

Assessment of Objectives and Policies

The following assessment takes into account the current discharges (some of which include traces of untreated sewage), and the effects of those discharges on the receiving environment after reasonable mixing, including the coastal environment. The applicant has committed to actively identifying sewage contamination sources and eliminating them from the stormwater network, along with reductions in other contaminants such as metals and sediment.

In continuing the proposed discharges of stormwater and contaminants to water, the applicant undertakes to:

- i. **maintain** the existing quality of the receiving waters and affected coastal waters in their current state, initially (i.e. the application is to continue an existing discharge which has occurred in some form since Invercargill was first established, and which will not degrade existing water quality further); and
- ii. **enhance** the quality of the receiving waters and affected coastal waters (insofar as they are affected by the discharges) by taking active steps to identify the sources of stormwater contaminants (particularly sewage) and progressively remove and / or reduce them at source.

This assessment finds that, in taking a broad view of the provisions of the Regional Water Plan (RWP) and the proposed Southland Water and Land Plan (pSWLP) in respect of s104D(1)(b)(iii) of the RMA, the proposal passes the 'policy' gateway test under s104D(1)(b) as it is not contrary to the relevant provisions. Consequently s104D does not prevent the granting of the consent applied for, and enables the application to then be considered under s104 and determined in accordance with s104B.

The conclusions in the following table are colour-coded:

- Green: provisions where the application is considered to meet the stated objectives or to be **consistent** with policies.
- Orange: provisions where the application is not considered to meet the stated objectives or is **not consistent** with policies, but not to the extent that the activity is contrary to the provisions.
- Red: provisions where the application is considered to be **contrary** to the objectives or policies.

Text in the provisions that is underlined is the writer's emphasis.

1. Regional Water Plan for Southland

RWP	Assessment	Conclusion
Objective 2 – Maintain water quality <i>To manage water quality so that there is no reduction in the quality of the water in any surface water body, beyond the zone of reasonable mixing for discharges, below that of the date this Plan became operative (January 2010).</i>	<p>Existing water quality will be maintained (i.e. will not be made worse). The stormwater discharges are not new (i.e. they pre-date January 2010), and will be improved over time (i.e. will not get worse or cause receiving water quality to decline further). The effects of the discharges on water quality will be the same as existed at January 2010, taking into account the environmental effects of those discharges to date.</p> <p>The quality of stormwater discharged from the network will therefore not be reducing receiving water quality beyond the zone of reasonable mixing, as it existed in January 2010</p>	<u>Will meet the objective</u>

RWP	Assessment	Conclusion
<p>Objective 3 – Surface water bodies other than in Natural State waters <i>To maintain and enhance the quality of surface water bodies so that the following values are protected where water quality is already suitable for them, and where water quality is currently not suitable, measurable progress is achieved towards making it suitable for them.</i> <i>In surface water bodies classified as ... lowland (hard bed), lowland (soft bed) ...:</i> <i>(a) bathing, in those sites where bathing is popular;</i> <i>(b) trout where present, otherwise native fish;</i> <i>(c) stock drinking water;</i> <i>(d) Ngāi Tahu cultural values, including mahinga kai;</i> <i>(e) natural character including aesthetics.</i> ...</p>	<p>Insofar as the discharges of stormwater affect receiving water quality, the discharges will not make it any worse than at present (i.e. will maintain water quality as it currently is) and will maintain it over time, particularly in regard to</p> <p>Taking into account the proposed measures to remove the illegal discharges (cross-connections, I&I etc.), audit and improve discharges from industrial sites where necessary, remove sewage cross-contamination through the City's renewals programme, and require LID principles to be applied to stormwater management for new land developments, water quality will improve over time. That is to say, measureable progress will be made toward achieving the values specified in Objective 3, and enhancing water quality.</p> <p>Objective 3 which specifically anticipates that improvements in water quality will need to be made over time where water quality is not currently 'suitable' – as set out in the explanation to the objective: <i>"These goals will not be met overnight. The objective is therefore to make progress towards achieving them"</i>.</p>	<p><u>Will meet the objective</u></p> <p>Water quality will be maintained (i.e. will not be made worse than it currently is) and will be enhanced over time.</p> <p>Measureable progress will be made towards achieving the specified values.</p>
<p>Objective 4 – Gradual Improvement of water quality parameters <i>To manage the discharge of contaminants and encourage best environmental practice to improve the water quality in surface water bodies classified as hill, lowland (hard bed), lowland (soft bed) and spring fed, and in particular to achieve a minimum of 10 percent improvement in levels of the following water quality parameters over 10 years from the date this Plan became operative (January 2010):</i> <i>(a) microbiological contaminants</i> <i>(b) nitrate</i> <i>(c) phosphorus</i> <i>(d) clarity</i></p>	<p>Objective 4 anticipates a gradual improvement of water quality over time. The explanation to the objective notes in respect of reducing the specified contaminants: <i>"Attempting to achieve them in a short timeframe would require significant constraints on both land use activities and direct discharge of contaminants to water."</i></p> <p>The obligation to improve the stated parameters by 10% is not the applicant's alone – however the changes proposed will contribute to meeting this objective. If applied in the absence of the above expectation, the timeframe would give the ICC less than three years in which to achieve the 10% reduction, when in fact the stormwater contribution has been shown to be a minor contributor.</p> <p>The applicant's proposed improvements will achieve measureable progress in respect of a gradual improvement in receiving water quality in</p>	<p><u>Will contribute to meeting the objective</u></p> <p>Receiving water quality will be enhanced in respect of the stated parameters as the quality of stormwater discharges improve.</p> <p>The applicant, on its own cannot achieve a 10% improvement in the stated water quality parameters, especially as the stormwater discharges are not the primary sources of those contaminants in receiving waters.</p>

RWP	Assessment	Conclusion
	the stated parameters of (a) to (d) to the extent that it is affected by stormwater discharges, primarily by the removal of sewage contaminants.	
Objective 10 <i>To maintain or enhance the diversity and integrity of aquatic and riverine habitats and ecosystems</i>	<p>The maintenance and enhancement of the aquatic and riverine habitats and ecosystems will in part be a consequence of improved water quality. The proposed discharge will not make the existing situation worse (i.e. will maintain it) and will enhance it over time as the applicant makes the specified improvements and removes sewage contamination.</p>	<p><u>Will meet the objective</u></p> <p>Water quality will be maintained (i.e. will not be made worse than it currently is) and will be enhanced over time.</p> <p>The effects are more than minor but not significant and will be reduced over time.</p>
RWP	Assessment	Conclusion
Policy A4 1. ... 2. ... 3. <i>This policy applies to the following discharges (including a diffuse discharge by any person or animal):</i> a. <u>a new discharge</u> or b. <u>a change or increase in any discharge</u> – of any contaminant into fresh water ...	N/A The proposal is not for a new discharge as stormwater has been discharged from the network for over 100 years. The scale and nature of the discharge will not change or increase. This policy therefore does not apply to this application.	N/A
Policy 1A <i>Any assessment of an activity covered by this plan must take into account any relevant Iwi Management Plan.</i>	The relevant iwi management plan (<i>Te Tangi a Tauira</i>) was taken into account in assessing the effects of the activity and preparing the application. The relevant provisions of that document are addressed below.	<u>Consistent</u>
Policy 3 <i>Allow no discharges to surface water bodies that will result in a reduction of water quality beyond the zone of reasonable mixing, <u>unless it is consistent with the promotion of the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, as set out in Part 2 of the Resource Management Act 1991, to do so.</u></i>	While the sewage content (which will be removed over time) of some discharges currently reduces water quality beyond the zone of reasonable mixing, the existing stormwater discharges do not otherwise reduce water quality beyond the water quality standards of the RWP, beyond the zone of reasonable mixing.	<u>Consistent</u>

RWP	Assessment	Conclusion
	<p>The policy anticipates that a reduction in water quality may be appropriate when considered in the context of the broader purpose of the RMA, requiring a judgement that takes account of the benefits of achieving water quality standards, while also taking into account the effects of doing so on the social, cultural and economic wellbeing of the community.</p> <p>For the reasons stated from paragraph 64 of my evidence in chief, the proposal is consistent with the promotion of sustainable management, and therefore Policy 3. By actively improving the quality of the stormwater discharged from the network, the applicant will be better providing for the health and safety, and the social, cultural and economic wellbeing of the community, as well as the matters of national importance in s6, the 'other matters' to which regard must be had in s7, and the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi in s8.</p>	
<p>Policy 4 <i>For surface water bodies outside Natural State Waters, manage point source and non-point source discharges to meet or exceed the water quality standards referred to in Rule 1 and specified in Appendix G "Water Quality Standards", unless it is consistent with the promotion of the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, as set out in Part 2 of the Resource Management Act 1991, to do so and so avoid levels of contaminants in water and sediments that could harm the health of humans, domestic animals including stock and/or aquatic life.</i></p>	<p>The discharges will not meet all of the standards in Appendix G, however that is mostly due to the upstream water quality influences, and the nature of the receiving environment (for example, the highly modified nature of the waterways as they pass through the urban environment, including straightening, channelization, removal of riparian vegetation etc.), rather than solely due to the effects of contaminants in the stormwater. It is important to note that the effects of the discharges are not significant (although including the current sewage content are more than minor). It is also important to note that the ability of the water quality standards to be achieved relies substantially on parties other than the ICC.</p> <p>Enabling the discharge is consistent with the promotion of sustainable management as set out in Part 2 of the RMA as it allows time for the sources of sewage to be progressively identified and removed, while recognising the important function that the stormwater network and discharges play in providing for the community's health and safety, and their social, cultural and economic wellbeing.</p> <p>Sewage is understood to be intermittently present, but may render some receiving waters as unsuitable for contact in respect of human and animal health until the sewage is removed. The levels of contaminants that are attributable to the stormwater discharges are otherwise sufficiently low so as to avoid harm to human and animal health, and aquatic life upon the</p>	<p>Not consistent The discharges will not meet the Appendix G standards while sewage is included, but it is consistent with the promotion of sustainable management under the RMA to allow the discharges (see assessment from paragraph 64 of evidence in chief);</p> <p>and</p> <p>the levels of contaminants in water and sediments are not significant, and are not sufficient to result in harm to human & animal health or aquatic life once sewage is removed.</p>

