

Proposed Natural Resources Plan:

Submitter:

**Michael Slater**

Submitter Number:

**S113**



**Form 5: Submission on the Proposed Natural Resources Plan for the Wellington Region**  
This is a submission on the Proposed Natural Resources Plan for the Wellington Region pursuant to Clause 6 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

To: Freepost 3156  
Wellington Regional Council  
PO Box 11646  
Wellington 6142

Wellington Regional Council  
28 SEP 2015

**Your details**

Full name: Michael John Slater

Organisation name (if applicable): \_\_\_\_\_

Address for service: 24A Huperui Road Greytown

Telephone no's: Work: \_\_\_\_\_ Home: \_\_\_\_\_ Cell: 0274-845257

Contact person: Mike

Address and telephone no (if different from above): \_\_\_\_\_

**Electronic communication**

Wellington Regional Council has a preference for providing information about the Proposed Natural Resources Plan via email. We will send you updates on the process, information and provide you with details of any meetings and the hearing. Please tick here  if you do not agree to receive communication via email.

Email address: mikeslater257@hotmail.com

**Trade competition**

I/we could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission [If you ticked this box, delete the rest of this section and go straight to "Your submission"]

I/we could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

- If you could gain an advantage please complete one of the following:
- I/we are directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of my submission that adversely affects the environment, and does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.
  - I/we are not directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of my submission that adversely affects the environment, and does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

**Your submission**

The specific provisions of the Proposed Natural Resources Plan that this submission relates to are:  
Please continue on separate sheet(s) – an excel spreadsheet of all of the proposed plan provisions is available online [www.gw.govt.nz/regional-plan-review](http://www.gw.govt.nz/regional-plan-review)

The specific provision of the Proposed Natural Resources Plan that my submission relates to is (please specify the provision/section number):	My submission on this provision is: →	<input type="checkbox"/> I support the provision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I oppose the provision <input type="checkbox"/> I wish to have the specific provision amended
<u>R94 &amp; R95</u>	Reasons for my submission: →	This rule will not achieve anything by protecting waterways. Most waterways have built up banks next to them to prevent runoff by way of cleanings.
	I seek the following decision from WRC (give precise details): →	This rule needs to be removed!

<p>The specific provision of the Proposed Natural Resources Plan that my submission relates to is (please specify the provision/ section number):  <u>R100</u>.....</p>	<p>My submission on this provision is: →</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> I support the provision  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I oppose the provision  <input type="checkbox"/> I wish to have the specific provision amended</p>
	<p>Reasons for my submission: : →</p>	<p>If a large property wants to remove vegetation of up to over 2ha/property/year then they have the right to 2ha isint finincily // Viable for the landowner.</p>
	<p>I seek the following decision from WRC (give precise details):  →</p>	<p>This rule needs to be removed.  How is this a issiye?  Do we see Hundreds of acres done / property / year?  NO</p>
<p>The specific provision of the Proposed Natural Resources Plan that my submission relates to is (please specify the provision/ section number):  <u>R115</u>.....</p>	<p>My submission on this provision is: →</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> I support the provision  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I oppose the provision  <input type="checkbox"/> I wish to have the specific provision amended</p>
	<p>Reasons for my submission: : →</p>	<p>Culvert pipes should not have restrictions on them. There requiremants should be case by case.  How are culvert size restrictions helping the environment?</p>
	<p>I seek the following decision from WRC (give precise details):  →</p>	<p>This rule needs to be removed.</p>

<p>The specific provision of the Proposed Natural Resources Plan that my submission relates to is (please specify the provision/section number):</p> <p>R121 ..... <i>A</i>  <i>G J 1 &amp; 11</i>  <i>L</i></p>	<p>My submission on this provision is: →</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> I support the provision  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I oppose the provision  <input type="checkbox"/> I wish to have the specific provision amended</p>
	<p>Reasons for my submission: →</p>	<p><i>prohibiting the</i>  <i>How is deepening or widening drains helping the environment?</i>  <i>They are there for a reason &amp; it changes over time, require more than maintenance. Such as deepening here &amp; there to improve water flow &amp; drainage then this should be done.</i></p>
	<p>I seek the following decision from WRC (give precise details): →</p>	<p><i>This Rule needs to be removed</i></p>

<p>The specific provision of the Proposed Natural Resources Plan that my submission relates to is (please specify the provision/section number):</p> <p>R90 .....</p>	<p>My submission on this provision is: →</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> I support the provision  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I oppose the provision  <input type="checkbox"/> I wish to have the specific provision amended</p>
	<p>Reasons for my submission: →</p>	<p><i>Silage walls with impermeable liners won't work. Refer to how silage is made &amp; the processes involved with it. If concrete bunkers were used then the run-off would just go to where it would find drainage. It defeats the purpose for what reason but cost.</i></p>
	<p>I seek the following decision from WRC (give precise details): →</p>	<p><i>This Rule needs to be removed.</i></p>

---

**Attendance and wish to be heard at hearing(s)**

- I/We do wish to be heard in support of my/our submission  
[Note: This means that you wish to speak in support of your submission at the hearing(s).]
- I/We do not wish to be heard in support of my/our submission  
[Note: This means that you cannot speak at the hearing. However, you will still retain your right to appeal any decision made by the Wellington Regional Council to the Environment Court.]
- If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.

Signature:

*MJ Stata*

Date:

*23/9/15*

[Person making submission or person authorised to sign  
on behalf of person making submission. NB. Not required if making an  
electronic submission]

---

**Publication of details**

Wellington Regional Council is legally required to notify a summary of submissions, including **your name and address for service** as provided on this submission form. Your name and address are included so that a person making a further submission is able to serve you with a copy of it.

**Form 5: Submission on the Proposed Natural Resources Plan for the Wellington Region**  
 This is a submission on the Proposed Natural Resources Plan for the Wellington Region pursuant to Clause 6 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991



To: Freepost 3156  
 Wellington Regional Council  
 PO Box 11646  
 Wellington 6142

**Your details**

Full name: Mike Slater

Organisation name (if applicable): \_\_\_\_\_

Address for service: 24 A Hupenei Road Greytown

Telephone no's: Work: \_\_\_\_\_ Home: \_\_\_\_\_ Cell: 0274845257

Contact person: Mike

Address and telephone no (if different from above): \_\_\_\_\_

**Electronic communication**

Wellington Regional Council has a preference for providing information about the Proposed Natural Resources Plan via email. We will send you updates on the process, information and provide you with details of any meetings and the hearing. Please tick here  if you do not agree to receive communication via email.

Email address: mikeslater257@hotmail.com

**Trade competition**

- I/we could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission [If you ticked this box, delete the rest of this section and go straight to 'Your submission']
- I/we could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

If you could gain an advantage please complete one of the following:

- I/we are directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of my submission that adversely affects the environment, and does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.
- I/we are not directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of my submission that adversely affects the environment, and does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

**Your submission**

**The specific provisions of the Proposed Natural Resources Plan that this submission relates to are:**

Please continue on separate sheet(s) – an excel spreadsheet of all of the proposed plan provisions is available online [www.gw.govt.nz/regional-plan-revieuw](http://www.gw.govt.nz/regional-plan-revieuw)

The specific provision of the Proposed Natural Resources Plan that my submission relates to is (please specify the provision/section number):	My submission on this provision is: →	<input type="checkbox"/> I support the provision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I oppose the provision <input type="checkbox"/> I wish to have the specific provision amended
<u>R89</u>	Reasons for my submission: →	What's the difference, whether there's dirt before a otal hole & a farm dump or not? Why can't we burn in farm dumps?
	I seek the following decision from WRC (give precise details): →	How is it affecting the environment if there's a fire on top of the ground or in a farm dump? None.

