

**BEFORE THE HEARING COMMISSIONERS
AT GREATER WELLINGTON REGIONAL COUNCIL**

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991 (“**the Act**”)

AND

IN THE MATTER of the Proposed Natural Resources Plan for the Wellington Region

Hearing Stream One:
Overall policy framework of the proposed plan,
Beneficial use and development,

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE BY LYNETTE PEARL WHARFE
FOR HORTICULTURE NEW ZEALAND
5 MAY 2017**

1. QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

- 1.1 My name is Lynette Pearl Wharfe. I am a planning consultant with The AgriBusiness Group. I have a BA in Social Sciences and post graduate papers in Environmental Studies, including Environmental Law, Resource Economics and Resource Management.
- 1.2 I am an accredited commissioner under the Making Good Decisions programme with Ministry for the Environment.
- 1.3 I have been a consultant with The AgriBusiness Group since 2002. The Agribusiness Group was established in 2001 to help build business capability in the primary sector.
- 1.4 I have spent over 18 years as a consultant, primarily to the agricultural industry and rural sector, specialising in resource management, environmental issues, and environmental education and facilitation, including 17 years of providing advice to Horticulture New Zealand (“**HortNZ**”) and its precursor organisations NZ Vegetable and Potato Growers Federation, NZ Fruitgrowers Federation.
- 1.5 Some of the projects I have been involved in that I consider are particularly relevant in this context are:
 - (a) Project Manager and facilitator for a Sustainable Management Fund (“**SMF**”) Project ‘Reducing nitrate leaching to groundwater from winter vegetable crops’, to develop management tools for vegetable growers to implement best practice for fertiliser applications, to assist in changing fertiliser usage.
 - (b) Managed an SMF project for NZ Agrichemical Education Trust communicating the revised NZS 8409:2004 Management of Agrichemicals to local authorities throughout NZ, including development and leading workshops with councils.
 - (c) Revised the Manual for the Introductory GROWSAFE® Course for the NZ Agrichemical Education Trust, to make the Manual more user friendly and accessible and to align it with the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms legislation.
 - (d) Managing the research component for SFF project – SAMSN – developing a framework for the development of Sustainable Management Systems for agriculture and horticulture.

- (e) Project Manager MAF Operational Research Project Effectiveness of Codes of Practice investigating the use of codes of practice in the agriculture and horticulture sectors.
 - (f) Undertook a review of Current Industry and Regional Programmes aimed at reducing pesticide risk, including assessing a number of Codes of Practice.
 - (g) Contributed as a project team member for a Sustainable Farming Fund project 'Environmental best practice in agricultural and rural aviation' that included developing a Guidance Note on agricultural aviation, which is now on the Quality Planning website.
 - (h) Undertook a review of agrichemical provisions in the Auckland Regional Air Land and Water Plan and developed a risk based response for inclusion in the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan.
- 1.6 I have been involved as a consultant to HortNZ on the Proposed Natural Resource Plan (PNRP) contributing to the submission and further submissions.
- 1.7 Documents that I have relied on in preparing this evidence include:
- (a) Section 42A Hearing Report Overall policy framework of the proposed Plan – Part B 20 April 2017
 - (b) Section 42A Hearing Report Beneficial use and development 19 April 2017
 - (c) Regional Policy Statement for the Wellington Region
 - (d) National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2014
- 1.8 I have read the Environment Court's Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses, and I agree to comply with it. My qualifications as an expert are set out above. I confirm that the issues addressed in this brief of evidence are within my area of expertise, except where I state I am relying on what I have been told by another person. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions expressed.

2. SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

- 2.1 This evidence provides a planning assessment of those provisions on which HortNZ submitted or made further submissions and addresses the Section 42A report for Hearing Stream One prepared by the Council.

