

Canterbury Water Management Strategy Waimakariri Zone Committee

Agenda

Monday 13 March 2017

2.00pm

***Function Room,
Rangiora Town Hall
303 High Street, Rangiora***

Members:

Grant Edge (Acting Chairperson)
David Ashby
Carolyn Latham
Judith Roper-Lindsay
Gary Walton
ECan Councillor Claire McKay
WDC Councillor Sandra Stewart
Clare Williams (Te Ngai Tūāhuriri Rūnanga)
Cherie Williams (Te Ngai Tūāhuriri Rūnanga)

Chairperson and Members

CWMS WAIMAKARIRI ZONE COMMITTEE

AGENDA FOR THE MEETING OF THE **CANTERBURY WATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGY WAIMAKARIRI ZONE COMMITTEE** TO BE HELD IN THE **FUNCTION ROOM** OF THE **RANGIORA TOWN HALL, 303 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA** ON **MONDAY 13 MARCH 2017 AT 2.00PM.**

Adrienne Smith
Committee Advisor

Recommendations in reports are not to be construed as
Council policy until adopted by the Council

BUSINESS

PAGES

KARAKIA

APOLOGIES AND INTRODUCTIONS

- 1 **APPOINTMENT OF A CHAIR, DEPUTY CHAIR AND REGIONAL COMMITTEE REPRESENTATIVE FOR 2017** – M Griffin (Facilitator, ECan) and Zone Committee Members

4

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the CWMS Waimakariri Zone Committee:

- (a) **Appoints** committee member as Chairperson.
- (b) **Appoints** committee member as Deputy Chairperson.
- (c) **Appoints** committee member as the CWMS Regional Committee representative for 2017.

REGISTER OF INTEREST

5

Conflicts of interest (if any) to be reported for minuting.

- 2 **CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

- 2.1 **Minutes of the Canterbury Water Management Strategy Waimakariri Zone Committee meeting – 13 February 2017**

6-15

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the CWMS Waimakariri Zone Committee:

- (a) **Confirms** the circulated minutes of the Canterbury Water Management Strategy Waimakariri Zone Committee meeting, held 13 February 2017, as a true and accurate record.

MATTERS ARISING

3 OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC TO SPEAK

- 4 **COMMITTEE UPDATES** – Zone Committee Members, A Arps (Waimakariri Zone Delivery Team Leader, ECan) and M Griffin (Facilitator, ECan)

16-17

4.1 Regional Committee Meeting – 14 February 2017

18

4.2 Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan – ‘Omnibus’ Plan Change 4

19-20

4.3 Lees Valley Farmers Group Briefing – Initial Response from ECan

21-27

4.4 Waimakariri Zone Delivery – Update

28-30

4.5 Zone Committee 2016 Annual Report

4.6 Zone Committee Engagement & Communications

4.7 Action List

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the CWMS Waimakariri Zone Committee:

- (a) **Receives** these updates for its information and with regard to the committee's 5 Year Outcomes and 2017 community engagement priorities.

- 5 **GENERAL BUSINESS AND FUTURE MEETING PRIORITIES** – Chair and M Griffin (Facilitator, ECan)

---ooo0ooo---

WORKSHOP

- 6 **WAIMAKARIRI KEY ISSUES SUMMARY** – B Nicholas and M Griffin (Facilitators, ECan)

31-34

SUPPER

- 7 **KEY DECISION AREAS AND SOLUTIONS PROGRAMME SCHEDULE - WORKSHOP** – B Nicholas and M Griffin (Facilitators, ECan)

35-36

- 8 **COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT – WORKSHOP** – B Nicholas and M Griffin (Facilitators, ECan)

AGENDA ITEM NO: 2	SUBJECT MATTER: Appointment of Chairperson and Deputy, and CWMS Regional Committee representative for 2017	
REPORT TO: Waimakariri Water Zone Committee		MEETING DATE: 13 March 2017
REPORT BY: Murray Griffin, CWMS Facilitator, ECan		

PURPOSE

The purpose of the agenda item is to assist the Zone Committee in the process of appointing a Chairperson, Deputy Chairperson and CWMS Regional Committee representative for 2017.

These appointments are in accord with the Zone Committee's Terms of Reference, which state that the committee make these appointments each year by simple majority. Nominations can be made by a committee member on behalf of themselves or for another member.

- The committee shall first accept nominations for the Chairperson followed by nominations for the position of Deputy Chairperson.
- The committee shall then accept nominations for the position of CWMS Regional Committee representative for the committee

Should there be more than one nominee for any of these positions the appointment process shall be undertaken by a simple ballot vote.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Zone Committee appoints a Chairperson, Deputy Chairperson, and CWMS Regional Committee representative for 2017.

WAIMAKARIRI ZONE COMMITTEE

Register of Interests – at February 2017

Name	Committee Member Interests
David Ashby	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Director/shareholder: Pineleigh Farm Limited - Director/shareholder: Dave Ashby Rural Consultants Limited - Shareholder: Waimakariri Irrigation Limited - Member: Cust Main Drain Water User Group
Grant Edge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Director: Edge Landscape Projects Ltd, Edge Plants Ltd, and Edge Products Ltd - Member: NZ Institute of Landscape Architects - Member: Urban Design Forum - Member: QEII National Trust - Member: NZ Forest & Bird - Member: Heritage NZ - 1ha property Fernside (shallow bore user)
Carolyn Latham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Farmer: Sheep, beef and racehorse agistment - Director of Latham Ag Ltd Consulting - Shareholder: Silver Fern Farms, Farmlands - Registered Member: New Zealand Institute of Primary Industry Management - Member: Canterbury Ice Hockey Association
Claire McKay	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dairy Farmer - Irrigator and shareholder: Waimakariri Irrigation Ltd - Holder of Groundwater take and use consents in Cust groundwater allocation zone - Holder of Effluent discharge consents - Member: Federated Farmers - Member: DairyNZ Dairy Environmental Leaders forum - Member: P21 Canterbury Industry Advisory Group
Judith Roper-Lindsay	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Director/ecologist: JR-L Consulting Ltd. - Land-owner/small-scale sheep farmer, Ashley downs - Fellow: Environment Institute of Australia and New Zealand (EIANZ)
Sandra Stewart	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Self-employed journalist - Land-owner, 4ha Springbank – sheep & dogs
Gary Walton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Director, Walton Farm Consulting Ltd - Director & Shareholder, Loburn Irrigation Co - Trustee, Rugby World Heritage Trust - Ashley Rugby Football Club (Inc.) - Farmer, sheep & cattle, Loburn
Cherie Williams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Member: Mana Whenua Working Party - Tangatiaki / Kaitiaki - NZTA Northern and Southern Bypass Rūnanga Representative
Clare Williams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Chair, Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga Inc. - Selwyn/Waihora Zone Committee – Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga representative - Member: Mana Whenua Working Party - Trustee: Central Plains Water Trust

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CANTERBURY WATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGY WAIMAKARIRI ZONE COMMITTEE HELD IN THE FUNCTION ROOM OF THE RANGIORA TOWN HALL, 303 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA ON MONDAY 13 FEBRUARY 2017 AT 2.05PM.

PRESENT

Grant Edge (Acting Chairperson), David Ashby, Carolyn Latham, Judith Roper-Lindsay, Claire McKay (Environment Canterbury Commissioner) and WDC Councillor Sandra Stewart.

IN ATTENDANCE

Murray Griffin (Zone Facilitator, ECan), Andrew Arps (Waimakariri Zone Team Leader, ECan), Don Chittock (Policy Manager CWMS, ECan), Jason Holland (Principal Planning Advisor, ECan), Matt Dodson (Hydrogeologist, ECan), Anna Veltman (Land Management Advisor, ECan), Maureen Whalen (ECan), Mary Sparrow (ECan Contractor), Geoff Meadows (Policy Manager, WDC), Alistair Picken (Senior Planner, ECan), Barbara Nicholas, Jason Butt (Biodiversity Officer, ECan), A Meredith, Gerard Cleary (Manager Utilities & Roading, WDC), Trevor Ellis (Development Planning Manager, WDC), Stephen Bragg (Tangata Whenua Facilitator, ECan), Gina McKenzie (Real Communications), Rachel McClung (Policy Analyst, WDC), Owen Davies (Drainage Manager, WDC), Brent Walton (WIL), Greg Bennet (Land Drainage Engineer, WDC), Julia Beijeman (Beef and Lamb NZ), Simon Goodall (Lees Valley Farmer), Marilyn Dalzell (Lees Valley Farmer), David Ayers (Mayor, WDC), Michael Bate (Kaiapoi), Cam Henderson (Dairy Farmer, Oxford), Penny Wright (Forest and Bird), and Emma Stubbs (Minute Secretary, WDC).

