



ATTACHMENTS

UNDER SEPARATE COVER

Ordinary Council Meeting

28 February 2017

Table of Contents

5.3 Submission on the Proposed Waikato Regional Plan Change 1 - Waikato and Waipa River Catchments

Attachment 1 Draft Submission on Proposed Waikato Regional Council Plan Change 1 [A1867686]3

Proposed Waikato Regional Plan Change 1 – Waikato and Waipa River Catchments.

Submission form on publicly notified –
Proposed Waikato Regional Plan Change 1 –
Waikato and Waipa River Catchments.

Sub Form	PC12016	COVER SHEET	
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY			
Submission Number			
Entered	Initials		
File Ref	Sheet 1 of		

FORM 5 Clause 6 of First Schedule, Resource Management Act 1991

SUBMISSIONS CAN BE	
Mailed to	Chief Executive, 401 Grey Street, Private Bag 3038, Waikato Mail Centre, Hamilton 3240
Delivered to	Waikato Regional Council, 401 Grey Street, Hamilton East, Hamilton
Emailed to	healthyrivers@waikatoregion.govt.nz Please Note: Submissions received by email must contain full contact details. We also request you send us a signed original by post or courier.
Online at	www.waikatoregion.govt.nz/healthyrivers
We need to receive your submission by 5pm, 8 March 2017.	

YOUR NAME AND CONTACT DETAILS		
Full name Taupō District Council		
Full address Private Bag 2005, Taupō Mail Centre, Taupō 3352		
Email smavor@taupo.govt.nz	Phone 07 376 0688	Fax 07 378 0118

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE OF SUBMITTER		
Full name Taupō District Council		
Address for service of person making submission Private Bag 2005, Taupō Mail Centre, Taupō 3352		
Email smavor@taupo.govt.nz	Phone 07 376 0688	Fax 07 378 0118

TRADE COMPETITION AND ADVERSE EFFECTS <i>(select appropriate)</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

A1867686

THE SPECIFIC PROVISIONS OF PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 1 THAT MY SUBMISSION RELATES TO*Please state the provision, map or page number e.g. Objective 4 or Rule 3.11.5.1**(continue on separate sheet(s) if necessary.)*

See attached table

I SUPPORT OR OPPOSE THE ABOVE PROVISION/S*(select as appropriate and continue on separate sheet(s) if necessary.)*

- ☐ Support the above provisions
- ☐ Support the above provision with amendments
- ☐ Oppose the above provisions

See attached table

MY SUBMISSION IS THAT*Tell us the reasons why you support or oppose or wish to have the specific provisions amended.**(Please continue on separate sheet(s) if necessary.)*

See attached table

I SEEK THE FOLLOWING DECISION BY COUNCIL*(select as appropriate and continue on separate sheet(s) if necessary.)*

- ☐ Accept the above provision
- ☐ Accept the above provision with amendments as outlined below
- ☐ Decline the above provision
- ☐ If not declined, then amend the above provision as outlined below

See attached table

Amend as follows:

See attached table

PLEASE INDICATE BY TICKING THE RELEVANT BOX WHETHER YOU WISH TO BE HEARD IN SUPPORT OF YOUR SUBMISSION

☒ I wish to speak at the hearing in support of my submissions.

☐ I do not wish to speak at the hearing in support of my submissions.

JOINT SUBMISSIONS

☒ If others make a similar submission, please tick this box if you will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.

IF YOU HAVE USED EXTRA SHEETS FOR THIS SUBMISSION PLEASE ATTACH THEM TO THIS FORM AND INDICATE BELOW

☒ Yes, I have attached extra sheets.

☐ No, I have not attached extra sheets.

SIGNATURE OF SUBMITTER

(or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)

A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means.

Signature

Date

Personal information is used for the administration of the submission process and will be made public. All information collected will be held by Waikato Regional Council, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information.

**GREAT LAKE TAUPŌ**

Taupo District Council
72 Lake Terrace, Taupo 331
Private Bag 2005, Taupo Mail Cent
Taupo 3352, New Zealand
T 07 376 081
F 07 378 011
E general@taupo.govt.nz
www.taupo.govt.nz

22 February 2017

Chief Executive
401 Grey Street
Private Bag 3038
Waikato Mail Centre
Hamilton 3240

Dear Vaughan

Submission on Proposed Waikato Regional Plan Change 1- Waikato and Waipa River Catchments

Taupo District Council (TDC) appreciates being invited to submit on the Waikato Regional Plan Change 1 – Waikato and Waipa River Catchments. We appreciate being involved in developing the proposed plan change and recognise the collaborative approach taken by the Waikato Regional Council and the Collaborative Stakeholder Group in preparing the proposed change.