2.2 This evidence will follow the s42A Report format and address submissions and further submissions that are included in the following report sections:

- Overall policy framework of the Proposed Plan
 - a) Issue 1 Structure
 - b) Issue 4 Objectives O1 and O2 and related policies
 - c) Issue 6 Objective O5, and Mahinga Kai
 - d) Issue 7 Policy 4
- Topic: Beneficial Use and development
 - a) Issue 1 New objectives
 - b) Issue 2 Importance of land and water
 - c) Issue 4 Regionally significant infrastructure

3. MY UNDERSTANDING OF HORTICULTURE NEW ZEALAND'S SUBMISSIONS

3.1 The HortNZ submission and further submissions on the PNRP that are included in Hearing Stream 1 focus on:

- (a) How values are incorporated into the Plan
- (b) Inclusion of food production for human sustenance
- (c) Provisions to enable biosecurity responses
- (d) Providing certainty for users

3.2 Key matters of concern to HortNZ are ensuring that the provisions in the Plan are workable and practical, and ensuring that best practice is used when undertaking horticultural activities.

3.3 Appendix 1 includes a table of the HortNZ submission points addressed in Hearing Stream 1 and the where they are addressed in the s42A Report.

3.4 Some further submission points are not addressed in this evidence as the s42A Report recommendations are appropriate or they will be addressed in rebuttal based on evidence presented by the original submitter.

4. OVERALL POLICY FRAMEWORK – S42A REPORT ISSUE 1

4.1 Issue 1 addresses submissions on the Structure of the Plan.

- 4.2 The HortNZ submission points are addressed in Issue 1.1 Introductory Text in Chapter 1, Section 1.6 Values of water in the Plan (s42A Report Pg 18).
- 4.3 Section 1.6 in the PNRP describes the place of values of water in the Plan and Table 1.1 sets out “the values that have been identified and given practical application through the different objectives, policies and methods in the Plan.” (PNRP 1.6 Para 6).
- 4.4 HortNZ sought a number of changes to this section of the Plan to better provide for the values of water throughout the Plan:
- (a) Retain the text regarding the values of water in Section 1 but amend to add at the end of the 4th para: The contact recreation value will be expressed in the plan as either a primary or secondary contact recreation value depending on the location. (301/01)
 - (b) Move the table of values of water to an Objective in Section 3, preferably as an overarching objective in 3.1 as follows:

The values of freshwater are recognised and provided for.

Include Table 1.1 with the listed values. (301/02)
 - (c) Add new objective in 3.1: The values of freshwater are recognised and provided for.

Include Table 1.1 with the listed values.

Amend Table 1.1 ‘Use values – direct’ by adding after ‘Human sustenance, health and wellbeing’ – ‘including production of food’. (307/10)
- 4.5 The s42A Report considers these submission points and does not recommend any changes as a result of the HortNZ submissions.
- 4.6 The NPS-FM in National Objectives Framework sets out the approach for identifying values prior to establishing freshwater objectives in CA National Objectives Framework.
- 4.7 The values are pivotal in the process of formulating freshwater objectives and limits that are set.
- 4.8 Only including values in an Introductory section of the Plan provides no status for the values that have been identified. As the values are applied throughout the Plan, including in rules, it is important that the values are accorded an appropriate status in the Plan.
- 4.9 The s42A Report (para 81) appears to imply that the values in Table 1.1 are nothing other than a ‘description of the past and the

development of the proposed Plan.’ This statement does not recognise the significance accorded values in the NPS-FM.

