

ORC Omnibus Plan Change - Plan Change 8

Submission Reference no: 89

Elizabeth Clarkson



Submitter Type: Not specified

Source: Email

Overall Notes:

Clause

Are you a trade competitor?

Notes

see submission

Clause

What are you submitting on? You can submit on specific parts of Plan Change 8 or the whole plan change.

Position

I am submitting on specific parts of the plan change (please detail below).

Notes

Clause

What is your view on the Plan Change 8 or the specific parts listed above? Please select one, if you have multiple views state clearly in the notes box below.

Position

Oppose

Notes

Clause

What decision would you like the Environment Court to make?

Position

Decline the plan change

Notes

Clause

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission? All submissions will be considered by the Environment Court. Please indicate if you wish to be heard in support of your submission.

Position

I wish to be heard in support of my submission

Notes

Clause

Please indicate your choice(s) below. If you do not indicate your intention to call experts, you can change your mind later and decide to call experts to give evidence in relation to your submission, provided you do so in time to meet any procedural direction the Environment Court might make.

Position

If others make a similar submission I/we would consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing

Notes

Clause

Authority to act:

Position

I confirm I have the authority to sign this submission on behalf of the submitter

SUBMISSION FORM

6 July 2020

Otago Regional Council Omnibus Plan Change - Plan Change 8 (Water Quality) to the Regional Plan: Water for Otago

This form is for making submissions on a change the Otago Regional Council (ORC) has prepared for the Regional Plan: Water for Otago. This plan change is one of two comprising the Omnibus Plan Changes (also known as the Water Quality Plan Change). The Omnibus Plan Change has been called in by the Minister for the Environment under section 142(2) of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).

Plan Change 8 proposes to introduce a range of amendments targeting specific issues or activities known to be contributing to water quality issues in parts of Otago.

NB: Please use a **separate form** if you wish to make a submission on the other part of the Omnibus Plan Change - Plan Change 1 (Dust suppressants and landfills) to the Regional Plan: Waste for Otago.

This submission form includes guidance to aid the submitter. For more information on Plan Change 8, please refer to the Public Notice or further information on the EPA website: www.epa.govt.nz/ORCplanchanges.

Where to get help preparing your submission

If you have any queries about making a submission or the plan change itself please contact the EPA by phone on 0800 401 673 or by email at ORCplanchanges@epa.govt.nz.

How to make a submission

Your submission on Plan Change 8 must be received no later than **5pm on Monday, 17 August 2020**.

You must also send a copy of your submission on Plan Change 8 to the ORC when you make a submission.

Submissions on Plan Change 8 can be made by either:

1. Using the online submission form on the EPA website under www.epa.govt.nz/ORCplanchanges
All submissions made online will automatically be forwarded to the applicant and the form includes a space to upload any supporting documents;

OR

2. Filling out this form and:
 - a. Emailing it and any supporting information to ORCplanchanges@epa.govt.nz (if smaller than 10 MB) with the following subject line: Submission [Your Name] ORC Plan Change (Omnibus); OR
 - b. Posting it and any supporting information to: Environmental Protection Authority, ORC Proposed Plan Changes, Private Bag 63002, Wellington 6140; OR
 - c. Delivering it in person to the Environmental Protection Authority office on Level 10/215 Lambton Quay.

Submissions made on this form must be forwarded to ORC by either:

1. Emailing it and any supporting information to policy@orc.govt.nz (if smaller than 10 MB) with the following subject line: Submission [Your Name] ORC Plan Change (Omnibus);
2. Posting it and any supporting information to Otago Regional Council (attention Rachel Currie), Private Bag 1954, Dunedin 9054
3. Delivering it in person to Otago Regional Council (attention Rachel Currie), at any of the Otago Regional Council office:
 - Alexandra (William Fraser Building, Dunorling Street),
 - Dunedin (70 Stafford Street); or
 - Queenstown (Terrace Junction, 1092 Frankton Road).

Privacy statement

The personal information you provide on this form will be held by the EPA, 215 Lambton Quay, Wellington. It will be used by the EPA for the purpose of administering the public consultation aspects of the Omnibus Plan Change. Copies of your full submission will be provided to the Environment Court and the ORC, and your address for service may also be provided to other parties in the process. Other than your name, your personal contact information in Part A of this form will not be published on the EPA website.

Your name, the information in Part B of this form, and any attached information will be published on the EPA website, and made available to the Environment Court, the ORC and the public for use in the processing and consideration of the proposed WPPC.

By completing this submission form, you give the EPA permission to use the information for the purpose stated above. You have the right to access and correct personal information held by the EPA. All information held by the EPA is subject to the Official Information Act 1982. Note: If the submitter is a company, full business contact details will be published on the website.

Notes about your submission

Please note, your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the authority is satisfied that at least 1 of the following applies to the submission or (part of the submission):

- it is frivolous or vexatious:
- it discloses no reasonable or relevant case:
- it would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further:
- it is supported only by evidence that purports to be independent expert evidence, but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert evidence on the matter:
- it contains offensive language.

