

Full Council

8 October 2026

Report for Agenda Item | Rīpoata moto e Rāraki take [2]

Department: Property & Infrastructure

Title | Taitara: Shotover Wastewater Treatment Plant (SWWTP) Consent Application – Discharge Design Amendments & Treatment Enhancements

Purpose of the Report | Te Take mō te Pūroko

The purpose of this report is to seek Council's approval of various updates in connection with the long-term disposal resource consent for the Shotover Wastewater Treatment Plant (SWWTP):

Executive Summary | Whakarāpopototaka Matua

The SWWTP is critical infrastructure servicing the Whakatipu Basin and wider Queenstown urban area. Council lodged consent applications for the long-term wastewater disposal solution on 29 May 2026 in accordance with an Environment Court enforcement order.

Following Council's March 2026 decision approving the preparation and submission of a resource consent for a Kawarau River discharge solution, further investigations and design development have been completed by GHD to support consenting and provide confidence that environmental, public health and regulatory requirements can be achieved. These investigations included extensive river surveys, Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD) modelling, water quality assessments and public health risk assessments.

The updated investigations have provided valuable insight into discharge performance and identified an opportunity to optimise mixing and dilution through a revised discharge arrangement.

As a result, a revised discharge configuration is recommended comprising a piped outfall extending approximately 10 metres into the Kawarau River where deeper, faster-flowing water provides substantially improved dilution and mixing.

The Kawarau River provides a highly suitable receiving environment for treated wastewater due to its large, high-energy flows, which enable rapid dilution and dispersion. Technical assessments undertaken to date, indicate that once the discharge has mixed with the river beyond the defined mixing zone, the effects on water quality, ecological values and public health are no more than minor. This reflects both the high treatment standard achieved at the SWWTP and the capacity of the receiving environment.

Further technical investigations and design development have identified opportunities to strengthen the long-term consent application through enhanced phosphorus removal and further assessment of virus management requirements. Staff therefore recommend proceeding with a phosphorus dosing upgrade and continuing two UV design pathways pending completion of the current virus monitoring programme and Quantitative Microbial Health Risk Assessment (QMRA), which will determine the preferred long-term UV solution.

Consistent with Council's March 2026 resolution, further engagement and technical review have been undertaken with the support of an independent facilitator, to enable Council's final decision on the long-term disposal solution for the SWWTP, including consideration of alternative land-based and hybrid disposal options.

The alternative options assessment, facilitated by an independent party, provides Council with an understanding of the key opportunities, constraints, trade-offs and costs associated with these alternatives, alongside input from mana whenua, stakeholders and the community, to inform future decision-making.

The recommendations are expected to be accommodated within existing project budgets. The proposed changes are intended to improve environmental performance, strengthen consentability, and support delivery of the long-term wastewater disposal solution required by 31 December 2030.

Recommendation | Kā Tūtohuka

That the Council:

1. **Note** the contents of this report;
2. **Note** that in accordance with the March 2026 Council decision on Shotover Wastewater Treatment Plant disposal:
 - a. Resolution 2 – Further work has been undertaken in support of the decision to proceed with an application to discharge to the Kawarau River and is the subject of this report with amendments being proposed;
 - b. Resolution 3 – Further investigations are continuing into the identification and assessment of reasonably practicable wastewater disposal options, including land-based and hybrid land–water options to be reported back to Council in March 2027. This report nor its recommendations affect the alternative options process currently underway;
3. **Approve** the option put forward in the long-term resource consent application for the discharge of treated wastewater from the Shotover Wastewater Treatment Plant before the Otago Regional Council to:

- a. Change from a rock outfall to a direct piped discharge configuration to the Kawarau River;
 - b. Introduce a chemical dosing system to provide enhanced phosphorus removal
4. **Note** that in respect of the possible need for additional UV disinfection as part of the long term consent application that:
- a. Work will continue on two concurrent UV disinfection design pathways until completion of the virus testing programme and Quantitative Microbial Health Risk Assessment (QMRA); and
 - b. Staff will return to Council (or Alpine Waters - timing dependent) for a final decision to implement the preferred UV disinfection solution following completion of the virus monitoring programme and QMRA assessment, with confirmation that the selected option can be accommodated within existing approved budgets.

