SUMMARY STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE

In the matter of	the Resource Management Act 1991
And	a submission and further submissions on Proposed Waikato Regional Plan Change 1 – Waikato and Waipā River Catchments (PPC1)
Submitter's Name:	Hamilton City Council (HCC)
Submission Number:	74051
Hearing Topics:	**Part B – Outcomes:** • **Overall direction and whole plan submissions** • **Values and uses** • **Objectives**
Type of Evidence:	Summary presented at the hearing
Witness:	Paul Stanley Ryan
Date:	13 March 2019

Introduction

1. My name is Paul Stanley Ryan. I appear in support of Hamilton City Council's submission and further submissions.
2. I am a Principal Planner at Hamilton City Council.
3. I have prepared three statements of primary evidence, three statements of rebuttal evidence and one supplementary statement of evidence.
4. I also prepared Council's submission and further submissions in collaboration with my colleagues.
5. In this presentation I will provide a brief outline of Council's response to the Proposed Plan Change and the relief it seeks relevant to the Block 1 hearing. I will also outline a change I wish to make to my evidence on Objective 3. Finally, I will comment on the relief the Waikato Region Territorial Authorities Group (WARTA) is seeking.

Outline of Council's response to the Proposed Plan Change

6. Hamilton City Council recognises the need to give effect to the NPS-FM and the NPS-UDC and to achieve, over time, the Vision and Strategy for Waikato River.
7. Prior to drafting its submission on Plan Change 1, Council engaged consultants to assess the high-level implications of the Plan Change for Hamilton City and its operations.
8. The assessment concluded that Council will face significant technical challenges when trying to meet the Plan Change's requirements and water quality targets.

9. Consequently, Council anticipates it will face significant future costs relating to accommodating population growth and complying with the water quality targets. For example, Council's 2018-48 Infrastructure Strategy identifies expenditure of $260M in years 11 to 30 for upgrading the Wastewater Treatment Plant.
10. Council intends to do what is best for the river but seeks a policy framework that maximises the range of tools and flexibility to achieve the water quality targets.
11. Accordingly, Council's submission supports the Plan Change in parts and opposes it in other parts.
12. Council's submission does not oppose the water quality targets set out in Table 3.11-1.

The relief Council seeks

13. In broad outline, the relief Council seeks can be characterised as being of three types.
    a. Firstly, Council seeks policy recognition for municipal discharges and planned urban growth. Within the scope of the Block 1 hearing this includes recognition of the *National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity* within the "Background and explanation" section of the Plan Change. This recognition is vital because this national policy statement requires Council to provide for urban growth, and this growth will generate more urban stormwater and wastewater to be treated and discharged to the Waikato and Waipaa Rivers.
    b. Secondly, Council seeks retention of provisions that will afford Council and other municipal dischargers flexibility in how they fulfil their various statutory responsibilities and functions and meet the challenging targets in the Plan Change. In this respect, Council seeks retention of provisions allowing four things:
        i. Continuation of municipal point source discharges under existing consent terms until the consents expire;
        ii. A staged approach to achieving the 80-year targets; and
        iii. Employment of the Best Practicable Option; and
        iv. Employment of offset measures.
    c. The third type of relief Council's submission seeks is amendments to the wording of provisions to make them clearer and more certain.
14. Within these three types of relief, my evidence seeks some specific relief.
    a. First, I seek amendments that will distinguish between "natural" and "constructed" wetlands. Council does not want the constructed wetlands it will be relying on to treat urban stormwater to be caught by provisions that are intended to apply to natural wetlands only. Failure to make this distinction could reduce the efficiency and effectiveness of constructed wetlands and

add unnecessary cost to achieving the water quality targets for the Waikato River.

b. The second set of relief I seek is amendments to the value and use statements, so they are expressed in consistent and comprehensive terms and don't account more than once for the same value and use.
c. And thirdly, I also seek recognition of the "drainage" value and use of the Waikato and Waipaa Rivers.

Changes to my evidence re Objective 3

15. I wish to change my evidence about Objective 3 to correct a problem with the relief it seeks.
16. I have prepared a brief statement of supplementary evidence to correct this matter. With the Chairman's permission, I would like to table that evidence and read two paragraphs of it.
17. [Read para 8 and 9]

WARTA Relief (Waikato Regional Territorial Authorities)

18. Hamilton City Council has prepared its own submission and further submission and I am presenting evidence in support of these.
19. Hamilton City Council is also a party to the Waikato Regional Territorial Authorities group (WARTA), which has made further submissions and prepared evidence.
20. There are some differences between the relief Hamilton City Council and WARTA seek.
21. I do not support all the relief WARTA's expert evidence seeks. In my opinion, some of it seeks removal or amendment of provisions Hamilton City Council wishes to retain.
22. I mention this to clarify that Hamilton City Council does not wish the panel to regard its submissions and evidence as secondary in any way to those of WARTA.
23. It is my intention to discuss my differences with WARTA prior to their appearance at the hearing.

Conclusion

24. This concludes my presentation. I have outlined the Council's response to the Plan Change and the relief Council is seeking. I have set out a change to my evidence regarding Objective 3, and I have alerted you to the fact that I have some issues with the relief WARTA seeks. I now invite any questions the Commissioners may have for me.

HCC Reference: D-2916672