Part A

Submitter details

Name of organisation (if relevant):			
Title:	Mr Mrs Miss Ms Dr Other: MS <i>(Please tick the appropriate title)</i>		
First name of submitter:	Elizabeth	Surname of submitter:	Clarkson
First name of contact person (if different to above):		Surname of contact person (if different to above):	
Home Ph:	██████████	Work Ph:	
Mobile:	██████████		
Email address for service:	██		
Postal Address (or alternative address for service):	██	Postcode:	████

Part B

Submitter Name: Elizabeth Clarkson

This is a submission on a matter in relation to which the Minister for the Environment made a direction under section 142(2) of the Resource Management Act 1991. The matter is **Water Plan Change 8**, part of the Omnibus Plan Change prepared by the Otago Regional Council.

If you require additional space for any question(s) please attach further documents or paper to this submission form and clearly state your name and the question(s) you are expanding on.

Are you a trade competitor?

Please select the appropriate option.

I am not a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission	I am a person who would gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission and am directly affected by an effect of the plan change that adversely affects the environment and does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition
---	--

What are you submitting on?

You can submit on specific parts of Water Plan Change 8 or the whole plan change.

I am submitting on the whole of Plan Change 8	I am submitting on specific parts of Plan Change 8 (please detail below) YES
The specific parts of the matter that my submission relates to are:	

Part A Policy 7D .6

I oppose this policy

Policy 7.D.9 (b) (i) Progressive Exclusion of Stock from Waterways

Delete or Amend this Policy

14.6.1 Permitted Activities :Intensive Grazing

Oppose and Amend

What is your view on Plan Change 8 or the specific parts listed above?

Please select one, if you have multiple views state clearly in the comments box below.

Support	Neutral	Oppose X
The reasons for my view(s) are:		
<p>Policy 7.D.6 Nitrogen.</p> <p>I oppose this condition as from implementation in both Canterbury and the Waikato the mechanism of grandparenting to assess nutrient allocation and drive regulation has already proven to be inequitable. It has highlighted that resource consents have been successfully secured by large emitters and/or organisations who can continue unabated in their activity, while other farmers are being regulated immediately. If there is such urgency to meet Government requirements then those who have the greatest emissions need to take responsibility first. To continue unchallenged for up to 10 years is both unfair and hypocritical.</p> <p>As dry land farmers here in Otago the proposed principle of grandparenting of nitrogen loss is cruel. Historically nutrient inputs have been lower over our extensive farms but the leaching of, has also been low due to low annual rainfall and soil type; making us a low risk. It is the scope within our extensive properties and a lower stocking rate that allows our farms to be viable up until now, introducing efficiencies as technology and science evolve. If policy makers believe even further savings are possible, the answer is NO. We need flexibility if we are to survive. The flexibility to make additional quantities of supplement when rainfall has been adequate to store for those years of limited rain/drought. All farmers need this. Note the recent Hawkes Bay drought. We need the option to grow sufficient food for our stock and reserves, and continue to be profitable i.e. to optimally use our land resource as we have thoughtfully done to date. Without flexibility farms will become unprofitable- their sale value determined by grandparenting rules. A purchaser is locked into a crippling nutrient mechanism and has to also accommodate climate change, market volatility, compliance and running costs. Other social and economic impacts: the demise of the family farm (corporate/state ownership), depression and suicide, the loss of rural communities and employment.</p> <p>7.D.9 (b) i</p> <p>This policy needs to be flexible for dry land and high country farmers. Simply, not all areas where streams travel can be fenced. It poses a Health and Safety risk to attempt to do so. Bush, scrub, terrain and topography all present an issue and streams tend not to run in straight lines. However, these blocks form an integral part of our grazing management and are considered effective acreage; and this includes cattle. By grazing it reduces fire risk by keeping vegetation lower and</p>		

keeps gorse and broom under control. The policy of fencing higher elevations would fail after the first major rainfall event . Debris becomes attached to wires and creates a dam effect- erosion and soil loss

The stock water system on our property consists of man-made ponds(not sediment traps) , are contained and therefore no risk of sediment reaching a water body. These service blocks between 30-100 Ha and are filled exclusively by rain; which is 500-550 mls per annum. Such a system works ,is low risk and needs to continue as a permitted activity for both sheep and beef stock and remain unfenced. If policy determines differently then much of our farm is unviable as we would have an animal welfare crisis.

Have policy makers considered the cost ,in dollar terms, of regulating for reticulated water as the sole option? Extensive grazing properties are large (over 1000) Ha meaning multiple sites for underground water to be drilled where a property is separated by road, terrain, a neighbour or in merely attempting to supply the property. A huge cost. Then there is the 10's of kilometres of plastic pipe to be ripped through clay and rock. What is the life span of the underground water after all that? Further, if power is required for pumping ,an estimate for the installation of power is \$40,000.00 per Kilometre. This is an unaffordable burden

14.6.1 Permitted Activities

The question needs to be asked as to how the 10% or 100Ha max. Intensive grazing amount was derived as it has no scientific explanation and bears no relationship to farm size ,stock requirements /rates. An arbitrary limit imposed for intensive grazing without consideration of the above is effectively a stock reducing mechanism.