Prepared by:



Name: Simon Mason

Title: Infrastructure Operations Manager

9 September 2026

Reviewed and Authorised by:



Name: Tony Avery

Title: General Manager Property &
Infrastructure

21 September 2026

Context | Horopaki

Background

1. On 26 March 2026, Queenstown Lakes District Council (QLDC) considered the future wastewater disposal strategy for the Shotover Wastewater Treatment Plant (SWWTP) and resolved to proceed with Option 1 – Land flow path and discharge to the Kawarau River, as the preferred pathway for preparing and lodging a resource consent application for a treated wastewater discharge to the Kawarau River. In adopting this approach, Council recognised the need to meet the Environment Court-directed consent application timeframe while continuing to investigate the possibility of longer-term alternatives that may better align with cultural and community expectations.
2. Council also directed the Chief Executive to undertake a comprehensive programme of further investigations into long-term wastewater disposal options. This work includes the identification and assessment of reasonably practicable alternatives, including land-based and hybrid land-water disposal options that could reduce the extent of treated wastewater discharged to water. Council further directed staff to continue engagement with Kāi Tahu Rūnaka leadership, provide information on alternative options to mana whenua and the community, and undertake further community consultation to inform future decision-making. The outcome of this work is to be reported back to Council in March 2027, at which time Council will make a final decision on implementation of the long-term disposal solution, including whether to retain the current preferred option, adopt an alternative option, or pursue a combination of solutions.
3. In addition, Council approved the application for a 35-year resource consent, noted that Option 1 includes tertiary filtration, supported the development of a recycled water reuse scheme, confirmed the continued delivery of the Calamity Pond project, and agreed that Option 5 was not reasonably practicable and should not be progressed further. The full resolution is attached to this report as *Attachment B - Council Resolution 19 March 2026*.
4. In support of this resolution, QLDC subsequently lodged resource consent applications with ORC on 29 May 2026, in accordance with the deadlines imposed by the Environment Court as part of the previous enforcement order.
5. The applications lodged with the ORC seek authorisation to:
 - a. Discharge treated wastewater via land flow path to the Kawarau River.
 - b. Discharge odour to air.
 - c. Disturb the bed of the Kawarau River and place and maintain an outfall structure.
 - d. Undertake groundwater take associated with construction dewatering.
6. The applications were accepted by ORC as complete on 16 June 2026.

7. Following submission, detailed technical investigations were completed to further develop the preferred option and support the consent process. These investigations identified opportunities to improve environmental outcomes and increase confidence that the requirements of the Water Conservation Order can be achieved.
8. A review of the past 12 months of monitoring data, following the commissioning of the second MLE reactor and clarifier, demonstrates significant improvements in treated wastewater quality, particularly with respect to nutrient removal. The plants performance has greatly improved when compared to its historic performance when treated wastewater was being discharged to the now decommissioned oxidation ponds and the dose & drain disposal field.
9. Current treated wastewater quality performs favourably with wastewater treatment plants of a similar size across New Zealand. *Attachment A – Plant Performance over the last 12 months*, includes a list of several figures taken from the QLDC monitoring dashboard, across various nutrient parameters that demonstrate this performance consistency since establishment of the second MLE and clarifier. Total Phosphorus (TP) and Dissolved Reactive Phosphorus (DRP) concentrations have shown a downward trend from elevated levels in early 2026 and appear to exhibit a seasonal trend. Further monitoring through the 2026/27 summer period is expected to confirm this pattern and help inform any future seasonal optimisation of the proposed chemical dosing to manage elevated phosphorus levels.
10. The Kawarau River has a large high energy flow that provides rapid dilution and dispersion of the discharged treated wastewater. Technical assessments undertaken to date, indicate that once the discharge has mixed with the river beyond the defined mixing zone, the effects on water quality, ecological values and public health are no more than minor. This reflects both the high treatment standard achieved at the SWWTP and the capacity of the receiving environment. The proposed plant upgrades and modifications to the outfall structure go further to optimise the discharge solution, strengthening the long term consent application.

Direct Piped Discharge to Kawarau River

11. The original consent design approved by Council contemplated treated wastewater being conveyed to the Kawarau River and discharged via a rock-armoured land-flow path situated near the river margin. The design was intended to minimise visual effects, provide a minor degree of land contact and allow passive mixing of treated wastewater with river flows.
12. Following Council's decision, detailed bathymetric surveying and CFD modelling were undertaken to better understand flow patterns and mixing characteristics within the Kawarau River.
13. The investigations demonstrated that the near-shore environment contains relatively shallow, slow-moving water extending approximately ten metres from the river edge during low flow conditions. Water velocities in this zone were found to be approximately one-third of those in the main river channel.