RWP	Assessment	Conclusion
	removal of sewage contamination, which is the premise upon which this application is based.	
<p>Policy 5 <i>Manage discharges to water in artificial watercourses so that any new discharge, in conjunction with existing discharges, does not reduce the water quality of the surface water body into which the artificial watercourse flows below any standards set for the surface water body in Appendix G "Water Quality Standards" following a zone of reasonable mixing from the point of confluence of the artificial watercourse with the surface water body.</i></p>	<p>The proposal does not involve new discharges of stormwater to artificial watercourses. Regardless, the scale and nature of the existing discharge to the artificial the watercourse (Waikiwi Stream catchment) will not change or increase, and does not further reduce the water quality standards in Waikiwi Stream beyond the zone of reasonable mixing. The proposal is consistent with Policy 5.</p>	<p><u>Consistent</u></p>
<p>Policy 7 <i>Prefer discharges to land over discharges to water where this is practicable and the effects are less adverse.</i></p>	<p>Discharges to land are not a practicable alternative for the City's stormwater discharges given the technical, physical and operational constraints that apply. The proposal is consistent with Policy 7.</p>	<p><u>Consistent</u></p>
<p>Policy 8 <i>Prefer point source discharges of contaminants to water at times of high flow over discharges at normal or low flows, and ensure that where discharging does take place at low flows, the effects that could not be practically avoided are minimised.</i></p>	<p>Aside from the potential for a temporary lag between network discharges and stream flow responses to precipitation, most stormwater discharges will occur to surface water at times of high stream flow. Discharges from the stormwater network will occur at low flows on occasion as a result of groundwater intrusion into the network. The effects of low flow discharges can be minimised by removing contaminants over time.</p> <p>The progressive upgrading of the network will ultimately reduce if not remove groundwater / low flow discharges from the network, avoiding adverse effects to the extent practicable over time. In the short term, the effects cannot be practically avoided – however they will be minimised and progressively so, until they are avoided by removing sewage.</p>	<p><u>Consistent</u></p>
<p>Policy 9 <i>When determining the size of the zone of reasonable mixing, minimise the size of the area where the relevant water quality standards are breached. Consideration</i></p>	<p>The applicant has proposed a reasonable mixing zone that is consistent with the existing discharge permits.</p> <p>The evidence of Ms Bennett and Mr Stewart indicates that the effects of the discharges on aquatic ecosystems of the receiving water bodies is</p>	<p><u>Not consistent</u></p>

RWP	Assessment	Conclusion
<p><i>should be given to, but not be limited to, the following matters:</i></p> <p><i>(a) the aquatic ecosystem values in the affected reach;</i></p> <p><i>(b) the need for fish passage;</i></p> <p><i>(c) the uses of the water body adjacent to and downstream of the point of discharge.</i></p>	<p>more than minor but not significant, and that the effects on aquatic ecosystem values will be progressively reduced.</p> <p>Fish passage will not be physically obstructed.</p> <p>The discharges do not prevent the existing uses of downstream water bodies, however the potential for some cultural and public health effects to occur until sewage is removed is acknowledged. The application is not consistent with the policy since, due to the sewage component, the water quality standards cannot be met within the existing mixing zone, but will be able to comply upon the removal of sewage contamination.</p>	
<p>Policy 11</p> <p><i>Apply consent conditions requiring consented discharges of stormwater to meet both the ANZECC sediment guidelines and the relevant water quality standards following reasonable mixing to:</i></p> <p><i>(a) All resource consents for new stormwater discharges; and</i></p> <p><i>(b) All new resource consents for existing stormwater discharges. Unless it is consistent with the purpose of the Act to allow further time, existing discharges will be required to meet the standards and guidelines by 2010 or the date the resource consent commences, whichever is the latter.</i></p>	<p>This policy requires that consent conditions are included in resource consents requiring the ANZECC ISQG sediment guidelines and the relevant water quality standards to be achieved after reasonable mixing.</p> <p>No monitoring sites were found to exceed the ISQG-High guidelines (above which adverse effects are <i>likely</i> to occur). Compliance with the water quality standards will not be able to be achieved at the commencement of the consent. In such circumstances, the policy anticipates that a reduction in water quality over time may be appropriate when considered in the context of the purpose of the RMA, requiring a judgement broader than just in respect of water quality to be made.</p> <p>In my view, the proposal is consistent with this policy when the broad judgement under Part 2 is applied, taking into account the applicant's intention to improve the discharges to meet the stated standards over time, and the social and economic benefits of allowing the applicant time to do so given the scale of the network, that it is a legacy issue, and the limited alternatives available.</p>	<p>Consistent –</p>
<p>Policy 13</p> <p><i>Avoid the point source discharge of raw sewage, foul water and untreated agricultural effluent to water.</i></p>	<p>Some of the stormwater discharges show contamination by sewage, but do not consist of point source discharges of raw sewage. The discharge of raw sewage to water is a prohibited activity under Rule 14 of the RWP and consent cannot be sought. Furthermore, the discharge of raw sewage is explicitly excluded from the consent being sought by the applicant. This policy is not a relevant consideration.</p>	<p>N/A</p>

2. Proposed Southland Water and Land Plan

pSWLP - Ngai Tahu	Assessment	Conclusion
<p>Objective 3 <i>The Mauri of waterbodies provides for the health of the people, environment and the waterbody</i></p>	<p>The physical effects on the quality of the receiving water, and the corresponding effects on the health of people and the environment are not significant, however it is acknowledged that the effect on the Mauri of the affected fresh and coastal water bodies is more than minor. With the improvements proposed, this effect will be progressively mitigated to the extent that it is degraded by the stormwater discharges, and in doing so will better provide for the health of people, the environment and the water body itself.</p>	<p><u>Will meet this objective</u></p>
<p>Objective 4 <i>Tāngata whenua values and interests are <u>identified and reflected</u> in the management of freshwater and associated ecosystems.</i></p>	<p>The relevant tangata whenua values have been identified in the application, and in evidence on behalf of the applicant. Tangata whenua values and interests are adversely affected by the discharges of stormwater and contaminants. However through the proposed consent conditions, including the application of mitigation measures, the progressive removal of contaminants at source, and the active role of representatives from Te Ao Marama Inc on the Working Party, tangata whenua values and interests will now be reflected and better provided for in the management of both fresh and coastal waters going forward.</p>	<p><u>Will meet this objective</u></p>
<p>Objective 5 <i>Ngāi Tahu have access to and sustainable customary use of, both commercial and non-commercial, mahinga kai resources, nohoanga, mātaītai and taiāpure.</i></p>	<p>The proposal will not adversely affect physical access to the waterways or the New River Estuary. The progressive improvements to stormwater quality and particularly the removal of sewage at source will improve access to mahinga kai resources, including in the New River Estuary, to the extent that the stormwater discharges impact these values. There are no effects resulting from the proposal that prevent or reduce access to or use of nohoanga or mātaītai.</p>	<p><u>Will meet this objective</u></p>
<p>Policy 1</p>	<p>The applicant has engaged with Te Ao Marama as representatives of Ta Runanga o Waihopai in preparing the application, and in the pre-hearing period. Including representatives in the Working Party proposed in</p>	<p><u>Consistent</u></p>

pSWLP - Ngai Tahu	Assessment	Conclusion
<p><i>Enable papatipu rūnanga to effectively undertake their kaitiaki responsibilities in freshwater and land management through Environment Southland:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. providing copies of all applications that may affect a Statutory Acknowledgement area, tōpuni, nohoanga, mātaītai or taiāpure to Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu and the relevant papatipu rūnanga; 2. identifying Ngāi Tahu interests in freshwater and associated ecosystems in Southland/Murihiku; 3. reflect Ngāi Tahu values and interests in the management of and decision-making on freshwater and freshwater ecosystems in Southland/Murihiku, consistent with the Charter of Understanding. 	<p>consent conditions is also recognition of ongoing interests in freshwater management. Specifically, conditions now propose that the ICC engages with Te Ao Marama Inc to establish and implement a cultural health monitoring programme, providing iwi with an effective and meaningful role in the management of freshwater resources.</p>	
<p>Policy 2 <i>Any assessment of an activity covered by this plan must:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Take into account any relevant iwi management plan; and 2. Assess water quality and quantity based on Ngāi Tahu indicators of health. 	<p>The assessment of effects submitted with the application, and the evidence presented take the provisions of <i>Te Tangi a Tauira</i> into account (see also the assessment of those provisions below). While there is cross-over between the water quality assessment of Ms Bennett and Dr Stewart with Ngāi Tahu indicators of health, a specific assessment was not undertaken as part of the application (and is therefore not consistent with this policy). Despite that, such assessments have been explicitly provided for in the proposed conditions of consent, and as part of the outcome of the Working Party, and will involve significant input from, and leadership by iwi.</p>	<u>Not consistent</u>
<p>Policy 3 <i>To manage activities that adversely affect taonga species, identified in Appendix M.</i></p>	<p>The applicant acknowledges that the discharge of stormwater and contaminants contribute to cumulative adverse effects on taonga species, although the effects attributable to stormwater alone are not significant. Improvements in the management of land use activities (industrial site audits, contaminant removal at source, LID in new land development, etc.) will result in improvements in the quality of the stormwater discharges, and will correspondingly reduce the extent to which taonga species are adversely affected.</p>	<u>Consistent</u>
pSWLP - Water Quality	Assessment	Conclusion
<p>Objective 1 <i>Land and water and associated ecosystems are managed as integrated natural resources, recognising</i></p>	<p>The mitigation measures proposed by the applicant, including such measures as industrial site audits, low impact design measures in new land development, and identifying and removing sources of cross-</p>	<u>Will meet this objective</u>