1 KARAKIA

Nil.

2 APOLOGIES AND INTRODUCTIONS

Moved D Ashby Seconded C Latham

Apologies were received and sustained from Claire Williams, Cherie Williams and Gary Walton.

CARRIED

REGISTER OF INTEREST

Nil.

3 APPOINTMENT OF A CHAIR, DEPUTY CHAIR AND REGIONAL COMMITTEE REPRESENTATIVE FOR 2017 – M Griffin (Facilitator, ECan) and Zone Committee Members

G Edge advised this item would be deferred to the following month.

4 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

4.1 Minutes of the Canterbury Water Management Strategy Waimakariri Zone Committee meeting – 12 December 2016

Moved J Roper-Lindsay seconded D Ashby

THAT the CWMS Waimakariri Zone Committee:

- (a) **Amends** the minutes of the Canterbury Water Management Strategy – Waimakariri Zone Committee held on Monday 12 December 2016. Page 2, following item 2, should read *Cherie Williams* arrived at 2.30pm. Page 5, Item 5, sentence 1, should read Paul Edwards (Farm Systems Advisor, DairyNZ). Page 3, Item 3.3 Nutrient Management and Water Efficiency Working Group should read 'D Ashby tabled an overview from Angela Harvey (DairyNZ) of the 'Dairy Farms Waimakariri GMPs 2016/17'.
- (a) **Confirms** the circulated minutes of the Canterbury Water Management Strategy Waimakariri Zone Committee meeting, held 12 December 2016, as a true and accurate record.

CARRIED

MATTERS ARISING

J Roper-Lindsay asked why there was not an update on the Kaiapoi River Rehabilitation Investigation for February. M Griffin advised that A Meredith would provide a report in April as there would be more meaningful data to present following the driest months of February and March. There had been some issues with the dataloggers however they were now out recording.

G Edge queried whether the waterway typology exercise would also be updated in April and M Griffin replied yes.

J Roper-Lindsay queried whether there had been sea foam present on the beach. M Bate commented yes and that he had informed WDC of its presence. No sample had been taken.

J Roper-Lindsay asked if there had been a response to the request for additional committee members and M Griffin replied he would provide an update on the refreshment later in the meeting.

G Edge advised that the Cam River (Tuahiwi Stream) walkabout had taken place. It had been a good session with the opportunity for recreation and stream improvements recognised to be followed up once the Henry Hudson report was released. S Stewart advised that the report had been due February 10th 2017 and was imminent.

G Edge queried whether the Salt Water Creek sampling had been carried out and M Griffin advised he assumed it had been as the COMAR work was now completed.

G Edge asked if the Walk for the Planet Initiative had received funding through ECan. A Arps advised it was his understanding that the application for \$70,000 from ECan had been declined. G McKenzie advised that the Initiative was still happy to have the zone committee involved and the project would still go ahead without the funding. G McKenzie would provide an update at a later meeting.

5 OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC TO SPEAK

Penny Wright had asked to speak but advised that she had received new information over the last few days and would refer her deputation to the following meeting to provide as full a picture as possible.

Michael Bate tabled a number of newspaper and print articles that referred to environmental issues throughout New Zealand including;

- The issue of cadmium pollution in the North Island and requested that the zone committee look at the issue in the Waimakariri.
- The condition of Lake Forsyth
- Use of ineffective fish screens on the Rangitata for 70 years.
- Nelson consent to discharge raw sewage – and requested that something be done about the Waimakariri treatment plant as he believed it was contributing to algae blooms at sea and beach foam.
- Article from the Kaiapoi Mail 1998 commenting on the issue of suspended sediments in the river – noting that identification of the issue was 19 years ago.
- Article from the Kaiapoi Mail 1998 that advised that water released from the treatment plant would be bathing water standard.
- Farms encroaching on braided rivers – running stock on shingle.

Noted the presence of toxic algae in the Cust Main Drain and had requested signs be put up. WDC had done this. He asked why shellfish had not been tested and why core samples of sediment were not tested.

M Bate asked that the committee look at minimum flows and noted that this could be achieved by water storage.

M Bate showed videos of 'before and after' effects of spraying in the Flaxton Drain, with the dates of 11 June and 17 December 2016. The before video showed the presence of numerous water weed and invertebrates, the after showed a 'slimy, toxic mess' with very little life.

J Roper-Lindsay asked how often the drain was sprayed and if life did come back and M Bate replied that yes life did come back.

G Edge commented that it was reasonable to make everyone aware of his concerns and ask questions of ECan and WDC. He noted some work had been undertaken by WDC on the sea foam and that there was regular monitoring of toxic algae.

D Ashby showed M Bate a photo of a drain through his dairy farm commenting that it had high water quality.

Owen Davies provided clarification that the Flaxton Drain had been sprayed by a landowner rather than WDC. M Bates noted he had videos of other waterways that WDC had sprayed that were identical. O Davies commented there would be more definitive answers after the results of the CAREX trial. WDC was trying to get more information especially around invertebrates. He was unsure when the full report would be available. It was requested that members of the CAREX group provide a brief update at the following meeting.

M Bate was thanked for presenting his information.

6 **COMMITTEE UPDATES** – Zone Committee Members, A Arps (Waimakariri Zone Delivery Team Leader, ECan) and M Griffin (Facilitator, ECan)

- Zone Committee Refresh 2017

M Griffin advanced that there was a schedule in place for the refresh process, Ashburton was going through the same process. The position would be advertised 20th Feb – 12th March with a selection workshop 20-24th March. Following reporting to ECan and WDC any new members could be on board for 8th May meeting.

- Committee Working Groups

Nutrient Management & Water Efficiency Working Group

D Ashby advised the group had not met the previous month. They were looking at running a small block owners workshop in March in association with Primary ITO. The first session would be a pilot within a catchment and then they would look to extend through the district. The approach of targeting individual landowners within a catchment needed to be confirmed. After completing management plans the information could be entered through the portal. The management plan would incorporate work on riparian management including appropriate plantings. They were looking at doing a stream walk in the Silverstream catchment and then sending letters to those identified which was about 60 small block holders. They were currently waiting on Primary ITO. The decision to wrap qualifications around the small block management plan process was causing delay.

D Ashby advised that WIL had started on their FEP audit programme. He noted a major education and extension programme in the district was required to contact other farmers within the orange zone in particular that would require a resource consent. He was concerned that the message was not getting out there. It was predicted there would be a bottleneck when these farmers completed nitrogen baseline calculations. This would require good communication with Ravensdown and Ballance environmental teams as the process progressed. D Ashby noted G Walton and C Latham were involved in Beef and Lamb workshops.

S Stewart asked what the criteria was for small block holders and D Ashby commented that it may change with Plan Change 5, currently it was those above 4 hectare who were non-commercial. S Stewart noted that there were 6500 small block holders and that it was an issue WDC should be in touch with through the District Development Strategy. D Ashby commented that ECan had good tools that provided a good start in what they should be doing.

There was some discussion around use of databases to target those requiring engagement. In response to a query from G Edge, Mary Sparrow advised that WDC could extract relevant information from its data bases using various filters. A Arps noted that those in the orange zone had been identified and were being worked with, there had been three relevant articles in the paper this week and there was a programme being advanced called 'Farming for Generations'. They would continue to try and get the message out.

D Ashby commented that they were making good progress, all bar six dairy farms had a management plan. Under Plan Change 5, 285 farms may not require a resource consent. It was important to keep the momentum going.

Lowlands Waterways, Braided Rivers and Biodiversity Working Group

G Edge advised the meeting notes had been completed and a date needed to be set for the next stakeholder meeting in March. They were hoping for progress on waterway typology which could provide guidance on which rivers needed to be swimmable verse wadeable. There needed to be discussion with drainage groups and council around redefining some 'drains' as spring fed waterways and their roles in stormwater management.