Brassica crops are an essential part of farm management ,covering the winter period when grass has stopped growing, or the land is covered in snow. Our catchment has a short growing season ,affected by dry or winter so rather than being discretionary it is essential and to apply for consent above that should not be required. Without these crops our capital stock and young stock would starve. We can not just off load stock as this stock provides our income in the coming spring. To reduce stock numbers equals a reduced income. We constantly assess our stocking rate based on feed supply/rainfall. The chance of crop failure has also to be factored in when determining feed requirements

The 10 metre zone needs explanation as it seems rather excessive .

Pugging is a common sense matter .I think farmers and farmer organisations have been really pro-active on this issue and have provided good guidelines through networks and publications. There is only so much preparatory work can be done to prevent pugging but exceptional events will still occur

What decision would you like the Environment Court to make?

Approve Plan Change 8	Approve Plan Change 8 with amendments	Decline Plan Change 8 Yes
The reasons for my view and/or any amendments I am seeking are:		

Policy 7.D.6

Decline Plan 8

Delete this policy and start by obtaining actual data, scientifically collected from all catchments within Otago, not just Overseer as it has limitations; but include other modelling that takes into account the uniqueness of each catchment and the differing management /farming activity taking place and even consultation with farmers ,those who are impacted. From there principles need to be developed that are fair,manageable and understandable to all

Those who are undertaking activities that are causing water problems need to take responsibility to assist in improving water quality,sooner; not at the expiry or extension of their consent.

Flexibility of land use must be maintained.Regulation and the monitoring of should be relative to the level of risk our farming activities have on water quality.

Policy 7.D.9.(b) i

This clause must recognise that not all water bodies can be fenced; it is an unrealistic and unsafe expectation.The land in those zones to be still grazeable by all stock classes

Delete the progressive exclusion clause . Insert an exemption clause to cover prolonged dry/ drought periods where stock can access for water and graze closer to a water body

Continue to allow stock water ponds for their purpose for all stock classes .The policy needs to recognise different farming systems and how they impact on water quality within the catchment. For good management low risk activity leave it to continue as is with low consequences.

If the policy is regulated as is, then farmers will need Government support to implement these restrictive measures.

Or , Government needs to compensate farmers on an annual basis for loss of productivity through loss of effective land use.

14.6.1 Permitted Activity

Delete any maximum limits for intensive grazing .Each year farm plans, oral or written ,have probable paddocks set aside for those crops as part of paddock rejuvenation programme . Each farm will have a differing acreage depending on farm size andstock numbers but enough to meet requirements . Factor in potential for crop failure.As it is essential for the welfare of our animals to grow these fodder crops, it has serious consequences if there are limits imposed on this activity.

Delete the consent required for intensive grazing over 100 Ha or 10% .As above it is an essential activity

Sediment buffer zones should be 5 metres. Is in line with the Essential Fresh water Rules.Or it could be based on slope .of the paddock.

In monitoring pugging ,flexibility needs to be granted around gateways and their approaches. Requirements should pertain to the immediate grazing portion of the paddock.

Farmers have copped the blame almost exclusively for the degradation of water bodies but note also that farmers have invested huge capital in retifying damage done to water quality over many generations .I t would be more beneficial to build on those investments and improvements rather than to re-write the book.Right now ,New Zealand has \$100 billion debt and farming is best situated to assist in any financial recovery but we can't if our profitability and viability is strangled by regulation. I would recommend deferring the implementation of these rule changes.

With the explosion in tourism and its resulting pollution ,there are numerous issues that have been exposed that Councils too need to address in real terms,like waste water discharge into water bodies . Urban water quality and discharge is under the radar while an example is being made of the farming community.

Climate change is a challenge in itself that we're trying to adapt to but my fear is that many farmers may not appreciate the implications of these measures for various reasons ; do not see themselves as causing a problem ,have been good custodians of the land all their farming life ,the technology is baffling and much of it

Any changes need to be simple ,easily understood and any consent cost should be minimal if nor free.

Employ staff that have an excellent understanding of farm systems as well as the organisational requirements

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission?

All submissions will be considered by the Environment Court.

Please indicate if you wish to be heard in support of your submission

I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission

I wish to be heard in support of my submission Yes

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing YES

I intend to call an expert witness(es)

(If you do not tick this box, you can change your mind later and decide to call experts to give evidence in relation to your submission, provided you do so in time to meet any procedural direction the Environment Court might make)

Authority to Act

I confirm that I have authority to sign this submission on behalf of the submitter **Yes**

Signature: E Clarkson 16/08/2020 -

 Date:

