

Agenda

Canterbury Policy Forum

Date	Friday 6 May 2016
Time	12.00pm (lunch) for 12.30pm (meeting commences)
Venue	Council Chambers, Selwyn District Council, 2 Norman Kirk Drive, Rolleston
Attendees	Bill Bayfield (Chair, Environment Canterbury), David Ward (Selwyn), Angela Oosthuizen (Kaikōura), Hamish Dobbie (Hurunui), Geoff Meadows and Simon Markham (Waimakariri), Brendan Anstiss (Christchurch), Vincie Billante (Ashburton), Mark Low (Timaru), Toni Morrison (Mackenzie), Bede Carran (Waimate), Jill Atkinson (Environment Canterbury),
In Attendance	Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment: Iain Southall (Manager Strategic Policy Integration, Economic Strategy) and Siobhan Routledge (Policy Director, Sector Policy – Tourism, Sectors, Regions and Cities) Ministry for the Environment: Rowan Taylor Secretariat: Steve Gibling, Ronnie Cooper, Lorraine Johns, Bernadette Sanders (Minutes)
Apologies	Michael Ross (Waitaki), Vincie Billante (lateness), Toni Morrison (lateness)

Item	Person
1. Welcome, introductions and apologies	Chair
Housekeeping	
2. Confirmation of Agenda	Chair
3. Minutes from the previous meeting	
a. Confirmation of meeting Minutes, 18 March 2016	Chair
b. Action points	Secretariat
c. Regional governance meetings schedule	
Regional priorities	
4. Government's Business Growth Agenda – Canterbury opportunities	Iain Southall and Siobhan Routledge
5. Canterbury Regional Economic Development Strategy update	Steve Gibling
6. Further local government collaboration <i>Attachment: McGredy Winder Report to Canterbury Mayoral Forum, April 2016</i>	Chair
Multiple council issues	
7. Government initiatives update <i>Attachments: Canterbury Mayoral Forum submissions</i>	Ronnie Cooper
• <i>Freshwater Next Steps consultation document</i>	
• <i>Resource Legislation Amendment Bill</i>	
8. OIA/LGOIMA procedures update (verbal)	Brendan Anstiss
9. Regional Land Transport Plan	Lorraine Johns
10. Canterbury Mayoral Forum/Chief Executives Forum updates (verbal)	Chair
11. Canterbury Planning Managers Group update (verbal)	Geoff Meadows
General business	
12. Other matters identified	
13. Next meeting: Friday 12 August 2016	

Canterbury Policy Forum

Date: Friday 18 March 2016
 Time: 12.30pm
 Venue: Council Chambers, Selwyn District Council, 2 Norman Kirk Drive, Rolleston
 Attendees: David Ward (Acting Chair, Selwyn), Hamish Dobbie (Hurunui), Geoff Meadows and Simon Markham (Waimakariri), Brendan Anstiss (Christchurch), Mark Low (Timaru), Bede Carran (Waimate)
 In attendance: Hafsa Ahmed (Environment Canterbury – Item 7), Sean Rainey (Christchurch – Item 8)
 Secretariat: Steve Gibling, Ronnie Cooper, Bernadette Sanders (notes)
 Apologies: Bill Bayfield (Chair) and Jill Atkinson (Environment Canterbury), Angela Oosthuizen (Kaikōura), Toni Morrison (Mackenzie), Vincie Billante (Ashburton), Michael Ross (Waitaki), Brendan Anstiss (Christchurch, early departure)

The meeting commenced at 12.34pm.

1. Welcome, introductions and apologies

David Ward welcomed attendees to the meeting. Apologies were noted, including the early departure of Brendan Anstiss.

2. Confirmation of Agenda

- Item 8 (OIA/LGOIMA procedures), led by Christchurch, will be brought forward to accommodate the availability of Brendan Anstiss.
- Attendees were requested and agreed to a break in the meeting at 1.30pm to attend a conference call in the Executive Meeting Room with Jim Palmer and Bill Bayfield.

Sean Rainey joined the meeting at 12.38pm.

3. Minutes from the previous meeting

a. Confirmation of meeting Minutes, 29 January 2016'

Following a query from Waimakariri regarding councils' advice on resourcing capability to support the Mayoral Forum programme, Steve Gibling confirmed that this discussion is continuing with the Chief Executives and Canterbury Mayoral Forums, where a request for resourcing information from all councils has been made. In terms of Environment Canterbury resourcing, the Council has provided for a general rate for the secretariat.

The Minutes from the meeting held 29 January 2016 were accepted as a true and accurate record.

*Mark Low/Simon Markham
 Carried*

b. Action points

The action schedule was reviewed and updated.

c. Regional governance meetings schedule

Meeting dates were noted, as follows:

- Sister City Forum will be held in Nelson on 28-30 April 2016
- Mayoral Forum has moved to 29 April 2016
- RTC has moved to 29 April 2016
- meetings in the Chatham Islands will be held over 19-22 April.

4. CREDS update

David Ward spoke to the Agenda item, the purpose of which was to provide an overview of progress to date on the seven work streams.

Key issues for the Digital Strategy, Visitor Strategy, the Case for Canterbury, Transport, Canterbury Investment, Education, Newcomer and Migrant Settlement and Value-Added Production were outlined.

Resolved

The Canterbury Policy Forum

- 1 noted progress in implementing the CREDS since November 2015

David Ward/Steve Gibling

- 2 agreed to seek opportunities to support lead Mayors and Chief Executives to implement and further develop CREDS work programmes.

Simon Markham/Mark Low

Carried

Further updates were provided, as follows:

Value-Added Production: Stakeholder meetings have been held with a recurring theme noted of the necessity of a good integrated irrigation infrastructure to support high value crops. Environment Canterbury has a team reviewing all schemes planned and underway, including all milestones and deliverables.

Transport: Current focus is on freight and multi-modal freight. The GPS sets government policy but is focused on the road network and not sea, rail and air. A lot of work will be undertaken by existing groups such as RTC under the framework set by the Mayoral Forum. It was noted that investment in the transport sector for the Canterbury region is low; NZTA funding is constrained and the RTC is focusing on this issue.

David Ward reminded attendees to ensure that the summary information circulated by the secretariat following the Policy, Chief Executives and Mayoral Forums is passed on to staff in the region's councils.

Reports from Chief Executives on the seven work streams will be made available prior to the local government elections.

Brendan Anstiss left the meeting at 1.29pm.

The meeting then adjourned at 1.29 pm to join a conference call in the Executive Meeting Room, chaired by Jim Palmer and including Bill Bayfield and Andrew Dalziel.

The purpose of the conference call was to discuss the region's response to central government in terms of regional collaboration already taking place and planned, further to a conversation this morning with Dame Margaret.

Bill Bayfield explained that a working group is being convened to review a paper drafted by David (Bromell) and a report being compiled by Peter Winder to be presented to the Chief Executives Forum on 4 April 2016. It was noted that Peter Winder will not be liaising with all councils for his preparation of the report.

The desired result of the paper is to present a collaborative approach across the region to ensure customers receive a consistent and standard response from all councils.

The discussion at the Chief Executives Forum will cover a review of what has been achieved region-wide as well as a look to the future. This will establish the basis to inform the government of Canterbury's achievements and competence in region-wide collaboration.

A stocktake will be taken at the Chief Executives Forum, if possible, on what funding is needed from councils for the 2016 and 2017 years and whether the funds are to be used for CREDS, or for operational and collaborative initiatives. A conversation will be required on whether the regional council will be requested to fund some of the CREDS work streams. David Bromell will circulate an email to CEs prior to the meeting to ensure relevant financial information is made available for the discussion.

The Policy forum had a brief discussion on the potentials with CCOs and amalgamation. Those present were of the view that CCOs would not be a compelling service delivery option, nor would amalgamation add value to the region's communities. Forum members considered Dame Margaret's suggested virtual regulatory authority, and identified a need for clarification around support services, IT platforms and finance systems. Snap Send Solve was also raised.

Bill Bayfield left the conference call at 1.48pm.

The conference call ended at 1.51pm, and the Policy Forum recommenced in the Council Chambers at 1.53pm.

5. Regulation and Regional Economic Development Strategy update

Geoff Meadows spoke to the Agenda item, noting that a preliminary report from Kaikōura regarding tourism interests has been received – the third item of the regulatory barriers review. Draft results have been included in the paper and a full report covering the three issues of Digital Connectivity, Value-Added Production and Tourism will be available for the Chief Executives Forum on 4 April 2016.

Resolved

The Canterbury Policy Forum

- 1 noted that the reports from Timaru on Digital Connectivity, and from Waimate on Value-Added Production, were formally endorsed by the Canterbury Planning Managers Group on 19 February 2016
- 2 noted that the Chief Executives Forum, at their meeting on 15 February 2016, deferred consideration of the regulatory barriers report pending completion of the Tourism component from Kaikōura District Council

- 3 noted that the results of a survey of tourism interest and a preliminary draft report have been circulated amongst staff from Kaikōura, Christchurch, Environment Canterbury, and the chair of the CPG for comment, and that the report and findings need further work before circulating more widely.

Geoff Meadows/Steve Gibling
Carried

6. Annual Plan – approach to community engagement

David Ward spoke to the Agenda item and invited the councils present to update the Forum on their respective annual plan processes currently underway, including any community engagement taking place.

Selwyn: Will adopt its Annual Plan on 23 March 2016 and will undertake public consultation over a period of four weeks.

Waimate: Will be consulting on the issue of rates transferral. The Annual Plan will follow Waimate's LTP year 2.

Hurunui: Will undertake consultation with a focus on small community amenity issues, although no significant changes from the LTP.

Waimakariri: Consultation undertaken from 12 March 2016, with a reduction in rates increase a good news statement in its consultation document.

Timaru: Will not be consulting on its Annual Plan. A small rates increase will be introduced.

Environment Canterbury: Will not formally consult on its Annual Plan, but council is seeking feedback from the community.

7. Freedom camping

Steve Gibling introduced the Agenda item on behalf of the secretariat and Wayne Barnett, and introduced Hafsa Ahmed to the Forum. Steve reminded attendees that the issue had been raised 18 months ago. Now the Mayoral Forum's visitor strategy work programme has encouraged a review of what has already been done and to look at opportunities on how the issue can be managed consistently across the region. The lead council for the visitor work stream is Kaikōura.

Hafsa Ahmed spoke to a presentation on Freedom Camping, which outlined current known problems and issues, opportunities, outcomes, and proposals, including:

- the establishment of a working group to develop a multi-agency response
- quantification of costs for councils through data collection
- better education and communication (social media, existing apps)
- assessment of bylaws across the region
- the promotion of responsible camping.

Discussion focused around the key priority of encouraging visitors to continue to freedom camp, and the benefits for the region's communities and economies of smaller rural centres. There was concern around the media's current portrayal.

The establishment of a working group to develop a region-wide consistent response was believed beneficial in terms of identifying common issues for all as well as those affecting only a small number of councils. This would act as a lead in to an overall destination management discussion. The working group would focus on the key areas of visitor marketing, communications, infrastructure, apps, and bylaws.

A discussion around the make-up of the working group took place. It was believed that, eventually, visitor organisations and agencies would be invited to participate, however, local government staff would develop the group and agree on who should be involved, including DOC, LINZ and KiwiRail. Sector stakeholders should also be involved.

Steve explained that, in association with Wayne Barnett, a workshop to commence the establishment of the working group will be developed prior to the next Canterbury Mayoral Forum on 29 April 2016. An email will be circulated to all councils with details.

A Terms of Reference for the working group was requested.

AP: Workshop to commence the establishment of the working group to be developed by Environment Canterbury and Mackenzie.

AP: Terms of Reference for the working group to be drafted by Environment Canterbury and Mackenzie.

A brief discussion on the current Act took place, including its prohibitions and resulting pressure to install infrastructure across the region, and the effect this had on campground managers.

TIANZ has undertaken a survey and is looking at solutions, including education.

Resolved

The Canterbury Policy Forum

- 1 noted the current issues relating to freedom camping in Canterbury
- 2 discussed and agreed to progress a joined-up approach to address freedom camping issues by establishing a working group from Canterbury councils.

*Steve Gibling/David Ward
Carried*

8. OIA/LGOIMA procedures

This item was discussed following Agenda item 3c.

Brendan Anstiss opened the Agenda item and introduced Sean Rainey to the meeting.

Following a request at the Canterbury Policy Forum (CPF) meeting in January 2016, Sean has collated information on current OIA/LGOIMA handling and charging procedures from the region's councils. Chris advised that, under LGOIMA and Ombudsman instruction, TAs may charge for the provision of information provided certain criteria are met and charges are reasonable. There is consistency in some areas already across the region, but there was a marked difference in the number of LGOIMA requests received per month per council.

Three options were presented, all uniting policies on charging across the region:

- status quo
- develop a region-wide policy: dictating a consistent charging policy across the region's councils
- a region-wide network for official information: This preferred option would see the establishment of an informal network group to agree on the administration of official information, including how to deal with requests, transfer of information, and generally

support each other around the region. Sean confirmed that Christchurch is happy to informally assist in this process.

David Ward reminded the meeting that the issue councils were increasingly dealing with was requests for the supply of information that was already available through online sources, and that consistency across the region in the handling and charging of these requests is key.

A brief discussion on a potential review of LGOIMA took place. It was noted that no review was imminent, however, the Act is broad and councils need to adapt in terms of what information is held, for example, digital and social media. The new Ombudsman intends to implement a regime that all information be made available (unless there is a valid reason for exclusion) and, to that effect, it is important for the region to have a standard response for regional requests.

Resolved

The Canterbury Policy Forum

- 1 noted the options raised in the paper
- 2 of the three options presented, chose Option 3 – to establish a region-wide discussion group for official information.

Bede Carran/Geoff Meadows
Carried

Brendan and Sean were requested to present a discussion paper at the next meeting on 6 May 2016, with a focus on streamlining ways of working, responding and charging across the region. A Terms of Reference will also be created for the LGOIMA group. SOLGM's role in LGOIMA requests was raised as an opportunity to investigate.

AP: Brendan Anstiss and Sean Rainey to present a discussion paper to the CPF on 6 May 2016 with a focus on streamlining ways for working, responding and charging across the region.

AP: Brendan Anstiss and Sean Rainey to prepare a Terms of Reference for the LGOIMA group.

Sean Rainey left the meeting at 1.13pm.

9. Canterbury Councils' joined-up response to the Resource Legislation Amendment Bill

Geoff Meadows spoke to the Agenda item, noting that an extensive process to co-ordinate several councils' views and concerns had taken place, demonstrating how consensus across the region's planning managers had been achieved in the form of a draft submission, with a placeholder submission now in place from Dame Margaret Bazley. Geoff took the opportunity to urge attendees to ensure all Chief Executives and Mayors are aware of the draft submission.

David Ward endorsed Geoff's positive comments on the process and requested that his compliments be passed on to those involved in the compilation of the draft submission.

A request to ensure the draft submission states clearly that the majority of councils have this position was made and the document will be updated to reflect this where appropriate.

AP: Ronnie Cooper to update the draft submission to ensure that, where appropriate, the wording clearly states the majority of councils support particular points in the submission.

Resolved

The Canterbury Policy Forum

- 1 noted that several Canterbury councils had submitted independently on the bill
- 2 noted that Waitaki, Mackenzie and Hurunui are relying on the joined-up Canterbury response as their submission on the bill
- 3 noted the attached matrix of each council's position on the bill and the significant consensus on most points of the submission
- 4 noted the closing date for submissions to the Select Committee was 14 March 2016
- 5 noted that an extension of time had been granted by the Select Committee and that in the interim a placeholder submission had been made by the Canterbury Mayoral Forum.

