



Submission on Proposed Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan

EC - CHCH	
FILE REF. FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	
DOCUMENT No.:	
116933 - 9 OCT 2012	ACTION INFO
Submitter ID: 0366	
File No: PLAN/LWRP/DRFT/6SU/2	
EC166451	

Form 5: Submissions on a Publicly Notified Proposed Policy Statement or Regional Plan under Clause 6 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Return your signed submission by 5.00pm Friday 5 October 2012 to:
 Freepost 1201 Proposed Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan
 Environment Canterbury
 P O Box 345
 Christchurch 8140

Full Name: DAVID BARLASS Phone (Hm): 033028128
 Organisation*: _____ Phone (Wk): 0274373793
 * the organisation that this submission is made on behalf of
 Postal Address: 713 Mt Hutt Station Road Phone (Cell): _____
 Email: dbarlass@extra.co.nz Postcode: _____
 Fax: _____
 Contact name and postal address for service of person making submission (if different from above):
AS ABOVE

Trade Competition

Pursuant to Clause 6 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991, a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission may make a submission only if directly affected by an effect of the proposed policy statement or plan that:

- a) adversely affects the environment; and
- b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Please tick the sentence that applies to you:

- I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission; or
- I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

If you have ticked this box please select one of the following:

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

Signature: [Signature] Date: _____
 (Signature of person making submission or person authorised to sign on behalf of person making the submission)

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

- I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission; or
- I do wish to be heard in support of my submission, and if so.
- If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.

(2) My submission is that: (include whether you support or oppose the specific provisions or wish to have them amended and the reasons for your views.)

I own a farm in the Methven area which is located just inside the red Ashburton - Rakaia Nutrient Allocation Zone. I have significant concerns regarding the classification of the upper foothills are of the Ashburton - Rakaia Nutrient Allocation Zone as red zone where (MAP A-056) "water quality objectives are not met". In particular the property located at 713 Mt Hutt Station road has no natural or artificial water courses running through it and is supported by 30cm of top soil (gorge silt loam) and under that a clay layer that ranges from 1-2m in depth. In our experience farming there is very little if any nutrient loss through the soil and particularly clay barrier.

This is in significant contrast to areas coded orange closer to the North Branch of the Ashburton River which have significantly lighter and stony soils and generally little or no clay.

Consequently, I oppose the classification of the area above Methven and North East of Dry Creek (classified as having soil type Gorg2z on the Landcare Research smap website) in the Ashburton - Rakaia Nutrient Allocation Zone being classified as a red zone.

Further supporting this submission I note in the attached soil report the soil is classified as a Category D Farm Dairy Effluent risk i.e. "well-drained soils with little or no connection to surface water pose the lowest risk for direct losses of applied effluents" this classification is in direct contrast to a Red zoning in the Ashburton - Rakaia Nutrient Allocation Zone in the Proposed Canterbury Land & Water Regional Plan

(3) I seek the following decisions from Environment Canterbury: (Please give precise details for each provision. The more specific you can be the easier it will be for the Council to understand your concerns.)

I am seeking that the area mentioned in (2) above be classified as green given the low probability for any nutrient contamination below the clay layer and also the lack of any water courses to collect and carry nutrients off farm.



Report generated: 27-Sep-2012 from <http://smap.landcareresearch.co.nz>

This information sheet describes the typical average properties of the specified soil to a depth of 1 metre, and should not be the primary source of data when making land use decisions on individual farms and paddocks.

Gorgef

Gorg2z (60% of the mapunit at location (5175914, 1489277), Confidence: Medium)

S-map ref: Gorg_2.1

Key physical properties

Depth class (diggability)	Moderately Deep (45 - 90 cm)
Texture profile	Silty Loam
Potential rooting depth	Unlimited
Rooting barrier	No significant barrier within 1 m
Topsoil stoniness	Stoneless
Topsoil clay range	15 - 25 %
Drainage class	Well drained
Aeration in root zone	Unlimited
Permeability profile	Moderate Over Rapid
Depth to slowly permeable horizon	No slowly permeable horizon
Permeability of slowest horizon	Moderate (4 - 72 mm/h)
Profile total available water	(0 - 100cm) Moderate to high (140 mm)
Top 60 cm available water	(0 - 60cm) Very high (115 mm)
Top 30 cm available water	(0 - 30cm) High (66 mm)
Dry bulk density, topsoil	1.09 (g/cm ³)
Dry bulk density, subsoil	1.42 (g/cm ³)
Depth to hard rock	No hard rock within 1 m
Depth to soft rock	No soft rock within 1 m

Key chemical properties

Topsoil P retention	Medium (43%)
---------------------	--------------

Overseer values

Soil Order	Brown
Sand parent material	
Topsoil soil texture	
Depth	

About this publication

- This information sheet describes the *typical average properties* of the specified soil to a depth of 1 metre.
- For further information on individual soils, contact Landcare Research New Zealand Ltd: www.landcareresearch.co.nz
- Advice should be sought from soil and land use experts before making decisions on individual farms and paddocks.
- The information has been derived from numerous sources. It may not be complete, correct or up to date.
- This information sheet is licensed by Landcare Research on an "as is" and "as available" basis and without any warranty of any kind, either express or implied.
- Landcare Research shall not be liable on any legal basis (including without limitation negligence) and expressly excludes all liability for loss or damage howsoever and whenever caused to a user of this factsheet.



Additional factors to consider in choice of management practices

Vulnerability classes relate to soil properties only and do not take into account climate or management

Soil structure integrity

Erodibility of soil material	Moderate
Vulnerability to rill and slip erosion	not available yet
Structural vulnerability	Moderate (0.52)
Pugging vulnerability	not available yet

Water management

Water logging vulnerability	Very Low
Drought vulnerability - if not irrigated	Low
Bypass flow	Medium
Hydrological soil group	A
Irrigability	Flat to very gently undulating land with good drainage/permeability and soils with high to very high PAW

Contaminant management

N leaching vulnerability	Medium
P leaching vulnerability	not available yet
Runoff potential	Very Low
Bypass flow	Medium
Dairy effluent (FDE) risk category:	D

Additional information

Soil classification	Typic Firm Brown Soils
Family	Gorgef
Sibling number	2
Dominant texture 0 - 60 cm	Silty
Soil profile material	Moderately deep soil
Rock class of stones/rocks	From Hard Sandstone Rock
Rock origin of fine earth	From Hard Sandstone Rock
Parent material origin	Loess on Alluvium

Characteristics of functional horizons in order from top to base of profile:

Functional Horizon	Thickness	Stones	Clay	Sand
Loamy Weak	20 - 30 cm	0 %	15 - 25 %	5 - 15 %
Loamy Weak	20 - 35 cm	0 %	15 - 30 %	5 - 15 %
Loamy Coarse Slightly Firm	0 - 30 cm	0 - 10 %	20 - 30 %	5 - 30 %
Very Stony Loamy Compact	10 - 15 cm	40 - 60 %	4 - 8 %	30 - 70 %
Very Stony Sandy Loose	0 - 40 cm	60 - 75 %	1 - 4 %	85 - 95 %

>>>>>> Carried By >>>>>>
>>>> NEW ZEALAND POST
08.OCT.12 810-17 0213



Freepost 1201
Proposed Canterbury Land & Water Regional Plan.
Enrolment Canterbury
Box 345
Christchurch 8140