In terms of braided rivers there would be a discussion this afternoon on the Ashley/Rakahuri. It needed to be addressed as part of the solutions programme.

Regional Committee Meeting – 13 December 2016

G Edge provided an update to the Regional Committee regarding achievements and progress in the zone, this update was circulated to the committee. He had requested scoping for the alpine section of the LWRP

due to cross boundary issues and issues related to the Waimakariri River. He had requested more information on climate change and raised the issues of woody weeds. D Chittock advised that the Regional Pest Management Strategy would be notified prior to the end of June 2017. There would be more stakeholder engagement including with zone committees. G Edge read the notes of agreement from that meeting. They would be circulated to the committee.

G Edge advised he had attended the Recreational and Amenity Working Group on 23rd December. There had been discussion around the need for more work to be done of the recreation and amenity targets.

J Roper-Lindsay asked what the implications were for the WWZC and G Edge commented that the committee needed to decide on its most significant recreation project to foster, in addition when looking at solutions the committee needed to look more closely at recreation and amenity.

There was some discussion around the role of the Lowlands Waterways, Braided Rivers and Biodiversity Working Group and Nutrient Management & Water Efficiency Working Group and it was noted that they had not met for some time. G Edge asked the committee whether they wished to continue with the working groups. C Latham commented that members needed to be involved across the board, and C McKay believed they had fulfilled their purpose and believed there would be people in the committee able to take the lead on individual projects. J Roper-Lindsay supported the discontinuation of the working groups and believed that the solutions phase required more specifics than 'biodiversity'. A Arps commented that it was a busy year and they were keen to meet with those groups in whatever structure.

Moved D Ashby Seconded J Roper-Lindsay

THAT the CWMS Waimakariri Zone Committee:

- a) **Discontinues** with the Lowlands Waterways, Braided Rivers and Biodiversity Working Group and Nutrient Management & Water Efficiency Working Group and instead have specific extension projects throughout the zone with a committee member taking the lead on each identified project.

CARRIED

S Stewart queried who identified the projects and asked if there could be a report defining who did what and how to form a targeted approach. A Arps advised that currently the work programme for the WWZC was being drawn up which would be a reference starting point. It would be circulated when completed.

Waimakariri Zone Delivery – Update

A Arps noted that the small block holder programme was coming together.

6.1 First 500 Springhead Protection Programme - Waimakariri Zone

A Arps introduced Jason Butt (ECan Biodiversity Officer) and the First 500 Springhead Protection Programme which picked up on the priority outcome of protecting major springheads on lowland streams. The programme would initially concentrate on the Silverstream catchment which had a specific focus in the Five Year Plan. Stream walks would be undertaken to have a more intimate understanding of the catchment and allow proactive targeting of people with major springheads.

J Roper-Lindsay asked if the springhead protection programme would meet IMS fund criteria as better rankings were given to projects with existing native vegetation. She suspected many springheads would be in a wet, bare paddock. J Butt said that a significant spring with permanent flow would be a priority. Many 'wet paddock' springs would not be first priority as they had likely not to have been identified yet. The ECan GIS layer had half a dozen major springs and it was likely more would be identified on the stream walk.

G Edge commented that IMS had \$500,000 funding available and at \$10,000 a spring that would only be 50 projects. A Arps commented it was important to be proactive and gain momentum. G Edge suggested there should be a discussion around the best spend of money – fencing and protection or riparian vegetation and noted the cost of fencing to the farmer. He suggested cost sharing to incentivise farmers to protect the springs. C Latham suggested it was better to have the springheads fenced rather nothing to be done. A Arps commented that it was situational and discussions would be held with farmers. Feedback would be provided to the committee.

S Stewart requested clarification of what was being asked of the committee. Were they being asked to

- a) approve the approach of negotiating with landowners to fence and plant springheads? and
- b) would individual projects be brought back to the committee for approval?

A Arps commented that the first part was correct, however, they were not expecting to get approval for each individual project. G Edge commented he was reluctant to lose that oversight. C Latham noted there was an associated cost and delay to reporting on each individual project. A Arps suggested approving prefunding was a way to go and get things started without being a large piece of work. M Griffin suggested that the programme could begin early work and bring back examples to provide more confidence in the approach. G Edge commented that there needed to be consideration of number of factors including the interrelationship with other waterways, flood mitigation etc. J Roper-Lindsay believed that level of analysis was unnecessary, the LWRP identified springheads as vital and suggested \$30,000 be approved as an IMS pilot. C McKay supported the proposal noting that a criticism was things were not happening fast enough with the zone committee. C Latham commented they needed to have trust in ECan that they would put the money to good use.

Moved J Roper-Lindsay Seconded C Latham

THAT the CWMS Waimakariri Zone Committee:

- a) **Approves** prefunding IMS projects up to the value of \$30,000 until June 2017, targeting Silverstream and Burgess Creek Catchments for the protection of springheads in accordance with the report Page 19 of the Canterbury Water Management Strategy Waimakariri Zone Committee Agenda Monday 13 February 2017.

CARRIED

C McKay commented that the programme could result in farmers losing a significant amount of ground and asked if there was flexibility to which J Butt replied yes.

S Stewart requested that in future that better quality maps are presented identifying roads and waterways.

G Edge queried why the ECan Living Streams documents had not been reproduced for farmers. A Arps would follow up.

Zone Committee 2016 Annual Report

M Griffin advised he had started a draft which would be emailed to committee members.

Walk for the Planet 2017

M Griffin noted the dates included in the agenda.

Engagement and Communications

G McKenzie advised the next Monthly E Newsletter would be sent 21st February.

M Griffin noted the dates in the agenda for the Alternate Pathways scenario.

Action List

M Griffin provided an updated Actions List and gave a brief overview.

S Stewart highlighted the action point of a Waterway Care publication commenting that it had been raised for two years. She requested that the action point get accelerated noting that Owen Davies had raised the spraying of drains by private landowners. She suggested when doing the springhead project it would be good to leave something with landowners around the care of waterways. It was suggested it should be in easily digestible pamphlet form. A Arps advised he could have a draft proposal for the next meeting.

Moved D Ashby seconded J Roper-Lindsay

THAT the CWMS Waimakariri Zone Committee:

- (a) **Receives** these updates for its information and with regard to the committee's 5 Year Outcomes and 2017 community engagement priorities.

CARRIED

7 WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY – UPDATE – T Ellis (Development Planning Manager, WDC)

T Ellis spoke to a PowerPoint presentation to provide an update on where the council was at in terms of the District Development Strategy. The time horizon of the strategy was 30 years and it reflected Urban Development and Infrastructure strategies.

T Ellis provided a number of statistics

- The population was predicted to increase from 57,800 to between 80,200 and 105,900 in 2048.
- Building consents remained relatively static at 450 annually.
- Number of households was currently 21-22000 and were expected to increase by 11,000 by 2048.
- The elderly population would increase from 17% to 33%.

A growth model was currently being prepared which looked at basic development options going forward looking to see if there was sufficient capacity to plan for growth.

T Ellis noted the key documents for the process – the RMA, Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy and the proposed NPS on Urban Development

Capacity in which WDC was defined in the high growth category which required planning measures.

T Ellis showed diagrammatically feedback from community events. Respondents did not want changes in community, nature and rural but did want transport changes. Key feedback was around local employment, economic development, natural hazards, environment and rural areas. Further engagement was ongoing and WWZC would be invited to be part of a focus group.

T Ellis advised that the next steps were community engagement, retail assessment, growth model, business land supply and demand and transport as well as procedural steps. They needed to be mindful of the District Plan and alignment was required with the WWZC.

J Roper-Lindsay referred to the growth model and asked if there was the infrastructure to support growth, for example drinking water capacity. T Ellis replied that a lot of that information came out of the engineering side.

G Edge asked if sustainability was kept in mind. T Ellis replied that they had to look to the future for sustainability through creativity and technology.

G Edge commented that the WWZC would look to share and contribute and noted going forward there should be greater dialogue between ECan, WDC and WWZC.

