



Bruce & Yvonne C <glenullen@gmail.com>

PC1 submission

2 messages

Bruce & Yvonne C <glenullen@gmail.com>

Wed, Mar 8, 2017 at 3:28 PM

To: healthyriders@waikatoregion.govt.nz

Dear sir

Please find attached my submission.

I also wish to add under Policy 3 that Horticulture should be exempted from nutrient discharges as proposed in this policy and follow Auckland policy of exempting Horticulture provided they follow excepted good management practices.

This is in recondition of their importance to the growing population in the region.

Regards

Bruce Cameron

Sent from my iPad

 **BBC Submission to PC1 2017.docx**
60K

Healthy Rivers <healthyriders@waikatoregion.govt.nz>

Wed, Mar 8, 2017 at 4:53 PM

To: Bruce & Yvonne C <glenullen@gmail.com>

Hi there,

Thank you for your submission, it has been received. We will be in touch in the next week or so should we require any further information from you.

Kind regards,

Danica

Danica de Lisle | Submissions Co-ordinator | Science and Strategy

Waikato Regional Council

DDI: 07 859 0835

Private Bag 3038, Waikato Mail Centre, Hamilton 3240

Please consider the environment before printing this email

[Quoted text hidden]

This email message and any attached files may contain confidential information, and may be subject to legal professional privilege. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately and destroy the original message. Any views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Waikato Regional Council. Waikato Regional Council makes reasonable efforts to ensure that its email has been scanned and is free of viruses, however can make no warranty that this email or any attachments to it are free from viruses.

Visit our website at <http://www.waikatoregion.govt.nz>

Submission: Waikato Regional Council's Proposed Healthy Rivers/Wai Ora Plan Change 1 (PPC1)

Submission on a publicly notified proposed Regional Plan prepared under the Resource Management Act 1991.

Submitting On: The Waikato Regional Council's Proposed Healthy Rivers/Wai Ora Plan Change 1 (PC1)

Submitting To: Waikato Regional Council
401 Grey Street
Hamilton East
Private bag 3038
Waikato Mail Centre
HAMILTON 3240

Full Name:	Bruce Bell Cameron
Phone (home):	09 233 3045
Phone (mobile/work):	0274 531 382
Postal Address:	R D 5 Tuakau 2695
Email Address:	glenullen@gmail.com

Submission

1. I have reviewed Waikato Regional Council's Proposed Healthy Rivers/Wai Ora Plan Change 1 (PPC1) and **oppose** the Plan Change in its current form.
2. I wish to be heard in support of this submission.

I am not a trade competitor for the purposes of the submission but the proposed plan has a direct impact on my ability to farm. If changes sought in the plan are adopted they may impact on others but I am not in direct trade competition with them.

B B Cameron _____ **1-3-17** _____
Signature **date**



Signature **date**

3. Thank you for the opportunity to submit on the Waikato Regional Council's Proposed Plan Change 1 (PPC1).

I own, along with my wife, Glenullen Holdings Ltd which runs a drystock property of 334ha carrying around 400 bulls, rearing most from calves and taking them through to 18mnths/2years of age before sending them to the works.

We also run sheep; 1000 breeding ewes with all progeny sold prime to the works.

The property is in the Whangape Sub Catchment number 16 and is listed as a priority one.

I have farmed this property for 43 years along with my wife.

When I first took over running this property, I started a large scheme of planting poplar and willow poles to stabilise hillsides and streams.

A substantial amount of fencing has been carried out on this property with approximately 20ha of bush and wetlands fenced off from stock and retired.

I have also fenced off approximately 3 kms of waterways.

When I first took over this property, if a beast or sheep got into a stream, it would turn muddy. I had a couple of places along the streams where I would be able to check (by it's clarity) if any animals had got in.

Now that virtually all the waterways are fenced off with no stock getting into them, I have regular muddy waterways from having koi carp moving in and stirring up the stream bottom.

As a note, koi carp have not been addressed in PC1. Koi carp are endemic in this catchment, especially in Lake Whangape. Koi carp will move 14 times their weight in silt per day, which, extrapolated out, equates to 1 tonne of koi carp moving 14 tonnes of silt per day.

Over the 43 years of farming this property, I have developed a stock policy with a mix of sheep and cattle that suits the climate and the land type.

Cattle are kept off the wet hills in the winter, with sheep being grazed in these areas. We make extensive use of electric fencing.

