

oms 10 14  
45

18 OCT 2019

06105

**SUBMISSION ON**  
**PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 2 TO THE HORIZONS ONE PLAN – EXISTING**  
**INTENSIVE FARMING LAND USES**

**TO:** Manawatū-Whanganui (Horizons) Regional Council (**Council**)  
PO Box 11025  
Manawatū Mail Centre  
PALMERSTON NORTH 4442  
**Via email:** submissions@horizons.govt.nz

**SUBMITTER:** Ravensdown Limited (**Ravensdown**)  
292 Main South Road  
PO Box 1059  
CHRISTCHURCH 8140  
**Contact:** Anna Wilkes  
Environmental Policy Specialist  
**Mobile:** 021 229 0439  
**Email:** anna.wilkes@ravensdown.co.nz

**ADDRESS FOR SERVICE:** Planz Consultants Limited (**Planz**)  
PO Box 1845  
CHRISTCHURCH 8140  
**Contact:** Carmen Taylor  
Consultant Planner  
**Mobile:** 021 312 781  
**Email:** carmen@planzconsultants.co.nz

## 1. INTRODUCTION

### Ravensdown Limited – Overview and Interests in the Manawatū-Whanganui Region

- 1.1 Ravensdown Limited (**Ravensdown**) is a farmer owned co-operative. Ravensdown's goal is to enable smarter farming for a better New Zealand. Given this goal, Ravensdown provides products, namely fertiliser and agrochemicals (agrichemicals), expertise and technology to help farmers reduce environmental impacts and to optimise value, or outputs, from their land.
- 1.2 Ravensdown, in deciding whether to participate in regional planning processes, considers whether the plan, or proposed plan change, will achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (**RMA**) while also evaluating whether the planning provisions will unduly constrain its own activities (i.e., manufacturing, store sites and quarries) and/or the users of their products (i.e., its farming shareholders).
- 1.3 In this context, the nature of Ravensdown's interests in the Manawatū-Whanganui region include various bulk stores. In addition, through Ravensdown Environmental, Ravensdown assists its shareholders and others to meet regional planning requirements through the provision of farm environment services, which include nutrient loss and mitigation modelling (including Overseer Nutrient Budgeting), Farm Environment Plan (**FEP**) development and associated resource consent planning services.
- 1.4 Given the nature of Ravensdown's activities in the region, Ravensdown seeks to ensure that the Proposed Plan Change 2 – Existing Intensive Farming Land Uses (**PPC2**) to the Horizons One Plan (**One Plan**) promotes the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, in this instance, the region's land and water resources. This includes the ability to continue to use and develop resources, including the rural land resource, while ensuring that adverse effects of activities are avoided, remedied or mitigated.
- 1.5 Given the above context, the provisions of PPC2 are of interest to Ravensdown given its activities in the region and the nature of farming activities undertaken by its farming shareholders in the region, as outlined in **paragraph 1.3** above. Therefore, in preparing this submission, Ravensdown has focussed on the proposed amendments to the nutrient management provisions of PPC2 and the implications that the proposed amendments will have for the region's existing farming activities.

### Overview of Submission

- 1.6 Ravensdown's submission, given its interests in the Manawatū-Whanganui region and the potential implications of PPC2 to the region's farming community, generally supports PPC2 in terms of its goal to address the issues associated with the effectiveness and workability of the One Plan in relation to the management of existing intensive farming land uses and associated nutrient discharges. Ravensdown supports the requirement for all existing intensive farming activities to: implement Good Management Practices (**GMP**); to comply with various permitted activity rules or resource consents as a means of managing and reducing diffuse nutrient discharge; to prepare and implement Nutrient Management Plans (**NMP**) as a means of identifying nutrient sources and to identify associated nutrient management practices and mitigations where a resource consent is required; and, given the issues associated with 'cumulative nitrogen leaching maximum' values specified in Table 14.2 of the One Plan, the inclusion of an alternative consent pathway for existing intensive farming activities in the

targeted Water Management Sub-zones (as identified in Table 14.1) that do not comply with the Table 14.2 leaching values.

1.7 However, through these submissions, Ravensdown seeks amendments that enable Ravensdown's shareholders and the users of its products to continue to undertake farming activities in the region in a manner that continues to provide for the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, including the region's land and water resource, while also ensuring that adverse effects on the environment are avoided, remedied or mitigated.

1.8 Ravensdown's submissions on PPC2 are structured as follows:

- (a) General comments, including the areas of support and areas of concern where Ravensdown seeks amendments to provisions, are overviewed in **Section 2** of this submission;
- (b) Specific submission points on the provisions of PPC2 are contained in the table provided in **Attachment A**; and
- (c) A conclusion, including the overarching reasons for the submission, is provided in **Section 3**.

## 2. GENERAL COMMENTS

### Areas of Support

2.1 Ravensdown supports the intent of PPC2 to address the current issues associated with the effectiveness and workability of the One Plan while providing for the use and development of the region's land and water resources by the region's existing intensive farming activities, subject to a management framework, which will achieve the water quality objective of the Regional Policy Statement (**RPS** – Part 1 of the One Plan). In broad terms, the water quality objective of the RPS is to maintain good water quality and to enhance poor water quality. While the overall intent of the plan change is supported, amendments to the plan change provisions are requested to address the matters raised in this submission.

2.2 In relation to PPC2 provisions, Ravensdown supports:

- (a) The aim of PPC2 to address effectiveness and workability issues associated with the One Plan in relation to the management of existing intensive farming activities where the existing, and proposed, cumulative nitrogen leaching maximums in Table 14.2 cannot be complied with.
- (b) The requirement for existing intensive farming activities to implement GMP.
- (c) The requirement for existing intensive farming activities within the Water Management Sub-zones listed in Table 14.1, which need to seek resource consents, to prepare and implement a NMP to manage and/or reduce nutrient leaching for farming activities.
- (d) The provision of the alternative consent pathway, as provided for by amended policies and an associated new discretionary activity Rule 14-2A, as a means of managing and reducing diffuse nutrient discharge where the cumulative nitrogen leaching maximums in Table 14.2 are not or cannot be complied with.

