Proposed Waikato Regional Plan Change 1 – Waikato and Waipa River Catchments.

Submission form on publicly notified – Proposed Waikato Regional Plan Change 1 – Waikato and Waipa River Catchments.

SubForm	PC12016	COVER SHEET	
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY			
		Submission Number	
Entered		Initials	
File Ref		Sheet 1 of	

FORM 5 Clause 6 of First Schedule, Resource Management Act 1991

SUBMISSIONS CAN BE	
Mailed to	Chief Executive, 401 Grey Street, Private Bag 3038, Waikato Mail Centre, Hamilton 3240
Delivered to	Waikato Regional Council, 401 Grey Street, Hamilton East, Hamilton
Faxed to	(07) 859 0998 ***Please Note:** if you fax your submission, please post or deliver a copy to one of the above addresses*
Emailed to	healthyrivers@waikatoregion.govt.nz ***Please Note:** Submissions received my email must contain full contact details. We also request you send us a signed original by post or courier.*
Online at	www.waikatoregion.govt.nz/healthyrivers

YOUR NAME AND CONTACT DETAILS		
Full name: **Mangakotukutuku Stream Care Group Incorporated**		
Full address P.O. Box 19104, Hamilton 3244		
Email mangacare@gmail.com	Phone 0212772798	Fax

THE SPECIFIC PROVISIONS OF PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 1 THAT MY SUBMISSION RELATES TO

Please state the provision, map or page number e.g. Objective 4 or Rule 3.11.5.1 (continue on separate sheet/s, if necessary.)

1. 3.11.2 Objectives – all
2. 3.11.3 Policies – all
3. 3.11.4.3 – FEP's
4. 3.11.4.5 - Sub-catchment scale planning
5. 3.11.4.6 – Funding and Implementation
6. 3.11.4.7 - Information Needs
7. 3.11.4.9 – Managing the effects of urban development
8. 3.11.4.10 & 11 – Monitoring
9. 3.11.4.12 – Research and best practice
10. 3.11.5 – Rules – all
11. Table 3.11-2 and Map 3.11-2. Proposed Plan Change 1 proposes that the Mangakotukutuku Stream catchment (No.30) be a Priority 1 catchment with respect to the implementation of relevant rules, specifically that Farm Environment Plans are required to be lodged by 2020 for this catchment.
12. Schedule's A – C, 1-2
13. Definitions of *'Wetland'* and *'Edge of field mitigation/s'*

I SUPPORT OR OPPOSE THE ABOVE PROVISION/S

(select as appropriate and continue on separate sheet(s) if necessary.)

Mangakotukutuku Stream Care Group Incorporated (MSCGI) support the above provisions, subject to the amendments requested below.

MY SUBMISSION IS THAT

Tell us the reasons why you support or oppose or wish to have the specific provisions amended

(Please continue on separate sheet(s) if necessary.)

MSCGI supports the Proposed Plan Change 1(PPC1) in its entirety and subject to the amendments requested below or other amendments consistent with this submission.

The reasons for our submission, general support for PPC1 and amendments as sought are contained within the website of the MSCGI (http://www.streamcare.org.nz/) which sets out the vision and goals of the MSCGI, the values of the Mangakotukutuku Stream and the threats to those values, summarised as follows.

In a highly modified setting such as the Hamilton urban area, streams with high biodiversity values are rare, so relatively unimpacted systems such as the streams draining the Mangakotukutuku Stream catchment assume greater significance for local biodiversity. Some species found in the Mangakotukutuku Stream such as the longfin eel and giant kokopu, are considered nationally threatened by the Department of Conservation.

The health of streams is closely linked to activities undertaken in the catchment upstream and is why MSCGI supports the increased regulation of catchment land uses and the restoration of stream water quality, as proposed by PPC1.

I SEEK THE FOLLOWING DECISION BY COUNCIL

(select as appropriate and continue on separate sheet(s) if necessary.)

Accept the above provisions with requested amendments/additions as follows:

1. **3.11.4.5 - Sub-catchment scale planning. Sub-catchment plans be required for all sub-catchments or if not all catchments certainly includes the Mangakotukutuku Stream catchment in order to implement 3.11.4.9.**
2. **3.11.4.6 – Funding and Implementation. It is requested that the WRC establish an appropriate funding model to fully implement the requirements of PPC1 setting out the appropriate and equitable apportionment of all on-farm implementation costs between central government, the WRC, landowners and any other relevant party (eg potentially including the Waikato River Authority), such that each approved FEP sets out the cost, cost sharing arrangement and available grant assistance for all on-farm work required to comply with the requirements of each FEP. This request is premised on the basis that the successive Governments and Local Governments have not only condoned the present land use and its intensity, but actively supported it in most ways imaginable over most of the 100+period of land use prior to the present day. So not only are the 'Governments' responsible for the current state of water quality, but the benefits of implementing PPC1 largely accrue off-site and so for both reasons it is inequitable to put the full costs (or even a large proportion of costs) of complying with PPC1 onto landowners.**
3. **3.11.4.9 – Managing the effects of urban development – part b) requires that the WRC ....'*When undertaking sub-catchment scale planning under Method 3.11.4.5 in urban sub-catchments engage with urban communities to raise awareness of water quality issues, and to identify and implement effective solutions for the urban context.*' While this sounds good in principle, under sec 3.11.4.5 sub-catchment plans are not mandatory or proposed to be necessarily prepared anywhere. Under this provision urban communities are required to be 'engaged with'. It is requested the term 'engaged with' be changed to 'consulted' and that the term 'urban communities' be broadened to explicitly require that groups such as MSCGI be consulted with in respect to the preparation of any sub-catchment plan within the Mangakotukutuku Stream catchment.**
4. **Table 3.11-2 and Map 3.11-2. Proposed Plan Change 1 proposes that the Mangakotukutuku Stream catchment (No.30) be a Priority 1 catchment with respect to the implementation of relevant rules, specifically that Farm Environment Plans are required to be lodged by 2020 for this catchment. Any request or proposal to reduce the priority of Mangakotukutuku Stream catchment (No.30) or delay the required for FEP's is opposed.**
5. **Protection of remaining wetlands and gully seeps and new incentives to encourage the creation**

/reinstatement of wetland areas – new and stronger regulatory protection is required to protect all remaining wetlands and gully seeps given the extent of their loss from the landscape and the relatively high ability of these areas (proportional to their areal extent) in ameliorating contaminant loads, role in regulating surface flows and potential biodiversity benefits. Funding incentives to create/reinstate wetland areas on privately owned land should be at the highest level possible (i.e. 100% of the cost), given their potential importance in achieving the objectives of PPC1

6. Definition of 'wetland' - The WRP definition of 'wetland' has no reference to spatial extent and relies on the area in question *'....supporting a natural ecosystem of plants and animals adapted to wet conditions'*. This definition is problematic for a number of reasons, particularly in relation to the stock exclusion requirements - for example, if a wetland has been grazed heavily/repeatedly by a mob of cows it becomes a 'bog' being of little resemblance to *'...a natural ecosystem of plants and animals adapted to wet conditions'*, but it could still be a potentially important contaminant trapping/mitigation zone. The wetland definition requires both wetland plants and wetland animals, so technically (ie legally) if you have one or the other (but not both) then the area is not a wetland as defined presently. Additionally, small spring seeps which are permanently wet and importance sources/sinks for contaminants may contain no wetland plants/animals followed repeated grazing so these areas would also not be a wetland as defined presently. The Beef+Lamb Land and Environment Plan Guidelines state that ...*'Wetlands can include bogs, wet gully bottoms, swamps and seeps that contain or channel water some or all of the time.'* It is requested that the definition of wetland be amended to read as follows - *Wetland includes permanently or intermittently wet areas, shallow water, and land water margins that support ~~a natural ecosystem of~~ plants ~~and animals~~ that are adapted to wet conditions **and may include bogs, wet gully bottoms, swamps and seeps***.

   For the purpose of PPC1 perhaps the definition of 'wetlands' should also include reference to the contaminant mitigating function of these areas, although that crosses somewhat into the existing *'Edge of field mitigation/s: mitigation actions or technologies to reduce loss of contaminants from farm land by intervening at edge of field either on or off-farm, and includes constructed wetlands, sedimentation ponds and detention bunds.'* This definition is considered to be far too narrow and excludes actions which may be taken around bogs, wet gully bottoms, swamps and seeps to improve their contaminant mitigating potential.

   It is suggested that the term *'Edge of field mitigation/s'* needs to be significant widened to address this issue and/or create a new term/definition that specifically relates to the function that these areas have in reducing contaminant losses to offsite surface waters, eg *'Contaminant Mitigation Zone' - Permanently or intermittently wet areas, shallow water, bogs, wet gully bottoms, swamps and seeps which have the potential to reduce losses of contaminants from farm land to surface water.'*

   In summary, it is requested that the definition of *'Wetland'* and *'Edge of field mitigation/s'* be amended and that a new term *'Contaminant Mitigation Zone'* be considered with consequential changes required to the related PPC1 provisions to refer to this term as a means of implementing reductions in contaminant losses to surface water, as set out above.

PLEASE INDICATE BY TICKING THE RELEVANT BOX WHETHER YOU WISH TO BE HEARD IN SUPPORT OF YOUR SUBMISSION

We wish to speak at the hearing in support of submissions.

JOINT SUBMISSIONS

If others make a similar submission, we would consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.

IF YOU HAVE USED EXTRA SHEETS FOR THIS SUBMISSION PLEASE ATTACH THEM TO THIS FORM AND INDICATE BELOW

No, I have not attached extra sheets.

SIGNATURE OF SUBMITTER *(or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)* *A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means*	
 **Signature** **Grant Blackie** **Chairperson** **Mangakotukutuku Stream Care Group Incorporated**	**Date 6 March 2017**
Personal information is used for the administration of the submission process and will be made public. All information collected will be held by Waikato Regional Council, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information.	