pSWLP - Ngai Tahu	Assessment	Conclusion
<i>the connectivity between surface water and groundwater, and between freshwater, land and the coast.</i>	contamination represent a move towards improved integrated management of land and water resources, and will help achieve Objective 1.	
<p>Objective 6 <i>There is <u>no reduction in the quality of freshwater and water in estuaries by:</u></i> <i>(a) maintaining water quality where it is not degraded; and</i> <i>(b) <u>improving water quality in waterbodies, estuaries and coastal lagoons, which have been degraded by human activity.</u></i></p>	The discharges will not result in further degradation of receiving water quality (i.e. no further reduction), and will contribute to improving water quality overall, including in the estuary as the contaminants are removed or reduced at source. This is the fundamental premise of this application.	<u>Will meet this objective</u>
<p>Objective 13 <i>Enable the use and development of land and soils, provided:</i> <i>(a) The</i> <i>(b) <u>The discharge of contaminants to land or water that have significant or cumulative effects on human health are avoided; and</u></i> <i>(c) <u>Adverse effects on ecosystems (including diversity and integrity of habitats), amenity values, cultural values and historic heritage values are avoided, remedied or mitigated to ensure these values are maintained or enhanced.</u></i></p>	The discharges do not have significant adverse effects on human health, and have minimal contribution to adverse cumulative effects. The effects of the discharges, including cultural effects will be progressively improved through the mitigation measures proposed, particularly with the removal of sewage discharges. The adverse effects of the discharges on the values identified in (c) – ecosystems, amenity values, historic and cultural values – will be mitigated by the removal of sewage and other contaminants.	<u>Will meet the objective</u>
<p>Objective 14 <i>The range and diversity of indigenous ecosystem types and habitats within dryland environments, rivers, estuaries, wetlands and lakes, including their margins, and their life-supporting capacity are <u>maintained or enhanced.</u></i></p>	The evidence of Ms Bennett and Dr Stewart show that the effects of the discharges on indigenous biodiversity in receiving waters, including the New River Estuary is minimal. This will not increase as a result of a new consent (i.e. will be maintained), and will be enhanced as contaminants are removed at source, to the limited extent that the contaminants have an adverse effect.	<u>Will meet the objective</u>
<p>Objective 16 <i>Public access to river and lake beds is <u>maintained, except in circumstances where public health and safety are at risk.</u></i></p>	The proposal will not hinder public access to rivers. While the applicant proposes to place signage advising the public of the potential for occasional health risks in some locations for public health reasons due to intermittent sewage discharges, ultimately public access will remain unchanged, and as far as recreational contact with water is concerned, will be improved over time. The incidence of restrictions due to sewage	<u>Will meet the objective</u>

pSWLP - Ngai Tahu	Assessment	Conclusion
	discharges will reduce over time as sewage is removed from the discharges.	
<p>Objective 18 <i>All activities operate at “good (environmental) management practice” or better to optimise efficient resource use and protect the region’s land, soils, and water from quality and quantity degradation.</i></p>	<p>Taking into account the practicable, technical and physical constraints, the activity is consistent with the best practicable option, however is not considered to meet ‘good environmental practice’ as would be expected from a new system for example (versus discharges from an established (legacy) system as in this case).</p>	<p>Will not meet the objective</p>
<p>Policy A4 NPS 2014 Policy 13 <i>Manage land use activities and discharges to land and water so that water quality and the health of humans, domestic animals and aquatic life, is protected.</i></p>	<p>The levels of contaminants in water and sediments that are attributable to the stormwater discharges, including the cumulative effect of them are considered to be sufficiently low as to avoid harm to human and animal health, and aquatic life, particularly following the removal and reduction of sewage and contaminants in the discharges. However, human and animal health and aquatic life will be better provided for (and protected) over time – initial discharges will have a more than minor effect.</p>	<p>Not consistent</p>
<p>Policy 14 <i>Prefer discharges to land, rather than direct discharges to water.</i></p>	<p>Discharges to land are not a practicable alternative for the City’s stormwater discharges given the practicable, technical and physical constraints that apply. The policy expresses a <u>preference</u> for discharges to land, however does not limit or prevent discharges to surface water.</p>	<p>Not consistent</p>
<p>Policy 15 <u>Maintain and improve water quality by:</u> 1. <i>despite any other policy or objective in this Plan, avoiding new discharges to surface waterbodies that will reduce water quality beyond the zone of reasonable mixing;</i> 2. <i>avoiding point source and non-point source discharges to land that will reduce surface or groundwater quality, unless the adverse effects of the discharge can be avoided, remedied or mitigated;</i> 3 <i>avoiding land use activities that will reduce surface or groundwater quality, unless the adverse effects can be avoided, remedied or mitigated; and</i> 4. <i>avoiding discharges to artificial watercourses that will reduce water quality in a river, lake or modified watercourse beyond the zone of reasonable mixing; so that:</i></p>	<p>This policy does not apply as consent is not sought for new discharges (1); no discharges to land are proposed (2); the land use activities are already established, and surface water quality will be maintained at the current state, then effects progressively avoided or mitigated (4); and discharges to artificial water courses (Waikiwi catchment) will not reduce the existing water quality in the Waikiwi stream after reasonable mixing.</p> <p>I also note that this policy is subject to substantial challenge from multiple submissions, yet to be resolved through the plan hearing process.</p>	<p>Consistent</p>

pSWLP - Ngai Tahu	Assessment	Conclusion
<p>1. water quality is maintained where it is better than the water quality standards specified in Appendix E “Water Quality Standards”; or</p> <p>2. water quality is improved where it does not meet the water quality standards specified in Appendix E “Water Quality Standards”; and</p> <p>3. water quality meets the Drinking-Water Standards for New Zealand 2005 (revised 2008); and</p> <p>4. ANZECC sediment guidelines (as shown in Appendix C of this Plan) are met.</p>		
<p>Policy 17</p> <p>1. Avoid adverse effects on water quality, and avoid as far as practicable other adverse environmental effects of the operation of, and discharges from <u>effluent management systems</u>.</p> <p>2. Manage effluent systems and discharges from them by:</p> <p>(a) designing, constructing and locating systems appropriately and in accordance with standards;</p> <p>(b) maintaining and operating effluent systems in accordance with best practice guidelines;</p> <p>(c) avoiding any surface run-off/overland flow, ponding or contamination of water resulting from the application of agricultural effluent to pasture;</p> <p>(d) avoiding the discharge of raw sewage and untreated agricultural effluent to water.</p>	<p>The proposal is not an effluent system and hence this policy is not relevant.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
pSWLP - Freshwater Management Unit	Assessment	Conclusion
<p>Objective 7</p> <p>Any further over-allocation of freshwater (water quality and quantity) is avoided and existing over-allocation is phased out in accordance with timeframes established under Freshwater Management Unit processes.</p>	<p>Current effects will be maintained, and will therefore avoid any ‘further over-allocation’ assuming the receiving waters are considered to be over-allocated already. The effects on water quality from the discharges will be progressively reduced.</p>	<p><u>Consistent</u></p>
<p>Policy 39A</p>	<p>The application considers the whole of the catchments for which consent is sought, and includes consideration of the ‘downstream’ effects of the</p>	<p><u>Consistent</u></p>