- (e) The acknowledgement, through the provision of this alternative consent pathway, of the existing and continued limitations associated with the absolute numbers contained in Table 14.2.

#### **Areas of Concern**

##### ***General Comment***

- 2.3 In preparing this submission, Ravensdown has recognised that Council is seeking to put in place a workable solution to the issue associated with the policy and regulatory framework that applies to the region's existing intensive farming activities. In this context, PPC2 does not seek to put in place a fundamentally different regime for the management of such activities in the region.
- 2.4 On this basis, subject to the amendments requested in **Attachment A** of this submission, Ravensdown acknowledges that the approach incorporated into PPC2 should provide an interim workable solution.
- 2.5 While acknowledging this fact, it is considered that Council had an opportunity, through this plan change, to amend the nature of the One Plan's farming activity provisions to more accurately align with emerging 'best practice' around New Zealand. In addition to the requirement for farming activities to implement GMP as required by PPC2, this could have included the requirement to prepare and implement a broader FEP<sup>1</sup>, rather than a NMP, that is regularly reviewed, certified and/or audited.
- 2.6 However, Ravensdown also acknowledges that a range of national instruments that will apply to farming activities are currently under development. Therefore, until the final form of these various national instruments are known, Ravensdown acknowledges that the potential interim approach currently provided for by PPC2 is generally appropriate.

##### ***Overseer and Cumulative Nitrogen Leaching Maximums (Table 14.2)***

- 2.7 Overseer is a model that is used to provide information that enables farmers to make decisions on the management of nutrients at the farm level. It also has the ability to model greenhouse gas emissions at a farm level. In the One Plan, Overseer was used to calculate the cumulative nitrogen leaching maximums contained in Table 14.2, with the operative policy and rule framework requiring existing intensive farming activities in the targeted Water Management sub-zones to then meet these values. However, Overseer version changes, and associated changes to nitrogen leaching rates, resulted in many farming systems not being able to comply with the cumulative nitrogen leaching values in Table 14.2.
- 2.8 The above matter, in conjunction with a policy and rule framework that restricted Council's ability to grant resource consents for farming activities that could not comply with the Table 14.2 values, is the main issue that PPC2 is aiming to address. Accordingly, the Table 14.2 values have been amended, reportedly based on the current version of Overseer. In the context of the alternative consent pathway, Ravensdown considers that this approach is workable, only insofar as the cumulative nitrogen leaching maximums effectively triggers a different activity

---

<sup>1</sup> FEPs traverse the full range of farm activities that have the potential to adversely affect the environment, whereas the focus of NMPs is solely on the management of nutrient discharges (direct and indirect).

status for existing intensive farming activities (i.e., between controlled and restricted discretionary activity to discretionary activity under Rule 14-2A).

- 2.9 In regard to Overseer, it is important to recognise that Overseer will continue to be updated and refined into the future. This is how all such models should operate (i.e., they should not be static and should reflect the most up-to-date knowledge and data). The section 32 Report identifies that version 6.3.1 of Overseer was used to recalculate the Table 14.2 values<sup>2</sup>. Therefore, the PPC2 values contained in Table 14.2 may already be 'out of date' as the current version of Overseer is version 6.3.2, and this version is associated with the new cloud-based OverseerFM. It is also understood that in the future, updates to OverseerFM (i.e., new and/or updated data and model refinements) will occur more regularly than the previous twice yearly updates of earlier versions of Overseer.
- 2.10 Therefore, alignment of One Plan provisions with any particular version of Overseer could be problematic. On this basis, as outlined in Ravensdown's submissions points contained in the table in **Attachment A**, it is important that Council recognises that the future role of Overseer in decision making for the region's existing intensive farming activities is whether nitrogen loss reductions are being achieved (i.e., not whether the Table 14.2 values will be complied with).

### 3. CONCLUSION

- 3.1 Ravensdown generally supports PPC2 to the One Plan, subject to the amendments requested to address the concerns raised within its submission. In relation to the provisions that Ravensdown has raised concerns about, those provisions require amendment because, without amendment, those provisions:
  - (a) will not promote sustainable management of resources and will not achieve the purpose of the RMA;
  - (b) is contrary to Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA;
  - (c) will not enable the social and economic well-being of the community of the Manawatū-Whanganui region;
  - (d) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations;
  - (e) will not achieve integrated management of the effects of the use, development or protection of the region's land and water resources;
  - (f) will not enable the efficient use and development of those resources which are dependent on, or benefit from, Ravensdown's assets and operations; and
  - (g) do not represent the most appropriate means of exercising Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.
- 3.2 Ravensdown could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

---

<sup>2</sup> It is acknowledged that the section 32 Report identifies that Overseer version 6.3.1 was the current version of Overseer at the time the report was prepared, and that Table 14.2 has been recalibrated with the most up to date version of Overseer. The last bullet point on page 52 of the section 32 Report specifically states that version 6.3.1 of Overseer was used to recalibrate Table 14.2.

- 3.3 Ravensdown wishes **to be heard** in support of its submissions.
- 3.4 If others are making a similar submission, Ravensdown will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.