Our interest in this plan change stems from:

- Managing a number of community wastewater systems which discharge within the Waikato River catchment. This includes the systems for the Taupō, Atiamuri, Whakamaru and Mangakino.
- Owning land used for a number of purposes, including recreation, community infrastructure, forestry, residential and commercial uses, and future investment.
- Our role as an advocate for the wider community of the Taupō district.

TDC generally supports the purpose of the plan change and understands the need to give effect to the Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River. We acknowledge the complexity of the issues you need to address in the development of the plan change.

We acknowledge that the plan change is focused on the Waikato and Waipa Rivers, but we believe that it would be artificial to ignore the connection between Lake Taupō and the Waikato River. It is important that the substantial and ongoing commitment to improving the water quality in Lake Taupō is recognised and provided for in the plan change.

The Taupō district has a long history of involvement in improving the water quality of Lake Taupō and the Waikato River. We discontinued the discharge of wastewater to the Waikato River in 1994 and began discharging to land. We were also a partner with the Crown, Ngati Tuwharetoa and yourselves in the development of the Lake Taupō Protection Trust and the resulting change to the Regional Plan. This involvement and significant community contribution have resulted in a high level of water quality as it enters the Waikato River and throughout the upper freshwater management unit.

The majority of the land in the Taupō District affected by the plan change is rural. These communities will be significantly affected by the plan change in the short and long term both economically and socially. These impacts will be felt wider than the rural community and we have concerns for those who live in the Taupō District.

TDC would welcome the opportunity to work with the regional council officers if they require further information when responding to matters raised in our submission.

Council formally endorsed this submission at the Council meeting on 28 February 2017.

Kind regards

David Trewavas
Mayor



Page No.	Reference	Support/Oppose	Reasons	I seek the following decision from the local authority:
27	3.11.2 Objectives	Generally support	Council supports the intention of the objectives but recognise that wording changes may occur throughout the submission and further submission processes and we wish to be involved in those discussions.	Maintain the intent of the objectives
27	3.11.2 Objective 1: Long-term restoration and protection of water quality for each sub-catchment and Freshwater Management Unit.	Support for the intent of this objective	Council recognises that this objective addresses the Waikato Regional Council's (WRC) obligation to give effect to the Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River.	Maintain the intent of this objective
27	3.11.2 Objective 2: Social, economic and cultural wellbeing is maintained in the long-term	Support for the intent of this objective	Council recognises that this objective is necessary to ensure that a balanced approach to change is undertaken. There is potential for conflict between this objective and Objective 1. Over time the impacts of attempting to achieve Objective 1 are likely to have a negative impact on some individuals and communities as they grapple with the impact of change. We acknowledge that Objective 4 attempts to reconcile this impact.	Maintain the intent of this objective
27	3.11.2 Objective 3: Short-term improvements in water quality in the first stage of restoration and protection of water quality for each sub-catchment and Freshwater Management Unit.	Support for the intent of this objective	We support the intent of this objective as it recognises that there needs to be changes made in order to achieve the water quality targets. However it may be that changes made now are not reflected in water quality until a date past 2026.	Maintain the intent of this objective
27	3.11.2 Objective 4: People and community resilience	Support	Agree that a staged approach is likely to best support communities being able to achieve the objectives of the plan change whilst having to adapt to the changes. However it is unclear what	Clarity around what the staged approach means and also what is intended by the term 'short-term'. It would be useful for this term to be defined.