Geoff Meadows/Simon Markham

Carried

David Ward noted that recommendation number 2 underpinned the importance of the Canterbury Policy Forum for the smaller councils of the region.

10. Government initiatives – Canterbury engagement and responses

Ronnie Cooper spoke to the Agenda item, noting that the paper was an update on shared Canterbury-wide responses to central government initiatives, including an updated timeline diagram from MfE. Ronnie noted that MPI representatives will attend the next Canterbury Planning Managers Group meeting to discuss the proposed NES for Plantation Forestry and its implications for councils. She noted that representatives of MfE and other Ministries are keen to continue engagement with Policy Forum and Canterbury Planning Managers Group as a means of accessing the region's councils.

Ronnie noted that a meeting on the Freshwater Management NPS is scheduled for Tuesday 22 March 2016. A submission will be drafted following the meeting and will be circulated to councils for comment, prior to the submission deadline of 22 April 2016.

AP: Ronnie Cooper to draft and circulate the draft submission on the Freshwater Management NPS prior to the deadline of 22 April 2016

Resolved

The Canterbury Policy Forum

- 1 noted the Ministry for the Environment's revised timeline for consultation on National Direction Projects (NPSs and NESs)
- 2 noted the work under way to maximise opportunities to engage with central government agencies on proposed new policy and legislation.

Hamish Dobbie/Mark Low

Carried

11. Canterbury Mayoral Forum/Chief Executives Forum updates

David Ward spoke to the Agenda item and provided an opportunity to discuss connectivity between the three Forums and any ways the Policy Forum can contribute to the attached CEF/CMF work programme 2013–16.

The work programme was reviewed. Of note:

- It was believed Christchurch may be arranging a LGOIMA training session. Ronnie Cooper will look into this.

- Health and Safety: The virtual team involving Selwyn, Waimakariri and Environment Canterbury is working well, with Ashburton expressing an interest in being involved.
- Geoff Meadows noted that item # 43 (Storm Water Forum) is working well, however, the recent Plan Change 4 has resulted in many local authorities submitting against it, causing an adversarial reaction amongst TAs.

Overall, it is agreed that there is value in the work undertaken by the three Forums in terms of supporting council thinking across the region and collaborating and sharing of information and knowledge. A key opportunity for the Policy Forum is enabling of staff from the smaller councils to collaborate and share training opportunities with other councils in the region.

Resolved

The Canterbury Policy Forum

- 1 noted the work programmes of the Canterbury Mayoral Forum and Chief Executives Forum
- 2 discussed and reviewed opportunities for the Canterbury Policy Forum to contribute to and support these programmes.

Simon Markham/David Ward
Carried

12. Training and professional development

Ronnie Cooper spoke to the Agenda item, noting that little response had been received from councils in terms of requests for staff training.

A potential training session on LGOIMA may be taking place at CCC; Ronnie will liaise with Brendan Anstiss and Sean Rainey.

A recent Canterbury Planning Managers Group discussion raised the suggestion of field trips to extend opportunities for staff to learn about regulation issues and get more hands-on experiences.

A repeat of the new policy advisor workshop held last November can be arranged for August/September 2016 if required.

AP: Ronnie Cooper to liaise with Brendan Anstiss and Sean Rainey regarding a potential LGOIMA training session at CCC.

13. General business

No items of general business were raised.

14. Next meeting

Friday 6 May 2016, Council Chambers, Selwyn District Council.

David Ward reminded attendees to ensure full use of the Canterbury Policy Forum was made.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 2.51pm.

Action Points

Canterbury Policy Forum

As at 3 May 2016

Items will be removed once complete.

Date	Subject	Actioned by	Deadline	Status
29.10.14	Mayoral Forum: Keep CPF informed.	Bill Bayfield	Ongoing	
26.06.15	Online voting: Provide feedback, when available, on the outcome of SDC's use of the online voting system for the 2016 local government elections.	David Ward	Ongoing	Eight councils have registered; meetings taking place with DIA and relevant election companies. SDC relaying messaging to community, ECan and DHB candidates around online campaigning and voting.
29.01.16	Training requirements: All councils to notify the secretariat with areas of professional development interest, and who to target this at over the next 18 months.	Forum	Ongoing	Request for training requirements circulated 29 February 2016.
29.01.16	Any council bringing professional trainers in-house are encouraged to extend an invitation to other councils, where possible.	Forum	Ongoing	
25.09.15	Local government regulation and CREDS: Support the Planning Managers Group to report to CEF on opportunities to address unnecessary regulatory barriers and improve consistency of regulation in relation to digital connectivity, value-added production and tourism in Canterbury (CREDS).	Timaru, Waimate, Kaikōura, Christchurch	February 2016	29.01: Tourism paper yet to be finalised.
29.01.16	All councils to update their communities around the Spark roll out timeframe.	Forum	ASAP	
29.01.16	Geoff Meadows and David Bromell to prepare summary report for Chief Executives Forum on all three reports.	David Bromell, Geoff Meadows	15 February 2016	CEF discussion deferred to April 2016.
18.03.16	OIA/LGOIMA: Brendan Anstiss and Sean Rainey to present a discussion paper to the CPF with a focus on streamlining ways for working, responding and charging across the region.	Brendan Anstiss	6 May 2016	Refer Agenda item 8.
18.03.16	Brendan Anstiss and Sean Rainey to prepare a Terms of Reference for the LGOIMA group.			

Date	Subject	Actioned by	Deadline	Status
18.03.16	Freedom camping: Workshop to commence the establishment of the Freedom camping working group to be developed by Environment Canterbury and Mackenzie. Terms of Reference for the working group to be drafted by Environment Canterbury and Mackenzie.	Environment Canterbury, Mackenzie		Workshop scheduled for 12 May 2016. Completed.
18.03.16	Response to the Resource Legislation Amendment Bill Update the draft submission to ensure that, where appropriate, the wording clearly states the majority of councils support particular points in the submission.	Ronnie Cooper	24 March 2016	Completed. Refer Agenda item 7.
18.03.16	Government initiatives Draft and circulate the draft submission on the Freshwater Management NPOS prior to the deadline of 22 April 2016.	Ronnie Cooper	22 April 2016	Completed. Refer Agenda item 7.
18.03.16	Training and professional development Liaise with Brendan Anstiss and Sean Rainey regarding a potential LGOIMA training session at CCC.	Ronnie Cooper		Completed. Workshop scheduled 6 May 2016.

Week Beginning	Canterbury Policy Forum	Canterbury Chief Executives Forum	Canterbury Mayoral Forum	Canterbury Planners Forum	RTC	Zones 5 and 6	South Island Strategic Alliance	Recovery Strategy Advisory Comm	Regional Sector Group	SOGLM
	Chair: Bill Bayfield	Chair: Jim Palmer	Chair: Dame Margaret Bazley	Chair: Geoff Meadows	Chair: Rex Williams	Chair: Richard Kempthorne	Chair: Richard Kempthorne	Chair: Bill Wasley	Chair: Stephen Woodhead	Chair:
	Secretariat: Bernadette Sanders	Secretariat: Bernadette Sanders	Secretariat: Louise McDonald	Secretariat: Brett Aldridge	Secretariat: Therese Deval	Secretariat: TDC (Pamela White)	Secretariat: TDC (Pamela White)	Secretariat: Caroline Hart	Secretariat: LGNZ (Clare Wooding)	Secretariat: Louise Boland
04.04.16		Mon 04.04.16		Fri 8.04.16						
11.04.16										
18.04.16						19-22.04.16 (Chathams)	21.04.16 (Chathams)			
25.04.16			Thurs 28/Fri 29.04.16		Fri 29.04.16					
02.05.16	Fri 06.05.16									
09.05.16									Fri 13.05.16	
16.05.16										
23.05.16										
30.05.16		Mon 30.05.16: BIM								
06.06.16										
13.06.16										
20.16.16			Thurs 23/Fri 24.06.16: CREDS and BIM		Fri 24.06.16					
27.06.16										
04.07.16										
11.07.16				Fri 15.07.16						
18.07.16										
25.07.16										
01.08.16										
08.08.16	Fri 12.08.16									
15.08.16										
22.08.16										
29.08.16		Mon 29.08.16							Fri 02.09.16	
05.09.16							Sept or Nov tbc			
12.09.16				Fri 16.09.16						
19.09.16										Annual summitt 21-23.09.16
26.09.16										
03.10.16										
10.10.16										
17.10.16										
24.10.16										
31.10.16		Mon 31.10.16							Fri 04.11.16	
07.11.16						07.11.16	Sept or Nov tbc			
14.11.16										
21.11.16			Fri 25.11.16		Fri 25.11.16					
28.11.16	Fri 02.12.16									
05.12.16										
12.12.16										
19.12.16										
26.12.16										

Canterbury Policy Forum

Item 4

Date: 6 May 2016

Presented by: Secretariat

Government's Business Growth Agenda

Purpose

This paper provides Forum members with background on the Government's Business Growth Agenda to inform the discussion with Iain Southall and Siobhan Routledge of MBIE.

Recommendations

That the Canterbury Policy Forum:

- 1 **consider** the priorities and aims of the Government's Business Growth Agenda
- 2 **explore** opportunities and alignment with the Canterbury Regional Economic Development Strategy.

Background

- 1 The Business Growth Agenda (BGA) led by the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (MBIE) is a series of Government initiatives and priority actions to build a more productive and competitive economy. It seeks to support diversification of the economy, and to increase jobs and incomes in New Zealand. The BGA is focused around six key areas or work streams:
 - Investment
 - Infrastructure
 - Innovation
 - Export markets
 - Natural resources
 - Skilled and safe workplaces.
- 2 The BGA has been updated each year since 2012; the 2015 updates include new chapters on *Building export markets*, *Building innovation*, *Building investment* and *Building natural resources*. The chapters are available at: <http://www.mbie.govt.nz/info-services/business/business-growth-agenda/towards-2025>. Chapters updating the remaining two key areas – Infrastructure and Workplaces – are due shortly.
- 3 The Government has indicated that 'it is committed to staying focused on what matters to business.' It will work with agencies and the business community to achieve a high-level goal to increase the ratio of exports to GDP by 40% by 2025.

Focus areas	Vision	Target	Next Steps
Investment	Attracting high-quality investment into all parts of New Zealand	Significantly lift the rate of business investment as a percentage of GDP, with an emphasis on attracting capital that generates economic growth, creates high value jobs and builds resilience in regions	
Export markets	Creating internationally connected businesses that are able to add value to volume and seize opportunities in an increasingly Asia-Pacific-centric world	Increase the ration of exports to GDP to 40% by 2025	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a free trade strategy - maximising benefits to exporters of our trade agreements - operating the world's most efficient and cost effective Border Management system to support trade and people flows - growing NZTE's portfolio of export-active companies - increasing value to NZ from tourism - growing international education - developing and growing NZ's international marketing brand
Innovation	Developing New Zealand as a hub of high-value, knowledge-intensive businesses conducting more R&D	Create the right business environment and incentives to encourage New Zealand's business sector to increase its expenditure on R&D by 1% of GDP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - encourage business innovation - attract multi-national R&D investment in New Zealand - make the most of the digital economy by encouraging more effective use and uptake of ICT - proactively review market regulation to ensure it supports the development of new and innovative products and services -increase the impact and relevance of publicly-funded scientific research - grow the availability of innovation skills in NZ
Skilled and safe workplaces	Equipping all our people with the skills to participate and succeed in our economy and society	Materially lift New Zealand's long-run productivity growth rate while maintaining our high rate of labour force participation	
Natural resources	Improving the productivity of our resource-reliant businesses while reducing their environmental impact	Quality of our natural resource base improves over time while sustaining the growth needed from key sectors to meet our 40% exports to GDP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - grow the availability of innovation skills in NZ - maximise the productivity of agricultural and horticultural land while reducing environmental effects

Focus areas	Vision	Target	Next Steps
		target	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - provide more flexible governance options for Māori land, and assist Māori trusts and landowners to improve the productivity of their land - encourage regional economic development with certain and timely processes for allocating access to resources - free up urban land supply and accelerate access and use of it - improve the efficiency of freshwater allocation and usage within limits, and encourage investment in water storage and irrigation - develop our aquaculture, fisheries and other marine resources, while maintaining marine biodiversity and sustainability - improve energy efficiency and use of renewable energy to raise productivity, reduce carbon emissions and promote consumer choice
Infrastructure	Creating connections and supporting future investment, growth and quality of life	By 2030, New Zealand's infrastructure is resilient and coordinated and contributes to economic growth and increased quality of life	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - support and attract investment into all parts of NZ, through the NZ Investment Attraction Strategy and the Regional Economic Action Plans - Implement, embed and monitor recent reforms to financial market regulation to ensure they allow financial markets to thrive - rebuild the Government's balance sheet to reduce the risks of future adverse events and to optimise the allocation of Crown capital - Modernise IRD's systems to preserve our broad-based tax base, reduce compliance costs, and smooth tax collection impacts on firm cash-flows - Improve the financial capability of all New Zealanders and encourage personal savings and investment

Canterbury Policy Forum

Item 5

Date: 6 May 2016

Presented by: Mayoral Forum Secretariat, for lead Mayors

Canterbury Regional Economic Development Strategy progress update

Purpose

This paper provides an update on progress on the implementation of the seven Canterbury Regional Economic Development Strategy (CREDS) work streams.

Recommendations

That the Canterbury Policy Forum:

- 1 **receive** the report
- 2 **note** progress on the implementation of the seven Canterbury Regional Economic Development Strategy work streams.

Progress update

- 1 The table below outlines recent progress for each work stream of CREDS.
- 2 All work streams are currently on track.
- 3 An RFP is also in development for a UAI survey to build the case for Canterbury.