**Date:** 18 October 2019



.....  
Carmen Taylor  
**Consultant Planner (Associate)**  
Authorised to sign this submission on behalf of Ravensdown Limited

**ATTACHMENT A – RAVENSDOWN LIMITED'S SUBMISSIONS ON PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 2 TO THE HORIZONS ONE PLAN – EXISTING INTENSIVE FARMING LAND USES**

SUB. REF.	PROVISION REF.	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
<b>PART 1: REGIONAL POLICY STATEMENT</b>				
<b>Chapter 5: Water / Section 5.4 – Policies / Section 5.4.2.3 – Discharges and Land Use Activities Affecting Water Quality</b>				
1	Policy 5-8 – <u>Management and Regulation of intensive farming land use activities affecting groundwater and surface water quality</u>	Support	<p>This policy describes the resource management framework for existing intensive farming activities in the region. The operative policy title states that intensive farming activity are to be regulated, which in terms of policy development can be considered very directive. Such direction has the potential to restrict or limit resource management options (subject to the provisions that give effect to such a policy), without the potential to assess the actual adverse effects of an activity in the context of broader policy framework of relevant resource management plans.</p> <p>Given the use of this directive terminology, and the issues associated with the nitrogen leaching maximums contained in Table 14.2, the proposed PPC2 amendments seek to address the current effectiveness and workability of the One Plan in terms of the region's existing intensive farming activities. The proposed amendment to the title and introduction to Policy 5-8, identifies that such activities are to be managed, as well as regulated, where these activities are affecting groundwater and surface water in accordance with the guidance provided by parts (a) to (d) of this policy.</p> <p>On the above basis, and subject to the notified amendments to parts (a) and (d) of this policy plus the amendments to parts (a) and (d) requested by Ravensdown below (Sub. Refs. 2 and 3), the proposed PPC2 amendment to the beginning to Policy 5-8 is</p>	<p>Retain the amendments to the first part of Policy 5-8 as notified, as follows:</p> <p><b>"Policy 5-8: Management and Regulation of intensive farming land use activities affecting groundwater and surface water quality</b></p> <p><i>In order to give effect to Policy 5-7, the effects of intensive farming land use activities on groundwater and surface water quality must be managed in the following manner: ...</i></p>

SUB. REF.	PROVISION	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
2	Policy 5-8(a) - Nutrients	Support in part	<p>Operative Policy 5-8(a) outlines the framework for managing nutrient discharges from intensive farming activities. The operative framework requires the establishment of nitrogen leaching maximums (as provided in Table 14.2 of the One Plan) that take into account all non-point sources, the strategies for water quality outlined in relevant policies, the productive capacity of the land and that are achievable through the application of good management practices (GMP) within appropriate timeframes. Under part (a)(ii) of this policy, in specific target Water Management Sub-zones (WMS) (as identified in Table 14.1 of the One Plan) existing intensive farming activities are to be regulated (i.e., required to gain a resource consent) so as to achieve the nitrogen leaching maximums.</p> <p>This operative policy, and subsequent One Plan provisions, underpins the issues that PPC2 is aiming to address. That is, where an existing intensive farming activity in the WMSs listed in Table 14.1 cannot identify that it can achieve the nitrogen leaching maximums, then under the One Plan such an activity becomes a restricted discretionary activity (Rule 14-2). Given the One Plan's operative policy framework, gaining a resource consent for such an activity was unlikely. Another aspect of the issue that PPC2 is aiming to address, is that the nitrogen leaching maximums in Table 14-2, which were calculated by Overseer do not now reflect farm system outputs associated with new versions of Overseer (as well as updated data used within the model).</p> <p>The proposed PPC2 amendments seek to address the issues associated with the operative policy by providing for an alternative consent pathway for intensive farming</p>	<p>Amend Policy 5-8(a) - Nutrients, as follows, with amendments shown in shaded and double underlined or <del>stricken</del> text:</p> <p>"<i>Nutrients</i>"</p> <p>(A) take into account all the non-point sources of nitrogen in the catchment</p> <p>(B) will achieve the strategies for surface water quality set out in Policies 5-2, 5-3, 5-4 and 5-5, and the strategy for groundwater quality in Policy 5-6</p> <p>(B) (C) recognise the productive capability of land in the Water Management Sub-zone*</p> <p>(C) (D) are achievable on most farms using good management practices*</p> <p>(D) (E) provide for appropriate timeframes for achievement where large changes to management practices or high levels of investment are required to achieve the nitrogen leaching maximums.</p> <p>(ii) Existing intensive farming land use activities must be regulated in targeted Water Management Sub-zones* to achieve the nitrogen leaching maximums specified in (i) except as provided for in (iia) and (iib) below.</p> <p>(iia) Existing intensive land use activities which do not comply with (ii) must be regulated to reduce nitrogen leaching which is in excess of the nitrogen leaching maximums established</p>

SUB. REF.	PROVISION SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS RELIEF SOUGHT
		<p>activities where the nitrogen leaching maximums cannot be achieved (as outlined in parts (iia) and (iib) of the amended policy). The alternative pathway, and associated discretionary activity rule (new Rule 14-2A), provides a consenting pathway for existing intensive farming activities that cannot achieve the nitrogen leaching maximums. Under this approach, given the continuing issues associated with the nitrogen leaching maximums (Sub. Ref. 9), the nitrogen leaching maximum effectively acts as a trigger to a discretionary activity rule (rather than controlled activity). Existing intensive farming activities seeking resource consents under this consent pathway are required to implement GMP and additional measures to minimise nitrogen leaching.</p> <p>While Ravensdown supports the provision of the alternative consent pathway as outlined in parts (iia) and (iib) of this policy, given the continuing issues associated with Table 14.2 (Sub. Ref. 9), it is considered that requiring such farming activities to minimise nitrogen losses with regard to the nitrogen leaching maximums is not appropriate. Rather a downward trend of nitrogen losses should be encouraged. Therefore, amendments to parts (iia) and (iib) of the policy are requested, that require nitrogen losses from the activity to not increase and to reduce nitrogen losses.</p> <p>(iib) Existing land<sup>a</sup> use activities which do not comply with (ii) but are intended to transition to an alternative non-intensive farming land<sup>a</sup> use must be regulated to ensure that they are able to continue for a limited period of time in order to enable that transition and only where there is no increase in the <del>excessive of the</del> nitrogen leaching losses from the existing land<sup>a</sup> use activity <del>existing established</del></p> <p>(iii) New intensive farming land<sup>a</sup> use activities must be regulated throughout the Region to achieve the nitrogen leaching maximums specified in (i).</p> <p>(iv) New intensive farming land<sup>a</sup> use activities must be regulated throughout the Region to achieve the nitrogen leaching maximums specified in (i).</p> <p>Amend 5-8(d) – Good management practices*, as follows, with amendments shown in shaded and double underlined or <del>strike through</del> text:</p> <p><b>"Good management practices*</b></p> <p>(i) All intensive farming land<sup>a</sup> use activities must be regulated to manage nutrient leaching and run-off, faecal contamination, and sediment losses in accordance with good management</p>
3	Policy 5-8(d) - Good management practices*	Ravensdown supports, throughout New Zealand, the adoption of GMP, as outlined in the 'Industry-agreed Good Management Practices relating to water quality (September 2015), for all farming activities. GMP, based on the proposed One Plan definition (refer to Sub. Ref. 13 below), is a resource management tool that assists farmers in improving environmental performance. Ravensdown also considers that an important