- 4.10 In considering the setting of Freshwater objectives and limits in Para 255- 258 of the s42A Report Section CA of the NPS is referred to but no mention made of the value setting process that is clearly outlined in the NPSFM.
- 4.11 In my opinion it is important that the consideration of values under Policy CA2 of the NPSFM is clearly recognised in the Plan. Inclusion of the new objective sought by HortNZ ‘The values of freshwater are recognised and provided for’ would provide such a framework.
- 4.12 It is noted that in Section 3.1 Ki uta ki tai: mountains to sea that a number of values are specifically provided for in the objectives. (e.g Objective O4 intrinsic values of aquatic freshwater, Objective O5 contact recreation and Maori customary use). However not all values identified in Table 1.1 are included in the objectives.
- 4.13 Given that the values have been identified in Table 1.1 they should all be incorporated within the planning framework.
- 4.14 Inclusion of Table 1.1 under the new objective would provide appropriate recognition and inclusion of the values in Table 1.1 and provide a framework for the application of these values through the Plan.
- 4.15 I consider this to be an appropriate planning framework to ensure that the NPSFM is implemented through the Plan and the FMU process.
- 4.16 I recognise that the values in Table 1.1 have been developed from a range of sources. However I also note that there may be other values that the community has identified during consultation on the Plan which are not incorporated into Table 1.1.
- 4.17 The direct use values include ‘human sustenance, health and wellbeing’ as a value. HortNZ has sought that food production be included as part of provision of such human sustenance as it is a very direct human need and value.
- 4.18 The s42A Report does not specifically address the addition of this point, but rather implies that the values developed through the Plan process are sufficient.
- 4.19 The HortNZ submission point identifies that the need for food production for human sustenance, health and wellbeing is an important consideration that should be added to the values.

- 4.20 The Schedule 1 submission process is an appropriate forum for additional values to be identified and included. The s42A Report does not provide clear reason why the importance of food for human sustenance is not recognised and included in the Plan.
- 4.21 In my opinion provision of food is an important part of wellbeing and the Plan needs to ensure that it is appropriately recognised. The addition sought by HortNZ would provide such recognition.

5. OVERALL POLICY FRAMEWORK – ISSUE 4 OBJECTIVES O1 AND O4 AND POLICIES P1, P2, P3, P5 AND P6 AND METHOD M1.

Issue 4.1 - Objective O1 and Policy P1

- 5.1 Objective O1 and Policy P1 are addressed in Issue 4.1 and relate to Ki uta ki tai and integrated catchment management.
- 5.2 HortNZ made a submission on Policy P1 seeking that ‘use of good management practices’ be included in the principles of integrated catchment management which are listed in the Policy. The submission is addressed in the s42A Report Para 284.
- 5.3 The s42A Report considers that the use of good management practice is more appropriate as a principle or method in policies that address minimising adverse effects (e.g. Policy P4.)
- 5.4 While good management practices are relevant to minimising adverse effects they are also relevant to achieving integrated management. In addition Policy P4 is limited in its application in the Plan to specific policies. Application of good management practices should be at a broader level.
- 5.5 Objective O1 seeks that:
- ‘Land, freshwater bodies and the coast are managed as integrated and connected resources; ki uta ki tai – mountains to sea.’*
- 5.6 Policy P1 seeks that land and water resources will be managed by using principles of integrated catchment management.
- 5.7 The principles set out in Policy P1 are:
- (a) Decision making using the catchment as the spatial unit
 - (b) Applying an adaptive management approach to take into account the dynamic nature and processes of the catchment
 - (c) Co-coordinated management with decisions based on best available information

- (d) Taking into account the connected nature of resources and natural processes within a catchment
 - (e) Recognising links between environmental, soil, cultural and economic sustainability of the catchment.
- 5.8 By seeking the addition of 'use of good management practices' I consider that HortNZ was reflecting the approach in the PNRP which identifies good management practices as a key tool to achieving the outcomes sought in the Plan and that they are integral to achieving the principles set out in Policy P1.
- 5.9 Inclusion of good management practices supports the principles such as coordinated management and recognising links across the catchment and gives good management practice a broader context than just as a means to minimise adverse effects.
- 5.10 It is noted that the s42A Report is recommending that 'improvements in technology and science' be added to Principle c). Such technology and science needs to be applied to achieve the outcome and recognition of good management practices is a means to achieve that outcome.
- 5.11 Therefore I consider that achieving integrated management would be assisted by recognition of good management practices.