The age of the cattle carried has been reduced to lessen their impact over winter. In the future, I intend to finish my stream fencing, and fence more areas so I can carry more cattle on the property without having any further impact of significance on the land.

I am concerned the way PC1 is proposed, as it does not allow for increases in production without having to go through significant resource consent costs.

I could carry on doing conservation planting and fencing, but I would be hesitant to do so, as PC1 provides me with no certainty that the investment would be worth it, as, in 10 years' time, when the plan is revisited, I may be told that not enough has been achieved in the reduction of the four contaminants into the Waikato River and the land has now got to be planted into trees.

I NEED CERTAINTY THAT MY INVESTMENT IN MITIGATION OF CONTAMINANTS IS NOT WASTED.

In the section 32 analysis page 64 C.2.2.2 Historical Changes in land use and nitrogen leaching losses

I note that it states: *“estimated nitrogen losses from non-dairy pastoral land use increased by 4% over the period 1972 to 2012”*

So, over a 40 year period a 4% increase is very minor, yet PC1 as proposed is using a draconian sledge hammer over this sector of farming at huge cost with questionable gain to the environment.

In Summary:

PC1 effectively caps production out of the Waikato and Waipa catchments, and with the restrictions placed on it, would make it hard and costly to increase production.

With Auckland being on the very front door of the Waikato and having an expected population increase of one million people by 2035/40, extra food production is going to be required especially in the horticultural sector. With no further increase in horticultural land permitted for 10 years, are we now going to be expected to Airfreight fresh vegetables in from overseas in the future?

With the mitigation costs involved in meeting PC1, expectations as ground truthed by the Federated farmers study I can see a large number of farms being made uneconomic.

Banks would most likely not lend to farms to carry out mitigation work which would make the farm uneconomic and this then defeats any attempt to improve river quality.

For young people wanting to come on to the land and increase a farm's potential, it would not now be viable.

Young people need to be able to see how they can improve production/profit, whilst still looking after the environment and under PC1 there can be no lift in the “N” reference point. For this reason, our son will not be taking over our property, and has left the farming industry as he does not see a future in it for him under PC1.

4. The table below are the details for the specific provisions of the proposal that this submission relates to and the decisions it seeks from Council. The outcomes sought and the wording used is as a suggestion only, where a suggestion is proposed it is with the intention of 'or words to that effect'. The outcomes sought may require consequential changes to the plan, including Objectives, Policies, or other rules, or restructuring of the Plan, or parts thereof, to give effect to the relief sought.

No.	Section number of the Proposed Plan Change 1	Support/ Oppose	Submission	Decision sought
3.11.2 Objectives				
4.1	Objective 1 Long-term restoration and protection of water quality for each sub-catchment and Freshwater Management Unit	Support with amendments	Support the intention of Objective 1. Oppose the attribute targets set in Table 3.11-1. The attribute targets are too prescriptive and should align with the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM) and Waikato River Authority's (WRA) Vision and Strategy. Objective 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not consider all contaminant sources holistically • Includes flood/high flow conditions in water quality target data which are considered outliers • Does not take into consideration the variability associated with sub-catchments i.e. climate and soil type 	Retain the long-term restoration and protection of water quality for the Waikato and Waipa rivers. Amend PC1 to be holistic and include all sources influencing the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River and its catchments, for example Koi Carp, point source discharges, and hydro-dams. Remove flood/high flow conditions from water quality target data. Address contaminants on a sub-catchment basis, to enable targeting of the highest omitting sub-catchments.
4.2	Objective 2 Social, economic and cultural wellbeing is maintained in the long term	Support with amendments	Support maintaining the long term social, economic and cultural wellbeing; this must be a foundation objective in PC1. However, PC1 is not achieving Objective 2 because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The section 32 analysis is incomplete due to the withdrawal of the Hauraki iwi area. 	Retain the maintenance of long-term social, economic and cultural wellbeing in the Waikato and Waipa catchment communities. Withdraw PC1 until the Hauraki Iwi area and the WRA's Vision and Strategy has been amended. Then conduct a section 32 analysis to investigate the revised impact PC1 could have on society and