Page No.	Reference	Support/Oppose	Reasons	I seek the following decision from the local authority:
			timeframe is covered by 'short-term'.	
30	3.11.3 Policies	Generally support	Council generally supports the intent of the policies within the plan change. There is an opportunity to condense the policies and possibly use some of the current wording to inform either the implementation methods or the rules. We recognise that wording changes may occur throughout the submission and further submission processes and we wish to be involved in those discussions.	To consider amalgamating policy 1, 2, 3 and 4 and utilising the information to inform the implementation methods and rules. Maintain the intent of the policies.
30	3.11.3 Policy 1: Manage diffuse discharges of nitrogen, phosphorus, sediment and microbial pathogens	Support	Council supports this policy as it recognises that diffuse discharges are a key contributor to water quality. We also understand that the improvements that have been made over time to in point source discharge quality are being recognised within this policy.	Maintain the intent of this policy
31	3.11.3 Policy 5: Staged approach	Support	Council supports the intention of this policy. We recognise that a staged approach is more likely to reduce the disruption and negative impact on communities.	Maintain the intent of this policy
32	3.11.3 Policy 7: Preparing for allocation in the future	Support in part	Recognise that preparing for future allocation is important in terms of attempting to reduce the overall amount of diffuse discharges of the four contaminants. There is the potential with this approach combined with the development of the nitrogen reference point to reward those who have traditionally applied or discharged high levels of contaminants and penalising those who have utilised best practice to reduce their discharges. There needs to be consideration of the ability to allow those who are below what may be considered an acceptable level of discharge to increase.	That further allocation systems and processes recognise the efforts made to reduce contaminants prior to the introduction of plan change 1. This would be similar to the approach applied to point source discharges as outlined in Policy 12.
33	3.11.3 Policy 9: Sub-catchment (including edge of field) mitigation	Support	The mechanisms identified in this policy are likely to assist in achieving the objectives of the plan change. We have some concern regarding the	Maintain the intent of the policy.

Page No.	Reference	Support/Oppose	Reasons	I seek the following decision from the local authority:
	<i>planning, co-ordination and funding</i>		funding of this policy.	Ensure that the required funding is provided to enable the effective implementation of this policy.
33	3.11.3 Policy 10: <i>Provide for point source discharges of regional significance</i>	Support	<p>Council's wastewater operations are considered to be regionally significant infrastructure. We anticipate that this includes the extension of any existing infrastructure that is required to meet the needs of a growing community. We are concerned that stormwater infrastructure is not covered by the definition of regionally significant infrastructure.</p> <p>We are concerned that we will not be able to prove that the point source discharge improvements that we make will result in the desired water quality improvements in the Waikato River.</p>	<p>Maintain the intent of the policy.</p> <p>That the policy recognises the monitoring undertaken during the operation of consented wastewater operations when assessing and considering the renewal of resource consents.</p> <p>That the definition of regionally significant infrastructure includes stormwater infrastructure.</p>
33	3.11.3 Policy 11: <i>Application of Best Practicable Option and mitigation or offset of effects to point source discharges</i>	Support in part	<p>Taupō District Council and the community have made a significant contribution to date including the removal of wastewater discharge into the Waikato River in 1994. This has meant that the water quality in the upper freshwater management unit (FMU) is significantly better than it would have been otherwise. We agree with the application of best practicable option and note that this is determined under the Resource Management Act. When considering resource consent applications it is important that the proportion of contaminant removal is considered against the cost. We note that this is included in Policy 12 for consideration.</p> <p>We also believe that offsetting is a mitigation measure that should be considered alongside other mitigation measures, not as a last resort.</p> <p>Although the current provisions allow for offsetting in an FMU upstream this is not possible for Taupō District Council as the plan change geographical area begins at Huka Falls. However clearly Lake Taupō is our upper catchment. As such we would</p>	<p>That offsetting is considered a mitigating measure rather than being considered only after all other options to avoid or mitigate have been considered.</p> <p>In recognition of the significant contribution made to date by the Taupō district communities that offsetting be provided for in the Lake Taupō catchment as the freshwater management unit above the Waikato River.</p>

Page No.	Reference	Support/Oppose	Reasons	I seek the following decision from the local authority:
			like the opportunity to offset in the Lake Taupō catchment.	
34	3.11.3 Policy 12: Additional considerations for point source discharges in relation to water quality targets	Support	This policy provides additional flexibility for Council and therefore our communities in achieving the objectives of the plan change.	Retain the policy as proposed.
34	3.11.3 Policy 13: Point sources consent duration	Support in part	This policy supports the contribution already made by our communities, and recognises that there is a need to provide certainty for the continuation and development of regionally significant infrastructure. We believe that the consent term should be set at 35 years as this protects the investment that our communities will need to make.	Support the intent of the policy. Request that the consent term be 35 years.
35	3.11.3 Policy 17: Considering the wider context of the Vision and Strategy	Support	We recognise the wider context of the Vision and Strategy and the potential wider environmental benefits of other actions.	Retain the policy as proposed.
NA	Addition of new policy to allow for urban growth	Support	Statistics NZ population projections for the Taupō District forecast growth in a number of the urban areas. Council is mindful of being able to accommodate the increase in population with the required infrastructure and associated discharges. There is a requirement in the National Policy Statement for Urban Development Capacity to provide for urban growth.	The addition of a policy that provides for an increase in contaminant concentrations from regionally significant infrastructure to provide for population growth in urban areas.
36	3.11.4.1 Working with others	Support	We recognise the value that working together brings.	Retain as proposed.
36	3.11.4.3 Farm Environment Plans	Support in part	We support the concept of Farm Environment Plans; however we are concerned with the implementation of this method. We believe that there will be a considerable burden on landowners and the regional council to ensure that these are useful and provide a suitable mechanism going	Maintain the intent of the implementation method. Include a provision of a funding stream to assist in the development and

Page No.	Reference	Support/Oppose	Reasons	I seek the following decision from the local authority:
			forward. There is also likely to be a significant financial requirement for landowners to successfully implement the Farm Environment Plan. This should be recognised in the development of the plans and funding should be provided to assist with the costs of implementation.	implementation of Farm Environment Plans.
37	3.11.4.5 Sub-catchment scale planning	Support in part	This implementation method is ambitious and is likely to be costly for those involved. It is not clear what the timeframes are for implementation and how this method will be funded.	Changes are required to provide timeframes, funding options and priorities.
37	3.11.4.6 Funding and implementation	Support in part	The successful implementation of the plan change will rely on the commitment of the Waikato Regional Council. There is a significant workload signalled in the plan change and if the objectives of the plan change are to be achieved there needs to be the staff resources and funding streams in place. It will be challenging from a timing perspective to ensure that funds are available in the Long-term Plan and/or Annual Plan to support the successful implementation of the plan change. There is also a concern that the plan change will be relitigated through the funding discussion that will be required through the Long-term Plan process.	Retain as proposed
37	3.11.4.7 Information needs to support any future allocation	Support	We acknowledge that developing an allocation framework is challenging and requires the gathering and analysis of a significant amount of data.	Maintain the intent of the implementation method.
37	3.11.4.8 Reviewing Chapter 3.11 and developing an allocation framework for the next Regional Plan	Support in part	Any allocation framework should not penalise those who have already implemented sound farming practices which reduce the diffuse discharge of contaminants. The framework should allow the opportunity for increasing an allocation on a property where a landowner has demonstrated reduced discharges. This would mean reducing an allocation on a property which had made little efforts to reduce the diffuse	Support for development of an allocation framework that rewards changes in land use management that have resulted in the reduction of diffuse discharge of contaminants. Council requests involvement in the development of the allocation framework

A1867686

Taupo District Council submission on Waikato Regional Plan Change 1

Page 9

Page No.	Reference	Support/Oppose	Reasons	I seek the following decision from the local authority:
38	3.11.4.9 Managing the effects of urban development	Support in part	discharge of contaminants. Acknowledge the need to manage the effects of urban development. Council will work with the regional council to further define the range of effective solutions for the urban areas.	Maintain the intent of the implementation method. Council seeks involvement in the development of solutions to manage the effects of urban development.
38	3.11.4.10 Accounting system and monitoring	Support	We recognise that monitoring data is required to ensure the effective implementation and monitoring of the plan change. The method should recognise that the data collection will occur over the first ten years and that the accounting system is likely to be developed for use in the second plan change.	Maintain the intent of the implementation method. Clarity around the expected timeframes would provide additional certainty.
38	3.11.4.12 Support research and dissemination of best practice guidelines to reduce diffuse discharges	Support	The development of resources will be very useful for the landowners and will assist in reducing the discharge of contaminants.	Retain as proposed.
39	3.11.5 Rules	Support in part	Further clarity is required regarding the rules. They are not straight forward and require a large amount of consideration to ensure that you are either complying with the rule or not. They are confusing and will not assist landowners in making an informed decision regarding consent requirements. There is a large burden on landowners to provide information and evidence, some of which is currently readily available to the regional council.	That the rules are simplified. The rules contain a number of "and, or, either" requirements in terms of assessment.

