~~~~~~

Legislation Committee Case-notes – February 2017

Feedback Please! Any Feedback? Drop us a note!

We would appreciate comments and suggestions from members on content, format or information about cases that might be of interest to members but may have not been reported in "Your Environment".

The Case-book Editor Roger Low can be contacted through the National Office, or by e-mail, Roger Low<rlow@lowcom.co.nz>

~~~~~~

Summaries of cases from Thomson Reuter's "Your Environment".

This month we report on four court decisions covering diverse situations associated with subdivision, development and land use activities from around the country:

- A jurisdictional challenge associated with an enforcement order sought by Thames-Coromandel District Council. In this case, the recipients of the order had carried out unauthorised earthworks on their property but claimed that Maori land was not subject to the RMA or its processes;
- A case in Auckland that considered the question: "Is the holder of a current but unimplemented land use resource consent required to obtain further resource consent for the already consented activity when a new or changed plan provision came into effect?
- An unsuccessful appeal against the decision of Christchurch City Council to re-consent the existing wind turbine electricity generator, at Gebbies Pass on Banks Peninsula;
- A successful appeal by Southland Fish & Game NZ against consent granted by Southland District Council for development of a cycle trail adjoining the upper Oreti River, a world-famous trout fishing river;
- Also in the other news we have two important news items:
  - one is an report of a decision on a major challenge to the Auckland Unitary Plan of particular interest to members operating in the Auckland area, and;
  - the other is an announcement from Hon Dr Nick Smith about establishment of an urban development authority.

~~~~~~

CASE NOTES MARCH 2017:

~~~~~~

Thames-Coromandel District Council v Pemberton - [2016] NZEnvC 221

Keywords: jurisdiction; enforcement order; Maori land

This decision concerned a jurisdictional challenge to the power of the Environment Court to make certain enforcement orders sought by Thames-Coromandel District Council ("the council"). The council applied for the orders against R and W Pemberton ("the respondents) in relation to alleged earthworks undertaken by the respondents at 10 Bayview Place, Fairy Landing, Whitianga ("the site"). The challenge to jurisdiction was based on the proposition that the site was customary Maori land held in accordance with tikanga Maori and as such was not subject to the RMA or its processes.

The Court stated that the RMA was enacted by the New Zealand Parliament to control the management of natural and physical resources, as defined in s 2 of the RMA, within New Zealand's territorial limits. The Court noted that two points were relevant: first, the land subject to the council's enforcement order was land within New Zealand; and second, there was no limitation or exclusion of operation of the RMA in respect of any identified land anywhere in New Zealand. The RMA applied to all land in the country and nothing excluded Maori customary, or any other, land from operation of the Act's processes. Further, the Court stated that it was

irrelevant who owned any given parcel of land when considering the issue of whether or not activities undertaken by persons such as the respondents could be subject to the RMA. The question of the status of the land or its ownership was irrelevant to the issue of activities undertaken on that land.

The Court also rejected the respondents' submissions that ss 6 and 8 of the RMA were relevant to or formed a basis for dismissal of the council's application. There was no principle of the Treaty of Waitangi which exempted any person from the general requirements of any law, absent a clear and specific exemption in that law. There was no such exemption in the RMA; s 314 authorised the Court to make enforcement orders against a "person", into which description the respondents certainly fell. Finally, in response to the respondents' challenge to the capacity of the Judge and Commissioner to adjudicate in the present proceedings, the Court referred to s 266 of the RMA. The Court held that it had jurisdiction to hear and determine the enforcement proceedings brought by the council against the respondents and made timetabling directions to the council.