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadequate social modelling conducted • Compliance costs alone are likely to cost my business a considerable amount of money as estimated by the Federated Farmers (2016) case study. • Outcomes from PC1 will highly alter my business Glenullen Holdings Ltd and community of Glen Murray because they will be undermined through unsustainable and unjustified compliance and mitigation costs, farm devaluation and Nitrogen Reference Point (NRP). • Waikato Regional Council (WRC) has stated they currently have no known means of robustly measuring social, economic or cultural wellbeing. 	<p>economy.</p> <p>Amend rules in PC1 to remove NRP to align with intention of Objective 2.</p> <p>Enable appropriate mitigation strategies to be adopted in the context of water quality gains to be made, through a tailored Farm Environment Plan (FEP) to align with intention of Objective 2.</p> <p>Address contaminants on a sub-catchment basis, to enable targeting of the highest omitting sub-catchments to align with intention of Objective 2.</p> <p>Develop robust indicators to measure social, economic and cultural wellbeing.</p>
4.3	Objective 3 Short-term improvements in water quality in the first stage of restoration and protection of water quality for each sub-catchment and Freshwater Management Unit	Support with amendments	<p>Support reducing the diffuse discharges in the short-term by 10%, of the overall long-term 80-year water quality targets.</p> <p>However, there is a lack of scientific data to support PC1 to achieve Objective 3. For example, PC1 incentives high emitters - to maintain flexibility on my farm, and therefore my land value, I will need to keep my NRP as high as possible.</p> <p>To me, this is the opposite effect of what PC1 should achieve to improve the health and wellbeing of the Waikato and Waipa rivers.</p>	<p>Retain a 10% achievement of the long-term water quality targets set out in PC1 by 2026.</p> <p>Amend rules in PC1 to remove NRP.</p> <p>Adopt a sub-catchment management approach to ensure collaborative and fair management of resources within each sub-catchment.</p> <p>Enable appropriate mitigation strategies to be adopted in the context of water quality gains to be made, through a tailored FEP.</p>
4.4	Objective 4 People and community resilience	Support with amendments	<p>Support people and community resilience – it must be a cornerstone objective in PC1.</p> <p>However, currently PC1 does not meet the requirements of Objective 4. The proposed rules undermine community resilience in the</p>	<p>Retain the staged approach.</p> <p>Amend rules in PC1 to remove NRP and land use change restriction.</p> <p>Adopt a sub-catchment management approach to</p>

			<p>rural communities of the Waikato and Waipa catchments and will adversely impact on social and economic wellbeing in both the short term and long term. The NRP, associated farm devaluation and loss of flexibility, coupled with substantial compliance and mitigation costs on many farms is unsustainable, as evidenced by case studies.</p> <p>Water quality already meets attribute targets in the majority of these sub-catchments. Despite this, no benefit is awarded to low emitters who may be forced off their land through unsustainable financial impacts imposed by PC1. This will in turn undermine the rural communities of the Waikato and Waipa catchments, as detailed in Objective 2.</p>	<p>ensure collaborative and fair management of resources within each sub-catchment.</p> <p>Enable appropriate mitigation strategies to be adopted in the context of water quality gains to be made, through a tailored FEP.</p>
4.5	Objective 5 Mana Tangata – protecting and restoring tangata whenua values	Support with amendments	<p>Support protecting and restoring Tangata whenua values. Mana Tangata is important to New Zealand’s culture, but it also needs the support of industries, markets, and communities (primary production). The Waikato region is an integrated community therefore co-management is the key, not run all primary sectors into the ground.</p>	Revise PC1 to acknowledge primary production as a core value to reflect Mana Tangata.
4.6	Objective 6 Whangamarino Wetland	Support	The Whangamarino Wetland should be restored.	Retain as proposed
3.11.3 Policy				
4.7	Policy 1 Manage diffuse discharges of nitrogen, phosphorus, sediment and microbial pathogens	Support with amendments	<p>Support managing water quality on a sub-catchment basis because it considers soil suitability and climate conditions.</p> <p>Support stock exclusion, however only where it is practical to do so, and is relative to water quality benefit gains.</p>	<p>Retain managing diffuse discharges and water quality on a sub-catchment basis.</p> <p>Enable appropriate mitigation strategies to be adopted in the context of water quality gains to be made, through a tailored FEP.</p> <p>Amend rules in PC1 to reflect Policy 1 and 9.</p>

