

## Further Submission on Proposed Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan

Submitter ID: 200

File No:

Form 6: Further Submissions in support of, or in opposition to, submission on a Publicly Notified Proposed Policy Statement or Regional Plan under Clause 8 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Return your signed further submission by **5.00pm Wednesday 14 November 2012** to:

Freeport 1201 Proposed Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan  
Environment Canterbury  
P O Box 345  
Christchurch 8140

<b>Full Name:</b> Nicola de Wit _____	<b>Phone (Hm):</b> _____
<b>Organisation*:</b> Environmental Defence Society _____ <small>* the organisation that this further submission is made on behalf of</small>	<b>Phone (Wk):</b> 09 480 2565 _____
<b>Postal Address:</b> PO Box 95 152, Swanson, Auckland _____	<b>Phone (Cell):</b> _____
_____	<b>Postcode:</b> 0653 _____
<b>Email:</b> nicola@eds.org.nz _____	<b>Fax:</b> _____
<b>Contact name and postal address for service of person making further submission</b> (if different from above): _____ _____	

**Only certain people can make further submissions. Please tick the option that applies to you:**

I am a person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest; or

I am a person who has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest the general public has (for example, I am affected by the content of a submission); or

I am the local authority for the relevant area.

I do not wish to be heard in support of my further submission; or

I do wish to be heard in support of my further submission; and if so,

I would be prepared to consider presenting your further submission in a joint case with others making a similar submission at any hearing

**Service of your further submission:**  
Please note: any person making a further submission must **serve a copy of that submission on the original submitter no later than five working days after the submission has been provided to Environment Canterbury**. If you have made a further submission on a number of original submissions, then copies of your further submission will need to be served with each original submitter.

**Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** 14 November 2012 \_\_\_\_\_

(Signature of person making submission or person authorised to sign on behalf of person making the submission)

Please note:  
(1) all information contained in a submission under the Resource Management Act 1991, including names and addresses for service, becomes public information.

(1) I support or oppose the submission of:	(2) The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	(3) The reasons for my support or opposition are:	(4) Support or oppose
<i>Name &amp; postal address of original submission</i>	<i>Submission point reference number i.e. 4.23</i>	<i>Provide reason for support or opposition</i>	<i>Note support or oppose</i>
<b>270, Fonterra Co-operative Group Limited (Auckland)</b> <b>PO Box 3399, Shortland Street, Auckland, 1140</b> <a href="mailto:janette.campbell@cowpercampbell.co.nz">janette.campbell@cowpercampbell.co.nz</a>	Paragraph 6.17	We oppose the suggestion that there should be flexibility to enable a change in land use where it is not practicable to reduce nutrient losses (i.e. conversion from sheep farming to dairy farming). Such changes in land use are a major contributor to the water quality issues facing the Region and should be regulated.	Oppose
	Definition of "Changed"	10% is a significant margin of change. A larger figure will compromise the objectives of the plan.	Oppose
	New objectives	Any new objective relating to economic and social benefit must be subject to requirements to meet environmental bottom lines set through limits, to ensure consistency with the RMA and NPSFM.  If any new objectives are to be inserted, we support the use of the term "recognise" as the appropriate weight to be given.	Oppose in part
	Policies 4.1 – 4.8 and 4.28 – 4.36	We support the notified version, subject to our submissions.  In particular, treating outcomes as targets rather than limits is inconsistent with the NPSFM and use of good practice is insufficient if outcomes are not being achieved.	Oppose in part
	Policy 4.73	A requirement to surrender part of the allocation is necessary if the transfer of permits is to be used as a tool to phase-out over allocation.	Oppose in part
	Rules 5.43 to 5.45	We oppose a reduction in the activity statuses for land use change. The notified activity statuses are appropriate to provide a signal to users as to the appropriateness of certain activities.	Oppose
	Rule 5.47 to 5.49	The rules are necessary to ensure water quality does not continue to deteriorate. The rules applying prior to 1 July 2017 are merely interim measures and are insufficient to prevent further deterioration.	Oppose