Moved G Edge seconded D Ashby

THAT the CWMS Waimakariri Zone Committee:

- (a) **Receives** this update for its information and,
- (b) **Considers** the community engagement scheduled in 2017 for Waimakariri Land and Water Solutions Programme 2017, and areas of overlapping focus with the District Development Strategy.

CARRIED

8 LEES VALLEY FARMERS GROUP – BRIEFING – M Dalzell and J Beijeman

M Dalzell spoke to the committee on behalf of the Lees Valley Farmers noting her report as included in the agenda. She was supported by J Beijeman and Simon Goodall.

M Dalzell outlined that they were asking the zone committee to provide feedback on intended actions of the Lees Valley Farmers, allow them to present findings to the Zone Committee before October 2017 and to consider including Lees Valley specific recommendations in the ZIP addendum.

M Dalzell advised that the Lees Valley Farmers Group were a tight knit group who worked closely together. The nitrogen loss through Lees Valley was not high due to the extensive farming practices. Overseer numbers for the properties were less than 15. Intensification would not be practical in the Lees Valley due to environmental conditions including snow. The farmers were very aware they were at the 'top' of the catchment and noted there was a unique water monitoring point. Plan Change 5 would require the three landowners to get a consent to farm. They were not opposed to the consents, and had been advised that they would be granted consent, however they believed the money required to get a consent would be better spent on 'on the ground actions' for example water troughs and culverts.

S Goodall reiterated that Lees Valley was a unique catchment with a unique exit point that was easy to monitor.

J Beijeman commented that there had been good communication with ECan regarding the issues and the parties were willing to work together. PC5 caught Lees Valley under two different rules. Firstly M Dalzell had 50 hectares irrigated land (the only property with irrigated land in Lees Valley). The irrigation was not for grass fed stock rather for winter feed. Secondly the property S Goodall managed exceeded the 100 hectares maximum allowance for greenfeed, it was noted that he had 27,000 hectares of land.

J Beijeman highlighted that the Lees Valley farmers were highly engaged and commented that there was an opportunity for through the ZIP addendum to allow realistic farm management practices in Lees Valley as well as maintaining or improving water quality. They were asking the zone committee to seriously consider including Lees Valley specific recommendations in the ZIP addendum.

G Edge thanked the group for attending and advising of the situation. He noted the solutions program was in the early stages. Following the meeting there would be a workshop on the Lees Valley catchment where ideas could be discussed. G Edge noted the idea that within management units there could be sub catchment or management areas with solutions tailor made for particular circumstances. The initial orange and red zones were first applied as a holding pattern while more information was gathered.

J Roper-Lindsay noted that the Lees Valley was discrete unit and commented that the solutions package had a regulatory component and non-regulatory component.

C McKay thanked the group for attending and noted the unique environment of Lees Valley. She fully supportive of the group coming to the zone committee with proposals and having continued dialogue in order to develop something that the Lees Valley group could accept.

G Edge suggested that the Lees Valley farmers work with the other big landowners in the valley including WDC/LINZ/DoC/ECAN.

C Latham noted the timeframe of October 2017 for the group to present findings to the zone committee. M Griffin advised that the Zone Committee would be looking at solutions April – July 2017 and that the Lees Valley Farmers Group would need to present findings prior to the end of July. M Dalzell advised that timeframe could be met however they were trying to gather supporting evidence especially in relation to the effect of peatlands in the Lees Valley. G Edge suggested that they present what they could at the time.

J Holland endorsed this type of local engagement and commented it was good to see a relationship had been forged between the Lees Valley farmers, ECan and the zone committee. J Holland advised that the process of the zone committee was one about solutions to meet outcomes. ECan had to be mindful that the regulatory and planning side was not overly complicated. He noted that no one wanted to be required to farm with a resource consent and could argue that they were special or unique. He was happy to keep working with the team to scope a project and come back to the Zone Committee in a month to six weeks.

Moved J Roper-Lindsay seconded C Latham

THAT the CWMS Waimakariri Zone Committee:

- (a) **Receives** the briefing for its information and encourages the continuation of dialogue.

CARRIED

D Ashby commented that it was brilliant to get this feedback. In his experience, in the Ashburton high country, the problem was not N but DRP and a lot of money was spent on Overseer that achieved nothing and it was better to work together to spend money in the right place.

9 **GENERAL BUSINESS AND FUTURE MEETING PRIORITIES** – Chair and M Griffin (Facilitator, ECan)

M Griffin provided a draft spreadsheet of process stages and key decision areas for the Waimakariri Land and Water Solutions program. The spreadsheet went through to 2018 and full notification. The updated version included where the technical planning fitted in, key decision areas as a committee, and the work of the committee for the remainder of the year. As those who provided the governance in this process the Zone Committee would move the project forward informed by the technical work.

G Edge noted that the period April-June for a solutions package after six years of digesting information was not a long time. He asked that if they go to the end of June and found that the pathway to the sub-regional plan could be simplified with more focus on non-statutory solutions rather than a plan change, could the timeframe be changed. J Holland commented it was a good way to look at it and the zone committee would have more knowledge on this by June.

M Griffin acknowledged J Roper-Lindsay on receiving the Environmental Institute of Australia and New Zealand's Practitioner of the year for Australasia. She was the first New Zealander to receive this award.

J Roper-Lindsay referred to the ECan report regarding farm encroachment onto riverbeds and requested a short briefing on the issue in the Waimakariri zone. D Chittock commented that from memory it was more an issue further north and south of this zone.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 4.57pm

CONFIRMED

Chairperson

Date

---ooo0ooo---

WORKSHOP

10 **ASHLEY/RAKAHURI & THE LEES VALLEY SUB-CATCHMENT – WORKSHOP**
– Zone Committee Members, Lees Valley Farmers Group and M Griffin (Facilitator, ECan)

Whiteboard Notes would be circulated for information to the LVFG and the Zone committee discussion.

AGENDA ITEM NO: 5	SUBJECT: Committee Updates
REPORT TO: Waimakariri Water Zone Committee	MEETING DATE: 13 March 2016
REPORT BY: Murray Griffin, Facilitator, ECan	

PROPOSAL

This agenda item provides the committee with an overview of updates as tabled. For this meeting, with the emphasis on the committee workshops to follow the formal meeting, all papers are presented as read-only. The committee are encouraged to note any points of follow-up or questions they may have for the facilitator.

RECOMMENDATION

The Zone Committee are asked to receive these updates for its information and with regard to the committee's 5 Year Outcomes and 2017 community engagement priorities.

COMMITTEE UPDATES

The following updates are tabled for the committee:

- **Regional Committee Meeting – 14 February 2017**

Claire McKay has provided a report from the 14 February CWMS Regional Committee meeting for the committee's information. It is provided as agenda item 5 – 1. The following link is to the CWMS Regional Committee meeting agenda page.

Link: <https://ecan.govt.nz/data/document-library/?Search=regional+water+management+committee%2C+agenda&documentTypes=-1&pageSize=12&start=1&sortDir=desc>

- **Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan – 'Omnibus' Plan Change 4**

The media release for Plan Change 4, the 'Omnibus', of the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan is provided for the committee's information as agenda item 5 – 2. Below is a link for information on this Plan Change.

Link: <https://ecan.govt.nz/get-involved/news-and-events/2017/land-and-water-regional-plan-change-the-omnibus-to-be-made-operative/>

- **Lees Valley Farmers Group Briefing – Initial Response from ECan**

Given the limited time available at this meeting for an extended discussion on this item, this paper is provided for the committee's information, with any follow-up questions or suggestions to be noted or emailed to the Zone Committee's Facilitator.

This paper is an initial response to the briefing made to the Zone Committee at their 13 February meeting by the Lees Valley Farmers Group and following workshop discussion. This paper is provided as an initial response from the ECan Science and Planning Teams to the issues raised by the Lees Valley Farmers Group as agenda item 5 – 3.

- **Waimakariri Zone Delivery – Update**

Given the limited time available at this meeting, Andrew Arps will provide a more detailed briefing on the Zone Delivery Team work programme for discussion at the next zone committee workshop.

- **Zone Committee 2016 Annual Report**

Copies of the 2016 Annual Report will be available at this meeting.