			<p>Support enabling low intensity land uses.</p> <p>Support moderate to high levels of contaminant discharges to reduce their discharges by appropriate mitigation strategies through a tailored FEP.</p> <p>However, the rules in PC1 do not reflect Policy 1 and 9.</p> <p>Oppose mandatory fencing in areas where slopes are over 15°. This requirement is unjustified, does not align with proposed amendments to the NPS-FM, and is financially unsustainable for the majority. It is considered that the increased erosion risk and sediment loading in waterbodies from constructing fences over 15°.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 1 in PC1 to state (changes are red):</p> <p>c. Progressively excluding cattle, horses, deer and pigs from rivers, streams, drains, wetlands and lakes for areas with a slope less than 15 degrees and on those slopes exceeding 15 degrees where break feeding occurs.</p> <p>d. Requiring farming activities on slopes exceeding 15 degrees (where break feeding does not occur) to manage contaminant discharges to water bodies through mitigation actions that specifically target critical source areas.</p> <p>Require clarification on how slope is measured given the ranges of topography experienced within each paddock and adjoining watercourses.</p>
4.8	Policy 2 Tailored approach to reducing diffuse discharges from farming activities	Support with amendments	<p>Support a tailored, risk based FEP, allowing appropriate and tailored mitigations to reduce diffuse discharges.</p> <p>Support the reduction of diffuse discharges throughout all sub-catchments, however only where applicable i.e. if the sub-catchment is well below all attribute targets then maintenance would be appropriate.</p> <p>Oppose a NRP because there should not be an uncertain, estimated number that governs land management based upon nitrogen only. My FEP will provide transparency and confidence to Waikato Regional Council, and the wider community, that my property is</p>	<p>Retain appropriate mitigation strategies to be adopted in the context of water quality gains to be made, through a tailored FEP.</p> <p>Amend PC1 to reflect Policy 1 in adopting a sub-catchment management approach to ensure collaborative and fair management of resources within each sub-catchment.</p> <p>Amend rules in PC1 to remove NRP.</p>

			reducing, or maintaining where applicable, its diffuse discharges relative to all four contaminants.	
4.9	Policy 4 Enabling activities with lower discharges to continue or to be established while signalling further change may be required in future	Support with amendments	Support enabling low intensity land uses. However, I consider the uncertainty surrounding 'future mitigation actions' to be unacceptable. The level of capital expenditure required to meet the 10-year plan without assurance of future compliance for hill country farmers is prohibitive and counterproductive. If best practice is being adopted, then future certainty should be provided.	Retain provisions allowing for low intensity land uses to continue and establish. Remove any signalling of future mitigation action requirements from Policy 4 in PC1
4.10	Policy 5 Stage approach	Support with amendments	Support an 80-year staged approach to achieve the long-term water quality targets. However, Policy 5 does not support Objective 2, 4 and 5. Because it does not: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimise social disruption • Allow for innovation and new practices to develop • Support prosperous communities There is little scientific evidence that PC1 will reduce diffuse discharges to achieve the long-term water quality targets.	Retain the staged approach. Amend rules in PC1 to remove NRP. Adopt a sub-catchment management approach to ensure collaborative and fair management of resources within each sub-catchment. Enable appropriate mitigation strategies to be adopted in the context of water quality gains to be made, through a tailored FEP.
4.11	Policy 6 Restricting land use change	Oppose	Oppose restricting land use change based on the type of land use, as it is a blunt tool. This Policy, and related rule (3.11.5.7), will inhibit growth and innovation within the Waikato region, and nationally because I am unable to adapt to market demands/changes. Land use flexibility is key to running	Amend PC1 to state high priority sub-catchments, in relation to water quality, have a Restricted Discretionary activity status. And low priority sub-catchments to have a Permitted activity status. Amend PC1 to adopt a sub-catchment management approach to ensure collaborative