	Rule 5.97	Non-complying status is appropriate to provide a signal to users as to the appropriateness of certain activities.	Oppose
	Rule 5.107	A requirement to surrender part of the allocation is necessary if the transfer of permits is to be used as a tool to phase-out over allocation.	Oppose
<b>315, DairyNZ Incorporated</b> <b>Private Bag 3221, Waikato Mail</b> <b>Centre, Hamilton, 3240</b>		We disagree that there “is no compelling rationale for the establishment of limits to be rushed, via interim limits”. To the contrary water quality in many water bodies is already unacceptable and further degradation in the interim must be minimised. Region-wide interim limits are essential.	Oppose
	Paragraph 4	We accept the value of the dairy industry to the economy. However, the Region should not rely on this industry which is also vulnerable to volatility. Diversification is essential for economic wellbeing.	Oppose in part
	Objective 3.X	We accept the importance of water to social and economic wellbeing. If this objective is to be inserted it must be subsidiary to achieving the bio-physical bottom lines as required by other objectives.	Oppose in part
	Objective 3.14	The submission is inconsistent with the CWMS which prioritises community drinking water supplies.	Oppose
	Policy 4.1	We recognise that region-wide limits are not the best solution. However, water quality in many water bodies is already unacceptable and further degradation in the interim must be minimised. Region-wide interim limits are essential, and must form part of the policies rather than “aspirational” objectives.	Oppose
	Policy 4.6	Allowing the submission would be inconsistent with the NPSFM as it could allow over-allocation.	Oppose
	Policy 4.7	Mitigation of over-allocation is not consistent with the NPSFM which requires the phase-out of over-allocation.	Oppose
	Policy 4.34	Within Red and Lake Zones the water quality is such that it is appropriate that there is a need to demonstrate a significant and enduring reduction from existing levels.	Oppose
	Policy 4.38	The NPSFM requires the setting of limits.	Oppose

	Policy 4.73	A requirement to surrender part of the allocation is necessary if the transfer of permits is to be used as a tool to phase-out over allocation.	Oppose
	Rule 5.45	Non-complying status is appropriate in a Red Zone.	Oppose
	Rule 5.49	As above. High costs for preparing consent applications are appropriate where those activities are to be discouraged.	Oppose
	Rule 5.96	The rules must require annual volume limits to ensure consistency with the NPSFM.	Oppose
<b>320, Combined Canterbury Provinces, Federated Farmers of New Zealand</b> <b>PO Box 414, Ashburton, 7740</b> <a href="mailto:lhume@fedfarm.org">lhume@fedfarm.org</a> <a href="mailto:mbennett@fedfarm.org.nz">mbennett@fedfarm.org.nz</a>	General Submissions – CWMS	We recognise that region-wide limits are not the best solution. However, water quality in many water bodies is already unacceptable and further degradation in the interim must be minimised while sub-regional based limits are established. Although the implementation timeframe in the NPSFM may allow further delays, the current state of water quality does not allow further delays.	Oppose
	Definition of “changed”	An increase of more than 10% in the loss of nitrogen is appropriate as it addresses the effect to be managed. Any change in land use that will cause increases in nutrient output should be managed by the provisions that apply to land use change. The issue is with the effects not the activity.	Oppose
	New objective	We accept the importance of water to social and economic wellbeing. If this objective is to be inserted it must be subsidiary to achieving the bio-physical bottom lines as required by other objectives.	Oppose in part
	Policy 4.1	We recognise that sub-regional limits are preferable. However, water quality in many water bodies is already unacceptable and further degradation in the interim must be minimised. Region-wide interim limits are essential, and must form part of the policies rather than “aspirational” objectives.	Oppose
	Policy 4.2	Use of good practice is insufficient if outcomes are not being achieved.	Oppose
	Policy 4.4	Policy is consistent with CWMS.	Oppose