Decision date 8 December 2016 – Your Environment 09 December 2016

~~~~~~

Arapata Trust Ltd v Auckland Council - [2016] NZEnvC 236

***Keywords**: resource consent; district plan; rule; interpretation, costs*

This was an application by Aparata Trust Ltd ("the trust") for costs against Auckland Council ("the council"). However, the Court considered that the case also raised an important substantive issue which was: whether the holder of a current but unimplemented land use resource consent required any further resource consent for the already consented activity when a new or changed plan provision came into effect. The trust owned a four-storey commercial building at 83 Albert St ("the building"). At the time of purchase by the trust, the building was subject to a character overlay under the then operative district plan provision and was subject to a submission by Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga ("HNZPT") that the building be included in a schedule in the Auckland Unitary Plan ("AUP"). The trust had reached an agreement with HNZPT that the building might be scheduled in the AUP subject to HNZPT's approval of certain works ("the works") proposed by the trust, which included refurbishment and strengthening of the existing building and construction of a further four storeys. The council granted resource consent, under the then operative district plan provisions, to the trust on 22 October 2015 to undertake the works. Subsequently the trust decided not to proceed with its full works, but to undertake only the refurbishment of the building, and advised the council of this. On 22 September 2016, the council responded that this would be within scope of the existing consent. However, on 26 September 2016, the council further advised the trust that, although the works were already consented, they would trigger a need for a new resource consent under the new AUP. The trust now applied for an urgent fixture for declarations that it could carry out the works under the original consent as it had already made financial and contracting commitments in reliance on it. The Court put the proceeding on a priority track. On 11 October, the parties advised the Court that they had reached agreement and the trust withdrew its declaration application, without prejudice to the issue of costs. The trust's legal costs incurred totalled $8,662 and it submitted that it was put to unnecessary expense because the council was wrong to contend that a further consent was required. The council opposed costs.

The Court considered the relationship between ss 9 and 86B of the RMA and stated that the facts of the case raised an issue as to the relationship between the provisions in pt 5, relating to standards, policy statements and plans, and those in pt 6, relating to resource consents. Further, the matter raised wider issues as to the need for landowners to have certainty of planning and the consenting process, and for consent authorities in respect of making and administration of plans. The Court noted that s 9(3) imposed a restriction on the use of land in contravention of a district rule, subject to the exception regarding a use which was allowed by a resource consent. Further, s 104 provided that any consideration of an application for consent must have regard to the relevant planning documents. The Court concluded that it was correct to consider a land use consent as permitting a person to use land in a particular way, and not as merely to contravene specified rules. This meant that the rules in any relevant provision of a proposed plan might change, but the use of land was still consented. On this approach there was nothing in s 86B of the RMA which would change the effect of a current resource consent under s 9(3)(a). If the council's position were accepted, this would mean that a consent authorised only those contraventions of a district plan which might be specifically provided for in
~~~~~~

the terms of the consent, and that a further consent would be required should such provisions change. Further such a position, if correct, would put holders of a consent in a worse position that any person with continuing use rights under s 10 of the Act. The council's position also raised issues of retrospectively, which were inconsistent with s 7 of the Interpretation Act 1999. Accordingly, the Court concluded that a holder of a resource consent for a specified use or activity was not required to obtain a further resource consent for the same use when a new or changed rule or plan provision came into effect. The Court held that the trust held a current consent to refurbish and strengthen the building and required no further consent for the council. The council had erred.

Turning then to the question of costs, the Court considered the provisions of s 285 and relevant principles applying to its discretion to award costs. The Court stated that the council in the present case had not presented any robust argument, based on s 9, as to why the trust should obtain a further resource consent. In the particular circumstances of the case, the Court found it appropriate to award costs to the party withdrawing the proceeding. Further, the Court found that the trust was entitled to an uplift from the comfort zone of 25-33 per cent of costs incurred because the council had pursued an unjustified requirement for a further resource consent. Accordingly, the trust was awarded $5,000 against the council.