SUB. REF.	PROVISION	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
			<p>component of GMP is that the actions or practices required, are not static and will evolve over time. For this reason, the proposed inclusion of part (d) in Policy 5-8 is considered appropriate.</p> <p>However, it is considered that all existing intensive farming activities, not just those that are 'regulated' (i.e., those that require a resource consent), should manage farming activities in accordance with GMP. For this reason, it is considered that reference to 'regulated' within this policy is not appropriate.</p>	<p><i>practices**</i></p>
4	New Method 5-12 – Innovative Land Use Research	Support in part	<p>This new method identifies that Council will support land use innovation research to develop options for sustainable land use in the region. A priority for research under this method will be within the WMS where nitrogen leaching is an issue (i.e., as identified in Table 14.1). The purpose and intent of this method is considered appropriate, particularly as it identifies potential mechanisms that will work alongside the One Plan and potentially inform future plan changes.</p> <p>However, two amendments to the method are requested. The first relates to moving the reference to Table 14.1, for the purpose of clarity, such that it is more directly connected to the WMSs where nitrogen leaching is an issue. The second amendment arises from the fact that the focus of this method should be the development of options for sustainable land uses, not achieving the nitrogen leaching maximums, particularly given the existing and ongoing issues with these values.</p>	<p>Amend Method 5-12, as follows, with amendments shown in shaded and double underlined or <del>struck-through</del> text:</p> <p><b>Description</b></p> <p><i>Support initiatives by local communities, sector groups or tangata whenua which develop options for sustainable land use in the Region. Support for work in Water Management Sub-zones* where nitrogen leaching is an issue as identified in Table 14.1 will be a priority in order to find viable options for intensive farming land users to sustainably reduce nitrogen leaching from their farming activities <del>that will have effectively increased the effectiveness of nitrogen leaching processes*</del> refer Table 14.1.</i></p> <p><i>Horizons will provide assistance through providing data and information that will assist in the identification and evaluation of innovative land use options and participating in any evaluative work as appropriate.</i></p> <p><b>Who</b></p>

SUB. REF.	PROVISION	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
				<p><u>Local communities, rural and other sector groups.</u></p> <p><u>Territorial Authorities, Regional Council.</u></p> <p><u>Links to Policy</u></p> <p><u>This method implements Policies 5-7 and 5-8.</u></p> <p><u><b>Target</b></u> <u>Advice and assistance is available for landowners in the Region regarding land use management practices.</u></p>
5	New Method 5-13 – Provision of Information	Support in part	<p>A key issue associated with the One Plan, and which has given rise to the need for PPC2 to address the effectiveness and workability of the One Plan, has been Overseer version changes with associated changes to nitrogen leaching rates calculated for the same modelled farm system. This is an outcome of ongoing changes and refinements, within the various versions of Overseer, to the underlying data used and/or improvements to the models' functionality.</p> <p>It is understood that PPC2 has been developed to address this issue, at least in part, and it is considered that this method is an important component of PPC2 and therefore needs to be retained. This method identifies that Council will collate and publish information on Overseer and any other appropriate models for calculating on-farm nutrient losses.</p> <p>While this method is supported, the current version of Overseer is version 6.3.2, which operates in the new cloud-based OverseerFM. Updates to OverseerFM (i.e., new and/or updated data and model refinements) will occur more regularly as part of the cloud-based system and files held within OverseerFM will generally automatically update, except where additional information may be required which will still need to be done manually. It is understood that while there will</p>	<p>Amend Method 5-12, as follows, with amendments shown in shaded and double <u>underlined</u> or <del>stricken</del> text:</p> <p><u>"Description</u> <u>Horizons will collate and publish information regarding Overseer <del>version</del> <del>changes</del> and the identification and evaluation of nutrient management models other than Overseer that may be more appropriate for calculation of on-farm nutrient losses.</u></p> <p><u><b>Who</b></u> <u>Regional Council, rural sector groups, and nutrient management model providers.</u></p> <p><u><b>Links to Policy</b></u></p> <p><u><b>This method implements Policy 5-8.</b></u></p> <p><u><b>Target</b></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Horizons will consider whether it needs to respond to changes in Overseer through a plan change process.</u></li> <li>• <u>A list of nutrient management models appropriate for use in intensive farming land is maintained on Horizons' website..</u></li> </ul>