*This rule needs to be removed.*

<p>The specific provision of the Proposed Natural Resources Plan that my submission relates to is (please specify the provision/ section number):</p> <p><u>R70</u>      F                     G</p>	<p>My submission on this provision is: →</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> I support the provision  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I oppose the provision  <input type="checkbox"/> I wish to have the specific provision amended</p>
	<p>Reasons for my submission: →</p>	<p>If there's more room to dispose of clean fill than 100m<sup>3</sup> then this should be allowed.  Why do we need caps?  Volumes and origins of fill to be recorded will be impossible, inaccurate, unwarranted and for what good?</p>
	<p>I seek the following decision from WRC (give precise details):  →</p>	<p>This rule needs to be removed.</p>
<p>The specific provision of the Proposed Natural Resources Plan that my submission relates to is (please specify the provision/ section number):</p> <p><u>R122</u>      K1                     K2</p>	<p>My submission on this provision is: →</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> I support the provision  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I oppose the provision  <input type="checkbox"/> I wish to have the specific provision amended</p>
	<p>Reasons for my submission: →</p>	<p>When removing vegetation along 200m then 10m has to be left just adds further costs to projects that are expensive already.  What good is leaving 10m?  Whats achieved?  Money will get wasted on coming back @ a later time just for 10m.  We can't afford this.</p>
	<p>I seek the following decision from WRC (give precise details):  →</p>	<p>This rule needs to be removed.</p>




<p>The specific provision of the Proposed Natural Resources Plan that my submission relates to is (please specify the provision/section number):</p> <p>R 136 F 137 G</p>	<p>My submission on this provision is: →</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> I support the provision  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I oppose the provision  <input type="checkbox"/> I wish to have the specific provision amended</p>
	<p>Reasons for my submission: : →</p>	<p>Why waste time with water meters on surface water takes of 2.5L/s. Its natural water that we are using efficiently.</p>
	<p>I seek the following decision from WRC (give precise details): →</p>	<p>This rule needs to be removed.</p>
<p>The specific provision of the Proposed Natural Resources Plan that my submission relates to is (please specify the provision/section number):</p> <p>.....?</p>	<p>My submission on this provision is: →</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> I support the provision  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I oppose the provision  <input type="checkbox"/> I wish to have the specific provision amended</p>
	<p>Reasons for my submission: : →</p>	<p>Compost Limit of 150kg N/year we put more than this on pasture. Its far to low.</p>
	<p>I seek the following decision from WRC (give precise details): →</p>	<p>This needs to be removed as oversea takes this sort of thing into consideration.</p>

---


**Attendance and wish to be heard at hearing(s)**

- I/We do wish to be heard in support of my/our submission  
[Note: This means that you wish to speak in support of your submission at the hearing(s).]
- I/We do not wish to be heard in support of my/our submission  
[Note: This means that you cannot speak at the hearing. However, you will still retain your right to appeal any decision made by the Wellington Regional Council to the Environment Court.]
- If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

  
[Person making submission or person authorised to sign  
on behalf of person making submission. NB. Not required if making an  
electronic submission]

Date: \_\_\_\_\_



---

**Publication of details**

Wellington Regional Council is legally required to notify a summary of submissions, including **your name and address for service** as provided on this submission form. Your name and address are included so that a person making a further submission is able to serve you with a copy of it.

#1530998

~~1530998~~

**SUBMISSION on the proposed Natural Resources Plan for the Wellington Region**

To: [regionalplan@gw.govt.nz](mailto:regionalplan@gw.govt.nz) OR Freepost 3156, GWRC, PO Box 11646, Wellington 6142

Name	Mike Slater	GREATER WELLINGTON REGIONAL COUNCIL 23 OCT 2015
Farm Name	Huapui e Otahuna	RECEIVED
Physical Address	24A Huapui Road Greytown	
Phone Number	0274845257	
Email Address	mikeslater257@hotmail.com	

Communication from GWRC: I prefer email OR hardmail – choose one

Trade competition: I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission ✓

Hearing: I wish to be heard and would consider jointly appearing with other submitters Yes

Support: I support Wairarapa Federated Farmers submission *MS Slater*

**INTRODUCTION – Key Points about farm/business**

Farm Type	e.g. (Sheep, Beef, Arable, Dairy, agricultural business)
Farm size (area)	11.7 hectares
Main Waterways	Mahanui Stream
GW Soil plan or Farm Plan	Yes No
Environmental investments	
QE2 or Retirement Blocks	
General Comments	e.g. if you like the partnership approach with council staff on the ground, say so

## STOCK EXCLUSION

### Specific Provisions that my submission relates to are:

Definition of Category Two waterbodies, including water races and drains > 1 metre

Schedule I and Map 22: important trout spawning habitat

Rule 97: access to the beds of surface waterbodies by livestock

- Stock exclusion from Category One waterbodies by July 2018
- Stock exclusion from Category Two waterbodies by July 2022
- Stock access to Category Three waterbodies – permitted subject to conditions, e.g. crossings

### My submission is: ~~support~~/oppose

### I seek the following changes:

Extend the timeframes, e.g. Category One by 2020, Category Two by 2025

Exclude sheep from Category One

Exclude water races and drains from Category Two

Delete requirement for dairy cow exclusion from hill country rivers > 1 metre

Specify that stock exclusion from spawning sites – inanga or trout – is during the spawning season.

Specify criteria for “important” trout spawning rivers; delete those that don’t meet the criteria

Amend the definitions of stock crossing to match hill country practicalities and effects

Allow for stock drinking points

Ensure that alternative stock water supplies are available and rules don’t apply until they are.

### **Stock Exclusion Comments and Reasons**

*Specific to your farm, e.g. discussion on costs, practicalities, stock water; attach/include photos  
For Category One sites, would it be reasonable to exclude sheep where there is agreement between landowner, council and iwi as part of Council funded management plan?*

## **WETLANDS**

### **Specific Provisions that my submission relates to are:**

Interpretation: definition of natural wetland and significant natural wetlands

Schedule F3: significant wetlands

Rule 105: Planting in wetlands - approved native plants only

Rule 106: Restoration of natural or significant wetlands – controlled if Wetland Management Plan

Rule 107: Activities in natural or significant wetlands – discretionary

Rule 108: Activities in wetlands - non-complying, including diversion of water into a natural wetland

**My submission is: ~~support~~/oppose**

### **I seek the following changes:**

Natural wetlands: Natural wetlands: amend to exclude intermittent and ephemeral water bodies, and clarify these do not include hill country seeps or paddocks subject to regular ponding, dominated by cultivated pasture, whether or not associated with sedge, raupo or rush species.

