

From: [Mary Sparrow](#)
To: [Mailroom Mailbox](#)
Subject: Re: Submission to Plan Change 5 of the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan
Date: Thursday, 10 March 2016 4:55:37 p.m.
Attachments: [SUBMISSION TO ENVIRONMENT CANTERBURY Sparrow.docx](#)

Please find the attached submission

Regards

Mary Sparrow

**SUBMISSION TO ENVIRONMENT CANTERBURY:
PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 5
TO THE CANTERBURY LAND AND WATER REGIONAL PLAN**

**FROM: Mary Sparrow
2 McRoberts Road
R.D. 5
Rangiora 7475**

Contact: Mary Sparrow
e-mail hmsparrow@xtra.co.nz

1 Submission: Amend Definition “Winter grazing” (p.3-3) and Rule 5.44A 4. (p.4-5)

The Plan Change as notified provides a definition of winter grazing and in Rule 5.44A sets a threshold of 20 hectares above which farming of greater than 10 hectares ceases to become a permitted activity. This submission seeks to stream-line this provision by making it clear that winter grazing applies to cattle that are only on a property between 1 May and 30 September. In addition there are difficulties with the definition as proposed as it states “or supplementary feed that has been brought on to the property”, but does not give any indication of volume or include the possibility of such feed being used alongside the feeding of forage crops. The setting of a threshold of 20 hectares may result in cases where areas planted in forage crops will be just below the threshold which could frustrate the purpose of the plan so this submission proposes to do away with the 20 hectare threshold.

Decision requested

Amend the definition of *winter grazing* to read:

“means the grazing of cattle *that are on to a property only between 1 May and 30 September and that are fed predominantly by break-feeding of forage crops and/or with supplementary feed that has been brought onto the property.*”

Amend Rule 5.44A 4. To read

“The property is not used for winter grazing; and ...”

2 Submission: Delete Policy 4.38AB (p.4-4)

It is important that people called upon to use the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan can easily understand the effect that each Policy is going to have when decisions are made under. This submission calls for the deletion of Policy 4.38AB because its intent and/or application are unclear.

Decision requested

Delete Policy 4.38AB

3 Submission: Amend Policy 4.41A (p.4-5)

Policy 4.41A (b) states with respect to assessments of the accuracy of the nutrient budgets and Farm Environment Plans that “a level of scrutiny that is proportional to the qualification, experience and performance of the person who prepared the budget” will apply. In addition Policy 4.41A (c) states “providing a controlled activity consent pathway for resource consent applications that have been prepared or reviewed by an Accredited Farm Consultant”.

This is not the appropriate basis for an organisation charged with responsibility for the administration of plans under the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) approach the assessment the merits of documentation associated with a resource consent application. In addition to requiring nutrient budgets in accordance with Overseer Best Practice Input Standards, it would be appropriate for the level of scrutiny to be relative to the matters involved with the assessment. This means that Policy 4.41A should not focus on who has prepared the documentation, but on the standard of documentation in relation to the assessment of the scale and risks associated with activity for which consent is being sought.

Decision requested:

Amend Policy 4.41A (b) to read:

Applying to any nutrient budget that forms part of an application for resource consent a level of scrutiny that is proportional to the scale of the activity proposed and the level of risk associated with the proposed activity; and

Amend Policy 4.41A (c) to read:

Providing a controlled activity consent pathway for resource consent applications where the scale of the activity proposed is limited and the level of risk associated with the proposed activity is low.

4 Submission: Amend Policy 4.41B (.4.6)

Policy 4.41B states “Attainment of the water quality outcomes for the region are enhanced through the implantation of good management practice. In fact, given the matters addressed in this Policy as a whole, it would be more accurate to state that this Policy is about the “auditing” of the implementation of good management practice. Similarly, the wording of (b) and (c) could be amended to more accurately reflect the circumstances that are being addressed in this Policy.

Decision requested:

Amend the preamble for Policy 4.41B to read “...enhanced through the auditing of the implementation of good management practice”.

Amend 4.41B (b) to read “the use of audit grades as the basis for determining the level of compliance and the frequency of the need for any future audits; ...”

Amend 4.41B (c) to read “requiring the completion of corrective actions to address incidence of non-compliances identified in the Farm Environment Plan; ...”

5 Submission: Amend Rule 5.42A (p.5.3)

The preamble to Rule 5.42A states “*where any property includes land in more than one Nutrient Allocation Zone ...*”. The definition of property in the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan is stated as meaning: “*any contiguous area of land, including land separated by a road or river, held in one or more than one ownership, that is utilised as a single operating unit, and may include one or more certificates of title.*”

The Plan also provides a definition of “*farming enterprise*” which “*means an aggregation of parcels of land held in single or multiple ownership (whether or not held in common ownership) that constitutes a single operating unit for the purpose of nutrient management.*” As the definition of “*farming enterprise*” specifically indicates that nutrient management calculations can be done of an enterprise basis, which means that the parcels of land included do not have to meet the definition of “*property*”, the preamble to Rule 5.42A should read “*where any property or farming enterprise includes ...*”.

Decision requested:

Amend the preamble to Rule 5.42A to read:

“Where any property or farming enterprise includes land in more than one Nutrient Allocation Zone, as shown on the Planning Maps:”

6 Submission: Amend Rule 5.44A (1) (p.5-4), Rule 5.54A (1) (p.5-9) and Rule 5.57A (1) (p.5-12)

In each of these Rules a date is specified by which properties of greater than 10 hectares have register with the Farm Portal to have permitted activity status so long as they meet other stated conditions. The realignment of property boundaries often occurs in rural areas, and provision should be made for the registration of properties of greater than 10 hectares later than the specified dates when this occurs because of the subdivision of properties currently registered. Consideration should also be given to providing a method of capturing situation where a property becomes one that needs to register with the Farm Portal through the acquisition or aggregation of land that would fall within the definition of “*property*” for the purposes of the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan.

Decision requested:

Amend Rules 5.44A (1) 5.54A (1) 5.57A (1) by adding:

“or, is registered in the Farm Portal after (the respective dates) within 6 months of any change in landownership or management which results in the creation of a new qualifying property”

Alternatively, add statements to similar effect.

I wish to be heard in support of this submission.