			<p>sustainable business operations. Therefore, Policy 6 conflicts with Objective 2, 4, 5 and Policy 5.</p> <p>Where a sub-catchment is of high priority (in terms of water quality), land use change should be a restricted discretionary activity status. However, where a sub-catchment is of low priority, land use change should be a permitted activity.</p>	<p>and fair management of resources within each sub-catchment. Then enable appropriate mitigation strategies to be adopted in the context of water quality gains to be made, through a tailored FEP</p>
4.12	Policy 7 Preparing for allocation in the future	Support with amendments	<p>Support as it takes into account land suitability regarding diffuse discharge reductions.</p> <p>However, PC1 is severely restricting growth and innovation on my farm and in my community in order to give more time to gain scientific data to appropriately implement this Policy in the future.</p> <p>WRC needs to work collaboratively with stakeholder groups to develop sub-catchment management approach, and enable appropriate mitigation strategies through a tailored FEP.</p>	<p>Retain reducing diffuse discharges while considering land suitability.</p> <p>Enable appropriate mitigation strategies to be adopted in the context of water quality gains to be made, through a tailored FEP.</p> <p>WRC to work collaboratively with stakeholder groups to develop sub-catchment management approach.</p>
4.13	Policy 8 Prioritised implementation	Support with amendments	<p>Support prioritising sub-catchments and implementing at different stages.</p>	<p>Retain as proposed with altered priority catchments as proposed in PC1</p>
4.14	Policy 9 Sub-catchment (including edge of field) mitigation planning, co-ordination and funding	Support with amendments	<p>Support managing water quality at a sub-catchment level.</p> <p>However, the rules in PC1 should give effect to this Policy and enable appropriate mitigation strategies through a tailored FEP.</p>	<p>Retain managing water quality on a sub-catchment level.</p> <p>Amend the rules in PC1 to reflect Policy 1 and 9.</p> <p>Enable appropriate mitigation strategies to be adopted in the context of water quality gains to be made, through a tailored FEP.</p>

4.15	Policy 10 Provide for point source discharges of regional significance	Support with amendments	Support considering the regional significance of infrastructure and industry because there are certain point source discharges that are vital to human health and wellbeing. However, point source discharges should be taken into consideration for achieving the short and long term water quality targets, through a sub-catchment approach.	Retain the consideration of regional significance of point source discharges infrastructure and industry. Amend PC1 to be holistic and include all sources influencing the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River and its catchments, including pest fish species, point sources, and hydro-dams. Adopt a sub-catchment management approach to ensure collaborative and fair management of resources within each sub-catchment.
4.16	Policy 11 Application of Best Practicable Options and mitigation or offset of effects to point source discharges	Support with amendments	Support applying Best Practicable Options. However, this is not applicable to all stakeholders, and there are no specific rules to reflect this Policy in PC1.	Retain applying Best Practicable Options but amend to include all stakeholders e.g. through FEP. Provide clarification for what is a “significant toxic adverse effect”. Amend rules to reflect Policy 11.
4.17	Policy 12 Additional considerations for point source discharges in relation to water quality targets.	Support with amendments	Support considering past technology upgrades and costs associated with upgrading. However, this consideration is not consistent with land owners. Point source discharges can stage future mitigations to spread innovation costs over time to allow for a return in investment. This is not the case for me as a land owner. There is also no regard to cumulative effects from point source discharges.	Retain considering past technology upgrades and costs associated with upgrading. Adopt a sub-catchment management approach to ensure collaborative and fair management of resources within the region. Amend PC1 to allow these considerations to occur across all sources influencing the health and wellbeing of the Waikato and Waipa rivers. This could be achieved by enabling appropriate mitigation strategies to be adopted in the context of water quality gains to be made, through a tailored FEP.

4.18	Policy 13 Point sources consent duration	Support with amendments	Support considering the magnitude and significance of the investment made. However, land owners should be provided the same consideration when applying for consent under rule 3.11.5.4, 3.11.5.5, 3.11.5.6 and 3.11.5.7 in PC1.	Retain consideration of the consent duration in relation to the magnitude and significance of the investment made. Adopt to include all property owners and enterprises within the Waikato and Waipa Catchments.
4.19	Policy 14 Lakes Freshwater Management Units	Support	Support restoring and protecting lakes in 80 years through tailored plans.	Retain as proposed.
4.20	Policy 15 Whangamarino Wetland	Support with amendments	Support restoring the Whangamarino Wetland. However, I believe that all sources influencing the water quality of the wetland should be considered and remediated in collaboration, not just one source.	Retain restoring the Whangamarino Wetland. Amend Policy 15 to be holistic and include all sources influencing the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River and its catchments especially pest fish species, in relation to sub-catchment management.
4.21	Policy 16 Flexibility for development of land returned under Te Tiriti o Waitangi settlements and multiple owned Māori land	Support with amendments	Support flexibility for development of Māori land. However, there is no rule in PC1 to reflect this Policy (16). Additionally, under PC1 all property owners and enterprises have restricted flexibility. This in turn reduces the social, economic and cultural benefits for everybody because the surrounding rural communities are compromised.	Retain flexibility for development of Māori land. Amend PC1 to include a rule to reflect Policy 16. Consider a similar flexibility for all property owners and enterprises.
4.22	Policy 17 Considering the wider context of the Vision and Strategy	Support with amendments	Support applying policies and methods based on the Vision and Strategy. However, the WRA's Vision and Strategy is currently under review, therefore PC1 may end up inadequately reflecting the Vision and Strategy.	Retain applying policies and methods based on the Vision and Strategy. Withdraw PC1 until the Hauraki Iwi area and the WRA's Vision and Strategy has been amended.
3.11.4 Implementation Methods				