Decision date 20 January 2017 _ Your Environment 23 January 2017

Note: The key component of this decision is confirmation that changes to rules or introduction of new objectives, policies or other provisions in a district plan does not prevent a consent holder from giving effect (or even giving partial effect) to a resource consent previously granted by the Council. The corollary may be that if the consent lapses without being given effect the consent holder may be unlikely to receive consent to an application for re-approval. Curiously, the appeal was determined without representation on behalf of Auckland Council. – RHL.

~~~~~~

Pickering v Christchurch City Council _ [2016] NZEnvC 237

Keywords: resource consent; conditions; electricity; noise; adverse effects; landscape protection; amenity

L Pickering ("P") and other residents of McQueen's Valley ("the Valley"), appealed against the decision of Christchurch City Council ("the council") to re-consent the existing wind turbine of Windflow Technology Ltd ("Windflow"), operational since 2003, at Gebbies Pass, Banks Peninsula ("the site"). Issues arising included whether the proposal had adverse effects on: noise in the receiving environment of the Valley; and landscape and rural character.

The Court noted that the application activity was non-complying and so considered the proposal under ss 104D and 104. Regarding noise effects, the Court referred to NZS6808:2010 – Wind Farm Noise and stated that limits in such standard or in the district plan did not give absolute protection against noise. Rather, the limits were designed to protect the sleep, health and safety of the majority of the population. Evidence from Valley residents, including P, as to the effects of the turbine noise on their enjoyment of their property, and of three acoustic experts, was considered by the Court. Windflow's proposed conditions required that the turbine sound levels, when measured and assessed according to the NZS6808, were not to exceed the limits specified. The Court stated that the question to be decided was whether the character of the receiving environment was sufficiently out of the ordinary, and the character of the wind turbine noise was sufficiently annoying, that the noise limits in NZS6808 did not, by themselves, maintain the amenity of the residents of the Valley. After considering the expert evidence, the Court found that the turbine could operate within the noise limits in NZS6808 at the notional boundaries of the residences in the Valley and that penalties for special audible characteristics would not apply. The uncontroverted evidence from the residents was that the noise had the most deleterious effect during the evening. The Court noted that Windflow had offered modified conditions of consent by which the turbine would be shut down between the hours of 7 pm to 10 pm each day.

The Court addressed the effect on views and the visual amenity of the landscape and stated that a wind turbine was an industrial activity and incongruous in appearance within a rural landscape. However, the Court was satisfied that the single turbine would maintain the function, character and amenity of the rural environment and the distinctive character and amenity of Banks Peninsula. Further, the Valley's landscape had been modified by extensive farming,
~~~~~~

forestry plantations and a 200 m radio mast on the ridgeline. Against this, the turbine and associated structures did not constitute visually prominent development.

As the proposal met one of the tests in s 104D of the RMA, the Court considered the application on its merits under s 104. There were benefits to people and communities from the production of renewable energy, although there was no direct support under the operative Banks Peninsula District Plan for locating the turbine within the Rural Amenity Landscape. However, Court was satisfied that the proposal was not contrary to, but gave effect to, provisions of the proposed Christchurch Replacement District Plan. The Court confirmed the grant of consent but issued the decision as an interim one, due to concerns about the enforceability of certain conditions, set out in Attachment A to the decision.