pSWLP - Ngai Tahu	Assessment	Conclusion
<p><i>To improve integrated management of freshwater and the use and development of land in whole catchments, including the interactions between freshwater, land and associated ecosystems (including estuaries).</i></p>	<p>discharges in the New River Estuary. This policy indicates an improvement is required, which is acknowledged by the applicant, and is the basis for this application. The mitigation measures proposed by the applicant will positively affect the whole catchment and associated ecosystems to the extent that adverse effects are attributable to the stormwater discharges.</p>	
<p>Policy 40 <i>When determining the term of a resource consent consideration will be given, but not limited, to:</i> 1. <i>granting a shorter duration when there is <u>uncertainty regarding the nature, scale, duration and frequency of adverse effects</u> from the activity or the capacity of the resource;</i> 2. <i>relevant <u>tangata whenua values</u> and Ngai Tahu indicators of health;</i> 3. <i>the duration sought by the applicant, plus material to support the duration sought;</i> 4. <i>the permanence and economic life of any capital investment;</i> 5. <i>the desirability of applying a <u>common expiry date</u> for water permits that allocate water from the same resource or land use and discharges that may affect the quality of the same resource;</i> 6. <i>the <u>applicant's compliance with the conditions</u> of any previous resource consent; and</i> 7. <i>the <u>timing of development of FMU sections of this Plan</u>, and whether granting a shorter or longer duration will better enable implementation of the any revised frameworks established in those sections.</i></p>	<p>There is adequate certainty as to the effects of the activity to understand the scale and nature of the effects, and the capacity of the receiving environments. The adverse effects of the discharges on tangata whenua values and cultural health indicators will be progressively reduced as sewage is detected and removed, and other contaminants reduced. Mr Stewart notes that the effects of stormwater discharges on the suitability of fish and shellfish from the New River Estuary for human consumption is negligible, understanding that this is a small part of the cultural value placed on water quality. Further, the role of iwi representatives on the proposed Working Party will help to ensure that such values remain a key part of the Council's ongoing management of stormwater, and will facilitate a long term beneficial relationship with the applicant. The stormwater network is a permanent and necessary part of the City's infrastructure, with an anticipated operational life of at least 100 years. The capital investment required for the network is substantial. Given the longevity of such infrastructure, the value of the associate community investment, and the time needed for both mitigation programmes and the working party to be effective, aligning the expiry date with existing consents to reduce the term below 25 years would be inefficient. It would also result in substantial costs incurred by needing to re-consent both the stormwater and wastewater consents at the same time for both the ICC and ES, and is not favoured for that reason.</p>	<p><u>Consistent</u></p>
<p>Policy 41 <i>Consider the magnitude of environmental effects and risk when determining requirements for auditing and supply of monitoring information on resource consents.</i></p>	<p>There is adequate certainty as to the effects of the activity to understand the scale and nature of the effects, and the capacity of the receiving environments. The robust monitoring programme proposed in conditions has been confirmed through independent peer reviewed to be appropriate.</p>	<p><u>Consistent</u></p>

The above assessment demonstrates that, for the purposes of s104D(1)(b)(iii) of the RMA, the proposal is not contrary to the relevant objectives and policies of the operative and proposed regional plans when considered as a whole.

The assessment of the following plans is relevant to the consideration of the application as a whole, as required under s104(1)(b)(i) – (vi) of the RMA. In considering the application, the consent authority must have regard to the relevant provisions of the following plans:

3. Regional Coastal Plan

RCP	Assessment	Conclusion
<p>Objective 6.2.1 Maintain and enhance the values of New River Estuary <i>To maintain and enhance those values that contribute to the mauri of the estuary and provide for its use as:</i></p> <p><i>a. a city playground</i> <i>- a family environment, picnics on the shore and swimming in sheltered waters; and,</i> <i>- a variety of water sports to be enjoyed in enclosed waters without the constraints of conflict or pollution.</i></p> <p><i>b. a symbol for Invercargill</i> <i>- an introduction for visitors, good views for people driving to and from Otatara, the airport and Bluff; and</i> <i>- an estuary on display.</i></p> <p><i>c. a significant habitat</i> <i>- where native species can exist alongside humanity;</i> <i>- a refuge for freshwater and marine species, and a spawning and rearing ground, and fish passageway;</i> <i>- a feeding and roosting area for birds including waders and waterfowl; and</i> <i>- sequences of vegetation including a nationally important maritime marsh to totara sand dune forest.</i></p> <p><i>d. a retreat</i> <i>- a place for families to escape the pressures of the city;</i> <i>- an opportunity to experience a natural setting, where the estuary predominates as an ecosystem and human influences are unobtrusive; and</i> <i>- a place where tranquillity and nature replenish the soul.</i></p> <p><i>e a place of learning</i> <i>- where people can discover the heritage of Southland,</i></p>	<p>The values of the New River Estuary as identified in the Objective will be maintained, and will be progressively enhanced as contaminants are removed or reduced at source. The discharges will not degrade receiving water further, and will progressively enhance those values as sewage and other contaminants are removed. Accordingly, continuing the discharges will maintain the current receiving water quality and will enhance it over time. Contaminant levels in the New River Estuary sourced from stormwater are sufficiently low to avoid affecting water sports, or appearing to be obtrusive. The health risks from consuming food sourced from the estuary have been shown to be negligible.</p>	<p><u>Will meet the objective</u></p>

RCP	Assessment	Conclusion
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - where people can gain an understanding of a natural unique ecosystem, the interface of land, sea and freshwater; and, - where, through research, a programme for restoration of the estuary can be developed. f a food basket - where there are no health risks from consuming the products of recreational fishing and shellfish gathering. g an opportunity for commercial use - allowing commercial uses which are in harmony with nature and other uses. h a place with historical and geological values - historical and geological values are located near the estuary shores throughout the area. 		
<p>Policy 6.2.1 The natural character of New River Estuary <i>To maintain and enhance the natural character of New River Estuary.</i></p>	The stormwater discharges will not result in greater adverse effects on natural character than at present, and these will reduce over time as contaminants are removed.	<u>Consistent</u>

4. Southland Regional Policy Statement

SRPS - Takata Whenua o Murihiku	Assessment	Conclusion
<p>Objective 1.2 <i>To recognise the importance of wahi tapu, wahi taoka, mahika kai and the customary use of water to Kai Tahu.</i></p>	<p>The application recognised the importance of the customary use of water and other cultural values, and the progressive improvements will reduce the adverse effects of the current discharges. The removal of the sewage contamination as fast as practicable is, in part, in recognition of Maori spiritual and cultural values.</p> <p>The Working Party will help achieve the concept of kaitiakitanga by providing a management forum for ongoing involvement with the applicant. The proposal is consistent with achieving both Objectives.</p>	<u>Will meet the objective</u>
<p>Objective 1.4 <i>To have particular regard to the concept of kaitiakitanga in relation to managing the use, development and protection of natural and physical resources.</i></p>		<u>Will meet the objective</u>
SRPS - Water Quality	Assessment	Conclusion
<p>Objective 5.1</p>	The discharges maintain the current receiving water quality in the short term, and with the mitigation measures proposed, will help to enhance it.	<u>Will meet the objective</u>

SRPS - Takata Whenua o Murihiku	Assessment	Conclusion
<p><i>To sustain the quality of the region's water resources so as to:</i> <i>(a) meet the needs of a range of uses, including the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations</i> <i>(b) safeguard the life-supporting capacity of water and related ecosystems.</i></p>	<p>Providing for stormwater to be discharged at a quality that largely avoids adverse effects on the environment after reasonable mixing (ultimately) will meet the needs of future generations, without unduly compromising the biophysical and life-supporting values of the receiving environment. This will further improve with the removal of the sewage.</p>	
<p>Objective 5.2 <i>To ensure that in the use and development of water and land resources, and the discharge of contaminants, water quality is maintained and wherever practicable enhanced.</i></p>	<p>This application is based on the premise of receiving water quality being maintained in its current state, and being progressively enhanced to the extent practicable.</p>	<p><u>Will meet the objective</u></p>
<p>Objective 5.3 <i>To ensure the taking, use, damming, diversion of water and the discharge of contaminants into water does not compromise water quality standards established for the region.</i></p>	<p>The water quality standards (after reasonable mixing) will initially be compromised until such time as sewage is removed. Some water quality standards are not adversely affected by the discharges (e.g. temperature) but may not be met in the streams due to other influences (e.g. channelization).</p>	<p><u>Will not meet the objective</u></p>
<p>Objective 5.4 <i>To recognise the relationship of Maori with water.</i></p>		<p><u>Will meet the objective</u></p>
<p>Policy 5.2 <i>Require all point source discharges, after reasonable mixing, to comply with water quality standards.</i></p>	<p>The stormwater discharges comply with the water quality standards after reasonable mixing, other than for discharges with a sewage component. Once this sewage is removed, the discharges are expected to comply. Looking at the effects of stormwater alone, the proposal is consistent with this policy, but may be considered contrary at the outset until sewage is removed.</p>	<p><u>Contrary</u></p>
<p>Policy 5.5 <i>In preparing, implementing and administering Regional and District Plans and in considering resource consents, local authorities shall assess the effects of land use and development on ground water and surface water quality, including both point and non-point source discharges, and provide for any adverse effects to be avoided, remedied or mitigated.</i></p>	<p>The adverse effects of new development will be managed through the Council's land development and subdivision bylaw.</p> <p>The active removal and management of sewage and contaminants at source recognises the effect of such contaminants on Maori values, and ultimately will better provide for them.</p>	<p><u>Consistent</u></p>
<p>Policy 5.8 <i>Manage the Region's water resources in ways that recognise and provide for the values that Maori place on water.</i></p>	<p>Persistent and bio-accumulative contaminants identified from stormwater sources are negligible.</p>	<p><u>Not consistent</u></p>
<p>Policy 5.9</p>		<p><u>Consistent</u></p>