Significant wetlands: re-prioritise to focus efforts on the highest value sites; change minimum size from 0.1ha to 1.0ha

Rule 104: allow use of machines rather than just hand held

Rule 105: allow for planting introduced species for bees or ducks

Rule 106, 107: amend to provide for restoration or enhancement of wetlands to be a permitted activity, with plans prepared as a non-regulatory partnership.

Rule 108: Allow diversion of water as part of a restoration plan

### ***Wetlands Comments and Reasons***

*e.g. If you have been advised of a significant wetland on your farm – and you question it – state the name of the wetland and your reasoning (size, condition, man-made, etc)*

*Mention if you have an interest in constructing or extending wetlands.*

## FARM EFFLUENT

### Specific Provisions that my submission relates to are:

Rule 83: Discharge of collected animal effluent to land – controlled

Rule 93: effluent to land in supply protection area – discretionary

Map 27: groundwater community drinking water supply protection areas

**My submission is: support/oppose**

### I seek the following changes:

Undertake more rigorous regional cost-benefit analysis of pond storage and sealing requirements prior to the hearing to support proper consideration by the Hearing Commissioners.

Provide reasonable timeframes and a stepped approach for the installation of storage (e.g. 3-5 years)

Clarify the definition of ponding; and exclude extreme weather events, breakdowns occurring out of manager's control, be consistent with urban conditions.

In groundwater protection areas, undertake a risk analysis prior to the hearing to support appropriate conditions being established in a controlled rule, rather than discretionary.

Extend the consent timeframe to 20 years to reflect the investment made

### **Effluent Comment and Reasons**

*e.g. are they over-estimating the risks and under-estimating the costs?*

*If you already have ponds, is it reasonable to up the ante on storage and sealing?*

## SILAGE

### Specific Provisions that my submission relates to are:

Definition: a fermented high moisture stored fodder

Rule R90: manufacture and storage of silage and compost, including

- Condition a) the manufacture and storage area shall not be located within 20m of a surface water body ( stream, drain, water race and intermittently flowing streams)
- Condition d) the walls and floor of a silage storage area shall have an impermeable lining able to withstand corrosion, and there shall be no discharge of leachate to water

**My submission is: ~~support~~/oppose**

### I seek the following changes:

Delete the requirement for impermeable lining; retain the condition that there be no discharge to water

Delete the requirement for location not allowed within 20m of a surface water body (not needed due to no discharge condition above)

Change the definition to specify this does not include baleage

### **Silage Comments and Reasons**

*e.g. low risk from wilted silage; costs for impermeable lining – estimate the costs if you can  
Cost Benefit analysis has not included any clear evidence of the benefits outweighing the costs.  
Difficulty in dealing with surplus years – filled up the main stack but still have extra. This rule will make us turn to baleage that is twice as expensive and has the plastic disposal issues.*

## CULTIVATION & BREAKFEEDING

Specific Provisions that my submission relates to are:

Rule 94: Cultivation & Rule 95: Break feeding

- Cultivation/ break feeding shall not occur within 5m of a surface waterbody, including open drains and water races

My submission is: ~~support~~/oppose

I seek the following changes:

Delete the conditions requiring 5m setbacks

### Cultivation/Breakfeeding Comments and Reasons

*e.g. costs, practicalities, timing, lay of the land*

*Add a statement in about what you normally do when cultivating or breakfeeding*



## DRAIN CLEANING

### Specific Provisions that my submission relates to are:

Definition of highly modified watercourse:

- Modified and channeled to the extent it has the characteristics of a drain, including that: the channel is a single flow, straight, no curves, mechanically formed with straight or steep banks, maintained to keep the watertable at least 0.3m below the pasture root zone, and it exhibits these characteristics for the entire length of the property

Rule 121: Maintenance of drains and highly modified streams; *and*

Rule 122: Removing vegetation from the bed of any river; *same conditions for both*

- any fish shall be returned no later than one hour
- only one side shall be cleared at any one time, and the other side three months later; or, only the middle shall be cleared, leaving no less than 0.3m each side
  - for drains and highly modified streams, this condition applies from July 2017

Method M14: Maintenance of drains

- GWRC will develop an education programme in collaboration with industry and other stakeholders to support implementation of Rule 121

**My submission is: ~~support~~/oppose**

**I seek the following changes:**

Change the definition of highly modified stream to include all streams that have been modified by human activity – straightening, deepening, channeling.

Provide high resolution maps in the plan, clearly showing drains and highly modified streams that are covered by Rule 121. This is required before the hearing to see the scale of the issue.

Provide direction to landowners about the type of waterways on their land.

Fast-forward Method 14 to develop agreed good practice for drain cleaning to inform the Hearing Commissioners consideration of the proposed rules.

Extend the timeframe for the implementation of the new conditions from 2017 to 2020

### ***Drain Cleaning Comments and Reasons***

*e.g. costs, practicalities, historical modification not recognized*

## **EARTHWORKS**

### **Specific Provisions that my submission relates to are:**

Definition of earthworks

Rule R99: earthworks of a contiguous area up to 3000m<sup>2</sup> per property per 12 months – permitted

Rule 101: earthworks that doesn't meet permitted conditions - discretionary

**My submission is: support/oppose**

### **I seek the following changes:**

Amend the definition and Rule 99 to allow construction of farm tracks as a permitted activity, as well as maintenance.

Change Rule 101 to controlled or restricted discretionary with clear conditions

### **Earthworks comments and reasons**

*e.g. operational and farm safety aspects*

*Note the word "contiguous" is important in thinking about impact*

## **VEGETATION CLEARANCE on Erosion-Prone Land**

### **Specific Provisions that my submission relates to are:**

Definition of erosion-prone: slope >20 degrees

Definition of vegetation clearance: clearance of woody vegetation (exotic or native) by mechanical or chemical means including felling, spraying by hand or aerial means, hand clearance and burning

Rule R100: vegetation clearance on erosion-prone land

- contiguous area up to 2ha per property per 12 months– permitted

Rule 101: vegetation clearance that doesn't meet permitted conditions - discretionary

**My submission is: ~~support~~/oppose**

### **I seek the following changes:**

Change definition of erosion prone to increase the slope, and exclude stable substrate, e.g. greywacke

Change definition of vegetation clearance to exclude hand clearance, hand or aerial spraying and roller crushing

Change Rule 101 to controlled or restricted discretionary with clear conditions

### **Vegetation Clearance comments and reasons**

*e.g. confusion with different slope triggers.*

*Add a statement in about what you normally do, e.g. leave an area unsprayed*

*Note the word "contiguous" is important in thinking about impact*

## CULVERTS & BRIDGES

### Specific Provisions that my submission relates to are:

Rule R114: weirs, fords, small bridges – permitted if

- not >20m<sup>2</sup> in size / footprint
- catchment not >50ha west of the Ruamahanga, 200ha east of the Ruamahanga

Rule R115: culverts – permitted if

- not >20m length and not >0.3m-1.2m diameter

Rule 125: small river crossings, dams, structures in a mana whenua site – restricted discretionary

**My submission is: ~~support~~/oppose**

### I seek the following changes:

Rule R114: Change the 50ha catchment restriction to 200ha (or clarify rationale for the difference)

- Increase the size for fords and bridges (20m<sup>2</sup> too small)

Rule R115: delete the condition restricting culvert diameter; retain condition that the culvert be constructed to allow for 20 year flood event.