14. As outlined in *Attachment C - GHD Report – SWWTP 30% Design Amendments Memo* modelling has demonstrated that a discharge at the river margin would result in treated wastewater becoming concentrated near the riverbank with limited initial dilution. This could potentially create elevated nutrient and pathogen concentrations within areas most accessible to recreational river users and could increase uncertainty around compliance with requirements of the Water Conservation (Kawarau) Order 1997.
15. To address these issues, GHD has developed a revised outfall concept that extends the discharge point approximately 10 metres into the Kawarau River (further details are provided in *Attachment C - GHD Report SWWTP 30% Design Amendments Memo*). Rather than discharging passively through a rock flow path, treated wastewater would be conveyed through a pipe and discharged into deeper, faster-flowing water. The revised design includes:
- Piped conveyance through the outfall structure;
 - A discharge outlet extending approximately 10 metres into the river;
 - Rock armouring to provide scour protection;
 - Landscaping to minimise visual effects; and
 - Geometry specifically designed to minimise hydraulic dead zones and improve mixing.
16. The revised design provides several significant environmental and consenting benefits:
- Approximately three-fold dilution immediately at the discharge point;
 - Approximately five-fold dilution within 40 metres downstream;
 - More than fifty-fold dilution following complete mixing downstream of the Shotover River confluence;
 - Reduced nutrient concentrations adjacent to the river margin;
 - Reduced pathogen concentrations within near-shore recreational areas;
 - Improved confidence that bathing values within the Water Conservation Order can be maintained; and
 - Greater consentability of the long-term discharge proposal.
17. The revised design introduces additional complexity compared with the original outfall concept. Potential disadvantages include:
- Increased construction complexity;

- Potentially greater maintenance requirements;
- Additional works within the river environment; and
- Potential effects on river hydraulics requiring further assessment.

18. Notwithstanding these considerations, the revised outfall provides substantially improved environmental performance and significantly strengthens the consentability of the long-term consent application.

19. The rock outfall structure as part of the initial design included within the long term consent application, in isolation, had an approx. capital cost of \$650,000 to \$750,000. Approximately 50% of this cost was associated with the supply and installation of the rock riprap channel and associated landscaping works.

20. The revised piped discharge option removes the need for the majority of the terrestrial riprap channel works, resulting in a significant reduction in the cost of constructing the above-ground components of the outfall structure. However, this option requires additional works extending from the river edge into the riverbed and active channel, including temporary works and enhanced erosion and sediment control measures, which increase construction costs.

21. Current cost estimates indicate that the piped discharge option is broadly cost-neutral when compared with the rock outfall structure on a P50 basis, and between approximately **\$250,000 and \$350,000 higher** on a P90 basis.¹

22. Notwithstanding the potential increase in capital cost, the piped discharge option is expected to provide improved long-term resilience and may reduce ongoing operational and maintenance costs subject to confirmation through the detailed design process. In particular, removal of the rock outfall structure eliminates the risk of sediment accumulation during flood events, as this risk does not exist with a direct piped discharge.

Chemical Dosing for Phosphorus Removal

23. The SWWTP currently achieves a high standard of treatment through the two Modified Ludzack-Ettinger (MLE) plants and existing clarifiers. While the plant performs well for nitrogen removal, phosphorus concentrations remain elevated.

24. Technical assessments completed during both the short-term and long-term consenting processes concluded that phosphorus is likely to become a key consenting issue. Although current monitoring does not indicate local ecological impacts, phosphorus discharged from the SWWTP contributes to cumulative nutrient loading within the Kawarau River catchment.

¹ A P50 probabilistic estimate represents a 50% chance the final cost will be at or below the estimate. A P90 estimate means there is a 90% chance the final cost will be at or below the estimate.

25. As outlined in the *Attachment C - GHD Report – SWWTP 30% Design Amendments Memo* the proposed upgrade consists of installation of a chemical dosing system that introduces coagulants upstream of the secondary clarifiers. The chemicals bind dissolved phosphorus into solids which can then be removed through the treatment process. The system would include the construction of bulk chemical storage, dosing pumps and controls, chemical delivery infrastructure, bunding and spill containment and associated instrumentation and monitoring.