SUB. REF.	PROVISION	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
			continue to be version changes within OverseerFM, not all updates (i.e., data refinement) will give rise to a formal version release number.	
<b>PART 2: REGIONAL PLAN</b>				
	<b>Chapter 14: Discharges to Land and Water / Section 14.2 – Policies</b>			
6	Policy 14-3 – Industry-based standards Good management practices*	Support	<p>As outlined in Sub. Ref. 3, Ravensdown supports the adoption of GMP for all farming activities. GMP, based on the proposed One Plan definition (refer to Sub. Ref. 13 below), is a resource management tool that assists farmers in improving environmental performance.</p> <p>Consistent with the Policy 5-8(d), the proposed amendments to this policy identify that when making decisions on consent applications to discharge contaminants to land and water Council are to have regard to GMP. In relation to existing intensive farming activities that will need to seek resource consents under the amended PPC2 provisions, consideration of GMP is considered appropriate.</p>	<p>Retain the amendments to Policy 14-3 as notified, as follows:</p> <p><b>"Policy 14-3: Industry-based standards Good management practices*</b></p> <p><i>When making decisions on resource consent applications, and setting consent conditions, for activities affecting groundwater and surface water quality. The Regional Council must have regard to good management practices* will examine on an on-going basis relevant industry-based standards (including guidelines and codes of practice), recognising that such industry-based standards generally represent current best practice, and may accept compliance with those standards as being adequate to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects to the extent that those standards good management practices* address the matters in Policies 14-1, 14-2, 14-4, and 14-5 and 14-6."</i></p>
7	Policy 14-5 - Management of intensive farming land <sup>a</sup> uses	Support	<p>Operative Policy 14-5 outlines how intensive farming land uses will be managed in order to give effect to Policies 5-7 and 5-8 of the RPS.</p> <p>While PPC2 does not amend the management approaches outlined in this policy, amendments to parts (b)(i) and (d) of the policy are required to ensure that the necessary connectiveness with new PPC2 provisions are accommodated. The amendment to part (d)</p>	<p>Retain the amendments to Policy 14-5 as notified, as follows:</p> <p><b>"Policy 14-5: Management of intensive farming land<sup>a</sup> uses</b></p> <p><i>In order to give effect to Policy 5-7 and Policy 5-8, intensive farming land<sup>a</sup> use activities affecting groundwater and surface water quality must be managed in the following manner:</i></p>

SUB. REF.	PROVISION	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
			<p>accommodates the alternative consent pathway where the cumulative nitrogen leaching maximums cannot be met. For this reason, the proposed amendments are appropriate.</p>	<p>(a) <i>The following land uses have been identified as intensive farming land<sup>a</sup> uses:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Dairy farming*</li> <li>(ii) Commercial vegetable growing*</li> <li>(iii) Cropping*</li> <li>(iv) Intensive sheep and beef*</li> </ul> <p>(b) <i>The intensive farming land<sup>a</sup> uses identified in (a) must be regulated where:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) They are existing (ie., established prior to the Plan having legal effect) intensive farming land<sup>a</sup> uses, in the targeted Water Management Sub-zones* identified in Table 14.1<sup>1</sup>.</li> <li>(ii) They are new (ie., established after the Plan has legal effect<sup>2</sup>) intensive farming land<sup>a</sup> uses, in all Water Management Subzones* in the Region.</li> </ul> <p>(c) Nitrogen leaching maximums have been established in Table 14.2.</p> <p>(d) <u>Except as provided for in Policy 14-6(d),</u> Existing intensive farming land<sup>a</sup> uses regulated in accordance with (b)(i) must be managed to ensure that the leaching of nitrogen from those land<sup>a</sup> uses does not exceed the cumulative nitrogen leaching maximum* values for each year contained in Table 14.2, <del>unless the circumstances in Policy 14-6 apply</del>.</p> <p>(e) New intensive farming land<sup>a</sup> uses regulated in accordance with (b)(ii) must be managed to ensure that the leaching of nitrogen from those land<sup>a</sup> uses does not exceed the</p>

SUB. REF.	PROVISION	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
8	Policy 14-6 - Resource consent decision-making for intensive farming land <sup>a</sup> uses	Support in part	<p>Policy 14-6 provides guidance for resource consent decision makers for intensive farming activities. The proposed PPC2 amendments to this policy are required to accommodate PPC2's amended resource management approach for existing intensive farming activities. This includes the requirements for the implementation of GMP (part (b)) and the alternative consent pathway, as outlined in parts (d) to (f), where existing intensive farming activities do not meet the cumulative nitrogen leaching maximums in Table 14-2. The alternative consent pathway outlined in part (d) of this policy provides for two different farming approaches. The first of the farming approaches is where the intensive farming activity is to continue while being required to implement GMP in accordance with a NMP, and to implement other measures that aim to progressively reduce diffuse discharges from such farming activities over time (part (d)(i)). The second farming approach, as outlined in part (d)(ii) of this policy, is where the farming activity is intending to transition to an alternative non-intensive farming activity whereby it can continue to operate as an existing intensive farming activity for up to 5-years provided there is no increase in diffuse discharges over this time period. Parts (e) and (f) then outline, for each of the farming approaches, the matters to be considered when determining whether to enable (i.e., grant the resource consent being sought) these farming activities.</p> <p>Given the issues associated with the One Plan in relation to existing intensive farming activities as well as the</p>	<p>Amend Policy 14-, as follows, with amendments shown in shaded and double underlined or <del>stricken</del> text:</p> <p><b>"Policy 14-6: Resource consent decision-making for intensive farming land<sup>a</sup> uses</b></p> <p>When making decisions on resource consent<sup>a</sup> applications, and setting consent conditions<sup>a</sup>, for intensive farming land<sup>a</sup> uses the Regional Council must:</p> <p>(a) Ensure the nitrogen leaching from the land<sup>a</sup> is managed in accordance with Policy 14-5.</p> <p>(b) Ensure implementation of good management practices<sup>a</sup> to manage nutrient leaching and run-off, faecal contamination and sediment loss, as part of any intensive farming land<sup>a</sup> use.</p> <p>An exception may be made to (b) for existing intensive farming land<sup>a</sup> uses in the following circumstances:</p> <p>(i) where the existing intensive farming land<sup>a</sup> use occurs on land that has 50% or higher off-site classes IV to VII and has an average annual rainfall of 1500 mm or greater; or</p> <p>(ii) where the existing intensive farming land<sup>a</sup> use cannot meet year 1 cumulative nitrogen leaching maximums<sup>a</sup> in year 1, they shall be managed through conditions on their resource consent to ensure year 1 cumulative nitrogen leaching maximums<sup>a</sup></p> <p>cumulative nitrogen leaching maximum* values for each year contained in Table 14-2.</p> <p>..."</p>