Decision date 25 January 1/2017 _ Your Environment 27 January 2017

~~~~~~

Southland Fish & Game New Zealand v Southland Regional Council and Southland District Council _ [2016] NZEnvC 220

Keywords: resource consent; fishing; river; access; amenity; landscape protection; district plan; regional policy statement; sustainable management

Southland Fish & Game New Zealand ("Fish and Game") appealed against the grant of consent by the Southland Regional and District Councils to Southland District Council, as applicant ("SDC") to authorise the proposal for a 22.5 km cycle trail along the upper Oreti Valley. The proposal would complete the Around the Mountain Cycle Trail which opened in 2014. The upper Oreti Valley was one of two alternative routes for this section. The other was the Mararoa Valley, which was preferred by Fish and Game, supported by six other parties, because of concerns about adverse effects on the brown trout fishery in the upper Oreti Valley which was recognised as an outstanding angling amenity under a Water Conservation Order. Overall, the status of the proposal was considered as a discretionary activity and considered under ss 104 and 104B of the RMA.

The Court stated that SDC's failure to consult with Fish and Game prior to lodging the consent application meant that the opportunity was lost to focus on the central issue which was whether the use of the cycle trail would undermine the area's outstanding angling amenity. The Court then considered the evidence relating to the topics of recreational amenity, landscape and features, public access, economic benefits, construction and operation and terrestrial ecology. Regarding amenity values, the Court found that, subject to the proposed mitigation strategies, the nationally outstanding angling amenity values of the fishery would be adversely affected nce to the fish habitat. The adverse effects of the proposal on amenity would likely displace specialised anglers. The proposed recreational management plan sought to avoid adverse effects resulting from interaction between users of the trail and the angling community, but the Court considered that this would be less than effective and the cycle trail would result in passive forms of recreation directly in the river. Considering such effects in the context of plan policy, the Court concluded that overall the effect on landscape and on the fishery would not achieve the objective in the proposed district plan ("PDP") that rural area amenity values were to be maintained. Further, the Court gave considerable weight to the river's nationally recognised outstanding angling amenity and also found that the proposal failed to achieve objectives in the operative district plan ("ODP") to maintain such values and to separate incompatible effects.

Regarding landscape and features, the Court found that the expert analysis fell short of what the Court would expect to enable it to form an opinion whether the landscape values constituted an outstanding natural landscape ("ONL"). Further, the Court found that the district council had yet to comply with its duties under s 6 of the RMA and had delayed identification of ONLs and outstanding natural features ("ONFs") and in the meantime provided little guidance and no certainty as to the circumstances in which such assessments were required by the PDP policies, despite strongly worded policies in the regional policy statement ("RPS") that such landscapes and features were to be identified and protected in district plans. The Court noted that since the Supreme Court decision in *King Salmon*, it was clear what was to be achieved in terms of protecting ONLs from inappropriate development. The Court concluded that the ODP had no ONF or ONL provisions capable of implementation and, although the experts were unanimous that large areas in the present proposal were potentially outstanding, the Court found the evidence insufficient to make any finding on this. Nevertheless, the Court found that there were moderate to significant adverse effects on the landscape and a reduction of amenity and perception of the area's natural character, and that the proposal was in tension with
~~~~~~

specified provisions of the Regional Water Plan. The Court was not satisfied that the proposal would be undertaken in a manner that maintained the area's amenity values.

The Court stated that it was not a purpose of the cycle trail to "facilitate" public access to and along the river and, while conditions of consent might discourage such access, they could not prevent it. RPS provisions stated that access to water bodies should be encouraged, but the Court stated that this was not without constraint: restrictions were necessary to protect important amenity and ecological values and avoid adverse effects. SDC failed to give adequate regard to such policies, and to amenity values which needed to be protected.

Evidence and projections as to the economic benefits of the proposal, and of the alternative Mararoa Valley route, were considered at length, along with estimates as to the economic benefits now provided by the angling activities. The Court stated that the key to realising financial benefits of the proposal was that two to four star accommodation, costing up to $5 million, would have to be provided and, without this, market demand for the trail as proposed would struggle to be viable. The Court noted that the RMA was not engaged in regulation of market access to a resource, but instead was concerned with the use and development and protection of resources, within the purpose of the Act, as articulated by policies in the planning documents. There was no direct support under such documents in the present case for the economic benefit derived from the use of the resource. In fact the policy direction told against the proposal as the benefits of land use in providing for growth and development were not to be recognised at any cost to the environment. Under s 290A of the RMA, the Court gave its reasons for differing from the conclusions in the Commissioner's decision.