4.23	3.11.4.1 Working with others	Support with amendments	Support working with stakeholders to ensure PC1 is implemented efficiently and cost effectively	Retain with reference to efficiency and costs.
4.24	3.11.4.2 Certified Industry Scheme	Support	Support that I can opt into a Certified Industry Scheme to help me manage my operation to the highest environmental standard, while considering my social, cultural, and economic impacts.	Retain as proposed.
4.25	3.11.4.3 Farm Environment Plans	Support with amendments	<p>Support a tailored, risk based FEP for my business to improve, or maintain where applicable, my environmental standard in a desired time-frame negotiated between my Farm Environmental Planner and myself.</p> <p>However, I understand there could be a shortage of Certified Farm Environment Planners. As an alternative, I suggest that land users who have adequate experience and capabilities should be able to work with an approved industry or scheme, run by WRC, to be accredited to develop their own FEP based upon a common template.</p> <p>Support robust third party auditing and this must be independent of WRC also.</p>	<p>Retain a tailored, risk based FEP.</p> <p>Enable land users who have adequate experience and capabilities should be able to work with an approved industry or scheme, run by WRC, to be accredited to develop their own FEP based upon a common template.</p> <p>The auditing process to be independent of the farmer, the certified Farm Environment Planner and WRC</p>
4.26	3.11.4.4 Lakes and Whangamarino Wetland	Support with amendments	<p>Support WRC working with others to gain knowledge and information around lakes and the Whangamarino wetland.</p> <p>Support 3.11.4.4 (d) "work towards managing the presence of pest weeds and fish in the shallow lakes and connected lowland rivers area, including Whangamarino Wetland".</p> <p>However, there are no policies, objectives or</p>	<p>Retain working with others in relation to lakes and Whangamarino Wetland.</p> <p>Retain managing pest weeds and fish.</p> <p>Amend PC1 to include the management of pest weeds and fish in the policies, objectives and rules in the Waikato and Waipa Catchments.</p>

			rules in PC1 that recognise this point. It should also be extended to the Waikato and Waipa rivers and their catchments, not just shallow lakes and connected lowland river areas.	
4.27	3.11.4.5 Sub-catchment scale planning	Support with amendments	Fully support managing diffuse discharges and water quality on a sub-catchment level. However, this method is not reflected in the rules of PC1.	Retain managing diffuse discharges and water quality on a sub-catchment level. Amend PC1 to reflect this method in the rules.
4.28	3.11.4.6 Funding and implementation	Support	Support WRC providing resources and leadership to implement PC1. Support securing funding for implementation of PC1.	Retain as proposed.
4.29	3.11.4.7/8 Information needs to support any future allocation/Reviewing Chapter 3.11 and developing an allocation framework for the next Regional Plan	Support with amendments	Support gaining data. Support allocation on a sub-catchment basis. Oppose future allocation.	Retain gaining data. Amend PC1 to enable the management of diffuse discharges on a sub-catchment basis.
4.30	3.11.4.9 Managing the effects of urban development	Support	Support managing the effects of urban development.	Retain as proposed
4.31	3.11.4.12 Support research and dissemination of best practice guidelines to reduce diffuse discharges	Support	Support implementing best practice guideline to reduce diffuse discharges.	Retain as proposed.
	3.11.5 Rules			
4.32	3.11.5.1 Permitted Activity	Support	Support enabling low intensity land uses to continue and establish under a Permitted	Retain enabling low intensity land uses to continue and establish under a Permitted Activity