	Work stream	Lead	Progress
1	Integrated regional transport planning and infrastructure investment	Mayor Winton Dalley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Councils are aiming to complete the approval process for the new Joint Committee in May 2016, and hold the first meeting in June 2016 • The Strategic Refresh of the front section of the Regional Land Transport Plan was approved at the Regional Transport Committee (RTC) meeting of 29 April 2016 • A proposal is in development to establish a transport strategic advisory group comprising Chairs of major modes (rail, air, sea) as well as a freight representative, and local and central government representatives – this group would support more integrated transport planning and information sharing • A further meeting with private sector Chief Executives will occur before June 2016 • The series of individual meetings with southern RTC Chairs is complete, and work is in progress to hold a combined meeting of all southern RTC Chairs on 30 May 2016 • A draft RFP is being developed to investigate freight data gaps • A meeting will be held with KiwiRail to discuss potential opportunities for the midland line to transport visitors
2	Digital connectivity: extension and update of fast broadband in rural areas	Mayor Damon Odey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Canterbury Digital Strategy 2016 was published on 26 February 2016 • Work is in progress on engagement with Crown Fibre Holdings on the proposal of a Canterbury Digital Accord • A meeting took place between the Secretariat and NZ Young Farmers to discuss making innovative use of ICT
3	Freshwater management and irrigation infrastructure	Commissioner David Caygill	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A letter was sent to the Minister for Economic Development proposing Canterbury as a “special economic zone”, with barriers to investment in irrigation infrastructure as one of four areas where there is potential for partnership with central government • The Hurunui Water Project (HWP) has been granted an additional \$520,000 through the Irrigation Acceleration Fund (IAF) to refine project layout and re-engage with landowners and shareholders. A successful outcome will enable access to \$3.3M in a reserved IAF grant which requires local matching funds to support a full Stage 1 feasibility work programme. Amuri Irrigation shareholders have approved a proposal to pipe their scheme • Central Plains Water Ltd Stage 2+/Sheffield Scheme planning is underway with a capital call expected in the first half of 2016 • Environment Canterbury, the CWMS Regional Committee and the three south Canterbury zone committees continue to advance an integrated “southern Infrastructure” approach. An IAF water

	Work stream	Lead	Progress
			<p>resource modelling study and supporting demand study will be completed by June 2016</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A recent capital call by Hunter Downs had sufficient uptake to progress to the next stage of investigations. Closer alignment with the Morven Glenavy Ikawai Scheme is emerging and a new advisory panel has been formed to consider Wainono augmentation options involving both schemes • A trial of managed aquifer recharge in the Hinds Plains area has received funding from the IAF, Environment Canterbury, and local irrigation/community interests. A six week pilot will begin in May
4	Value-added production	Mayor Craig Rowley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A meeting will be held with Hon Steven Joyce, Minister of Economic Develop, on 19 May 2016 regarding irrigation infrastructure and value-added production
5	Education and training for a skilled workforce	Mayor David Ayers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tertiary institutions decided their 'centres of excellence', such as water engineering, need to be paused as two organisations have a lot of change going on – ARA and Lincoln University • Meeting held to develop approach to students transitioning to work – the Education Blueprint due out in a month will help identify areas to partner with government. Connections are being made at the regional level with MSD and MOE to identify opportunities • Approach being made to the local Chinese Confucius Society to gain support and identify ways of increasing the number of classes teaching Chinese in Canterbury
6	Newcomer and migrant settlement	Mayor Angus McKay	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided Environment Canterbury with the business case for the resource needed for this work stream
7	Regional visitor strategy	Mayor Winston Gray	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A regional forum for regional and district tourism organisations to be held mid-June 2016 • Consultation with Christchurch Airport and Christchurch & Canterbury Tourism is complete. A final draft has been circulated to Mayors for approval for publication • Letter sent to Prime Minister from the Mayoral Forum on the further expansion of tourism in Canterbury • Work in progress on mapping the availability of free WiFi in Canterbury towns • Discussion on the purchase and installation of solar charging tables

Canterbury Policy Forum

Item 6

Date: 6 May 2016

Presented by: Steve Gibling, Secretariat

Further local government collaboration

Purpose

To generate advice to the Chief Executives Forum on further collaborative initiatives in the Canterbury region.

Recommendations

That the Canterbury Policy Forum:

- 1 **discuss** the McGredy Winder review of progress on local government collaboration
- 2 **recommend** to the Chief Executives Forum, a set of criteria for analysing and prioritising collaborative initiatives in the Canterbury region
- 3 **advise** the Chief Executives Forum of opportunities for further collaboration that should be prioritised
- 4 **advise** the Chief Executives Forum of opportunities that the Policy Forum can progress.

Background

- 1 In March 2016, the Chief Executives Forum contracted McGredy Winder & Co to provide an independent review of progress on local government collaboration during the 2013-16 triennium, and provide advice on further opportunities for collaboration in 2016-19.
- 2 The Mayoral Forum considered the resulting report *Collaboration between Canterbury Local Authorities – progress and opportunities* (attached) at its meeting on 29 April 2016.
- 3 The Mayoral Forum agreed that the Chief Executives Forum would workshop, agree and prioritise areas for further collaboration and shared services. The Chief Executives Forum will report to the Mayoral Forum on 24 June 2016 with advice on how councils might resource investigation of these, in order to inform the briefing to incoming Mayors following local body elections in October 2016.
- 4 To support Chief Executives to provide this advice, the Policy Forum is being asked to recommend criteria for assessing and prioritising options for further collaboration, as well as applying these criteria to identify opportunities for further collaboration that should be prioritised.
- 5 A copy of the McGredy Winder report is attached to assist with this discussion. It is important to note that Mayors considered that some of the matters discussed in this report may be sub-regional, not 'regional'. The Mayoral Forum therefore agreed that consideration of whether an initiative is suitable to progress at the regional level or not, should be incorporated in the framework for analysis of opportunities.

Current collaboration

- 6 The region currently collaborates in a number of ways. Section 3 of the Triennial Agreement 2013-16 details collaborative commitments for the 2013-16 term. A number of shared governance and shared services initiatives are also progressing, and investigations are currently underway in relation to valuation and rating services, a consistent approach to requests for official information, and a common approach to the regulation and management of freedom camping.

Canterbury Regional Economic Development Strategy

- 7 In February 2015, Mayors agreed seven priority work programmes to achieve the Canterbury Regional Economic Development Strategy (CREDS) objective, with a lead Mayor and council for each work programme:
- Freshwater management and irrigation infrastructure
 - Integrated transport planning and infrastructure investment
 - Digital connectivity: extension and uptake of fast broadband in rural areas
 - Value-added production/secondary economies
 - Education and training for a skilled workforce
 - Newcomer/migrant settlement: skilled workers, cohesive communities
 - Regional visitor strategy.

Summary of suggestions in McGredy Winder report

- 8 The McGredy Winder report identifies a number of areas where collaboration could be further progressed (pages 7-13 of the report), which can be briefly summarised as:
- tourism promotion, including developing and agreeing a fair and sustainably resourced model for promoting the Canterbury region
 - rural fire and emergency management in rural communities, including interconnectivity and use of radio by councils
 - building control
 - rating services
 - regulatory environment and by-laws, including district plan integration
 - integration of corporate services
 - integration of engineering services and common standards
 - integration of water and wastewater delivery
 - integration of roading or transport delivery
 - benchmarking and performance improvement.

Possible criteria for analysing and prioritising initiatives

- 9 The Mayoral Forum agreed that Chief Executives would :
- consider whether concerns are regional or sub-regional, or potentially best dealt with at the South Island/national or city/district level
 - specifically consider initiatives that could be best progressed centrally

10 This paper provides some criteria that could potentially be used to analyse and prioritise those initiatives that could be progressed regionally, drawing on a number of sources, in particular the report *Local Government Information Series: A review of collaboration among councils* (The Department of Internal Affairs, 2009).

11 Possible criteria for analysing and prioritising potential collaborative initiatives (in no particular order) include the following:

a. extent of contribution to the priorities established in the CREDS (as discussed above)

no direct connection to a work stream			some connection			supports a work stream		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	

b. nature and extent of efficiency savings (for example economies of scale, reduction in duplication, better value-for-money, better use of resources/time savings)

minor potential savings			moderate potential savings			significant potential savings		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	

c. potential to improve quality of services and outcomes (for example, greater capacity to address issues and interests, better advocacy and promotion, potential for shared knowledge)

minor improvement			moderate improvement			significant improvement		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	

d. nature and extent of the cost and resourcing required to take up the opportunity

minor investment			moderate investment			significant investment		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	

e. likely nature and size of impact (economic, social, cultural etc)

minor impact			moderate impact			significant impact		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	

f. potential for more consistent policies and practices

minor improvement			moderate improvement			significant improvement		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	

- g. extent to which issues and risks will be managed more effectively (for example, increasing capability and/or capacity to do so)

minor improvement			moderate improvement			significant improvement		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	

- h. extent to which there will be greater capacity to further regional interests

minor improvement			moderate improvement			significant improvement		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	

- i. extent to which collaborating and being seen to collaborate may secure other advantages

minor improvement			moderate improvement			significant improvement		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	

- 12 The criteria above cover a wide range of considerations and could provide a basis for exploring, in a consistent manner, the potential benefits and challenges of options identified in the McGredy Winder report, so that options can be prioritised for further investigation.

For discussion

Criteria

1. Of the possible criteria above, which criteria – or mix of criteria – would provide a basis for prioritising the progression of issues on a regional basis?
2. What other criteria could be selected?
3. Should the criteria be weighted?
4. Should criteria be given number scores?

Other matters for consideration

5. Is the matter best dealt with at the regional or sub-regional level, or otherwise?
6. Is there another group looking at the matter, or another local government structure, better placed to respond?
7. Are there other parties, outside of local government, that could support this work?
8. Are any matters ideal for progression by central government?

Identification of priorities

9. What are the opportunities for further collaboration that should be prioritised?
10. Are there any additional opportunities that should be considered?
11. What opportunities could the Policy Forum progress?

Next steps

- 13 Following discussion at the Policy Forum, the Chief Executives Forum will be asked to agree on particular options for further investigation and report back to the Mayoral Forum on 24 June 2016 with these options.



Collaboration between Canterbury Local Authorities – progress and opportunities

Report to Canterbury Mayoral Forum.

Peter Winder
April 2016



Introduction

1. In June 2013 McGredy Winder & Co provided advice to the Canterbury Mayoral Forum about options for collaboration between Canterbury councils on strategy, policy and planning issues. That paper set out a framework for thinking about collaboration including both the motives for collaboration and how to develop a shared agenda for joint strategy and policy work.
2. A further report in August 2013 provided advice on options for broader collaboration. That report explored a wide range of opportunities to collaborate through:
 - sharing information
 - joint procurement of goods and services
 - shared capability
 - joint project teams and specific initiatives
 - shared business systems
 - integrated or joint delivery of services.
3. A strong theme of the advice provided in 2013 was that for collaboration to be successful, participating councils must have common objectives and motives from the outset. Successful collaboration will be characterised by councils that have:
 - both a need and a willingness to share resources
 - an open and transparent approach to working with others
 - clearly identified and communicated what they want from the arrangement
 - defined the level of financial, intellectual and real resources they can commit
 - developed clear decision-making and problem solving mechanisms for joint work (including how to set priorities and when they might opt out).
4. The June 2013 report concluded that:

Building a track record of success with simple, but effective collaboration will lay the foundations necessary for more complex, but more rewarding collaboration. It is therefore suggested that the Canterbury councils would be wise to focus collaborative efforts relating to strategy and policy on the simple but effective forms of collaboration.
5. Since that time the Canterbury councils, through the Mayoral Forum, have made considerable progress in establishing a range of collaborative mechanisms and a track record of working together.
6. As the Mayoral Forum approaches the end of the current triennium it is considering what progress has been made and what may be appropriate targets for collaboration over the next three years.



Progress Since 2013

7. Since 2013 the Canterbury councils have made significant progress on a number of collaborative initiatives. The Mayoral Forum has tended to be the focus and driver of region-wide initiatives. Their work programme has 44 activities, which range from exploring after-hours call centre opportunities to the key planks of the regional economic development strategy. There are also a number of sub-regional collaboration initiatives involving two or more councils.
8. Since 2013 the councils have established and supported significant collaborative work programmes through the Mayoral Forum.
9. The operation of the mayoral forum has in part been possible because of the leadership that has been exercised by Dame Margaret Bazley and the spirit in which that leadership role has been accepted. This has been a period of relative harmony in the relationships between Environment Canterbury and the region's territorial authorities.
10. The successful operation of the Mayoral Forum has also depended on a number of other well-functioning groups including the Canterbury Chief Executives Forum and the Policy Forum. They are cornerstones of significant collaborative work. The executive support for these groups provided by Environment Canterbury has also been essential.
11. The flagship product of the Mayoral Forum's collaboration is the Canterbury Regional Economic Development Strategy (CREDS). It presents a strong 20-year vision for the future of the region and supports it with seven practical work streams, each championed by a different Mayor.
12. The other major area of effective collaboration has been in the development and implementation of the Canterbury Water Management Strategy. Approached on a catchment basis, one of the critical success factors of the programme has been the effective collaboration between Environment Canterbury, territorial authorities and community representatives.
13. The way in which the Canterbury councils are now working has been visible outside of local government. Through the initiatives to improve mobile connectivity and the universal roll out of 4G mobile coverage, Spark noted a fundamental change in the way the region's local authorities worked together. The ability to engage with all of the councils in one place, do business, and get a common approach meant that Spark was willing to bring forward a \$14m investment across the region to deliver 4G services far sooner than would otherwise have been the case. There are other opportunities where this sort of collaboration could be applied.
14. Through the work of the Policy Forum, Canterbury now has the ability to develop and advocate for a Canterbury-wide perspective on policy issues. The combined approach is significantly improving the ability of Canterbury councils to contribute to important national policy issues with one voice.
15. Not all of the efforts at collaboration have been easy or immediately successful. One of the key initiatives with respect to transport was to develop better integration of governance and decision-making with respect to public transport for greater Christchurch. This work



highlighted major shortcomings with the legislative framework, which are now being addressed by the government's Better Local Government Services Package. This work also illustrated quite different expectations and approaches to decision-making and delegation between the four councils involved. Ensuring effective and appropriate community input and a balance between the interests of four councils, with respect to sharing influence, control, financial accountability and good governance, has required considerable effort.

16. It has also been challenging to resource the implementation of joint strategies. The CREDS identifies a large number of actions to implement the strategy. They would need to be undertaken by both public and private sector organisations. Even where the actions might primarily fall to either central government or the private sector there is a leadership and co-ordination role for the Canterbury local authorities. However, it has to date proved challenging for the local authorities to resource this sort of activity. By and large this would be new and additional activity for each council. Funding it would either require the reallocation of existing resources or raising additional revenue. Each council is likely to have existing unfunded projects that they consider to be a higher priority than parts of the CREDS implementation plan.
17. In addition to the higher-profile region-wide collaborative efforts there are a number of lower-profile regional initiatives like Canterbury Maps, and forums for finance managers, IT managers, planning managers, and engineers dealing with roading and 3 waters. Sub-regional initiatives include:
 - collaboration and sharing of health and safety expertise between Waimakariri and Selwyn districts and Environment Canterbury
 - a joint approach to roading contracts for maintenance and reseals between the Mid and South Canterbury councils
 - emerging North Canterbury roading collaboration dealing with the co-ordination of tenders and work programmes
 - the establishment of a single Rural Fire Authority combining Mackenzie, Timaru, Ashburton and Waimate Districts, the Department of Conservation, New Zealand Forest Owners and the New Zealand Fire Service
 - Hurinui district providing IT services to Kaikoura district.
18. There is also collaboration on a scale that is larger than the region. For example:
 - building control officials from across the upper South Island are working together on a number of projects, including a single standard portal for the submission of on-line building consent applications
 - collaboration around archive and electronic records.

Lessons and Observations

19. Those who were interviewed for this report noted a number of quite important lessons from the progress that has been made over the last three years including:
 - It is important to have success – success builds the confidence and trust necessary to take on other initiatives.



- Positive and effective personal relationships between mayors and between chief executives are a necessary platform for collaboration.
- The leadership of a number of Canterbury councils, and Environment Canterbury in particular, will or may change as a result of the election.
- The shared leadership / portfolio approach used to develop CREDS has driven a stronger sense of ownership than would have been achieved if it had been led by one council.
- Environment Canterbury and the resourcing that it has provided has been central to many of the initiatives, but for this to be successful they must completely embrace a genuinely collaborative model and ensure that they are not seen to be taking over.
- Whilst there is a willingness to collaborate within each of the Canterbury councils there is also significant reluctance to change.
- The current regional collaborative model is a completely voluntary opt-in model driven through the Mayoral Forum (which has no ability to make binding decisions) and collaboration is therefore limited to the extent to which there is a coalition of willing partners.
- Given the small size of many of the Canterbury councils, initiatives that require scale will depend on the larger councils and Christchurch City Council in particular making a significant contribution.
- There is a perception that over the last period Christchurch City Council has been focused on earthquake recovery and significant internal reorganisation but that this will change over the next three years, providing the opportunity for Christchurch City Council to play a greater regional leadership role.
- Collaboration is difficult where there are political differences with respect to approach, level of delegation, the need for control, and the degree to which change threatens current political autonomy.
- There is a natural suspicion of the motives of others.