- Provide advice to landowner of appropriate culvert sizes to achieve the above condition

Mana whenua sites: undertake proper assessment of restrictions proposed for mana whenua sites within the plan itself – not leaving this to a consent process at landowner cost

#### **Culverts/Bridges comments and reasons**

*e.g. fords/crossings good alternative method to constructing structures especially where use is infrequent or risks of structure outweigh the impact of a ford.*

*Should not include Floodways as it doesn't meet the destination.*

## OFFAL PITS, FARM REFUSE DUMPS

Specific Provisions that my submission relates to are:

Rule 89: Farm Refuse Dumps – 15 conditions

Rule 91: Offal Pit – 9 conditions

My submission is: ~~support~~/oppose

I seek the following changes:

Rule 89: Farm Refuse Dumps

- increase size from 50m<sup>3</sup> to 100m<sup>3</sup>
- heavily prune the fourteen other conditions to focus on clear effects

Rule 91: Offal Pits

- retain condition a) re only containing dead matter from the property; and condition h) odour is not offensive beyond the boundary
- heavily prune the other seven conditions to focus on effects

### Offal Pits/Refuse Dumps Comments and Reasons

*e.g. these are an existing activity on farms and do not cause adverse effects so do not need multiple conditions.*

## AGRI-CHEMICALS

### Specific Provisions that my submission relates to are:

Rule 36: Agrichemicals – permitted activity conditions relating to aerial and vehicle based spraying

- (e) no discharge within a community drinking water supply protection area
- (g) spray plan must be prepared once pa
  - identify sensitive areas (dwelling house, schools, amenity areas, non-target crops sensitive to agchem, organically certified properties, surface water bodies including natural wetlands and associated riparian vegetation, and significant and outstanding water bodies)
  - notify neighbours the spray plan is available on request
  - get written agreement from adjoining neighbours that notification is not required
  - supply a copy of the spray plan at least 24 hours prior to application, to the owner/occupier of sensitive areas or likely to be directly affected, or requests a copy

**My submission is: ~~support~~/oppose**

### I seek the following changes:

Change condition g) to more reasonably reflect practicalities and risks

In water supply protection areas, undertake a risk analysis prior to the hearing to support appropriate conditions being established in a controlled rule, rather than discretionary.

#### **Agri-chemicals Comments and Reasons**

*e.g. provides a level of protection that is not associated with the risk, demands undue notification requirements when neighbours might not be affected*

## FERTILISER

### Specific Provisions that my submission relates to are:

Rule 82: Application of fertilizer – permitted activity, provided

Condition a) not into or onto a surface water body or beyond the boundary, including as a result of wind drift

**My submission is: ~~support~~/oppose**

**I seek the following changes:**

Amend condition a) to reflect the practicalities of aerial fertiliser application

#### **Fertiliser Application Comments and Reasons**

*e.g. It is impossible to miss all intermittent surface waterbodies when using a plane or helicopter. Technology is being developed to allow this but it is not commercially available. Condition a) will cause a health and safety risk to the operation of aerial fertilizer application.*

## STORM WATER

### Specific Provisions that my submission relates to are:

Rule R48: storm water from individual property permitted, except

- the discharge is not into an outstanding waterbody (e.g. Lake Wairarapa)
- concentration of total suspended solids does not exceed specified concentrations
  - 50g - 100g/m<sup>3</sup> or 20-33% change depending on "significance" of site

**My submission is: support/oppose**

### I seek the following changes:

Rule R48: delete condition (a): no discharge into outstanding waterbodies

Delete condition (e) specifying suspended solid concentrations, retain condition (g) requiring no conspicuous films, scum, floatables etc

### Stormwater comments and reasons

*e.g. impracticality, costs, low risk. Would it require a consultants report to get consent?*

**Any other areas of concern – just copy format above**



**Form 5: Submission on the Proposed Natural Resources Plan for the Wellington Region**  
 This is a submission on the Proposed Natural Resources Plan for the Wellington Region pursuant to  
 Clause 6 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991



**greater WELLINGTON**  
 REGIONAL COUNCIL  
 Te Pane Matua Takao

To: Freepost 3156  
 Wellington Regional Council  
 PO Box 11646  
 Wellington 6142

Or email: regionalplan@gw.govt.nz

**Your details**

Full name: Michael John Slater  
 Organisation name: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (If applicable)  
 Address for Service: 24A Huperui Road Greytown

Telephone no's: Work: 06 Home: 063049467 Cell: 0274845257  
 Contact person: Mike Slater  
 Address and telephone no (if different from above): \_\_\_\_\_

**Electronic communication**

Wellington Regional Council has a preference for providing information about the Proposed Natural Resources Plan via email. We will send you updates on the process, information and provide you with details of any meetings and the hearing. Please tick here  if you do not agree to receive communication via email.

Email address: mikeslater257@hotmail.com

**Trade competition**

I/we could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission. [Go straight to Your Submission]

I/we could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.  
 If you could gain an advantage please complete one of the following:

- I/we are directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of my submission that adversely affects the environment and does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.
- I/we are not directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of my submission that adversely affects the environment and does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

**Your submission**

The specific provisions of the Proposed Natural Resources Plan that this submission relates to are:

The specific provision of the Proposed Natural Resources Plan that my submission relates to is (please specify the provision/section number): <u>Whole Plan</u>	My submission on this provision is: →	<input type="checkbox"/> I support the provision <input type="checkbox"/> I oppose the provision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I wish to have the specific provision amended
	Reasons for my submission: →	I support the submission of the Wairarapa Water Users Society Inc as a member of that organisation.
	I seek the following decision from WRC (give precise details): →	

**The specific provisions of the Proposed Natural Resources Plan that this submission relates to are:**

The specific provision of the Proposed Natural Resources Plan that my submission relates to is (please specify the provision/ section number):	My submission on this provision is: →	<input type="checkbox"/> I support the provision <input type="checkbox"/> I oppose the provision <input type="checkbox"/> I wish to have the specific provision amended
	Reasons for my submission: →	
	I seek the following decision from WRC (give precise details): →	

**The specific provisions of the Proposed Natural Resources Plan that this submission relates to are:**

The specific provision of the Proposed Natural Resources Plan that my submission relates to is (please specify the provision/ section number):	My submission on this provision is: →	<input type="checkbox"/> I support the provision <input type="checkbox"/> I oppose the provision <input type="checkbox"/> I wish to have the specific provision amended
	Reasons for my submission: →	
	I seek the following decision from WRC (give precise details): →	

**The specific provisions of the Proposed Natural Resources Plan that this submission relates to are:**

The specific provision of the Proposed Natural Resources Plan that my submission relates to is (please specify the provision/ section number):	My submission on this provision is: →	<input type="checkbox"/> I support the provision <input type="checkbox"/> I oppose the provision <input type="checkbox"/> I wish to have the specific provision amended
	Reasons for my submission: →	
	I seek the following decision from WRC (give precise details): →	


If you have more submissions you wish to make, please find more boxes at the bottom of this document

**Attendance and wish to be heard at hearing(s)**

I/We do wish to be heard in support of my/our submission.  
 [Note: This means that you wish to speak in support of your submission at the hearing(s).]