	Rule – Small and Low Intensity farming activities		<p>Activity status.</p> <p>Stock exclusion should be in conformance with the proposed amendments to the NPS-FM.</p> <p>Additionally, clarification is required to determine what constitutes slope on land where topography is undulating, and portions of the slope are both under and over the 15° threshold. This is currently subject to interpretation and difficult to implement.</p>	<p>status.</p> <p>Amend PC1 for stock exclusion: Cattle, horses, deer and pigs are excluded from water bodies in conformance with Schedule C for areas with a slope less than 15 degrees and on those slopes exceeding 15 degrees where break feeding occurs.</p> <p>Provide clarification on how/where to measure slope on undulating land.</p>
4.33	3.11.5.2 Permitted Activity Rule – Other farming activities	Support with amendments	<p>Support low intensity land uses that have little to no environmental risk to be under a Permitted Activity status.</p> <p>Support stock exclusion, however only where it is practical to do so, and is relative to water quality benefit gains.</p> <p>Oppose a NRP because there should not be a number that controls my ability to manage my land in the way I see fit. My FEP will provide a risk based mitigation plan to reduce all my diffuse discharges. Additionally, the 2014/2015 and 2015/2016 financial years occur when my stocking level was lower, therefore my on-farm inputs were lower. This is not a true representation of the past use of land.</p> <p>Opposed 3.11.5.2-3b(i), I should not be limited to my stocking rate on my land at 22 October 2016. This is not a true representation of my farming activity and it severely limits my growth</p>	<p>Retain Permitted Activity status for low intensity land uses.</p> <p>Amend PC1 for stock exclusion: Cattle, horses, deer and pigs are excluded from water bodies in conformance with Schedule C for areas with a slope less than 15 degrees and on those slopes exceeding 15 degrees where break feeding occurs.</p> <p>Amend rules in PC1 to remove NRP.</p> <p>Address contaminants on a sub-catchment basis, to enable targeting of the highest omitting sub-catchments.</p> <p>Enable appropriate mitigation strategies to be adopted in the context of water quality gains to be made, through a tailored Farm Environment Plan.</p> <p>Amend 3.11.5.2 introduction to: The use of land for farming activities (excluding</p>

			<p>and innovation. It also hinders my economic viability for my business and for my community. In turn, this will generate an additional load of stress on myself and my community. Overall this undermines Objective 2, 4, 5 and Policy 5.</p> <p>By adding a maximum of 18 stock units per hectare, at 30 June 2016 would indicate the optimal winter carrying capacity of the land, aligning with good management practices.</p> <p>Oppose 3.11.5.4 c, "or grazed" should not be included and cultivation should be allowed up to 25°. Again, it severely limits my growth and innovation. It also hinders my economic viability for my business and for my community. In turn, this will generate an additional load of stress on myself and my community. Overall this undermines Objective 2, 4, 5 and Policy 5.</p> <p>Require clarification around stock exclusion. 3.11.5.2-3e and 3.11.5.2-4e(ii) states a three-metre buffer between water body and stock is required. However, in Schedule C the buffer is one-meter, and in Schedule 1 the buffer is based on slope.</p>	<p>commercial vegetable production) and the associated diffuse discharge of nitrogen, phosphorous, sediment and microbial pathogens onto or into land in circumstances which may result in those contaminants entering water where the property area is greater than 4.1 hectares, and has more than 6 stock units per hectare but less than 18 stock units per hectare at the 30 June 2016, or is used for arable cropping, is a permitted activity subject to the following conditions:</p> <p>Amend rule in PC1 to remove 3.11.2-3b(i).</p> <p>Amend rule in PC1 to: No part of the property or enterprise over 45 25° slope is cultivated or grazed unless effects of diffuse discharges can be mitigated</p> <p>Provide clarification around stock exclusion requirements i.e. setback buffers and where to measure setback from on undulating land.</p>
4.34	3.11.5.3 Permitted Activity Rule – Farming activities with a Farm Environment Plan under a Certified Industry Scheme	Support with amendments	<p>Support a tailored, risk based Farm Environment Plan to reduce diffuse discharges.</p> <p>Support a Certified Industry Scheme</p> <p>Support stock exclusion, however only where it is practical to do so, and is relative to water</p>	<p>Retain FEP, Certified Industry Scheme, and stock exclusion where practical.</p> <p>Amend rule in PC1 to remove NRP.</p> <p>Amend rule in PC1 to: Cattle, horses, deer and pigs are excluded from water bodies in conformance with Schedule C for</p>

