



OFFICER REPORT No. 2 Chapter 8 SCN1

ON

**PROPOSED VARIATION 1 OF THE
PROPOSED CANTERBURY NATURAL RESOURCES
REGIONAL PLAN:**

Chapter 8 - Soil Conservation

Matters to be heard

All submissions made on any provisions of Chapter 8

**Dates of hearing: 12, 14, 18, 19
and 20, 21 (optional) September 2006
at ECan offices, 58 Kilmore Street in Christchurch**

This page is intentionally blank.

Introduction

Content of this report

This officer report is one of a series considering submissions to Proposed Variation 1 (Chapters 4 to 8) to the Proposed Canterbury Natural Resources Regional Plan (NRRP). Submissions evaluated in this report are those that relate to the matters to be heard as listed on the cover of this report.

Purpose of this officer report

This officer report has been prepared under Section 42A of the Resource Management Act:

1. to assist the Hearing Panel in making its recommendations to Environment Canterbury on the submissions and further submissions to Proposed Variation 1 to the Proposed NRRP;
2. to assist submitters and further submitters who requested to be heard, by providing, prior to the hearing, a staff evaluation of decisions requested in submissions.

The evaluations and recommendations presented in the report are based on the information available prior to the hearing, including that contained in the submissions and further submissions. In evaluating the submissions and further submissions, the matters considered include whether a decision requested:

1. falls within the functions of Environment Canterbury under the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA);
2. will enhance the ability of the Proposed NRRP to achieve the purpose of the RMA;
3. will improve an objective so that it is a more appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA;
4. will improve a policy, rule or other method so that it is more efficient and effective for achieving the relevant objectives;
5. will improve the plan in relation to such matters as its lawfulness, clarity, accuracy, effectiveness, coherence, integration, etc.

How to read this report

This report is presented in three parts:

Part 1: Index of submitters and further submitters

The index tells you where to find the evaluation of your submission or further submission. Submissions are usually listed in numerical order, followed by further submissions (which are identified with the letter F before the further submission number). The page numbers next to your submission name indicate the pages in the officer report on which your name is listed under the provisions you have submitted on. The actual evaluation of your submissions is in the text immediately following each table.

Part 2: Officer's evaluation of submissions and recommendations

This is the main part of the report. For each provision submitted on, Part 2 contains the following standard format:

- the name of the provision (shaded), followed by a coding number (see explanation of coding below).
- the summary of decisions requested by submitters on that provision set out in table format
- **Clarification:** only used where the decision requested needs further elaboration/clarification as to its intent
- **Evaluation and reasons:** This part discusses the merits of submissions and includes reasons for accepting, accepting in part, or rejecting it
- **Recommendations:** This will identify for each submission whether it should be accepted, accepted in part, or rejected
- **Amendment required:** will identify specifically the location and nature of any amendment being recommended in response to submissions on the provision.

All clarifications, evaluations and recommendations are prefaced by the submission number to which they relate.

Amendments recommended to the Proposed NRRP are identified in the following way:

- deletions are shown by the use of strikethrough e.g. ~~strikethrough~~
- additions are shown by underlining e.g. underlining

Part 3: The relevant part of the Chapter amended to show the recommendations in the officer report

The amended plan is on coloured paper at the end of the report. It shows all the changes recommended in Part 2 to allow you to see the overall effect of the recommendations. Strikeouts and underlining are used to show the amendments.

Explanation of numbers in the tables

Each set of submissions evaluated in this report is preceded by the name of the provision submitted on and a coding number. The coding number is a reference to where the provision is located in the Proposed NRRP. The formula for coding is generally as follows:

[Chapter number]-[page number] [line number] on which the provision begins.

For example, Policy WQN14(4) is coded 5-83 32, which indicates that this provision is located in Chapter 5, beginning on line 32 of page 83.

When a submission was summarised and put onto our submission database, staff gave every decision requested its own number. Thus a submission with 55 separate decisions requested would have 55 entries in our database, one for each plan provision submitted on. These are numbered from 1 to 55 and the extra number comes after the

actual submission number and looks like this: 103.55 where 103 is the submission number. This helps staff keep track of each decision requested and ensure that all submission points have been addressed.

Abbreviations and symbols

BPO	best practicable option
CMA	Coastal Marine Area
CRPMS	Canterbury Regional Pest Management Strategy
CRPS	Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (26 June 1998)
HSNO	Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996
L&VMRP	Land & Vegetation Management Regional Plan
L/s	litres per second
LTCCP	Long-Term Council Community Plan
MALF	mean annual low flow
$\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	micrograms per cubic metre
mg/kg	milligram per kilogram
mg/m^3	milligrams per cubic metre
m^3/day	cubic metres per day
MHWS	mean high water springs
NMTRP	Nelson-Marlborough Transitional Regional Plan
NRPP	Proposed Canterbury Natural Resources Regional Plan
NTCSA	Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998
ORRP	Opihi River Regional Plan
PCE	Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment
RCEP	Regional Coastal Environment Plan
RLTS	Regional Land Transport Strategy
RMA	Resource Management Act 1991
WCWARP	Waimakariri Catchment Water Allocation Regional Plan
WRRP	Waimakariri River Regional Plan
7DMALF	seven-day mean annual low flow

Part 1: Index of submitters and further submitters

List of Submission numbers and the pages where they are

Submitter	Sub No	Page Number(s)
Ashburton Branch Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society, F1032:		47, 48
Ashburton District Council, 565:	27, 28, 30, 32, 45, 48, 52, 66, 70, 80, 89, 97, 100, 101, 103, 104	
Ashburton District Council, F1018:		27, 28, 100, 101, 103, 104
Avon Heathcote Estuary Ihutai Trust, 55:		3, 5
Avon Heathcote Estuary Ihutai Trust, F1008:		5
Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group, 293:	3, 5, 6, 7, 18, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 32, 33, 37, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, 46, 47, 48, 49, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 61, 63, 64, 65, 67, 68, 71, 72, 73, 75, 77, 78, 80, 81, 82, 83, 85, 86, 87, 88, 93, 94, 96, 97, 99, 100, 103, 104, 105, 107, 109, 111, 112, 115, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 124	
Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group, F1043:	3, 5, 6, 7, 18, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 32, 33, 37, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, 46, 47, 48, 49, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 61, 63, 64, 65, 67, 68, 71, 72, 73, 75, 77, 78, 80, 81, 82, 83, 85, 86, 87, 88, 93, 94, 96, 97, 99, 100, 103, 104, 105, 107, 109, 111, 112, 115, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 124	
Canterbury Growers Society Ltd, 540:	5, 18, 21, 22, 27, 92, 94, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 103, 107, 108, 113, 119, 120, 123	
Carter Holt Harvey Forests, 603:	7, 30, 32, 39, 40, 43, 47, 48, 53, 54, 55, 56, 71, 73, 75, 77, 81, 82, 83, 85, 115	
Cashmere Park Trust, 213:		3
Christchurch City Council (formerly BPDC), 378:	33, 43, 45, 46, 49, 53, 55, 58, 64, 65, 88, 91	
Christchurch City Council (formerly BPDC), F1063:	27, 28, 33, 43, 45, 46, 49, 53, 55, 58, 64, 65, 88, 91, 100, 101, 103, 104	
Christchurch City Council, 476:	4, 5, 17, 22, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 38, 41, 43, 45, 46, 49, 53, 55, 58, 61, 64, 65, 70, 72, 74, 75, 76, 77, 79, 88, 89, 91, 94, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 109, 117	
Christchurch City Council, F1040:		30, 32, 33, 38
Coastal Conway Landcare Group (B. MacFarlane), 402:		122
Department of Conservation, F1046:	3, 6, 27, 43, 48, 53, 63, 64, 73, 80	
Enterprise North Canterbury, 550:	30, 32, 39, 40	
Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces, 586:	3, 7, 18, 21, 23, 26, 37, 47, 58, 63, 67, 68, 72, 73, 78, 80, 87, 93, 94, 96, 97, 99, 104, 105, 107, 109, 111, 112, 117, 119, 120, 121, 122, 124	
Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc, Mackenzie Branch, 472:	18, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 30, 31, 39, 45, 47, 48, 58, 60, 61, 64, 66, 67, 68, 113, 115	
Federated Farmers of NZ (Inc), F1074:	3, 4, 5, 20, 27, 31, 32, 41, 43, 52, 55, 56, 61, 62, 63, 64, 69, 70, 75, 77, 79, 85, 91, 94, 115	
Glendore (New Zealand) Ltd, 433:		4, 111
Hugh Turnbull, 506:	5, 18, 21, 23, 26, 37, 46, 58, 63, 67, 68, 72, 73, 78, 80, 87, 93, 94, 96, 97, 99, 103, 105, 107, 109, 111, 112, 117, 119, 120, 122, 123, 124	
Hurunui Community Water Development Project Working Group, 509:		80
Hurunui Community Water Development Working Group, F1060:		3
Hurunui District Council, 564:	6, 27, 33, 43, 45, 47, 53, 55, 59, 65, 69, 79, 89, 100, 101, 103	
Hurunui District Council, F1009:		27, 100, 101, 103
Hurunui SNA Group Incorporated Society, 569:		7
K W & P W Stackhouse, 215:		91, 94, 97
Kaikoura District Council, 573:	27, 33, 43, 45, 47, 49, 53, 55, 59, 65, 89, 100, 101, 103	
Kaikoura District Council, F1004:		27, 100, 101, 103
Land Solutions (Otago) Limited & J T O'Connell, 615:		80
Landcare Research New Zealand Ltd (J Cavanagh), 583:		109
Landco Pastoral Holdings Ltd, F1003:	3, 41, 58, 61, 66, 78, 80, 87, 91, 96, 97, 100, 102, 105, 107, 109, 111	
M S & K Meares, 424:		4
Mackenzie District Council, 338:	27, 33, 43, 45, 46, 49, 53, 55, 58, 64, 65, 88, 100, 101, 103	
Mackenzie District Council, F1011:		27, 100, 101, 103
MainPower NZ Limited, 510:		80
MainPower NZ Ltd, F1061:		3
Matariki Forests, F1027:	4, 40, 43, 47, 53, 59, 64, 65, 118, 121	
Meridian Energy Ltd, 544:		6
New Zealand Fertiliser Manufacturers Research Association Inc, 411:	3, 19, 20, 21, 61, 66, 67, 106, 107, 110, 111	
New Zealand Railways Corporation, 397:		80
Ngai Tahu Ltd, F1053:		6

North Bank Land Owners Group, 289: ..3, 18, 21, 23, 26, 37, 46, 58, 63, 67, 68, 72, 73, 78, 80, 87, 93, 94, 96, 97, 99, 102, 105, 106, 109, 111, 112	
NZ Forest Owners Assn, F1042: .5, 7, 30, 32, 39, 40, 43, 47, 48, 53, 54, 55, 56, 59, 64, 65, 71, 73, 75, 77, 81, 82, 83, 85, 115, 118, 121	
NZ Vegetable & Potato Growers Federation Inc et al, 541: ..5, 6, 18, 21, 22, 27, 92, 93, 94, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 103, 107, 108, 113, 119, 121, 124	
NZ Vegetable and Potato Growers and three other organisations, F1076: 3, 4, 5, 6, 23, 26, 30, 32, 67, 82, 85, 91, 94, 105, 106, 107, 109, 110, 111, 115, 118, 123	
Ontrack (NZ Railways Corporation), F1059:	3
R D Fenwick, 353:	63
Rangitata Diversion Race Irrigator Forum, 594:.....	7, 81, 83, 85, 86, 87, 91, 95, 97
Rangitata Diversion Race Management Ltd, 602:	7, 81, 83, 85, 86, 87, 91, 95, 97
Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society of NZ Inc, F1051:	3, 7, 27, 48, 64, 74, 80
Selwyn Central Community Board, 471:	33, 43, 45, 46, 49, 53, 55, 58, 64, 65, 88
Selwyn District Council, 334:	27, 33, 43, 44, 46, 48, 53, 55, 58, 64, 65, 88, 100, 101, 103
Selwyn District Council, F1002:.....	27, 100, 101, 103
Selwyn Plantation Board Limited, F1044: ...3, 5, 6, 7, 18, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 32, 33, 37, 39, 40, 41, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 61, 63, 64, 65, 67, 69, 71, 72, 73, 75, 78, 80, 81, 82, 83, 85, 86, 87, 88, 93, 94, 96, 97, 99, 100, 103, 104, 105, 107, 109, 111, 112, 115, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124	
Selwyn Plantation Board Ltd, 529:	5
South Island High Country Section, Federated Farmers NZ, 669:.. 7, 18, 22, 23, 26, 37, 47, 58, 63, 67, 69, 72, 74, 78, 81, 87, 93, 95, 96, 97, 99, 104, 105, 107, 109, 111, 112, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125	
Te Hapu O Ngati Wheke Rapaki Runanga Inc, 563:	6, 24, 28, 29, 30, 41, 61, 80, 101, 104
Te Runanga O Arowhenua Society Inc, 609:	113
Te Runanga O Ngai Tahu, 486:	24, 26, 29, 30, 41, 61, 80, 99, 100, 103
Te Taumutu Runanga, 559:.....	113
Timaru District Council, 539:	27, 33, 43, 45, 46, 47, 49, 53, 55, 59, 64, 89, 100, 101, 103
Timaru District Council, F1006:	27, 100, 101, 103
Transit New Zealand, 449:	4, 26, 38, 52, 62, 71, 79, 83, 88, 91, 94, 97, 102, 109, 118
Transit New Zealand, F1035:	26
Transpower New Zealand Ltd, 211:	3
TrustPower Limited, 379:.....	3, 81, 83, 85, 86, 87
Upper Waitaki Branch Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc, 257: . 3, 17, 21, 23, 26, 37, 46, 58, 63, 67, 68, 72, 73, 78, 80, 87, 93, 94, 96, 97, 99, 102, 105, 106, 109, 111, 112, 117, 118, 120, 122, 123, 124	
Waimakariri District Council, 448:	4, 6, 89
Waimakariri District Council, F1055:	6
Waimate District Council, 413:	33, 43, 45, 46, 49, 53, 55, 58, 64, 65, 88
Waitaki District Council, 352:.....	33, 43, 45, 46, 49, 53, 55, 58, 64, 65, 88
Winstone Aggregates, 513:	3
Winstone Aggregates, F1057:.....	3

Part 2: Submission summary, submission clarification, evaluation and recommendation on Chapter 8 Soil Conservation

8-0-0 General Submissions - Chapter 8 Soil Conservation (SCN)

8-0-0	55.4	Avon Heathcote Estuary Ihutai Trust	Provide consistency between Chapters 5 and 8 (see also submission point 55.3).
	F1043.4192	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.4152	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
8-0-0	55.21	Avon Heathcote Estuary Ihutai Trust	Introduce specific rules to avoid soil run off into spring-fed rivers, in Chapter 8.
	F1046.166	Department of Conservation	<i>Support</i>
	F1051.160	Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society of NZ Inc	<i>Support</i>
	F1059.417	Ontrack (NZ Railways Corporation)	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1060.708	Hurunui Community Water Development Working Group	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1061.708	MainPower NZ Ltd	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1074.628	Federated Farmers of NZ (Inc)	<i>Oppose</i>
8-0-0	211.61	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Retain the non-regulatory approach taken in Chapter 8 to soil conservation.
	F1057.196	Winstone Aggregates.	<i>Support</i>
	F1076.451	NZ Vegetable and Potato Growers and three other organisations	<i>Support</i>
8-0-0	213.2	Cashmere Park Trust	Add objectives, policies and rules in Chapter 8 to deal with the issue of soil erosion from increased flooding when rural land is converted to residential use or when a dam such as the Opuha is opened.
	F1074.629	Federated Farmers of NZ (Inc)	<i>Oppose</i>
8-0-0	257.1582	Upper Waitaki Branch Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-0-0	289.25	North Bank Land Owners Group	Amend Chapter 8 to have no reference to existing uses, works and developments requiring to be lawfully established. If established prior to July 2004, they should be permitted.
8-0-0	289.2103	North Bank Land Owners Group	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-0-0	379.158	TrustPower Limited	Retain the non-regulatory approach in Chapter 8 - Soil Conservation.
	F1003.40	Landco Pastoral Holdings Ltd	<i>Support in part.</i>
	F1043.649	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1044.649	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1057.197	Winstone Aggregates.	<i>Support</i>
8-0-0	411.35	New Zealand Fertiliser Manufacturers Research Association Inc	Carry the need highlighted in Chapter 8 to manage soils on a site specific basis based on their particular properties through to

			other sections of the plan.
	F1074.630	Federated Farmers of NZ (Inc)	<i>Support</i>
8-0-0	424.8	M S & K Meares	Delete all references to "natural state" and "high naturalness".
	F1074.631	Federated Farmers of NZ (Inc)	<i>Support</i>
8-0-0	433.42	Glendore (New Zealand) Ltd	Amend the various tables and provisions to correct and remove any reference to the Transitional Regional Plans, as having no effect once the NRRP becomes operative. Consider changing the Waimakariri and Opihi River Regional Plans to revise the rules relating to discharge to surface water to bring them in line with the NRRP.
8-0-0	433.43	Glendore (New Zealand) Ltd	Reformat and reorganise the rules on the following basis or similar: 1. Each activity should only be the subject of one rule. 2. Conditions should be applied consistently between each status of the activity. 3. Rules for specific activities should precede generic rules. 4. Rules should not refer to other rules to determine status. 5. Assessment matters should be developed in relation to each condition on an activity. 6. Activities which are permitted activities, which fail to meet one or more conditions of a permitted activity should be limited to the matters of non-compliance.
	F1074.632	Federated Farmers of NZ (Inc)	<i>Oppose</i>
8-0-0	433.57	Glendore (New Zealand) Ltd	Withdraw Chapter 8 and re-notify it with Assessment Matters included. Alternatively, defer any decisions on submissions until such a time as Assessment Matters have been introduced by way of a Variation.
8-0-0	433.61	Glendore (New Zealand) Ltd	Amend Chapter 8 by deleting all references to the provision of financial contributions as being an assessment matter.
8-0-0	448.209	Waimakariri District Council	Review effectiveness of proposed methods in Chapter 8 in the context of known erosion-prone areas such as Mt. Thomas.
8-0-0	449.242	Transit New Zealand	Clarify the intent of Chapter 8 - clearly identify in the Plan the issues, objectives, policies and methods that this chapter is intended to focus on agricultural activities, e.g. farming and grazing.
	F1074.633	Federated Farmers of NZ (Inc)	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1076.452	NZ Vegetable and Potato Growers and three other organisations	<i>Oppose</i>
8-0-0	476.30	Christchurch City Council	Avoid conflict between NRRP Chapters 5 & 8 provisions by clearly showing how the two chapters relate to each other and whether or not there is a hierarchy when determining which provisions apply. CCC seeks a mechanism to allow this to be determined on a case by case basis (see also submission point 476.29).
	F1027.117	Matariki Forests	<i>Support</i>

	F1042.328	NZ Forest Owners Assn	<i>Support</i>
	F1043.4170	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.4130	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
8-0-0	476.809	Christchurch City Council	Amend Chapter 8 to indicate that, as part of the integrated management required by the RMA, a lesser level of soil conservation is proposed in respect of land on the Port Hills, due to other significant values, such as the open character of this outstanding landscape and the biological diversity it provides.
	F1008.12	Avon Heathcote Estuary Ihutai Trust.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1074.634	Federated Farmers of NZ (Inc)	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1076.453	NZ Vegetable and Potato Growers and three other organisations	<i>Support in part / oppose in part</i>
8-0-0	506.1574	Hugh Turnbull	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-0-0	529.60	Selwyn Plantation Board Ltd	Delete or amend the objectives, policies and rules relating to soil conservation in order to establish a framework for management of soil conservation that: recognises existing investments in plantation forest by landowners and the existence of existing user's rights and resource consents held by plantation forest owners; provides appropriate recognition of the significant and varied benefits of plantation forestry as a sustainable land use; and enables establishment, maintenance and harvesting of plantation forest provided that the adverse effects of any such plantation are no more than minor.
	F1043.1028	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
8-0-0	540.24	Canterbury Growers Society Ltd	Rename Chapter 8 " <u>Land Management</u> ".
8-0-0	540.298	Canterbury Growers Society Ltd	Retain the non-regulatory approach of this plan notwithstanding the Federation's specific submission on 8.4.2 (refer 540.306), and the positive recognition of the achievements land users have and are making in the soil conservation area.
8-0-0	540.304	Canterbury Growers Society Ltd	Include maps or map overlays in Chapter 8 of the region that show just the two major groupings "arable" and "non-arable" to provide further certainty for plan users.
8-0-0	540.307	Canterbury Growers Society Ltd	Rename Chapter 8 " <u>Land Management</u> " or other words that are suitable to cover the inclusion of these additional matters.
8-0-0	541.24	NZ Vegetable & Potato Growers Federation Inc et al	Rename Chapter 8 " <u>Land Management</u> ".
8-0-0	541.298	NZ Vegetable & Potato Growers Federation Inc et al	Retain the non-regulatory approach of this plan notwithstanding the Federation's specific submission on 8.4.2 (refer 540.306), and the positive recognition of the

			achievements land users have and are making in the soil conservation area.
8-0-0	541.299	NZ Vegetable & Potato Growers Federation Inc et al	Rename Chapter 8 " <u>Land Management</u> ".
8-0-0	541.304	NZ Vegetable & Potato Growers Federation Inc et al	Include maps or map overlays in Chapter 8 of the region that show just the two major groupings "arable" and "non-arable" to provide further certainty for plan users.
8-0-0	541.307	NZ Vegetable & Potato Growers Federation Inc et al	Rename Chapter 8 " <u>Land Management</u> " or other words that are suitable to cover the inclusion of these additional matters.
8-0-0	544.368	Meridian Energy Ltd	Amend Chapter 8 to provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> An additional issue that soil conservation outcomes are achieved by measures that promote the sustainable management of resources. <input type="checkbox"/> Objectives and policies that integrate Chapter 8 with the rest of the chapters in the NRRP, and in particular Chapter 4 Water Quality and Chapter 5 Water Quantity. <input type="checkbox"/> Objectives and policies that promote the overall sustainable management of natural and physical resources <input type="checkbox"/> Certainty for existing consent holders that their existing rights will not be eroded by the methods proposed in this chapter. <input type="checkbox"/> Criteria for selecting methods to avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects on the soil resource. These should include the evaluation of consequential effects. <input type="checkbox"/> A well-designed and comprehensive monitoring program covering at minimum the life of the plan to determine the effect of the plan's non-regulatory measures.
	F1043.4102	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.4089	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
	F1053.1697	Ngai Tahu Ltd	<i>Support</i>
	F1055.129	Waimakariri District Council.	<i>Support</i>
	F1076.454	NZ Vegetable and Potato Growers and three other organisations	<i>Support</i>
8-0-0	563.353	Te Hapu O Ngati Wheke Rapaki Runanga Inc	Ensure that Chapter 8: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevents the removal of vegetation and soils where this will cause increased runoff and surface water flow and stressed plants. • Provides for native vegetation restoration or similar ecosystems to rehabilitate degraded sites. • Considers the impact of erosion on sites significant to Ngai Tahu.
	F1046.167	Department of Conservation	<i>Support</i>
8-0-	564.280	Hurunui District Council	Retain the non-regulatory approach in all

0			provisions except amendments made to Policy SCN1(a)(i), Explanation to Policy SCN1(1)(b), Policy SCN4(2), Policy SCN3, Method SCN4(a)(e), Method SCN5(c), Objective SCN1, Policy SCN1(a), Policy SCN1(b), Policy SCN1(d)(i), Method SCN1(a) and Policy SCN2(2).
8-0-0	569.6	Hurunui SNA Group Incorporated Society	Retain the non-regulatory approach of Chapter 8.
8-0-0	586.1574	Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces	Withdraw Chapter 8.
	F1043.3063	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.3052	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
	F1051.36	Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society of NZ Inc	<i>Oppose</i>
8-0-0	594.158	Rangitata Diversion Race Irrigator Forum	Retain the non-regulatory approach as provided within Chapter 8 - Soil Conservation of the Proposed Plan.
8-0-0	602.168	Rangitata Diversion Race Management Ltd	Retain the non-regulatory approach as provided within Chapter 8 - Soil Conservation of the Proposed Plan.
8-0-0	603.157	Carter Holt Harvey Forests	Withdraw Chapter 8 and redevelop it so that it achieves integrated management of the Region's natural and physical resources.
	F1042.157	NZ Forest Owners Assn	<i>Support</i>
	F1043.157	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.157	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
8-0-0	603.158	Carter Holt Harvey Forests	Amend Chapter 8 to clearly identify what the Council will do to achieve effective soil conservation in the Region.
	F1042.158	NZ Forest Owners Assn	<i>Support</i>
	F1043.158	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.158	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
8-0-0	603.159	Carter Holt Harvey Forests	Provide specific recognition of the benefits of woody vegetation in soil conservation and the role plantation forestry has played in the Region's soil conservation history and can play in providing landowners with an economic use of marginal land.
	F1042.159	NZ Forest Owners Assn	<i>Support</i>
	F1043.159	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.159	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
8-0-0	669.1570	South Island High Country Section, Federated Farmers NZ	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).