6. OVERALL POLICY FRAMEWORK – ISSUE 6 – OBJECTIVE 5

- 6.1 HortNZ made submissions that are addressed under:
- a) Issue 6.2.1 Objective 5 subclause a) and b) Shared values
 - b) Issue 6.2.2 Objective 5 subclause c) Health needs of people
- Issue 6.2.1 Objective 5 subclause a) and b) Shared values**
- 6.2 A submission (307/012) was made seeking a new objective in 3.1:
Natural and physical resources, are managed to provide an appropriate balance across values and uses in a catchment.
- 6.3 HortNZ sought this objective to ensure that there is recognition of the range of values in the PNRP.
- 6.4 As I have stated above, while the NPSFM requires consideration of values as part of the FMU process, the PNRP is relatively silent on how such values will be identified and incorporated into the policy framework.

- 6.5 The values listed in Table 1.1 cover a range of matters which may at times conflict. Therefore the plan should be clear how such competing or conflicting values will be managed.
- 6.6 I consider that the Objective sought by HortNZ seeks to recognise that there needs to be a discussion about how such values are provided for, including a balance between any competing or conflicting values in a catchment.
- 6.7 Federated Farmers has sought a similar outcome through an amendment to Objective O5. The way that Objective O5 is currently drafted essentially establishes a priority for some values which the s42A Report identifies as shared values designed to give effect to the NPSFM.
- 6.8 The s42A Report addresses the Federated Farmers submission point that seeks to amend Objective O5 but does not specifically consider the HortNZ point which seeks a new objective, rather than amending Objective O5.
- 6.9 The s42A Report considers that taking all the objectives together a 'balance across values and uses' will be achieved.
- 6.10 However I consider that there is a gap in the framework as the values as set out in Table 1.1 are not clearly incorporated into the objectives. Unless they are included the policy framework a balance across values and uses will not be able to be achieved.
- 6.11 Therefore I support the submission by HortNZ to seek specific inclusion of values in the policy framework in the Plan.

Issue 6.2.2 Objective 5 subclause c) Health needs of people

- 6.12 HortNZ sought that Objective O5 be amended to include a new clause for recognition of the 'production of food for human sustenance.'
- 6.13 The s42A Report rejects this submission as it is considered that it will be achieved through consideration of the entire suite of objectives and policies across the Plan.
- 6.14 HortNZ has identified that human sustenance, health and wellbeing are listed as values in Table 1.1 and that provision of food is an essential component of such wellbeing.
- 6.15 Objective O5 c) focuses on the 'health needs to people' as defined in the Plan but does not recognise that human sustenance is also an important component of providing for human wellbeing. Water is an essential part of enabling provision of food for human sustenance.

- 6.16 There is no objective that recognises this component of human wellbeing so therefore it will not be achieved through consideration of the entire suite of objectives and policies across the Plan.
- 6.17 I consider that recognition of the provision of food is an important part of providing for social wellbeing of the community and should be appropriately recognised in the Plan, along with providing for the health needs of people.

7. OVERALL POLICY FRAMEWORK – ISSUE 7 – POLICY 4

- 7.1 Policy P4 sets out a framework for minimising adverse effects of activities.
- 7.2 ‘Minimise adverse effects’ is a term used throughout the PNRP and Policy P4 seeks to provide direction as to how such policies will be assessed.
- 7.3 Policy P4 is subject to a number of submissions but the s42A Report recommends that no changes be made.
- 7.4 HortNZ made a submission on Policy P4 seeking that it be amended to:
- Where minimisation of adverse effects is required by the policies in the Plan minimisation means taking all reasonable steps to reduce ~~reducing~~ adverse effects of the activity to the smallest amount practicable and includes:*
- 7.5 HortNZ was concerned that something may be ‘practicable’ but actually ‘unreasonable’.
- 7.6 The s42A Report (Para 553) sets out three things that the policy sought to achieve:
- (a) *Provide information to guide resource consent assessments where policies direct that adverse effects are to be minimised*
 - (b) *Clarify that the word minimisation in policies means reducing adverse effects to the smallest amount practicable*
 - (c) *Specify criteria to achieve minimisation.*
- 7.7 I consider that the change sought by HortNZ would achieve point a). The submission does not seek to amend the criteria in c) so that outcome would still stand with the changes sought by HortNZ.
- 7.8 The outstanding issue is the extent to which adverse effects are to be reduced, in particular qualifying the term ‘smallest amount

practicable'. This matter is considered at Para 579 in the s42A Report.