SRPS - Takata Whenua o Murihiku	Assessment	Conclusion
<i>Discourage, and where practicable prohibit, the discharge of persistent and bio-accumulative contaminants into water.</i>		
SRPS - Built Environment	Assessment	Conclusion
Policy 10.2 <i>Require that network utilities associated with the built environment be undertaken in such a manner as to <u>avoid wherever practicable, remedy or mitigate effects on the quality of natural and physical resources.</u></i>	The stormwater network mitigates significant adverse effects on the quality of the receiving environment that would occur if it was not provided. Given the lack of practicable alternatives available to the applicant the proposal represents the best practicable option. Progressively removing the contaminants will enable the applicant to avoid some adverse effects and will substantially mitigate the effects of the remaining contaminants.	<u>Consistent</u>
SRPS - Coast	Assessment	Conclusion
Objective 13.5 <i>To facilitate integrated management of the land and coastal marine area interface.</i>	The integrated management of land and water, including the effects on the downstream CMA will be better achieved by granting this application given the focus on removing contaminants at source, industrial site audits, and LID measures for new land development. Contact recreation is generally not significantly affected other than in some specific reaches following storm events, although no bathing sites as identified in the plan are affected. The effects of the current discharges on human consumption of fish and shellfish are negligible, and will become less significant as contamination is further removed at source. The improvements better provide for natural, cultural and spiritual values of importance to Maori, represented on an ongoing basis by members of Te Runanga o Waihopai on the working party.	<u>Will meet the objective</u>
Policy 13.1 <i>Recognise sites and resources of cultural, natural and spiritual significance to Maori and consult the takata whenua when making statutory decisions on issues impacting upon such matters.</i>		<u>Consistent</u>
Policy 13.5 <i>Provide for contact recreation, the human consumption of shellfish and the health and vitality of aquatic organisms within the coastal waters of the Region.</i>		<u>Consistent</u>
SRPS - Biodiversity	Assessment	Conclusion
Policy 2.4 <i>Avoid, wherever practicable, remedy or mitigate adverse impacts on biodiversity and the natural processes of ecosystems.</i>	The effects of the discharges on biodiversity and ecosystems attributable to the stormwater will be avoided to the extent practicable by removing and / or reducing contaminants at source.	<u>Consistent</u>
SRPS - Monitoring	Assessment	Conclusion
Monitoring Policy 1 <i>Undertake monitoring sufficient to provide a level of understanding of the environment necessary for effective resource management.</i>	A detailed surveillance and monitoring programme is proposed which will provide significant detail on the effects of the discharges.	<u>Consistent</u>

5. Proposed Southland Regional Policy Statement

pSRPS - Takata Whenua	Assessment	Conclusion
<p>Objective TW.3 <i>Mauri and wairua are sustained or improved where degraded, and mahinga kai and customary resources are healthy, abundant and accessible to tangata whenua.</i></p>	<p>By maintaining (i.e. not allowing a decline in) water quality, and contributing to improvements by improving the quality of the discharges, the Mauri and wairua of the receiving waters and associated values will also be sustained and improved. Mauri and wairua are degraded – the applicant’s proposal will contribute to improving it, and by doing so will help to reduce the cultural (versus the human health) barriers to customary resources, mahinga kai etc.</p>	<p>Will meet this objective</p>
<p>Policy TW.1 <i>Consult with, and enhance tangata whenua involvement in local authority resource management decision-making processes, in a manner that is consistent with the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi/Te Tiriti o Waitangi.</i></p>	<p>The provisions of Te Tangi a Taurira were considered in preparing the application and evidence. Te Ao Marama Inc were engaged throughout the process, and will continue to be part of the administration of the consent on an ongoing basis through the proposed working party. The working party also provides a forum for ongoing engagement with the consent authority on matters of importance to Te Runanga o Waihopai, including opportunities to advise and provide direction on matters of</p>	<p>Consistent</p>
<p>Policy TW.3 <i>Take Iwi Management Plans into account within local authority resource management decision making processes.</i></p>	<p>Maori environmental and cultural health.</p>	<p>Consistent</p>
<p>Policy TW.4 <i>When making resource management decisions, ensure that local authority functions and powers are exercised in a manner that:</i> <i>(a) recognises and provides for:</i> <i>(i) traditional Māori uses and practices relating to natural resources;</i> <i>(ii) the ahi kā relationship of tangata whenua with and their role as kaitiaki of natural resources;</i> <i>(iii) mahinga kai and access to areas of natural resources used for customary purposes;</i> <i>(iv) mauri and wairua of natural resources;</i> <i>(v) places, sites and areas with significant spiritual or cultural historic heritage value to tangata whenua;</i> <i>(vi) Māori environmental health and cultural wellbeing.</i> <i>(b) recognises that only tangata whenua can identify their relationship and that of their culture and traditions</i></p>		<p>Consistent</p>

pSRPS - Takata Whenua	Assessment	Conclusion
<i>with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga.</i>		
pSRPS - Water Quality	Assessment	Conclusion
<p>Objective WQUAL 1 <i>Water quality in the region:</i> <i>(a) safeguards the life-supporting capacity of water and related ecosystems;</i> <i>(b) safeguards the health of people and communities;</i> <i>(c) is maintained, or improved in accordance with freshwater objectives formulated under the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2014;</i> <i>(d) is managed to meet the reasonably foreseeable social, economic and cultural needs of future generations.</i></p>	<p>The current discharges do not result in significant adverse effects on the life-supporting capacity of water and ecosystems, and the effects of the discharges in this regard will be further reduced with the progressive removal of contaminants. Similarly, the health of people and communities will be better provided for, and overall water quality will be maintained and improved by the proposed measures as previously stated. By improving water quality as proposed, the social, economic and cultural needs of future generations will be better provided for.</p>	<u>Will meet this objective</u>
<p>Objective WQUAL.2 <i>Halt the decline, and improve water quality in lowland water bodies and coastal lakes, lagoons, tidal estuaries, salt marshes and coastal wetlands in accordance with freshwater objectives formulated in accordance with the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2014.</i></p>	<p>There will be no further decline in water quality as a result of these discharges, and with the proposed measures, the receiving water body quality will be progressively improved.</p>	<u>Will meet this objective</u>
<p>Policy WQUAL.1 (a) <i>(b) Manage discharges and land use activities to <u>maintain water quality, or improve it</u>, to ensure freshwater objectives are met.</i></p>	<p>Water quality will be maintained and improved, including by managing land use activities through industrial site audits, LID for new developments, etc. In conjunction with other improvements in wider water quality, the progressive improvements of stormwater quality will contribute toward the achievement of freshwater objectives.</p>	<u>Consistent</u>
<p>Policy WQUAL.2 <i>In managing water quality, particular regard will be had to the following contaminants:</i> <i>(a) nitrogen;</i> <i>(b) phosphorus;</i> <i>(c) sediment;</i> <i>(d) microbiological contaminants.</i></p>	<p>The removal of key contaminants, particularly those related to sewage is consistent with the focus of this policy on the identified contaminants.</p>	<u>Consistent</u>
<p>Policy WQUAL.8 <i>Avoid the direct discharge of sewage, wastewater, industrial and trade waste and agricultural effluent to</i></p>	<p>Pol WQUAL.8 is not relevant to stormwater</p>	<p>Pol WQUAL.8 is not relevant to s/water</p>

pSRPS - Takata Whenua	Assessment	Conclusion
<i>water unless these discharges have undergone treatment.</i>		
Policy WQUAL.9 <i>Where practicable, manage the siting and operation of activities that result in point source discharges of contaminants to land to ensure that adverse effects on groundwater, surface water and coastal water quality are avoided, remedied or mitigated.</i>	Land-based discharges or discharges to an alternative environment are not a practicable alternative for the ICC stormwater network discharges. The discharges are operated, and are managed to the extent practicable – and with the proposed improvements the adverse environmental effects will be minimised.	<u>Consistent</u>
Policy WQUAL.11 <i>Integrate the management of land use, water quality, water quantity, coast and air, and the use, development and protection of resources wherever possible to achieve the freshwater objectives formulated in accordance with Policy WQUAL.1.</i>	The actions and improvements proposed by the applicant represents the integration between land use activities and the effects on water quality, including coastal water and associated ecosystems, and is a step toward achieving freshwater objectives to the extent possible, taking into account the relatively minor contribution of stormwater to overall receiving water quality.	<u>Consistent</u>
Policy WQUAL.12 <i>Continue to improve knowledge and understanding of water resources, and the relationship of land use activities with water quality values in water bodies, in Southland to promote the sustainable management of water.</i>	The robust surveillance and monitoring regime proposed will contribute substantially over the term of the consent (if granted) to understanding of the receiving water resources.	<u>Consistent</u>
pSRPS - Coast	Assessment	Conclusion
Objective COAST.3 <i>Coastal water quality and its ecosystems are maintained or enhanced.</i>	The proposal will maintain and progressively enhance coastal water quality in the New River Estuary, and help to achieve this Objective.	<u>Will meet this objective</u>
Policy COAST.5 <i>Avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of land-based activities on coastal water quality and its ecosystems.</i>	The adverse effects of the discharges will be progressively removed and / or reduced, and will ultimately avoid some and mitigate other effects on coastal water quality from contaminant discharges.	<u>Consistent</u>
pSRPS - Biodiversity	Assessment	Conclusion
Objective BIO.2 <i>Maintain indigenous biodiversity in Southland and protect areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna for present and future generations.</i>	Maintaining (initially) and enhancing stormwater quality will contribute to the protection of significant habitats of indigenous fauna, and help achieve this objective.	<u>Will meet this objective</u>
Objective BIO.3 <i>Enhance the range, extent and condition of indigenous biodiversity in Southland, with a particular emphasis on those areas most at risk to further loss or degradation.</i>	The proposed improvements to stormwater quality will help to enhance indigenous biodiversity in the receiving water bodies, including the New River Estuary.	<u>Will meet this objective</u>