The Court stated that weight had been given to the PDP provisions regarding infrastructure which provided that infrastructure should meet the needs of the district while ensuring that adverse environmental effects were avoided, remedied or mitigated. Measured against the purpose of the RMA, the Court found that this did not give an unfettered discretion. The proposal had the potential to give effect to relevant provisions for maintaining terrestrial ecology, water quality, protection of streams and soil resources. Existing recreational opportunities were to be maintained and separated from other incompatible activities. At certain points on the proposed trail it was likely that the public would access the river waters and that this was incommensurate with maintaining the area's outstanding angling amenity and would undermine the characteristics sought to be protected under the Water Conservation Order. It was clear that under the PDP policies if such effects could not be remedied then they were to be avoided. The Court recognised SDC's desire to optimise socio-economic benefits from the route along the upper Oreti Valley; however, these were contingent on an accommodation lodge being built. As the proposal did not give effect to the plan's policies for public access and amenity, the Court decided to allow the appeal and refuse the consent. Costs were reserved.

Decision date 7 December 2016 _ Your Environment 8 December 2016

~~~~~~

The above brief summaries are extracted from "Alert 24 - Your Environment" published by Thomson Reuters and are reprinted with permission. They are intended to draw attention to decisions that may be of interest to members. Please consult the complete decisions for a full understanding of the subject matter. Should you wish to obtain a copy of the decision please phone Thomson Reuters Customer Care on 0800 10 60 60 or by email to judgments@thomsonreuters.co.nz.

~~~~~~

This month's cases were selected by Roger Low, rlow@lowcom.co.nz, and Hazim Ali, hazim.ali@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz.

~~~~~~

Other News Items for March 2017

High Court backs Auckland high density housing decision _ 13/2/2017

Stuff reports that the High Court has ruled the Independent Hearings Panel that considered Auckland's Unitary Plan acted lawfully in reaching its decision allowing increased density in
~~~~~~

residential housing in certain areas of the city. The Court found the panel's approach to scope for residential zoning in the key test case areas was lawful. Read the full story here.

The following is the press release dated 13 February 2017 from Auckland Council -.
High Court determines approach to "scope" lawful

The High Court has today released a decision ruling that the Auckland Unitary Plan Independent Hearings Panel's approach to "scope" for residential zoning in key test case areas was lawful.

The decision follows a preliminary hearing held in November 2016 which considered whether the Panel approached the matter of "scope" correctly in relation to certain areas of residential zoning in the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan.

The court was formally asked to rule on seven agreed questions of law. The issue at the heart of the preliminary questions potentially affected approximately 29,000 properties originally zoned Single House and Mixed Housing Suburban in the notified Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan.

The Court addressed the matter of scope by focusing on residential zoning in a number of test cases in Mt Albert, Glendowie, Blockhouse Bay, Judges Bay, Grey Lynn, Takanini, Howick and Parnell.

The court ruled that the IHP has approached the matter of "scope" correctly, with the exception of two site specific test cases – 117-133 The Strand, Parnell (relocation of view-shaft), and 55 Takanini School Road (notified as Industrial and rezoned Residential).

In his decision, Justice Whata said: "The purpose of resolving the test cases was to provide affected appellants with guidance on the issue of scope. It will be for them to decide whether and to what extent they wish to pursue their appeals in light of my decision."

Auckland Council's Director Legal and Risk, Katherine Anderson says: "As the decision has implications for appeals that are still before the courts, the council will not be making any further comment at this stage."

The High Court decision is **Albany North Landowners & others vs Auckland Council**.
CIV-2016-404-2336 - [2016] NZHC 138

~~~~~~

The Government has announced consultation on a new law for establishing Urban Development Authorities. Consultation closes 19 May 2017.

Minister's press release – Open the link: Enabling faster and better urban development

Public consultation has opened on proposed legislation to fast track the redevelopment and regeneration of urban areas to better meet housing and commercial needs, Building and Construction Minister Dr Nick Smith says.

"New Zealand needs Urban Development Authority (UDA) legislation to enable faster and better quality regeneration in our major cities. These new authorities need the power to assemble parcels of land, develop site specific plans, reconfigure infrastructure and to construct a mix of public and private buildings to create vibrant hubs for modern urban living," Dr Smith says.

"These reforms are part of the solution to Auckland's growth pressures over housing and infrastructure. [Questions and answers]

Ministry of Business Innovation and Employment – Urban development authorities

Urban development authorities discussion document