- 7.9 The Report considers that the 'reasonably practicable' requires a case by case analysis. However 'smallest amount practicable' also requires a case by case analysis as to what is actually the extent of 'smallest amount practicable'.
- 7.10 The Report considers that the sub-clauses a-e) clarify what is considered 'practicable'. However there is no consideration of 'reasonableness' in the criteria.
- 7.11 In addition the list of criteria is not exclusive – 'shall include'. Therefore it is uncertain what other criteria the Council may seek to apply or whether other criteria identified by a user will be considered acceptable.
- 7.12 I consider that the policy as notified is establishing a framework that provides insufficient certainty for users. Given the extent to which it will be applied through the Plan there should be greater certainty.
- 7.13 The change sought by HortNZ would assist as it requires 'taking all reasonable steps' which includes the listed criteria.
- 7.14 I consider that, while this may still have a degree of uncertainty, it does provide clear direction as to what is to be undertaken.

8. BENEFICIAL USE AND DEVELOPMENT – ISSUE 1 NEW OBJECTIVES

- 8.1 HortNZ made submissions seeking new objectives be included for rural production activities and biosecurity that are addressed under Issue 1:

(a) Issue 1.1 Rural Production Activities

Add a new objective in 3.2 Beneficial use and development: The social, economic and cultural wellbeing benefits of rural production activities are recognised and provided for. (307/015)

(b) Issue 1.2 Biosecurity

Add a new objective in 3.2 Beneficial use and development: Take an integrated management approach to biosecurity risks to ensure that rural production is not adversely affected by incursions of pests and unwanted organisms. (307/014)

Issue 1.1 Rural production activities

- 8.2 HortNZ sought that there be a new objective included to provide for rural production activities as a beneficial use. A number of other submitters sought similar provisions.
- 8.3 The s42A Report Issue 1.1 (Pg 19) does not support the inclusion of specific recognition of rural production activities and refers to Objective O2. It is considered that rural production activities are adequately recognised and that do not need to be specifically recognised and provided for above other land and water uses.
- 8.4 I note that Objective 2 is included in the 'Ki uta ki tai Mountains to sea' set of objectives, not in the objectives relating to Beneficial use and development, even though it is assessed as part of the Beneficial use and development Hearing Report. Policies that implement the objective are also under Beneficial use and development.
- 8.5 While recognition of the importance and contribution of land and water to the social, economic and cultural well-being of the community are recognised in Objective 2 there are other objectives under Beneficial use and development that are for specific activities (e.g. O9, O12, O13).
- 8.6 While the intent of the Plan is to recognise all land uses, given the importance and scale of rural production being a key factor in provision of social, economic and cultural well-being for the Region it is appropriate that it is identified within the policy framework of the Plan.
- 8.7 Inclusion of an objective under Beneficial use and development would provide clearer linkages than that provided through Objective O2.
- 8.8 Therefore in my opinion there is value in having a clear specific objective to provide for rural production activities as sought by HortNZ and a number of submitters.

Issue 1.2 Biosecurity

- 8.9 HortNZ has sought that provisions be included in the PNRP to ensure that responses to incursions of unwanted organisms can be appropriately managed and addressed through the inclusion of an overarching objective and then specific provisions in policies and rules.
- 8.10 The s42A Report rejects the submission as it is considered that the proposed Plan does not preclude any biosecurity action being taken by the appropriate authorities.

