

Report to Rural Services and Wairarapa Committee
from Peter Holden, Resource Advisor

Land Use Compliance Monitoring - Annual Report 1998/99

1. Purpose

To inform the committee of compliance monitoring of land use consents during the 1998/99 year.

2. Background

2.1 Compliance monitoring of land use consents is required under the Council's Resource Management Charging Policy. Most land use consents receive a 'one-off' charge which is invoiced once a compliance inspection has been made. The resource management charge comprises a customer service charge, an inspection charge, and charge for reporting to the client.

2.2 The table below summarises land use compliance monitoring undertaken during the period from 1 July 1998 to 30 June 1999.

Inspection Type	Number of Inspections	Number of Consents Processed During Period
Gravel – Consent	41	72
Gravel – Reach	17	N/A
Logging & Tracking	2	25*
Vegetation Clearance and Tracking	0	0
Tracking	0	0
Structures and River Works	19	40
Soil Disturbance	0	0
Total	79	137

* includes those consents processed in previous years requiring inspections in 1998/99. The majority of inspections were undertaken to assess compliance with conditions on consents for extraction of gravel from rivers.

3. Results

3.1 Gravel

- (1) Formal compliance monitoring of almost all one-off gravel extractions has occurred. This has been achieved through either specific site inspections or through undertaking “reach inspections” which assess the effects of a large number of consents in a particular length of river. Staff have endeavoured to carry out compliance inspections shortly following the completion of the activity in order to assess the performance of individual contractors.
- (2) Compliance with these consents was generally very good with sites left tidy and well rehabilitated. Only in two cases were sites found to be untidy. In both cases the contractors were contacted and it was discovered that they had not yet finished their extractions. Follow up inspections found the sites to be well rehabilitated.
- (3) In terms of compliance on annual sites informal monitoring occurs on the majority of reaches where extraction is occurring. From basic anecdotal information supplied by the Council’s technical and field staff generally the level of compliance with resource consents appears to be reasonably good.
- (4) A trend that emerged was that although there was good compliance amongst the larger extractions, there were problems associated with small extractions in the order of 20m³ -30m³ where the bed was left in an untidy state. This occurred at sites such as the Kokotau Bridge and at the end of Kuratawhiti Street.

Under the Proposed Regional Freshwater Plan landowners that live adjacent the rivers are allowed to extract 50m³ of gravel as a permitted activity. This may be the source of some of these small extractions however it may also be contractors extracting gravel for small one off jobs. This is difficult to prove and evidence of these small extractions is soon removed by the next flood.

3.2 River Works (Disturbance of Bed, Culvert and Bridge Construction)

- (1) Compliance monitoring occurred for 19 of the 40 consents processed during the last year. Those not currently inspected include those which have not yet been started or need to be inspected after the next significant flood event. Alternatively photos have been submitted.

- (2) Submission of photographs is a cost saving approach for those consent holders who have constructed structures such as bridges or culverts that have little or no ongoing adverse effects. Supplying photographs means the overall compliance charge can be lowered by eliminating the inspection component.
- (3) From the inspections undertaken there has been a good level of compliance and tidiness with these jobs. Bank protection works and channel realignments all appear to be functioning well. This includes work which was undertaken under emergency works status following the late 1998 floods.
- (4) Of disappointment was work undertaken by the Carterton District Council in the Waiohine River. The District Council realigned part of the channel adjacent to the Gorge Road in order to protect it from further erosion. Although they had been granted consent to undertake the work, it was disappointing to learn that they had undertaken the work outside the term of their consent which had been set to avoid the trout spawning season.

3.3 Logging, Tracking and Land Clearance

- (1) Compliance monitoring was undertaken for only a few of the logging and tracking consents processed in the last 2 years.
- (2) Compliance monitoring of logging consents has tended to occur following the clearance or planting phases, or at the end of the actual logging operation, hence providing a dual compliance and educational role as the activity progresses. On this basis many logging consents have yet to be inspected.
- (3) There has also been a down turn in the number of consents processed for logging, tracking and land clearance activities over the past year.
- (4) The few inspections which have been undertaken have shown a good level of compliance. No follow up inspections have been required.

4. Conclusion

- 4.1 Whilst overall compliance was good, there were some disappointing performances by a few gravel extractors. Encouraging better compliance requires ongoing vigilance and a strong presence in the field by Regional Council Staff.
- 4.2 Of concern in all areas was the failure of many consent holders to contact the Council before or after the activity had been completed as

per their consent conditions. This has lead in some cases to inspections being undertaken retrospectively after staff have indirectly learnt that the work is complete. This has meant that adverse effects, which might have occurred while the work was being undertaken, could not be properly assessed. Compliance reports sent to consent holders have highlighted this concern.

5. Communications

The report will be made available to the media through normal report distribution. Highlights will be included in the Consents newsletter.

6. Recommendation

That the report be received and its content noted.

Report prepared by:

Approved for submission by:

Peter Holden
Resource Advisor

Steve Blakemore
Manager, Planning and Resources