SUB. REF.	PROVISION	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
			<p>issues associated with Table 14.2, the amendments to this policy are generally considered appropriate. However, four amendments to part (e) are necessary in order to provide consistency with the approach provided for by the alternative consent pathway under part (d)(i), and Ravensdown's other submission points. The reasons for the amendments are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Part (e)(i) refers to whether the proposed innovations and measures represent the 'best practicable option' to minimise diffuse discharges. GMP is a key tool used within PPC2 to minimise such discharges and therefore reference to 'best practicable option' within this policy is not considered appropriate. Given that part (b) of this policy already requires GMP to be implemented, part (e)(i) should refer to the innovations and actions proposed as a means of minimising diffuse discharges.</li> <li>• Part (e)(i)(B) refers to the rate of reduction of nitrogen loss towards achieving the cumulative nitrogen leaching maximum. As discussed above in relation to Policy 5-8(a) (Sub. Ref. 2), given the existing and continued issues associated with the nitrogen leaching values in Table 14.2, the aim for existing intensive farming activity should be on the reduction of nitrogen losses, not compliance with the values in the table.</li> <li>• Part (e)(ii) effectively requires, at a farm level, comparison between various versions of Overseer. It is understood that such a comparison may not be possible. Given this issue, and given that Ravensdown has requested a number of amendments to PPC2 provisions to require intensive</li> </ul>	<p><i>be met within 4 years.</i>  <i>Where an exception is made to the cumulative nitrogen leaching maximum* the existing intensive farming land uses must be managed by consent conditions to ensure:</i></p> <p>(f) Good management practices to minimise the loss of nitrogen, phosphorus, faecal sediment and sediment are implemented.</p> <p>(f) Any losses of nitrogen, which cannot be minimised, are remedied or mitigated, including by other works or environmental compensation. Mitigation works may include but are not limited to, creation of wetland and riparian planted zones.</p> <p>(c) Ensure that cattle are excluded from surface water in accordance with Policy 14-5 (f) and (g) except where landscape or geographical constraints make stock exclusion impractical and the effects of cattle stock movements are must be avoided, remedied or mitigated. In all cases any unavoidable losses of nitrogen, phosphorus, faecal contamination and sediment are remedied or mitigated by other works or environmental compensation. Mitigation works may include but are not limited to, creation of wetland and riparian planted zones.</p> <p>(d) Provide for exceptions to (a) for existing intensive farming land uses that exceed the cumulative nitrogen leaching maximum* where:</p> <p>(i) Good management practices* are</p>

SUB. REF.	PROVISION	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS RELIEF SOUGHT
		<p>farming activities to achieve nitrogen loss reductions, not compliance with Table 14.2 maximums, it is considered that part (e)(ii) of this policy is not necessary and therefore should be deleted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parts (e)(iii) to (iv) need to be renumbered given Ravensdown's request to delete part (e)(ii) of this policy (refer above).</li> </ul>	<p><i>implemented in accordance with a nutrient management plan*, along with additional innovations and measures to further reduce nutrient leaching and run-off, faecal contamination and sediment losses from the land\ progressively over time; or</i></p> <p><i>(ii) The existing intensive farming land\ use is to continue for no longer than five years in order to enable the transition to an alternative non-intensive farming land\ use without an increase in nutrient leaching and run-off, faecal contamination and sediment losses from the land\ over that period of time.</i></p> <p><i>(e) When determining whether to enable an existing intensive farm land\ use to continue under (d)(i), have regard to:</i></p> <p><i>(i) Whether the proposed innovations and measures <del>represent the best practicable</del> will minimise the nutrient leaching and run-off, faecal contamination and sediment losses from the land\, having particular regard to:</i></p> <p><i>(A) The extent of the exceedance of the cumulative nitrogen leaching maximum* in Table 14.2;</i></p> <p><i>(B) The rate of reduction of nitrogen loss towards the cumulative nitrogen leaching maximum* for any other reason;</i></p> <p><i># Table 14.2;</i></p> <p><i>(C) Whether further reductions are currently possible for the intensive farming land\ use based on existing</i></p>

SUB. REF.	PROVISION	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
				<p><u>(i) The extent to which the proposed measures with the indicative timescales specified in Table 14-2 is attributable to updates to versions of OVERSEER.</u></p> <p><u>(ii) The nature and characteristics of the land<sup>1</sup>, having regard to physical characteristics of the soil including in terms of attenuation capacity, climatic conditions, and topography of the property.</u></p> <p><u>(iii) The contribution of the progressive reduction in nutrient leaching and run-off, faecal contamination and sediment losses from the land<sup>1</sup>, over time, to the improvement of water<sup>1</sup> quality within that Water Management Sub-zone*.</u></p> <p><u>(iv) The strategy for surface water<sup>1</sup> quality set out in Policies 5-2, 5-3, 5-4 and 5-5, and the strategy for groundwater quality in Policy 5-6.</u></p> <p><u>(f) When determining whether to enable the existing intensive farming land<sup>1</sup> use to continue under (d)(ii), have regard to:</u></p> <p><u>(i) Measures implemented in accordance with a nutrient management plan* to ensure that nutrient leaching and run-off, faecal contamination and sediment losses from the land<sup>1</sup> do not increase over the duration of the resource consent<sup>1</sup>.</u></p> <p><u>(ii) good management practices* proposed to avoid, remedy or mitigate nutrient</u></p>