- 8.11 As I understand the HortNZ submission is seeking is an enabling approach to ensure that provisions in the PNRP do not present a regulatory hurdle in the event of an incursion of an unwanted organism.
- 8.12 While incursions of unwanted organisms are managed under the Biosecurity Act 1993 there is an interface with the RMA in that some of the actions that need to be taken to respond to an incursion may be regulated under a regional or district plan. Such actions may include:
- (a) Removal of infected material, including from riparian areas
 - (b) Application of agrichemicals
 - (c) Burning of infected materials
 - (d) Earthworks for burying infected materials
- 8.13 The Regional Council manages known pests through the Pest Management Strategy. But what HortNZ is seeking are provisions relating to currently unknown species – unwanted organisms under the Biosecurity Act. Therefore the Regional Pest Management Strategy does not address such pests.
- 8.14 In the event of a biosecurity incursion a response is triggered by the either the Minister declaring an emergency, or the Chief Technical Officer of MPI declaring an incursion, under the Biosecurity Act 1993.
- 8.15 If the Minister declares an emergency then the Biosecurity Act overrides RMA provisions. However there has never been an emergency declared, even with PSA or fruit fly incursions.
- 8.16 If the declaration is made by the Chief Technical Officer of MPI the RMA provisions are not overridden and any response needs to comply with relevant regional and district plan rules.
- 8.17 In the event of a biosecurity incursion of an unwanted organism there is the need to be able to respond rapidly to manage spread. Vegetation removal, burial, burning, spraying of material are methods that may be used. Therefore it is important that the PNRP adequately provides for these activities to be undertaken.
- 8.18 It became evident during the PSA incursion in the kiwifruit industry that regional and district plans can unintentionally be regulatory hurdles to a rapid response to an incursion through provisions such as limitation of earthworks for burying infected material or clearance of infected vegetation, including in riparian areas.

- 8.19 If an incursion of an unwanted organism was unable to be appropriately managed due to regulatory barriers in the plan it could have significant impact on the region and the rural economy.
- 8.20 While the HortNZ submission focussed on the effects of a biosecurity incursion on rural production such incursions can also affect biodiversity and indigenous flora and fauna so the consideration is wider than just on rural production.
- 8.21 Given the importance of a rapid response to an incursion I consider that it is appropriate that the regional plan enable such a response by including a planning framework to support rules that enable removal and destruction of material infected by unwanted organisms.
- 8.22 While the methods to address biosecurity incursions may be located under the relevant activities there is a need for an objective or policy framework to provide for such activities.
- 8.23 The objective sought by HortNZ is:
Take an integrated management approach to biosecurity risks to ensure that rural production is not adversely affected by incursions of pests and unwanted organisms.
- 8.24 I consider that it is an appropriate objective to include in the Plan under beneficial use and development as it provides a framework for provisions in the Plan to enable biosecurity responses.
- 8.25 However given that biosecurity effects are not limited to rural production it would be appropriate to add 'natural resources' to the proposed wording:
Take an integrated management approach to biosecurity risks to ensure that rural production and natural resources are not adversely affected by incursions of pests and unwanted organisms.
- 8.26 HortNZ has also sought in submission 307/033 that a new policy be added in Policy 8 to provide for unwanted organisms:
Include an additional policy in Policy P8 Beneficial activities: m) removal of pest species identified in the Regional Pest Management Strategies and material declared as unwanted organisms under the Biosecurity Act 1993
- 8.27 This submission point is addressed in the s42A Report under Issue 2.2 (Page 36) but as it is closely linked to the objective sought for biosecurity I will respond at this point.