Drivers and Incentives for Collaboration

20. The same underlying business drivers for collaboration exist today as did in 2013. These include the potential to:

- share knowledge and resources
- benefit from the knowledge and resources of others (particularly where they have limited strategic and policy development capability)
- be seen to collaborate in order to secure other advantages
- tailor service delivery to meet common community needs
- reduce costs through the elimination of duplication
- access economies of scale
- develop an effective local platform from which to engage with government to achieve outcomes for the community.



21. These drivers are underpinned in the Local Government Act by the strong focus in the purpose of local government (s10) on cost-effective delivery. This flavour is even more strongly embodied in the requirement under s17A to undertake regular and systematic reviews of the cost-effectiveness of service delivery.
22. It is fair to say however, that despite the requirements of S17A councils do not feel significant pressure to improve the cost-effectiveness of their service delivery unless (as in the case of Christchurch City Council) there are other fundamental cost pressures that are forcing more systematic and comprehensive efforts to reconsider efficiency of service delivery, service levels and delivery mechanisms.
23. In addition to these drivers the Government has recently announced its Better Local Services Package. In introducing the reform package Minister of Local Government Mr Lotu-liga said:

“The reforms include more flexibility to collaborate and develop shared services; reorganisation processes that can be locally led and driven; and greater use of Council Controlled Organisations, with improved accountability tools to safeguard local democracy.

The costs of local services are rising faster than council revenues, so councils need new ways to manage finances, improve efficiencies and create value for ratepayers.

There are also enhanced Local Government Commission powers and processes to enable the Commission to promote and facilitate reorganisations.

Local government must respond and adapt to an increasing range of challenges if it is to deliver modern, cost effective services that meet the evolving needs and expectations of New Zealanders.

The Better Local Services package creates new options for councils and communities to improve performance and better manage local services and infrastructure”.
24. As described by the Department of Internal Affairs this suite of initiatives is designed “to enable and equip local government to:
 - *Remain responsive to local preferences;*
 - *Increase the coordination and cost effectiveness of local services and infrastructure; and*
 - *Increase support for regional growth and prosperity.”*
25. The proposals build on the speech that the then Minister of Local Government Paula Bennett delivered to the Local Government Conference in 2015. The proposals will provide:
 - greater flexibility for councils to collaborate to deliver services and infrastructure – more options to choose from
 - more flexible reorganisation processes
 - a new process for council-led reorganisations rather than a single Local Government Commission-led option



- a more proactive role for the Local Government Commission to work with local communities to improve their local government
 - increased checks and balances on the Commission
 - two pre-approved Transport CCO models:
 - a regional transport CCO, responsible for local roads, public transport (including public transport services contracting), and transport planning
 - a roading only CCO, responsible for local road maintenance; control and regulation; and improvements (under this model regional transport planning and public transport contracting and funding would remain with the regional council)
 - the ability to create a 'bespoke' Transport CCO which does not conform to either of these models
 - joint water CCOs to allow for integrated services and infrastructure.
 - the ability for water and transport CCOs to access specific regulatory powers that are currently held by councils
 - greater ability to transfer statutory or non-statutory functions between councils, through both a Commission-led reorganisation process and a council-led reorganisation process
 - more opportunities for joint governance (with iwi) over areas of shared and common interest.
26. Cabinet has approved the drafting of the required legislation to give effect to this package. It is reasonable to assume that these new provisions will be available to councils in the next three year term of office.
27. These new provisions, and in particular the potential for the Local Government Commission to initiate reorganisation are a significant new driver for thinking about collaboration and alternative governance arrangements. However, the fundamentals remain. For collaborative work to be successful, the participating councils must have common objectives and motives from the outset.
28. For significant collaborative or shared service initiatives to progress, councils also need to be prepared to jointly invest in investigations and business cases that may or may not progress to bankable improvements. Over the last few years each of the council shared service organisations in the Bay of Plenty, Waikato and Southland have realised that without a shared business improvement capability that is able to develop robust business cases, they will not be able to progress significant shared service initiatives.
29. The potential cost and complexity of developing an implementable business case for a major shared service is well demonstrated by the work that Hamilton City and Waikato and Waipa District Councils have done on a possible jointly owned council controlled organisation providing water, wastewater and stormwater services for the three councils. The business case identifies the potential for such a CCO to realise savings of around \$107m over the first ten years of its operation. The Councils are now finalising the terms of an agreed approach to such a CCO that could support a full public consultation process. To date the three Councils have committed to over \$750,000 of expenditure on this initiative. It is still possible that following the election and public consultation one of the councils could decide not to proceed.



30. The Local Government Commission is currently funding an initial piece of work in Northland exploring the potential for a waters CCO to deliver benefits to the communities of the Far North, Whangarei and Kaipara districts. It is not yet clear how willing, or able the Commission will be to undertake similar work across the rest of the country.
31. It is very likely that the new provisions from the Better Local Services Package will open the door for a new range of parties to initiate reforms that are well short of wholesale reorganisation, but offer the potential for more cost effective services. Demonstrated progress on improving delivery will remain the best opportunity for councils to avoid either the Local Government Commission, or a community group from initiating a change that the council does not welcome, or see merit in.

The Next Three Years

32. From the interviews conducted in preparing this report, previous advice and a desk-top review of the progress that has been made in Canterbury over the last three years, there are a number of shared service or collaboration opportunities that could provide significant benefits to the councils and communities of the region above and beyond those already underway. Some of these are likely to arise in conjunction with other central government reform processes.
33. The following section provides a list of potential opportunities that are, in the view of the author, worth considering for development over the next three years. However, it must be noted that progressing some of them will require considerable further work to determine the potential risks and rewards before a decision to proceed could be made.
34. It is also important to note that not all of the opportunities identified here need to be approached on a region-wide basis. Indeed some may be far easier to achieve, and deliver far faster payback, if they were sub-regional or bilateral initiatives.

Existing Forums, Policy and Advocacy

35. All of those who were interviewed saw considerable merit in working to cement in place the policy and strategy for collaboration that is now an integral part of the operation of the Mayoral Forum, the Chief Executives Forum and the Policy forum. These and the range of other current initiatives provide a core of ongoing collaboration and relationship between the Canterbury councils that is an important foundation.

CWMS

36. The continued development and implementation of the Canterbury Water Management Strategy is essential for the future of the region. Its success depends on a collaborative approach to underpin environmental and land use controls and support the broader economic and regional development objectives of the CREDS.



Economic Development - Implementing CREDS

37. Developing the CREDS has been a significant achievement. Implementing it will require a sustainably resourced custodian for the strategy. That custodian must be able to secure the ongoing interest, engagement and support of the councils, the government and private sector agencies that need to be partners in implementation. It is possible that the Mayoral Forum could continue to be the custodian and individual mayors / councils take the lead in implementing each part of the strategy, but even that will require an agreed approach to setting priorities and jointly resourcing the work.

Tourism Promotion

38. Tourism promotion is fairly part of the economic development strategy, however, it has historically been done by different, special purpose regional or district tourism organisations. To progress a vision for the development and promotion of Canterbury tourism, the councils of the region will need to find a way to jointly fund and oversee a collaborative marketing effort that is well aligned with the tourism industry. Progressing the 'Case for Canterbury' may provide a way forward in this area.

Rural Fire and Emergency Management

39. The 2015 decision to unify New Zealand's fire services from mid-2017 will end the current role that territorial local authorities play with respect to rural fire authorities. The integration of the urban and rural (professional and volunteer) fire services will also prompt the New Zealand Fire Service to consider the long-term location and nature of its command and control environment and the location of its control centres.
40. Due to the way that many councils have integrated the staffing and support for rural fire with broader emergency management responsibilities, this change will provide an opportunity to rethink the staffing and provision of emergency management activities across rural communities. This could be a catalyst for the joint provision of permanent emergency management staff between councils, as well as the opportunity to rethink the provision of emergency management offices and the points of co-ordination with first responders. This is likely to be a more significant opportunity across rural communities than urban ones. Elsewhere in the country a number of councils share permanent emergency management staff. In Southland there is a single regional approach. In Northland, Kaipara District Council is supported by an emergency management officer employed by the Northland Regional Council.

Interconnectivity and Use of Radio by Councils

41. At a far more operational level, the Canterbury councils have a variety of uses for radio to provide emergency communications, telemetry and other interconnectivity that is not dependent upon the mobile or fixed line phone and data networks. There is an opportunity to rationalise and better integrate this activity to provide more effective and robust coverage and ensue interconnection between councils and other services for emergency management.



Regional approach to hazards

42. One of the consequences of the Christchurch earthquakes is a heightened recognition of the need to deal effectively with hazards. A major feature of the replacement Christchurch City District Plan is its new approach to dealing with natural hazards.
43. Across the region there is an opportunity to adopt a more uniform approach to identifying hazards, and implementing common approaches to managing like risks. This is likely to involve a mix of alternative approaches to the zoning and development of land, different priorities for investment in regional infrastructure to ensure that risks from hazards are appropriately mitigated, and an ongoing programme of mapping and investigating potential hazards. Apart from the benefits of a comprehensive standardised approach, collaboration in this area would provide the opportunity for smaller councils to benefit from rare and specialist skills. The Canterbury Policy Forum has initiated a common approach to natural hazard risk management. This initiative is being led by Environment Canterbury.

Building Control

44. Despite the support that is provided between a number of Canterbury (and other) councils to deal with overloading, or more complex building consents, there are ongoing opportunities to collaborate more closely with respect to building control. In particular, for some of the smaller councils, the costs of maintaining separate accreditation as a building consent authority are significant. Substantial progress in this area may require some legislative change in order to deal effectively with the potential liabilities of one local authority undertaking all (or substantially) all of the building control work of another local authority. However, that may be possible through the legislation to implement the government's Better Local Services Package. This could open the door to very different approaches to building control (either region-wide, or sub-regional or bilateral) and savings for builders, developers and communities.

Rating

45. There has been debate over the potential for savings to be secured through the development of a shared service in relation to rating. There are a number of aspects of the rating process where it may be possible to secure savings through collaboration. These include:
 - maintenance of the rating register for each local authority
 - procuring and undertaking bulk property valuation services
 - implementing more customer friendly mechanisms of rates notifications and payments online to avoid the costs of printing, postage and distribution of rates invoices
 - procurement and management of rates collection and debt collection services.
46. There are a number of commercial providers that are active in this area. There are also a number of commercially available business systems designed to support rating processes. It may be possible to secure savings through a range of collaborative actions including:
 - joint procurement of services
 - contracts for services between local authorities



- the establishment of a regional CCO to conduct rating activities for councils.
47. Ernst and Young has been engaged to develop a business case for a possible rating shared service. This work is underway but not yet completed.
 48. The bottom line for collaboration in this area is that rates must be set and assessed correctly for each and every property in each district (and region) in a way that is consistent with the rating resolutions of each council in each year. Each council must remain at liberty to change the way in which it rates, consistent with the provisions of the Local Government Rating Act 2002 (LGRA). Rating is a specialised activity that is only undertaken by local authorities. Failure to meet the requirements of the LGRA can have significant consequences for both individuals and councils.

Regulatory Environment and By-laws

49. There is potential to streamline and harmonise a range of regulatory measures undertaken by territorial authorities. Regulatory and enforcement activity relating to dogs and dog registration, swimming pools, freedom camping, environmental health, noise control, litter, or general nuisance tend to be a poor cousin to consenting activity under the Resource Management Act and the Building Act. In each of these areas of activity there is opportunity for collaboration in one or more of:
 - policy development, standard setting and by-law reviews
 - delivery of online services and payment options
 - specialist expertise and skills to support change and new regulations
 - productivity tools designed to improve the cost-effectiveness of inspection and education or enforcement activity, including standard procedures for collecting evidence
 - training and development of staff
 - shared staff and co-ordinated enforcement activity.

District Plan Integration

50. There has been discussion of the potential for benefits to be secured through collaboration in relation to district plans. Given the substantial review processes currently underway across Christchurch City, Waimakariri and Selwyn Districts and related recent changes to the Regional Policy Statement, there are probably limited region-wide opportunities for wholesale change.
51. However, the harmonisation of provisions that relate to infrastructure or services that cross local authority boundaries may have considerable merit. Doing this would not require major changes to complete district plans.
52. Equally, the government's current work on a possible national policy statement (or other mechanism) relating to urban development could well provide a compelling case for a Canterbury-wide approach to district plan provisions relating to urban development.



Integration of Corporate Services

53. There is considerable scope for collaboration or shared delivery of corporate services. However, there are equally significant impediments associated with:
- different legacy systems
 - quite different business and control processes
 - differing service standards and expectations
 - the relative age of existing systems and their currency with respect to contemporary customer and business service expectations
 - the physical capability to connect systems (including fast broadband connections)
 - expectations of the potential efficiencies in relation to the cost and impact of change.
54. It is most likely that a region-wide approach to integration of shared services would be very difficult to achieve on a voluntary basis, and indeed, given the comparative youth of some council systems the business case for a region-wide approach may not be compelling. However, there may well be strong cases for bilateral, or sub-regional collaboration on some corporate services. The strongest candidates for a shared approach will be investments in new ways of enabling online transactions with council customers that both transform the customer experience and reduce the cost of service delivery.

Integration of Engineering Services and Common Standards

55. Across the Canterbury councils there is variability in the engineering and other technical standards that are used for infrastructure and for the procurement and delivery of engineering, construction and maintenance activity. Each territorial authority also maintains to some degree engineering and asset management skills. These different approaches can be reflected in different tender specifications, different approaches to procurement, and different service standards. There may be legitimate reasons for the differences. Variations may also reflect different (and potentially historic) judgements and preferences exercised by engineers.
56. A common approach seeking to harmonise, or at least rationalise differences in engineering specifications and approaches between local authorities should result in the identification of best practice, the potential to remove costly or unwarranted practices and improve productivity and cost-effectiveness. A similar approach by the Auckland territorial authorities in the early 2000's delivered significant savings.
57. Another potential for securing benefits from collaboration would be through a shared professional service relating to engineering, infrastructure and roading. The Northland councils are currently considering a business case for the establishment of a joint business unit to provide the management and professional services for their local authority roads. The envisaged business unit would incorporate staff seconded from each local authority and co-located with NZTA staff in Whangarei. Each council will retain responsibility for roading decisions, priorities, approving contracts, and funding, but the business unit will provide the technical advice to each council that is required.



58. A similar approach could be considered for Canterbury, or for parts of Canterbury. The emerging clusters of collaboration to the north of Christchurch and through Mid and South Canterbury may provide the easiest way to progress such an approach.

Integration of Water and Wastewater Delivery

59. The provisions of the Better Local Services Package will make it far easier to establish CCOs that can deliver water and wastewater services. It may be possible to secure considerable benefits from such an approach. Indeed, the recent business case for Hamilton, Waikato and Waipa suggests that even though the benefits that can be secured from physically integrating the systems of the three authorities are modest, the benefits of combining the development, operation and maintenance of their systems are substantial.
60. However, change on this sort of scale would more profoundly challenge the sense of identity and nature of each of the territorial authorities than the range of other initiatives discussed above.