26. The benefits with introducing chemical dosing include:

- Reduction in phosphorus discharge concentrations;
- Reduced cumulative nutrient loading to the Kawarau catchment;
- Improved compliance with emerging regulatory expectations;
- Improved suspended solids removal;
- Improved wastewater clarity;
- Improved UV system performance due to higher water clarity; and
- Greater operational flexibility.

27. The estimated capital cost of the chemical dosing system is approximately \$700,000 including contingencies.

28. Annual operating costs are estimated at approximately \$290,000 per annum in 2030 and \$610,000 per annum by 2060.

29. The costs are considered proportionate to the anticipated environmental benefits and the reduced consenting risk.

UV Disinfection Strategy

30. One of the principal issues arising through both the short-term and long-term consent processes relates to protection of public health and maintaining the Kawarau River's bathing values.

31. Historically, wastewater discharge assessments have relied heavily on E. coli as a surrogate indicator of health risk. While SWWTP consistently achieves very low E. coli concentrations after treatment, concerns have been raised by ORC and submitters regarding the potential presence of viral pathogens, particularly norovirus.

32. A Quantitative Microbial Health Risk Assessment (QMRA) is currently underway to better understand these risks.

33. At present, QLDC does not have sufficient information to determine the size and complexity of UV upgrades that may ultimately be required because the virus monitoring has not yet been completed. Designing only one solution at this stage could create significant programme risk and potentially delay compliance with proposed short term consent conditions. It is therefore recommended that two design pathways are continued in parallel.
34. Option A: New UV Facility. This option provides for two new UV reactors, a dedicated building, high level virus removal capacity, long term scalability and significant operational redundancy. The capital cost is currently estimated at approximately \$15m plus ongoing operational costs.
35. Option B: Existing UV Upgrade. This option involves enhancement of existing UV equipment, construction of a parallel UV channel, upgrade and modify the existing UV channel, introduction of redundancy through duplicated treatment trains and potential lower capital and ongoing operational costs.
36. Maintaining both design streams concurrently provides flexibility while preserving programme timelines. Design work associated with the existing UV channel is less complex than a new set of UV reactors and dedicated building, and as such any sunk/abortive cost is minimal. A decision to proceed with the preferred UV solution will then be sought from Council (or Alpine Waters depending on timing) following completion of the virus monitoring programme and QMRA expected in mid-2027.

Analysis and Advice | Tatāritaka me kā Tohutohu

37. This report identifies and assesses the following reasonably practicable options for addressing the matter as required by section 77 of the Local Government Act 2002.
38. Option 1 (Recommended): Approve the proposed refinements to the long-term wastewater disposal project and consenting strategy
39. This option includes:
- Adoption of the revised direct piped discharge configuration to the Kawarau River;
 - Implementation of a chemical dosing system to improve phosphorus removal; and
 - Continuation of two UV disinfection design pathways pending completion of the virus monitoring programme and Quantitative Microbial Health Risk Assessment (QMRA);

Advantages

- Improves environmental outcomes through enhanced dilution, phosphorus removal and potential virus management improvements.

- Further strengthens the long-term resource consent application and reinforces confidence in achieving compliance with the Water Conservation (Kawarau) Order 1997.
- Maintains programme momentum and supports delivery of the long-term solution within the timeframes established by the Environment Court enforcement order.
- Preserves flexibility while further virus monitoring and assessment work is completed.

Disadvantages

- Requires additional capital and operating expenditure associated with plant upgrades.
- Results in some abortive expenditure associated with progressing two UV design pathways in parallel.
- Introduces additional construction and operational complexity compared with the original discharge concept.

40. Option 2 Retain the currently approved design and consenting approach

41. This option would continue with the originally approved near-shore discharge configuration and defer the proposed treatment enhancements and consenting refinements

Advantages

- Avoids additional capital expenditure in the short term.
- Avoids abortive design costs associated with maintaining parallel UV design pathways.
- Maintains consistency with the designs previously endorsed by Council.

Disadvantages

- Does not incorporate the benefits identified through subsequent technical investigations and design development.
- Provides less certainty and resilience flexibility in achieving the desired dilution and environmental outcomes compared with the preferred option.
- Increases consenting risk and the likelihood of additional mitigation measures or redesign being required during the consent process.
- Could reduce certainty around programme delivery and compliance with enforcement order timeframes.