I/We do not wish to be heard in support of my/our submission.  
 [Note: This means that you cannot speak at the hearing. However, you will still retain your right to appeal any decision made by the Wellington Regional Council to the Environment Court.]

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.

Signature:  Date: 13/10/15

[Person making submission or person authorised to sign on behalf of person making submission. NB. Not required if making an electronic submission]

**Publication of details**

Wellington Regional Council is legally required to notify a summary of submissions, including your name and address for service as provided on this submission form. Your name and address are included so that a person making a further submission is able to serve you with a copy of it.

#1530376

**Form 5: Submission on the Proposed Natural Resources Plan for the Wellington Region**  
This is a submission on the Proposed Natural Resources Plan for the Wellington Region pursuant to Clause 6 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991



To: Freepost 3156  
Wellington Regional Council  
PO Box 11646  
Wellington 6142

RECEIVED  
REGISTRATION CONTROL

Your details

21 OCT 2015

Full name: Leo Vollebregt

RECEIVED

Organisation name (if applicable): Wairarapa Water User's Inc. Society

4.10 PM

Address for service: Leo Vollebregt

235 Pahautea Road, RD1,

Featherston

Telephone no's: Work: 063088405 Home: 063088405 Cell: 0272588405

Contact person: Leo Vollebregt

Address and telephone no (if different from above): \_\_\_\_\_

Electronic communication

Wellington Regional Council has a preference for providing information about the Proposed Natural Resources Plan via email. We will send you updates on the process, information and provide you with details of any meetings and the hearing. Please tick here  if you do not agree to receive communication via email.

Email address: lvoll@xtra.co.nz

Trade competition

**yes** I/we could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission [if you ticked this box, delete the rest of this section and go straight to 'Your submission']

I/we could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

If you could gain an advantage please complete one of the following:

I/we are directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of my submission that adversely affects the environment, and does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

I/we are not directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of my submission that adversely affects the environment, and does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Your submission

The specific provisions of the Proposed Natural Resources Plan that this submission relates to are:

Please continue on separate sheet(s) - an excel spreadsheet of all of the proposed plan provisions is available online [www.ew.govt.nz/regional-plan-review](http://www.ew.govt.nz/regional-plan-review)

The specific provision of the Proposed Natural Resources Plan that my submission relates to is (please specify the provision/ section number):  .....	My submission on this provision is: →	<input type="checkbox"/> I support the provision <input type="checkbox"/> I oppose the provision <input type="checkbox"/> I wish to have the specific provision amended
	Reasons for my submission: : →	our submission is attached to this details form
	I seek the following decision from WRC (give precise details): →	

---

Attendance and wish to be heard at hearing(s)

- YES** I/We do wish to be heard in support of my/our submission  
[Note: This means that you wish to speak in support of your submission at the hearing(s).]
- I/We do not wish to be heard in support of my/our submission  
[Note: This means that you cannot speak at the hearing. However, you will still retain your right to appeal any decision made by the Wellington Regional Council to the Environment Court.]
- If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.

Signature:



Date: 20/10/2015

[Person making submission or person authorised to sign  
on behalf of person making submission. NB. Not required if making an  
electronic submission]

---

Publication of details

Wellington Regional Council is legally required to notify a summary of submissions, including your name and address for service as provided on this submission form. Your name and address are included so that a person making a further submission is able to serve you with a copy of it.

Wairarapa Water User's Inc. Society,  
c/- Leo Vollebregt,  
235 Pahautea Road,  
RD1,  
Featherston.

Wellington Regional Council  
Wellington

21<sup>st</sup> October 2015

Dear Sir/Madam

Please find enclosed our submission on the Proposed Natural Resources Plan for the Greater Wellington Region.

This replaces the interim submission we put in before the 25<sup>th</sup> of September.

Also enclosed are the submissions of 49 of our members some of whom have added extra comments.

Our society and it's members were granted an extension of the submission deadline to the 23<sup>rd</sup> of October 2015.

Yours sincerely



Leo Vollebregt

Chairman

List of submitters;

Wairarapa Water User's Inc. Society

Graeme Tulloch

Peter Vollebregt

Willy and Sally Bosch

Bernard George

Jim Hedley

Richard and Carolyn Stevenson

Andrew Patrick

Gary and Ann Daysh

A and A Webster	Chris Engel
Sandra Shivas	Andrew Harvey
Shane Gray	John Barton
George Ritchie	Mike Warren
Stephen Hammond	Mike Moran
Gerard Vollebregt	Simon Campbell
Bryan Tucker	Matt Honeysett
Rod Sutherland	David Holmes
Bob Tosswill	Mike Slater
Richard Kershaw	Ray Craig
Shaun Rose	Mark Guscott
Willem Stolte	Ed Handyside
Richard Osborne	Brad Gooding
Blair Roberts	Daniel George
Hayden Thurston	Neville Davies
Brian Bosch	Gary Svenson
Stewart Weatherstone	Ann Gray
Owen Butcher	Sandy Bidwill
Donald McCreary	Lewis Herrick
Leo and Rebecca Vollebregt	John Petrie
Kurt Simmonds	

**Wairarapa Water User's Inc. Society**

**Submission on the**

**Proposed Natural Resources Plan**

<u>Provision</u>	<u>Text</u>	<u>Support/ Oppose/ Amend</u>	<u>Reasons</u>	<u>Relief sought</u>
<u>Definitions</u>	<p>Groundwater directly connected to surface water at the locations generally shown in Figures 7.2, 7.5, 7.6, 7.7, 7.8 and 7.9 in chapter 7; Figures 8.1 and 8.2 in chapter 8; and Figure 10.1 and 10.2 in chapter 10. Taking water from <b>Category A groundwater</b> is considered to be surface water allocation.</p>	amend	<p>The categorisation of groundwater needs clarification in the definitions. The connectivity between various ground water takes has not been verified and amongst the users there is significant doubt. Expecting users to individually verify as consents are renewed is expensive and potential use of water is restricted unnecessarily impacting on farm businesses severely.</p>	<p>Ground water will be categorised A or B or C once GW has field verified its connectivity with surface water and performed an empirical calibration of the model</p>
<p><b>Category A groundwater</b></p>	<p>Groundwater not classified as either category A groundwater or category C groundwater and which is defined as being directly connected to surface water through applying the tests in Schedule Q (efficient use). <b>Category B groundwater (directly connected)</b> is at the locations generally described in Tables 7.3 and 7.4 in chapter 7, Table 8.2 chapter 8 and Table 10.2 in chapter 10. Taking water from <b>category B groundwater (directly connected)</b> is considered to be surface water allocation.</p>		<p>The definitions of Category A, B and C groundwater need to be robust, and a mechanism or process must be provided for identifying which Category aquifer a particular abstraction may be tapping. Since any conditions must be related to the 'effects', it would seem that Category A (i.e. direct connection) should be able to demonstrate a strong and consistent relationship between daily river levels and daily groundwater levels. If not then conditions linked to low flows will have no relevance. There should also be a clear and quantifiable difference between Category A &amp; B. at present the 'management approach' appears to be the same even though the two aquifers are demonstrably different in their response to river levels.</p>	
<p><b>Category B groundwater (not directly connected)</b></p>	<p>Groundwater not classified as either category A groundwater or category C groundwater and which is defined as being not directly connected to surface water through applying the tests in Schedule Q (efficient use). <b>Category B groundwater (not directly connected)</b> is at the locations generally described in Table 7.5 in chapter 7, Table 8.3 in chapter 8 and Table 10.3 in chapter 10. Taking water from <b>category B groundwater (not directly connected)</b> is considered to be groundwater allocation.</p>		<p>In February 2015 work undertaken in the river bed by the Waihenga river level recorder interfered with readings so that consent holders unknowingly resumed taking water even though the river had reached minimum flow. Observers working by the river reported no adverse</p>	
<p><b>Category C groundwater</b></p>	<p>Groundwater not directly connected to surface water at the locations generally shown in Figures 7.2-7.9 in chapter 7.</p>			