- **Zone Committee Engagement & Communications**

Engagements

- Community meetings on the Alternative Pathways scenario for the Waimakariri:
 - Rangiora – 15 March at Rossburn Receptions, 7-9pm
 - Cust – 20 March at Cust Community Centre, 7-9pm
 - Kaiapoi – 22 March at Kaiapoi High School Auditorium, 7-9

Communications – Recent media coverage and advertising campaigns

- Irrigation NZ magazine article on Scott Evans and FEPs
- North Canterbury News - Tuesday February 9th
 - page 24 - Good progress on GMP - Andrew Arps quoted regarding nitrate limits
 - page 25 - FEP article on Scott Evans - half page feature - benefits of FEP to environment and bottom line
 - page 27 - Wrybill nesting at Ashley River - half page feature -mentions WZC's focus on protecting braided rivers and quotes Andrew Arps and Nick Ledgard (ARRG)
- Advertising for upcoming community meetings
 - Oxford Bulletin - 3 March and 17 March - full page ads
 - Woodend Woodpecker - March edition - full page ad
 - WWZC March newsletter - reminder included with all meeting details + link to zone committee member applications for zone committee refresh
 - North Canterbury News - 9 March and 15 March - half page ads
 - Kaiapoi Advocate - 10 March - full page ad
 - Northern Outlook - 12 March and 19 March - full page ads
 - Rangiora Cinema - 23 February - 20 March - 1 minute cinema ad
 - Neighbourly - 10 March - 17th March - online ad running
 - CWMS Facebook page - 10 March - 20 March - meeting reminders posted
- Committee's Monthly E Newsletter – the first E-Newsletter for 2017 was sent on 7 March. It is included as agenda item 5 – 4

Action List

- An updated list of action points from previous meetings will be tabled with the committee to confirm completed items and ongoing follow-up.

RECOMMENDATION

The Zone Committee are asked to receive these updates for its information and with regard to the committee's 5 Year Outcomes and 2017 community engagement priorities.

Regional Committee meeting 14th Feb 2017

There are a number of vacancies for representatives from zone committees that will be filled by election in their respective zones over the next few weeks.

The recreation and amenity working group (RAWG) provided a verbal update to the regional meeting in December, with their recommendations for continuing work in this area. A proposal was initially presented by Scott Pearson (North Canterbury F&G) and Doug Rankin (Whitewater NZ) focused on discussing a possible pathway for ensuring recreation and amenity values were adequately understood and recognised under the wider CWMS process.

Staff will now progress work to scope this report following some clarification, from Councillor Tom Lambie, Scott Pearson and Doug Rankin, on the uses of such a report and the issues to which it needed to respond.

Following the opportunity in December for each zone representative to provide an 'overview' report on the achievements, key issues and opportunities in their zones, the RC has decided to shift to more substantial reporting from each zone.

Five zones will provide a more in depth briefing to profile the achievements, and the current challenges and priorities, each meeting, instead of a brief update on zone activity, as previously. This will be the first item on the agenda and could be the basis for discussion of emerging issues report, or used as a means to identify additional strategic issues that cut across zones.

In considering the 2017 work programme, members were reminded that the purpose and function of the CWMS regional committee is to:

1. Monitor progress of the implementation of the CWMS cross the Canterbury Region, and
2. Provide advice to Environment Canterbury on regional issues associated with the implementation of CWMS.

The committee has reviewed the work of the current working groups, responded to the December zone updates and agreed the priorities for their work programme for the coming year. There will be five working groups:

- Biodiversity and ecosystem health
- Braided rivers
- Infrastructure
- Recreation and Amenity
- Communications and Education

Background information was provided in the agenda for each of these working groups (see p 15 onwards of agenda)

Comprehensive information was provided in the agenda around Climate change and the obligations on ECan, and its considerations in planning and decision making processes.

The committee agreed to the draft annual report content, subject to several editorial /graphic corrections.

Report by Claire McKay Environment Canterbury appointee to Zone Committee

MEDIA RELEASE*23 February, 2017*

For video clips on the key impacts of the Omnibus Plan Change, go to www.ecan.govt.nz/lwrp-pc4

“Omnibus” plan change to be made operative

Environment Canterbury announced today that Plan Change 4 to the Land & Water Regional Plan, the “Omnibus” plan change, would be made operative on 11 March 2017.

Councillor Peter Skelton said the plan change covers a range of issues and applies throughout Canterbury, including in areas where a sub-region section of the Land & Water Regional Plan has been developed.

“It is pleasing that the rules regarding removal of vegetation from braided river beds have been strengthened,” Professor Skelton said. “Further, the stock exclusion rules now define braided river beds to make it easier to understand how to comply with the rules.

“The plan change also puts in place new provisions to protect areas of potential inanga spawning habitat. The effect of this is to prohibit farmed cattle, deer and pigs from more lowland waterbodies than is currently the case.”

The Omnibus Plan Change amends the rules on exclusion of non-intensively farmed cattle from high country lakes. Existing Land & Water Regional Plan prohibitions are unaffected, with limited exceptions. “The change makes the rules regarding non-intensively farmed cattle standing in some lakes more practical,” Professor Skelton said. “Applying these rules is more straightforward on the Canterbury Plains than in the high country. In the high country, the challenges of excluding cattle from standing in water on these vast properties are considerable and the impact on water quality may well be minor.”

Strong prohibitions remain in place - stock in waterways can have a substantial environmental impact on areas such as spawning sites. “It is a non-complying activity for intensively farmed stock to use and disturb the bed and banks of any lake. Environment Canterbury’s compliance response to these activities will be followed through,” Professor Skelton said.

Another key topic covered by the Omnibus Plan Change is community drinking water.

The change to the definition of community drinking water supply means any supply listed on the drinking water register, and which supplies drinking water to no fewer than 25 persons per year is treated as a “community drinking water supply”. The previous definition provided protection only to supplies that served more than 500 people. Some activities within the protection zone of a community drinking water supply will require consent.

The plan change also amends the policies and rules relating to management and operation of stormwater discharges into and from reticulated stormwater systems. It requires operators of these systems to implement methods to manage the quality and quantity of all stormwater entering their system. From 2025, they must be responsible for all stormwater discharged from the system.

Application of the rules

The Omnibus Plan Change applies throughout Canterbury, except where the activity is subject to policies and rules in:

- a separate plan – for example, a catchment-specific plan; or
- a sub-region section of the Land & Water Regional plan and those provisions prevail over the region-wide provisions of that plan.

For video clips on the key impacts of the Omnibus Plan Change, go to www.ecan.govt.nz/lwrp-pc4

More information

Angus McLeod, Senior Communications Advisor, Environment Canterbury, 0275 497 691

Environment Canterbury Media

027 221 5259

027 221 5259

AGENDA ITEM NO: 5–3	SUBJECT MATTER: Initial Response to Lees Valley Farmers Group Briefing	
REPORT TO: Waimakariri Water Zone Committee		MEETING DATE: 13 March 2017
REPORT BY: Alastair Picken, Matt Dodson, Adrian Meredith – Environment Canterbury		

RECOMMENDATION

1. That the Waimakariri Zone Committee note the content of this paper for information

PURPOSE

This briefing:

- Provides the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee with our initial advice in response to issues raised by the Lees Valley Farmers Group at the Zone Committee meeting and workshop on 13 February
- Sets out how we will work with Lees Valley Farmers Group and when we will report back to the Zone Committee

BY WHO

This briefing has been prepared by Alastair Picken, Matt Dodson and Adrian Meredith, who will be available to answer questions at the Zone Committee meeting.

BACKGROUND

The Lees Valley area is currently subject to Orange Nutrient Allocation Zone (NAZ) rules for farming land use activities.

Current LWRP Rules vs. Plan Change 5 Rules and Reasons for Change

Under current LWRP nutrient rules, farming in an Orange NAZ is a permitted activity if a property's nitrogen loss is less than 20 kg/ha/yr. From January 2016 land use consent is required if a property's nitrogen loss exceeds 20 kg/ha/yr. The "activity status" depends on the size of the property, the level of nitrogen loss relative to the nitrogen baseline, and whether a compliant Farm Environment Plan is submitted with the application.