~~~~~~

Opposition to proposed powers given to Minister in overhauled RMA _

Radio New Zealand reports that the majority of the 230 submitters on the Government's proposed RMA changes oppose new powers given to the Minister to override some local council decisions. The amendment bill is due to be reported back to the House for its second reading next week. Read the full story here.

~~~~~~

New Hilton hotel for Wellington. *Stuff* reports that global hotel chain Hilton's first hotel in Wellington will be going into the renovated T&G building, also known as the old Harcourts
~~~~~~

building on Lambton Quay. The four-and-a-half star hotel will have 108 rooms, full service, a gym, meeting rooms and a restaurant. Read the full story here.

~~~~~~

Work to start on $100 million Queenstown housing complex. The *Otago Daily Times* reports that a $100 million Queenstown housing complex is being developed by listed Singaporean company GYP Properties. It is hoped the housing project - 225 mostly four-bedroom, three-and four-storey townhouses - will start in July. Read the full story here.

~~~~~~

Ngāti Maru interested in 80,000 hectares of DOC land in Taranaki. *Radio New Zealand* reports that a Taranaki iwi has indicated its interest under a possible Treaty settlement in 80,000 hectares of land lost in the late 19th century and now held by the Department of Conservation. Read the full story here.

~~~~~~

Rotorua's Koutu hotel consent declined. The *Rotorua Daily Post* reports that a proposal to build a 100-room, four-star hotel on Bennetts Rd, Rotorua, has been declined by council commissioners, following objections raised by local residents concerned about the possible adverse amenity effects from such a commercial development in the residential area. Read the full story here.

~~~~~~

New Orewa housing project. *The New Zealand Herald* reports that Changda International (NZ) is planning a 570-residence housing project on Sunnyheights Rd, Orewa. Auckland Council's planning committee chairman Chris Darby says he hopes the $420 million housing development will result in housing occupied by people. Read the full story here.

~~~~~~

13 Auckland special housing areas abandoned. *Radio New Zealand* reports that Auckland Council has confirmed that 13 Special Housing Areas in the city have been cancelled because the owners have not built any houses on the land. Read the full story here.

~~~~~~

Emergency earthquake measures so farmers can undertake works. *Radio New Zealand* reports that the Government has introduced three new emergency bills to allow work to be undertaken on farms affected by the earthquake without first obtaining the usual consents. Until the end of March next year, farmers need only notify authorities of earthworks such as digging bores and dredging the Kaikoura harbour. Read the full story here.

~~~~~~

Landcorp to sell 11,650 hectares of NZ land. *Stuff* reports that the Government farming entity Landcorp is offering 10 farming properties for sale, totalling 11,650 hectares. Eight of the farms will be offered first to the relevant iwi. Read the full story here.

~~~~~~

New Palmerston North supermarket approved. *Stuff* reports that Palmerston North City Council, after opposing the proposal for two years, has finally agreed to the $16 million Progressive Enterprises supermarket, commercial and retail development at Pioneer Highway, Awapuni. Read the full story here.

~~~~~~

Kapiti expressway completion approved. *The Dominion Post* reports that Transport Minister Simon Bridges has confirmed that construction will begin next year on the final 13 kilometre stretch of the Kapiti expressway but the project will cost $80 million more than the $250 million estimated by the NZTA. Read the full story here.

~~~~~~

25 Queenstown sections sold in 2 hours. The *Otago Daily Times* reports that Melbourne-based developers RCL Group sold 25 residential sections in a new Queenstown subdivision in under 120 minutes. Read the full story here.

~~~~~~

ORC Dunedin bus hub plan. The *Otago Daily Times* reports that Otago Regional Council wants community feedback about its proposed bus interchange in Great King St, Dunedin. The
~~~~~~

new hub will be central to a $3 million project relating to transport in the city. Read the full story here.

~~~~~~

HNZ decides not to sell 23 Porirua state houses. *The Dominion Post* reports that in the face of long waiting lists for rental social housing in Porirua, Housing New Zealand has reversed its decision to sell 23 state houses in the city. Read the full story here.