- 8.28 The s42A Report is recommending that Policy 8d) be amended to recognise as beneficial the removal of aquatic weeds, pest plants and animal pests.
- 8.29 The s42A Report suggests that this would provide for removal of all forms of pests, without limiting to those identified in specific documents.
- 8.30 I support the recommended change but consider that the clause should be further enhanced by the addition of or unwanted organisms under the Biosecurity Act 1993.
- 8.31 Not all unwanted organisms are pest plants or animals. They can be other organisms, such as insects, physillids or fungi, so it is important that unwanted organisms are specifically included.
- 8.32 By limiting the provision to removal of unwanted organisms under the Biosecurity Act 1993 makes it clear what organisms would be included.
- 8.33 Inclusion of the clause would give effect to the objective sought by HortNZ and also provide a framework to include provisions that enable unwanted organisms to be removed or managed.
- 8.34 I consider that such a provision in the Plan is clearly linked to a beneficial use that should be provided for in the Region to ensure that cultural, social and economic wellbeing are provided for.
- 8.35 The proposed change to Policy P8 d) would be:
the removal of aquatic weeds, pest plants and animal pests, or unwanted organisms under the Biosecurity Act 1993.

**9. BENEFICIAL USE AND DEVELOPMENT – ISSUE 2
IMPORTANCE OF LAND AND WATER**

Issue 2.2 Policy 7

- 9.1 HortNZ made a submission on Policy 7 seeking the addition of primary production to the list of used for land and water as it provides cultural, social and economic benefits. A number of other submitters made similar submissions.
- 9.2 The s42A Report does not recommend that primary production be added for similar reasons why an additional objective for rural production activities is rejected. It is considered to be implicitly recognised.
- 9.3 I recognise that some aspects of primary production are listed in Policy 7, including food production and harvesting. Given that some

aspects of primary production are identified it is unclear why there is a resistance to recognition of primary production per se.

- 9.4 Clearly primary production is a use of land and water that provides for cultural, social and economic benefits to the Region yet is not supported to be explicitly recognised and included as a beneficial activity for the Region.
- 9.5 Inclusion in Policy 7 does not provide a priority as all objectives and policies need to be read in conjunction.
- 9.6 Therefore I consider that it is appropriate to explicitly identify and recognise an important activity which contributes to the cultural, social and economic wellbeing to the Region.

Issue 2.2 Policy 8

- 9.7 HortNZ made a submission seeking addition of a clause relating to biosecurity in Policy 8.
- 9.8 I have addressed this submission point in Section 8 above that addresses submission points relating to biosecurity.

10. BENEFICIAL USE AND DEVELOPMENT – ISSUE 4 INFRASTRUCTURE

- 10.1 Issue 4.1 Definition of regionally significant infrastructure
- 10.2 HortNZ opposed a submission by PowerCo (S29/060) that sought that all of the local electricity distribution network be classed as regionally significant infrastructure.
- 10.3 The s42A Report considers that “the submitter’s request would in essence dilute the definition of regionally significant infrastructure to apply to the local electricity network and this is not the intent.” (Para 265)
- 10.4 I concur with this statement.
- 10.5 The issue of regionally significant infrastructure was canvassed during the RPS process with the resulting definition that is included in both the RPS and the PNRP.
- 10.6 It is important that the focus of regionally significant infrastructure is on those components which are essential for the whole region.
- 10.7 The implications of amending the definition as sought are significant as the framework applying to regionally significant infrastructure would then apply to all local distribution lines.

- 10.8 Therefore I support the distinction made in the PNRP for electricity distribution infrastructure and the s42A Report recommendation to reject the submission by PowerCo.

Issue 4.2 Other definitions in beneficial use and development

- 10.9 HortNZ and Transpower have sought that the definition of national electricity grid be changed to 'National Grid' as this is the term that is in common usage.
- 10.10 The s42A Report supports that change and I support that recommendation.
- 10.11 HortNZ made a further submission on the submission by NZTA (146/031) seeking changes to the definition of reverse sensitivity.
- 10.12 The definition of reverse sensitivity was widely canvassed during the RPS process, including appeals, with the resulting definition being included in the RPS and now the PNRP.
- 10.13 The definition of reverse sensitivity applies in a range of context throughout the Plan and therefore needs to be able to be applied broadly. The changes sought by the submitter are more activity specific and would affect the broader application of the term.
- 10.14 Given the extent of discussion that occurred at that time I consider that the definition is appropriate for the range of uses within the plan so do not support the changes as sought.