	<p>Figures 8.1-8.2 in chapter 8, and Figure 10.1 in chapter 10. Taking water from category C groundwater is considered to be groundwater allocation.</p>		<p>effects to this take at low flows indicating poor relation of the takes to the river.</p>	
<p>groundwater directly connected to surface water regionally significant infrastructure*</p>	<p>Category A groundwater and the component of category B groundwater that is directly connected to surface water and part of the surface water allocation amount.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the local authority wastewater and stormwater networks, systems and wastewater treatment plants</li> </ul>	<p>amend</p>	<p>There is no definition of what directly connected means.</p> <p>Water race networks are vital community assets as are the many investments farmers and orchardists have made to use water</p>	<p>Ground water in the bore is at the same level as the water in the river and moves up and down with the level of the river</p> <p>Add after treatment plants ... water race networks and facilities for the irrigation of pasture and crops</p>
<p>In used water</p>	<p>Where more than 25% of the maximum daily amount of water allocated to a person for use on a property they own or have an interest in, but not including water that is transferred for use at another location by means of a transfer permit, is demonstrated to not be used over a period of two consecutive years.</p>	<p>support</p>		<p>retain</p>
<p>Objective O8</p>	<p>The social, economic, cultural and environmental benefits of taking and using water are recognised and provided for within the Plan's allocation framework.</p>	<p>amend</p>	<p>Objective does not give enough value to the use and potential use of water.</p>	<p>the social, agricultural, industrial, cultural and environmental benefits of taking and using water for current uses and also for future needs are recognised and provided for within the Plan's allocation framework"</p>
<p>Objective O25 (c)</p>	<p>To safeguard aquatic ecosystem health and mahinga kai in fresh water bodies and coastal marine area:</p> <p>(c) where an objective in Tables 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7 or 3.8 is not met, a fresh water body or coastal marine area is</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>Objective (c) aims to meet certain standards -this objective should not be giving guidance to the Whaitua before current water quality levels are known</p>	<p>Remove</p>

<p>able 3.6 roundwater irectly connected o surface water</p>	<p>improved over time to meet that objective.  Nitrate concentrations do not cause unacceptable effects on groundwater-dependent ecosystems or on aquatic plants, invertebrate or fish communities in connected surface water bodies</p>	<p>amend</p>	<p>Unrealistic and non defined The actual numerical amount needs to be stated</p>	<p><u>nitrate in groundwater should not exceed human drinking water standards, i.e. 11.3</u></p>
<p>Objective O52</p>	<p>The efficiency of allocation and use of water is improved and maximised through time, including by means of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) efficient infrastructure, and</li> <li>(b) <b>good management practice</b>, including irrigation, domestic municipal and industry practices, and</li> <li>(c) maximising reuse, recovery and recycling of water and contaminants, and</li> <li>(d) enabling water to be transferred between users, and</li> <li>(e) enabling water storage outside river beds.</li> </ul>	<p>amend</p>	<p>Increasing water allocation allows for growth.  (a) to (e) are good means to the objective.  There needs to be the possibility of storage in stream</p>	<p>the efficiency of allocation and use of water is improved and <u>maximised the amount is increased</u> through time, including by means of: (a) to (e) are good means to the objective.  Add (f) <u>enabling storage within the bed of a river</u></p>
<p>Policy P6: Synchronised expiry and review dates</p>	<p>Resource consents may be granted with a common expiry or review date within a <b>whatua or sub-catchment</b>, if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) the affected resource is fully allocated or over-allocated, or</li> </ul>	<p>Support/ amend</p>	<p>We support a good consistent and integrated approach i.e. in line with other consent periods in the region – 25 years Due to the significant investment in infrastructure a long consent is necessary.</p>	<p>Retain  Add (c) <u>consents will run for a period of 25 years</u></p>

	<p>(b) the exercise of the resource consent may impede the ability to implement an integrated solution to manage water quality, quantity or habitat within that <b>whaitua</b> or <b>sub-catchment</b>.</p>			
<p>Policy P7: Uses of and water (b) and (h)</p>	<p>(b) treatment, dilution and disposal of <b>wastewater</b> and <b>stormwater</b>, and</p> <p>(h) irrigation and stock water, and</p>	<p>Amend</p> <p>support</p>	<p>(b) recognises the use of water for diluting wastewater and stormwater. Diffuse contaminants need to be included.</p> <p>We are pleased to see irrigation get a special mention.</p>	<p>Add <u>diffuse contaminants to</u> (b)</p> <p>retain</p>
<p>Policy P11: In-stream water storage</p>	<p>The benefits associated with the damming and storing of water within the bed of a river are recognised when:</p> <p>(c) there are significant social and economic benefits for the region, and</p> <p>(d) water remains available for multiple in-stream and out of stream uses concurrently, and</p> <p>(e) the reliability of water supply improves as a result, and</p> <p>(f) the damming and storage of water contributes to the</p>	<p>support</p>		<p>retain</p>

	<p><b>efficient allocation and use of water.</b></p>			
<p>Policy P107: Framework for taking and using water</p>	<p>The framework for the take and use of water recognises:</p> <p>(a) groundwater connectivity to surface water shall be managed as described in Schedule P (groundwater connectivity), and</p> <p>(b) the take and use of water does not exceed allocation amounts provided for in the Plan, and</p> <p>(c) minimum flows or water levels are managed in accordance with the Plan provisions.</p>	<p>amend</p>	<p>The connectivity between various ground water takes has not been verified and amongst the users there is significant doubt.</p> <p>Expecting users to individually verify as consents are renewed is expensive and potential use of water is restricted unnecessarily impacting on farm businesses and the district and regional economies severely and unnecessarily. An empirical calibration is necessary.</p>	<p>(a) <u>the groundwater connectivity described in schedule P needs verifying and GW have significant part to play in establishing the evidence</u></p> <p>Insert (d) when schedule P changes: <u>-ve effect on consent holders – 10 year lead in time to reflect cost. +ve effect – the water availability should be released immediately.</u></p>
<p>Policy P109: Lapse dates affecting water takes</p>	<p>Resource consents to take and use water shall be given effect to within three years of the commencement date unless a longer lapse date is justified due to the scale or complexity of the activity. For the purpose of this policy, "given effect to" includes the installation of infrastructure, water meter or flow measuring device or the use of the water in accordance with the purpose of the resource consent.</p>	<p>support</p>	<p>We support the use of water</p>	
<p>Policy P111: Water takes at minimum</p>	<p>The take and use of water shall not occur when flows or water levels fall below <b>minimum flows or water levels</b> in the <b>whatitua</b> chapters (chapters 7-</p>	<p>Amend</p>	<p>Policy 111 (water takes at minimum flows and water levels)(c) and 115 (authorising</p>	<p>Category A groundwater which shall be required to reduce take by 50% of the amount consented</p>