	Policy 4.6	The suggested paragraph (b) would allow limits to be breach/further over-allocation which is inconsistent with the NPSFM.	Oppose
	Policy 4.26	Livestock exclusion has been recognised by the industry itself as essential for protecting water quality for some time e.g. the Clean Streams Accord sets a target of 90% exclusion by 2012. There are few exceptions where exclusion is <i>truly</i> not possible.	Oppose
	Policy 4.28	The NPSFM directs the use of limits.	Oppose
	Policy 4.31	In Red Zones water quality outcomes are currently not met and maintenance is not sufficient, improvements must be made.	Oppose
	Policy 4.32	The NPSFM directs the use of limits.	Oppose
	Policy 4.34	In Red Zones water quality outcomes are currently not met and maintenance is not sufficient, improvements must be made.	Oppose
	Policy 4.73	A requirement to surrender part of the allocation is necessary if the transfer of permits is to be used as a tool to phase-out over allocation.	Oppose
	Rules 5.40	Voluntary use of farm management plans is insufficient as an interim measure.	Oppose
	Rule 5.43	Strong controls are necessary to ensure water quality does not deteriorate in these areas as it has done in other areas.	Oppose
	Rule 5.44	Discretionary activity status is appropriate to provide a signal to users as to the appropriateness of certain activities.	Oppose
	Rule 5.45	Non-complying activity status is appropriate to provide a signal to users as to the appropriateness of certain activities.	Oppose
	Rule 5.47	Strong controls are necessary to ensure water quality does not deteriorate in these areas as it has done in other areas.	Oppose
	Rule 5.48	Discretionary activity status is appropriate to provide a signal to users as to the appropriateness of certain activities.	Oppose
	Rule 5.49	Non-complying activity status is appropriate to provide a signal to users as to the appropriateness of certain activities.	Oppose
	Rule 5.107	A requirement to surrender part of the allocation is necessary if the transfer of permits is to be used as a tool to phase-out over allocation.	Oppose

	Rule 5.133 – 5.137	Prohibited activity status is appropriate to provide a signal to users as to the appropriateness of certain activities.	Oppose in part
<b>326, Horticulture New Zealand</b> <b>PO Box 10232, The Terrace,</b> <b>Wellington, 6143</b> <a href="mailto:chris.keenan@hortnz.co.nz">chris.keenan@hortnz.co.nz</a>	Definition of “Changed”:	Requiring the <i>entire</i> property to be changed to arable or horticultural land use is too high a standard for measuring a change.	Oppose
	Policy 4.28:	Discharge targets are required throughout the region. Areas which currently have good water quality require targets to ensure this is maintained.	Oppose
	Policy 4.29:	There must be an interim policy in place to ensure that effects are managed while ‘good practice’ is articulated.	Oppose
	Policy 4.31:	The policy must require the achievement of water quality outcomes and reductions in allocation to ensure consistency with the NPSFM.	Oppose
	Policy 4.33:	The notified version provides greater certainty. Audits are necessary to ensure compliance.	Oppose
	Policy 4.34:	The policy must require the achievement of water quality outcomes and reductions in allocation to ensure consistency with the NPSFM.	Oppose
	Rule 5.25	We oppose the deletion of (6) as it is necessary to protect community drinking water supplies.	Oppose
	Rule 5.47:	Restricted discretionary status is required to ensure there is an ability to turn down consent.	Oppose
	Rule 5.48 and 5.49:	Discretionary and non-complying status is appropriate to provide a signal to users as to the appropriateness of certain activities.	Oppose
	Rule 5.96:	The submission may allow takes that exceed limits inconsistent with the NPSFM.	Oppose
	Rule 5.97 and 5.98:	Non-complying and prohibited activity status is appropriate to provide a signal to users as to the appropriateness of certain	Oppose

		activities and <i>ensure</i> limits are met.	
	Rule 5.101:	The submission may allow takes that exceed limits inconsistent with the NPSFM.	Oppose
	Rules 5.103, 5.103, and 5.104:	Non-complying and prohibited activity status is appropriate to provide a signal to users as to the appropriateness of certain activities and <i>ensure</i> limits are met.	Oppose
	Rules (general):	We accept that there may be a need for amendments to take into account the characteristics of horticulture (e.g. OVERSEER being better suited to pastoral farming). However, we submit that any amendments should retain equivalent standards as for other activities and any differences are procedural only. As one example, a number of suggested rule changes (Rule 5.xP and xRDA) fail to exclude the Lake Zone.	Oppose