42. Having considered the advantages and disadvantages of each option, staff recommend Option 1 as it incorporates the refinements identified through further technical investigations and design development, including adoption of the revised piped discharge configuration to the Kawarau River, implementation of enhanced phosphorus removal, and continuation of parallel UV design pathways pending completion of virus monitoring and the Quantitative Microbial Health Risk Assessment (QMRA).
43. Collectively, these measures provide a more robust and resilient solution, enhancing environmental performance, strengthening both the short-term and long-term resource consent applications, reducing consenting and programme risks, and supporting delivery of a practical and implementable long-term wastewater disposal solution for the Shotover Wastewater Treatment Plant within the timeframes established by the enforcement order. Option 1 also ensures that any potential delay or risk to Enforcement Order milestones is mitigated through advancing two concurrent UV upgrade designs, while retaining a final decision by Council (or Alpine Waters) following completion of the virus monitoring and QMRA.

[Consultation Process | Hātepe Matapaki](#)

Significance and Engagement | Te Whakamahi i kā Whakaaro Hiraka

44. This matter has been assessed against Council's Significance and Engagement Policy 2024. The broader Shotover Wastewater Treatment Plant long-term disposal project is considered a matter of high significance. This decision reflects the potential consentability of both the short and long term consent applications and optimisation of the disposal design to further demonstrate to the TA that effects are no more than minor.
45. Council's decision in March 2026 to proceed with a long-term disposal solution involving discharge to the Kawarau River was made following extensive investigation, options assessment, stakeholder engagement and public communication. The disposal project itself was identified within Council's Long Term Plan and has been the subject of significant public discussion and elected members consideration.
46. The decisions sought through this report do not revisit the previously approved strategic direction. Rather, they relate to refinements to the discharge design, proposed treatment enhancements and the consenting pathway identified through subsequent technical investigations and ongoing project development.
47. While important, the recommendations are considered project delivery and consenting decisions within an established strategic framework. They do not alter the approved disposal pathway, introduce a new wastewater disposal methodology, or fundamentally change the nature or purpose of the long-term resource consent applications currently before Otago Regional Council.
48. Consistent with the March 2026 resolution, Council has progressed additional engagement with Kāi Tahu, Rūnaka leaders, stakeholders and the wider community to inform Council's final decision-making process. The subsequent programme of work, currently in progress, includes

independent facilitation of a structured engagement process, technical review and challenge sessions, community engagement activities, and consideration of whether any additional reasonably practicable alternative disposal options should be assessed.

49. The alternative land and hybrid options assessment forms part of this wider programme and is intended to provide Council with a comprehensive understanding of the opportunities, constraints, trade-offs and costs associated with alternative disposal pathways. This work will support a future Council decision on the preferred long-term disposal solution and ensure that elected members are informed by robust technical analysis, mana whenua perspectives, stakeholder input and community feedback.

Māori Consultation | Iwi Rūnaka

50. Engagement with mana whenua has been undertaken throughout development of the long-term wastewater disposal project and continues through both the short-term and long-term consenting processes. This engagement has included ongoing discussions with Te Ao Marama Inc and Aukaha on behalf of mana whenua regarding the proposed disposal solution and associated consent applications. Both Te Ao Marama Inc and Aukaha have been presented with the details of the proposed long term consent amendments as part of this engagement and more recent structured hui.
51. Separately, in accordance with the third resolution of Council at its March 2026 decision, consultation has continued on the alternative options process and engagement. Council and some elected members recently met with mana whenua at Ōtākou Marae to discuss the proposed long-term wastewater discharge solution for the Shotover Wastewater Treatment Plant. Discussions focused on the assessment of alternative treatment and disposal options, the proposed consent term, and opportunities to establish a pathway toward reduced reliance on discharge to the Kawarau River over time. Mana whenua reiterated a strong preference for land-based disposal solutions and emphasised the importance of a genuine review process and long-term vision for wastewater management in the Whakatipu Basin.
52. Council has acknowledged these concerns, reaffirmed its commitment to exploring future improvements and alternative approaches, and agreed to continue working collaboratively with ka rūnaka to develop a shared long-term vision, inform consent conditions, and strengthen ongoing partnership arrangements.
53. The next step in mana whenua engagement is the establishment of a Rūnaka Subject Matter Expert (SME) Group. The SME Group will be provided with the same technical information, early insights, and opportunities for input and challenge as have been available to elected members and the Alpine Waters Board throughout the alternative options assessment process. Engagement with the group will be facilitated by an independent party, who will coordinate discussions and collate feedback and findings across the various workstreams to help inform future decision-making.