Integration of Roothing or Transport Delivery

61. There are two possible approaches to increased integration of roading and transport delivery: building on current initiatives; and major change to governance and delivery.
62. Timaru, Ashburton, Waimate and Mackenzie District Councils are pursuing the first of these approaches as they consider opportunities to build on current joint contracting. This includes that potential for sharing data collection (RAMM) and asset management services under a joint memorandum of understanding. This sort of opportunity would equally apply to North Canterbury Councils.
63. The provisions of the Better Local Services Package will make it possible to pursue more substantial change. The reforms will provide for the establishment of two pre-approved forms of transport CCO. It may be possible to secure considerable benefits from such an approach. However, change on this sort of scale would more profoundly challenge the sense of identity and nature of each of the territorial authorities than the range of other initiatives discussed above.

Benchmarking and Performance Improvement

64. One of the issues that all councils face when considering how to improve cost-effectiveness is the absence of comprehensive benchmarking. There are few measures that demonstrate the relative performance of both different councils and different service delivery models. One response to this would be to contribute to a broader benchmarking and performance framework that can underpin efforts to improve cost-effective service delivery.

Conclusions and Suggestions for the New Term

65. It is timely for the current councils to reflect on their progress with collaboration and shared services over the last three years. The councils set out down a path of collaboration that



has deliberately tried to build a track record of success and an environment of trust. Significant progress has been made and lessons have been learned. However, the collaborative effort has not yet seriously tested the independence of any of the councils. Neither has it attempted to change a significant service delivery area. Collaborative efforts to date have tended to be non-threatening low-hanging fruit, where it is relatively easy to get all parties to agree.

66. Significant opportunities for collaboration or shared services that could support more cost-effective delivery remain. They range in size and complexity from the relatively trivial to quite fundamental changes in the way that councils operate. A number of these opportunities would require changes to the political decision-making role of councils that are likely to be unacceptable to a number of Canterbury councils.
67. The fundamental requirements for collaboration are unchanged from those identified in 2013. The Canterbury councils have spent some time building a track record of success. There will be something of a potential discontinuity provided by the 2016 election and changes to the governance of Environment Canterbury. However, there should be a strong motivation to build on the track record that has now been established.
68. To make progress it is suggested that before the election, the Canterbury councils express through the Mayoral Forum their ongoing commitment to collaboration and an approach to the next triennium that involves:
 - building on successes with shared policy and advocacy
 - continued collaboration on CWMS
 - integrated and collaborative implementation of CREDS, including developing and agreeing a fair and sustainably resourced implementation model
 - advancing tourism promotion, including developing and agreeing a fair and sustainably resourced model for promoting the whole of Canterbury and developing tourism product and events
 - seizing opportunities presented by the Fire Service Review
 - developing a broader collaboration and shared services agenda that continues to systematically identify and explore opportunities
 - considering a broad benchmarking and performance improvement programme to underpin cost-effectiveness initiatives
 - considering a shared business improvement resource that can drive an improvement programme.
69. It is also suggested that the Canterbury councils note that collaboration may not need to be regional. A number of the identified opportunities could be approached on a bilateral or sub-regional basis.
70. Most importantly, it is strongly suggested that following the election the leaders of each council spend time to develop and maintain the working relationships that are essential for any collaboration.

Canterbury Policy Forum

Item 7

Date: 6 May 2016

Presented by: Ronnie Cooper, Secretariat

Government initiatives update

Purpose

This paper provides Forum members with an update on the Government's programme of National Direction projects and legislation review, and Canterbury region's input and engagement.

Recommendations

- 1 That the Canterbury Policy Forum **receive** the report.

Background

- 1 At its meeting on 25 September 2015 the Forum agreed to work in collaboration and with the Canterbury Planning Managers Group (CPMG) to develop shared responses to each of the Government's policy initiatives for new and revised national policy instruments under the RMA. The CPMG also led a process to develop a shared submission on the Resource Legislation Amendment Bill.

Next steps for fresh water

- 2 The Minister for the Environment released in February a consultation document outlining a range of proposed changes to New Zealand's systems for managing freshwater. The proposals included:
 - amending the National Policy Statement on Freshwater Management (NPS-FM) to include:
 - regulations around the exclusion of stock from water bodies – this overlaps with proposals in the Resource Legislation Amendment Bill
 - applying the requirement to 'maintain or improve water quality' to every freshwater management unit¹ rather than to a region as a whole
 - using the Macroinvertebrate Community Index as a mandatory monitoring method
 - exceptions to national bottom lines for catchments with significant infrastructure
 - extending the application of national bottom lines and thresholds for lakes to intermittently closing and opening lakes and lagoons (ICOLLs) – in Canterbury region these are Te Waihora/Lake Ellesmere, Wairewa/Lake Forsyth, and Wainono Lagoon

¹ Freshwater management units (FMUs) are catchment-based areas for which community values will be identified for freshwater objectives and limit-setting.

- economic use of freshwater – requiring more efficient use and good management practice via the introduction of national technical efficiency standards and good management practice standards
 - requiring councils to reflect Te Mana o Te Wai in their implementation of all relevant policies in the NPS-FM, and to engage with iwi and hapū at the outset of freshwater planning processes
 - establishing a \$100 million Freshwater Improvement Fund.
- 3 The Secretariat worked closely with managers and staff from member councils to prepare the shared Canterbury submission on the proposals (attached). The submission was lodged with the Ministry for the Environment on 22 April 2016.
 - 4 A number of Canterbury councils decided not to make their own separate submissions on the Freshwater Next Steps proposals, and have relied on the shared Canterbury submission.

National Environmental Standard for Plantation Forestry

- 5 Oliver Hendrickson from the Ministry for Primary Industries (MPI) met with the CPMG at their meeting on 15 April 2016 to outline the work under way revising the draft NES for Plantation Forestry.
- 6 The revised draft NES is to go to Cabinet in June 2016, and once approved will go through the legal drafting phase with the Parliamentary Counsel Office. MPI are looking to run workshops in October and November 2016 around an exposure draft, with gazettal of the NES anticipated in April 2017. MPI will also be working with councils and the forestry sector to develop guidance. Canterbury councils expressed an interest in being part of the South Island workshops expected later this year.

Resource Legislation Amendment Bill

- 7 At the last Policy Forum meeting, work was still under way to finalise the shared Canterbury councils' submission to the Local Government and Environment Select Committee on the Resource Legislation Amendment Bill. This was completed and the attached submission was lodged with the Committee on 24 March 2016 (the extension date).
- 8 On 2 May 2016 Dame Margaret Bazley, Chair of the Mayoral Forum, and Prof. Peter Skelton spoke to the submission in the Select Committee hearing in Christchurch. Dame Margaret highlighted the value of working collaboratively together to present Canterbury's priorities and concerns and support our common interests as a region. She emphasised the importance of trust and constructive relationships, and the need for statutory frameworks that enable collaboration to grow. The Select Committee members asked questions about integrating national groups and interests in regional processes, getting the right balance between national levels and local flexibility, and the systems for iwi and hapū participation in council processes.

Future National Directions initiatives

- 9 Forthcoming initiatives signalled for consultation in the next few months by the Ministry for the Environment include the proposed new NPS for Development Capacity and amendments to the NESs for Contaminants in Soil and Air Quality. A proposed NPS for Aquaculture will address coastal aquaculture only and therefore will only have relevance for some Canterbury councils. The Secretariat will keep member councils informed and will involve you in the processes for developing responses on these proposals when they are released.

Other initiatives from the Ministry for the Environment

National Monitoring System for RMA

- 10 The Ministry is soon to release the first year's data and findings from the National Monitoring System (NMS) which gathers information from councils on how the RMA is being implemented. The 78 datasets, with more than 3 million cells of data, underwent an intensive process of data validation. The Ministry advises that, instead of producing a printed report available online as a PDF (as for the former RMA survey of Local Authorities) the NMS reporting will be web-based, with an interactive visualisation tool. The complete NMS 2014/15 dataset will also be available online.

Non-statutory guidance

- 11 The Ministry is working with MBIE on non-statutory guidance on assessing liquefaction risks covering land assessments, land use planning and building foundations. This guidance is intended to be published in late 2016.
- 12 The Ministry is also updating its guidance to councils on Coastal Hazards and Climate Change. This review will take into account the latest science and the recommendations made by the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment in her recent report on sea level rise and coastal hazards. The revised guidance is due to be completed in late 2016.

Environment Aotearoa

- 13 Following the release of the first all-of-environment report, *Environment Aotearoa 2015*, last October, the Ministry is working on the next specific domain reports due under the Environmental Reporting Act. The Marine domain report will be released on 27 October 2016. Other domain reports are scheduled:
 - Freshwater domain report – April 2017
 - Atmosphere and climate domain report – October 2017
 - Land domain report – April 2018
 - Air domain report – October 2018
 - All domains report – April 2019.

Submission to the Ministry for the Environment

CANTERBURY Mayoral Forum

*A strong regional economy with resilient, connected
communities and a better quality of life, for all.*

Fresh Water Consultation 2016

22 April 2016

1. The Canterbury Mayoral Forum (the Forum) thanks the Ministry for this opportunity to offer comment on the proposed changes to New Zealand's fresh water management, as set out in the Government's consultation document *Next Steps for Fresh Water*.
2. The Forum offers the following submission on the basis of our member councils' statutory roles and responsibilities under the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA).

Context

3. The Canterbury Mayoral Forum comprises the Mayors of the ten territorial local authorities in Canterbury and the Chair of Environment Canterbury, supported by our Chief Executives. The Forum's purposes are to promote collaboration across the region and to increase the effectiveness of local government in meeting the needs of Canterbury's communities.
4. All Canterbury councils actively participate in the Forum: Kaikōura District Council, Hurunui District Council, Waimakariri District Council, Christchurch City Council, Selwyn District Council, Ashburton District Council, Mackenzie District Council, Timaru District Council, Waimate District Council, Waitaki District Council and Environment Canterbury.
5. The Forum work programme is implemented by the Canterbury Chief Executives Forum and the Canterbury Policy Forum. For matters that impinge on planning, the Policy Forum is supported by the Canterbury Planning Managers Group.
6. The following submission has been developed with input from the Policy Forum and Planning Managers Group, and other relevant staff from our member councils. There is consensus amongst the region's councils on many of the proposals advanced in the consultation document, as outlined in the submission. However we also provide additional comment on some matters where our member councils have a range of views and concerns.
7. Individual Canterbury councils have separately provided their own submissions on the proposed fresh water management changes. This submission is not intended to replace or detract from any of those independent council submissions.

Mayors standing together for Canterbury.

Ashburton District Council • Canterbury Regional Council • Christchurch City Council • Hurunui District Council
Kaikōura District Council • MacKenzie District Council • Selwyn District Council • Timaru District Council
Waimakariri District Council • Waimate District Council • Waitaki District Council

Mayoral Forum Secretariat, C/- Environment Canterbury, PO Box 345, Christchurch 8140 T: 03 345 9323

8. The Community and Public Health team of the Canterbury District Health Board (CDHB) has also been involved in the development of this submission. Canterbury councils and the CDHB work closely together on environmental health matters for our region. The CDHB is making its own independent submission on the *Next Steps* proposals.

General Comments

9. The proposals set out in the consultation document are considered in relation to the Canterbury Water Management Strategy (CWMS).¹ The vision of the CWMS is:

To gain the greatest cultural, economic, environmental, recreational and social benefits from our water resources within a sustainable framework both now and for future generations.

10. The CWMS establishes targets over 30 years and priority work programmes for water management in the region over ten target areas:
- Ecosystem health and biodiversity
 - Natural character of braided rivers
 - Kaitiakitanga
 - Drinking water
 - Recreational and amenity opportunities
 - Water-use efficiency
 - Irrigated land area
 - Energy security and efficiency
 - Regional and national economies
 - Environmental limits.
11. The CWMS is a collaborative framework for all fresh water related activity in our region, with extensive community engagement and close involvement of Ngāi Tahu rūnanga. The work of setting goals and priorities has been undertaken by community-based Zone Committees, which are joint committees of Environment Canterbury and the relevant territorial local authorities (TLAs) under the LGA. This ensures a strong foundation for CWMS activities in the expertise, local knowledge, and planning and management work of our member councils. There is also a Regional Committee that considers regional issues of environmental restoration and repair, land use impacts on water quality, and water storage, distribution and efficiency options.
12. CWMS implementation includes the translation of Zone Committee goals and priorities into sub-regional chapters of the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan, giving a formal planning basis to the local values and aspirations brought through by the Committees. Other work includes Immediate Steps, a five year \$10 million biodiversity protection and restoration programme to address the declining health of freshwater ecosystems and loss of native biodiversity.

¹ <http://ecan.govt.nz/get-involved/canterburywater/Pages/default.aspx>

Mayors standing together for Canterbury.

Ashburton District Council • Canterbury Regional Council • Christchurch City Council • Hurunui District Council
Kaikoura District Council • MacKenzie District Council • Selwyn District Council • Timaru District Council
Waimakariri District Council • Waimate District Council • Waitaki District Council

Mayoral Forum Secretariat, C/- Environment Canterbury, PO Box 345, Christchurch 8140 T: 03 345 9323

Fresh water and the environment***Measuring water quality***

13. The Forum supports Proposals 1.1 and 1.2 in the consultation document, with some qualifications and concerns about matters which will need careful consideration before these proposals could be implemented.
14. Proposal 1.1 would amend the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM) so that the requirement to maintain or improve water quality would apply within a freshwater management unit (FMU) rather than across the whole region.
15. This is a pragmatic approach that would be compatible with CWMS Zone structures and could be applied on a catchment or sub-catchment basis or across multiple associated catchments as relevant. However the Forum considers that decisions on FMUs and their scope and scale must be retained at local and regional council levels, to ensure appropriate management frameworks that respect and provide for local conditions and needs – environmental, economic, social and cultural. We note the reference in the consultation document (p 13) to communities setting freshwater objectives and limits, and endorse this principle of local determination. Logically water quality assessment should be undertaken at the smallest level possible (catchment or sub-catchment) to enable comparatively rapid identification of issues as they arise, and consequential remedial action. However this needs to be balanced with the practicality and costs involved for councils. The NPS should enable measurement of water quality at a scale proportionate to perceived risk.
16. Proposal 1.2 is intended to provide clarification of the methods that councils use to determine how fresh water quality is maintained or improved, by establishing flexibility via 'a number of routes, specifically including: ensuring attributes remain with their current bands as defined in the National Objectives Framework (NOF)... [and] where attributes do not have defined bands, demonstrating that a value is no worse off' (*Consultation document*, p 13). The Forum supports the use of attribute bands rather than absolute values for determining water quality.
17. The Forum considers however that movements of water quality measures within an attribute band must also be tracked and managed. Overall quality within a FMU would be based on the band, but monitoring and reporting of trends within the band is also important. A downward pattern over time of water quality measures within a band, or a cluster of measures at the bottom end of the band, should be identified and proactively addressed. Similarly improved measures within a band and the contributing factors should be highlighted. We note that the monitoring required under the Environmental Reporting Act 2015 will align with these provisions of the NPS-FM.
18. ***The Forum recommends*** that Objective A2 of the NPS-FM is amended to require local authorities to monitor and report both on the overall water quality measures of a FMU within an attribute band and on any trends, positive or negative, within the band.

Mayors standing together for Canterbury.