Under the notified Plan Change 5 rules, some farmers in Orange NAZ that currently do not require land use consent may need consent to use their land for farming. This includes properties irrigating more than 50 ha of land or using more than 20 ha of land for winter grazing of cattle¹. A Farm Environment Plan and nutrient budget is required as part of the consent application and the nitrogen loss calculation should not exceed the nitrogen baseline, and from July 2020 the Baseline GMP Loss Rate -

¹ Winter grazing is defined as: "means the grazing of cattle within the period of 1 May to 30 September, where the cattle are contained for break-feeding of in-situ forage crops or supplementary feed that has been brought onto the property".

the average nitrogen loss for the farming activity during the baseline period as if that activity had been operating at GMP.

The Plan Change 5 section 32 report² describes the issues with the current LWRP nutrient rules and reasons for the changes proposed in Plan Change 5. This includes a tightening of the rules for Orange NAZ. In summary, analysis and water quality trends suggest that many Orange NAZ are closer to over-allocation than previously thought.

Nitrogen losses per hectare from hill and high country properties are generally low. However, these areas make up a large proportion of many catchments, and collectively can contribute a significant proportion of total catchment nitrogen load.

Development opportunities may be limited and many hill and high country farming properties may not reach the current LWRP permitted activity threshold of 20 kg/ha/yr. However, the Plan Change 5 section 32 report highlights that even relatively small increases in nitrogen losses per hectare (e.g. 4-5 kg/ha/yr) coupled with the high nutrient load in many rivers could cause more orange zone catchments to breach their freshwater outcomes and potentially jeopardise the Council's NPSFM obligation to maintain or improve overall water quality. Given this risk, there is a need to carefully manage any increases in nutrient losses from low nutrient emitting farming activities.

Lees Valley Farmers Group Briefing

On 13 February 2017 the Lees Valley Farmers Group presented a briefing paper to the Zone Committee in which they advocated for lesser consenting requirements than what Plan Change 5 nutrient management rules for Orange Zones provide.

The Lees Valley Farmers Group wants to work with Environment Canterbury to develop a nutrient management rule framework that maintains water quality whilst allowing for flexible land use. The Group sought the Zone Committees approval to come back with its findings before October 2017 and for the Committee to include Lees Valley specific recommendations in its ZIP Addendum.

Nutrient Management Plan Change (Plan Change 5)

Plan Change 5 is the culmination of three year's work. It has established a planning framework for Canterbury that provides a firm basis for giving effect to the National Policy Statement on Freshwater Management (NPSFM) and delivering on the CWMS vision and principles without the need to reinvent the wheel in each sub-region.

In our view, Plan Change 5 has established a fair and equitable way of determining baseline GMP loss rates and GMP loss rates for nitrogen and consent thresholds for intervention. The farm portal and audited farm environment plans are key methods for implementing the plan change and understanding how environmental outcomes are achieved over time.

² Section 32 Evaluation Report for Plan Change 5 (Nutrient Management and Waitaki Sub-region) to the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan, 4 February 2016. Refer Section 4 Issues and Responses

Instead of starting with a blank sheet of paper and looking at new rules to achieve community freshwater outcomes in each zone, the starting point should be how close we get with a combination of the region-wide provisions in Plan Change 5 and on-the-ground actions. If the region-wide provisions and a comprehensive on the ground work programme will not achieve the community freshwater outcomes within an appropriate timeframe, there may be options for going beyond good management practice within a sub region planning process as illustrated in the figure below.



OUR UNDERSTANDING OF LEES VALLEY ISSUES AND INITIAL RESPONSE

The Lees Valley Farmers Group do not believe that the notified rules in Plan Change 5 and recommended changes to the winter grazing threshold in the Council's Reply Report work for the Lees Valley situation.

The main issues set out in the Group's briefing paper are paraphrased below with an initial response:

Issue #1: Each landowner would require a land use consent under Plan Change 5 orange zone rules whereas Lees Valley farming operations are a permitted activity (no consent required) under the existing LWRP nutrient rules

Initial Response

It is not possible to say what Plan Change 5 will mean for each landowner in Lees Valley until we receive the hearing panel's recommendations to Council (expected June 2017) and have details of current land use (including areas of irrigation, winter grazing and nitrogen loss rates) and development aspirations or plans.

It is correct that land use consent would be required for farming activities that exceed the narrative thresholds for irrigation and winter grazing under the notified Plan Change 5 rules.

There appears to be common agreement that the rules for the Lees Valley area need to reflect the reality of what it takes to farm sustainably in hill country conditions whilst at the same time maintaining or improving water quality (required by the NPSFM). We think that Plan Change 5 does this already by:

- providing the ability to have up to 50 ha of irrigated land use or 20 ha of winter grazing land use without needing a land use consent, nutrient budget or audited Farm Environment Plan (noting that both thresholds won't be known until around June this year) and
- Enabling greater areas of irrigated land use and winter grazing than this subject to consenting, nutrient budgeting and audited Farm Environment Plan requirements.

Nevertheless, we agree to work with the Lees Valley Farmers group to test the likely effects of alternative permitted activity thresholds and land use on water quality in the

Ashley River/Rakahuri at the gorge (see way forward). However, there are likely to be constraints on the extent to which the Plan Change 5 rule framework can be changed given the need to maintain or improve water quality, and the importance of avoiding an overly complicated set of farming land use rules in the Waimakariri sub-region.

Issue #2: The high cost and spending money on obtaining a land use consent rather than on-the-ground actions

Initial Response

We consider that audited Farm Environment Plans are an important tool for delivering good management practices on farms and achieving environmental outcomes.

Following the workshop Lees Valley farmers are broadly in agreement with staff on the cost of obtaining resource consent having initially suggested figures in the \$30-40k range.

In our view, one-off costs are likely to be in the \$5-13k range with recurring costs in the order of \$1-2.5k. It is helpful to break this down into the main components. Indicative costs are provided below³.

- **Prepare Farm Environment Plan** – \$0 if a farmer writes their own plan through a workshop organised by industry to \$2000 for a reasonably large farm (one-off cost). Annual update to FEP \$0-200 (in response to audit recommendations).
- **Farm Environment Plan Audit** – \$800-1200 (every 2-3 years)
- **Prepare a nutrient budget using OVERSEER** – \$3000-6000 for a nitrogen baseline and nitrogen loss calculation (most recent four years). Annual update of nitrogen loss calculation \$500-1000.
- **Consent application** - \$0 if farmer completes application to between \$1000-2000 if done by a consultant (one-off cost).

***Note:** Environment Canterbury is making the consent application process as easy as possible to reduce the need for consultants and it also provides an hour of free pre-application advice to assist applicants*

- **Consent processing** – in the \$1500-2000 range for the majority of farms (one-off cost)

Issue #3: Environment Canterbury's water quality monitoring shows that current Lees Valley farming practices are not having a detrimental effect on the receiving environment

Initial Response

We do not believe that low concentrations of nutrients instream means that land use activities are not having an effect.

³ Personal communication with knowledgeable Environment Canterbury staff.

If there was no farming in Lees Valley the dissolved nitrogen concentration would often be effectively zero (below detection level) because there would be low levels of leaching of nitrogen from native nitrogen fixing plants (such as matagouri) and indigenous fauna, and the extensive valley bed wetlands could additionally encourage denitrification. Similarly, dissolved phosphorus concentrations would be very low too for similar reasons. When we have low measured dissolved nutrient concentrations, this is because they are effectively all assimilated in-stream in providing thin slime growth in riverbeds to support aquatic life, such that there is seldom any 'residual' dissolved nutrient measurable most of the time. This continues to be the issue, that when we are measuring dissolved nutrients in rivers, what we are measuring is the 'residual concentration' that is over and above that required for environmental growths. So in clean 'natural' environments the concentrations should most often be zero or close to it, but the level of biological growths may vary depending upon the amount of dissolved nutrients available to take up. It is only when leached dissolved nutrients exceed the ability for biological growths to assimilate them that concentrations become routinely measurable in waterways, and biological growths can become conspicuous.

For a high quality gravel river bed environment such as the Ashley River/Rakahuri in Lees Valley and the gorge, concentrations of dissolved nutrients need to be maintained at or close to detection limits to ensure biological growths do not become conspicuous and begin to affect ecological and recreational values.

