From: Mary Sparrow
To: Sarah Drummond

Subject: PRINTED Re: Answers to the LWRP hearing panel from the Waimakariri District Council.

**Date:** Thursday, 13 June 2013 2:42:39 p.m.

## Sarah Please find the answers to the following questions.

Section 2.9;	Mary	1.7	David: Issues arise between NRRP, LWRP and WRRP
Sub regional	Sparrow		where the activity statuses of some rules dealing with
Section 8			the same matters are quite different. Stock access to
Waimakariri			waterways cited as an example. Wording to be
			provided which better describes the relationship
			between LWRP and WRRP so its clear what parts of
			the LWRP apply within the Waimakariri catchment.
			Amendments would be to section 2.9 and sub-
			regional section 8.1.1. Relying on their further
			submission to EDS submission
Rule 5.39	Jane Whyte	Section 3; 3.2	Rob/David: Issue with large numbers of small
		graphs Page	holdings of 4ha having to prepare nutrient
		10	management plans. WDC want 10ha. 40% of
			properties in WDC comprise 3% of land area so
			overall effect is small. WDC will provide text re
			site/size that is appropriate for controls in relation to
			preparing nutrient management plans, and also
			consider the risk of amalgamations of several blocks
			into one operating unit where a nutrient plan may be
			needed

With respect to Section 2.9: Sub regional Section 8 Waimakariri our recommendation would be for all policies and rules addressing issues related to the management of water quality in the Land and Water Plan will take precedence (or replace) the Waimakariri River Regional Plan: Chapter 6 Quality.

If the officers considered it desirable to replace the measures in Chapter 7 River and Lake Beds at this stage the Council would support this. From a planning perspective it would appear that only the Water Quantity Chapter of the WRRP would have to remain as it sets the allocation regime for the main stem which was the subject of the recent Plan Change and the minimum flows in the tributaries which were the subject of a review on 2009 and any recommended changes were only minor, so removing the other two chapters would go a long way to satisfying the Environmental Defence Society's submission which was supported by the Waimakariri District Council.

With respect to Rule 5.39 the Council's hearings submission which presented information with respect to the number of lots in the Waimakariri District below 10 hectares was designed to illustrate the Council's view that the requirement as notified, for all property owners to prepare nutrient management plans would require a lot of work for minimal gain. It was not an attempt to advocate for the use of 10 hectares as the threshold below which land owners would not have to prepare nutrient management plans. The Council understands that this is a matter that was raised with the Commissioners by a number of submitters and it does not have a particular view about where the threshold should be set, simply that it should not be a universal requirement.

Mary Sparrow Principal Policy Analyst Waimakariri District Council. The information contained in this email message is CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION and may also be LEGALLY PRIVILEGED. It is intended only for the individual or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, review, dissemination, distribution or copying of this document is strictly prohibited. If you received this document in error, please immediately notify us by telephone (+64-3-3118900) and destroy the original message.

This email has been scrubbed for your protection by SMX. For more information visit <a href="mail.com"><u>smxemail.com</u></a>