Ashburton District Council • Canterbury Regional Council • Christchurch City Council • Hurunui District Council
Kaikoura District Council • MacKenzie District Council • Selwyn District Council • Timaru District Council
Waimakariri District Council • Waimate District Council • Waitaki District Council

Mayoral Forum Secretariat, C/- Environment Canterbury, PO Box 345, Christchurch 8140 T: 03 345 9323

Guidance for local authorities

19. The Forum notes the comment in the consultation document (p 13) that there is little direction for councils on how to maintain overall water quality, and how to manage challenges including managing trade-offs, limit setting and potential litigation. However the consultation document provides no detail or clarification on these matters or how the Minister intends to address them beyond the two options set out in Proposal 1.2. The Forum acknowledges the more general guidance provided in the *Guide to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2014* (August 2015, pp 30-36), but considers that development of clear guidance on such questions should be a priority. This should be undertaken in collaboration with the local government sector. The Forum and our member councils would welcome the opportunity to assist with this process.
20. **The Forum recommends** *that a collaborative working group is established comprising representatives of local government to work with the Ministry for the Environment and the Ministry for Primary Industries to develop practical detailed guidance for local authorities for how to meet the requirements of Objective A2 of the NPS-FM.*

Macroinvertebrate Community Index

21. The Forum is generally supportive of the concept of using the Macroinvertebrate Community Index (MCI) in Proposals 1.3 and 1.4. Some of our member councils already use some MCI assessments as a surrogate measure for water quality. There is some concern at the costs to councils of MCI monitoring.
22. We note a lack of clarity as to the underlying intent of the proposal to use this method. The consultation document (p 14) states both that the MCI would be used as a measure of water quality and as a measure of ecosystem health or the ecological health of rivers. We welcome the opportunity for further clarification of the purpose and value of using MCI in fresh water monitoring as signalled in Proposal 1.4. We note that the supporting text in the consultation document (p 14) also refers to the science community.
23. Specific MCI and sampling regimes will be required for different kinds of water bodies, ecosystems and contexts including land use and seasonal factors. There are key questions around sampling processes, timing and scale, and determining appropriate processes and scale for particular FMUs. Some water bodies may have a low MCI but still be healthy representatives of their ecosystem type.
24. The Forum considers that Proposal 1.4 should be extended to include strong local government involvement along with the Land and Water Forum. In particular, the Forum considers it essential that the process provided for in Proposal 1.4 includes at least one regional council from the South Island. Regional and local councils have a wide range of valuable expertise and knowledge that will be important in working through the questions of how MCI can most productively be incorporated in NPS-FM monitoring and reporting.
25. **The Forum recommends** *that Proposal 1.4 is amended to provide for local government participation, and specifically for the involvement of at least one South Island regional council, in the work on the potential inclusion of a macroinvertebrate measure as an attribute in the NPS-FM National Objectives Framework.*

Mayors standing together for Canterbury.

Ashburton District Council • Canterbury Regional Council • Christchurch City Council • Hurunui District Council
Kaikoura District Council • MacKenzie District Council • Selwyn District Council • Timaru District Council
Waimakariri District Council • Waimate District Council • Waitaki District Council

Mayoral Forum Secretariat, C/- Environment Canterbury, PO Box 345, Christchurch 8140 T: 03 345 9323

Significant infrastructure and water quality

26. Proposal 1.5 would provide further direction for the processes for exceptions to the national bottom line for freshwater quality where significant infrastructure affects water quality. The Forum welcomes the opportunity for discussion and clarification of the issues involved in such exceptions. The local government sector, and particularly regional councils, need to be part of the discussions to develop any such direction.
27. It is essential that whatever direction is provided does not undermine community aims for local and regional management of freshwater and water bodies, or the processes through which communities, tangata whenua and local authorities work together to determine local priorities and long term goals. The CWMS processes in our region have already established an effective framework for managing the impacts of major infrastructure and factoring in these effects as part of wider planning and limit setting. The CWMS integrates the value and benefits of energy security and efficiency as one of the ten priority target areas noted above at paragraph 9.
28. **The Forum recommends** that Proposal 1.5 is amended to provide for local government participation in a collaborative process for the development of direction for exclusion of significant infrastructure via Appendix 3 of the NPS-FM.

Coastal lakes and lagoons

29. There is support from some of the Forum's member councils for Proposals 1.6 and 1.7, which would provide that the NPS-FM attributes would apply to intermittently closing and opening lakes and lagoons (ICOLLS) with the same band thresholds and national bottom lines as lakes, and would provide direction to councils on transitional objectives for FMUs under Appendix 4 of the NPS-FM. We note that Appendix 4 NPS-FM is currently empty. We also note that Canterbury region has more major ICOLLS than any other region in the country (*Consultation document*, p 17).
30. Environment Canterbury does not support Proposals 1.6 or 1.7, as outlined in their separate submission on the *Next Steps* consultation document. However some of the region's TLAs, including Christchurch City Council and Selwyn District Council, support the proposals, and highlight the achievements in Canterbury with ICOLLS. Positive initiatives include the processes for managing the opening of Te Waihora, which take ecological matters into account along with a range of other criteria. Other achievements include work to protect and restore animals and plants in and around Wainono lagoon, supported by local landowners and rūnanga, the Lower Waitaki Zone Committee, councils and other groups. At Wairewa, controlled openings and closings of the lake to the sea enable the lake to be kept at a higher, more stable level, helping to address water quality issues.
31. The Forum considers that the transitional objective provisions outlined in Proposal 1.7 need to acknowledge the reality that some ICOLLS are likely to require a transitional objective for the foreseeable future, while others may only require this provision for a relatively short period of time. Therefore the transitional objective review period provisions should be specific to each water body rather than a standard timeframe applicable to all water bodies covered under Appendix 4.

Mayors standing together for Canterbury.

Ashburton District Council • Canterbury Regional Council • Christchurch City Council • Hurunui District Council
Kaikoura District Council • MacKenzie District Council • Selwyn District Council • Timaru District Council
Waimakariri District Council • Waimate District Council • Waitaki District Council

Mayoral Forum Secretariat, C/- Environment Canterbury, PO Box 345, Christchurch 8140 T: 03 345 9323

32. **The Forum recommends** that Proposal 1.7 is amended to provide that the review period for transitional objectives under Appendix 4 of the NPS-FM is specific to each water body.
33. The potential application to ICOLLs of the same attributes, band thresholds and national bottom lines as lakes raises complex and sensitive challenges. While there is progress with recognition and setting of limits in surrounding catchments, and practical achievements with restoration projects and community support, the extremely long term nature of the legacy of past land uses for water bodies such as Te Waihora, Wainono and Wairewa must be acknowledged. Furthermore some coastal lagoons or lakes are subject to natural variance in water quality depending on outflow or tidal incursions. Canterbury local authorities (and the relevant councils for other New Zealand ICOLLs) must be included in any process for determining how these unique water bodies are evaluated.

Stock exclusion from water bodies

34. Proposal 1.8 would regulate for exclusion of dairy cattle and other livestock types from water bodies, with a schedule of dates for this to apply to different kinds of livestock and different topographical contexts (*Consultation document*, p 20). The Forum supports in principle the establishment of national regulation for stock exclusion from water bodies. However there is significant uncertainty about a number of aspects of the proposal as currently drafted, and without additional detail the Forum is unable to make a complete assessment of the proposal.
35. Matters which need further clarification include:
- questions around the definition of the water bodies the exclusion regulation will apply to – including details of the 1 metre width criterion
 - the sequences of timeframes for different categories of stock to be covered by the proposed regulation
 - questions relating to the classification of water bodies according to the steepness of the land – for example, does this apply as an average of the whole property or landscape, or only in the immediate area alongside the river or stream? We note that in Banks Peninsula some water bodies where stock exclusion would be necessary, including sources of drinking water, have slopes steeper than 15°
 - the effects of stocking levels for all categories of stock and topographies – the intensity of stocking levels in the catchment will be a factor for all farming types, and the requirements for stock exclusion could be based on stock units per hectare as well as the broad categories in the current proposal
 - The effects of non-point-source contamination – for example field drains running into the same water bodies the stock are fenced off from
 - how the proposed regulation will be set in place – such as by Order in Council
 - whether there would be any provision for stock exclusion specifically incorporated into the NPS-FM or whether the proposed regulations would be established at RMA level via the Resource Legislation Amendment Bill.
36. The Forum supports the proviso (*Consultation document*, p 19) that the proposed national stock exclusion regulations would not override more stringent local authority rules, and that councils would be able to apply stock exclusion rules more widely if necessary and desirable.

Mayors standing together for Canterbury.

Ashburton District Council • Canterbury Regional Council • Christchurch City Council • Hurunui District Council
Kaikoura District Council • MacKenzie District Council • Selwyn District Council • Timaru District Council
Waimakariri District Council • Waimate District Council • Waitaki District Council

Mayoral Forum Secretariat, C/- Environment Canterbury, PO Box 345, Christchurch 8140 T: 03 345 9323

37. The Forum considers that representatives of local government need to be involved in a collaborative process with the two Ministries and the farming sector to address the uncertainties and practical issues in creating an effective and workable national regulation for stock exclusion from water bodies. The Forum would be keen to assist in the further development of the proposed stock exclusion regulation.
38. ***The Forum recommends*** that a collaborative working group is established comprising representatives of local government to work with the Ministry for the Environment and the Ministry for Primary Industries and agricultural sector representatives to develop national regulation for stock exclusion from water bodies.

Economic use of fresh water

Efficiency and good management practice standards

39. Proposals 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 would require councils to apply technical efficiency standards for water allocation and good management practice standards for discharge allowances, in catchments that are at, or approaching, full allocation. The Forum notes that technical efficiency standards are already applied in Canterbury, and that our region has developed and is in the process of implementing industry agreed good management practices in the agricultural sector. The Forum would welcome the opportunity to share our knowledge and experience in developing these tools and securing sector and industry support, to help avoid any potential duplication of effort by central government and others.
40. Standards for water allocation and discharges of nitrogen and other nutrients will vary depending on climatic regimes, soil types and other factors. Therefore any standardisation should only be established at a catchment or sub-catchment level. This has been done in our region by the CWMS Zone Committees for nitrogen.
41. The Forum acknowledges that there are questions relating to the potential application of technical efficiency standards to any use of freshwater other than community drinking water supplies or irrigation – for example, different types of industrial uses.
42. The Forum questions the rationale behind the requirement for efficiency and good management standards only in catchments that are at or approaching full allocation. This has the potential to create inequities between different consent holders and different areas. This also would seem to assume that catchments can be downgraded without constraint until the issues become urgent. If efficiency and good management standards are important tools in achieving sustainable management and fulfilling the purposes of the RMA, there is a logic that they should apply to all users of fresh water and all creators of contaminant discharges.
43. The Forum supports Proposals 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 subject to the comments in paragraphs 38 – 42, and the recognition of councils' existing arrangements and the work that has gone into establishing effective standards with our communities and industry.

Mayors standing together for Canterbury.

Ashburton District Council • Canterbury Regional Council • Christchurch City Council • Hurunui District Council
Kaikoura District Council • MacKenzie District Council • Selwyn District Council • Timaru District Council
Waimakariri District Council • Waimate District Council • Waitaki District Council

Mayoral Forum Secretariat, C/- Environment Canterbury, PO Box 345, Christchurch 8140 T: 03 345 9323

Transfers to more efficient, higher valued uses

44. Proposal 2.4 would provide for investigation of measures to better enable transfers of allocated water and discharge allowances to higher valued uses. While there is some support from some of our member councils for transfer of water take consents within the same contributing catchment, the Forum does not consider that the proposal as currently framed acknowledges or addresses the real nature of the problems. The issues are extremely complex and multi-faceted, including technical, commercial and political dimensions, and the tensions between private interests and the public good.
45. The Forum considers that community use – eg for drinking water – should be recognised as the highest value use of fresh water. We consider that the definition of ‘higher value use’ provided in the *Consultation document* (p 24) is inadequate and needs revision to provide for a wider range of non-monetary values and benefits.
46. The Forum also notes that clarification is needed as to where the assessment and decision would be made as to what constitutes a higher valued use. It could be assumed that this would be determined by regional councils through planning and hearings processes under the RMA, but there would be potential for litigation and it would make sense to specify where the decision would be made and the criteria that would be applied.
47. The Forum considers that the challenges around appropriate measures for trading water and discharge permits will only be resolved through a process of collaboration and dialogue with the two Ministries, local government, tangata whenua and the relevant businesses and sectors.
48. ***The Forum recommends*** that a collaborative working group is established comprising representatives of local government to work with the Ministry for the Environment and the Ministry for Primary Industries, iwi and hapū and the relevant business sectors to develop the proposed measures to enable transfers of allocated water and discharge allowances to higher valued uses, including:
- *determining the full range of higher valued uses including non-monetary values and benefits*
 - *determining where the responsibility would lie for decisions as to what is deemed higher valued uses, and the criteria upon which those decisions are to be made.*

Addressing over-allocation and over-use

49. The Forum is supportive of the development of guidance for councils on possible measures to address over-allocation of water quality and quantity. However these issues are complex and extend well beyond the scope of the NPS-FM. An ongoing, long-term transition is needed that will not compromise the economic viability of regions and sectors. Once again the local government sector should be closely involved in the process, to ensure that existing council initiatives and experience are recognised and maximised, and to avoid unnecessary duplication of effort. The Forum notes that the measures outlined in the *Consultation document* (p 25) for Proposal 2.5 reflect the current approach in the Canterbury region.

Mayors standing together for Canterbury.

Ashburton District Council • Canterbury Regional Council • Christchurch City Council • Hurunui District Council
Kaikoura District Council • MacKenzie District Council • Selwyn District Council • Timaru District Council
Waimakariri District Council • Waimate District Council • Waitaki District Council

Mayoral Forum Secretariat, C/- Environment Canterbury, PO Box 345, Christchurch 8140 T: 03 345 9323

Council funding for freshwater management

50. The principles underpinning Proposal 2.6 as articulated in the *Consultation document* (p 25) are that councils should have more ability to recover costs from water users who impose costs on the freshwater management system for science, monitoring, management and enforcement. This provision should apply to TLAs as well as regional councils.
51. However the Forum questions the need for this proposal and considers that it needs clarification as to how it would be implemented. It is not clear whether it is envisaged that the proposed cost recovery would be enabled under the RMA through the NPS-FM, or through the LGA and councils' ratings processes. If the latter, there could be implications for TLA rates to regional councils. We note that councils are able to recover such costs already via a range of mechanisms and their ratings and revenue policy.
52. The Forum considers that Proposal 2.6 needs further discussion and development before it proceeds, including clarification of the scale and distribution of the need for cost recovery for these purposes, and the full range of existing mechanisms available to councils. There are also wider questions of the relationships between the benefits derived from consents and the consent holders who are the target of Proposal 2.6. The immediate consumers or polluters do not always exclusively benefit.

Iwi rights and interests in fresh water

53. The Forum is supportive in principle of most of the proposals in this section of the *Consultation document*. We note that current policy and practice of our member councils already establish constructive working relationships with Ngāi Tahu rūnanga, the mana whenua in our region and districts. We also note that iwi and hapū already have the ability to prepare Iwi Management Plans (IMPs) for the natural resources and taonga in their rohe, which will logically include the iwi or hapū statements of their relationships with significant water bodies. Councils are already required to have regard to IMPs.
54. The Forum supports Proposal 3.1, that the NPS-FM includes a purpose statement clarifying the meaning of *Te Mana o te Wai* and its status as the underpinning platform for community discussions on freshwater values, objectives and limits.
55. The Forum supports Proposal 3.2 requiring regional councils to reflect *Te Mana o te Wai* in their implementation of all relevant policies in the NPS-FM. As Environment Canterbury explains in their independent submission on the *Next Steps* proposals, the regional council's Tuia partnership agreement with Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu and the papatipu rūnanga of Canterbury region provides a strong foundation for mana whenua values and priorities to be integrated into policy and operations across the council.
56. The Forum supports Proposals 3.3 and 3.4 requiring councils to engage with iwi and hapū at the outset of freshwater planning processes and when identifying values and setting objectives for FMUs. We note that this is already standard practice for our member councils and Ngāi Tahu, and is supported by MOUs and other agreements between councils and rūnanga.