Evaluations and reasons

55.4, F1043.4192, F1044.4152: The submitter notes that there is overlap and inconsistency between Chapters 5 and 8 and identifies a specific concern with provisions in Chapter 8 where plantation forestry or other deep-rooted or tall vegetation could be considered for erosion prone land on the Port Hills. They state that these provisions are against policy of the Christchurch City Council.

F1043, F1044 supported the original submission for the reasons given by the submitter. The specific concern raised by the submitter relates to Policy SCN4 "Stabilisation of hill country slopes subject to deep-seated erosion" which encourages the planting of deep-rooted vegetation for slope stabilisation. The specific example identified by the submitter relates to the effect of tree planting on the outstanding landscape values of the Port Hills. The inconsistency referred to by the submitter between Chapter 5 and 8 refers to the encouragement of tree planting in Chapter 8 Policy SCN4 for slope stabilisation, and the controls limiting forestry planting in Chapter 5 Policy WQN6 in catchments where this may reduce water yield. The chapters of the NRRP deal with different aspects of the resource management functions of regional councils. They need to be read together to provide for the integrated management of resources. Where there is potential for conflict to occur between provisions in different chapters this should be identified by cross-referencing in each chapter. For example Chapter 8 Policy SCN4(3) recognises a number of values attached to land that may be affected by the planting of tree and shrub cover and states that planting to stabilise slopes should be undertaken in ways that "(b) avoid significant adverse effects on any important natural, landscape or amenity values for the area..." (addressing concerns raised by the submitter, in relation to the Port Hills) and "(d) minimise adverse effects on stream flows..." (referring specifically to flow-sensitive catchments in Chapter 5 NRRP). It is considered that the policy approach taken in Chapter 8 Policy SCN4 and Chapter 5 provides for consistency between chapters of the NRRP and minimises the potential for conflict in relation to the management of tall vegetation. For the reasons set out above, submission 55.4 and further submitters in support are rejected and no amendment is required.

55.21, F1046.166, F1051.160, F1059.417, F1060.708, F1061.708, F1074.628: The submitter 55.21 generally supports the non-regulatory approach to manage soil erosion in Chapter 8, but believes that there are some receiving water situations where more active management is required. They oppose the absence of rules to manage soil erosion as a result of earthworks in the catchments of spring fed streams.

F1046 supports 55.21 on the grounds that sedimentation has the potential to adversely affect instream habitat values.

F1051 supports the original submission on the grounds that soil runoff can have adverse effects on the biodiversity of spring fed streams.

F1059, F1060 and F1061 oppose 55.21 as "unwarranted" but provide no reasons for their opposition.

F1074 opposes 55.21 because it has supported the non-regulatory approach taken in Chapter 8.

The issue of sedimentation of spring-fed streams, raised by the submitter, is an issue for water quality so this issue is already addressed in Chapter 4 Water Quality: specifically Policies WQL4 and WQL5 and Rules WQL32-WQL34 control land use activities in the riparian margin that have the potential to result in sediment movement into rivers. Table WQL5 lists maximum sediment loadings for different stream types, and Rules WQL33 and WQL34 which set in place the conditions under which any disturbance of the margins of lakes and rivers can take place.

Chapter 8 addresses land use activities generally within the catchment that could result in the loss of soil, and sediment generation where it can get into water. Policy SCN5(d)(i) addresses the management of earthworks activities where these increase the risk of erosion occurring. The Explanation to Policy SCN5 acknowledges the potential impacts of erosion and sediment on water quality and instream health. The addition of rules to Chapter 8 is not considered to be necessary as this is already provided through Chapter 4. The addition of text to cross reference between policies in Chapters 4 and 8 addressing the issues of erosion, sedimentation and water quality and highlighting the specific issues for spring-fed streams would be a useful addition to provide clear linkages between the NRRP chapters for addressing this particular issue.

F1059, F1060, F1061 - The opposition is accepted in part, not because it is unwarranted to have rules to manage the issue of sedimentation, but because the issue is already addressed in Chapter 4 as outlined above.

F1074 - The opposition is accepted in part as the issue raised was an issue more appropriately dealt with elsewhere in NRRP.

For the reasons set out above, submission 55.21 and further submissions F1046.166, F1051.160, F1059.417, F1060.708, F1061.708 and F1074.628 are all accepted in part and an amendment is required to Chapter 8.

211.61, F1057.196, F1076.451; 379.158, F1003.40, F1043.649, F1044.649, F1057.197; 564.280, 569.6, 594.158, 602.168: All the original submitters listed support the non-regulatory approach taken in the chapter.

Submitters 211, 564, 569 supported the approach but with no reasons provided.

Submitters 379, 594, 602 supported the non-regulatory approach as being consistent with the RMA.

F1057, F1076 support the original submission point 211.61 without any additional reasons provided.

F1057 supports original submission point 379.158 for the reasons given by the original submitter.

F1003.40 supports the original submission point 379.158 on the basis that the chapter achieves the

outcomes sought with a non-regulatory approach.

F1043.649, F1044.649, oppose original submission 379 as it relates to the regulation of forestry planting. As this issue is not relevant to the matters raised in submission point 379.158, these further submissions are rejected.

To the extent that the submissions all support the current approach taken by Chapter 8, the submissions 211.61, 379.158, 564.280, 569.6, 594.158, 602.168 and further submissions F1057.196, F1076.451, F1003.40, F1057.197 are accepted. F1043.649, F1044.649 are rejected. No amendment is required.

213.2, F1074.629: The submitter has requested that new objectives, policies and rules are added to Chapter 8 to address flooding resulting from increased runoff from new subdivisions or from the management of dams.

F1074 - opposes the original submission on the grounds that they have supported the non-regulatory approach taken by Chapter 8 for addressing soil conservation issues.

The issue of urbanisation increasing flood flows is not a soil conservation issue and therefore is beyond the scope of Chapter 8. This issue is already being addressed through other chapters of the NRRP, together with specific, non-statutory, floodplain management strategies and through District Plan provisions.

Within the NRRP, Chapter 5 addresses the damming and diversion of water, including the setting of flow and level regimes, the management of surface runoff and land drainage, and the diversion of floodwaters (see Policy WQN4 and Rules WQN34-44). Chapter 6 has policies and rules applying to the construction and maintenance of dams, including conditions on permitted activities requiring the prevention of erosion or flooding as a result of dam management (see Policy BLR1 and Rules BLR1, 2, 7 and 8). Any dam of the scale of the Opuha Dam will require consent and will include consideration of the risk of failure and the consequences of this. Consents will also be required under the Building Act.

District and city councils control the effects of land use, including subdivision, through their district plans. This will include erosion and flooding resulting from land disturbance activities. It is therefore not necessary for regional plans to duplicate these controls. However, in relation to these activities territorial authorities will need to take into account the erosion-proneness of soils when setting consent conditions for subdivision activities.

F1074.629 - While this opposition is accepted, the original submission addresses a situation where land use activities can result in a range of adverse effects on resources other than the soil resource, which may require some form of control under the RMA.

For the reasons set out above, and to the extent that the points raised in the submission are already addressed by other chapters of the NRRP and other operative plans, submission 213.2 is rejected and further submission F1074.629 is accepted in part. No amendment is required.

289.25, 290.33, 433.43, F1074.632; 433.57, 433.61: The submitters have all included Chapter 8 in a range of global submissions dealing with regulatory aspects of NRRP Variation 1.

F1074 has opposed submission 433.43 on the grounds that it supports a non-regulatory approach to Chapter 8.

Chapter 8 has been included incorrectly as a consequence of submitters including all chapters in their submission, or saying, "delete all references (in NRRP) to..." As Chapter 8 has taken a non-regulatory approach to managing soil conservation issues, these submissions points are not relevant to the chapter. For the reasons set out above, submissions 289.25, 290.33, 433.43, 433.57 and 433.61 are all rejected. Further submission F1074.632 is accepted. No amendment is required.

411.35, F1074.630: The submitter states that the implication of soil properties varying over short distances is that different management options have to be applied according to the local situation.

F1074 - supports the submitter on the grounds that the "one size fits all" approach to soil management is impractical.

Chapter 8 recognises the variation in landforms and soils across the region by identifying eight "soil environment groups" in section 8.2.3 that share particular combinations of climate and landforms. Within each of these groups it is recognised that there will still be local variations that require different forms of management for soil conservation and erosion control. The policies in Chapter 8 recognise differences in soil types by focusing on specific management needs such as slope stability in soft rock hill country soil, wind and water erosion on arable soils and vegetation cover in high country soils. Each policy sets out a range of best practices for management plus a range of adverse effects that should be avoided where possible. This provides the basis for selecting management practices that are most suitable for a particular situation, based on the soil properties and the wider soil environment. It is considered that this approach provides for effective site-specific management of soils in the region.

To the extent that the point raised in the submission is already addressed by Chapter 8, submission 411.35 and further submission in support are accepted in part and no amendment is required.

424.8, F1074.631: The submitter asks that all references to "natural state" and "high naturalness" waterways be deleted from the plan. F1074 supports the original submission on the grounds that they

have opposed these terms in a number of submissions.

Chapter 8 does not make any reference to natural state or high naturalness waterways so the submission is not relevant to Chapter 8. For these reasons submission 424.8 and further submission in support are rejected and no amendment is required.

433.42: The submitter has asked that either the Variation is deleted in its entirety, or that amendments are made to explanations about the status of TRP rules once the NRRP becomes operative. The reasons for complete withdrawal of the plan have been based on the confusing nature of some of the provisions that identify the relationships between the various operative regional plans and the NRRP.

The TRP, as its name implies, is a transitional plan and there is a statutory process under the RMA for the review of the plan and the gradual withdrawal of provisions as they are covered by other regional plans. The provisions of the TRP for erosion control will continue to apply until they are replaced by operative provisions within a regional plan.

Dealing with Chapter 8 Soil Conservation specifically: because Chapter 8 contains no rules it will not alter the status of the TRP rules once it becomes operative. Table SCN1 correctly identifies that Chapter 8 contains no rules, but notes that applications for resource consents for land use activities under the TRP that relate to soil conservation must still have regard to any relevant provisions in the NRRP.

There is no reason to withdraw the entire NRRP to address any concerns with this relationship.

For the reasons set out above, submission 433.42 is rejected and no amendment is required.

448.209: The submitter questions the reliance on non-interventionist methods to achieve the objectives in Chapter 8. The submitter cites the example of Mt Thomas hill country where large-scale intervention was required to arrest land stability.

While Chapter 8 takes a non-regulatory approach to soil conservation and erosion control management, it cannot be said to be "non-interventionist" as it puts in place targets for achieving erosion control including tree planting for stabilising soft rock hill country slopes, vegetation cover restoration in non-arable hill and high country and reducing the rate of soil erosion on arable soils. The effectiveness of this non-regulatory approach will be reviewed on the basis of the comprehensive monitoring programme included in Chapter 8. While rules can control the scale and practices used for earthworks and soil disturbance activities, the way in which land is managed will have an influence on the risk of erosion occurring. For example the risk of deep-seated erosion on the loess-mantled slopes of North Canterbury will be reduced by the establishment of deep-rooted vegetation cover to maintain slope stability. Slopes with a pasture cover will be at greater risk of large erosion events. These erosion events will not always be a direct response to a specific land use activity, but can be triggered by climatic events such as prolonged or heavy rainfall. In the case of the example cited by the submitter is unlikely that rules would have prevented such an event, but best practice tree planting could have reduced the risk of erosion occurring, or the scale of the erosion event

Environment Canterbury also has a number of operative regional plans that include controls on land disturbance activities in parts of the region, including the Land and Vegetation Management Regional Plan (Parts I and II) and the Transitional Regional Plan. Chapter 8 includes a method to review all existing earthworks and vegetation clearance provisions in regional plans for Canterbury, with the aim to review their effectiveness and incorporate them into Chapter 8 of the NRRP to provide for the consistent and effective management of erosion across the region. It is considered that this combined approach will provide for the issues raised by the submitter.

To the extent that the points raised in the submission are already addressed through Chapter 8, submission 448.209 is accepted in part and no amendment is required.

449.242, F1074.633, F1076.452: The submitter states that from the issues, objectives and policies, it appears that the chapter is intended to focus on agricultural activities. If this is the intent then it needs to be clearly identified.

F1074, F1076: oppose the original submission on the grounds that any activity affecting soils should be managed on an equal basis.

Chapter 8 deals with the management of all soils in the region and all activities likely to affect soil quality or the risk of soil erosion. The chapter deals mainly with the rural parts of the region as urban subdivision and land use is addressed primarily through provisions in district plans. It is not the intent of the chapter to focus exclusively on farming activities though agriculture is the most extensive form of land use in the rural part of the region and some of the policies in Chapter 8 are specifically directed to farming activities and practices. Other policies, such as Policy SCN4 and SCN5 address soil conservation management issues that are applicable across a range of different land use activities. Policy SCN5, dealing with earthworks and vegetation clearance activities, includes roading and tracking activities as undertaken by the submitter. Earthworks is defined in the Definitions as including (but not limited to) "...the construction of roads, tracks, firebreaks and landings, and ground shaping (recontouring), root raking and blading." Issue SCN1 introduces the range of activities that are addressed through the objectives and policies of Chapter 8. The addition of a sentence to the Explanation to Issue SCN1 and Objective SCN1 to emphasise the applicability of the Objective to both agricultural and non-agricultural activities is

considered to be a useful way to cover the concerns raised by the submitter. For the reasons set out above the submission 449.242 is accepted in part and an amendment is required. The further submissions F1074.633, F1076.452 are accepted in part for their opposition as an amendment is required in response to the original submission.

476.30, F1027.117, F1042.328, F1043.4170, F1044.4130: The submitter wants the relationship between policies in Chapters 5 and 8 relating to the management of woody vegetation in flow-sensitive catchments to be made clearer. The areas identified for clarification are:

- (i) the existence of a hierarchy between the chapter provisions
- (ii) application of provisions to catchments not listed in Appendix WQN4
- (iii) ability to determine hierarchy between provisions on a case-by-case basis

F1027, F1042, F1043, F1044 - all further submissions support the original submission for the reasons given by the original submitter. Therefore the following evaluation applies to all the submissions and further submissions.

All the chapters of the NRRP should be read together to provide for the integrated management of resources. Where there are a number of provisions in different chapters applying to the management of woody vegetation the regulatory provisions will carry more weight than the non-regulatory ones. So the rules applying to forestry planting in Chapter 5 will have to be complied with, whereas the non-regulatory methods in Chapters 5 and 8 cannot compel compliance or co-operation. Where no rules apply to an activity, then all methods have equal weight and the methods likely to provide the greatest opportunity for success can be chosen on a case-by-case basis. This decision was applied to both Chapter 5 and Chapter 8, so the following evaluation will apply specifically to Chapter 8.

The key policies applying to tree planting and management of woody vegetation in Chapter 8 are Policies SCN1 and SCN4 which focus on vegetation management for minimising the risk of erosion. Each of these policies in Chapter 8 already contains a reference to the water yield issue addressed in Chapter 5 but specific reference to Policy WQN6 which has rules under it, could be included in Policies SCN1(d)(iii) and SCN4(6). This will make clearer the need to comply with regulatory provisions on this issue and provide a better basis for ensuring integration between the chapters. This would need to be accompanied by additional explanatory text within the Explanation for each policy.

The submitter makes reference to catchments "not listed in Appendix WQN4 or Schedule WQN15 that may meet the criteria for 'flow-sensitive catchments' described in Issue WQN2". Appendix WQN4 lists all the flow-sensitive catchments that are of concern under Issue WQN2. The management of woody vegetation for water yield only applies to those catchments listed in Appendix WQN4.

For the reasons set out above the submission 476.30 and the further submissions F1027.117, F1042.328, F1043.4170 and F1044.4130 are accepted in part and an amendment is required.

476.809, F1008.12, F1074.634, F1076.453: The submitter states that soil conservation is just one of a number of issues to be considered under the RMA, and that the extent to which soil conservation objectives are achieved in any particular situation will be dependent on the importance of other considerations such as protection of landscape values and providing for economic well-being. With respect to the Port Hills, the submitter suggests that a lesser level of soil conservation is achieved in order to protect the range of other values identified for the area.

F1008, F1074 oppose the suggestion of a lesser level of soil conservation for the Port Hills in order to achieve protection of the natural values of the area.

F1076 supports an integrated approach, but not any changes to provisions with respect to the Port Hills issue raised.

It is agreed with the submitter that soil conservation should not be considered in isolation from other issues under the RMA. However safeguarding the life-supporting capacity of the soil is a s5(2)(b) matter and therefore ranks above matters set out in sections 6-8 of the RMA. Without long-term protection of the soil resource, life-supporting capacity will suffer and if that happens it is quite likely that the landscape and economic and social well-being concerns raised by the submitter will not be achieved either.

The Port Hills are highly erosion prone and subject to tunnel gullying, slips and slumping. Poorly vegetated areas slipped extensively in the 1980's after prolonged rain. The type of vegetation cover over these soils will have a significant influence on slope stability. A lesser level of soil conservation for these slopes, as suggested by the submitter, will increase the risk of soil erosion which will put more sediment into the streams draining the Port Hills and out into the Heathcote Estuary. This would be contrary to both s5 and s6 of the RMA.

The focus for policies in Chapter 8 is soil conservation, however each policy identifies the range of other values and resources that may be affected by soil conservation measures to provide for an integrated approach to management. The Chapter also emphasises that many of the values identified will be dependent on maintaining the quality and quantity of soils. It may be that the outcome in some situations will involve some compromise to soil conservation resources to maintain other values, provided that this does not impact on the long-term sustainability of those resources. This will have to be addressed on a case-by-case basis. Addressing the protection of values for the Port Hills, as presented by the submitter, will require the significance of any adverse effects to be weighed against the benefits of soil conservation

measures and the risks of not undertaking the soil conservation measures. It is considered that the structure of the policies and methods in Chapter 8 provide the basis for undertaking this assessment. The reasons provided by the further submitters are accepted. The key to integrated management is to look at the range of options for management to achieve the most effective outcomes for all values. For the reasons set out above, submission 476.809 is rejected and further submissions F1008.12, F1074.634 and F1076.453 are accepted. No amendment is required.

529.60, F1043.1028: The submitter requests the deletion or revision of all objectives policies and rules in Chapter 8 that affect the planting, maintenance and harvesting of plantation forest and the establishment of a framework for management of soils that recognises existing investment in plantation forestry and enables the establishment and maintenance of plantation forestry provided the effects are no more than minor. The submitter claims that there has been inadequate assessment of the consequences on landowners interested in planting plantation forestry arising from the approach taken in the chapter, including an inadequate s32 analysis. There are three areas that the submitter wishes to see recognised in the chapter:

- (i) recognise existing use rights and existing investment of landowners for plantation forestry
- (ii) recognise the benefits of plantation forestry as a sustainable land use
- (iii) enable plantation forestry as a land use providing the effects are no more than minor.

F1043.28 supports the original submission for the reasons given by the submitter.

The submission appears to be based on the presumption that Chapter 8 contains rules that restrict the use of land for plantation forestry. This is not the case. Chapter 8 uses non-regulatory methods to achieve its policies and objectives. In this regard the point raised by the submitter that "the objectives, policies and rules are unduly restrictive and/or uncertain and inconsistent with the Resource Management Act 1991" is incorrect and is not accepted. No specific examples are provided to illustrate how the approach taken "is an inappropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act" or "not an efficient or effective means of exercising the Council's functions under the Act". The Section 32 document provides an assessment of the effectiveness of a non-regulatory approach compared with the use of regulation to achieve the objectives of the chapter and the purpose of the RMA.

Regional plans under the RMA deal with the integrated management of resources and minimising adverse effects of activities. Recognition of specific activities is only made in terms of their ability to contribute to sustainable management of resources, and in the case of Chapter 8 for the conservation of soils through improved soil quality or reduced risk of erosion. As the chapter contains no rules for land use activities, the recognition of existing use rights is not relevant - there are no controls limiting any land use or existing use.

In regard to recognising the benefits of plantation forestry as a sustainable land use, the chapter deals with the benefits of land use activities for soil conservation, and specific mention is made of the benefits of establishing deep-rooted vegetation cover, such as plantation forestry, to stabilise land subject to deep-seated forms of erosion, and to improve the intactness and resilience of vegetation cover on hill country land. Under Sec 9 of the RMA the use of land is allowed as of right unless specifically controlled by rules in a regional or district plan. In this regard the chapter places no controls on the establishment and management of plantation forest and already meets the decision sought by the submitter. There is no reason to delete or revise any provisions to address the concerns raised.

For the reasons set out above the submission and the further submission are rejected. No amendment is required.

540.24, 540.307, 541.24, 541.299, 541.307: The submitters seek to rename the chapter "Land Management" to recognise the wider coverage of land uses. They consider that the name "Soil Conservation" is misleading and too confining.

The focus for the Chapter is soil conservation and policies address land use and land management in terms of the contribution they make towards the conservation of soil quality and quantity. Other chapters of the NRRP also deal with "land management" as it relates to water quality, water quantity, wetlands or the beds of rivers. Chapter 8 should not be read in isolation from other chapters of the NRRP, all chapters are designed to be read together as an integrated document. Retaining the title "Soil Conservation" for Chapter 8 is considered to accurately reflect the issues being dealt with in this Chapter. For these reasons, all of the submissions are rejected and no amendment is required.

