In the Environment Court of New Zealand Christchurch Registry

I Te Kooti Taiao O Aotearoa Ōtautahi Rohe

ENV-2024-CHC-

Under the Resource Management Act 1991 (the Act)

In the matter of an appeal under clause 14(1) of the First Schedule of the Act

and in the matter of decisions by Otago Regional Council in respect of the Proposed

Otago Regional Policy Statement 2021

Between Environmental Defence Society

Appellant

And Otago Regional Council

Respondent

Notice of New Zealand Transport Agency Waka Kotahi wish to be party to proceedings

Dated 5 June 2024

大成 DENTONS KENSINGTON SWAN

 40 Bowen Street
 P
 +64 4 472 7877

 PO Box 10246
 F
 +64 4 472 2291

 Wellington 6143
 DX
 SP26517

Solicitor: N McIndoe/S Fowler

Enicky.mcindoe@dentons.com/samantha.fowler@dentons.com

To The Registrar
Environment Court
Christchurch

- New Zealand Transport Agency Waka Kotahi ('NZTA') wishes to be a party to an appeal by the Environmental Defence Society (Appellant) against the decisions of the Otago Regional Council on the Proposed Regional Policy Statement 2021 (non-freshwater parts) ('PORPS').
- 2 NZTA made a submission (number 305) and further submission (number 305) on the PORPS. NZTA either submitted and/or further submitted on all of the provisions listed at paragraph 5 to which it has an interest.
- NZTA is not a trade competitor for the purposes of sections 308C or 308CA of the Resource Management Act 1991.
- 4 NZTA is interested in part of the proceedings, being those aspects of the appeal that are set out below at paragraph 5 of this notice.
- 5 NZTA is interested in the following issues:
 - a Amendments sought to IM-P12;
 - b Amendments sought to CE-O5;
 - c Amendments sought to CE-P9;
 - d Amendments sought to CE-P10;
 - e Amendments sought to EIT-INF-O4; and
 - f Amendments sought to EIT-INF-P12.
- NZTA has set out its position in relation to the above provisions and the reasons for those in **Appendix A** to this notice.

12120118

NZTA agrees to participate in mediation or other alternative dispute resolution of the proceedings.

Dated 5 June 2024



Nicola McIndoe

Counsel for New Zealand Transport Agency Waka Kotahi

Address for service:

New Zealand Transport Agency

PO Box 5245

Dunedin 9058

New Zealand

Email: environmentalplanning@nzta.govt.nz

12120118

Appendix A Table of PORPS provisions of interest

TABLE OF PORPS PROVISIONS OF INTEREST		
PROVISION	POSITION	REASON
IM-P12	Oppose	NZTA opposes the Appellant's relief because it introduces environmental bottom lines and limits which are uncertain and not required by the RMA or national direction. The relief sought would also introduce a requirement that there be no alternative location, site or method for the activity, which is a particularly onerous requirement, and may compromise NZTA's ability to carry out its statutory functions.
CE-O5	Oppose	The Appellant seeks to amend CE-O5 so only activities that have a functional need to be located within the coastal environment can be located there. NZTA opposes the Appellant's relief because it introduces functional need as a threshold requirement for activities located in the coastal environment, rather than acknowledging that some activities have a functional need to be located in the coastal environment.
CE-P9	Oppose	The Appellant seeks to delete the reference to 'operational need' in CE-P9. NZTA supports the inclusion of 'operational need' in CE-P9, and considers that this better gives effect to the NZCPS as a whole.
CE-P10	Oppose	The Appellant seeks to delete the reference to 'operational need' in CE-P10. As above, NZTA supports the Decisions version of CE-P10, which recognises the relevance of operational need.
EIT-INF-O4	Oppose	The Appellant seeks to reinstate "within environmental limits" to this provision. As above, NZTA opposes the inclusion of "environmental limits" which are uncertain and not required by the RMA or national direction.
EIT-INF-P12	Oppose	The Appellant seeks to add a new clause to this provision which would require adverse effects to be managed in accordance with the ECO, CE, NFL and LF chapters. The relief proposed by the Appellant is redundant as the chapters referenced in this amendment would apply regardless.

12120118