pSRPS - Takata Whenua	Assessment	Conclusion
<p>Policy BIO.2 <i>Areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna in the Southland region will be protected and where appropriate enhanced.</i></p>	<p>Maintaining (initially) and enhancing stormwater quality will contribute to the protection of significant habitats of indigenous fauna, taking into account the conclusions of Dr Stewart in relation to the scale and extent of adverse effects from the discharges on the quality of the environment of the New River Estuary.</p>	<p><u>Consistent</u></p>
<p>Policy BIO.3 <i>Protect indigenous biodiversity from adverse effects in the coastal environment as set out in Policy 11 of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010.</i></p>		<p><u>Consistent</u></p>
pSRPS - Infrastructure	Assessment	Conclusion
<p>Objective INF.1 <i>Southland's regionally significant, nationally significant and critical infrastructure is secure, operates efficiently, and is appropriately integrated with land use activities and the environment.</i></p>	<p>Critical infrastructure is defined in the pSRPS as: <i>"Infrastructure that provides services which, if interrupted, would have a significant effect on the wellbeing and health and safety of people and communities and would require reinstatement, and includes all strategic facilities."</i></p> <p>Stormwater networks are part of the community's critical infrastructure, and are essential for protecting their health & safety, and the social, cultural and economic wellbeing. The proposal is well aligned with achieving this objective ensuring the stormwater network is operated efficiently, while integrating land use activities and the environment (including receiving waters). Appropriate integration includes the consideration of the positive and adverse effects of providing and operating critical infrastructure – in this case, the effects of doing so are not currently significant, and will be progressively reduced by removing and / or reducing contaminants at source.</p>	<p>Will meet this objective</p>
<p>Policy INF.1 <u>Recognise the benefits to be derived from, and make provision for, the development, maintenance, upgrade and ongoing operation of regionally significant, nationally significant and critical infrastructure and associated activities.</u></p>	<p>The criticality and benefits of providing for an efficient and functional stormwater system for the City are clear. The proposal is consistent with this policy, as consenting the discharges will authorise an essential component of the stormwater system.</p>	<p><u>Consistent</u></p>
<p>Policy INF.2 <u>Where practicable, avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of infrastructure on the environment. In determining the practicability of avoiding, remedying, or mitigating adverse effects on the environment, the following matters should be taken into account:</u></p>	<p>The adverse effects of stormwater infrastructure on the environment will be avoided, and mitigated to the extent practicable, taking into account the practicable, technical and operational constraints of the network. There are no reasonably practical alternative designs or locations for the discharges, and the proposal represents the BPO. Good practice</p>	<p><u>Consistent</u></p>

pSRPS - Takata Whenua	Assessment	Conclusion
<p><i>(a) any functional, operational or technical constraints that require the physical infrastructure of regional or national significance to be located or designed in the manner proposed;</i></p> <p><i>(b) whether there are any reasonably practical alternative designs or locations;</i></p> <p><i>(c) whether good practice approaches in design and construction are being adopted;</i></p> <p><i>(d) where appropriate, and such measures are volunteered by a resource user, whether any significant residual adverse effects can be offset or compensated for; and</i></p> <p><i>(e)</i></p>	<p>designs for new infrastructure are required as directed by the Council's land development bylaw, and the emphasis on LID measures.</p>	
pSRPS - Urban	Assessment	Conclusion
<p>Policy URB.1 <i>The adverse effects of urban development on the environment should be avoided, remedied or mitigated.</i></p> <p>Policy URB.2 <i>Manage urban growth and development in ways that:</i></p> <p><i>(a) support existing urban areas;</i></p> <p><i>(b) promote development and/or redevelopment of existing urban areas ahead of greenfield development;</i></p> <p><i>(c) promote urban growth and development within areas that have existing infrastructure capacity;</i></p> <p><i>(d) promote the progressive upgrading of infrastructure and improvement of the quality of sewage and stormwater discharges;</i></p> <p><i>(e)</i></p> <p><i>(f) plan ahead for the expansion of urban areas;</i></p> <p><i>(g)</i></p> <p><i>(h)</i></p>	<p>The network itself provides a substantial form of effects mitigation, helping to substantially reduce the potential adverse effects of stormwater stemming from urban development by managing it. The network will be progressively upgraded to improve the quality of the stormwater discharges.</p>	<p><u>Consistent</u></p> <p><u>Consistent</u></p>

6. Te Tangi a Taurira

Te Tangi a Taurira	Assessment	Conclusion
<p>Wastewater Disposal Policy 3.5.2.6 <i>Avoid the use of water as a receiving environment for the direct, or point source, discharge of contaminants. Even if the discharge is treated and therefore considered “clean”, it may still be culturally unacceptable. Generally, all discharge must first be to land.</i></p>	<p>‘Wastewater’ includes stormwater in this document. The discharges are clearly opposed to this policy. However, with the reference in the last sentence to “generally”, the policy contemplates that land-based discharges may not be possible / appropriate in all circumstances.</p>	<p><u>Contrary</u></p>
<p>Policy 3.5.2.15 <i>Any discharge activity must include a robust monitoring programme that includes regular monitoring of the discharge and the potential effects on the receiving environment. Monitoring can confirm system performance, and identify and remedy any system failures.</i></p>	<p>The applicant has proposed a robust monitoring programme which includes surveillance and investigation conditions, transparent reporting, and which have been peer reviewed by NIWA and found to be effective at achieving the desired environmental improvement outcomes.</p>	<p><u>Consistent</u></p>
<p>Policy 3.5.10.1 <i>The role of Ngāi Tahu ki Murihiku as kaitiaki of freshwater must be given effect to in freshwater policy, planning and management.</i> Policy 3.5.10.3 <i>Protect and enhance the mauri, or life supporting capacity, of freshwater resources throughout Murihiku.</i></p>	<p>The applicant has proposed a suite of conditions which includes the establishment of a Working Party, including representatives of Te Runanga o Waihopai. Through this Working Party, the runanga will have an forum to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ensure the consent holder maintains progress on improvements to stormwater quality; - includes the runanga in scrutiny and discussions regarding the outcome of annual monitoring results; - cultural health assessments on an ongoing basis; - exercise kaitiakitanga as manawhenua. 	<p><u>Consistent</u></p>
<p>Policy 3.5.10.4 <i>Manage our freshwater resources wisely, mō tātou, ā, mō ngā uri ā muri ake nei, for all of us and the generations that follow.</i></p>	<p>Taking into account the scale and nature of the environmental effects of the discharges, particularly once sewage is removed, the discharges will not prevent the use of the freshwater resources for future generations. Removing contamination at source will enable stormwater to be discharged to the receiving waters in a manner that avoids significantly compromising values, while safeguarding the Invercargill community from the effects of stormwater.</p>	<p><u>Consistent</u></p>
<p>Policy 3.5.10.5 <i>Promote the management of freshwater according to the principle of ki uta ki tai, and thus the flow of water from source to sea.</i></p>	<p>The discharge of stormwater to the receiving water bodies does not affect or interrupt the flow of water from the mountains to the sea.</p>	<p><u>Consistent</u></p>

Te Tangi a Tauria	Assessment	Conclusion
<p>Policy 3.5.10.8 <i>Protect and enhance the customary relationship of Ngāi Tahu ki Murihiku with freshwater resources.</i></p>	<p>The discharge of stormwater and contaminants to freshwater will be at odds with the protection of the customary relationship of Ngāi Tahu ki Murihiku with freshwater resources. However, the degree to which the activity compromises that relationship will progressively diminish as contaminants are removed.</p>	<p>Contrary</p>
<p>Explanation <i>Our bottom line is to avoid discharge of wastewater (e.g. sewage and stormwater) to water, as such activities have adverse effects on cultural values such as mauri, wairua, mahinga kai and wāhi tapu. Our preference is for wastewater to be treated to remove contaminants, and then discharged to land via wetlands and riparian areas, to allow Papatūānuku to provide a natural filter for waste. <u>Where this is not practical or feasible, and discharge to water is proposed, then adverse effects must be mitigated through treatment to a very high standard and robust monitoring programs.</u> Ngāi Tahu ki Murihiku will always look for the most culturally, environmentally, socially and economically appropriate option for a particular site.</i></p>	<p>The effect of the discharges on Maori cultural and spiritual values is acknowledged. The explanation to the 'wastewater' section notes however that there will be to the extent that land based discharges will be practicable and technical in some situations, and that discharges to water will not always be able to be avoided. The applicant in this case proposes to progressively remove and reduce contaminants, even though the adverse effects of the contaminants are not significant. Further, the contaminants will be removed at source, which is significantly more effective than treating stormwater to remove them once entrained. The applicant has a robust monitoring programme to ensure that progress and improvements are able to be measured and demonstrated. The current proposal represents the most environmentally, socially and economically appropriate option, and will be progressively more culturally appropriate over time as contaminants are reduced or removed, and the effects on values such as <i>mauri, wairua, mahinga kai and wāhi tapu</i> are further reduced.</p>	<p>While this is not an objective or policy, it provides context behind the policy framework for the 'wastewater' section and demonstrates that the application is consistent with the overall policy direction, given the lack of practicable and feasible options available to the applicant.</p>
<p>Water Quality Policy 3.5.13.2 <i>Strive for the highest possible standard of water quality that is characteristic of a particular place/waterway, recognising principles of achievability. This means that we strive for drinking water quality in water we once drank from, contact recreation in water we once used for bathing or swimming, water quality capable of sustaining healthy mahinga kai in waters we use for providing kai.</i></p>	<p>Recognising the degree to which this aspirational policy is achievable, and taking into account the progressive improvements to stormwater quality over time, the proposal will contribute to receiving water quality improvements, particularly in regard to achieving and maintaining contact recreation standards, and the sustenance of healthy mahinga kai.</p>	<p>Consistent</p>
<p>Policy 3.5.13.3 <i>Require cumulative effects assessments for any activity that may have adverse effects of water quality.</i></p>	<p>The cumulative effects of the discharges have been considered in the evidence of both Ms Bennett and Dr Stewart.</p>	<p>Consistent</p>
<p>Policy 3.5.13.5 <i>Avoid the use of water as a receiving environment for the direct, or point source, discharge of contaminants. Generally, all discharge must first be to land.</i></p>	<p>The discharge of stormwater and contaminants to freshwater will be at odds with this policy, however it does recognise (in the use of the word 'generally') that it will not always be possible / feasible to discharge to land as a preference.</p>	<p>Contrary</p>

