IN THE MATTER of the Resource

Management Act 1991

(RMA) and the Environment

Canterbury Temporary Commissioners and Improved Water

Management) Act 2010

AND

IN THE MATTER of the Environment

Canterbury: Proposed Canterbury Land & Water Regional Plan

(PCLWRP)

TO BE HEARD BY Canterbury Regional

Council

HEARING DATE 24 May 2013

Statement of Evidence of Christopher Adrian Hansen on Behalf of Ravensdown Fertiliser Co-operative Limited

2 April 2013

Introduction

- 1. My name is Christopher Adrian Hansen and I am a Director and Senior Planning Consultant with Chris Hansen Consultants Ltd. My qualifications are a Bachelor of Regional Planning (Hons) from Massey University (1980). I am a full member of the New Zealand Planning Institute and a member of the Resource Management Law Assoc. I have over 30 years' experience in planning and resource management.
- 2. I have particular experience in the review and assessment of regional plans and the preparation of submissions, attendance at hearings providing expert planning evidence, and in mediation to resolve appeals.
- 3. I provide the following statement of evidence in support of the submissions and further submissions lodged by the Ravensdown Fertiliser Co-operative Ltd (Ravensdown) to the Proposed Canterbury Land & Water Regional Plan (PCLWRP/proposed Plan). I assisted Ravensdown to prepare their submission(s).
- 4. I note that Ravensdown submitted on a number of matters that have already been covered by the Fertiliser Association of New Zealand (FANZ). For simplicity, Ravensdown adopts the approach taken by FANZ and the relief it seeks where they are consistent with its submission. I will reference these matters (see the attachment to this evidence), but not cover them in detail in this evidence
- 5. I have read the Code of Conduct contained in the Environment Court's Practice Notes for Expert Witnesses and agree to comply with it.

Outline of Evidence

6. Ravensdown's main submission points the subject of Hearing Group 2 have been covered in my evidence on behalf of the Fertiliser Association of New Zealand, and Ravensdown adopts the relief sought in that evidence. In addition to these matters, Ravensdown raised two addition points I will cover in this evidence. Similar to my approach to the Fert Assoc. evidence, I provide you with an overview of the planning matters raised by Ravensdown,

- and the relief they sought. I will also comment on the Officer Report's recommendation on that relief.
- 7. I note that the hearings on the PCLWRP are divided into 4 groups, and my evidence today relates to Hearing Group 2 and in particular the following matters:

Pest Control and Agricultural Discharges

Rule 5.35

Plan Provision: Rule 5.25 (Page 5-7)

- 8. "The discharge of an agrichemical, or agrichemical equipment or container washwater, into or onto land, including the bed of a lake, river or artificial watercourse, in circumstances where a contaminant or water may enter water is a permitted activity provided the following conditions are met:
 - 1. The agrichemical and application technique or method is approved for use under the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996;
 - 2. The discharge of the agrichemicals is undertaken in accordance with Section 5 and Appendices L and S of New Zealand Standard NZS 8409:2004 Management of Agrichemicals;
 - 3. No mixing or diluting of an agrichemical or rinsing or cleaning of containers or equipment takes place within:
 - (a) 5 m of a surface water body, or a bore; or
 - (b) in the bed of a river or lake, or within the Christchurch Groundwater Protection Zone as shown on the Planning Maps, unless:
 - (i) the mixing or dilution takes place within a sealed, bunded system that will contain a volume of at least 110% of the largest spray tank to be filled; or
 - (ii) the mixing or dilution is for a hand-held application technique or method.
 - 4. If the water used for mixing or dilution is being abstracted from a surface water body or groundwater, a backflow prevention system is in place to prevent the agrichemical from flowing back into the source water.
 - 5. Where the discharge is from an aircraft:
 - (a) the discharge is be carried out by a person who holds a GROWSAFER Pilots' Agrichemical Rating Certificate or an AIRCARETM Accreditation; (b) the flight paths are recorded by an on-board differential global positioning system and this record is kept for at least 12 months following