		<p>quality benefit gains.</p> <p>Oppose a NRP because there should not be a number that controls my ability to manage my land in the way I see fit. My FEP will provide a risk based mitigation plan to reduce all my diffuse discharges. Additionally, the 2014/2015 and 2015/2016 financial years occur when the payout was low, therefore my on-farm inputs were lower. This is not a true representation of the past use of land.</p> <p>Also, Overseer is the only available tool for me to generate my NRP, but it was never designed as a regulatory tool; only as a great management tool.</p> <p>Require clarification around stock exclusion. 3.11.5.3 refers to Schedule C and Schedule 1, both have stock exclusion requirements. Schedule C states the buffer is one-meter, and Schedule 1 the buffer is based on slope.</p>	<p>areas with a slope less than 15 degrees and on those slopes exceeding 15 degrees where break feeding occurs.</p> <p>Address contaminants on a sub-catchment basis, to enable targeting of the highest omitting sub-catchments.</p> <p>Provide clarification around stock exclusion requirements i.e. setback buffers and where to measure setback from on undulating land.</p> <p>Provide clarification around how long a FEP will be viable for.</p> <p>Provide clarification around stock exclusion requirements i.e. setback buffers and where to measure setback from on undulating land.</p>
4.35	3.11.5.4 Controlled Activity Rule – Farming activities with a Farm Environment Plan not under a Certified Industry Scheme	<p>Support a tailored, risk based Farm Environment Plan to reduce diffuse discharges.</p> <p>Support stock exclusion, however only where it is practical to do so, and is relative to water quality benefit gains.</p> <p>Require clarification around applying for consent to produce food, and other primary products, on my land. I have concerns around the costs and the background/knowledge level of the planner approving my consent. I am in priority sub-catchment 1, therefore I am a</p>	<p>Retain FEP, Certified Industry Scheme, and stock exclusion where practical.</p> <p>Amend rule in PC1 to remove NRP.</p> <p>Address contaminants on a sub-catchment basis, to enable targeting of the highest omitting sub-catchments.</p> <p>Recommend 15 years or more for consent duration.</p> <p>Provide clarification around stock exclusion requirements i.e. setback buffers and where to</p>

			<p>Permitted Activity until 1 January 2020.</p> <p>Assuming consents will not go past the proposed start date of 2026 for Plan Change 2, my consent will be for 6 years. The only positive of applying for a consent is the security and certainty that I can farm my land, as stated in my consent, for the next so many years. This duration needs to an appropriate length of time i.e. at least 10 years.</p> <p>Oppose a NRP because there should not a number that controls my ability to manage my land in the way I see fit. My FEP will provide a risk based mitigation plan to reduce all my diffuse discharges. Additionally, the 2014/2015 and 2015/2016 financial years occur when my stocking level was lower, therefore my on-farm inputs were lower. This is not a true representation of the past use of land. Also, Overseer is the only available tool for me to generate my NRP, but it was never designed as a regulatory tool; only as a management tool.</p> <p>Require clarification around stock exclusion. 3.11.5.3 refers to Schedule C and Schedule 1, both have stock exclusion requirements. Schedule C states the buffer is one-meter, and Schedule 1 the buffer is based on slope.</p>	<p>measure setback from on undulating land.</p> <p>Provide clarification around how long a FEP will be viable for.</p> <p>Provide clarification around stock exclusion requirements i.e. setback buffers and where to measure setback from on undulating land.</p>
4.36	3.11.5.7 Non-Complying Activity Rule – Land Use Change	Oppose	<p>Oppose non-complying activity status because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unaffordable to land owners wanting to increase their land area, rather than intensify • Eventually end up costing the consumer 	<p>Address contaminants on a sub-catchment basis, to enable targeting of the highest omitting sub-catchments.</p> <p>Reduce activity status to Restricted Discretionary</p>

		<p>due to limited food availability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limits flexibility, therefore growth innovation, and reduces land value • Jeopardises business, family and community success and growth • Transfers wealth based on high emissions and/or high NRP i.e. a dairy farm with a high NRP will have a higher land value compared to a dairy farm with a low NRP • Removes, to a degree, property rights • Adds stress to life, family life, and the community's life • Overall will largely affect the local, regional and national economy. <p>Overall this rule undermines Objective 2, 4, 5 and Policy 1, 2, 5 and 9.</p>	<p>for high priority sub-catchments, in relation to water quality, and limit discretion to the management of the diffuse discharges of the four contaminants.</p> <p>Reduce activity status to Permitted for low priority sub-catchments, in relation to water quality.</p> <p>Enable appropriate mitigation strategies to be adopted in the context of water quality gains to be made, through a tailored FEP.</p>
--	--	--	---