

24 September 2012

HYDROSERVICES Newsletter – Proposed Land and Water plan

Submissions on ECan's proposed Land and Water Regional Plan (pLWRP) [click [here](#) to read] close on Friday 5 October 2012.

This proposed plan affects the way in which you will be able to farm in several vital ways. If you have not already done so you should download the plan and read relevant sections. It is not necessary to read the entire document or digest all the schedules in the appendices. Pick out the Policies and Rules relevant to those policies that could affect the way you farm.

The Primary Sector Group comprising Federated Farmers, Irrigation NZ, Dairy NZ, FAR and a few others will be making a submission at the higher level rather than the detail of any particular rule. This group has already negotiated a 2017 date for you to implement some of the changes. I recommend you contact one of the organisations and ask to see their submission. You can provide your support to their submission by initially

While HydroServices will likely make a submission, we need to be cautious not to prohibit our involvement at an "expert" level to represent clients or other groups. If you do decide to make a submission it is not at all helpful to the hearing panel that you "object to the policy or rule" and "want it thrown out". You need to be constructive and suggest what would be a satisfactory outcome for you.

I have given some examples of policies and rules below, but in the first instance if you have contacted one of the Primary Sector Group members and you are happy with their submission, you can begin your submission with:

"I have read the submission of the Primary Sector Group (INZ, FF, FAR etc.). I support and accept their submission in full."

If you would like to voice your concerns about the transfer and farming rules, download a submission form from [here](#) and select **Submission Form**

Here are a couple of examples of how you might fill out a submission form on the pLWRP:

A. (1) The specific provisions of the Proposed Plan that my submission relates to are:

Specify the Section and page number

Section 2.10, page 2-5

(2) My submission is that:

I oppose the definition of "changed" as it has been interpreted by Environment Canterbury Consents and Planning staff to mean that all transfers of water permit allocations require a land use consent, even if the land use is not actually changing. For example, where a farmer has a groundwater permit with an annual volume that was calculated using an earlier version of Schedule WQN10 (which was based on a lower level of reliability, and may have also under-estimated total seasonal demand), any application seeking to transfer additional water to their property to make up for the shortfall will trigger a requirement for a land use consent, even though there is no change land use.

This definition makes no distinction concerning the size of the transfer. For example, someone farming a dozen beef cattle who is seeking to transfer a few litres per second to avoid having to buy in feed during a dry season will be required to apply for a land use consent.

(3) I seek the following decisions from Environment Canterbury:

Revise the definition of "Changed" to make it clear that the requirement for a land use consent does not apply where the land use is not actually changing.

B. (1) The specific provisions of the Proposed Plan that my submission relates to are:

Specify the Section and page number

Section 4, page 4-13

(2) My submission is that:

I oppose the requirement in Policy 4.69 for water to be applied with an efficiency of not less than 80%.

(3) I seek the following decisions from Environment Canterbury:

Delete reference to "not less than 80%" and instead adopt the Irrigation New Zealand standards in the Irrigation Design Code of Practice. Adopting the INZ standards recognises that not every land parcel can accommodate irrigation systems with high uniformity and therefore high application efficiency.

C. (1) The specific provisions of the Proposed Plan that my submission relates to are:

Specify the Section and page number

Section 5, pages 5-24 and 5-25

(2) My submission is that:

I oppose the requirement in Rule 5.101 condition 3 and subsequent Rules 5.102, 5.103 and 5.104 making the take and use of groundwater non-complying or prohibited activities. It is not at all clear the meaning of "the seasonal or annual volume of the groundwater take, in addition to all existing resource consented takes, does not exceed the limits for the relevant Groundwater Allocation Zone in sections 6-15."

(3) I seek the following decisions from Environment Canterbury:

Specific reference that this requirement does not apply to a resource consent(s) that currently do not have a condition containing an annual or seasonal volume is more explicit and does not apply to existing resource consents. The nominal seasonal volume (as recorded on the ECan data base) will be outdated and using current practice the relevant annual or seasonal volume would exceed the zone limit.

Questions?

If you have any questions about the contents of this newsletter or ECan's Draft Land and Water Regional Plan please contact me.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Dr Anthony Davoren', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Dr Anthony Davoren