540.298, 541.298: Both submitters support the non-regulatory approach taken and also the positive recognition given of the achievements land users have and are making. These submissions are accepted and no amendment is required.

540.304, 541.304: The submitters are seeking clarification of the relationship between the two groupings of soils in the chapter. They want maps of "arable" and "non-arable" land to be included in Chapter 8. Figures SCN2 (divided as SCN2.1, SCN2.2) and SCN3 in Chapter 8 already identify areas of non-arable and arable soils respectively, with an indication of their susceptibility to erosion from land use activities. For consistency, Figure SCN3 should be enlarged to the same scale as Figures SCN2.1 and SCN2.2.

This would provide a clearer comparison of the location and extent of areas of arable and non-arable soils in the region and also provide a basis for comparison with Figures SCN1.1 and 1.2 which describe the eight soil environment groups. For these reasons, the submissions are accepted and an amendment is required.

544.368, F1043.4102, F1044.4089, F1053.1697, F1055.129, F1076.454: The submitter suggests that the Soil Conservation Chapter needs to be more comprehensive in promoting the sustainable management of all resources not just the soil resource. Closer integration with the objectives and policies of other chapters of the NRRP is requested to achieve this. A number of changes are requested:

- (i) a new issue, objectives and policies to achieve soil conservation outcomes by measures that promote the sustainable management of all resources
- (ii) integration with the rest of the chapters in the NRRP, particularly Chapters 4 and 5
- (iii) certainty for existing use rights
- (iv) criteria for selection of methods to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects
- (v) comprehensive monitoring programme

No suggestions for wording changes, new issues, objectives etc are provided by the submitter in relation to this submission.

F1043.4102, F1044.4089 - oppose the whole submission based on their opposition to any increase in regulatory control of activities related to plantation forests sought by the submitter that is unnecessary or inconsistent with the RMA. This is not relevant to the submission point raised here so the opposition is rejected.

F1053.1697 - have supported the original submission on the grounds that the amendment sought will provide a more appropriate balance between environmental protection and social and economic considerations and better achieve the purpose of the RMA.

F1055.129 - have submitted in support of the original submission for the reasons given by the original submitter.

F1076.454 - have supported the original submitter on the grounds that the amendments will ensure the focus is on sustainable management and provide certainty

The submitter requests a number of changes to the chapter and the following evaluation addresses each one in turn as listed above.

1. New issue: All objectives in the NRRP set outcomes that promote the sustainable management of resources. To do otherwise would not be consistent with the RMA. Rather than identifying a separate issue, objectives and policies to promote sustainable management, as suggested by the submitter, sustainable management should be the cornerstone principle behind every objective, policy and method in the Chapter. On the basis that the concerns raised by the submitter are considered to be already provided for by the policies in Chapter 8, and because the submitter has not provided any wording suggestions for a new issue, this suggestion is not accepted.

2. Integration between chapters: All chapters in the NRRP are designed to be read together as an integrated document. While each chapter deals with different resources and resource issues, objectives and policies are cross-referenced between the chapters to show the linkages that need to be made to achieve the integrated management of resources. For example in the Soil Conservation Chapter, Policy SCN2 dealing with soil quality management refers specifically to Chapter 4 Water Quality chapter and the requirements to avoid the leaching of nutrients into the groundwater or discharge into surface water. Policy SCN4 which promotes the establishment of deep-rooted tree cover to achieve slope stabilisation makes specific reference to the possible effects of tree planting on stream flows in those flow-sensitive catchments identified in Chapter 5 Water Quantity and identifies the preferred option of using spaced plantings in these catchments. It is considered that Chapter 8 already provides for the integration requested by the submitter.

3. Certainty for existing use rights: Concern is raised at the promotion of irrigation as a method to reduce erosion risk and the implications of this on existing use rights. The use of irrigation is recognised as a means to maintain soil moisture levels, but it is only one option and it is emphasised that this should be undertaken in conjunction with good soil conservation management practices. Any use of water for irrigation will require a resource consent under s14 RMA. Chapter 5 Water Quantity has policies for water allocation that limit water use to safeguard instream values and maintain reliability of supply for existing users. This will provide certainty for existing use rights. Policies in Chapters 5 and 8 will together provide for the integrated management of water use for irrigation and soil conservation management that should satisfy the concerns raised by the submitter.

4. Criteria for the selection of methods: The submitter suggests the Chapter has not identified the consequential effects of different measures to achieve the outcomes to enable land owners to choose the most effective and efficient option. Examples given by the submitter include the use of exotics or indigenous species for vegetation restoration, the planting of forestry and the use of fertilisers. Policies in Chapter 8 provide for the concerns raised by the submitter by the inclusion of sub-clauses highlighting the potential adverse effects that should be avoided, such as effects on biodiversity values, landscape values, stream flows and water quality. The evaluation of these effects will need to be done on a case-by-case basis to select the most effective option for a particular situation. Individual landholders are

ultimately responsible for what happens on their land and they are encouraged to apply their own farming expertise, or seek advice, to establish the most effective option for maintaining soil resources. Again the chapters should be read together to provide for the integrated management of resources and to minimise adverse effects of the management of one resource on another.

5. Detailed monitoring programme: Chapter 8 already contains a detailed monitoring programme with indicators for determining the effectiveness of the policies and methods and the contribution of the methods to achievement of the outcomes. The monitoring programme will run over the life of the plan and will be used to assess whether any change is required to the non-regulatory approach to achieve the outcomes sought for soil conservation. The submitter does not comment on the existing monitoring programme, or identify what changes they would like to see made to make it more comprehensive.

For the reasons set out above, and to the extent that the points raised by the submitter are already addressed within the soil conservation chapter, the submission and the further submissions F1053.1697, F1055.129, F1076.454 are accepted in part. Further submissions F1043.4102, F1044.4089 are rejected. No amendment is required.

563.353, F1046.167: The submitter raises a number of aspects in relation to the management of land use where it has the potential to adversely affect mahinga kai, fauna and wahi tapu sites. They are supportive of the restoration of native vegetation, particularly for management of significant sites for Ngai Tahu, but recognise the primary need to prevent or manage soil degradation leading to erosion.

F1046.167 has supported the original submission as being in accordance with the purpose and principles of the RMA.

Chapter 8 gives consideration through its policies to the impact of any management practice or restorative practice on sites of significance to Ngai Tahu. In the absence of any specific relief being sought by the submitter, it is considered that the Chapter already addresses the issues raised by the submitter.

For the reasons set out above, the submission and further submission are accepted. No amendment required.

257.1582, 289.2103, 506.1574, 586.1574, 669.1570, F1043.3063, F1044.3052, F1051.36: The submitter 586.1574 requests that Chapter 8 is withdrawn as it provides no more than Chapter 7 of the CRPS. Submissions 257, 289, 506 and 669 endorse all points listed in submission 586 for the reasons stated in that submission.

F1043 and F1044 support submission 586 for the reasons stated by the submitter

F1051 opposes submission 586 on the grounds that soil conservation is an important matter and part of sustainable management.

Chapter 8 builds on the Issues, Objectives and Policies in the CRPS by creating policies and methods that are more detailed and specific, setting targets for outcomes and establishing a detailed monitoring programme to monitor progress and the effectiveness of the NRRP. Chapter 8 is complementary to the CRPS - it doesn't duplicate the policies as suggested. The absence of rules is not a valid reason to remove Chapter 8. The Chapter states clearly in each set of methods that "... during the life of the plan the effectiveness and efficiency of this non-regulatory approach will be monitored. Any changes to the present methods, including a need to consider adding rules to the mix of methods, will be based on that monitoring." Having a chapter for soil conservation in a regional plan provides a framework to monitor and review progress towards the achievement of the objectives and policies of the CRPS.

For the reasons set out above, submissions 257.1582, 289.2103, 506.1574, 586.1574, 669.1570 and further submissions F1043.3063, F1044.3052 are rejected. Further submission F1051.36 is accepted. No amendment is required.

603.157, F1042.157, F1043.157, F1044.157: The submitter requests withdrawal of the Chapter on the grounds that it fails to achieve the integrated management of resources. The submitter claims that the Chapter fails to provide clear guidance for protection and restoration of soils and fails to recognise the benefits of commercial plantation forestry. No wording changes to the provisions are proposed by the submitter to achieve this.

F1042, F1043 and F1044 support the original submission and the reasons provided by the submitter. The soil conservation chapter is designed to be read in conjunction with the rest of the NRRP chapters to achieve the integrated management of resources. References and cross references to other chapters throughout Chapter 8 provide for this integration.

In response to the claimed lack of guidance, Policy SCN1 deals specifically with the restoration of soils where vegetation cover has been depleted by providing guidance for best management practices and establishing priorities for restoration. Policies SCN2 - 5 all deal with the protection of "at risk" soils addressing specific aspects of managing soil quality and erosion risk. The policies are not prescriptive, but provide a framework for addressing the management of soils including criteria for assessment of degradation or erosion risk, priorities for management and setting targets for achieving objectives. A detailed monitoring programme is set out to determine progress towards the objectives and targets and to

determine the effectiveness of the non-regulatory approach.

The benefits of plantation forestry are specifically identified in relation to slope stabilisation and the restoration of an intact and resilient vegetation cover, but are tempered with the need to prevent any undesirable adverse effects of such plantings where there is a risk of wilding spread or effects on low flows in water-short catchments - these are key issues for the integrated management of resources and recognition of the range of values attached to the land. Minimising adverse effects on other values or resources applies to all plantings for restoration or slope stabilisation (see Policy SCN1(d) and Policy SCN4(3)) - it is not focused on plantation forestry as suggested.

Overall it is considered that Chapter 8 provides for the long-term sustainable management of soil resources, and in conjunction with other chapters of the NRRP enables the integrated management of natural resources.

For the reasons set out above, the submission 603.157 and the further submissions F1042.157, F1043.157 and F1044.157 are rejected. No amendment is required.

603.158, F1042.158, F1043.158, F1044.158: The submitter wants the chapter amended on the grounds that it does not go far enough in identifying and establishing a clear programme to achieving effective soil conservation in the region.

F1042.158, F1043.158, F1044.158 - all support the original submission for the reasons provided by the submitter.

It is considered that the objectives, policies and methods for soil conservation in Chapter 8 establish quite clearly what the Council will do to achieve effective soil conservation. The policies are not prescriptive, but provide a framework for management of soils including criteria for assessment of degradation or erosion risk, priorities for management and setting targets for achieving objectives. The methods under each policy are prefaced by "Environment Canterbury will" to identify clearly the actions that the Council will undertake to implement each policy. This includes investigating, identifying and providing information on the effectiveness of a range of techniques for vegetation restoration, nutrient management, grazing management, slope stabilisation, protection of natural and cultural values and best practices for tracking, earthworks and vegetation clearance activities. The provision of information on location of erosion-prone soils, appropriate species for vegetation management of degraded land, identification of important values etc enables landowners to select the most appropriate options for individual situations. A detailed monitoring programme in section 8.8 of the chapter provides indicators and methods to monitor the effectiveness of each policy and methods in achieving the environmental results anticipated. .

For the reasons set out above, and to the extent that the points raised in the submissions are already addressed in Chapter 8, the submission 603.158 and the further submissions F1042.158, F1043.158 and F1044.158 are rejected. No amendment is required.

603.159, F1042.159, F1043.159, F1044.159: The submitter wants the chapter to provide more specific recognition of benefits of woody vegetation for soil conservation and economic values.

F1042.159, F1043.159, F1044.159 - support the original submission for the reasons given by the submitter.

Chapter 8 already does recognise the benefits of woody vegetation for soil conservation, particularly the benefits of extensive, deep-rooted vegetation for slope stabilisation. This is found in the discussion of issues in section 8.4.1.2.2 and in Policies SCN1 and SCN4 where the benefits of plantation forestry are specifically identified in relation to the restoration of an intact and resilient vegetation cover and for slope stabilisation. Methods under these policies will provide specific information on techniques and management practices to achieve effective stabilisation of soils. The focus for the chapter and the promotion of woody vegetation establishment is soil conservation and the prevention of erosion. Whether or not this provides landowners with an economic return should be seen as a spin-off from soil conservation planting rather than an objective for soil conservation management.

The submitter requests inserting a historical overview to illustrate the role for forestry. This is already provided in Section 8.4.1.2.2(b) which refers to the role for deep-rooted vegetation on slopes subject to deep-seated forms of erosion and past studies that have established the value of woody vegetation cover for stabilisation of slopes. Including additional examples may reinforce the role of forestry for slope stabilisation but does not actually add anything new to the information already provided.

For the reasons set out above, and to the extent that the points raised by the submitter are already addressed by the Soil conservation chapter, the submission 603.159 and further submissions F1042.159, F1043.159 and F1044.159 are rejected and no amendment is required.

633.5: The submitter states that the provisions in Chapter 8 relating to soil conservation values of Lyttelton Harbour Basin (and wider Banks Peninsula) are not adequate in terms of meeting the major development issues likely to be faced by the area within the life of the NRRP. More comprehensive provisions are requested to protect the water quality values of the area in relation to soil conservation management. The submitter does not clarify in what areas they consider the provisions are inadequate. The provisions in Chapter 8 are primarily focused on the achievement of sound soil conservation management through the encouragement of best management practice to maintain soil quality and

vegetation cover to minimise the risk of erosion. Some aspects of land management are also addressed through other chapters of the NRRP where they have an effect on other resources. For example where any land use activities increases the potential for erosion then this also increases the risk of sedimentation of water bodies with runoff from exposed areas of soils. The management of land use activities, particularly in the riparian margins, to control non-point discharges (including sediment) into water bodies is addressed in Chapter 4 specifically for its effects on water quality. All chapters of the NRRP should be read together to provide for an integrated approach to the management of resources. It is not necessary for Chapter 8 to duplicate provisions already found in the other chapters.

There are also a number of other operative regional plans for Canterbury that address soil conservation and control land disturbance activities in parts of the region. In Chapter 8, Policy SCN5 includes Method SCN5(b) to identify the extent of erosion-prone soils in the region and review the adequacy and effectiveness of existing controls and methods for managing soil erosion risk throughout the region (in other regional plans) and any changes required to the scope and extent of these controls. This will include a review of the Land and Vegetation Management Regional Plan Part II which deals with earthworks and vegetation clearance activities on the Port Hills. The results of the review will establish what mix of rules and what extent of controls should apply across the region. These controls will be incorporated into the NRRP Chapter 8 by way of variation or plan change with full public consultation.

A comprehensive monitoring programme developed for each chapter of the NRRP and will be used to review the effectiveness of the provisions to meet the outcomes for soil and water conservation over the 10 year life of the Chapter. This should identify any areas where the Chapter 8 is not meeting its objectives and where changes are required. In combination, this set of provisions and the process of their review should address the concerns of the submitter to protect water quality values.

For the reasons set out above, and to the extent that the points raised in the submission are already addressed through the suite of chapters in the NRRP, the submission 633.5 is accepted in part and no amendment required.

SCN1.1. Recommendation

211.61, 379.158, 540.298, 540.304, 541.298, 541.304, 563.353, 564.280, 569.6, 594.158, 602.168, F1003.40, F1008.12, F1046.167, F1051.36, F1057.196, F1057.197, F1074.632, F1074.634, F1076.451, F1076.453: Accept

55.21, 411.35, 448.209, 449.242, 476.30, 633.5, F1027.117, F1042.328, F1043.4170, F1044.4130, F1046.166, F1051.160, F1053.1697, F1055.129, F1059.417, F1060.708, F1061.708, F1074.628, F1074.629, F1074.630, F1074.633, F1076.452, F1076.454: Accept in part

55.4, 213.2, 257.1582, 289.25, 289.2103, 290.33, 424.8, 433.42, 433.43, 433.57, 433.61, 476.809, 506.1574 529.60, 540.24, 540.307, 541.24, 541.299, 541.307, 544.368, 586.1574, 603.157, 603.158, 603.159, 669.1570, F1042.157, F1042.158, F1042.159, F1043.157, F1043.158, F1043.159, F1043.649, F1043.1028, F1043.3063, F1043.4102, F1043.4192, F1044.157, F1044.158, F1044.159, F1044.649, F1044.3052, F1044.4089, F1044.4152, F1074.631: Reject

Amendment

1. Enlarge Figure SCN3, page 8-22, to the same scale as Figures SCN1 and SCN2.

2. Amend Objective SCN1 Explanation, page 8-29, by adding the following paragraph to the beginning of the Explanation:

"Objective SCN1 addresses (a) and (b) of Issue SCN1, including any land use activity that has the potential to significantly affect soil quality or increase the risk of soil erosion on hill and high country non-arable land. This will include both agricultural and non-agricultural land uses.

This Objective addresses....."

3. Amend Policy SCN1(d)(iii), page 8-30, to read:

"(iii) significant adverse effects on stream flows, in flow-sensitive catchments listed in Chapter 5 Appendix WQN4. In particular activities will have to comply with"

4. Amend Policy SCN1 Explanation and principal reasons, page 8-32, last paragraph, to read:

"Other chapters of this plan have policies and rules relating to the management of vegetation: Chapter 5 Water Quantity has rules under Policy WQN6 to controls the"

5. Amend Policy SCN4(6), page 8-38, to read:

"In flow-sensitive catchments where this will achieve effective stabilisation of the slopes and meet the requirements for Policy WQN6 in Chapter 5: Water Quantity. (See Chapter 5 Appendix WQN4.....)"

6. Amend Policy SCN4 Explanation and principal reasons, page 8-39, para 6 to read:
 "Widely, or strategically spaced plantingsIn those catchments sensitive to the effects of afforestation on water yield listed in Appendix WQN4, or scattered plantings where this is able to achieve the stability required. For flow-sensitive catchments listed in Chapter 5 Schedule WQN15, any planting undertaken must comply with the rules under Policy WQN6.

7. Amend Policy SCN5 Explanation, para 1 page 8-42 to read:
 ".....may lead to adverse effects on water quality, and on the health of the aquatic instream environment. This is a particular issue for spring-fed streams in inland basins and lowlands that have limited flushing capability to dilute or disperse the sediment load. Management of land use activities in the riparian margins to minimise sediment movement into streams is addressed under Chapter 4 Water Quality, Policies WQL4 and WQL5. Sediment movement down slope...."

8-1-1 8.1 Introduction

8-1-1	476.808	Christchurch City Council	Amend 8.1 Introduction to reflect the fact that soil conservation is but one of the issues requiring consideration to appropriately achieve the purpose of the RMA, and that other resource management issues may affect the extent to which soil conservation is achieved, e.g. The maintenance of outstanding natural landscapes, or providing for the social and economic wellbeing of persons and the community.
-------	---------	---------------------------	--

Evaluations and reasons

476.808: The submitter wants the Soil Conservation Chapter to recognise that soil conservation is only one of many issues requiring consideration under the RMA and that other resource management issues will affect the extent to which soil conservation is achieved.

The role of regional plans is to achieve the integrated management of natural resources. While the NRRP is broken into chapters dealing with specific resources, these chapters are not intended to be read in isolation but are cross-referenced to identify where the management of one resource may have implications for other resources or values. Thus soil conservation will not be achieved in isolation from the consideration of the needs of other resources and values.

The submitter raises concerns that the achievement of soil conservation may be at the expense of protecting other values or providing for the social and economic wellbeing of people and communities. In relation to this concern, it is considered that the long-term sustainable management of soils will be fundamental to providing for the social and economic needs of present and future generations. It is not agreed that the conservation of one resource will necessarily be at the expense of another resource. Other resource management needs may influence the options taken to address soil conservation issues, but should not be at the expense of sustainable management.

The opening paragraph of the Soil Conservation Chapter establishes the interdependence of soils and other resources. Adding another sentence to explain how the Soil Conservation chapter works together with other chapters of the NRRP would illustrate how the integrated management of resources is achieved through his plan and provide for the concerns raised by the submitter.

For the reasons set out above the submission is accepted in part and an amendment is required.

SCN1.2. Recommendation

476.808: Accept in part

Amendment

Amend paragraph 1 in 8.1, page 8-1, Introduction to read:

"Soils, together with air and water The quality and depth of soils will vary from place to place, and over time, in response to natural processes and the influence of human use. An integrated approach to resource management requires that soil conservation is not undertaken in isolation from the management of other resources and the protection of the range of values held for the wider environment. Throughout this Chapter there are links made to other chapters of the Natural Resources Regional Plan (NRRP) to identify where the management of land for soil conservation affects, or is affected by, the management of other resources."

8-1-21 8.1.1 Progress in soil conservation management

8-1-21	257.1583	Upper Waitaki Branch Federated Farmers	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
--------	----------	--	--

		Of New Zealand Inc	
8-1-21	289.2104	North Bank Land Owners Group	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-1-21	506.1575	Hugh Turnbull	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-1-21	586.1575	Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces	Retain Section 8.1.1.
	F1043.3064	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.3053	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
8-1-21	669.1571	South Island High Country Section, Federated Farmers NZ	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).

Evaluations and reasons

257.1583, 289.2104, 506.1575, 586.1575, F1043.3064, F1044.3053; 669.1571:

The submitters all seek to retain section 8.1.1 of the Introduction on the grounds that it provides an excellent review of progress in soil conservation management.

F1043, F1044 - support submitter 586 for the reasons provided by the submitter.

The support of the submitters and further submitters is recognised, however as an amendment has been recommended on the basis of another submitter, the submissions and further submissions are accepted in part. No amendment is required.

SCN1.3. Recommendation

257.1583, 289.2104, 506.1575, 586.1575, 669.1571, F1043.3064, F1044.3053 : Accept in part

Amendment

Nil

8-2-24 8.2 Background

8-2-24	540.301	Canterbury Growers Society Ltd	Add to, or amend 8.2 Background as necessary to clarify how the eight different soil groups fall within the two broad categories of "arable" and "non-arable".
8-2-24	541.301	NZ Vegetable & Potato Growers Federation Inc et al	Add to, or amend 8.2 Background as necessary to clarify how the eight different soil groups fall within the two broad categories of "arable" and "non-arable".
8-2-46	472.1	Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc, Mackenzie Branch	Delete 8.2.1(f) re the link between Ngai Tahu values and life-supporting capacity of soil.

Evaluations and reasons

540.301, 541.301: The submitters find the Chapter confusing in the way it jumps from a discussion of the eight soil environment groups in the Background to use of arable and non-arable soils for the objectives and policies. They support the simplicity of the categories "arable" and "non-arable" but want the connections to the eight soil groups clarified within the text.

The eight soil environment groups provide broad groupings of landforms and soils within the region at a level that can be used to identify common physical and environmental issues that will be significant for the management of soil quality and erosion risk. Each group has distinctive characteristics, but there is still considerable variation of soil types within them reflecting smaller scale changes in climate, topography and the location of soils in the landscape. This has been summarised in Appendix SCN1(a)-(h) which provides an overview of each soil group. The arable/non-arable split is based on the capability of soils for land use with arable soils having the least limitation to use and the ability for sustained intensive production. Non-arable soils have more limitations for the intensity and types of land use that can be sustained.

Canterbury contains the most extensive area of arable for any region in New Zealand. Objectives and policies in Chapter 8 have therefore focused separately on arable and non-arable soils recognising the different management requirements for intensive versus extensive land use activities. Across the range of

non-arable land, the soil environment groups provide a framework to identify the major limitations to land use based on climatic and topographic influences, soil structure and on the vulnerability of soils to erosion. An addition to the information provided in the Background to explain the land use capability classification and the link between soil environment groups and the arable and non-arable soils would provide the clarification sought by the submitter and improve the usefulness of the chapter as a guide to best management of soils in the Canterbury region.

For the reasons set out above, the submissions are accepted and an amendment is required.

472.1: The submitter claims that including clause (f) in Section 8.2.1 is advocating for one particular world view, with the implication that others do not have similar or different world views. Section 8.2.1 lists a number of issues of importance for soil conservation that are relevant to achieving the purpose of the RMA, with particular reference to matters of national importance. This includes factors relating to the long-term, sustainable management of soils and the protection of natural cultural and amenity values placed on the land and providing for the social and economic well-being of present and future generations. The relationship of Maori and their traditions with their ancestral lands is a matter of national importance that must be provided for under s6 of the RMA. Clause (f) in the Background text does not advocate any particular view but explains the link between Maori traditional values and concepts of sustainable management. Other values held by the community are also included in this section as issues to include in soil conservation management: Clause (e) lists a range of values held by the community, while clause (g) identifies the economic and productive importance of soils to the region. All of these values are required to be addressed as part of the sustainable management of soils. For the reasons set out above the submission is rejected and no amendment is required.

SCN1.4. Recommendation

540.301, 541.301: Accept

472.1: Reject

Amendment

1. Insert a new sub section 8.2.2.5 **Soils and land use capability**

"Section 8.2.2 provides an overview of the major landforms making up the Canterbury landscape and the soils formed from them. The suitability and limitations of these soils for different land uses has been identified through the development of a Land Use Capability Classification (LUC) (Ministry of Works, 1969). The distribution of each soil class is based on the mapping of New Zealand soils in the 1970s. The classification has eight classes with increasing limitations to land use from Class I to Class VIII. Classes I to IV are defined as land suitable for arable use, classes V to VII are defined as land not suitable for arable use but suitable for pastoral or forestry use, and Class VIII is land not suitable for any form of primary production. There are increasing limitations for arable use from Class I to IV and to pastoral or forestry use from Class V to VII. The types of limitations to use may be due to a mixture of climatic, topographic, soil or erosion factors.

Each of the major landforms described in 8.2.2 has distinctive characteristics but there is still considerable variation in the types of land in each landform. Therefore most LUC classes will be found within each of the landforms, however the proportion of each class will vary according to the dominant character of each landform as shown below:

LUC Class	Plains	Downs	Hill & high country	Inland Basins
I	2%	0%	0%	0%
II	21%	16%	0%	0%
III	41%	27%	1%	7%
IV	28%	23%	3%	17%
V	1%	1%	0%	4%
VI	5%	32%	29%	60%
VII	1%	1%	26%	11%
VIII	0%	0%	41%	1%

2. Amend 8.2.3., page 8-5, paragraph 2 to read:

"The landforms of the Canterbury region, described in 8.2.2, can be subdivided into groups of natural stresses and human disturbances. Each of these groups will require a similar overall approach to management for soil conservation, however within each group it is recognised that may influence the specific on-site management requirements for soil conservation.

8-3-23 8.2.2.1 Soils of the plains

8-3-23	411.34	New Zealand Fertiliser Manufacturers Research	Retain the comments in 8.2.2.1 Soils of the Plains on the variability of soil properties and
--------	--------	---	--

		Association Inc	strengthen by pointing out the need for a site specific approach to sustainable management.
--	--	-----------------	---

Evaluations and reasons

411.34: The submitter supports the coverage of soil variability in the Chapter, and wants further additions to the Chapter to provide for the site-specific management of soils.

A number of methods are proposed through the Chapter to facilitate an understanding of the variability of soil properties and to identify site-specific management approaches to achieve the objectives for sustainable management. These include encouraging the use of on-farm monitoring and making available regional monitoring information on trends in soil properties, use of nutrient budget models and preparation of property plans. Chapter 8 cannot be prescriptive at a site-specific level as suggested by the submitter. It will be down to individual landholders to apply their farming expertise or to seek advice to select the tools and information most appropriate to the specific requirements for management at an "on-farm" scale.

It is considered that the methods included in Chapter 8 already provide a practical framework for enabling a site-specific approach to soil conservation management to be applied.

For the reasons set out above, and to the extent that the submitter seeks much the same approach as already in Chapter 8, the submission is accepted in part and no amendment is required.

SCN1.5. Recommendation

411.34: Accept in part.

Amendment

Nil

8-5-7 8.2.2.4 Soils of the hill and high country

8-5-21	411.36	New Zealand Fertiliser Manufacturers Research Association Inc	Retain the view in 8.2.2.4 Soils of the Hill and High Country that fertiliser is needed in hill country.
	F1074.635	Federated Farmers of NZ (Inc)	<i>Support</i>
8-5-21	472.2	Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc, Mackenzie Branch	Amend 8.2.2.4 to give sulphur the same prominence as phosphorous.

Evaluations and reasons

411.36, F1074.635: The submitter supports the discussion on the need for fertiliser inputs to maintain healthy vegetation cover on hill and high country soils. They are concerned that this may conflict with rules for fertiliser application in other chapters of the NRRP.

F1074.635 supports the point raised in the original submission as being essential to sustainable management.

The submitter's concerns relate to the potential for conflict between different chapters of the NRRP. In this case the promotion of fertiliser use in Chapter 8 and rules controlling the application of fertiliser in Chapter 4. The chapters of the NRRP are designed to be read together to provide for the integrated management of resources. For example the use of fertiliser for vegetation management must be managed to avoid causing leaching or runoff into water bodies. This is best practice and shouldn't be seen as a conflict between the approaches taken in individual chapters.

To the extent that the submitter seeks the same approach as already in Chapter 8, the submission and the further submission are accepted in part. No amendments are required.

472.2: The submitter wants the discussion of the hill and high country soils amended to give equal prominence to sulphur requirements for soils as is currently given to phosphorus.

The point raised by the submitter that sulphur requires equal prominence to phosphorus in terms of maintaining a healthy vegetate cover is agreed. Paragraph 4 of section 8.2.2.4 looks at phosphorus, sulphur and nitrogen as key nutrients for soil fertility management. The apparent prominence given to phosphorus could be inferred from the more specific discussion of its variance along the rainfall gradient, but this is not intended. Sulphur and nitrogen levels are generally low over most of the region so don't show the same pattern of change. A further sentence to identify the changing nature of fertiliser requirements across the rainfall gradient would improve the clarity of the paragraph and provide for the concerns raised by the submitter.

For the reasons outlined, the submission is accepted in part and an amendment is required.

SCN1.6. Recommendation

411.36, 472.2, F1074.635: Accept in part

Amendment

Amend section 8.2.2.4, paragraph 4, page 8-5 to read:

"Natural soil fertilityover all this landform. In drier climates such as the middle of the Waitaki valley, plant available soil P is likely to be adequate but S levels will be low. As rainfall increases plant available P becomes increasingly deficient and S remains low. Fertiliser inputs.....productive vegetation cover, with S required across the landform and P requirements increasing as rainfall increases."

8-8-5 8.3 Statutory framework

8-8-5	540.302	Canterbury Growers Society Ltd	Add to, or amend 8.3 Statutory framework as necessary to clarify how the eight different soil groups fall within the two broad categories of "arable" and "non-arable".
8-8-5	541.302	NZ Vegetable & Potato Growers Federation Inc et al	Add to, or amend 8.3 Statutory framework as necessary to clarify how the eight different soil groups fall within the two broad categories of "arable" and "non-arable".

Evaluations and reasons

540.302, 541.302: The submitters requested an explanation of the relationship between the eight soil groups and the arable/non-arable soil categories to be included in section 8.3 Statutory framework. Section 8.3 Statutory Framework deals with the range of plans and planning instruments under the RMA used to address soil conservation issues and their relationship to the NRRP. The point raised is not relevant to the content of this section. The submitters have also addressed the same submission point to Section 8.2 Background (see submission points 540-301, 541-301) and the concerns have been fully evaluated under that section.

For the reason set out above the submissions are rejected and no amendment is required.

SCN1.7. Recommendation

540.302, 541.302: Reject.

Amendment

Nil

8-8-6 8.3.1 Resource Management Act

8-8-6	411.37	New Zealand Fertiliser Manufacturers Research Association Inc	Retain the proactive, non-regulatory approach to soil conservation in 8.3 Statutory Framework.
8-8-6	472.3	Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc, Mackenzie Branch	Retain the pro-active non-regulatory approach in 8.3.1.
8-8-10	257.1585	Upper Waitaki Branch Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-8-10	289.2106	North Bank Land Owners Group	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-8-10	506.1577	Hugh Turnbull	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-8-10	586.1576	Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces	Retain the third sentence of Section 8.3.1. which reads: " <i>As of 2004, Environment Canterbury considers that it can address soil conservation issues by taking a proactive, non-regulatory approach...</i> "
	F1043.3065	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.3054	Selwyn Plantation Board	<i>Support</i>

		Limited	
8-8-10	669.1573	South Island High Country Section, Federated Farmers NZ	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).

Evaluations and reasons

257.1585, 289.2106, 411.37, 472.3, 506.1577, 586.1576, F1043.3065, F1044.3054; 669.1573:

The submitters and further submitters all wish to retain the proactive, non-regulatory approach of Chapter 8. This is acknowledged.

To the extent that the submitters seek to retain the approach taken for soil conservation in Chapter 8, the submissions and further submissions are accepted and no amendments are required.

SCN1.8. Recommendation

257.1585, 289.2106, 411.37, 472.3, 506.1577, 586.1576, 669.1573, F1043.3065, F1044.3054 : Accept.

Amendment

Nil

8-8-24 8.3.2 Planning instruments under the RMA

8-8-24	476.810	Christchurch City Council	The Regional Policy Statement provisions for these other significant interacting issues, such as the landscape chapter, should be referred to in 8.3.2.
8-9-29	540.305	Canterbury Growers Society Ltd	Retain the exclusion of versatile soil matters from Chapter 8.
8-9-29	541.305	NZ Vegetable & Potato Growers Federation Inc et al	Retain the exclusion of versatile soil matters from Chapter 8.

Evaluations and reasons

476.810: The submitter wants reference made in section 8.3.2 to the interaction between soil conservation management and provisions in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS) for other issues such as landscape protection.

Section 8.3 of Chapter 8 deals with the statutory function of regional councils under the RMA to control the use of land for soil conservation and the current regional planning documents that direct the management of soils in the region. The discussion of the CRPS is in relation to the key issues identified for soil conservation and the direction given to regional councils for addressing these issues. The CRPS identifies the development of a land chapter in the NRRP as a method to address the soil conservation issues.

The concerns raised by the submitter for integrating other s6 matters are more appropriately addressed in section 8.2.3 which discusses the integrated approach taken to soil conservation management in the chapter and the use of Appendix SCN1 to identify key issues for management. All objectives and policies in Chapter 8 reflect this integrated approach and provide guidance for managing soils in ways that do not cause adverse effects on other significant values and resources. It is considered that the information and provisions in the chapter adequately address the concerns raised by the submitter.

For the reasons set out above, and to the extent that the points raised by the submitter are already addressed in Chapter 8, the submission is accepted in part and no amendment is required.

540.305, 541.305: The submitters support the exclusion of any further discussion of versatile soils from Chapter 8. No reasons are provided for this support.

To the extent that the submitters support the chapter text in its current form, these submissions are accepted and no amendments are required.

SCN1.9. Recommendation

540.305, 541.305: Accept

476.810: Accept in part

Amendment

Nil

8-12-27 8.4.1.1.1 Indicators of Soil Quality Decline

8-12-27	472.4	Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc, Mackenzie Branch	Amend 8.4.1.1.1 Indicators of Soil Quality Decline in line with arguments in an appendix included in the submission that puts forward some different views.
8-13-39	257.1584	Upper Waitaki Branch Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-13-39	289.2105	North Bank Land Owners Group	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-13-39	506.1576	Hugh Turnbull	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-13-39	586.1577	Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces	Amend the fourth paragraph Section 8.4.1.1.1(b) to read: " <i>Poor cultivation and cropping practices have the potential to lead to a reduction...</i> "
	F1043.3066	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.3055	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
	F1076.456	NZ Vegetable and Potato Growers and three other organisations	<i>Support</i>
8-13-39	669.1572	South Island High Country Section, Federated Farmers NZ	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).

Evaluations and reasons

472.4: The submitter says that section 8.4.1.1.1 needs to be "re-appraised" on the basis of some alternative interpretations provided by the submitter in a report attached to their submission. The report includes alternative views and factual material relating to high country soil quality issues. The submitter has not provided any specific wording changes or indicated any particular parts of the text they wish to have amended.

Section 8.4.1.1.1 looks at indicators of soil quality decline including vegetation cover, levels of soil organic matter, reduced soil nutrient levels and soil acidification. The issues raised by the submitter in their report are addressed below under the key headings of their report:

High country erosion

The submitter discusses the changing scientific interpretations of the causes of bare ground and erosion in the high country, especially in relation to natural erosion and induced erosion.

The issue of soil erosion is discussed in section 8.4.1.2 and covers many of the issues raised by the submitter. The discussion in 8.4.1.2 recognises that erosion is a natural process that will occur irrespective of land use. However the chapter also recognises that physical disturbance of the soil or vegetation by land use activities can make the land more vulnerable to erosion by natural processes. The focus for the chapter is therefore identifying those land use practices contributing to increased levels of erosion and managing them to minimise soil loss. There does not appear to be any significant dispute between the views presented by the submitter in their report and the discussion in Chapter 8.

Nutrient balances

The submitter discusses the findings of a number of surveys of nutrient balances for high country pastoral operations that provide evidence that the average annual fertiliser inputs have been exceeding the off-takes for the last thirty years. The submitter claims that the estimates (of nutrient decline) in Chapter 8, page 8-14, are grossly wrong and should not be attributed to Metherell.

The estimates in Chapter 8 referred to by the submitter, relate to the cumulative losses of nutrients over the last 150 years of pastoral use of the high country. The chapter goes on to say that "Over the last 30 years there appears to have been a cessation, and possibly some redress, of nutrient losses from the system....." This is entirely in agreement with the findings quoted in the report by the submitter. The estimates of cumulative loss quoted in Chapter 8 have been correctly attributed to Metherell in a report prepared for Environment Canterbury in 1997. This report was reviewed in 2000 by Boswell which is also referenced in Chapter 8.

Other issues raised by the submitter in relation to nutrient balances in the undeveloped grasslands and the effects of nutrient transfer by stock are not considered to dispute any of the discussion in Chapter 8. It is not possible to provide all the relevant background information within the chapter, but the references

listed provide the key background information for the issues. Where new information is developed that disputes the underlying focus for the chapter, this can be addressed by way of a variation or plan change which will involve a full public consultation process

Herbivory

The submitter states in their report that the issue of the effects of grazing on vegetation cover may be more about the type of herbivory rather than the extent. Their discussion focuses on the evidence for pre-historic grazing in New Zealand and the possibility that the consequent adaptation of soils and vegetation to grazing has been underestimated.

The focus for vegetation management in Chapter 8 is on managing land use activities at levels that can sustain the intactness of the vegetation cover subject to the inherent factors of climate, altitude and soil fertility levels. The issue of pre-historic grazing and adaptation supplied by the submitter does not provide any reason to dispute the focus for Chapter 8 though it may well have an influence on the ability of the vegetation cover to withstand the effects of domestic and feral grazing.

In the absence of any specific amendment proposed by the submitter, the issues raised by the submitter are not considered to require any change to the existing text in section 8.4.1.1.1.

For the reasons set out above, and to the extent that many of the issues raised by the submitter were already addressed through the chapter, the submission is accepted in part, but no amendment is required.

257.1584, 289.2105, 506.1576, 586.1577, F1043.3066, F1044.3055, F1076.456; 669.1572:

Submitter 586 claims that section (b) "Reduced levels of soil organic matter" is inconsistent with the introductory section 8.1.1 which describes cultivation and cropping practices that have resulted in the improvement in soil organic matter levels. They emphasise that the danger comes from poor management and want this included as an amendment to the wording of this section.

257, 506, 669 - each submitter endorses the points raised and reasons provided by submitter 586

F1043, F1044 - support submission 586 for the reason provided by the submitter

F1076 - supports submission 586 on the grounds that the amendment clarifies the cause of the reduction.

As written, section 8.4.1.1(b) correctly states that cultivation and cropping will reduce the amount of organic matter in the soil through the processes described. However the text in 8.4.1.1(b) goes on to refer to good management practices such as no-till or minimum tillage, and use of a pasture phase that can be used to reduce or reverse any decline and ensure that there is no overall or long-term reduction in organic matter levels in the soil. This is consistent with the text in the Introduction. Chapter 8 uses the term "cultivation" in the context of soil tillage. The submitter has requested a wider meaning for cultivation which has been addressed under submission point 586.638, Definitions, but is not accepted for use in Chapter 8.

The focus for Chapter 8 is to encourage the use of those good management practices to prevent any overall loss of organic matter. The current wording in 8.4.1.1(b) is considered to cover the issues raised by the submitter. The wording suggested by the submitter does not improve the current text as it refers to "poor" cultivation practices without clarifying what these practices are.

For the reasons set out above and to the extent that the chapter already addresses the issues raised by the submitter, the submissions and further submissions are accepted in part and no amendment is required.

SCN1.10. Recommendation

257.1584, 289.2105, 472.4, 506.1576, 586.1577, 669.1572, F1043.3066, F1044.3055, F1076.456:
Accept in part

Amendment

Nil

8-15-8 8.4.1.2.1 The effects of induced erosion

8-15-8	472.5	Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc, Mackenzie Branch	Add a comment to 8.4.1.2.1 Induced Erosion acknowledging that uplift and erosion tend to cancel out in geological time compared with the short time scales so far discussed.
8-15-8	486.330	Te Runanga O Ngai Tahu	Retain 8.4.1.2.1.
	F1043.1474	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1044.1474	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Oppose</i>
8-15-8	563.342	Te Hapu O Ngati Wheke Rapaki	Support submission by Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu (refer 486).

Evaluations and reasons

472.5: The submitter claims additional comment is needed to explain that in geological timeframes human activity is probably insignificant, and soil conservation relates to short time scales. Reference is already made in Chapter 8, section 8.4.1.2.1 paragraph 3 to the extended timeframe of soil development by natural erosion processes. The implication of this for soil conservation is that the mineral content of soils lost by erosion is unlikely to be replaced within human timeframes, and therefore soils need to be treated as a non-renewable resource. The focus for the Soil Conservation Chapter is therefore to minimise the loss of soil by erosion. The amendment suggested by the submitter would highlight the difference in timeframes between renewal and loss of soils which sets the context for soil conservation. However the emphasis should be on the short timeframe for management rather than the long timeframe for renewal as suggested by the submitter - it is not the insignificance of human activities on a geological scale that is important for soil conservation, but the significance of the loss of soil for present and future generations. Including a reference to the different timescales for organic and inorganic development would clarify the restoration process.

For the reasons given, the submission is accepted in part and an amendment is required.

486.330, F1043.1474, F1044.1474, 563.342:

486, 563 - The submitters wish to retain section 8.4.1.2.1 as written

F1043, F1044 - oppose submission 486 in relation to any increase in regulatory control of plantation forestry activities sought by the submitter. This opposition is not relevant to the matter raised in this particular submission point.

The support by the submitters is accepted, however as a change to the text has been recommended on the basis of other submissions, the submissions 486.330, 563.342 are accepted in part and further submitters F1043.1474, F1044.1474 are rejected. No amendment is required.

SCN1.11. Recommendation

472.5, 486.330, 563.342: Accept in part

F1043.1474, F1044.1474: Reject

Amendment

Amend section 8.4.1.2.1, paragraph 3, page 8-15 to read:

"The formation of soils.....to develop. In human timeframes, the amount of soil development occurring over 25 years or even 100 years will be negligible and soils are need to be treated as a non-renewable an irreplaceable resource. Even though the organic content can be restored relatively quickly, the inorganic mineral component will take many hundreds or thousands of years to be replaced. "

8-15-29 8.4.1.2.2 Soils that are most at risk from induced erosion through land use practices

8-15-29	472.6	Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc, Mackenzie Branch	Balance the present discussion by acknowledging the benefits of historical erosion (like formation of plains soils).
---------	-------	--	--

Evaluations and reasons

472.6: The submitter seeks a more balanced discussion including the benefits of erosion and the re-distribution of material. It is unclear from the submission whether the submitter wants the benefits related to recent or geological timescales for re-distribution.

The focus for section 8.4.1.2.1 is the effects of "induced erosion" and the implications of this for the sustainable management of soils. While there may be some benefits from the re-distribution of soils to the site where soils are transported, this will be outweighed by the consequences of soil lost from the original site if the productivity cannot be restored.

The term "sustainable" must have a time context, and for the purposes of the RMA it is tied to human generations, not to geological millennia as suggested by the submitter. In this context there can be no "balance" between benefits and losses the loss is irreparable in human timeframes.

A description of the long-term redistribution of material resulting in the formation of the Canterbury soils is already covered in section 8.2 "Soils in the Canterbury region". The focus for section 8.4.1.2.2 is to look at resource issues of concern for sustainable management of soils. No change is recommended to this section in response to the submission.

For the reasons set out above, and to the extent that the submission is partly addressed elsewhere in the chapter, the submission is accepted in part and no amendment is required.

SCN1.12. Recommendation

472.6: Accept in part

Amendment

Nil

8-19-16 8.4.1.2.3 Land use practices that can lead to induced erosion

8-19-16	257.1586	Upper Waitaki Branch Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-19-16	289.2107	North Bank Land Owners Group	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-19-16	506.1578	Hugh Turnbull	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-19-16	586.1578	Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces	Amend the fifth sentence paragraph two of Section 8.4.1.2.3 to read: " <i>Poor cultivation practices can cause the physical breakdown of soil aggregates...</i> "
	F1043.3067	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.3056	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
	F1076.457	NZ Vegetable and Potato Growers and three other organisations	<i>Support</i>
8-19-16	669.1574	South Island High Country Section, Federated Farmers NZ	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).

Evaluations and reasons**257.1586, 289.2107, 506.1578, 586.1578, F1043.3067, F1044.3056, F1076.457; 669.1574:**

Submitter 586 requests an amendment to Chapter 8 section 8.4.1.2.3 on the grounds that the current wording is inconsistent with section 8.1.1 of the chapter and the recognition that good cultivation management has led to improved soil quality.

The rest of the listed submitters and further submitters all support submitter 586 for the reasons provided by the submitter.

The text in Chapter 8 referred to by the submitter has correctly described the physical process of cultivation of the soil - it does lead to the breakdown of soil aggregates and the more rapid decomposition of organic matter. The text goes on to say that including a restorative pasture phase will allow a reverse of these impacts. This is consistent with the Introduction text referred to by the submitter which identifies restorative practices that have been used to reverse the effects of cultivation. Chapter 8 uses the term "cultivation" in the context of soil tillage for crop establishment. The submitter has requested a wider meaning for cultivation which has been addressed under submission point 586.638, Definitions but not accepted for use in Chapter 8.

The focus for section 8.4.1.2.3 is describing those land use practices that can lead to induced erosion. Cultivation of the soil will do this, therefore the Soil Conservation chapter sets out to identify and encourage the use of good management practices that will prevent or reverse the breakdown of soil. The wording suggested by the submitter does not improve the current text as it refers to "poor" cultivation practices without clarifying what these practices are.

For the reasons set out above, the submissions are rejected and no amendment is required.

SCN1.13. Recommendation

257.1586, 289.2107, 506.1578, 586.1578, 669.1574, F1043.3067, F1044.3056, F1076.457: Reject

Amendment

Nil

8-23-1 8.4.2 Soil contamination

8-23-1	486.332	Te Runanga O Ngai Tahu	Add rule(s) to specifically regulate activities that may affect the life supporting capacity of soil ecosystems.
	F1035.115	Transit New Zealand.	<i>Oppose</i>

	F1043.1476	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1044.1476	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1046.168	Department of Conservation	<i>Support</i>
	F1051.48	Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society of NZ Inc	<i>Support</i>
	F1074.636	Federated Farmers of NZ (Inc)	<i>Oppose</i>
8-23-1	540.306	Canterbury Growers Society Ltd	Rework 8.4.2 Soil contamination and all other relevant provisions as necessary to incorporate the following provisions from Chapter 4: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule WQL3 - Activities that use or store hazardous substances • Policy WQL11 - Management of contaminated land • Methods WQL11(a) - (i) - Territorial local authorities • Rule WQL53 - Investigation of contaminated land • Rule WQL54 - Excavation of land or discharge to groundwater from land • Rule WQL59 - Use of land for certain activities.
	F1002.125	Selwyn District Council.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1004.125	Kaikoura District Council.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1006.125	Timaru District Council.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1009.125	Hurunui District Council.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1011.125	Mackenzie District Council.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1018.125	Ashburton District Council.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1063.125	Christchurch City Council (formerly BPDC)	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1074.637	Federated Farmers of NZ (Inc)	<i>Oppose</i>
8-23-1	541.306	NZ Vegetable & Potato Growers Federation Inc et al	Rework 8.4.2 Soil contamination and all other relevant provisions as necessary to incorporate the following provisions from Chapter 4: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule WQL3 - Activities that use or store hazardous substances • Policy WQL11 - Management of contaminated land • Methods WQL11(a) - (i) - Territorial local authorities • Rule WQL53 - Investigation of contaminated land • Rule WQL54 - Excavation of land or discharge to groundwater from land • Rule WQL59 - Use of land for certain activities.
	F1002.128	Selwyn District Council.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1004.128	Kaikoura District Council.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1006.128	Timaru District Council.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1009.128	Hurunui District Council.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1011.128	Mackenzie District	<i>Oppose</i>

		Council.	
	F1018.128	Ashburton District Council.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1063.128	Christchurch City Council (formerly BPDC)	<i>Oppose</i>
8-23-1	563.344	Te Hapu O Ngati Wheke Rapaki Runanga Inc	Support submission by Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu (refer 486).

Evaluations and reasons

486.332, F1035.115, F1043.1476, F1044.1476, F1046.168, F1051.48, F1074.636; 563.344:

486 requested that Chapter 8 address the control of land contamination in two ways:

a) Rules to regulate activities that may lead to contamination of soils that affects their life-supporting capacity; and

b) Methods to investigate all sites of contaminated land in Canterbury within five years of the plan becoming operative.

563 supports the original submission 486 for the reasons given by the submitter.

F1035 opposes the submission on the grounds that no rules have been suggested by the submitter making it impossible to determine the effects of such rules on other parties.

F1043 and F1044 - have opposed the whole submission of 486 for reasons relating to the imposition of controls on forestry activities. This is not relevant to the submission point being addressed here.

F1046 and F1051 support the original submission 486 on the grounds that protecting the life-supporting capacity of soils is part of sustainable management under the RMA.

F1074 opposes the original submission 486 because they have supported the non-regulatory approach taken in the proposed chapter.

Chapter 8 deals only with issues of widespread contamination that pose a risk to the sustainable management of soils on a regional scale. Site contamination issues are generally small and localised and do not necessarily have a significant effect on the regional soils resource. They often involve the risk of contaminants moving into water bodies so they have been addressed in Chapter 4 Water Quality.

Chapter 4 has a number of provisions to address the issues raised by the submitter: Policy WQL11 establishes a process for the establishment of a register of contaminated sites and a Strategy for the management of contaminated land; Rules WQL53, WQL54, implement Policy WQL11 for the identification and management of sites of contaminated land, and rules WQL55 and WQL59 will control activities that risk future contamination of land. Schedule WQL3 identifies the activities and substances to which controls will apply. It is not necessary to move these provisions into Chapter 8 as all chapters of the NRRP should be read together to provide for the integrated management of resources.

It is considered that the above provisions adequately provide for the issues raised by the submitter.

However, to assist users of the NRRP understand where the various policies and regulatory aspects of land contamination are dealt with, additional cross-referencing needs to be added to Chapter 8 to identify where each aspect of land contamination is addressed in the NRRP.

F1035 - the reasons for opposition are accepted

F1046, F1051 - while the reasons provided are accepted, the submission is already addressed in Chapter 4 of the NRRP and does not need to be included in Chapter 8.

F1074 - As the issues raised by the original submitter are addressed in other parts of the NRRP, the opposition to taking a regulatory approach in Chapter 8 is only accepted in part.

For the reasons set out above, and to the extent that the issues raised by the submitter 486.332 are already provided for in Chapter 4 of the NRRP, the submissions 486.332 and 563.344 and further submissions F1046.168, F1051.48, F1074.636 are accepted in part. Further submission F1035.115 is accepted and further submissions F1043.476 and F1044.476 are rejected. An amendment is required.

540.306, F1002.125, F1004.125, F1006.125, F1009.125, F1011.125, F1018.125, F1063.125, F1074.637; 541.306, F1002.128, F1004.128, F1006.128, F1009.128, F1011.128, F1018.128, F1063.128:

540.306, 541.306: the submitters want a number of provisions relating to soil contamination transferred from Chapter 4 Water Quality into Chapter 8 Soil Conservation on the grounds that they relate, in the first instance to land, and users of the plan are more likely to look for such issues in a land chapter.

F1002, F1004, F1006, F1009, F1011, F1018, F1063 each oppose both of the original submitters on the grounds that the provisions are already in Chapter 4 and they do not need to be repeated in Chapter 8.

They also consider that the relief sought is not necessary to achieve the objectives and policies of Chapter 8, or to achieve the purpose of the Act.

F1074.637 opposes original submission 540.306 because it already supports the non-regulatory approach taken in Chapter 8 to achieve soil conservation.

Chapter 8 Soil Conservation addresses land use activities that affect soils on a regional scale and where the principal impact is on the long-term sustainability of the soil resource. Soil contamination issues in

Chapter 8 focus on contaminants that are widespread in their application, that are immobile and persistent within the soil, and that are toxic in a way that affects soil organism functioning or affects the availability of soils for productive uses. Many soil contamination issues are localised in effect and do not fall within this framework because they do not have a significant effect on the regional soil resource. These localised contamination issues have either been addressed through other chapters of the NRRP or through other means such as non-statutory strategies and registers according to what effects they are likely to have on resources. For example, some contaminants move relatively easily through the soil into the ground water system where they become an issue for water quality and these have been addressed in Chapter 4 Water Quality; Chapter 3 Air Quality addresses land contamination issues that have the potential to affect air quality. Sites contaminated in the past cannot be dealt with through the regulatory process, but will be managed through a Contaminated Site Strategy which will provide advice and monitoring for ongoing management of the area. District Councils also have the responsibility to manage the effects of land use which will include the effects of contamination of the soil.

Case law has made it clear that plans have to be read as a whole. The chapters of the NRRP are designed to work together to provide for the integration of resources and their management. In the end it makes no difference whether land contamination issues are dealt with in one chapter or across several chapters, provided that they are clearly identified and cross referenced between the chapters to enable readers to readily identify those issues of concern for them. However for consistency, issues in the NRRP have been placed within the chapter where the major effects are likely to occur. For this reason localised land contamination issues are currently addressed in Chapter 4 Water Quality because of the potential risk they pose to the contamination of surface or ground water resources.

Transferring provisions from Chapter 4 to Chapter 8 as suggested by the submitters may just create further confusion if some water quality issues have to be addressed through the Soil conservation chapter. It would also result in the inclusion of rules in Chapter 8 Soil Conservation that address water quality management. The submissions are not favoured for this reason. However the submitters have identified an issue for amendment to improve the integration of the NRRP. Improving the cross-referencing between chapters will reduce any confusion for readers in deciding where issues are addressed. The inclusion of another paragraph in Chapter 8 section 8.4.2 to identify where each aspect of land contamination is addressed in the NRRP will provide guidance to the readers.

For the reasons outlined above, the submissions 540.306 and 541.306 are accepted in part, and an amendment is required.

Further submissions F1002.125, F1002.128, F1004.125, F1004.128, F1006.125, F1006.128, F1009.125, F1009.128, F1011.125, F1011.128, F1018.125, F1018.128, F1063.125, F1063.128 and F1074.637 are accepted for their opposition to the original submissions.

SCN1.14. Recommendation

F1035.115, F1002.125, F1002.128, F1004.125, F1004.128, F1006.125, F1006.128, F1009.125, F1009.128, F1011.125, F1011.128, F1018.125, F1018.128, F1063.125, F1063.128, F1074.637: Accept

486.332, 540.306, 541.306, 563.344, F1046.168, F1051.48, F1074.636: Accept in part

F1043.1476, F1044.1476: Reject

Amendment

Amend section 8.4.2.1, page 8-23, by adding the following paragraph after paragraph 3:

Only those land contamination issues that meet the criteria (a) - (d) above are addressed in this Chapter.

Land contamination issues that do not meet the criteria (a)-(d) are addressed in the following

Environment Canterbury documents:

Contaminants applied to land that may affect groundwater quality NRRP Chapter 4 Policies WQL6-9

Localised site contamination (presently occurring) NRRP Chapter 4 Policy WQL11

Localised site contamination (historical) Contaminated Site Information Management Strategy (sites outside NRRP)

8-23-2 8.4.2.1 Contaminants that create a soil conservation issue

8-23-2	486.331	Te Runanga O Ngai Tahu	Retain 8.4.2.1.
	F1043.1475	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1044.1475	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Oppose</i>
8-23-2	563.343	Te Hapu O Ngati Wheke Rapaki Runanga Inc	Support submission by Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu (refer 486).

Evaluations and reasons

486.331, 563.343, F1043.1475, F1044.1475:

Submitters 486 and 563 support the retention of 8.4.2.1 paragraph 4 on the effects on mauri. This is acknowledged.

F1043 and F1044 - have opposed the whole submission of 486 for reasons relating to the imposition of controls on forestry activities. This is not relevant to the submission point being addressed here.

The support of submissions 486.331 and 563.343 is accepted. Further submissions F1043.1475 and F1044.1475 are rejected. No amendment is required.

SCN1.15. Recommendation

486.331, 563.343: Accept

F1043.1475, F1044.1475: Reject

Amendment

Nil

8-28-1 Issue SCN1: Loss of soil quality and soil depth

8-28-1	486.334	Te Runanga O Ngai Tahu	Retain Issue SCN1 unchanged.
	F1043.1478	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1044.1478	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Oppose</i>
8-28-1	550.65	Enterprise North Canterbury	Retain Issue SCN1.
8-28-1	563.346	Te Hapu O Ngati Wheke Rapaki Runanga Inc	Support submission by Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu (refer 486).
8-28-1	565.233	Ashburton District Council	Amend Issue SCN1 to recognise the values that significant habitats and landscapes have and the need to balance soil erosion and fertility issues against these values.
	F1040.398	Christchurch City Council.	<i>Support</i>
	F1076.458	NZ Vegetable and Potato Growers and three other organisations	<i>Oppose</i>
8-28-1	603.161	Carter Holt Harvey Forests	Retain Issue SCN1 as worded.
	F1042.161	NZ Forest Owners Assn	<i>Support</i>
	F1043.161	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.161	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
8-28-20	472.7	Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc, Mackenzie Branch	Delete Issue SCN1(ii).
8-28-22	472.8	Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc, Mackenzie Branch	Delete Issue SCN1(iii).
8-28-24	472.9	Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc, Mackenzie Branch	Delete Issue SCN1(iii).

Evaluations and reasons

486.334, F1043.1478, F1044.1478; 550.65, 563.346, 603.161, F1042.161, F1043.161, F1044.161:

All the submitters want to retain Issue SCN1 unchanged. This support is acknowledged and accepted. F1043 and F1044 have opposed the entire submission of 486, but their reasons relate to their opposition to any increase in the regulatory control of forestry planting activities. These reasons are not relevant to the submission point raised here.

F1042, F1043, F1044 - support the original submission 603 for the reasons provided by the submitter.

Submissions 486.334, 550.65, 563.346, 603.161 and further submissions F1042.161, F1043.161, F1044.161 are accepted for their support. Further submissions F1043.1478, F1044.1478 are rejected.

565.233, F1040.398, F1076.458: Submitter 565 wants Issue SCN1 to recognise the values of significant habitats and landscapes and the potential impacts of soil conservation management on these values, such as the addition of fertilisers and the introduction of new plant species. No wording amendments are suggested to the provisions to meet the concerns raised.

F1040 - supports the original submission for the reasons provided by the submitter.

F1076 - opposes the original submission on the grounds that the submitter failed to show how the amendments requested would be implemented.

The focus for Chapter 8 is soil conservation and Issue SCN1 has appropriately outlined the key issues for soil conservation management in the region. It is agreed with the submitter that soil conservation should not be considered in isolation from other issues under the RMA. However safeguarding the life-supporting capacity of the soil is a s5 matter and therefore ranks above the matters set out in s6 of the RMA. Without long-term protection of the soil resource, the life-supporting capacity of the soil will suffer, and if that happens it is likely that the landscape and other natural values identified by the submitter will also suffer. This would be contrary to both s5 and s6 of the RMA. Issue SCN1 recognises the links between s5 and s6 by identifying some of the consequences of soil erosion which include impacts on the same values that are identified by the submitter. It is the role of objectives and policies to identify how the issue will be addressed, and each policy under Issue SCN1 identifies a number of significant values that may be affected by measures taken for soil conservation. The policies, therefore, are the key place to address the concerns raised by the submitter. The outcome in some situations may involve some compromise to soil conservation to maintain other values, provided that this does not impact on the long-term sustainability of the resource. This will have to be addressed on a case-by-case basis.

F1076 - the reasons given for opposition to the submission are accepted, but as the Chapter already addresses the concerns raised, the further submission can only be accepted in part.

For the reasons outlined, and to the extent that the submission is addressed by other parts of Chapter 8, the submission 565.233 and further submissions F1040.398, F1076.458 are accepted in part. No amendment is required.

472.7, 472.8, 472.9: The submitter wishes to delete three sub clauses of the Issue relating to the impacts of induced erosion on natural and cultural values, on the grounds that these are not really within the realm of soil conservation.

Under the RMA soil conservation includes "avoiding, remedying or mitigating soil erosion and maintaining the physical, chemical and biological qualities of soil." Regional councils have a function under s30(1) of the RMA to control the use of land for the purpose of soil conservation. Under s6 of the RMA all persons exercising their functions under the Act shall recognise and provide for a range of matters of national importance including the protection of outstanding landscapes, areas of significant indigenous vegetation and habitats and the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water etc. This is the basis of integrated management. The removal of the clauses identified by the submitter would therefore be inconsistent with the purpose and principles of the RMA.

For the reasons outlined, the submissions are rejected. No amendment is required.

SCN1.16. Recommendation

486.334, 550.65, 563.346, 603.161, F1042.161, F1043.161, F1044.16: Accept

565.233, F1040.398, F1076.458: Accept in part

472.7, 472.8, 472.9, F1043.1478, F1044.1478: Reject

Amendment

Nil

8-28-31 Objective SCN1: Hill and high country non-arable land

8-28-31	472.11	Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc, Mackenzie Branch	Amend Objective SCN1 to make it less biased towards the undeveloped. Recognise that on high country runs 80% of the production is on 20% of the land.
	F1074.639	Federated Farmers of NZ (Inc)	<i>Support</i>
8-28-31	476.811	Christchurch City Council	Amend Objective SCN1 and Methods to indicate that a somewhat less resilient vegetation cover and higher levels of grazing may be justified where it better reduces fire risks, or maintains outstanding landscapes or species bio-diversity, such

			as the open landscape of the eastern Port Hills.
	F1074.640	Federated Farmers of NZ (Inc)	<i>Support</i>
8-28-31	476.827	Christchurch City Council	Amend Objective SCN1 to make it clear that it does not apply when the land is used for urban activities, and amend the relevant environmental results anticipated to reflect this.
	F1074.641	Federated Farmers of NZ (Inc)	<i>Oppose</i>
8-28-31	476.831	Christchurch City Council	Amend Objective SCN1 to define the area that the percentages will be calculated over and ensure that it is not limited to just the building site, construction site, etc that is to be cleared.
	F1074.642	Federated Farmers of NZ (Inc)	<i>Support</i>
8-28-31	476.832	Christchurch City Council	Amend Objective SCN1 to include an exception for areas that naturally have a predominance of exposed regolith in the wording of the objective.
8-28-31	512.212	University of Canterbury	Amend Objective SCN1 to clarify the area over which cover is to be measured.
8-28-31	565.234	Ashburton District Council	Amend Objective SCN1 to recognise the values that significant habitats and landscapes have and the need to balance soil erosion and fertility issues against these values.
8-28-31	565.235	Ashburton District Council	Amend Objective SCN1 to add constraints on wilding tree spread.
8-28-31	603.162	Carter Holt Harvey Forests	Amend Objective SCN1 to read: <i>"On all hill and high country non-arable land, maintain soil quality and an intact and a resilient vegetation cover sufficient to minimise the risk of induced erosion, safeguard the life supporting capacity of the soil, and prevent, as far as practicable, the movement of soil into water bodies while providing for the economic needs of the Region's landowners. For the purposes of this objective:"</i> or words of like effect.
	F1042.162	NZ Forest Owners Assn	<i>Support</i>
	F1043.162	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.162	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
	F1076.459	NZ Vegetable and Potato Growers and three other organisations	<i>Support</i>
8-28-32	512.213	University of Canterbury	Amend the first paragraph of Objective SCN1 to include in the appropriate place the words: <i>"except for areas that naturally have a predominance of exposed regolith"</i> .
	F1040.400	Christchurch City Council.	<i>Support</i>
8-28-32	550.66	Enterprise North Canterbury	Amend Objective SCN1 to read: <i>"On all hill and high country non-arable land, maintain soil quality and an intact a resilient</i>

			<i>vegetation cover sufficient to minimise the risk of induced erosion, safeguard the life-supporting capacity of the soil, and prevent, as far as practicable, the movement of soil into water bodies while providing for the economic needs of the Region's landowners. For the purposes of this objective:..."</i>
8-28-35	334.338	Selwyn District Council	Add the words " <i>where the values and qualities of outstanding natural features and landscapes will not be affected</i> " after the words "water bodies" in Objective SCN1.
	F1040.399	Christchurch City Council.	<i>Support</i>
	F1043.4177	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Conditionally Oppose</i>
	F1044.4137	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Conditionally Oppose</i>
8-28-35	334.347	Selwyn District Council	Add the words " <i>and will not result in wilding trees</i> " after the words "water bodies" in Objective SCN1.
	F1043.4171	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Conditionally Oppose</i>
	F1044.4131	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Conditionally Oppose</i>
8-28-35	338.296	Mackenzie District Council	See submission point 334.338.
8-28-35	338.305	Mackenzie District Council	See submission point 334.347.
8-28-35	352.252	Waitaki District Council	See submission point 334.338.
8-28-35	352.261	Waitaki District Council	See submission point 334.347.
8-28-35	378.295	Christchurch City Council (formerly BPDC).	See submission point 334.338.
8-28-35	378.304	Christchurch City Council (formerly BPDC).	See submission point 334.347.
8-28-35	413.283	Waimate District Council	See submission point 334.338.
8-28-35	413.292	Waimate District Council	See submission point 334.347.
8-28-35	471.338	Selwyn Central Community Board	See submission point 334.338.
8-28-35	471.347	Selwyn Central Community Board	See submission point 334.347.
8-28-35	539.380	Timaru District Council	Amend Objective SCN1 by adding the words " <i>where the values and qualities of outstanding natural features and landscapes, and/or significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna will not be affected, and/or will not result in wilding trees</i> " after the words "water bodies".
	F1043.4185	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Conditionally Oppose</i>
	F1044.4145	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Conditionally Oppose</i>
8-28-35	564.288	Hurunui District Council	See submission point 334.347.
8-28-35	573.258	Kaikoura District Council	See submission point 334.338.
8-28-	573.267	Kaikoura District Council	See submission point 334.347.

Evaluations and reasons

334.338, F1040.399, F1043.4177, F1044.4137, 338.296, 352.252, 378.295, 413.283, 471.338, 573.258:

All the submitters listed have requested the same addition to the objective to address the "tension" that exists between promoting soil conservation and protecting outstanding natural features and landscapes. F1040 - supports the original submission 334 on the grounds that management requirements to achieve an intact and resilient vegetation cover may be unachievable and may conflict with management requirements to protect the values identified for the land.

F1043 and F1044 - oppose in part the original submission 334.338 on the grounds that the focus for the chapter is soil conservation and this should not be constrained by the matter raised by the submitter. The focus for Chapter 8 is soil conservation and the safeguarding of the life-supporting capacity of the soil resource. The objectives state the outcomes to be achieved in managing land for soil conservation. It is not considered that the amendment requested is an outcome for soil conservation - rather it is a matter to be considered and provided for within the policies which deal with the range of management approaches to achieve the objective. The submitters state that the matters identified in their submissions are currently only addressed in Policy SCN4. This is not correct - Policy SCN1(d) and Policy 5(d) also provide similar consideration.

The amendment requested by the submitters suggests that the protection of soils and the minimising of erosion and sedimentation are likely to have an adverse effect on 'the values and qualities of outstanding natural features and landscapes'. It is considered more likely that those values will benefit from the protection of soils in situ and the maintenance of a healthy vegetation cover. The objective provides the criteria for a vegetation cover that will be resilient and provide long-term protection for the soil. Decisions on the specific species composition and the management regime will be made on a site-by-site basis to take into account the range of values held for the land and the constraints for management.

F1040 - The points raised in the further submission are all valid considerations to be taken into account when deciding the most appropriate vegetation cover to establish to achieve the objective - they are not necessarily in conflict with the objective. The policies have already identified these as matters to be taken into account when maintaining or restoring vegetation cover.

F1043 and F1044 - There will be some constraints on the focus for achieving soil conservation in Chapter 8, but those constraints will be on deciding the most appropriate way to achieve soil conservation rather than the degree to which soil conservation should be achieved as is suggested by the original submitter. For the reasons set out above the submissions 334.338, 338.296, 352.252, 378.295, 413.283, 471.338, 573.258 are rejected. Further submission F1040.399 is rejected, and F1043.4177, F1044.4137 are accepted in part. No amendments are required.

334.347, F1043.4171, F1044.4131, 338.305, 352.261, 378.304, 413.292, 471.347, 564.288, 565.235, 573.267:

The submitters all request that the Objective recognises that an adverse effect exists with wilding trees as a result of soil conservation planting promoted through the Objective.

565 - supports the promotion for planting tall vegetation but wants constraints added to Objective SCN1 for wilding tree spread.

F1043, F1044 - support the submissions to manage wilding spread, but point out that such control is addressed by the Pest Management Strategy and through district plan conditions on consents. The focus for Chapter 8 is soil conservation. The objectives state the outcomes to be achieved in managing land for soil conservation. The policies identify the management approaches for achieving the objectives, including the consideration of, any issues related to the provision for matters of national significance listed in s6. Including the amendment as requested in the Objective would make it an outcome for soil conservation. This is not the case. However it is a matter to be provided for and is already appropriately included within the policies (see Policy SCN1(d)(i) together with policy SCN1 Explanation page 8-31 para 5(e) and page 8-32 para 6. Also Policy SCN4(3) together with Policy SCN4 Explanation page 8-39 para 2).

F1043, F1044 - As explained above the concerns raised are addressed by the policies.

For the reasons set out above and to the extent that the issues raised are already addressed by other provisions in Chapter 8, the submissions 334.347, 338.305, 352.261, 378.304, 413.292, 471.347, 564.288, 565.234, 573.267 and the further submissions F1043.4171, F1044.4131 are accepted in part. No amendment is required.

472.11, F1074.639:

The submitter suggests that Objective SCN1 needs a more balanced discussion as the present discussion is strongly biased towards the "undeveloped" section, whereas in the present pastoral situation close to 80% of the agricultural production of the high country runs comes from the 20% of the land that has been developed.

F1074.639 supports the original submission 472 for the reasons given by the submitter.

The Explanation and principal reasons for Objective SCN1 states in the opening sentence that the Objective addresses all high country non-arable land that would naturally have been vegetated. Maintaining a resilient and intact vegetation cover will therefore apply to both the developed and

undeveloped parts of the high country and to all agricultural production systems. The specific mention of undeveloped areas is in relation to the greater dependence of these areas on the maintenance of the indigenous component of the vegetation cover. However the criteria for intact and resilient vegetation cover will apply to developed and undeveloped situations alike.

For the reasons given above, the submission and further submission are rejected and no amendment is required.

476.811, F1074.640; 565.234: The submitters want the Objective amended to recognise the need to balance outcomes for soil conservation against other issues such as landscape protection or fire management.

476 says the objective is excessive in seeking plant cover and grazing management that will retain soils in situ.

565 claims that Objective SCN1 fails to recognise the value of significant natural areas and landscapes that may be affected by the potential introduction of plant species and fertilisers to give effect to it.

F1074 supports the submission 476 on the grounds that the policies shouldn't hinder achievement of the Objective.

Underpinning Objective SCN1 is the purpose of the RMA to safeguard the life-supporting capacity of the soil. This is a s5 matter and therefore ranks above matters set out in s6-8 of the RMA. This does not mean that soil conservation will be achieved in isolation from the issues raised by the submitters. Without long-term protection of the soil resource, however, life-supporting capacity will suffer, and if that happens it is likely that the landscape and natural values mentioned by the submitters will also suffer. The Port Hills contain areas that are highly erosion prone and subject to tunnel gullying, slips and slumping. Poorly vegetated areas slipped extensively in the 1980's after prolonged rain. The type of vegetation cover over these soils will have a significant influence on slope stability. A lesser level of soil conservation for these slopes, as suggested by submitter 476 will increase the risk of erosion which will put more sediment into the streams draining the Port Hills and out into the Heathcote Estuary. This would be contrary to both s5 and s6 of the RMA. The policies under Objective SCN1 identify a range of management options to achieve the objective and highlight other issues such as protection of values and effects on other resources that may be affected by the choice of management option. The policies therefore provide a framework for integrated management that will address the concerns raised by the submitters.

F1074 - the reasons provided by the further submitter are unclear.

For the reasons set out above, and to the extent that the points raised in the submissions are addressed elsewhere in Chapter 8, the submissions 476.811, 565.234 are accepted in part. The further submission F1074.640 is accepted in part for its support of the submission but not for the reasons provided. No amendment is required.

476.827, F1074.641: The submitter claims that the outcomes for Objective SCN1 are not appropriate where land is used for urban activities and they want the objective amended to exclude land used for urban activities.

F1074 - opposes that original submission 476 on the grounds that all activities should be treated on the same basis where they have the potential to cause induced erosion. Objective SCN1 states that it applies to all non-arable land and this will include land used for both pastoral and non-pastoral uses. Currently it is designed to cover concerns (a) and (b) from Issue SCN1 addressing activities that have lead to an increased risk or occurrence of erosion. This could well include urban activities such as subdivision that involve earthworks and extensive vegetation clearance activities. Any activities that involve the exposure or disturbance of the soil surface on hill and high country non-arable land will be of concern for soil conservation if they increase the risk of induced erosion. The exclusion of land used for urban activities is not considered appropriate if the activities increase the risk for soil erosion.

F1074 - the reasons provided in opposition to the original submission are accepted.

For the reasons set out above, the submissions 476.827 is rejected and further submission F1074.641 is accepted. No amendment is required.

476.831, F1074.642; 512.212: The submitters say that the Objective is not clear as to the area to which the criteria for intact vegetation apply and this needs to be clarified. They claim that the outcome would clearly not be appropriate if it was limited to just the building site or construction site.

F1074 - supports submission 476 on the grounds that it will add clarity to the Objective.

The area to which the measurement of vegetation cover criteria in Objective SCN1 apply should be appropriate land at the site level, not such a broad scale as suggested by submitter 476. The scale at which the criteria should be applied will depend on the nature of the activity and the type of management required to protect the soils. No one scale will be appropriate for all activities. If used as an average rating over large areas as suggested by the submitter, this could allow significant areas of land to fall below the criteria and be exposed to a higher erosion risk. The policies and methods under Objective SCN1 provide guidance and information on best practices for a range of situations where stabilisation of slopes and vegetation management is required to minimise the risk of erosion occurring.

For the reasons stated, the submissions 476.831, 512.212 and further submission F1074.642 are

rejected. No amendment is required.

476.832, 512.213, F1040.400: The submitters state that the exception identified in the Explanation to Objective SCN1 for areas of land that naturally have a predominance of exposed regolith is not reflected in the wording of the Objective. They request the inclusion of the exception in the wording of the Objective.

F1040 - supports the original submission 512 for the reasons provided by the submitter.

Objective SCN1 includes a range of outcomes to do with soil conservation, including maintaining soil quality, maintaining an intact vegetation cover, safeguarding the life-supporting capacity of soils and preventing, as far as practicable, the movement of soil into water bodies. It states clearly that it applies to all hill and high country non-arable land. The Explanation to Objective SCN1 creates some confusion in the first sentence by saying that the objective addresses all hill and high country non-arable land that would naturally have had a vegetative cover over the soil. The second sentence of the Explanation correctly states that an intact vegetation cover is not intended for areas that naturally have a predominance of exposed regolith. However it is not intended that these areas of naturally exposed regolith are excluded from the Objective as they may still have significant issues for stability and erosion management. Policy SCN5 dealing with earthworks and vegetation clearance activities addresses all land where these activities could increase the risk of erosion regardless of whether there is a vegetation cover over the land.

The point raised by the submitters that the wording in the Explanation is not reflected in the wording of the Objective is agreed to the extent that the Explanation also needs to accurately reflect the scope of the Objective. The suggestion by the submitters that the Objective should include the exception of areas of exposed regolith in relation to achieving an intact vegetation cover is accepted. A further amendment is required to the Explanation to ensure that it accurately reflects the scope of the Objective. This will provide clarity for all users of the Chapter.

For the reasons set out above the submission, 476.832, 512.213 and further submission F1040.400 are accepted and an amendment is required.

539.380, F1043.4185, F1044.4145: The submitter raises a number of points that have also been addressed by other submitters. They request that Objective SCN1 addresses the "tension" that exists between promoting soil conservation and protecting outstanding natural features and landscapes and avoiding the adverse effect of wilding trees. The submitter also suggests that there are conflicts evident between Objective SCN1 and provisions in the Timaru District Plan relating to where forestry adjoins areas of significant natural values.

F1043 and F1044 - oppose in part the original submission 539 on the grounds that the focus for the chapter is soil conservation and this should not be constrained by the matters raised by the submitter.

The focus for Chapter 8 is soil conservation. The objectives state the outcomes to be achieved in managing land for soil conservation. The policies identify the management approaches for achieving the objectives, including the consideration of, any issues related to the provision for matters of national significance listed in s6. Including the amendment requested in the Objective would make it an outcome for soil conservation. This is not the case. However it is a matter to be provided for and is appropriately included within the policies. (see Policy SCN1(d)(i) together with policy SCN1 Explanation page 8-31 para 5(e) and page 8-32 para 6. Also Policy SCN4(3) together with Policy SCN4 Explanation page 8-39 para 2). Under the RMA district plans must not be inconsistent with regional plans for any matters specified in s30(1). However it is considered that the matters addressed within the policies in Chapter 8 provide for the concerns raised by the submitter.

F1043, F1044 - As explained above the concerns raised are addressed by the policies

For the reasons set out above, and to the extent that the issues raised are already addressed by other provisions in Chapter 8, the submission 539.380 and further submissions F1043.4185 and F1044.4145 are accepted in part. No amendment is required.

550.66, 603.162, F1042.162, F1043.162, F1044.162, F1076.459: The submitters oppose the objective on the grounds that it fails to recognise that the "at-risk" land is in productive use and that techniques for soil conservation need to provide for continued productive use.

F1042, F1043, F1044, F1076 - all support the original submitter 603 for the reasons given by the submitter.

Objectives specify the outcomes to be achieved in line with responsibilities of regional councils under the RMA. For Chapter 8, the focus is soil conservation and safeguarding the life-supporting capacity of the soil resource. The way in which these outcomes are achieved is provided for by the policies and their methods of implementation. Providing for the economic needs of the region's landowners is not an outcome in itself, but it will be a consideration for identifying the most appropriate options for land use. If land is used in ways that do not conserve soils, then this will impact on the economic returns for the land owner and on the options for use of those soils by future landowners. The economic needs of the region have to be seen in the wider context including the range of values held by the community and the long-term needs of both present and future generations. It is considered that the Objective provides a

framework for sustaining the soil resource in the long-term while the policies and methods address the specific concerns for ongoing productive use raised by the submitters.

For the reasons outlined above, and to the extent that the issues raised by the submitters are already addressed in Chapter 8, the submitters 550.66, 603.162 and further submitters F1042.162, F1043.162, F1044.162, F1076.459 are accepted in part. No amendment is required.

SCN1.17. Recommendation

476.832, 512.213, F1040.400, F1074.641: Accept

334.347, 338.305, 352.261, 378.304, 413.292, 471.347, 476.811, 539.380, 550.66, 564.288, 565.234, 565.235, 573.267, 603.162, F1042.162, F1043.162, F1043.4171, F1043.4177, F1043.4185, F1044.162, F1044.4131, F1044.4137, F1044.4145, F1074.640, F1076.459: Accept in part

334.338, 338.296, 352.252, 378.295, 413.283, 471.338, 472.11, 476.827, 476.831, 512.212, 573.258, F1040.339, F1074.639, F1074.642: Reject

Amendment

1. Amend Objective SCN1, page 8-28, to read:

"On all hill and high country non-arable land, maintain soil quality and an intact and resilient vegetation cover over all land that would naturally have had a vegetation cover, sufficient to minimise the risk of erosion, safeguard the life-supporting capacity of the soil and prevent, as far as practicable....."

2. Amend Objective SCN1 Explanation and principal reasons, page 8-29, 1st paragraph to read:

"This objective addresses all hill and high country non-arable land in the Canterbury region, however it that would naturally have had a vegetative cover over the soil. It is not intended that an intact vegetation cover

8-28-37 Objective SCN1(a)

8-28-37	257.1587	Upper Waitaki Branch Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-28-37	289.2108	North Bank Land Owners Group	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-28-37	506.1579	Hugh Turnbull	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-28-37	586.1579	Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces	Retain Objective SCN1 but delete (a) in its entirety and remove the reference to (b).
	F1043.3068	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.3057	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
8-28-37	669.1575	South Island High Country Section, Federated Farmers NZ	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).

Evaluations and reasons

257.1587, 289.2108, 506.1579, 586.1579, F1043.3068, F1044.3057; 669.1575: The submitters agree with Objective SCN1, but want clause (a) removed on the grounds that it is too prescriptive and goes beyond the realms of an "objective". The scientific robustness of the criteria is also questioned. F1043, F1044 support submission 586 for the reasons stated by the submitter.

Objectives identify outcomes that the Council wants to see achieved to address the concerns raised in the Issue. The more prescriptive an objective can be the clearer that outcome will be and the easier to measure progress towards the outcome. However as there are no rules in Chapter 8 to achieve the outcomes of Objective SCN1, these criteria provide guidance only. The criteria for "intact vegetation

cover" in Objective SCN1 have been applied on the basis of long-term monitoring of bare ground in the hill and high country, measuring the relationship between the % bare ground over an area and the incidence and extent of erosion occurring. These studies showed a marked increase in erosion when bare ground exceeded 20%. This study is discussed on page 8-12 of Chapter 8, section 8.4.1.1.1 Indicators of soil quality decline.

The submitters also maintain that intactness of vegetation is not the sole indicators of soil quality. It is agreed that a range of soil composition factors could be used to measure the more detailed elements of soil quality, however many of these components require more complex monitoring techniques that may not be available to all land managers. The health of the vegetation cover will reflect the state of many of the components of soil quality, such as soil structure, soil nutrient levels, soil fauna and microbial activity, water holding capacity and soil organic matter levels. The criteria used to define "intactness" in Objective SCN1 are visible "above ground" indicators that are easily measurable and will provide a useful warning system for problems associated with the range of "below ground" soil quality factors. The focus for Chapter 8 is to provide easily accessible tools to land holders to enable them to make informed decisions on the management of their land.

For the above reasons, it is considered appropriate and necessary to retain clause (a) of Objective SCN1. To the extent that the submitters supported the Objective, apart from their request to delete clause (a), the submissions and further submissions F1043.3068, F1044.3057 are accepted in part. No amendment is required.

SCN1.18. Recommendation

257.1587, 289.2108, 506.1579, 586.1579, 669.1575, F1043.3068, F1044.3057: Accept in part

Amendment

Nil

8-28-38 Objective SCN1(a)(i)

8-28-38	449.243	Transit New Zealand	Amend Objective SCN1(a)(i) to clarify the area over which ground cover is to be measured as follows: "(i) at least 80 percent ground cover, <u>over x area...</u> "
	F1040.401	Christchurch City Council.	<i>Support</i>

Evaluations and reasons

449.243, F1040.401: The submitter wants the Objective to clarify the area over which the criteria in clauses (a) and (b) will be measured.

F1040 - support the original submission for the same reasons provided by the submitter.

There can be no hard and fast rule applied to measure the criteria in Objective SCN as this will need to vary in response to the vegetation type, soil/regolith, position in the landscape and the type of activity being undertaken. The criteria do not underpin any rules in Chapter 8. Rather they are in the Objective to provide guidance for making management decisions and to enable measurement of progress towards meeting the Objective. Landholders will be able to apply their own judgement to decide what area is appropriate for applying the criteria, according to the activities they are undertaking. The addition of a sentence to the Explanation to Objective SCN1 clarifying the role of the criteria for guidance would address the concerns raised by the submitter.

For the reasons stated above, the submission and further submission are accepted in part and an amendment is required to the Explanation and principal reasons for Objective SCN1.

SCN1.19. Recommendation

449.243, F1040.401: Accept in part

Amendment

Amend Explanation and principal reasons for Objective SCN1, page 8-29, by adding a new paragraph after paragraph 1 to read:

"The criteria in clauses (a) and (b) of Objective SCN1 provide guidance for land managers to maintain or achieve a vegetation cover that will provide effective protection of the soil. The area of land to which the criteria in clause (a) are applied will depend on the nature and location of the land use activity being undertaken."

8-29-5 Objective SCN1(b)(ii)

8-29-5	476.813	Christchurch City Council	Amend Objective SCN1(b)(ii) to read " <i>species</i>
--------	---------	---------------------------	--

			able to <u>assist in the retention of soils</u> under the prevailing...."
--	--	--	---

Evaluations and reasons

476.813: The submitter claims that the Objective as worded is excessive in seeking plant cover that will "retain soils in situ". They have suggested an amendment to clause (b)(ii) that seeks a less resilient vegetation cover to recognise the natural erosion processes operating and to allow for the protection of a range of other values for these areas. The submission refers specifically to the Port Hills and the natural instability of these soils which indicates that some erosion is likely to occur regardless of the vegetation cover established. The submitter states that the amendment to clause (b)(ii) to require plant species able to "assist" in the retention of soils is a more realistic criterion for resilience.

Chapter 8 recognises the occurrence of natural erosion processes in areas such as the Port Hills - processes that will occur whether or not human activities are taking place. There is also recognition in Chapter 8 that under extreme climate events erosion is likely to occur in highly erosion-prone areas such as the Port Hills, regardless of the vegetation cover in place. So it is accepted that the current criterion (b)(ii) could be interpreted as ignoring the likelihood of such natural events. The suggestion made by the submitter to substitute species able to "assist" in retaining soils in situ is not considered to provide any guidance as it could apply to a wide range of vegetation species and provides no certainty of resilience under even the most average conditions of climate and disturbance. The key to resilience is that the vegetation protection is as effective as possible. It is considered that the amendment of clause (b)(ii) to require "species most effective in retaining soils in situ...." would retain the focus on the outcome required by the Objective while recognising the limitations imposed by the natural environment.

The submitter has also suggested that the Objective should indicate that a less resilient vegetation cover is justified where it enables the protection of other values. The focus for Chapter 8 is soil conservation and the Objective identifies outcomes for soil conservation. The amendment suggested by the submitter is not an outcome for soil conservation, but a matter under s6 of the RMA to be provided for when managing land use for soil conservation. Soil conservation and the protection of the life-supporting capacity of soils is a s5 matter and therefore takes precedence over s6 matters. The policies under Objective SCN1 identify management options to achieve the Objective, including provision for the issues raised by the submitter for the protection of natural values.

For the reasons outlined above, the submission is accepted in part and an amendment is required.

SCN1.20. Recommendation

476.813: Accept in part

Amendment

Amend Objective SCN1(b)(ii), page 8-29, to read:

"(ii) species ~~able to retain~~ most effective at retaining soils in situ under the prevailing geological and environmental conditions;"

8-29-7 Objective SCN1(b)(iii)

8-29-7	472.10	Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc, Mackenzie Branch	Delete Objective SCN1(b)(iii).
8-29-7	550.67	Enterprise North Canterbury	Delete Objective SCN1(b)(iii).
8-29-7	603.163	Carter Holt Harvey Forests	Delete Objective SCN1(b)(iii).
	F1042.163	NZ Forest Owners Assn	<i>Support</i>
	F1043.163	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.163	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>

Evaluations and reasons

472.10, 550.67, 603.163, F1042.163, F1043.163, F1044.163:

The submitters have all requested the deletion of clause (b)(iii) from Objective SCN1 on the grounds that there is no evidence that indigenous species are superior to exotic vegetation for soil conservation.

472.10 - The submitter states that if one was revegetating a site, "there is no real evidence... that indigenous species are any more successful than exotics..... and several that indicate they are worse."

550.67, 603.163 - the submitters say they are unaware of any studies that would support the preference

for indigenous species over exotics for soil conservation. They refer to the text in Explanation to Objective SCN1 in relation to these concerns raised.

F1042.163, F1043.163, F1044.163 - support the original submission 603 for the reasons provided by the submitter.

Clause (b)(iii) refers specifically to the indigenous component of any undeveloped area - the importance of the indigenous species here is that they are adapted to the natural environmental conditions, and any land use undertaken without management inputs, should be managed at a level that will sustain as much of the indigenous component as possible. There may be some changes to species diversity or dominance within the habitat as a result of activities such as grazing, or burning. The clause as written focuses on retention of the indigenous "components" which allows for some change in response to changing conditions. All of the submitters have referred to situations where there would be some active management of the land - clause (b)(iii) is not directed to these situations.

The use of other species is not precluded by clause (iii), and the preference for retaining the indigenous component is only specified for the undeveloped areas. No evidence is provided by the submitters to support or qualify their statements of evidence for the success of exotic species under these (undeveloped) circumstances. In the absence of any active management of the undeveloped areas, it is considered that the clause identifies a key factor of resilience in vegetation and that the submissions have not provided any evidence to support its removal.

For the reasons set out above, the submissions 472.10, 550.67, 603.163 and further submissions F1042.163, F1043.163, F1044.163 are rejected. No amendment is required.

SCN1.21. Recommendation

472.10, 550.67, 603.163, F1042.163, F1043.163, F1044.163: Reject

Amendment

Nil

8-29-13 Explanation and principal reasons Objective SCN1

8-29-13	550.68	Enterprise North Canterbury	Amend the Explanation and principal reasons to recognise the role of plantation forestry in soil conservation and the benefits of afforestation where economic use and soil conservation are required.
	F1027.119	Matariki Forests	<i>Support</i>
	F1042.330	NZ Forest Owners Assn	<i>Support</i>
	F1043.4183	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.4143	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
8-29-13	603.164	Carter Holt Harvey Forests	Amend the Explanation and principal reasons to Objective SCN1 to recognise the role of plantation forestry in soil conservation and the benefits of afforestation where economic use and soil conservation are required.
	F1042.164	NZ Forest Owners Assn	<i>Support</i>
	F1043.164	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.164	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>

Evaluations and reasons

550.68, F1027.119, F1042.330, F1043.4183, F1044.4143; 603.164, F1042.164, F1043.164, F1044.164:

The submitters 550 and 603 question the statement in paragraph 5 of the Explanation that "Undisturbed indigenous vegetation will provide the highest, ongoing level of protection for soil conservation." stating that they are not aware of any studies to support this claim. As an alternative they suggest that woody vegetation cover will be required to achieve the desired outcomes for soil conservation. Neither of the submitters provides any evidence for their counter claim.

F1027, F1042, F1043, F1044 - support the original submission 550 for the reasons given by the original

submitter that more emphasis should be given to recognising the role of plantation forestry for soil conservation

F1042, F1043, F1044 - support the original submission 603 for the reasons given by the original submitter.

The statement addressed by the submitters refers to an "undisturbed" situation where human influences are minimal. It makes no assumption of the relative protective nature of indigenous and exotic vegetation under situations of human disturbance. The suggestion by the submitters that "woody vegetation will provide the highest, ongoing level of protection for soil conservation" is not considered to be appropriate as different species and habitats will vary in their effectiveness depending on the physical environment and the land management regime operating. It is recognised in the Explanation to Objective SCN1, paragraph 3, and in Policies SCN1 and SCN4 that deep-rooted woody vegetation will provide the most stabilising vegetation cover for hill country slopes at risk of deep-seated forms of erosion. There are also many parts of the hill and high country where woody vegetation will not be suited or appropriate. Species need to be chosen that are adapted to the specific environmental conditions and produce a vegetation cover that is sustainable in the long-term, particularly in the undeveloped parts of the region. The focus for Objective SCN1 is setting outcomes for soil conservation. It is the role of the Policies to cover the range of options for establishing appropriate vegetation cover, including options that enable the ongoing productive use of land and provide for the protection of significant values. The issue of woody vegetation raised by the submitters is already addressed in Policies SCN1 and SCN4.