~~~~~~

Irish wasp saved $488m damage by weevil. *The New Zealand Herald* reports that the destructive pest the root weevil has been controlled by an Irish immigrant: a wasp. Since its importation by AgResearch in 2006, the Irish wasp, which lays its eggs in the weevil, has saved the economy about $489 million. Read the full story here.

~~~~~~

Rare smuggled gecko repatriated to Otago Museum. The *Otago Daily Times* reports that a protected jewelled gecko, poached from New Zealand in 2010, and illegally smuggled into Germany, has been returned to live in the Otago Museum. Museum director Ian Griffin said biosecurity risks to other animals meant that the gecko could not be released into the wild in the Otago Peninsula. Read the full story here.

~~~~~~

Buildings on CentrePort's land may face demolition. *The New Zealand Herald* reports that following the Kaikoura earthquake several buildings on Wellington's waterfront might be demolished. The buildings, Shed 35, a cruise ship terminal and a cold storage building, are on CentrePort's land and chief executive Derek Nind confirmed that the heritage Shed 35 building was cordoned off and had suffered significant damage to its foundations. Read the full story here.

~~~~~~

Survey shows New Zealanders think migration and investors source of housing crisis. *The New Zealand Herald* reports that a the BNZ Financial Futures survey has found that only 11 per cent of people think that the supply of land is the cause of the housing crisis and that New Zealanders instead blame high immigration and property speculation. Read the full story here.

~~~~~~

Wanaka Airport governance options. The *Otago Daily Times* reports that some of the 78 submissions to Queenstown Lakes District Council concerning the running of Wanaka Airport show local opposition to the council's preferred governance option, which is to enter a lease and management agreement with Queenstown Airport. Read the full story here.

~~~~~~

Surge in building costs. *The New Zealand Herald* reports that the cost of new home builds has increased in the past 12 months at the fastest pace since 2005. The December consumer price index showed that the cost of new house builds rose 6.5 per cent in 2016. Read the full story here.

~~~~~~

Concerns over Dunedin City Council's new development rules. The *Otago Daily Times* reports that oil companies have raised issues of risks to public safety concerning Dunedin City Council's proposed development rules which may not provide enough buffer space around oil terminals in the city's waterfront. Read the full story here.

~~~~~~

Auckland City Rail Link tunnel progresses. *The New Zealand Herald* reports that Auckland Transport has completed a step in the construction of the City Rail Link. A two-metre wide tunnel boring and excavating machine has excavated 300 metres under Albert St to Swanson St. Read the full story here.

~~~~~~

Master plan proposed for Queenstown. The *Otago Daily Times* reports that a report to Queenstown Lakes District Council from Arrowtown consultants Rationale, suggests a single

master plan for Queenstown be created with the help of a paid advisory group. Queenstown Lakes Mayor Jim Boult supports the master plan. Read the full story here.

~~~~~~

Christchurch City Council pays $28m for carpark owned by Carter Group. *Radio New Zealand* reports that, under the terms of an agreement made in 2014 with developer Philip Carter, Christchurch City Council has contributed $28 million towards a carpark on the site of The Crossing retail complex. Read the full story here.

~~~~~~

New earthquake regulations for Wellington possible. *Stuff* reports that Wellington homeowners could be forced to remove chimneys, reinforce piles and install emergency water tanks under new earthquake regulations that could be fast-tracked by the Wellington City Council. Read the full story here.

~~~~~~

Auckland iwi housing plan opposed. *Radio New Zealand* reports that Ngāti Paoa proposes to start a 300 house development at Point England in east Auckland at the end of the year. Some locals say they would lose public space and that the development would destroy endangered wildlife. Read the full story here.

~~~~~~