Issue #4: Plan Change 5 rules (narrative thresholds) have been designed for standard intensive farming practices on the plains not extensive farming practices and large properties in Lees Valley.

Initial Response

Plan Change 5 changes the permitted activity thresholds for farming activities from 'numeric' nitrogen discharge limits based on OVERSEER® to 'narrative' land use thresholds (20 ha of winter grazing and 50 ha of irrigation) to capture farming activities that have a higher risk of nutrient losses.

A key issue raised during the Plan Change 5 hearing was whether to amend the permitted activity thresholds, with particular attention to the area of winter grazing. The Hearing Commissioners requested a clear recommendation on the thresholds as well as an analysis of the percentage of farm area-based approach sought by many submitters.

Following technical analysis and after hearing responses to the issue from submitters, the Council Officer's Reply Report⁴ recommended:

- No change to the irrigation permitted activity thresholds of 50 ha maximum and maximum increase of not more than 10 ha if less than this, in Red Zones and
- A change to the permitted activity threshold for winter grazing so that: a) Up to 10 ha of winter grazing is permitted on any property that is less than 100 ha in area. b) For all properties greater than 100 ha, up to 10% of the property area may be used for winter grazing as a permitted activity, up to a maximum of 100 ha of winter grazing.

⁴ Plan Change 5 to the Canterbury Land & Water Regional Plan Officer's Reply For Council Reply Hearing 2 December 2016

An upper cap of 100 ha was considered necessary, due to the extensive land areas of some properties throughout Canterbury, and the potentially significant nutrient discharge arising from winter grazing. Overall, it was considered that these revised thresholds would provide for significantly more flexibility for use of winter grazing as a part of a farming activity, particularly for larger properties.

Issue #5: In the Zone Committee workshop session on 13 February Lees Valley farmers highlighted aspirations to modify land use and suggested that the LWRP rules were unreasonable because had several properties not been amalgamated more irrigation and winter grazing would have been permitted without land use consent.

Initial Response

In our view, amalgamation of land parcels in the Lees Valley does not disadvantage landowners with respect to the permitted areas of winter grazing and irrigation.

This is because for the purpose of the rules, the LWRP definition of “property” includes all land that is contiguous and utilised as a single operating unit, whether held in one or more than one ownership or certificates of title⁵.

In fact, the reverse circumstance was highlighted during the consultation on Plan Change 5 where landowners suggested that properties could be subdivided to increase permitted development.

The definition prevents this ‘gaming’ of the rules. Subdividing land does not result in the subdivided pieces of land being treated as two ‘properties’ under the LWRP, as in all likelihood the land parcels would still be contiguous and utilised as a single operating unit.

However, if the landowner subdivided and sold off part of the original property to a new owner, and that owner operated a completely different farm system, independent of the farm system being operated on the original land parcel then in that circumstance they would be two different properties.

WAY FORWARD

At the Zone Committee workshop, we agreed to work with the Lees Valley Farmers Group to test a single alternative set of permitted activity thresholds for irrigation and winter grazing different to those in Plan Change 5 for the Lees Valley. The output will be an assessment of the potential effects of the thresholds and proposed land use on water quality, ecology and recreational values in the Ashley River/Rakahuri at the gorge.

Due to time and resource constraints this work will be progressed after the March round of public meetings on the “alternative pathways” scenario. There are a number of pre-requisites and steps to completing the work which are summarised below.

⁵ The LWRP definition of property “means 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.”

Step	
1	Lees Valley farmers provide information current land use including area of irrigation and winter grazing
2	Lees Valley farmers to provide details of planned land use intensification or modification including area of irrigation and winter grazing
3	Environment Canterbury and Lees Valley Farmers agree modelling assumptions
4	Run model to provide a change in nitrogen concentrations
5	Assess implications for water quality, ecology and recreational related values in Ashley River/Rakahuri at the gorge
6	Workshop with Lees Valley Farmers Group and Zone Committee representatives on the results

We will report back to Zone Committee with our advice following completion of the work July 2017.

Note: our modelling of the 'Alternative Pathways' scenario assumes 550 ha of new irrigated area in the Lees Valley associated with a hypothetical Lees Valley water storage scheme. This will provide the Zone Committee with valuable information about the impact of significant land use change in the Lees Valley on water quality, ecology and recreational values at the gorge.

Waimakariri Water Zone Committee



Waimakariri Water Zone Committee March Update

Welcome to your monthly e-newsletter for March. This update will let you know about zone committee activities, science work streams, and local or regional developments that could affect you.

Thank you to everyone who attended our Current State and Current Pathways meetings last year. We're looking forward to hearing your views at the upcoming Alternative Pathways meetings which start next week.

Your views and ideas on the future management of Waimakariri's waterways will help us understand what is important to the local community.

Events

March meeting dates for Alternative Pathways Scenario

- We're holding a series of community meetings across the zone in mid-March to explore critical issues and options for making changes to the current way we manage water in Waimakariri. Come along and have your say on the future management of water in Waimakariri.
- Meeting dates, times and locations:
- Wednesday 15th March, 7-9pm, Rossburn Receptions, Rangiora
- Monday 20th March, 7-9pm, Cust Community Centre
- Wednesday 22 March, 7-9pm, Kaiapoi High School auditorium

Zone Committee News

Current State and Current Pathways- feedback and videos

- If you were unable to attend the Current State or Current Pathways meetings or if you would like to review what happened at the meetings please click [here](#) for the Current State video and [here](#) for the Current Pathways video.
- We'd love to hear your thoughts and feedback on these meetings and your ideas on future water management options. To provide feedback please click [here](#)

Committee chair to be appointed this month

- The new zone committee chair will be appointed at the March meeting following a voting process by the zone committee.

Community Committee members wanted

- The zone committee is seeking up to seven new community committee members.
- Applications are open from now until 23 March.
- Click [here](#) for more information on how to apply

International award for committee member

- Congratulations to committee member Dr Judith Roper Lindsay for winning the Environmental Practitioner of the Year award - the first ever New Zealander to win this award.
- Judith was recognised for her "outstanding contribution to environmental practice".

Ongoing workKaiaipo River Study

- Trial planting has been completed along the banks of the Kaiapoi River with wire cages placed over the plants to prevent water fowl from eating the plants
- The committee will receive a report in April which will detail findings of the ongoing Environment Canterbury investigation into the causes of aquatic plant life reduction along the river.

NewsFarm Environment Plan reveals bigger picture



Waimakariri Irrigation Limited (WIL) environmental manager Paul Reese, farm manager Kain Harland and Oxford farmer Scott Evans discuss the practical aspects of the farm environment plan process.

- Stepping back and viewing his farm through the lens of the Farm Environment Plan (FEP) has provided Oxford farmer Scott Evans with some surprising benefits.
- Scott, who owns three farms with his family, says completing the plan highlighted small improvements he could make to run his farms more effectively while also protecting the environment.
- The FEP process uncovered four small areas of improvement for Scott around track maintenance, entry and exit to the sheds, fertiliser application and fence realignment
- Scott credits Waimakariri Irrigation Limited (WIL) environmental manager Paul Reese for helping him through the Farm Environment Plan process.
- Scott advises farmers who are starting the FEP process to consider it as a "space to get to know your farm better".

Make sure you have your say by attending our community meetings. Water is an important resource

and the decisions we make together will impact Waimakariri both now and in the future. Let us know what you think and get involved in the water management process.

If you can't attend the meetings please visit our [website](#) or our [Facebook page](#) to share your thoughts and provide feedback.

If you or someone you would know would like more information on the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee or the Canterbury Water Management Strategy, please do not hesitate to contact Waimakariri Zone Committee Manager [Andrew Arps](#).