Page No.	Reference	Support/Oppose	Reasons	I seek the following decision from the local authority:
39	<i>3.11.5.1 Permitted Activity Rule – Small and Low intensity farming activities</i>	Support in part	<p>Support for the provision of a permitted activity rule for smaller and low intensity farming activities. However the rule is confusing, particularly around the determination of the stock units per hectare on grazed land. Grazed land is not defined and therefore it is assumed that the stock unit rate would be applied over the total property area. This would provide flexibility based on the type of animal being grazed and also the type of land and time of year.</p> <p>The 2ha provision should also be included in the rule rather than appearing in Schedule A.</p>	<p>Clarity is sought regarding the area of land that the stocking rate is applied over i.e. is the rate applied over the property area or the grazed land. The preferred approach is to apply the stocking rate over the total property area.</p> <p>Inclusion of the 2ha provision in rule 3.11.5.1.</p>
40	<i>3.11.5.2 Permitted Activity Rule – Other farming activities</i>	Support in part	<p>Support for the provision of a permitted activity rule for other farming activities. The rule contains a number of provisions and as noted above places a large burden on the landowner for the provision of this information.</p> <p>The cut-off date of 22 October 2016 does not provide flexibility for determining the stocking rate on a property. Farms are managed based on feed available, prices for livestock, weather conditions and other variables. These properties should be able to determine an average stocking rate based on the past five years of information.</p> <p>The requirement for the property to have the same or lower diffuse discharge of the four contaminants as at 22 October 2016 will potentially make some land unusable and have a potential negative impact on the value of the land. It may also be challenging for some property owners to determine the current level of discharge. A five year average should be applied.</p>	That stocking rates and discharge of the four contaminants be based on a five year average prior to 22 October 2016.
41	<i>3.11.5.3 Permitted Activity Rule – Farming activities with a Farm Environment Plan under</i>	Support	Support for the provision of a permitted activity rule for Farming activities with a Farm Environment Plan under a Certified Industry Scheme.	Support the use of the Certified Industry Scheme.

Page No.	Reference	Support/Oppose	Reasons	I seek the following decision from the local authority:
47	<i>a Certified Industry Scheme</i> <i>Schedule B – Nitrogen Reference Point</i>	Support in part	<p>We note the specific requirements for a certified farm environment planner. We also note that this is likely to have an impact on the ability of properties to develop a Farm Environment Plan. This is considered a significant hurdle for the successful implementation of the plan change.</p> <p>Council recognises that a significant amount of data needs to be collected and analysed in order to develop an allocation framework. We are also concerned that there will be a significant expense to landowners to employ the certified farm nutrient advisor.</p>	As noted above Council requests involvement in the development of the allocation framework.
56	<i>Table 3.11-1 Short term and long term numerical water quality targets for the Waikato and Waipa River catchments</i>	Support in part	<p>The table is likely to be predominantly useful for the regional council when monitoring the progress toward the short term and 80 year attribute targets. We assume that showing the short term and 80 year level of attributes is intended to cover the contaminant load to come. It is also impossible to determine where the monitoring sites are along the Waikato River.</p>	<p>Table on page 57 – 67 is not accurately labelled with the table number reference on each page.</p> <p>The inclusion of a map illustrating where the monitoring sites are located.</p>
79	<i>Additions to Glossary of Terms</i>	Support in part	<p>Clarification is required in regards to the following matters:</p> <p><i>Farming activities</i> - support for this definition. Clarification is sought as to whether the harvesting of grass (cut and carry) is considered as the growing of crops. We also seek clarification on the use of stock to reduce grass cover for fire reduction purposes. For example at the Broadlands Road landfill the primary purpose of this site is waste disposal (as per our consent). However over part of the site is grazed to reduce fire risk – not as a farming activity.</p> <p><i>Regionally significant infrastructure</i> – supports this definition and asks that it is included in the regional plan. Also ask that stormwater</p>	<p>Retain the definition of <i>Farming activities</i> as outlined in the proposed plan change.</p> <p>Clarification should be provided to explain that the harvesting of grass (cut and carry) is not considered as the growing of crops.</p> <p>Clarification should be provided to exclude the use of stock to reduce grass cover for fire reduction purposes.</p> <p>Support for the definition of <i>Regionally significant infrastructure</i> and ask that it is included in the regional plan.</p>

Page No.	Reference	Support/Oppose	Reasons	I seek the following decision from the local authority:
			<p>infrastructure is included in the definition.</p> <p><i>Urban properties</i> – the term urban is used in Schedule A however there is no definition associated with urban.</p>	<p>That the definition of regionally significant infrastructure includes stormwater infrastructure.</p> <p>Request that a definition is provided for the term <i>Urban properties</i> to assist with the implementation of Schedule A.</p>