<p>ows and water :vels :)</p>	<p>11), with the exception that water is available below <b>minimum flows</b>:  (c) as authorised by resource consents in accordance with Policy P108.</p>	<p>takes below minimum flows and lake levels)(d) on restrictions should be changed to reflect the delayed interference with surface water and the likelihood of aquifer storage and infiltration rate at different distances from the surface water. A practical time lag should be allowed before take is reduced by 50%.</p>	<p>above minimum flows following a period of 10 days of continuous river levels at minimum flow</p>
<p>olicy P115: authorising takes below minimum flows and lake levels</p>	<p>(d) category A groundwater which shall be required to reduce the take by 50% of the amount consented above <b>minimum flows</b>, and</p>	<p>As above The section 32 analysis for moving from a cease take position to 50% reduction in takes needs to be extrapolated to the effects of moving from no restrictions to 50% reduction in takes.</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p>'d) and (c) i</p>	<p>(c) permanent horticultural or viticultural root crops (excluding pasture species, animal fodder crops and maize) for the sole purpose of avoiding their death provided:  (i) the water shall only be available five days (120 hours) after <b>minimum flow</b> take restrictions are imposed and where no practical alternative sources of water are available or accessible, and</p>	<p>Unrealistic to believe that only 5 days of additional water after minimum flows are reached will be enough to keep rootstock alive during prolonged low water levels</p>	<p>Delete (c) (i)</p>

<p>Policy P116: re-allocating water</p>	<p>Water that becomes available from resource consents that are surrendered, lapsed, cancelled or not replaced, and by existing resource consents that are replaced for a lesser amount shall not be reallocated if the core allocation identified in Rules R.R1, WH.R1 and K.R1 in the whatua chapters of the Plan (chapters 7, 8 and 10) is exceeded.</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>Retain</p>	
<p>Policy P117: Supplementary allocation amounts at flows above the median flow</p>	<p>In addition to core allocation, water is available from rivers at flows above the median flow provided flushing flows and a portion of flow above the median flow remains in the river to meet Objective O25.</p>	<p>support</p>	<p>retain</p>	
<p>Policy P118: Reasonable and efficient use</p>	<p>The amount of water taken or diverted through resource consents shall be reasonable and used efficiently, including consideration of:</p> <p>(a) applying the reasonable and efficient use criteria identified in Schedule Q (efficient use) to new users immediately, while existing users replacing existing resource consents have a period of four years from the date of the plan being made</p>	<p>amend</p>	<p>The investment in infrastructure is considerable and time is required to implement changes</p>	<p>(a) while existing users replacing existing resource consents have a period of 4 years from the date of the plan being made-operative "renewal of consent to meet the criteria"</p>

	operative to meet the criteria, and			
Policy P119: unused water	<p>Unused water allocated to an existing resource consent may be re-allocated to the same user when the <b>existing resource consent</b> is replaced, or the abstraction rate is changed, only if the consent holder can demonstrate how the <b>unused water</b> will be used within four years, including by means of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) a capital expenditure programme linked to the purpose water is used for, and</li> <li>(b) satisfying the reasonable and efficient use criteria identified in Schedule Q (efficient use).</li> </ul>	Support		Retain
Policy P120: taking water for storage	<p>The taking of water for storage outside a river bed at flows above the <b>median flow</b> is appropriate provided Policy P17 is satisfied.</p>	Support		Retain
Policy P128: transfer of resource consents	<p>The temporary or permanent transfer of the whole or part of the amount allocated by a resource consent(s) to take and use water shall be enabled, provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) the adverse effects of the take and use of transferred water are the same or less, and</li> </ul>	Support		retain

	<p>(b) the transfer occurs within the same catchment management unit, and</p> <p>(c) the same or a lesser amount of water is being taken or used, and</p> <p>(d) measuring and reporting the use of transferred water is no less than in the parent resource consent, and</p> <p>(e) the transferee's water take and use is reasonable and efficient for the intended use, including meeting the reasonable and efficient use criteria identified in Schedule Q (efficient use).</p>		
<p><u>Rules</u></p>			
<p>Rule R135: General rule for taking, use, damming and diverting water – discretionary activity</p>	<p>The damming or diverting of water that would otherwise contravene sections 14(2) or 14(3) of the Resource Management Act 1991 and is not permitted, controlled, restricted discretionary, discretionary, non-complying or a prohibited activity is a discretionary activity.</p>	<p>amend</p>	<p>The investment in infrastructure by users is significant and making this rule restricted discretionary gives consent holders more certainty at the time of consent renewal</p>
<p>Rule R137: Farm dairy washdown</p>	<p>The take and use of water from a surface water body (other than a water race that is permitted by Rule R138) or groundwater for the purpose of</p>	<p>amend</p>	<p>Make this rule <u>restricted discretionary</u></p>



<p>id milk-cooling ater – permitted :ivity )</p>	<p>farm dairy washdown and milk cooling on a dairy milking platform is a permitted activity, provided the following conditions are met:</p> <p>(b) the total take shall be no more than 70L per day per stock unit based on the maximum herd size on the property at any time during the three years prior to the date of public notification of the Proposed Natural Resources Plan (31.07.2015), and</p> <p>Note Water taken for farm dairy washdown and cooling water may be taken in addition to water taken under Rule R136.</p> <p>In respect of condition (b) the Wellington Regional Council holds a record of the maximum herd size on the property using information obtained from the property owner in compliance with a resource consent obtained under Rule R83.</p>		<p>(b) delete words after "...property." Leaving this in is anti growth and development and not in the best interests of the Wairarapa</p>	<p>(b) the total take shall be no more than 70L per day per stock unit based on the maximum herd size on the property at any-time during the three-years-prior-to-the-date-of public-notification-of-the-Proposed-Natural Resources-Plan-(31-07-2015),-and</p> <p>Note Water taken for farm dairy washdown and cooling water may be taken in addition to water taken under Rule R136.</p> <p>In respect of condition (b) the Wellington Regional Council holds a record of the maximum herd size on the property using information obtained from the property owner in compliance with a resource consent obtained under Rule R83.</p>
<p>Rule R143: emporary water ermit transfers – controlled activity</p>	<p>The transfer of the whole or part of a water permit for the take and use of water to another location for a period of no more than one year is a controlled activity, provided the following conditions are met:</p>	<p>amend</p>	<p>Rule 143 (temporary water permit transfers) – for this rule to serve the objective in a usable and dynamic way transferring water permits needs to be a permitted activity not controlled</p>	<p>Delete Controlled and make this rule a permitted activity</p>
<p>Rule R144: ransferring water ermits – restricted iscretionary activity</p>	<p>The transfer of the whole or part of a water permit for the take and use of water that does not meet the conditions of Rule R143 or that is for a period of more than one year is a restricted discretionary activity, provided the following conditions are met:</p>	<p>support</p>		<p>retain</p>
<p><u>Other methods</u></p>				

