

Fatal Flaw Assessment Table (for assessment of Base Scheme Elements Long List)

Scope	Ref	Potential criterion	Description (and rationale for exclusion where relevant)	Use as Fatal Flaw Assessment criterion?
Investment Objectives	1	Avoid discharge of treated human waste directly to natural water bodies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option results in direct discharge of treated human waste to natural water bodies, with no mitigation (e.g. Papatūānuku land passage or wetland). 	Yes
	2	Meet regulatory standards for treated wastewater contaminants.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option does not produce the right level of treatment to meet regulatory standards. As the regulatory standard is dependent on the receiving environment, this criterion can only be used to screen complete WWTP schemes, not individual elements. 	No
	3	Minimise risk of climate change impacts on the wastewater system.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option is exposed to significant natural hazards and climate change posing an unacceptable risk from coastal erosion, inundation and/or flooding. 	Yes
Minimum Service Requirements	4	Public health risk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option will result in a significant increase in public health risk. 	Yes
	5	Alignment with the planning and regulatory framework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option does not align with the requirements of the statutory planning instruments and or other regulations (e.g. drinking water) that apply to the option, meaning consents are very difficult or impossible to secure. 	Yes
	6	Constructability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option has insufficient land area available. Option is unsuitable for local conditions (e.g. topography, geology, soil, groundwater conditions, water demand). Any other known property impacts (e.g. land is highly unlikely to be obtained, unacceptable impacts on property or existing infrastructure). 	Yes
	7	GHG emissions / Carbon footprint	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option will generate unacceptable level of carbon emissions. Unlikely to have specific knowledge on carbon footprint for each option so criterion should be excluded from this stage. 	No
	8	Infrastructure and technology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Technology is unreliable, unproven, unavailable or is not easily operated or maintained on the West Coast. Option cannot accommodate upgrades to meet future standards. 	Yes
	9	Māori cultural	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option is unacceptable to Mana whenua cultural and spiritual values. 	Yes
Four Wellbeings	10	Natural environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option poses potentially significant adverse effects on the natural environment (e.g. air and water quality, terrestrial and aquatic ecology, soils, natural character values, indigenous habitat values etc.) that cannot be appropriately avoided, remedied, or mitigated. 	Yes
	11	Social and community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option is unacceptable socially, resulting in adverse amenity impacts (e.g. noise, visual amenity, odour, traffic etc.). Option poses an unacceptable adverse effect on social and community values (e.g. future land use, recreational activities, food gathering). Unlikely to be defined at the initial stage of the assessment so should be excluded from the fatal flaw assessment. 	No
	12	Economic development and growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option is unable to cater for current or projected resident and tourist populations and industrial activity. Option lacks flexibility for future staging and is likely to constrain growth (within District Plan limits) and economic development in the region. 	Yes