

From: [Sarah Drummond](#)
To: [Mailroom Mailbox](#)
Subject: FW: V3pLWRP Email Submission
Date: Tuesday, 26 May 2015 8:07:54 a.m.
Attachments: [20150513_Dryland_Generic_submission_variation_3.docx](#)
[ATT00001.htm](#)

For Trimming Please

From: Guy Wigley [mailto:gwigley@farmside.co.nz]
Sent: Monday, 25 May 2015 4:57 p.m.
To: Sarah Drummond
Subject: Re: V3pLWRP Email

Hi Sarah

Thank you with your help re submission on Variation 3

Here are my details

Guy Wigley
732 Lower Hook Road
8 R D
Waimate7978

gwigley@farmside.co.nz

Ph 03 689 8635
Cell 027 6033821
Fax 03 689 8638

I am not a Trade Competitor but the Variation has a direct impact on my ability to farm.
I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.
I am directly affected by the subject matter of this submission.

I do wish to be heard in support of my submission
I would be prepared to submit in a joint case with others making a similar submit at any hearing.

I wish to submit in support of the submission made by the NARG-Low Emitters as attached.

Submission on Proposed Variation 3 to the Proposed Canterbury Land and Water Regional plan – Section 15 – Waitaki and South Coastal Canterbury

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

FILL IN THIS OR FILL IN THE COVER SHEET ON ECAN WEBSITE

Full Name: Narg Low Emitters Group c/o Roger Small (chairman)

Phone (Hm): 036899040

Phone (Wk): 036899040

Postal Address: No 9R.D Waimate,7979

Phone (Cell): 0276890600

Postcode: 7979

Email: Leighbank@xtra.co.nz

We are not a trade competitor for the purposes of the submission but the variation has a direct impact on our ability to farm. If changes sought in the plan are adopted they may impact on others but we are not in direct trade competition with them.

We do wish to be heard in support of this submission

Nutrient Allocation Reference Group

We acknowledge the extensive work of the Nutrient Allocation Reference Group in seeking to put forward a consensus agreement on an allocation method for the catchment. While that agreement reflects an agreed decision to try and make the best of what is generally considered a bad solution to nutrient allocation in the catchment, we are concerned that position does not reach an optimal nutrient allocation for the catchment or for optimising or incentivising the management of Nitrogen and other nutrient loss from individual properties.

Our submission relates to all parts of the plan that allocate a nitrogen load for the Wainono catchment and applies it as a fixed nitrogen discharge limit to our properties using a flexibility cap or deriving a Nitrogen loss baseline

We oppose

- Applying nitrogen baselines as currently calculated
- The current load limit for the Wainono catchment
- Applying a nitrogen discharge limit to my property
- The allocation of nitrogen within the Wainono catchment
- Rule 15.5.2
- Rule 15.5.5
- Table 15(m), 15(N), 15(P)

We seek that the Council

- Review the load calculation to focus on priorities for achieving water quality outcomes
- Provide flexibility in the plan to allow for ongoing routine development and flexibility in farm management
- Provide for future N allocation to low emitters allowing flexibility for ongoing routine development
- Provide for transition times before allocation framework applies to allow for existing water consent holders to finish small scale irrigation infrastructure development
- Insert new policy into 15.4 to provide for greater flexibility and transition times and to recognise the potential of low emitter property development
- For stable low emitting farming systems extend the years over which the calculation of nitrogen baselines are derived and provide the maximum discharge from those years as the baseline
- Modified equal allocation for Waihao Wainono Northern Streams catchment.

Reasons for our submission

Nitrogen Baselines (2009-2013) need to be extended to provide for greater flexibility and recognise variations in existing farm management

Sheep, Beef and Cropping Farmers develop farms as economic farm surplus allows – this significantly impacts their baseline calculation. These properties are not high nitrogen loss properties but sustainably managed farms with a long term development plan. The current proposed variation severely restricts those farmers in their ability to realise the long term land management plan for their properties and to respond to markets

The plan unnecessarily and unfairly restricts our ability to farm

We are concerned that the science and models that have been used to derive the Nitrogen allocation model in the plan have relied on outdated versions of Overseer, incorrect soils information, incorrect use of the “look up tables” and do not provide for changes to incorporate the matrix of good management or updated Overseer and soils data.

Specific Provision	Submission Support/Oppose	Decision Sought	Reasons for decision
Policies 15.4.1 – 15.4.17	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend policies to provide for development of existing low emitting properties. • Provide for flexibility in current farming system if baseline is above flexibility cap. • Increase number of years in calculation of baseline. • Provide for more allocation to low emitting properties over time. • Immediately adopt flexibility cap to low emitting farmers up to 15kg Subject to variations in Overseer and the total load. • For stable low emitting farming systems extend the years over which the calculation of nitrogen baselines are derived and provide the maximum discharge from those years as the baseline • Time frames for achievement of max caps need to be 2025 as per NARG agreement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts our current ability to farm • Impacts on our flexibility of current and future land use • Will not necessarily achieve desired objectives of water quality • Actions of farmer to manage nutrients more important than focus on allocation of nitrogen • Suggested amendments provide greater flexibility in farming system to allow sustainable development • Numbers adopted and notified in the plan are too reliant on previous versions of Overseer, are not corrected for changes in soil knowledge and are predicated on knowledge of existing loads, not achieving water quality outcomes • Max caps not achieved as per NARG agreement and hence impacts on low emitters flexibility.
Rule 15.5.2 – 15.5.5	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend policies to provide for low level development of existing low emitting properties. • Provide for flexibility in current farming system if baseline is above flexibility cap. • Increase number of years in calculation of baseline. • Provide for more allocation to low emitting properties over time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts our current ability to farm • Impacts on our flexibility of current and future land use • Will not necessarily achieve desired objectives of water quality • Actions of farmer to manage nutrients more important than focus on allocation of nitrogen

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Immediately adopt flexibility cap to low emitting properties up to 15kg /ha Subject to variations in Overseer and total load calculations. • For stable low emitting farming systems extend the years over which the calculation of nitrogen baselines are derived and provide the maximum discharge from those years as the baseline 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggested amendments provide greater flexibility in farming system to allow sustainable development • Numbers adopted and notified in the plan are too reliant on previous versions of Overseer, are not corrected for changes in soil knowledge and are predicated on knowledge of existing loads, not achieving water quality outcomes
Table 15(m) ,15(N), 15(P)	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leave tables blank or defer decision on plan change and adoption of tables until catchment models have been updated to include new version of Overseer and Matrix of good management and updated soils data • We have always wanted modified equal allocation of the total nutrient load and that hasn't changed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Numbers adopted and notified in the plan are too reliant on previous versions of Overseer, are not corrected for changes in soil knowledge and are predicated on knowledge of existing loads, not achieving water quality outcomes Need to provide for matrix of good management updates Need to update and rerun catchment models that informed collaborative Nutrient Allocation discussions and plan change • As low emitters we believe the process to be flawed and to complicated from the beginning in allocating nitrogen and has proved to be so. Modified equal allocation is the best outcome for the environment and the simplest to implement. The fundamental point of allowing those who are causing the nitrogen issues to maintain the highest leaching limits while those who have not caused an issue are constrained by their past low impact behaviour is something we find inappropriate.