its responsibilities included education and monitoring programmes as well as a permitting system for Varroa Border Control from the North Island to the South Island.

The Agency was funded by South Island Regional and Unitary Councils and the bee industry.

The spread of the varroa mite to the South Island was inevitable with a first discovery in Nelson in late 2006.

Since 2007 the Agency has been winding down its operations and over the last two years it has largely been inactive.

It is now necessary to formally disestablish the Agency. To do this a resolution must be signed by all members. This does not require a meeting. **Attached** is a resolution we ask you to sign to complete the process.

The Agency's accounts have all been completed and there is approximately \$85,000 in cash funds remaining in the accounts. The Deed of Incorporation for the Agency requires that any remaining funds be given or used for charitable purposes. It is proposed the funds be distributed to the Honey Trust of NZ with a request the funds be used for work in connection with the control of or research into the varroa mite. The Trustees have seen the Trust Deed of the NZ Honey Trust and we have confirmation the Trust is happy to received the funds. The Trustees recommendation supports distribution to the Honey Trust of NZ as indicated

It is requested therefore that your organisation signs the **attached** resolution and returns it to Tony Quirk at the Marlborough District Council by 30 November 2010.

Should you have any queries about the disestablishment process please contact Duncan Butcher, Chairman of the Agency at the following email address dunmore7@xtra.co.nz

Yours sincerely

ANDREW BESLEY
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

encl:

INCORPORATED SOCIETIES ACT 1908**VARROA AGENCY INCORPORATED****RESOLUTION IN LIEU OF MEETING****RESOLVED:**

1. It is resolved by Resolution in lieu of a meeting of the Society:
- (a) That the Society namely Varroa Agency Incorporated, be put into liquidation;
 - (b) That thirty (30) days after the date on which this Resolution has been passed, a further Resolution in lieu of a meeting be put for the purpose of confirming these Resolutions;
 - (c) That a Member's execution of this Resolution constitutes an affirmative vote in favour of liquidation for the purposes of both resolutions;
 - (e) That subject to its charitable status being confirmed and subject to this Resolution being confirmed surplus funds be distributed to the Trustees of the time being of the Honey Trust of New Zealand with the request that the funds be used by that Trust for work in connection with the control of or research into the Varroa mite.

DATED this day of 2010

SIGNED for and on behalf of)
ENVIRONMENT CANTERBURY)
 by its authorised signatories:)

SIGNED for and on behalf of)
NATIONAL BEEKEEPERS ASSOCIATION)
OF NEW ZEALAND INCORPORATED)
 by its authorised signatories:)

SIGNED for and on behalf of)
FEDERATED FARMERS OF NEW ZEALAND (INC))
 by its authorised signatories:)

SIGNED for and on behalf of)
WEST COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL)
 by its authorised signatories:)

SIGNED for and on behalf of)
OTAGO REGIONAL COUNCIL)
 by its authorised signatories:)

SIGNED for and on behalf of)
MARLBOROUGH DISTRICT COUNCIL)
 by its authorised signatories:)

SIGNED for and on behalf of)
ENVIRONMENT SOUTHLAND)
 by its authorised signatories:)

SIGNED for and on behalf of)
TASMAN DISTRICT COUNCIL)
 by its authorised signatories:)

SIGNED for and on behalf of)
NELSON CITY COUNCIL)
by its authorised signatories:)

MDC – Varroa – Resolution 2.njl
5 October 2010

THE WEST COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL

To: Chairperson
West Coast Regional Council

I move that the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely, -

Agenda Item No. 8.			
27 – 28	8.1	Confirmation of Confidential Minutes 9 November 2010	
	8.2	Briefing to Councillors by Audit New Zealand Director, John Mackey – in accordance with Risk Management Policy	
29	8.3	Overdue Debtors Report	
30 – 50	8.4	Resource Consent RC94077 - Rehabilitation of Section 58, Little Boatmans Creek, Cronadun	
51 - 104	8.5	Enforcement Report	

Item No.	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.
8.			
8.1	Confirmation of Confidential Minutes 9 November 2010		Section 48(1)(a) and in particular Section 9 of 2nd Schedule Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987.
8.2	Briefing to Councillors by Audit New Zealand Director, John Mackey – in accordance with Risk Management Policy		
8.3	Overdue Debtors Report		
8.4	Resource Consent RC94077 - Rehabilitation of Section 58, Little Boatmans Creek, Cronadun		
8.5	Enforcement Report		

I also move that:

- Chris Ingle
- Robert Mallinson
- Michael Meehan
- Colin Dall

be permitted to remain at this meeting after the public has been excluded, because of their knowledge on the subject. This knowledge, which will be of assistance in relation to the matter to be discussed.

The Minutes Clerk also be permitted to remain at the meeting.