Te Tangi a Tauria	Assessment	Conclusion
<p>Policy 3.5.13.7 <i>When assessing the effects of an activity on water quality, where the water source is in a degraded state, the effects should be measured against the condition that the water source should be, and not the existing condition of the water source.</i></p>	<p>The effects of the discharges on receiving water have been determined to be minor (when considering stormwater and contaminants excluding sewage) – this is the state that the discharges will ultimately achieve as sewage is removed over time, and is not constrained by an assessment of the effects of the activity on existing receiving water quality.</p>	<p><u>Not consistent</u></p>
<p>Policy 3.5.13.11 <i>Require robust monitoring of discharge permits, to detect non-compliance with consent conditions. Noncompliance must result in appropriate enforcement action to discourage further non-compliance.</i></p>	<p>The applicant has proposed a robust monitoring programme which includes surveillance and investigation conditions, transparent reporting, and which have been peer reviewed by NIWA and found to be effective at achieving the desired environmental improvement outcomes.</p>	<p><u>Consistent</u></p>
<p>Mahinga kai Policy 3.5.16.1 <i>Work with local authorities and other statutory agencies to ensure that cultural values and perspectives associated with those species and places valued as mahinga kai are reflected in statutory water plans, best practice guidelines and strategies, and in concession and resource consent processes.</i></p>	<p>The applicant has sought to work with iwi through Te Ao Marama, both in inviting representatives to multiple pre-application meetings, and by including a Working Party condition (at Te Ao Marama's suggestion) in proposed conditions, to provide for on-going collaboration.</p>	<p><u>Consistent</u></p>

Te Tangi a Tauria	Assessment	Conclusion
Policy 3.5.16.2 <i>Work towards the restoration of key mahinga kai areas and species, and the tikanga associated with managing those places and species.</i>	The progressive removal of contaminants will contribute to the restoration of mahinga kai areas by helping to improve overall water quality.	<u>Consistent</u>
Policy 3.5.16.4 <i>Consider the actual and potential effects of proposed activities on mahinga kai places, species and activities when assessing applications for resource consent.</i>	The applicant considered the actual and potential effects of the current discharges, and discharges with sewage and other contaminants removed (the end goal) when applying for this consent. The effects are considered to be minor once sewage is removed.	<u>Consistent</u>
Policy 3.5.16.5 <i>Use the enhancement of mahinga kai places, species and activities to off set or mitigate the adverse effects of development and human activity on the land, water and biodiversity of Murihiku.</i>	Removing contaminants from stormwater will contribute to water quality improvements, which will have a positive effect on mahinga kai species, places and activities.	<u>Consistent</u>
Coastal Water Quality Policy 3.6.7.3 <i>Encourage protection and enhancement of the mauri of coastal waters, to ensure the ability to support cultural and customary usage.</i>	The discharges will have an adverse effect on the mauri of coastal waters, however with the removal of contaminants as proposed, the significance of that effect will be reduced over time, as will the effect on cultural and customary usage. In this sense, the activity is consistent with the policy, which seeks to <u>encourage</u> the protection and enhancement of the mauri of coastal waters, and which will be achieved in part by the removal of contaminants.	<u>Consistent</u>
Policy 3.6.7.4 <i>Avoid impacts on coastal waters as a result of inappropriate discharge from activities occurring upstream and in areas adjacent to coastal waters.</i>	The discharges have been shown to have a minor effect, if the effects of sewage are not considered. This is the end goal for the applicant. Once sewage removal is achieved, the effects on downstream coastal waters will be minimal, however will not be entirely avoidable as sought by the policy. In this sense, the activity is not consistent with the policy, but should not be considered to be 'inappropriate' given the scale and nature of the effects following removal of contaminants at source.	<u>Not consistent</u>
Policy 3.6.7.5 <i>Avoid the use of upstream waters as a receiving environment for point source discharge of contaminants.</i>	Given the lack of other feasible and practicable options open to the applicant for stormwater management, the use of upstream water bodies as a receiving environment for stormwater cannot be avoided.	<u>Contrary</u>
Policy 3.6.7.9 <i>Ensure the quality of water in all waterways is improved to support biodiversity in estuarine and coastal waters.</i>	The proposal will result in progressive improvements to stormwater quality, and correspondingly, to the life-supporting capacity of the estuarine and coastal waters of the New River Estuary.	<u>Consistent</u>

7. NPS-FM 2014

NPS-FM 2014	Assessment	Conclusion
<p>Objective A1 <i>To safeguard:</i> <i>a) the life-supporting capacity, ecosystem processes and indigenous species including their associated ecosystems, of fresh water; and</i> <i>b) the health of people and communities, at least as affected by secondary contact with fresh water; in sustainably managing the use and development of land, and of discharges of contaminants.</i></p>	<p>While the applicant recognises that the effects of the current discharges on the life-supporting capacity of the receiving water bodies is not significant, they have committed to progressively upgrading the quality of the discharges by removing contaminants at source. Doing so will better help to safeguard the life-supporting capacity and ecosystem processes of the receiving water bodies. It will also better provide for the health of people and communities.</p>	<p><u>Will meet this objective</u></p>
<p>Objective A2 <i>The overall quality of fresh water within a region is maintained or improved while:</i> <i>a) protecting the significant values of outstanding freshwater bodies;</i> <i>b) protecting the significant values of wetlands; and</i> <i>c) improving the quality of fresh water in water bodies that have been degraded by human activities to the point of being over-allocated.</i></p>	<p>The applicant proposes to continue with the existing discharges, and will therefore not result in additional contaminants entering the receiving water bodies (i.e. will maintain existing water quality). The progressive removal of contaminants will help to improve the quality of the receiving water bodies. The water bodies involved in this activity are not identified as 'outstanding' freshwater bodies, and the discharges will not affect any significant wetland values. While the applicant accepts that the water bodies are degraded by human activities, the water bodies have not yet been determined as over-allocated. Regardless, the applicant has committed to progressively removing contaminants at source.</p>	<p><u>Will meet this objective</u></p>
<p>Objective C1 <i>To improve integrated management of fresh water and the use and development of land in whole catchments, including the interactions between fresh water, land and associated ecosystems and the coastal environment.</i></p>	<p>The applicant notes the effects of stormwater from urban land use on receiving water body quality, and hence has proposed an effective suite of conditions that will address contaminants from many of the urban land uses, to the betterment of receiving water quality. In particular, future land use development will be subject to the applicant's land development bylaw which requires LID measures to address stormwater and contaminants at source.</p>	<p><u>Will meet this objective</u></p>
<p>Objective CC1 <i>To improve information on freshwater takes and sources of freshwater contaminants, in order to:</i> <i>a) ensure the necessary information is available for freshwater objective and limit setting and freshwater management under this national policy statement; and</i> <i>b) ensure information on resource availability is available for current and potential resource users.</i></p>	<p>The robust surveillance and monitoring regime proposed will contribute substantially over the term of the consent (if granted) to further understanding the sources of contaminants, and the effects on receiving water quality.</p>	<p><u>Will meet this objective</u></p>
<p>Objective D1</p>	<p>The provisions of Te Tangi a Taurira were taken into account in preparing the application and subsequent evidence, and the applicant held</p>	<p><u>Will meet this objective</u></p>

NPS-FM 2014	Assessment	Conclusion
<i>To provide for the involvement of iwi and hapu and to ensure that tangata whenua values and interests are identified and reflected.</i>	discussions with Te Ao Marama prior to the hearing. The values and interests of iwi were identified, acknowledged, and will be provided for through progressive water quality improvements, and an ongoing role and involvement through the Working Party.	
Policy C1 <i>By every regional council managing fresh water and land use and development in catchments in an integrated and sustainable way, so as to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects, including cumulative effects.</i>	N/a – is a direction to the consent authority.	N/a – is a direction to the consent authority.
Policy D1 <i>Local authorities shall take reasonable steps to involve iwi and hapu in the management of freshwater; work with iwi and hapu to identify tangata whenua values and interests; and to reflect tangata whenua values and interests in the management of and in the decision making regarding freshwater.</i>	The provisions of Te Tangi a Taurira were taken into account in preparing the application and subsequent evidence, and the applicant held discussions with Te Ao Marama prior to the hearing. The values and interests of iwi were identified, acknowledged, and will be provided for through progressive water quality improvements, and an ongoing role and involvement through the Working Party.	Consistent
Policy E1 a) <i>This policy applies to the implementation by a regional council of a policy of this national policy statement.</i> b) <i>Every regional council is to implement the policy as promptly as is reasonable in the circumstances, and so it is fully completed by no later than 31 December 2025. (ba) A regional council may extend the date in Policy E1(b) to 31 December 2030 if</i> c) <i>Where a regional council is satisfied that it is impracticable for it to complete implementation of a policy fully by 31 December 2015, the council may implement it by a programme of defined time-limited stages by which it is to be fully implemented by 31 December 2025 or 31 December 2030 if Policy E1(ba) applies.</i> d) e) f)	N/a – is a direction to the consent authority.	N/a – is a direction to the consent authority.