Mayors standing together for Canterbury.

Ashburton District Council • Canterbury Regional Council • Christchurch City Council • Hurunui District Council
Kaikoura District Council • MacKenzie District Council • Selwyn District Council • Timaru District Council
Waimakariri District Council • Waimate District Council • Waitaki District Council

Mayoral Forum Secretariat, C/- Environment Canterbury, PO Box 345, Christchurch 8140 T: 03 345 9323

57. However we would add the qualification to Proposal 3.3 that there is often a range of iwi and hapū relationships with water bodies and related sites with highly sensitive historical, cultural or spiritual significance to the community who hold mana whenua. In such cases it would be totally inappropriate for those places and relationships to be publicly identified in regional planning documents as specified in the current framing of Proposal 3.3. These kinds of situations can however be dealt with through a system of silent files and/or identification of the relevant iwi or hapū (or whanau) contacts to involve in council processes.
58. ***The Forum recommends*** that Proposal 3.3 is amended to allow for culturally appropriate measures to be agreed with the relevant iwi and hapū for water bodies and sites of highly sensitive historical, cultural or spiritual significance.
59. Proposal 3.5 would amend the RMA to establish provisions for a new rohe (region or catchment) based agreement between iwi and councils for natural resource management. The Forum notes the explanation provided by the Minister for the Environment at his public meeting in Christchurch on 17 March 2016 that this proposal would not conflict with the proposed iwi participation agreements (IPAs) advanced in the Resource Legislation Amendment Bill, although the *Consultation document* (p 30) states that the proposed *Mana whakahono a rohe* agreement would be an alternative to an IPA. However it is not clear how either of these proposed mechanisms would sit in relation to our member councils' existing relationship agreements and practical working partnerships with Ngāi Tahu rūnanga.
60. The Forum considers that the lack of clarity or detail provided for Proposal 3.5 makes it difficult to provide useful comment on this proposal. These questions need the involvement of local government in the proposed work with the Iwi Leaders Forum to determine the best way forward.
61. ***The Forum recommends*** that a collaborative working group is established comprising representatives of local government to work with the Ministry for the Environment and the Ministry for Primary Industries and the Iwi Leaders Forum to develop appropriate measures for agreements between iwi and hapū and local government for natural resource management and freshwater management in particular.
62. Proposal 3.6 sets out a range of amendments to the RMA relating to the processes for Water Conservation Order (WCO) applications. The Forum supports the first two points included in this proposal – for iwi involvement in WCO application processes and for the needs of iwi / tāngata whenua to be considered. However the remaining points in the proposal are not related in any way to iwi rights and interests in freshwater, and it is not clear why they have been included at this point in the *Consultation document*. There is no explanation provided of the rationale or need for these additional WCO measures. These remaining matters need clarification and separation from section 3 of the proposals.
63. ***The Forum recommends*** that the third, fourth and fifth bullet points of Proposal 3.6 are deleted and the measures proposed in them for WCO processes are advanced separately with adequate articulation of the need and rationale for these measures.

Mayors standing together for Canterbury.

Ashburton District Council • Canterbury Regional Council • Christchurch City Council • Hurunui District Council
Kaikoura District Council • MacKenzie District Council • Selwyn District Council • Timaru District Council
Waimakariri District Council • Waimate District Council • Waitaki District Council

Mayoral Forum Secretariat, C/- Environment Canterbury, PO Box 345, Christchurch 8140 T: 03 345 9323

64. The Forum acknowledges the need for consideration of the resourcing implications of these proposals, and the challenges for both councils and rūnanga in dealing with a wide range of resource management issues with often limited capacities. We support Proposal 3.7, that central government, via the Ministry for the Environment, facilitate and resource programmes to support councils and iwi and hapū. However we suggest that clarification is needed on what would constitute 'resourcing' of such programmes. We also note that some councils are already undertaking proactive initiatives in these areas, working with local rūnanga and with their staff to develop capacities and build awareness. It will be important that local government and iwi and hapū are involved in determining the proposed capacity-building programmes, to ensure that they do not undermine or replicate existing initiatives.
65. The Forum strongly supports Proposal 3.8 for possible additional funding for water infrastructure at marae and papakāinga, and suggests that the Government should consider not limiting the scope of this to iwi and hapū but extending such support to other small remote communities. The Forum notes that funding previously provided through the Ministry of Health's Capital Assistance Programme is about to finish, and that many small rural communities face significant challenges in ensuring safe, reliable water.
66. **The Forum recommends** that Proposal 3.8 is extended to include consideration of the needs for water infrastructure of other small remote communities.

Funding

67. The proposed criteria for eligibility for Government funding for freshwater projects are fairly well aligned with the frameworks established for projects in Canterbury under the CWMS. However the Forum has some questions for clarification, including:
- The proposal that 'any legal entity' would be eligible – would this include private companies and commercial organisations?
 - Clarification is needed of the requirement that 'the overall public and private benefits are clearly demonstrated to be greater than the public and private costs' (third bullet point, p 37 *Consultation document*).
 - Clarification is needed of the kinds of environmental benefits envisaged from irrigation projects (fourth bullet point, p 37 *Consultation document*).
 - Clarification is needed as to whether land purchase options are included under the proposed projects.
 - The minimum threshold of \$250,000 Government funding, to be 50% maximum of total funding, indicates that the Government is considering only quite large scale projects of minimum \$500,000. However in our councils' experience, enormous benefits including community buy-in are generated by relatively small projects with local significance. It is not clear whether a range of smaller projects might be packaged together to make a larger bid within this framework.
 - Clarification is needed of how the proposed funding would align with other funding schemes including the Ministry of Primary Industries' Irrigation Acceleration Fund.

Mayors standing together for Canterbury.

Ashburton District Council • Canterbury Regional Council • Christchurch City Council • Hurunui District Council
Kaikoura District Council • MacKenzie District Council • Selwyn District Council • Timaru District Council
Waimakariri District Council • Waimate District Council • Waitaki District Council

Mayoral Forum Secretariat, C/- Environment Canterbury, PO Box 345, Christchurch 8140 T: 03 345 9323

Conclusion

68. The Forum appreciates the opportunity to provide this submission on the proposals for freshwater management, the NPS-FM and the RMA. Our member councils are actively involved in ongoing work for improved management of Canterbury region's freshwater resources, through the CWMS and implementation of the Zone Committees' priorities, and a range of local government roles and functions including planning, consenting and engagement with our local communities and with Ngāi Tahu rūnanga.
69. The Forum welcomes the opportunity for further interaction with the two leading Ministries on the matters advanced in these proposals. A number of the recommendations we have offered in this submission advise the establishment of collaborative working groups to bring together local and central government to share the task of reviewing and refining the proposals to ensure practical, effective solutions to the needs of councils, business, farming, iwi and hapū, and communities. The Forum itself is a practical demonstration of the power of collaboration around common goals, bringing together Canterbury's councils to share our knowledge and experience, and to speak with a strong voice for our region and its interests. We are confident that a similar collaborative approach will be effective to address the questions and detail of implementation that remain around a number of the proposals included in the *Next Steps* package, and we look forward to contributing to these processes.

For further enquiries, please contact the Secretariat for the Canterbury Policy Forum:

Dr Ronnie Cooper, Environment Canterbury

ronnie.cooper@ecan.govt.nz / 027-839-2565

Mayors standing together for Canterbury.

Ashburton District Council • Canterbury Regional Council • Christchurch City Council • Hurunui District Council
Kaikoura District Council • MacKenzie District Council • Selwyn District Council • Timaru District Council
Waimakariri District Council • Waimate District Council • Waitaki District Council

Mayoral Forum Secretariat, C/- Environment Canterbury, PO Box 345, Christchurch 8140 T: 03 345 9323

Submission to the Local Government and Environment Select Committee

CANTERBURY Mayoral Forum

A strong regional economy with resilient, connected communities and a better quality of life, for all.

Resource Legislation Amendment Bill

24 March 2016

1. The Canterbury Mayoral Forum (the Forum) is pleased to have this opportunity to offer comment on the Resource Legislation Amendment Bill (the Bill) and the proposed changes to the Resource Management Act 1991 (the RMA).
2. The Forum acknowledges the generosity of the Committee in allowing an extension of time for us to confer amongst our member councils to make the following submission. This submission provides more substantive comment further to our earlier submission (Number W0MV7T7).
3. The Forum wishes to be heard in support of our submissions.

Context

4. The Canterbury Mayoral Forum comprises the Mayors of the ten territorial local authorities in Canterbury and the Chair of Environment Canterbury, supported by our Chief Executives. The purpose of the Forum is to promote collaboration across the region and to increase the effectiveness of local government in meeting the needs of Canterbury's communities.
5. All Canterbury councils actively participate in the Forum: Kaikōura District Council, Hurunui District Council, Waimakariri District Council, Christchurch City Council, Selwyn District Council, Ashburton District Council, Mackenzie District Council, Timaru District Council, Waimate District Council, Waitaki District Council and Environment Canterbury.
6. The Forum work programme is implemented by the Canterbury Chief Executives Forum and the Canterbury Policy Forum. For matters that impinge on planning, the Policy Forum is supported by the Canterbury Planning Managers Group.
7. The following submission has been developed by members of the Canterbury Planning Managers Group, and approved by the Forum. This submission records matters on which there is a consensus view amongst the region's councils, with additional comment on some matters where our member councils have a range of views and concerns.
8. Individual Canterbury councils have separately provided their own submissions on the Bill. This submission is not intended to replace or detract from any of those

Mayors standing together for Canterbury.

Ashburton District Council • Canterbury Regional Council • Christchurch City Council • Hurunui District Council
Kaikōura District Council • MacKenzie District Council • Selwyn District Council • Timaru District Council
Waimakariri District Council • Waimate District Council • Waitaki District Council

Mayoral Forum Secretariat, C/- Environment Canterbury, PO Box 345, Christchurch 8140 T: 03 345 9323

9. independent council submissions.

General Comments

10. The Bill introduces some worthwhile and welcome reforms which all Canterbury councils support. These proposed changes include:
- the addition of the management of natural hazard risks as a matter of national importance in s6 RMA, and the associated amendment to s106 RMA (clause 133 of the Bill)
 - regulation power to remove stock from water bodies
 - on-line servicing of documents.
11. Some other provisions of the Bill are supported in principle, such as the scaling of process costs, the collaborative and streamlined planning processes, and the introduction of Iwi Participation Agreements. However Canterbury councils' support for these proposals will depend on how the proposed new processes would work in practice. There is still considerable detail to come in relation to such matters as the proposed National Planning Template, regulations relating to fast track applications, and the proposed regulatory powers to prohibit and remove council planning provisions. The details of what these proposals could mean for local government and for our communities and stakeholder groups, and the costs these new processes may impose in implementation, are of concern to Canterbury councils.
12. The Forum notes that a theme of the Bill is the proposed new regulatory powers, and that in a number of instances the Bill in its current form would provide for regulation to be made by Order-in-Council. We acknowledge that the Bill includes requirements for public notification and consultation processes, and for evaluations under s32 RMA, for the introduction of some of the proposed measures (for example the provisions for the preparation of the National Planning Template (clause 37 of the Bill) and for regulations to permit or prohibit certain rules (clause 105 of the Bill)). However some of our member councils are concerned that there is not necessarily a public participation process for an Order-in-Council, and that local government and communities may have limited opportunity to provide input to those decisions.
13. The Bill proposes a number of changes to the RMA that Canterbury councils consider will complicate planning processes and increase process costs for local government. Some of these are outlined in the following specific points of submission.

Specific Points of Submission

National Planning Template

14. The Forum members are not able to support the National Planning Template (NPT) proposals in their current form in the Bill.
15. Some Forum members support the underlying principle and intent behind the NPT, to achieve greater consistency in plan making. Some Forum members agree with measures to establish common definitions, but many of the member councils are opposed to an NPT which would go beyond that to prescribe rules, objectives and policies in councils' plans. The view of many of the member councils is that an overly

Mayors standing together for Canterbury.

Ashburton District Council • Canterbury Regional Council • Christchurch City Council • Hurunui District Council
 Kaikoura District Council • MacKenzie District Council • Selwyn District Council • Timaru District Council
 Waimakariri District Council • Waimate District Council • Waitaki District Council

Mayoral Forum Secretariat, C/- Environment Canterbury, PO Box 345, Christchurch 8140 T: 03 345 9323

prescriptive NPT would override local community planning, would reduce flexibility and adaptability in plans, and would not allow for plan provisions specific to local areas and local conditions. Although some standardisation is supported in principle, some member councils consider that it is important that any common definitions and rules are not made mandatory, to ensure the ability for local authorities to provide appropriately for local conditions, requirements and aspirations in plans.

16. Some Forum members consider that the NPT as currently proposed would duplicate the provisions of existing national instruments under the RMA (National Policy Statements (NPSs) and National Environmental Standards (NESs)).
17. Some Forum members are concerned about the timeframes for introduction of the proposed NPT and the implications for councils' resourcing and planning schedules. The proposed new s58I(1) RMA would require the Minister to have the first National Planning Template (NPT) within two years of Assent of the Bill. Some Canterbury local authorities have recently completed district plan processes. The current proposals in the Bill would require councils to amend their plans to be consistent with the NPT within two years of Royal Assent rather than following the current 10 year review period under s79 RMA. This would be unreasonably costly, inefficient and inequitable.
18. Two Forum members, Christchurch City and Waimakariri District Councils, are opposed to the NPT and consider that it should not proceed.
19. Much of the implementation detail around the proposed NPT is yet to be determined. The Forum considers that, should the NPT proceed through your Committee's consideration of the Bill and the subsequent Parliamentary process, the most efficient and effective way to work through the issues with the scope and implementation of an NPT would be to involve local government in a collaborative process with the Ministry for the Environment, via a sector working group.
20. The Forum recommends that, if the proposal for a National Planning Template proceeds, a sector working group is established, comprising representatives of local government, to work in collaboration with the Ministry for the Environment to inform the development of the Template, including standard definitions and rules.

Hearings Commissioners

21. Clause 16 of the Bill would amend s34A RMA, to require councils to consult tangata whenua through iwi authorities on whether it would be appropriate to appoint a commissioner with an understanding of tikanga Māori and the perspectives of local iwi or hapū for a Schedule 1 hearing process. Some Canterbury councils have concerns over the implications of this proposal, because of their uncertainty about the availability of suitably qualified commissioners, and possible cost burdens for councils and applicants outside the main urban areas.
22. Clause 17 of the Bill proposes the insertion of a new s34B RMA, that councils may fix a fee for hearings commissioners, but must fix a fee if required by regulation. Some Canterbury Councils have concerns about the implications of potential fixed fees for the availability of suitably qualified commissioners.

Mayors standing together for Canterbury.