11. CONCLUSION

- 11.1 I have assessed the HortNZ submission points, the s42A Report responses and recommendations to provide a planning response to the identified issues. I have set out in the body of this evidence either support for the original submission by HortNZ or suggested alternative wording that addresses matters raised in the s42A Report.
- 11.2 I consider that the wording I have proposed will assist in achieving the outcomes sought in the RPS and the PNRP and assist to give effect to the NPSFM.

Lynette Wharfe

5 May 2017

**Appendix 1
HortNZ Hearing 1 submissions**

Plan Framework, Beneficial use and development and significant sites and areas for mana whenua

Sub Ref	Sub No	Provision	Topic	Decision sought	S42A ref	S42A Report response
1.1	307/001	Section 1	Plan framework	Retain the text regarding the values of water in Section 1 but amend to add at the end of the 4 th para: The contact recreation value will be expressed in the plan as either a primary or secondary contact recreation value depending on the location.	Overall Iss 1.1 Sect 1.6	Reject
1.1	307/002	Section 1	Plan framework	Move the table of values of water to an Objective in Section 3, preferably as an overarching objective in 3.1 as follows: The values of freshwater are recognised and provided for. Include Table 1.1 with the listed values.	Overall Iss 1.1 Sect 1.6	Reject
3.1.1	307/010	New objective	Plan framework	Add new objective in 3.1: The values of freshwater are recognised and provided for. Include Table 1.1 with the listed values. Amend Table 1.1 'Use values – direct' by adding after 'Human sustenance, health and wellbeing' – 'including production of food'.	Overall Iss 1.1 Sect 1.6	Reject
3.1.2	307/012	New objective	Plan framework	Add new Objective in 3.1 Natural and physical resources, are managed to	Overall Iss 6 Pg 117	Reject

				provide an appropriate balance across values and uses in a catchment.		
3.1.3	307/013	Objective 5	Plan framework	Amend Objective 05 by adding: d) production of food for human sustenance	Overall Iss 6 Pg 123	Reject
3.2.1	307/014	New objective	Beneficial use and development	Add a new objective in 3.2 Beneficial use and development Take an integrated management approach to biosecurity risks to ensure that rural production is not adversely affected by incursions of pests and unwanted organisms.	BUD Iss 1.2 Pg 20	Reject
3.2.2	307/015	New objective	Beneficial use and development	Add a new objective in 3.2 Beneficial use and development: The social, economic and cultural wellbeing benefits of rural production activities are recognised and provided for.	BUD Iss 1.1 Pg 19	Reject
4.1.1	307/030	Policy P1	Plan framework	Amend Policy P1 by adding f) use of good management practices.	Overall Iss 4 Pg 65	Reject
4.1.12	307/031	Policy P4	Plan framework	Amend Policy P4: Where minimisation of adverse effects is required by the policies in the Plan minimisation means taking all reasonable steps to reduce adverse effects of the activity and includes:....	Overall Iss 7 Pg 126	Reject
4.2.1	307/032	Policy P7	Beneficial use and development	Add l) primary production Amend Policy P7 by adding: shall be recognised <u>and provided for</u> .	BUD Iss 2 Pg 32	Reject

4.2.2	307/033	Policy P8	Beneficial use and development	<p>Include an additional policy in Policy P8 Beneficial activities: m) removal of pest species identified in the Regional Pest Management Strategies and material declared as unwanted organisms under the Biosecurity Act 1993.</p> <p>Amend point f) to include management of riparian margins.</p>	BUD Iss 2 Pg 36	Reject in part Accept in part (point f)
-------	---------	-----------	--------------------------------	--	-----------------------	--