SUB. REF.	PROVISION	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
				<p><i>leaching and run-off, faecal contamination and sediment losses from the land<sup>a</sup>. (iii) the nature, sequencing, measurability and enforceability of any steps proposed to transition out of the intensive farming land use by the expiry of the resource consent<sup>b</sup>.</i></p> <p>...</p>
<b>Chapter 14: Discharges to Land and Water / Section 14.3 – Rule – Agricultural Activities</b>				
9	Table 14.2 – Cumulative nitrogen leaching maximum* by Land Use Capability Class*	Oppose	<p>As outlined in the section 32 Report for PPC2, the operative cumulative nitrogen leaching maximums contained in Table 14.2 of the One Plan were intended to be the principal management mechanism for intensive farming land uses in the targeted sub-zones (i.e., the sub-zones listed in Table 14.1). However, ongoing changes to Overseer since the notification of the proposed One Plan means that farm systems that were able to meet the maximums modelled using Overseer version 5.2.6 (the version at the time that Table 14.2 was prepared) can no longer do so under updated versions of Overseer (now version 6.3.2).</p> <p>To address this issue, PPC2 proposes updating Table 14.2 with updated numbers that reflect a version of Overseer (version 6.3.1 – as stated in the section 32 Report), as well as providing for the alternative consent pathway as outlined in Policy 14-6 above (<b>Sub. Ref. 8</b>). Although version 6.3.2 is the current version of version, Overseer version 6.3.1 was reportedly the ‘current version’ at the time that PPC2 was prepared.</p> <p>Given the proposed introduction of the alternative consent pathway, it is considered that the cumulative nitrogen leaching maximums will act as a discretionary</p>	<p>While there will continue to be ongoing issues associated with the use of the ‘cumulative nitrogen leaching maximum’, as contained in Table 14.2, retain the table as amended by PPC2 given its use as a resource management tool throughout the One Plan;</p> <p><b>AND,</b></p> <p><b>Amend</b> Table 14.2 by identifying the version of Overseer (version 6.3.1) that was used to calculate the leaching values contained in this table.</p>

SUB. REF.	PROVISION	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
			<p>activity rule trigger whereby implementation of GMP and nitrogen loss reductions are required, rather than compliance with these Table 14.2 numbers. This approach is appropriate as even though PPC2 seeks to update the cumulative nitrogen leaching maximums, the reality is that the PPC2 updated maximums were calculated using a now older version of Overseer. In addition, as discussed above under Method 5.13 (<b>Sub. Ref. 5</b>), that Overseer will continue to be updated and refined. This is how all such models should operate (i.e., they should not be static and should reflect the most up-to-date knowledge and data). Therefore, while the retention of absolute numbers in Table 14.2 is not ideal, given PPC2's proposed introduction of the alternative consent pathway and the overall structure of the One Plan, Ravensdown are willing to accept the retention of the table and associated updated numbers.</p> <p>However, solely for the purpose of clarity, the table should include a note that identifies the version of Overseer used to calculate the current version of the Table 14.2 cumulative nitrogen leaching maximums.</p>	<p>Retain the amendments to Rule 14-1 as notified, as follows:</p> <p>"Control is reserved over:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(b) compliance with the cumulative nitrogen leaching maximum* specified in Table 14-2 good management practices* to avoid, remedy or mitigate nutrient leaching and runoff, fecal contamination and sediment losses from the land^</p> <p style="text-align: right;">..."</p>
10	Rule 14-1 – Existing intensive farming land^ use activities (controlled activity)	Support	<p>Operative Rule 14-1 provides for existing intensive farming activities within the targeted sub-zones listed in Table 14.1 as controlled activities subject to a range of conditions, including where the nitrogen losses will comply with the relevant Table 14.2 cumulative nitrogen leaching maximum (Condition (c)).</p> <p>PPC2 proposes amendments to the matters of control to reflect the new provisions arising out of the plan change, namely the requirement to implement GMP and the need to consider the matters arising out of Policies 14-5 and 14-6.</p> <p>The proposed amendments to this rule appropriately</p>	<p>Retain the amendments to Rule 14-1 as notified, as follows:</p> <p>"Control is reserved over:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(b) compliance with the cumulative nitrogen leaching maximum* specified in Table 14-2 good management practices* to avoid, remedy or mitigate nutrient leaching and runoff, fecal contamination and sediment losses from the land^</p> <p style="text-align: right;">..."</p>