Ashburton District Council • Canterbury Regional Council • Christchurch City Council • Hurunui District Council
Kaikoura District Council • MacKenzie District Council • Selwyn District Council • Timaru District Council
Waimakariri District Council • Waimate District Council • Waitaki District Council

Mayoral Forum Secretariat, C/- Environment Canterbury, PO Box 345, Christchurch 8140 T: 03 345 9323

23. Some Canterbury councils also point out that there are implications of fixed fees on the consent process. Some of our member councils are concerned about the risk that with fixed fees set by regulation, any additional or unanticipated costs of the hearings process would need to be met by ratepayers. The Forum notes that this risk would have particularly severe impact on councils with smaller ratepayer bases, of which there are a number in our region.

Collaborative and Streamlined Planning Processes

24. Clause 52 of the Bill and the proposed new Parts 4 and 5 of Schedule 1 RMA would establish two new planning process options. Canterbury councils support the development of collaborative and streamlined planning processes in principle, but many of our members are not able to support the proposals as currently framed in the Bill. Our member councils have a range of concerns about the implementation, efficiency and effectiveness of the proposed new planning options. One of the Forum members, Christchurch City Council, recommends that the proposals as currently drafted should be rejected to allow for the development of more practical options.
25. Should these proposals proceed through your Committee's consideration of the Bill and the subsequent Parliamentary process, the Forum considers that a collaborative sector working group would be the most appropriate way to ensure that local government practitioners' experience and expertise are maximised to develop the detail of how such planning options would work in practice.
26. ***The Forum recommends*** that, if the proposals for collaborative and streamlined planning processes proceed, a sector working group is established, comprising representatives of local government, to work in collaboration with the Ministry for the Environment to review the proposals and to develop appropriate processes and guidance.

Iwi Participation Arrangements

27. Canterbury councils support the proposal at clause 38 of the Bill to provide for Iwi Participation Arrangements – provided that these are not mandatory, and provided that the Bill is clarified to recognise existing arrangements between councils and iwi and hapū. The Forum considers that it is crucial that the Bill recognises existing mutually acceptable formal relationships between iwi and councils. Such well-established partnerships and arrangements have been developed over time and are firmly based in goodwill, understanding and ongoing practical working interactions between the parties.
28. ***The Forum recommends*** that the Bill's provisions for establishing Iwi Participation Arrangements are amended to clarify that the establishment of these arrangements would not be mandatory, and would not be necessary if a local authority and an iwi or hapū already have a satisfactory relationship agreement to provide for participation of the iwi or hapū in council processes.

On-line servicing of documents

29. The Forum supports the proposals in clauses 68-70 and clause 142 for electronic servicing of documents. We note that some minor administrative processes would need to be established to cater for situations where email addresses are changed,

Mayors standing together for Canterbury.

Ashburton District Council • Canterbury Regional Council • Christchurch City Council • Hurunui District Council
Kaikoura District Council • MacKenzie District Council • Selwyn District Council • Timaru District Council
Waimakariri District Council • Waimate District Council • Waitaki District Council

Mayoral Forum Secretariat, C/- Environment Canterbury, PO Box 345, Christchurch 8140 T: 03 345 9323

such as a practice note to ensure that electronic addresses for serving of notices are automatically sent with a request for a delivery and read receipt.

Regulations to exclude stock from water bodies

30. The Forum supports the proposals for regulatory powers to exclude stock from water bodies. However one of our member councils notes their concerns in relation to the prohibition of grazing where animals are being used to control weeds in riverbeds and where the impacts on water quality are minimal.

Sufficient Development Capacity

31. There are a range of views amongst Canterbury councils on the Bill's proposed changes to the roles of regional councils and territorial local authorities (clauses 11 and 12). Some of our member councils have noted their concerns about the proposal to set a definition of "development capacity" within the RMA, considering that this may have unintended consequences. Some councils consider there could be a risk that costly infrastructure could be required to be provided too far ahead of actual need.
32. The Forum notes the requirement under the Local Government Act 2002 for all councils to establish 30-year Infrastructure Strategies in association with Long-Term Plans. We also note the concurrent process and consultation for the development of a NPS for Urban Development which will address related issues around development capacity. Some of our member councils consider it would be more appropriate for a definition of "development capacity" to be incorporated within the proposed NPS rather than being inserted into ss 30 and 31 RMA.

Regulatory Power to Prohibit and Remove Planning Provisions

33. The proposed new regulation powers in clause 105 of the Bill are particularly of concern for Canterbury councils, giving central government regulatory power to prohibit a local authority from making specified rules, and power to override rules in a council plan that then must be withdrawn. District plan and regional plan rules have gone through a rigorous public process and reflect the values and aspirations of the community. Many of the Forum member councils consider that this proposed regulatory power would undermine the purpose and intent of RMA plans, and would diminish and devalue the comprehensive public process to develop the rules in the first place.
34. ***The Forum recommends*** that the regulation making powers proposed at clause 105 are deleted from the Bill.

Regulations Relating to Fast-track Applications

35. Clause 151 of the Bill would establish new provisions for fast tracked consent applications, including the addition of particular activities or classes of activities by Order-in-Council. Some Canterbury councils consider that nominating particular activities could create conflict with existing provisions in district plans, and in the case of effects-based plans, may lead to changes being required to the plan, with the attendant costs to councils and communities of that process.

Mayors standing together for Canterbury.

Ashburton District Council • Canterbury Regional Council • Christchurch City Council • Hurunui District Council
Kaikoura District Council • MacKenzie District Council • Selwyn District Council • Timaru District Council
Waimakariri District Council • Waimate District Council • Waitaki District Council

Mayoral Forum Secretariat, C/- Environment Canterbury, PO Box 345, Christchurch 8140 T: 03 345 9323

36. Views on this proposal amongst Forum members are divided. The regional council Environment Canterbury supports it in principle, while noting concerns with applications requiring substantive assessments and recommending an amendment to clause 121 of the Bill to allow for exclusion where technical review, scientific assessment or assessment of cultural effects is required. However the territorial local authorities are opposed to the proposal, for similar reasons in relation to the challenges of meeting a ten-day timeline when there is a need for expert reports and assessments to determine the effects and appropriate consent conditions. Christchurch City Council rejects this proposal, noting that there are insufficient safeguards around the type of activity that regulations could prescribe to be fast tracked.
37. Several Canterbury councils already have provision for fast track processes for genuinely straightforward applications, and practice fast tracking of such applications at present. However Forum member councils note the importance of local authorities retaining the flexibility to manage consenting processes appropriately given the complexity of some applications and the resourcing available.
38. The Forum considers that this is another matter where, if the proposal for a fast-track consent process proceeds through your Committee's consideration of the Bill and the subsequent Parliamentary process, the issues would best be resolved via a sector working group to go through the implications of these sections of the Bill to avoid any perverse or unintended consequences.
39. ***The Forum recommends*** that, if the proposal for a fast-track consent process proceeds, a sector working group is established, comprising representatives of local government, to work in collaboration with the Ministry for the Environment to inform the development of the process, including guidance and criteria for local authorities.

Boundary activities

40. Clause 122 of the Bill would create a new s87BA RMA providing that boundary activities approved by neighbours on affected boundaries are permitted activities. This is not supported in its current form by the majority of territorial local authorities in the Forum. While it would seem to be intended to reduce unnecessary resource consent costs, it would not allow for cumulative effects to be considered, and could give rise to undesirable outcomes.
41. Clause 128 of the Bill would specify persons eligible to be considered affected persons for the purpose of limited notification. The Forum's territorial local authority members have concerns about the interaction of these proposals with the proposals in clause 122, including questions relating to subdivisions and affected persons, the eligibility of iwi or hapū in relation to activities impacting upon sites within a silent file area or identified as wāhi taonga, and sites with heritage or archaeological values.
42. Canterbury territorial local authorities consider that the limitations as currently proposed could potentially lead to more public notifications, although this could only be done under special circumstances. Some district plans are not set up to automatically preclude notification for all discretionary (restricted) and discretionary subdivisions. The proposals could require councils to review their subdivision objectives, policies and methods in their district plan, imposing more costs on local government. Again the

Mayors standing together for Canterbury.

Ashburton District Council • Canterbury Regional Council • Christchurch City Council • Hurunui District Council
Kaikoura District Council • MacKenzie District Council • Selwyn District Council • Timaru District Council
Waimakariri District Council • Waimate District Council • Waitaki District Council

Mayoral Forum Secretariat, C/- Environment Canterbury, PO Box 345, Christchurch 8140 T: 03 345 9323

Forum considers that the potential complications and perverse outcomes of these proposals will best be resolved by engaging with local government practitioners.

43. **The Forum recommends** that a sector working group is established to work in collaboration with the Ministry for the Environment to review the implications of the proposed new provisions for boundary activities and avoid any perverse or unintended consequences from these sections of the bill.

Public Notification of Consent Applications

44. Clause 125 of the Bill would establish prescriptive criteria for determining whether or not applications should be notified or limited notified. The proposed process is mandatory and complicated, with cross-referencing to other sections of the RMA. It is unclear whether existing notification clauses in plans would still stand if they are not covered by the new provisions. There is the potential for challenge if all the adverse effects are not identified upfront, or the applicant considers some effects have been identified that should not have been. There is the potential for the erosion of participatory rights.
45. Some Canterbury councils consider it probable that consent processes would become more adversarial, and more complex and time consuming, as participants attempt to cover all potential effects. This likely outcome would be inconsistent with the aims and objects of the Bill, and would create additional costs for councils, applicants and communities. There could be further need for costly plan change processes to establish more appropriate activity status for certain activities to ensure that local requirements and standards are given effect under the proposed new notification criteria.
46. **The Forum recommends** that clause 125 is deleted from the Bill.

Striking Out Submissions

47. Clause 120 of the Bill would introduce new additional requirements that a submission or part of a resource consent submission must be struck out if it does not meet certain criteria specified in the proposed new s41D(2). Canterbury Councils are concerned about the workability and likely outcomes of these requirements. The Bill does not define “sufficient factual basis” nor specify where the responsibility would lie to determine this in relation to particular consent submissions. Furthermore the Forum is concerned by the strong likelihood that this proposal would adversely affect participation of lay people, who may be the parties most affected by the process, particularly in smaller rural communities where amenity values may be deemed to have “insufficient factual basis”.
48. **The Forum recommends** that clause 120 is deleted from the Bill.

Conclusion

49. The Forum considers that some of the proposed reforms in the Bill are worthwhile and welcome, as noted above. However there are a number of proposals which raise significant concerns for our member councils. The Forum acknowledges that with some matters in the Bill there is a range of views and concerns amongst its member councils. With regard to some other matters there is consensus amongst all

Mayors standing together for Canterbury.

Ashburton District Council • Canterbury Regional Council • Christchurch City Council • Hurunui District Council
Kaikoura District Council • MacKenzie District Council • Selwyn District Council • Timaru District Council
Waimakariri District Council • Waimate District Council • Waitaki District Council

Mayoral Forum Secretariat, C/- Environment Canterbury, PO Box 345, Christchurch 8140 T: 03 345 9323

Canterbury councils. The submission above has outlined as clearly as possible those areas of shared opinion, and areas where the concerns expressed are the views of a number of our member councils.

50. For further enquiries, please contact the Secretariat for the Canterbury Policy Forum:

Dr Ronnie Cooper, Environment Canterbury

ronnie.cooper@ecan.govt.nz / 027-839-2565

Mayors standing together for Canterbury.

*Ashburton District Council • Canterbury Regional Council • Christchurch City Council • Hurunui District Council
Kaikoura District Council • MacKenzie District Council • Selwyn District Council • Timaru District Council
Waimakariri District Council • Waimate District Council • Waitaki District Council*

Mayoral Forum Secretariat, C/- Environment Canterbury, PO Box 345, Christchurch 8140 T: 03 345 9323

Canterbury Policy Forum

Item 9

Date: 6 May 2016

Presented by: Steve Gibling, Secretariat

Regional Land Transport Plan

Purpose

This paper provides information about upcoming changes to the strategy in the Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP) that were approved by the Regional Transport Committee (RTC) on 29 April 2016.

Recommendations

That the Canterbury Policy Forum:

- 1 **note** the contents of this report.

Background

- 1 In 2015, the RTC and Canterbury Mayoral Forum requested a variation to the strategic section at the front of the current RLTP.
- 2 The purpose of this work was to better align the RLTP with the Canterbury Regional Economic Development Strategy, so that it reflects a more multi-modal and integrated philosophy.
- 3 To ensure this was supported by stakeholders across Canterbury, significant consultation was undertaken using a three-stage process (involving one-on-one meetings, workshops and written submissions).

Resulting changes to the RLTP

- 4 The replacement pages, developed over a seven-month period involving significant consultation, have created a far more comprehensive and strategic front end to the RLTP.
- 5 In summary, the replacement pages (discussed in further detail below):
 - outline Canterbury's demographics, economy and transport system
 - explain the drivers of change in Canterbury's transport system
 - comprehensively define the foreseen issues and challenges faced by the region
 - set out the overarching strategic response.
- 6 The context for the Canterbury region will now form part of the RLTP, and includes key information about Canterbury's population, economy, and the different components of the transport system (land, rail, air and sea), as well as inter-regional and international linkages. This is followed by a discussion of the strategic drivers of the transport system, including the international and domestic economy, population change, international and domestic visitors, technological change, and vulnerability to hazards.

- 7 The six challenges identified in the current RLTP have been replaced by a more comprehensive discussion of around 15 issues and challenges faced by the Canterbury region (which include and elaborate on those in the current RLTP). These can be summarised as follows:
- maintaining and improving levels of access and mobility
 - providing a range of transport and non-transport options to ensure people can access what they need in the way of goods, services and activities
 - supporting freight growth by taking an integrated multi-modal approach
 - developing the transport system to safely support domestic and international visitor growth
 - ensuring transport options are affordable, particularly given likely funding constraints
 - managing private vehicle traffic growth to reduce the economic cost of delays and ensure accessibility is maintained
 - improving road safety for all road users
 - ensuring transport makes a positive contribution to population health
 - managing the environmental impacts of transport
 - managing network security through minimising the risk of disruption by natural hazards on key regional and inter-regional transport routes
 - meeting the transport needs of dispersed communities and ensuring future land use development allows social and economic needs to be met most efficiently and affordably
 - ensuring the network is resilient to energy supply and fuel price volatility, moving toward a system that is less reliant on oil
 - managing the transport impacts of anticipated population change
 - taking advantage of iterative technological advances and managing disruptive technologic advances
 - managing traffic issues result from earthquake impacts (in particular, land use change).
- 8 The final section on the overarching strategic response sets out the key changes stakeholders would like to see. In essence, stakeholders want to see the RTC reach out more to neighbouring regions and other transport providers as a way to integrate the transport system and deliver multi-modal solutions to meet the identified future challenges in a way that is affordable to communities as well as industry.
- 9 This will require the establishment of meaningful structures for collaboration and knowledge sharing to better understand the movement of freight and people around the region and will, in turn, enable opportunities for better integration and multi-model solutions. Better integration of business-as-usual programmes and activities is also likely to be a benefit of closer collaboration between transport entities.

Next steps

- 10 Environment Canterbury will be asked to approve this variation in May 2016.
- 11 This work creates the need for the objectives and policies in the RLTP to be revised, as the current objectives and policies do not reflect the new emphasis on integration and multi-modal solutions. This will then establish the framework for evaluating future transport responses and activities proposed by RTC member organisations, as well as other entities. As such, the policies and objectives will need to be revised in time for the start of the statutory RLTP review that will commence early next year.