<p>Method M13: Wairarapa water races</p>	<p>Wellington Regional Council will work with Wairarapa district councils and landowners to characterise the hydrology, water quality, ecology, and the social, heritage and cultural values of the Wairarapa water races to develop management options for the water race systems by 2017. The management options include, but are not limited to:</p>	<p>amend</p>	<p>The economic values of water races are very important to land owners who have them. They were put in place so that the surrounding land could be farmed.</p>	<p>In opening paragraph insert after cultural values and <u>economic values</u> of the Wairarapa water races...</p>
<p>Method M18: Water use groups</p>	<p>Wellington Regional Council will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) support water user groups, or voluntary agreements between water users, to share takes and manage allocations, and</li> <li>(b) support water user groups to assist with water sharing during times of restrictions or when the catchment is fully allocated, and</li> <li>(c) provide, where available, accurate technical information to assist user groups.</li> </ul>	<p>Support</p>	<p>Method 18 (water user groups) will work well but transferring water needs to be a permitted activity.</p>	<p>retain</p>
<p>Method M19: Water management (d)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(d) promoting alternatives to the use of water races, and</li> </ul>	<p>amend</p>	<p>Costs of change will be substantial for some landowners. Access to power and underground water as well as maintenance of fenced off races are issues.</p>	<p>Change wording of (d) to <u>quantify costs and benefits of water races and explore alternatives</u></p>
<p>Method M28: Development of good management practice guidelines.</p>	<p>Wellington Regional Council will continue to develop practices, procedures and tools (including rules) in collaboration with industry, other relevant organisations and stakeholders to support the</p>	<p>support</p>	<p>good method esp. the use of the words "collaboration with industry"</p>	<p>retain</p>

	implementation of policies which rely on good management practice to achieve desired environmental outcomes.		positive move which will have farmers moving forward in their practices with the reg. council??
<u>Luamahanga</u> <u>Whaitua</u>	When allocating river water or groundwater directly connected to surface water, regard shall be given to cumulative adverse effects on aquatic ecosystems in downstream river reaches as a result of flow depletion from loss of river water to groundwater.	amend	Important that the effects are measured, not just modelled.
<u>Figures 7.3 – 7.8</u>	Water allocation amounts	Oppose	Again the categories need <u>empirical</u> verifying. Too big an impact and too little evidence of benefit to the environment to ignore. As a community we need to verify categories and as this occurs the amounts in these tables may change significantly
<u>Tables 7.3 – 7.5</u>	Surface and groundwater allocation amounts	Oppose	The allocation amount should reflect the current consented allocation amount. Some of the allocation amounts are considerably lower than the allocation currently consented. Consideration of consent applications has confirmed the amounts of allocation that are sustainable. Setting an allocation limit which is inconsistent with consented and sustainable allocations creates an unrealistic community expectation of the level of abstraction which can occur from the water sources.
			Insert after - adverse effects – that are measured on aquatic ...
			Do not include figures 7.3 – 7.8 in the plan until categories have been verified
			Change the allocation amounts to what is currently allocated or more if spare water has been identified

<p><u>Schedule P:</u>  Reasonable and efficient use of groundwater and surface water connectivity</p>	<p><u>Schedule Q:</u>  Reasonable and efficient use criteria</p>	<p>oppose</p>	<p>Needs empirical calibration by GW  The connectivity between various ground water takes and surface water has not been verified and amongst the users there is significant doubt.  Expecting users to individually verify as consents are renewed is expensive and potential use of water is restricted unnecessarily impacting on farm businesses severely.</p>	<p><u>Needs empirical calibration by GW</u></p>
	<p>Irrigation  A resource consent application to take water for irrigation purposes shall include an assessment using a field validated model that considers land use, crop water use requirements, on-site physical factors such as soil water holding capacity, and climatic factors such as rainfall variability and potential evapo-transpiration. The model must reliably predict annual irrigation volume within an accuracy of 15%. The annual volume calculated using the model shall meet with the following criteria:  (a) an irrigation application efficiency of 80%, and  (b) demand conditions that occur in nine out of 10 years.</p>	<p>Amend</p>	<p>Remove sentence "the model must reliably predict annual irrigation volume within an accuracy of 15%." Unreasonable for the Wairarapa because of dramatic seasonal weather variations.  Wairarapa conditions differ from the rest of the country. This needs to be recognised.  More consultation with affected parties is required.</p> <p>irrigators with lower efficiency may be more suitable for specific crops and farming situations. Case by case systems need to be assessed</p>	<p>Remove sentence the model must reliably predict annual irrigation volume within an accuracy of 15%  Add after field validated model – <u>for Wairarapa conditions</u>  (a) add after 80% - <u>where practicable.</u></p>

<p>Schedule R: guideline for stepdown allocations</p>	<p>When river flows are low, stepdown allocations may be included as conditions of resource consent when rivers approach <b>minimum flows</b>.  Stepdown allocations may require a take to cease or be reduced. Taking water that is not for the health needs of people may be required to cease or be reduced as flows approach minimum river flows. Typically, the reduction in water take that may be required will be half the consented amount.  Stepdown allocations for specific rivers are identified in Table R1 unless otherwise agreed by a water user group. In other rivers, stepdown allocations may be agreed by a water user group, or in the absence of agreement or such a group, may be implemented by the Wellington Regional Council.</p>	<p>Support with amendments</p>	<p>Schedule R – guideline for stepdown allocations – good schedule and good use of user groups  However needs of stock drinking water and rootstock protection needs acknowledging  However more and more appropriate management points e.g. further south of Waihenga are required. GWV to establish in consultation with water users.  As water is cleaned up the minimum flow requirement for dilution is lower.  The effects of low flows needs to demonstrated as are the effects of restrictions  There also needs to be room for the Whaitua to have their input</p>	<p>Add after health needs of people - <u>stock drinking water and rootstock protection</u>  Table R1 is interim  GWV to consult with water users</p>
-------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Table R1: Stepdown allocations for rivers in the Ruamāhanga River catchment

River	Minimum flow (L/sec)	Flow at which takes shall cease other than for the health needs of people or stock drinking water (water races) (L/sec)	Flow at which takes shall reduce (L/sec)	Management point
Waipoua River	250		300	Mikimiki Bridge
Waingawa River	1100	1700	1900	Kaituna
Parkvale Stream	100		120	Renalls Weir Recorder
Mangatarere Stream	[upper reach] 240		[upper reach] 330	Gorge Recorder
	[lower reach] 200		[lower reach] 240	Gorge Recorder
Waiohine River	2300	3040		Gorge Recorder
Upper Ruamāhanga River	2400		2700	Wardells
Tauherenikau River	1100	1300		Gorge Recorder
Lower Ruamāhanga River	8500		9200	Waihenga Recorder

We are concerned that the extent of section 32 reports in relation to water allocation do not identify the effects of proposed changes on our members in enough detail.