54. The recommendations within this report do not alter the previously approved wastewater disposal pathway but represent refinements to the proposed design and consenting approach arising from further technical investigations. Ongoing engagement with mana whenua will continue as the consent applications progress and design is further refined.

Risk and Mitigations | Kā Raru Tūpono me kā Whakamaurutaka

55. This matter relates to the Regulatory/Legal/Compliance risk category. It is associated with RISK10029 Ineffective compliance management practices within the QLDC Risk Register. This risk has been assessed as having a moderate residual risk rating.

56. The approval of the recommendations set out in this report, will allow Council to implement additional controls for this risk. This will be achieved by enhancing aspects of the long term discharge resource consent application currently before ORC, and further supporting the proposed consent conditions as part of the short term discharge resource consent as we head to the Environment Court hearing in November 2026.

Financial Implications | Kā Riteka ā-Pūtea

57. The existing project budget within the Long Term Plan (LTP) is considered sufficient to support the recommendations outlined.

58. Whilst a detailed cost assessment for the piped discharge structure has not been undertaken, it is expected to be cost neutral when compared with the previously proposed rock outfall. Subject to further optimisation of the discharge structure during detailed design, final costs for the discharge structure are expected to remain within the existing LTP project budget.

59. The estimated capital cost of the chemical dosing system is approximately \$700,000 including contingencies which falls within the existing LTP project budget. Additional annual operating costs are estimated at approximately \$290,000 per annum in 2030 and \$610,000 per annum by 2060.

60. Progressing parallel design solutions for the UV disinfection upgrades, will result in some sunk/abortive costs given only one UV upgrade solution will be progressed to implementation post completion of the virus monitoring programme and QMRA. This is anticipated to be <\$75,000.

Council Effects and Views | Kā Whakaaweawe me kā Tirohaka a te Kaunihera

61. The following Council policies, strategies and bylaws were considered, and the recommendations are consistent with the principles set out in these plans and frameworks:

- QLDC's Strategic Framework
- 30 Year Infrastructure Strategy

- Three Waters Services Asset and Activity Management Plan 2024-2034
- Climate and Biodiversity Plan 2025-28
- Long Term Plan 2024-34
- Queenstown Lakes Spatial Plan
- Queenstown Lakes District Plan
- Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile Structure Plan
- Te Tapuae Southern Corridor Structure Plan

62. This matter is included in the LTP as part of the 3 Waters capital investment programme (specifically as the *Shotover Disposal Field* project) and highlighted as a key planned activity of “Investment in the Shotover Disposal Field arrangements in the context of current challenges, to ensure ongoing performance and compliance”.

Legal Considerations and Statutory Responsibilities | Ka Ture Whaiwhakaaro me kā Takohaka Waeture

63. The proposed outfall design amendments and treatment plant upgrades form part of the long-term resource consent application for the Shotover Wastewater Treatment Plant under the Resource Management Act 1991. Legal input and support have been provided throughout the resource consent application process along with the assessment and development of these refinements to assist in ensuring the proposed approach aligns with relevant statutory requirements, consenting pathways, and applicable regulatory obligations. Staff are satisfied that the recommended option can be progressed within the existing legal and regulatory framework.

Local Government Act 2002 Purpose Provisions | Te Whakatureture 2002 o te Kāwanataka ā-Kiaka

64. Section 10 of the Local Government Act 2002 states the purpose of local government is (a) to enable democratic local decision-making and action by, and on behalf of, communities; and (b) to promote the social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being of communities in the present and for the future. The Shotover Disposal project ensures adequate infrastructure is established in Queenstown to contribute to the social, economic and environmental wellbeing of the community. As such, the recommendation in this report is appropriate and within the scope of Section 10 of the Act.

65. The recommended option:

- Can be implemented through current funding under the Long Term Plan and Annual Plan;
- Is consistent with the Council's plans and policies; and

- Would not significantly alter the intended level of service provision for any significant activity undertaken by or on behalf of the Council or transfer the ownership or control of a strategic asset to or from the Council.

Attachments | Kā Tāpirihaka

A	Plant Performance over the last 12 months
B	Council Resolution of 19 March 2026
C	GHD Report – SWWTP 30% Design Amendments Memo