For the reasons above, and to the extent that the points raised in the submissions and further submissions are already addressed elsewhere in Chapter 8, the submissions 550.68, 603.164 and the further submissions F1027.119, F1042.164, F1042.330, F1043.164, F1043.4183, F1044.164, F1044.4143 are all accepted in part and no amendment is required.

SCN1.22. Recommendation

550.68, 603.164, F1027.119, F1042.164, F1042.330, F1043.164, F1043.4183, F1044.164, F1044.4143: Accept in part

Amendment

Nil

8-30-1 Policy SCN1: Intact and resilient vegetation cover

8-30-1	476.814	Christchurch City Council	Amend Policy SCN1 to indicate that a somewhat less resilient vegetation cover and higher levels of grazing may be justified where it better reduces fire risks, or maintains outstanding landscapes or species bio-diversity, such as the open landscape of the eastern Port Hills.
	F1074.643	Federated Farmers of NZ (Inc)	<i>Support</i>
8-30-1	486.335	Te Runanga O Ngai Tahu	Retain Policy SCN1 unchanged.
	F1003.22	Landco Pastoral Holdings Ltd	<i>Support in part.</i>
	F1043.1479	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1044.1479	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Oppose</i>
8-30-1	512.214	University of Canterbury	Amend Policy SCN1 to recognise that increasing vegetation cover is not always the best solution to stabilise slopes subject to erosion.
8-30-1	563.347	Te Hapu O Ngati Wheke Rapaki Runanga Inc	Support submission by Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu (refer 486).

Evaluations and reasons

476.814, F1074.643: The submitter asks that Policy SCN1 be amended in line with relief they sought for Objective SCN1 (8-28-1, submission point 476.811) to recognise that a less resilient vegetation cover may be justified to maintain other values for the land. The example given by the submitter was the Port Hills where a less resilient vegetate cover and a higher levels of grazing may be required to protect the

landscape and biodiversity values. The submitter claims that Policy SCN1 contains internal conflicts with respect to the issues raised.

F1074.643 - supports the original submission to ensure that policies don't hinder achievement of the objective.

The stated purpose of the RMA to safeguard the life-supporting capacity of the soil underpinning Objective SCN1. This is a s5 matter and therefore ranks above matters set out in s6-8 of the RMA. This does not mean that soil conservation will be achieved in isolation from the issues raised by the submitters. Without long-term protection of the soil resource, however, life-supporting capacity will suffer, and if that happens it is likely that the landscape and natural values mentioned by the submitters will also suffer. The Port Hills contain areas that are highly erosion prone and subject to tunnel gullying, slips and slumping. Poorly vegetated areas slipped extensively in the 1980's after prolonged rain. The type of vegetation cover over these soils will have a significant influence on slope stability. A lesser level of soil conservation for these slopes, as suggested by submitter 476 will increase the risk of erosion which will put more sediment into the streams draining the Port Hills and out into the Heathcote Estuary. This would be contrary to both s5 and s6 of the RMA.

Objective SCN1 identifies outcomes for soil erosion. The role of the policies is to provide a decision framework for identifying the most appropriate options for achieving the objective on a site-by-site basis by identifying a range of options and any other matters for consideration. Policy SCN1 identifies a range of management options to achieve the criteria for intact and resilient vegetation listed in Objective SCN1. Policy SCN1(d) lists a number of issues that should be considered when deciding which measures to use to maintain or restore vegetation cover. These include the likelihood of significant adverse effects on natural, landscape and amenity values, sites of significance to Ngai Tahu and regional indigenous biodiversity. The policy thus provides a framework to integrate those matters raised by the submitter into decisions on the best option for vegetation management.

For the reasons set out above, and to the extent that Policy SCN1 already addresses some of the issues raised by the submitter, the submission and further submission are accepted in part and no amendment is required.

486.335, F1003.22, F1043.1479, F1044.1479; 563.347:

Both submitters support the wording and inclusion of clauses (c)(iii) and (c)(iv) in Policy SCN1.

F1003 supports original submission 486 for the reasons provided by the submitter.

F1043 and F1044 have opposed the entire submission of 486, but their reasons relate to their opposition to any increase in the regulatory control of forestry planting activities. These reasons are not relevant to the submission point raised here.

The matters included in Policy SCN1(c) are matters of national importance listed in s6 of the RMA that must be provided for by regional councils in exercising their functions under s30.

The support of submissions 486.335 and 563.347 and further submission F1003.22 are accepted. Further submissions F1043.1479 and F1044.1479 are rejected as not relevant. No amendment is required.

512.214: The submitter supports the intent of Policy SCN1 but believes that the policy is intended to cover farming activities. They claim that the policy needs to recognise that there are other methods than vegetation cover for stabilising slopes when non-farming earthworks activities are undertaken. All the policies under Objective SCN1 have equal weighting and are meant to be read together to enable the achievement of the outcomes of the Objective. Policies SCN1 to SCN5 address a range of situations and activities on non-arable hill and high country land that require specific techniques to maintain a resilient vegetation cover or to minimise the risk of erosion. Policy SCN1 deals with the maintenance or restoration of the vegetation cover. Policy SCN5 deals with disturbance activities that involve clearance of the vegetation and earthworks where the focus is on techniques for erosion and sediment control. The issues raised by the submitter are therefore more appropriately addressed by Policy SCN5. The submitter has also raised the same concern in a submission to Policy SCN5 and it has been addressed in more detail under that provision. The intent of Policy SCN1 would be clarified by amending the policy title to focus on the maintenance and restoration of vegetation cover.

For the reasons set out above, and to the extent that the issue raised by the submitter is dealt with elsewhere in Chapter 8, the submission is accepted in part and an amendment is required.

SCN1.23. Recommendation

486.335, 563.347, F1003.22: Accept

476.814, 512.214, F1074.643: Accept in part

F1043.1479, F1044.1479: Reject

Amendment

Amend the title of Policy SCN1, page 8-30, to read:

"Policy SCN1: Maintaining or restoring an intact and resilient vegetation cover"

8-30-3 Policy SCN1(a)

8-30-3	334.348	Selwyn District Council	Add the words " <u>except in relation to wilding trees</u> ", after the word "SCN1" in Policy SCN1(a).
	F1043.4172	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Conditionally Oppose</i>
	F1044.4132	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Conditionally Oppose</i>
	F1074.644	Federated Farmers of NZ (Inc)	<i>Oppose</i>
8-30-3	338.306	Mackenzie District Council	See submission point 334.348.
8-30-3	352.262	Waitaki District Council	See submission point 334.348.
8-30-3	378.305	Christchurch City Council (formerly BPDC).	See submission point 334.348.
8-30-3	413.293	Waimate District Council	See submission point 334.348.
8-30-3	471.348	Selwyn Central Community Board	See submission point 334.348.
8-30-3	539.381	Timaru District Council	See submission point 334.348.
	F1027.120	Matariki Forests	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1042.331	NZ Forest Owners Assn	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1043.4186	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Conditionally Oppose</i>
	F1044.4146	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Conditionally Oppose</i>
8-30-3	564.289	Hurunui District Council	See submission point 334.348.
8-30-3	573.268	Kaikoura District Council	See submission point 334.348.
	F1046.169	Department of Conservation	<i>Support</i>
8-30-3	603.165	Carter Holt Harvey Forests	Amend Policy SCN1(a) by adding a further bullet point: <u>"(iii) ensuring the harvest of any plantation forest areas are planned to minimise any earthworks and timed to re-establish the areas quickly as possible"</u> or words of like effect.
	F1042.165	NZ Forest Owners Assn	<i>Support</i>
	F1043.165	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.165	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>

Evaluations and reasons

334.348, F1043.4172, F1044.4132, F1074.644; 338.306, 352.262, 378.305, 413.293, 471.348, 539.381, F1027.120, F1042.331, F1043.4186, F1044.4146; 564.289, 573.268, F1046.169: The submitters have requested amendments to a number of clauses in Policy SCN1 to recognise that an adverse effect exists with wilding trees. The submitters state that the policy, as it stands, does not address the "tension" that exists between promoting soil conservation and ensuring that problems don't arise through wilding trees. F1027, F1042, F1043, F1044 all support the management of wilding spread, but oppose submission 334 on the grounds that the issue of wilding spread should not compromise soil conservation through Chapter 8. Further submitters F1043, F1044 point out that such control is already addressed by the Pest Management Strategy and through district plan conditions on land use consents. F1074 opposes the original submission 334 for similar concerns to those raised by F1043, F1044, but considers that the present wording of Policy SCN1(a)(i) allows for the managed removal of wildings. F1046 supports original submission 573 to recognise that wildings have the potential to impact

significantly on natural values.

Policy SCN1 has a number of clauses that should be read together as a package. The issue of managing wilding spread is not fundamental to the focus of the Policy to maintain or restore an intact and resilient vegetation cover, but it nevertheless is a significant matter for consideration in deciding how to implement the Policy. Clause (d) of the Policy identifies a number of matters for consideration, and this includes in sub clause (d)(i) the spread of any plant pest species and in sub clause (d)(ii) any significant adverse effects on important landscape values. Both these sub clauses apply to issues such as wilding pines where their presence is likely to have an adverse effect on the maintenance of vegetation cover or the protection of values. When all clauses in Policy SCN1 are read together, Policy SCN1 already addresses the concerns raised by the submitters, and there is no need to duplicate the reference to wilding trees in clause (a).

F1027, F1042, F1043, F1044 - the reasons given for opposition to submitter 334 are accepted, but as the issue is already addressed within Policy SCN1 the submissions are accepted in part.

F1074 - the opposition and reasons given are accepted.

F1046 - to the extent that Policy SCN1 already addresses the issues of wilding spread, the further submission is accepted in part.

For the reasons outlined above, the submissions 334.348, 338.306, 352.262, 378.305, 413.293, 471.348, 539.381, 564.289, 573.268 are rejected. Further submission F1074.644 is accepted, further submissions F1027.120, F1042.331, F1043.4172, F1043.4186, F1044.4132, F1044.4146 are accepted in part and further submission F1046.169 is rejected. No amendment is required.

603.165, F1042.165, F1043.165, F1044.165: The submitter states that the policy fails to recognise the role of plantation forestry in the region and says that as written, the policy is unreasonable and likely to render an interest in land incapable of reasonable use.

F1042, F1043, F1044 all support the original submission for the reasons provided by the submitter.

The focus for Chapter 8 is soil conservation. Policy SCN1 provides direction to achieve the outcomes of Objective SCN1. This includes identification of best management practices and also consideration of potential adverse effects of vegetation management options on other resources or values for the land.

The use of plantation forestry is not specifically promoted as a way to achieve the objective, though the policy does make reference to issues related to the use of land for forestry where they may affect soil conservation outcomes. The suggested amendment by the submitter to include a sub-clause in Policy SCN1(a) to address best practice for harvesting does have merit as forestry is a significant land use in the hill and high country and the amendment focuses on the maintenance of the intactness and resilience of the vegetation cover. The Explanation to Policy SCN1 already makes reference to plantation forestry, including a discussion of the positive role of forestry for soil protection and the best practices for harvesting to minimise the risk of erosion, so it would be appropriate to include this land use within the Policy. Including a sub clause in SCN1(a) would ensure that it was subject to the matters identified in SCN1(d).

The claim that the policy is likely to render land incapable of reasonable use is not accepted. The Policy encourages land use options in ways that are sustainable in the long-term and that provide for the integrated management of all resources and values.

For the reasons set out above the submission 603.165 and the further submissions F1042.165, F1043.165, F1044.165 are accepted in part and an amendment is required.

SCN1.24. Recommendation

F1074.644: Accept

603.165, F1027.120, F1042.165, F1042.331, F1043.165, F1043.4172, F1043.4186, F1044.165, F1044.4132, F1044.4146: Accept in part

334.348, 338.306, 352.262, 378.305, 413.293, 471.348, 539.381, 564.289, 573.268, F1046.169: Reject

Amendment

Amend Policy SCN1(a), page 8-30, by adding another clause:

"(iii) managing the harvest of areas of plantation forest to minimise any soil disturbance and re-establish the areas as quickly as possible."

8-30-6 Policy SCN1(a)(i)

8-30-6	334.342	Selwyn District Council	Replace the word ' <i>ensuring</i> ' in Policy SCN1(a)(i) with the word ' <i>promoting</i> '.
	F1043.4181	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Conditionally Oppose</i>

	F1044.4141	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Conditionally Oppose</i>
8-30-6	338.300	Mackenzie District Council	See submission point 334.342.
8-30-6	352.256	Waitaki District Council	See submission point 334.342.
8-30-6	378.299	Christchurch City Council (formerly BPDC).	See submission point 334.342.
8-30-6	413.287	Waimate District Council	See submission point 334.342.
8-30-6	471.342	Selwyn Central Community Board	See submission point 334.342.
8-30-6	539.388	Timaru District Council	See submission point 334.342.
8-30-6	564.281	Hurunui District Council	See submission point 334.342.
8-30-6	565.238	Ashburton District Council	Amend Policy SCN1(a)(i) by replacing "ensuring" with " <i>promoting</i> "
8-30-6	573.262	Kaikoura District Council	See submission point 334.342.

Evaluations and reasons

334.342, F1043.4181, F1044.4141; 338.300, 352.256, 378.299, 413.287, 471.342, 539.388, 564.281, 565.238, 573.262

The submitters all make the same submission to replace the term "ensuring" on the grounds that a non-regulatory policy cannot "ensure" any outcomes. This reasoning is accepted and an amendment needs to be made.

F1043 and F1044 have opposed the entire submission of 334, but their reasons relate to their opposition to any increase in the regulatory control of forestry planting activities. These reasons are not relevant to the submission point raised here.

For the reasons set out above the submissions 334.342, 338.300, 352.256, 378.299, 413.287, 471.342, 539.388, 564.281, 565.238, 573.262 are accepted and further submissions F1043.4181, F1044.4141 are rejected. An amendment is required.

SCN1.25. Recommendation

334.342, 338.300, 352.256, 378.299, 413.287, 471.342, 539.388, 564.281, 565.238, 573.262: Accept

F1043.4181, F1044.4141: Reject

Amendment

Amend Policy SCN1(a)(i), page 8-30, to read:

"(i) ~~ensuring that managing any changes to vegetation cover or composition do not result in a to avoid any~~ ensuring that managing any changes to vegetation cover or composition do not result in a to avoid any loss of resilience or intactness; and"

8-30-8 Policy SCN1(a)(ii)

8-30-8	472.12	Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc, Mackenzie Branch	Amend Policy SCN1(a)(ii) to remove any inference that landholders are responsible for controlling feral animals.
--------	--------	--	--

Evaluations and reasons

472.12: The submitter asks that the meaning of Policy SCN1(a)(ii) is checked to review the implication that landholders become responsible for feral animal control. The question posed by the submitter is whether landholders' responsibilities should extend to taking responsibility for the community interests. Policy SCN1 has no rules to implement it, so it cannot require landholders to undertake any measures. Neither can it direct any responsibilities under other legislation. However it recognises that grazing by feral animals will have an impact on vegetation condition and landholders will have to take this into account when deciding what measures they should take to maintain vegetation intactness and resilience. This is a fundamental element of sustainable management. As written the Policy "encourages" landholders to take these matters into consideration when deciding how to maintain vegetation cover. However the intent of the Policy would be clarified by adding a sentence to the Explanation to address the concerns raised in the submission.

For the reasons set out above, the submission is accepted in part and an amendment is required.

SCN1.26. Recommendation

472.12: Accept in part

Amendment

Amend Policy SCN1 Explanation, para 3, page 8-31, to read:

"...Grazing pressure that is too heavy..... that expose soils to a greater risk of erosion. This Policy does not impose any requirements on landholders to control feral animals, but it recognises the impact feral animals will have on the total grazing pressure and the level of domestic grazing that can be sustained by the vegetation."

8-30-13 Policy SCN1(b)

8-30-13	257.1588	Upper Waitaki Branch Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-30-13	289.2109	North Bank Land Owners Group	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-30-13	334.340	Selwyn District Council	Add new sub clause under Policy SCN1(b) as follows: " <u>areas identified as outstanding natural features and landscapes are not detrimentally affected.</u> "
	F1043.4179	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Conditionally Oppose</i>
	F1044.4139	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Conditionally Oppose</i>
8-30-13	334.349	Selwyn District Council	Add new sub clause " <u>(iv) ensuring that wilding trees do not occur.</u> " in Policy SCN1(b).
	F1043.4173	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Conditionally Oppose</i>
	F1044.4133	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Conditionally Oppose</i>
8-30-13	338.298	Mackenzie District Council	See submission point 334.340.
8-30-13	338.307	Mackenzie District Council	See submission point 334.349.
8-30-13	352.254	Waitaki District Council	See submission point 334.340.
8-30-13	352.263	Waitaki District Council	See submission point 334.349.
8-30-13	378.297	Christchurch City Council (formerly BPDC).	See submission point 334.340.
8-30-13	378.306	Christchurch City Council (formerly BPDC).	See submission point 334.349.
8-30-13	413.285	Waimate District Council	See submission point 334.340.
8-30-13	413.294	Waimate District Council	See submission point 334.349.
8-30-13	471.340	Selwyn Central Community Board	See submission point 334.340.
8-30-13	471.349	Selwyn Central Community Board	See submission point 334.349.
8-30-13	506.1580	Hugh Turnbull	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-30-13	539.383	Timaru District Council	Add a new clause (iv) to Policy SCN(1)(b) as follows: " <u>areas identified as outstanding natural features and landscapes, and/or significant indigenous vegetation and</u>

			<i>significant habitats of indigenous fauna are not adversely affected; and"</i>
	F1027.121	Matariki Forests	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1032.81	Ashburton Branch Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	<i>Support</i>
	F1042.332	NZ Forest Owners Assn	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1043.4188	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Conditionally Oppose</i>
	F1044.4148	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Conditionally Oppose</i>
8-30- 13	539.384	Timaru District Council	Add a new clause (v) to Policy SCN1(b) as follows: " <i>ensuring that wilding trees do not occur.</i> "
	F1027.122	Matariki Forests	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1032.82	Ashburton Branch Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	<i>Support</i>
	F1042.333	NZ Forest Owners Assn	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1043.4184	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Conditionally Oppose</i>
	F1044.4144	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Conditionally Oppose</i>
8-30- 13	564.290	Hurunui District Council	See submission point 334.349.
8-30- 13	573.260	Kaikoura District Council	See submission point 334.340.
8-30- 13	573.269	Kaikoura District Council	See submission point 334.349.
8-30- 13	586.1580	Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces	Delete subclause Policy SCN1(b) or delete the final sentence " <i>This may require the temporary or long-term destocking of the depleted area</i> " and delete the word " <i>indigenous</i> " 3 times from b(ii).
	F1043.3069	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.3058	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
8-30- 13	603.166	Carter Holt Harvey Forests	<i>Amend Policy SCN1(b) to read: "Where the vegetation cover has been depleted below the thresholds for resilience identified in Objective SCN1, encourage landholders to take measures to restore a resilient vegetation cover by:..." or words to like effect.</i>
	F1042.166	NZ Forest Owners Assn	<i>Support</i>
	F1043.166	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.166	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
8-30- 13	669.1576	South Island High Country Section, Federated Farmers NZ	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).

8-30-16 Policy SCN1(b)(i)

8-30-16	472.13	Federated Farmers Of	Delete Policy SCN1(b)(i).
---------	--------	----------------------	---------------------------

		New Zealand Inc, Mackenzie Branch	
--	--	--------------------------------------	--

8-30-20 Policy SCN1(b)(ii)

8-30-20	472.14	Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc, Mackenzie Branch	Delete Policy SCN1(b)(ii).
	F1046.170	Department of Conservation	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1051.151	Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society of NZ Inc	<i>Oppose</i>
8-30-20	603.167	Carter Holt Harvey Forests	<i>Amend Policy SCN1(b)(ii) to read: (ii) restoring existing indigenous vegetation communities, or enhancing the indigenous components of the vegetation communities, particularly in the undeveloped and/or retired areas, where this will improve the resilience of the vegetation and contribute to soil conservation and the protection of indigenous biodiversity and habitat;" or words to like effect.</i>
	F1032.35	Ashburton Branch Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	<i>Support</i>
	F1042.167	NZ Forest Owners Assn	<i>Support</i>
	F1043.167	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.167	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>

8-30-25 Policy SCN1(b)(iii)

8-30-25	472.15	Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc, Mackenzie Branch	Delete Policy SCN1(b)(iii).
	F1046.171	Department of Conservation	<i>Oppose</i>
8-30-25	565.236	Ashburton District Council	Amend Policy SCN1(b)(iii) to recognise the values that significant habitats and landscapes have and the need to balance soil erosion and fertility issues against these values.
8-30-25	603.168	Carter Holt Harvey Forests	Amend Policy SCN1(b)(iii) to read: <i>"(iii) <u>establishing exotic species to retain the productive use of the land while improving vegetation resilience or establishing a deep rooted, tall vegetation cover.</u>" ...or words of like effect.</i>
	F1042.168	NZ Forest Owners Assn	<i>Support</i>
	F1043.168	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.168	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
8-30-26	334.339	Selwyn District Council	Add the word " <u>providing</u> " after the word " <u>long-term</u> " in Policy SCN1(b)(iii), and add a further clause as in submission point 334.340.
	F1043.4178	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Conditionally Oppose</i>
	F1044.4138	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Conditionally Oppose</i>

8-30-26	338.297	Mackenzie District Council	See submission point 334.339.
8-30-26	352.253	Waitaki District Council	See submission point 334.339.
8-30-26	378.296	Christchurch City Council (formerly BPDC).	See submission point 334.339.
8-30-26	413.284	Waimate District Council	See submission point 334.339.
8-30-26	471.339	Selwyn Central Community Board	See submission point 334.339.
8-30-26	539.382	Timaru District Council	See submission point 334.339.
	F1043.4187	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Conditionally Oppose</i>
	F1044.4147	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Conditionally Oppose</i>
8-30-26	573.259	Kaikoura District Council	See submission point 334.339.

Submission Clarification

Submissions on Policy SCN1(b), Policy SCN1(b)(i), Policy SCN1(b)(ii) and Policy SCN1(b)(iii) are evaluated below.

Evaluations and reasons

257.1588, 289.2109, 506.1580, 586.1580, F1043.3069, F1044.3058; 669.1576:

The submitter all request the removal of Policy SCN1(b) on the grounds that it promotes measures inappropriate for this chapter. Specifically the submitters claim that "destocking" is only one of a number of remedies, while the origin of vegetation (indigenous or exotic) is irrelevant to soil conservation. As an alternative to deleting the entire clause (b) the submitters suggest some more minor changes. F1043, F1044 - support the original submission for the reasons provided by the original submitter. Policy SCN1(b) identifies a range of measures to restore the vegetation cover in areas where it has been depleted. The management of grazing pressure on the vegetation plays an important role in maintaining the intactness of the vegetation cover or enabling the restoration of depleted areas of vegetation. Destocking may be required in circumstances where any further vegetation depletion will pose a significant increase in the risk of soil erosion. Destocking is included as an option; it is not a requirement, but it is a measure that must be considered for the achievement of Objective SCN1. On this basis, the claim by the submitters that this measure is inappropriate for soil conservation is not accepted. The retention and enhancement of the indigenous component of the vegetation will be an important issue in the undeveloped areas, where there will not be any ongoing management inputs, and where inherent resilience of the vegetation will determine its ability to protect the soil. The protection of indigenous biodiversity is not itself a focus for soil conservation and the request by the submitters to remove reference to "indigenous" in clause (b) is accepted where it is used in the context of protecting indigenous biodiversity. The protection of indigenous biodiversity is more appropriately included in clauses (c) and (d) which set out the priorities for restoration and the matters to be taken into consideration when deciding the most suitable option for management.