SUB. REF.	PROVISION	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
11	Rule 14-2 – Existing intensive farming land <sup>a</sup> use activities not complying with any of the conditions, standards and terms (a), (b) and (d) to (i) of Rule 14-1 (restricted discretionary activity)	Support	reflect the proposed intent of PPC2 and for this reason they are considered appropriate.	<p>(i) the matters in Policies 14-5, 14-6 and 14-9."</p> <p>Operative Rule 14-2 provides for existing intensive farming activities within the targeted sub-zones listed in Table 14.1 as restricted discretionary activities where controlled activity Rule 14-1 did not apply. There were no conditions attached to this operative rule.</p> <p>PPC2 proposes amendments to reflect the new provisions arising out of the plan change, including the alternative consent pathway provided for by Rule 14-2A (refer below – <b>Sub. Ref. 12</b>). The proposed amendments to this rule include new conditions which require the preparation and implementation of a NMP and compliance with the cumulative nitrogen leaching maximums contained in Table 14.2. In addition, a matter of discretion has been amended to refer to GMP rather than just ‘measures’.</p> <p>The proposed amendments to this rule appropriately reflect the proposed intent of PPC2, including the introduction of an alternative consent pathway as provided for by new Rule 14-2A. For this reason, the amendments to this rule are considered appropriate.</p> <p>Retain the amendments to Rule 14-2 as notified, as follows:</p> <p><b>“Activity</b> <i>The use of land<sup>a</sup> pursuant to s9(2) RMA for any of the following intensive farming:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) dairy farming*</li> <li>(ii) commercial vegetable growing*</li> <li>(iii) cropping*</li> <li>(iv) intensive sheep and beef farming*</li> </ul> <p><i>that was existing in the Water Management Sub-zones* listed in and from the dates specified in Table 14.1, and any of the following discharges<sup>a</sup> pursuant to ss15(1) or 15(2A) RMA associated with intensive farming, that do not comply with one or more of the conditions<sup>b</sup>, standards and terms of Rule 14-1 (except for (c)):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) ....</li> </ul> <p><b>Conditions/Standards/Terms</b></p> <p>(a) A nutrient management plan* must be prepared for the land<sup>a</sup>, and provided annually to the Regional Council.</p> <p>(b) The activity must be undertaken in accordance with the nutrient management plan* prepared under (a).</p> <p>(c) The nutrient management plan* prepared under (a) must demonstrate that the nitrogen leaching loss from the activity will not exceed the cumulative nitrogen leaching maximum* for any year in Table 14.2.</p> <p><b>Control/Discretion</b></p>

SUB. REF.	PROVISION	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
				<p><i>Non-Notification</i></p> <p>Discretion is restricted to:</p> <p>(a) ...</p> <p>(b) <del>the extent of non-compliance with the cumulative nitrogen leaching maximum* specified in Table 14-2</del></p> <p>(b) <del>(e) measures good management practices* to avoid, remedy or mitigate nutrient leaching and runoff faecal contamination and sediment losses from the land<sup>a</sup></del></p> <p>...</p>
12	New Rule 14-2A – Existing intensive farming land <sup>a</sup> use activities not complying with condition, standard, term (c) of Rule 14-1 or Rule 14-2 (discretionary activity)	Support	This proposed discretionary activity rule provides for a consenting pathway for existing intensive farming activities that are not provided for by Rule 14-1 and 14-2 (i.e., farming activities that cannot meet the cumulative nitrogen leaching maximums contained in Table 14-2). This rule accommodates the alternative consent pathway provided for through PPC2's amendments to Policy 5.8(a), 14-5 and 14-6.	<p>Retain Rule 14-2A as notified, as follows:</p> <p><u>"Activity</u></p> <p><u>The use of land<sup>a</sup> pursuant to s9(2) RMA for any of the following intensive farming:</u></p> <p><u>(i) dairy farming*</u></p> <p><u>(ii) commercial vegetable growing*</u></p> <p><u>(iii) cropping*</u></p> <p><u>(iv) intensive sheep and beef farming*</u></p> <p><u>that was existing in the Water Management Sub-zones* listed in and from the dates specified in Table 14-1, and any of the following discharges<sup>a</sup> pursuant to ss15(1) or 15(2A) RMA associated with intensive farming, that do not comply with conditions, standards and term (c) of Rule 14-1 or one or more of the conditions<sup>a</sup>, standards and terms of Rule 14-2:</u></p> <p><u>(f) ...</u></p> <p><b>AND,</b></p> <p><b>Amend the Conditions (f) to (j), to Conditions (a) to (e).</b></p>

SUB. REF.	PROVISION	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS GLOSSARY	RELIEF SOUGHT
13	<u>Good management practices</u>	Support in part	The proposed definition appropriately identifies that GMP revolves around measures and methods which, when implemented, can assist in minimising and reducing the potential effects of activities. The definition also recognises that these measures and methods are not static and will evolve over time. However, the definition also identifies that GMP measures and methods include those established in industry-based standards. While there are a number of industry-based guidance documents that can be relied upon, for example the "Industry-agreed Good Management Practices relating to water quality" (September 2015), these documents do not contain standards that must be complied with.	Amend the definition of 'good management practices', as follows, with amendments shown in shaded and double <del>underlined or strikethrough</del> text:  "refers to evolving practical measures and methods, including those established in industry-based guidance documents <del>referenced</del> , which are used at a sector or community level to minimise the effects of discharges to land and water."
14	Nutrient management plan	Support in part	The proposed amendments to the definition of NMP which provides for other recognised nutrient management models to be used (i.e., in addition to Overseer) is considered appropriate. However, the specific reference to having to provide 'input and output files' within the NMP may be problematic. It is understood that in relation to OverseerFM, a parameter report' can be generated but the input and output files can only be accessed in OverseerFM and cannot be exported as .xml files as they could previously. For this reason, an amendment to the definition in relation to this matter is considered necessary.	Amend the definition of 'nutrient management plan', as follows, with amendments shown in shaded and double <del>underlined or strikethrough</del> text:  "means a plan prepared annually in accordance with the Code of Practice for Nutrient Management (NZ Fertiliser Manufacturers' Research Association 2007) which records (including copies of the OVERSEER® <del>output files of</del> information used in and derived from the recognised nutrient management model used to prepare the plan) and takes into account all sources of nutrients for intensive farming and identifies all current and relevant nutrient management practices and mitigations, and which is prepared by a person who has both a Certificate of Completion in Sustainable Nutrient Management in New Zealand Agriculture and a Certificate of Completion in Advanced Sustainable

SUB. REF.	PROVISION	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
			referred to in the definition. It is not appropriate to refer to the Certificate of Completion in Sustainable Nutrient Management in New Zealand Agriculture as this certificate is a pre-requisite for the advanced certificate.	<i>Nutrient Management from Massey University.</i>