8. New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement

NZCPS	Assessment	Conclusion
<p>Objective 1 <i>To safeguard the integrity, form, functioning and resilience of the coastal environment and sustain its ecosystems, including marine and intertidal areas, estuaries, dunes and land, by:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>maintaining or enhancing natural biological and physical processes in the coastal environment and recognising their dynamic, complex and interdependent nature;</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>protecting representative or significant natural ecosystems and sites of biological importance and maintaining the diversity of New Zealand's indigenous coastal flora and fauna; and</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>maintaining coastal water quality, and enhancing it where it has deteriorated from what would otherwise be its natural condition, with significant adverse effects on ecology and habitat, because of discharges associated with human activity.</i> 	<p>This objective identifies qualities of the coastal environment to be safeguarded – the proposal will help to achieve this objective by maintaining and progressively improving the quality of the stormwater discharges to streams, which ultimately reach the coastal environment. It is important to note that the effects of the discharges are not significant, and as noted by Dr Stewart, are not significant contributors to coastal or estuarine water quality degradation.</p>	<p><u>Will meet this objective</u></p>
<p>Policy 2 <i>In taking account of the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi (Te Tiriti o Waitangi), and kaitiakitanga, in relation to the coastal environment:</i></p> <p><i>(a) recognise that tangata whenua have traditional and continuing cultural relationships with areas of the coastal environment, including places where they have lived and fished for generations;</i></p> <p><i>(b) ...</i></p> <p><i>(c) with the consent of tangata whenua and as far as practicable in accordance with tikanga Māori, incorporate mātauranga Māori in regional policy statements, in plans, and in the consideration of applications for resource consents, notices of requirement for designation and private plan changes;</i></p> <p><i>(d) provide opportunities in appropriate circumstances for Māori involvement in decision making, for example when a consent application or notice of requirement is</i></p>	<p>The provisions of Te Tangi a Taurira were taken into account in preparing the application and subsequent evidence, and the applicant held discussions with Te Ao Marama prior to the hearing. The values and interests of iwi as defined in the IMP and through discussions were identified, acknowledged, and will be provided for through progressive water quality improvements, and through the ongoing role and involvement of tangata whenua through the Working Party.</p>	<p><u>Consistent</u></p>

NZCPS	Assessment	Conclusion
<p><i>dealing with cultural localities or issues of cultural significance, and Māori experts, including pūkenga, may have knowledge not otherwise available;</i></p> <p><i>(e) take into account any relevant <u>iwi resource management plan and any other relevant planning document recognised by the appropriate iwi authority or hapū and lodged with the council, to the extent that its content has a bearing on resource management issues</u> in the region or district; and</i></p> <p><i>(i)</i></p> <p><i>(ii)</i></p> <p><i>(f) provide for opportunities for tangata whenua to exercise kaitiakitanga over waters, forests, lands, and fisheries in the coastal environment through such measures as:</i></p> <p><i>(i) bringing cultural understanding to monitoring of natural resources;</i></p> <p><i>(ii) providing appropriate methods for the management, maintenance and protection of the taonga of tangata whenua;</i></p> <p><i>(iii) having regard to regulations, rules or bylaws relating to ensuring sustainability of fisheries resources such as taiāpure, mahinga mātaītai or other non-commercial Māori customary fishing; and</i></p> <p><i>(g) in consultation and collaboration with tangata whenua, working as far as practicable in accordance with tikanga Māori, and recognising that tangata whenua have the right to choose not to identify places or values of historic, cultural or spiritual significance or special value:</i></p> <p><i>(i) recognise the importance of Māori cultural and heritage values through such methods as historic heritage, landscape and cultural impact assessments; and</i></p> <p><i>(ii) provide for the identification, assessment, protection and management of areas or sites of significance or special value to Māori, including by historic analysis and archaeological survey and the development of methods such as alert layers and predictive</i></p>		

NZCPS	Assessment	Conclusion
<p>methodologies for identifying areas of high potential for undiscovered Māori heritage, for example coastal pā or fishing villages.</p>		
<p>Policy 11 <u>To protect indigenous biological diversity in the coastal environment:</u> a. b. <u>avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of activities on:</u> i. areas of predominantly indigenous vegetation in the coastal environment; ii. habitats in the coastal environment that are important during the vulnerable life stages of indigenous species; iii. indigenous ecosystems and habitats that are only found in the coastal environment and are particularly vulnerable to modification, including estuaries, lagoons, coastal wetlands, dunelands, intertidal zones, rocky reef systems, eelgrass and saltmarsh; iv. habitats of indigenous species in the coastal environment that are important for recreational, commercial, traditional or cultural purposes; vi. habitats, including areas and routes, important to migratory species; and vii. ecological corridors, and areas important for linking or maintaining biological values identified under this policy.</p>	<p>To the extent that the existing discharges result in adverse effects in the coastal environment, the indigenous biological diversity of the New River Estuary and adjacent coastal areas will be better protected as stormwater contaminants are removed. The discharges do not result in significant adverse effects, and through the actions proposed by the applicant, will largely avoid or otherwise mitigate less significant effects over the term of the consent, if granted for a term that is adequate for the proposed changes to take effect.</p>	<p><u>Consistent</u></p>
<p>Policy 14 Promote restoration or rehabilitation of the natural character of the coastal environment, including by: (a) (b) (c) where practicable, imposing or reviewing restoration or rehabilitation conditions on resource consents and designations, including for the continuation of activities; and recognising that where degraded areas of the coastal environment require restoration or rehabilitation, possible approaches include: (i) (ii)</p>	<p>Removing and / or reducing contaminants from stormwater at source will assist with improvements in water quality, and the rehabilitation of associated coastal environment values.</p>	<p><u>Consistent</u></p>

NZCPS	Assessment	Conclusion
<p>(iii) (iv) (v) (vi) <i>reducing or eliminating discharges of contaminants;</i> <i>or</i> (vii) (viii) (ix)</p>		
<p>Policy 22 (1) ... (2) ... (3) ... (4) <u>Reduce sediment loadings in runoff and in stormwater systems through controls on land use activities.</u></p>	<p>The application is based on progressively reducing contaminants in stormwater, including sediment. The application of the applicant's land development bylaw for all new land developments, and the requirement to include LID measures will help to mitigate future effects of land use on water quality.</p>	<p><u>Consistent</u></p>
<p>Policy 23 (1) <i>In managing discharges to water in the coastal environment, have particular regard to:</i> (a) <i>the sensitivity of the receiving environment;</i> (b) <i>the nature of the contaminants to be discharged, the particular concentration of contaminants needed to achieve the required water quality in the receiving environment, and the risks if that concentration of contaminants is exceeded; and</i> (c) <i>the capacity of the receiving environment to assimilate the contaminants; and:</i> (d) <u>avoid significant adverse effects on ecosystems and habitats after reasonable mixing;</u> (e) <i>use the smallest mixing zone necessary to achieve the required water quality in the receiving environment; and</i> (f) <u>minimise adverse effects on the life-supporting capacity of water within a mixing zone.</u> (2) <i>In managing discharge of human sewage, do not allow:</i> <u>(a) discharge of human sewage directly to water in the coastal environment without treatment; and</u> (b)</p>	<p>Significant adverse effects on the receiving environment are avoided. The receiving environment is able to assimilate the stormwater contaminants, given the scale and nature of the contaminants. No sewage is discharged directly to the coastal environment, taking into account that the discharges are for stormwater, some of which can be contaminated by sewage (versus consisting solely of human sewage). The adverse effects of the stormwater discharges are avoided by (4): (a) where practicable, and otherwise will be further remedied over time; (b) LID measures for new land development will reduce stormwater and contaminants at source; (c) will be managed in an integrated way across the catchments; (d) LID measures will help to reduce stormwater flows.</p> <p>There are no significant adverse effects on the receiving environment as a result of these discharges.</p>	<p><u>Consistent</u></p>

NZCPS	Assessment	Conclusion
<p>(3)</p> <p>(4) <i>In managing discharges of stormwater take steps to avoid adverse effects of stormwater discharge to water in the coastal environment, on a catchment by catchment basis, by:</i></p> <p>(a) <i>avoiding where practicable and otherwise remedying cross contamination of sewage and stormwater systems;</i></p> <p>(b) <i>reducing contaminant and sediment loadings in stormwater at source, through contaminant treatment and by controls on land use activities;</i></p> <p>(c) <i>promoting integrated management of catchments and stormwater networks; and</i></p> <p>(d) <i>promoting design options that reduce flows to stormwater reticulation systems at source.</i></p> <p>(5)</p>		