the discharge and made available to the CRC upon request; and

- (c) the discharge in the bed of a river in Hill and High Country areas does not occur between the first day of September and the last day of November in any year; and
- 6. The discharge is not within a group or community drinking water supply protection area as set out in Schedule 1 or within 10 m of any bore used for drinking water supply."
- 9. **Submission:** Ravensdown supports the intent of Rule 5.25 as it is currently written.
- 10. **Officer Report**: The Officer Report does not directly record Ravensdown's support for Rule 5.25. The Officer Report recommends two amendments to Rule 5.25:
 - "5. Where the discharge is from an aircraft:
 - (a) the discharge is be carried out by a person who holds a GROWSAFE® Pilots' Agrichemical Rating Certificate and an aerial application organisation that is AIRCARETM Accredited. or an AIRCARETM Accreditation"

And:

- 6. The discharge is not within:
- (a) A community water supply protection area as set out in Schedule 1; or
- (b) 10 metres of any bore used for water abstraction.
- 6. The discharge is not within a group or community drinking water supply protection area as set out in Schedule 1 or within 10 m of any bore used for drinking water supply.
- 11. **Comment**: In my view, both recommended amendments are minor and do not change the intent of the rule.
- 12. **Recommendation:** It is recommended the Commissioners retain the intent of Rule 5.25 as it is written, while adopting the amendments recommended in the Officer Report.

Chris Hansen

2 April 2013

Attachment 1 – Matters Covered by FANZ Evidence Adopted by Ravensdown

The following Ravensdown submission points have been covered by the evidence presented to Hearing Group 2 on behalf of FANZ which is adopted by Ravensdown:

Plan Provision: Officer Report Introduction – (Page 69 – 70)

Plan Provision: Officer Report Overall Analysis (Page 70 - 76)

Plan Provision: Recommended Polices - 4.27A - 4.38B

Plan Provision: Recommended Rules – 5.39 – 5.51

Plan Provision: Nutrient Zones (Page 4 - 8)

Plan Provision: Policy 4. 28 (Page 4-7)

Plan Provision: Policy 4. 29 (Page 4-7)

Plan Provision: Policy 4. 30 (Page 4-7)

Plan Provision: Policy 4. 31 (Page 4-7)

Plan Provision: Policy 4. 32 (Page 4-9)

Plan Provision: Policy 4. 34 (Page 4-9)

Plan Provision: Policy 4. 35 (Page 4-9)

Plan Provision: Policy 4. 37 (Page 4-9)

Plan Provision: Policy 4. 38 (Page 4-9)

Plan Provision: Policy 4. 67 (Page 4-9)

Plan Provision: Rule 5.39 (Page 5-11)

Plan Provision: Rule 5.40 (Page 5-12)

Plan Provision: Rule 5.41 (Page 5-12)

Plan Provision: Rule 5.42 (Page 5-12)

Plan Provision: Rule 5.43 (Page 5-12)

Plan Provision: Rule 5.46 (Page 5-13)

Plan Provision: Auditing of Information – Rules 5.39 – 5.54

Plan Provision: Rule 5.489 (Page 5-13)

Plan Provision: Rule 5.49 (Page 5-13)

Plan Provision: Rule 5.50 (Page 5-13)

Plan Provision: Rule 5.51 (Page 5-14)

Plan Provision: Rule 5.52 (Page 5-14)

Plan Provision: Rule 5.53 (Page 5-14)

Plan Provision: Rule 5.54 (Rule 5-14)

Plan Provision: Schedule 7
Plan Provision: Schedule 8

Plan Provision: Definition - Changed

Plan Provision: Definition – Environmental Management Strategy for Irrigation

Plan Provision: Definition – Farm Environment Plan Auditor

Plan Provision: Definition – Nutrient Discharge

Plan Provision: Definition – Existing Farming Activity

Plan Provision: Definition – New Farming Activity

Plan Provision: Definition – High Nutrient Risk Farming Activity

Plan Provision: Definition – Advance Mitigation Measures