For more information www.ecan.govt.nz/canterburywater

Waimakariri Water Zone Committee, a joint committee of



Summary of Key Issues in Waimakariri

March 2017

Issue	Cause/comment	Where do we think it will be a problem?
Cultural values not sustained in rivers Cultural values not sustained in rivers	As a result of other critical issues (i.e. water quality and quantity), and access to rivers plus other factors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waimakariri zone generally • Ashley/Rakahuri and estuary • Taranaki Stream • Little Ashley • Waikuku Stream • Saltwater Creek (Ashley/Rakahuri) • Boyne Creek • Cam River • Cust River • Silverstream • Kaiapoi River • Courtenay Stream
Stream Flow Reduction Potential reduction in spring-fed stream flows	Due to the combination of improving irrigation efficiency and climate change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cust Main Drain • Ohoka Stream • Silverstream • Saltwater Creek (Ashley/Rakahuri)
Potential impact on stream flow by over allocating surface water (including the impact from stream depleting wells)	Due to over allocating water to abstractors and potential changes to the way allocation blocks are calculated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ashley/Rakahuri - A band • Saltwater Creek (Ashley/Rakahuri) • Taranaki Creek • Waikuku Stream • North Brook
Potential reduction in spring-fed stream flows in the Ashley, Cust and Kowai management zone	Due to the potential for increasing groundwater abstraction because, there is still GW allocation available. Currently groundwater levels in this zone are declining which likely means a reduction in stream flow. Further abstraction would exacerbate this effect.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three brooks and the Cam • Waikuku • Little Ashley • Taranaki • Saltwater Creek (Ashley/Rakahuri) • Cust Main Drain
Potential for drying reaches of streams/rivers to be drier for longer	Intermittent waterways need flow in drying reach at least some of the time to support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ashley/Rakahuri • Eyre River

Summary of Key Issues in Waimakariri

March 2017

and dry over a larger area.	values. Due to the combination of improving irrigation efficiency, climate change and increasing groundwater abstraction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cust and Cust Main Drain (potential even for the intermittent streams on the Loburn management area)
Ground Water Reduction		
Reduction in groundwater levels in the Ashley management zone	Due to decreasing average flows in the Ashley River/Rakahuri. Could be in further exacerbated by climate change and increased groundwater abstraction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ashley management zone/ Ashley Groundwater Allocation Zone
Increased irrigation efficiency resulting in less groundwater recharge	Caused by less irrigation return water infiltrating into the aquifer, particularly within the WIL command area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eyre management zone • Cust management zone
Reduction in well reliability	As a result of reduction of flow in the Ashley River/Rakahuri, less irrigation return water infiltrating into the aquifer, particularly within the WIL command area, climate change and increased groundwater abstraction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ashley management zone • Eyre management zone • Cust management zone
Nitrate Level Increase		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
Increasing Nitrate levels in the Waimakariri River and potential for increased nuisance algae growth	Our available information shows that Nitrates are likely sourced from land use on the northern bank and flow into the river	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waimakariri River
Nitrates increasing to levels that are toxic to fish life (expected to exceed NOF national bottom lines)	Because of the 'load to come'. Ecological and economic (e.g. salmon hatcheries) implications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Silverstream • Ohoka •
Potential Drinking Water Issues		
Potential breaches of NZ drinking water standards for Nitrate in private wells	Because of the 'load to come'. No. of private supply wells exceeding DWS for nitrate expected to increase significantly in Eyre zone. Kowai zone not yet assessed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Majority of the Eyre management zone
Health Risks		
Health risk to people using waterways	Bacteria can come from a range of sources and can affect the health of humans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spring-fed streams of the Kowai, Ashley, Cust, Eyre and Coastal wetland management zones
Cyanobacteria affecting the health of	Multiple drivers – not well understood. Work still	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ashley/Rakahuri

Summary of Key Issues in Waimakariri

March 2017

dogs and humans	progressing	
Reduction of recreational opportunities and impact on amenities	As a result of other critical issues i.e. water quality and quantity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cust Main Drain (early 2017) • Waimakariri zone
Sediment Instream		
Sediment having a detrimental effect on instream ecology	Sediment from bank collapse and overland flow etc. Sediment can smother the bed of the stream where macroinvertebrates live. Concerns of sedimentation and clarity from Waimakariri sourced water (stockwater and irrigation water flowing through the race system)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spring-fed streams of the Kowai, Ashley, Cust, Eyre and Coastal wetland management zones • Majority of the Eyre management zone • Majority of the Cust management zone • Part of the Ashley management zone
Loss of Indigenous Biodiversity		
Continued loss of indigenous biodiversity as a result of habitat loss	Substantial loss of indigenous biodiversity primarily through the loss and modification of habitat by deforestation, burning, drainage, cultivation and other development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waimakariri zone
Continued loss of indigenous biodiversity as a result of pest and weeds	Substantial loss of indigenous biodiversity primarily through the loss and modification of habitat by new species introductions. For instance Lupins and exotic legumes in Ashley River/Rakahuri bed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waimakariri zone
Loss of indigenous biodiversity as a result of habitat loss in the Ashley/Rakahuri - Saltwater Creek Estuary	Risk of reclamation, constrained habitats, vegetation clearance by human activity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ashley/Rakahuri - Saltwater Creek Estuary
Tidal Water Quality		
Degradation of water quality in tidal rivers/coastal wetlands at the bottom of the catchments	Caused by combination of sources (stormwater, sediment, nutrients, bacteria etc.); and due to the combination of improving irrigation efficiency, climate and abstraction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kaiapoi and tidal reach of the Cam • Kaikanui Stream and other smaller tribs. • Coastal wetland management area
Climate Change		
Climate change impacts on water resources	Climate change is likely to effect: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alpine rivers that supply water to the Ashley/Okuku/Waimakariri Rivers on 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waimakariri zone

Summary of Key Issues in Waimakariri

March 2017

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> which major irrigation schemes rely <ul style="list-style-type: none"> plains by increased soil moisture deficits, reduced land surface recharge and increasing demand for water 	
Sea level rise as a result of climate change potentially inundating land and potential for saline intrusion into groundwater (saline intrusion yet to be assessed)	<p>Rising sea levels could see the coastline retreat inland, increase in storm surge and flood risk; and (yet to be assessed) potential for saline intrusion of groundwater</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coastal wetland management area generally Ashley/Rakahuri - Saltwater Creek Estuary Kaiapoi and tidal reach of the Cam Kaikanui Stream and other smaller tribs.
Irrigation efficiency		
Unreliable irrigation supplies which means people irrigate 'just in case' instead of 'just in time'	<p>Due to the combination of climate change, stream flows and how water is allocated</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Waimakariri zone

AGENDA ITEMS: 6–7–8	SUBJECT MATTER: Key Issues, Decision Areas, and Engagement for the Waimakariri Water Zone – Workshops	
REPORT TO: Waimakariri Water Zone Committee		MEETING DATE: 13 March 2017
REPORT BY: Murray Griffin and Barbara Nicholas – CWMS Facilitators		

PURPOSE

This workshop provides an opportunity for the committee to

1. identify the priority issues they need to address to deliver their recommendations for Waimakariri Land & Water Solutions Programme, and the key decisions they will need to make
2. Agree the work programme for 2017

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the WWZC

1. agree the key issues to be addressed in 2017
2. agree the key decisions they need to make
3. approve a draft work programme

BY WHO

The workshop will be led by Barbara Nicholas (Team Leader, CWMS Zone Facilitators)

BACKGROUND

The Waimakariri Zone committee has received a considerable body of technical reports and briefings over the last 6 months that has greatly enhanced their understanding of the challenges within the zone to deliver all the CWMS targets. They have also hosted a number of rounds of public meetings to inform the community of their work, and to share some of those technical understandings and future opportunities for community input into zone recommendations.

The committee is charged to deliver a fresh round of recommendations by October 2017. This workshop is an opportunity to step back from the details and re-focus the work programme for the coming year.

DISCUSSION

The workshop will assist the committee to

- a. Agree the priority issues that need to be addressed to advance delivery of CWMS targets (through both statutory and non-statutory means)
- b. Agree the key decisions that will need to be made
- c. Review a draft work programme to achieve these things in a timely way.

Attached is a collation of key issues, prepared by the technical team. Some of these are contextual/given (e.g. climate change) while other issues can be directly influenced by choices made.

At the workshop we will identify the specific site/area-specific issues for which we need to identify solutions, and the key decisions that the committee will work through in the coming year. We will also review the approach for the community meetings starting later in the week.

ATTACHMENTS

Agenda Item 6-1: Summary of Key Issues in Waimakariri Water Zone