For the reasons set out above, submissions 586.1580, 257.1588, 289.2109, 506.1580, 669.1576 and further submissions F1043.3069, F1044.3058 are accepted in part and an amendment is required.

334.339, F1043.4178, F1044.4138; 334.340, F1043.4179, F1044.4139; 334.349, F1043.4173, F1044.4133; 338.297, 338.298, 338.307, 352.253, 352.254, 352.263, 378.296, 378.297, 378.306, 413.284, 413.285, 413.294, 471.339, 471.340, 471.349, 539.383, F1027.121, F1032.81, F1042.332, F1043.4188, F1044.4148; 539.384, F1027.122, F1032.82, F1042.333, F1043.4184, F1044.4144; 564.290, 573.259, 573.260, 573.269; 539.382, F1043.4187, F1044.4147:

The submitters all make the same submission that the policy does not adequately address the "tension" between promoting soil conservation and protecting outstanding natural features and landscapes, including ensuring that problems don't arise through wilding trees. They claim that this tension is currently only addressed in Policy SCN4 and seek to have another sub clause added to Policy SCN1(b) to address their concerns.

F1043, F1044 conditionally oppose submitter 334 on the grounds that the protection of s6 matters should not constrain the management of soil conservation in Chapter 8. F1027, F1042, F1043, F1044 conditionally oppose submitter 539 on the grounds that s6 matters should not constrain soil conservation management, and because wilding control is addressed by the Pest Management Strategy and through district plans.

F1032 supports submitter 539 based on their support for the protection of natural values and the control of wildings

Policy SCN1 has several clauses that are meant to be read as a package. The claim by the submitters that Policy SCN1 does not address the tensions between soil conservation measures and the protection of values and wilding spread is not accepted. Clause (d) is designed to work alongside clauses (a) and (b) to enable decisions on land management options to take into account a range of matters that include the concerns raised by the submitters. There is no need to duplicate this step within the earlier clauses of Policy SCN1 as requested by the submitters.

F1043, F1044 - The management of soil conservation will be constrained by the requirement to provide for the range of matters listed under s6 of the RMA. However the constraints should only affect the choice of best option for soil conservation management; they should not constrain the achievement of soil conservation itself. The further submissions are accepted for their opposition, but not for the reasons provided.

For the reasons set out above, submissions 334.339, 334.340, 334.349, 338.297, 338.298, 338.307, 352.253, 352.254, 352.263, 378.296, 378.297, 378.306, 413.284, 413.285, 413.294, 471.339, 471.340, 471.349, 539.383 539.384, 564.290, 573.259, 573.260, 573.269, 539.382 and further submission F1032.81, F1032.82 are rejected. Further submissions F1027.121, F1027.122, F1042.332, F1042.333, F1043.4173, F1043.4178, F1043.4179, F1043.4184, F1043.4187, F1043.4188, F1044.4133, F1044.4138, F1044.4139, F1044.4144 F1044.4147, F1044.4148 are accepted for their opposition. No amendment is required.

472.13, 472.14, F1046.170, F1051.151; 472.15, F1046.171: The submitter wants to delete Policy SCN1(b)(i)-(iii) on the grounds that the means of restoring an in tact and resilient vegetation cover should not be part of the soil conservation policy, and there should not be the present indigenous' emphasis. F1046 opposes the original submission and supports the current Policy as being an appropriate means of safeguarding the life-supporting capacity of soils.

F1051 opposes the original submission on the grounds that the Policy is appropriate to maintain biodiversity values.

It is unclear as to whether the submitter is asking for the deletion of the entire clause (b), or just the sub-clauses (i)-(iii). The second option would make little sense as the opening sentence of the clause cannot stand alone.

Policies provide the framework to achieve the objectives - they cover the range of situations where some management direction is required and give guidance for achieving the objective. Policy SCN1 provides guidance in two main aspects to vegetation management - maintenance of vegetation that meets the criteria in Objective SCN1, and restoration of vegetation that fails to meet the criteria. Deleting clause (b) as suggested by the submitter, would remove the direction for restoring depleted areas of vegetation. Each of the sub-clauses in (b) addresses different aspects of restoration: managing pressures and identifying best options for achieving the objective. The emphasis on retention of indigenous vegetation components reinforces the criteria for resilience in Objective SCN1, particularly in undeveloped areas where there are little if any management inputs to the land. Clause (b)(iii) allows for the replacement of indigenous cover where it is sustainable in the long-term, again emphasising the importance of making decisions that will provide long-term solutions for soil conservation. The deletion of clause (b)(i) could not be supported for these reasons.

F1051 - The reasons given for opposing submitter 472 are accepted to the extent that while biodiversity protection is not a focus for soil conservation, it is an important matter to be provided for when making decisions on a case-by-case basis for vegetation management.

For the reasons set out above, the submission points 472.13, 472.14, 472.15 are rejected. Further submissions F1046.170, F1046.171 are accepted and F1051.151 is accepted in part. No amendment is required.

565.236: the submitter claims that Policy SCN1 does not place a value on possible significant natural values, s6(c) of the RMA. They site clause (b)(ii) as a clause that should include the recognition that soil erosion and fertility issues should be balanced against s6 matters.

Including the amendment suggested by the submitter in clause (b)(ii) of Policy SCN1 would imply that the achievement of soil conservation objectives should be limited by the requirements to protect natural values. This is not consistent with the RMA where the management of land for soil conservation and protecting the life-supporting capacity of soils is a s5 matter and therefore ranks above matters set out in s6-8. The focus for Policy SCN1 is the management of vegetation cover to achieve soil conservation. Clauses (c) and (d) appropriately identify the protection of biodiversity and other natural and cultural values as matters that have to be considered in setting priorities for restoration, and in deciding how best to achieve the management and restoration of areas of vegetation. The claim by the submitter that the Policy does not place a value on s6 matters is therefore not correct.

For the reasons set out above the submission 565.236 is rejected and no amendment is required.

603.166, F1042.166, F1043.166, F1044.166; 603.167, F1032.35, F1042.167, F1043.167, F1044.167;

603.168, F1042.168, F1043.168, F1044.168: Submitter 603 seeks to amend the clauses of Policy SCN1(b) on the grounds that it fails to recognise the role of plantation forestry in the region. The submitter considers that the current wording of the Policy should be promoting management options that are sustainable without significant inputs of energy, water and nutrients. The submitter claims that in its present form the Policy is unreasonable and likely to render an interest in land incapable of reasonable use.

F1042, F1043, F1044 - support each of the submission points raised for the reasons given by the original submitter.

F1032 - support submission point 603.167 to restore existing indigenous communities in retired areas. This support is based on advocating for restoring areas of indigenous vegetation generally. The support is accepted.

As currently written, the Policy directs future land use activities in ways that will achieve Objective SCN1. Plantation forestry is not specifically promoted as a way to achieve the Objective, but the role of forestry for soil conservation is discussed in the Explanation to Policy SCN1, including both the benefits of forestry and also the potential for the harvesting of forestry to increase the risk of erosion if soils are left exposed. In response to an earlier submission by 603, a new clause has been added to Policy SCN1(a) to specifically address the harvesting of forests in ways that will minimise the risk of erosion.

The suggestion by the submitter to remove the word "intactness" from the opening line of clause (b) is not considered to be appropriate for managing soil erosion risk. As discussed in Section 8.4.1.1.1 page 8-12 of the chapter, surveys to date have shown that the extent of bare ground is a significant influence on the risk of erosion occurring. Managing vegetation cover by the combination of resilience and intactness will provide the most effective basis for minimising the risk of erosion.

The submitter also suggests additional wording to clause (b)(ii) to encourage the retention or restoration of indigenous vegetation in retired areas. This is accepted as being appropriate for restoring resilience to areas that will no longer be used for productive purposes.

The suggested amendment by the submitter to clause (b)(iii) also has merit but, as worded, is inconsistent with Objective SCN1. Firstly the suggested wording implies that exotic species will provide greater resilience than the existing indigenous species. This will not always be the case and the amendment would need to be altered to ensure that the circumstances for replacement are based primarily on the maintenance of vegetation intactness and resilience. Policy SCN1(b)(iii) currently allows for the replacement of indigenous cover where it is sustainable in the long-term. This emphasises the importance of making decisions that will provide long-term solutions for soil conservation and needs to be retained in any amendment to the clause. Secondly, the suggested inclusion of "or" after the words "improving vegetation resilience" in the amendment to sub-clause (iii) implies that overall resilience can be traded off for other aspects of vegetation cover, such as root depth. This is not accepted as it is inconsistent with Objective SCN1 which identifies a number of components of resilience that need to be satisfied in choosing the appropriate vegetation cover.

The claim by the submitter that the Policy is likely to render land incapable of reasonable use is not accepted. The Policy encourages land use options in ways that are sustainable in the long-term and that provide for the integrated management of all resources and values.

For the reasons set out above, the submission points 603.166, 603.167, 603.168 and further submissions F1042.166-168, F1043.166-168, F1044.166-168 are accepted in part and further submission F1032.35 is accepted. An amendment is required to Policy SCN1(b)(ii) and (iii).

SCN1.27. Recommendation

F1027.121, F1027.122, F1032.35, F1042.332, F1042.333, F1043.4173, F1043.4178, F1043.4179, F1043.4184, F1043.4187, F1043.4188, F1044.4133, F1044.4138, F1044.4139, F1044.4144, F1044.4147, F1044.4148, F1046.170, F1046.171: Accept

257.1588, 289.2109, 506.1580, 586.1580, 603.166, 603.167, 603.168, 669.1576, F1042.166, F1042.167, F1042.168, F1043.166, F1043.167, F1043.168, F1043.3069, F1044.166, F1044.167, F1044.168, F1044.3058, F1051.151: Accept in part

334.339, 334.340, 334.349, 338.297, 338.298, 338.307, 352.253, 352.254, 352.263, 378.296, 378.297, 378.306, 413.284, 413.285, 413.294, 471.339, 471.340, 471.349, 472.13, 472.14, 472.15, 539.382, 539.383, 539.384, 564.290, 565.236, 573.259, 573.260, 573.269, F1032.81, F1032.82: Reject

Amendment

1. Amend Policy SCN1(b)(ii), page 8-30, to read:

(ii) restoring existing indigenous vegetation communities,....., particularly in the undeveloped areas and retired areas, where this will improve the resilience of the vegetation and contribute to soil conservation and the protection of indigenous biodiversity and habitat; and"

2. Amend Policy SCN1(b)(iii), page 8-30, as follows:

"(iii) ~~establishing replacing indigenous species with exotic species to retain the productive use of the land~~ only in circumstances where this will improve vegetation intactness and resilience in the long-term.

8-30-36 Policy SCN1(d)

8-30-36	449.244	Transit New Zealand	Amend Policy SCN1(d) to recognise that increasing vegetation cover is not always the best solution to stabilise slopes subject to erosion, to read: "...(d) <i>the measures taken to achieve (a), (b) or (c) should not result in: (iv) the use of vegetation cover when other stabilization methods are more appropriate.</i> " Or apply the policy to non-production land.
	F1074.645	Federated Farmers of NZ (Inc)	<i>Support</i>
8-30-36	565.237	Ashburton District Council	Amend Policy SCN1(d) to recognise the values that significant habitats and landscapes have and the need to balance soil erosion and fertility issues against these values

Evaluations and reasons

449.244, F1074.645: The submitter wants Policy SCN1 to recognise that there are other methods than vegetation cover for stabilising slopes when non-farming earthworks are involved.

F1074 - supports the original submission because it allows for the most practical method of achieving the Objective.

There are a number of policies under Objective SCN1 to address the range of situations for managing vegetation cover to minimise soil erosion. These should be read together to cover all the situations for containing soils on non-arable land. The submitter refers to "non-farming earthwork activities" requiring methods other than vegetation management to stabilise slopes. These activities are already addressed under Policy SCN5 which covers vegetation clearance and earthworks activities and the needs for minimising erosion when the vegetation cover has been removed. The submitter has raised the same concerns under Policy SCN5 and they are addressed in more detail there.

The focus for Policy SCN1 is the retention of the vegetation cover providing guidance for maintaining vegetation cover, or restoring the cover in areas where it has been depleted below the criteria for intactness in Objective SCN1. Any confusion as to the purpose of Policy SCN1 would be reduced by amending the title to specify "Maintaining" an intact and resilient cover.

For the reasons set out above, and to the extent that the point raised is already addressed by Policy SCN5, the submission 449.244 and further submission F1074.645 are accepted in part and an amendment is required.

565.237: The submitter claims that Policy SCN1 does not place a value on possible significant natural values, s6(c) of the RMA. They site clause (d) as a clause that should include the recognition that soil erosion and fertility issues should be balanced against s6 matters.

The amendment as suggested by the submitter implies that the achievement of soil conservation objectives should be "balanced", and therefore potentially limited, by the requirements to protect natural values. This is not consistent with the RMA where the management of land for soil conservation and protecting the life-supporting capacity of soils is a s5 matter and therefore ranks above matters set out in s6-8. The focus for Policy SCN1 is the management of vegetation cover to achieve soil conservation. Clause (d) already identifies the protection of biodiversity and other natural and cultural values as matters that have to be considered in setting priorities for restoration, and in deciding how best to achieve the management and restoration of areas of vegetation. The provision for the matters in clause (d) will not limit the achievement of soil conservation, but rather influence how it will be achieved. The claim by the submitter that the Policy does not place a value on RMA s6 matters is therefore not correct.

For the reasons set out above the submission 565.237 is rejected and no amendment is required.

SCN1.28. Recommendation

449.244, F1074.645: Accept in part

565.237: Reject

Amendment

1. Amend the title of Policy SCN1, page 8-30, to read:

"Maintaining or restoring an intact and resilient vegetation cover"

8-30-37 Policy SCN1(d)(i)

8-30-37	334.350	Selwyn District Council	Add ", <i>including wilding trees</i> " after the word " <i>species</i> " in Policy SCN1(d)(i).
	F1043.4174	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Conditionally Oppose</i>
	F1044.4134	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Conditionally Oppose</i>
	F1046.172	Department of Conservation	<i>Support</i>
8-30-37	338.308	Mackenzie District Council	See submission point 334.350.
8-30-37	352.264	Waitaki District Council	See submission point 334.350.
8-30-37	378.307	Christchurch City Council (formerly BPDC).	See submission point 334.350.
8-30-37	413.295	Waimate District Council	See submission point 334.350.
8-30-37	471.350	Selwyn Central Community Board	See submission point 334.350.
8-30-37	539.385	Timaru District Council	See submission point 334.350.
	F1027.123	Matariki Forests	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1042.334	NZ Forest Owners Assn	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1043.4189	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Conditionally Oppose</i>
	F1044.4149	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Conditionally Oppose</i>
8-30-37	564.291	Hurunui District Council	See submission point 334.350.
8-30-37	573.270	Kaikoura District Council	See submission point 334.350.
8-30-37	603.169	Carter Holt Harvey Forests	Amend Policy SCN1(d)(i) to read: " <i>the introduction or spread of any plant pest species identified in a regional pest management strategy for the region;</i> " or words of like effect.
	F1042.169	NZ Forest Owners Assn	<i>Support</i>
	F1043.169	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.169	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>

Evaluations and reasons

334.350, F1043.4174, F1044.4134, F1046.172; 338.308, 352.264, 378.307, 413.295, 471.350, 539.385, F1027.123, F1042.334, F1043.4189, F1044.4149; 564.291, 573.270: The submitters all make the same submission point to specifically include "wilding trees" as an example of "undesirable plant species". Their reasons are that the Policy does not address the tension between promoting soil conservation by planting in "at risk" areas, and the potential problems that can arise from wilding trees.

F1027, F1042 oppose the original submitter 539 on the grounds that protection of s6 matters should not constrain the achievement of soil conservation.

F1043, F1044 oppose the original submitters 334 and 539 on the grounds that while supporting the need to control wilding trees, this should not constrain management of soil conservation

F1046 supports the original submitter 334, acknowledging the significance of the wilding problem in Canterbury.

Clause (d), as currently worded, contains a number of important matters that need to be addressed when deciding the best option to achieving soil conservation. The consideration of wilding trees raised by the submitters is already addressed through clause (d)(i) which specifically refers to undesirable plant species or plant pest species, and through clause (d)(ii) in relation to any adverse effects on natural values. Under the operative Canterbury Regional Pest Management Strategy (2005), "high-value environmental areas" can be identified for the specific management of wilding conifer spread, so the

issue raised is already addressed through the Strategy. Policy SCN1(d)(i) does not need to duplicate the provisions for wilding management in the Strategy, but by referring to the Strategy, Policy SCN1 provides for the integration of management needs for soil conservation and wilding spread.

For the reasons set out above, and to the extent that the concerns raised are already addressed by the Policy, the submissions 334.350, 338.308, 352.264, 378.307, 413.295, 471.350, 539.385, 564.291, 573.270 and further submissions F1027.123, F1042.334, F1043.4174, F1043.4189, F1044.4134, F1044.4149, F1046.172 are accepted in part. No Amendment is required.

603.169, F1042.169, F1043.169, F1044.169: The submitter wants the removal of the term "undesirable plant species" from clause (d)(i) as it has not been clearly defined beyond being something other than a plant pest species identified in a Regional Pest Management Strategy.

F1042.169, F1043.169, F1044.169 - the further submitters support the original submission for the reasons given by the original submitter.

The Explanation to the Policy contains some examples of undesirable species on page 8-32, paragraph 6, but this does not provide a definitive list of species. This could allow for different interpretations of the term that may affect the way the policy is implemented. It is agreed that the clause as written does not provide sufficient clarity of purpose and the reference to "undesirable plant species" needs to be removed. Policy SCN1 sub-clauses (d)(ii) and (d)(iii) identify the adverse effects of any vegetation management or restoration project that need to be avoided where possible. It is considered that any "undesirable" plant species is already defined by species likely to have an effect on the values listed in these clauses. An amendment also needs to be made to the Explanation to reflect these changes.

For the reasons above, the submission point 603.169 and further submissions F1042.169, F1043.169, F1044.169 are accepted. An amendment is required to Policy SCN1(d)(i) and a consequential amendment is required to the Explanation to Policy SCN1.

SCN1.29. Recommendation

603.169, F1042.169, F1043.169, F1044.169: Accept

334.350, 338.308, 352.264, 378.307, 413.295, 471.350, 539.385, 564.291, 573.270, F1027.123, F1042.334, F1043.4174, F1043.4189, F1044.4134, F1044.4149, F1046.172: Accept in part

Amendment

1. Amend Policy SCN1(d)(i), page 8-30, to read:

"(i) the introduction or spread, ~~of any undesirable plant species~~, or encouragement of the spread of any plant pest species identified in a any operative regional pest management strategy for the region; "

2. Amend Policy SCN1 Explanation and principal reasons, page 8-32, by:

- deleting paragraph 6 beginning: "~~Undesirable species of plants.....~~ " and
- Adding a sentence to the paragraph commencing SCN1(4), after the first sentence to read: "...protection of biodiversity. Examples of adverse effects include invasion into established areas of vegetation by hieracium or wilding conifers, or the introduction of trees into important "open" landscapes. The key focus"

8-30-43 Policy SCN4(2)(d)

8-30-43	603.170	Carter Holt Harvey Forests	Delete Policy SCN1(d)(iii).
	F1042.170	NZ Forest Owners Assn	<i>Support</i>
	F1043.170	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.170	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>

Evaluations and reasons

603.170, F1042.170, F1043.170, F1044.170:

The submitter wants sub-clause (d)(iii) deleted from Policy SCN1 on the grounds that it elevates water yield and the needs of abstractors over the use of land for a range of other purposes.

F1042, F1043, F1044 - support the original submission for the reasons given by the submitter.

It is not considered that sub-clause (d)(iii) elevates water yield above other land uses, as suggested by the submitter. Rather it gives effect to the issue of the effect of vegetation cover on water yield identified in Chapter 5 Water Quantity and the need to take this into account when deciding what vegetation cover

will be the best option for soil conservation purposes. As a consequence this may limit the options available for restoration in some flow-sensitive catchments. The Explanation to Policy SCN1, explains that a measure of the significance of any adverse effects on the values listed in clause (d) will depend on whether those adverse effects outweigh the benefits of restoration. For the reasons set out above, the submission 603.170 and the further submissions F1042.170, F1043.170, F1044.170 are rejected and no amendment is required.

SCN1.30. Recommendation

603.170, F1042.170, F1043.170, F1044.170: Reject

Amendment

Nil

8-31-20 Explanation and principal reasons Policy SCN1 (paragraph 3)

8-31-20	334.343	Selwyn District Council	Amend the explanation and principal reasons to Policy SCN1(1)(b) to ensure that the references match the numbering and sub numbering utilised in the policy.
8-31-20	338.301	Mackenzie District Council	See submission point 334.343.
8-31-20	352.257	Waitaki District Council	See submission point 334.343.
8-31-20	378.300	Christchurch City Council (formerly BPDC).	See submission point 334.343.
8-31-20	413.288	Waimate District Council	See submission point 334.343.
8-31-20	471.343	Selwyn Central Community Board	See submission point 334.343.
8-31-20	539.389	Timaru District Council	See submission point 334.343.
8-31-20	564.282	Hurunui District Council	See submission point 334.343.
8-31-20	573.263	Kaikoura District Council	See submission point 334.343.
8-31-31	334.344	Selwyn District Council	Amend the explanation and principal reasons to Policy SCN1(1)(2) to ensure that the references match the numbering and sub numbering utilised in the policy.
8-31-31	338.302	Mackenzie District Council	See submission point 334.344.
8-31-31	413.289	Waimate District Council	See submission point 334.344.
8-31-31	471.344	Selwyn Central Community Board	See submission point 334.344.
8-31-31	539.390	Timaru District Council	See submission point 334.344.
8-31-31	564.283	Hurunui District Council	See submission point 334.344.
8-31-31	573.264	Kaikoura District Council	See submission point 334.344.
8-31-42	603.171	Carter Holt Harvey Forests	Delete point (b) of "Examples of management options are:"
	F1042.171	NZ Forest Owners Assn	<i>Support</i>
	F1043.171	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.171	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
	F1074.646	Federated Farmers of NZ (Inc)	<i>Oppose</i>
8-31-	603.172	Carter Holt Harvey	Amend point (c) of "Examples to

44		Forests	<i>management options are"</i> - to be renamed as (b) - as follows: <i>"(b) over-sowing and top-dressing of existing areas of pasture where there will be ongoing maintenance of the vegetation cover in the long-term;"</i> or words to like effect.
	F1042.172	NZ Forest Owners Assn	<i>Support</i>
	F1043.172	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.172	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
	F1074.647	Federated Farmers of NZ (Inc)	<i>Oppose</i>
8-31-47	603.173	Carter Holt Harvey Forests	Amend point (e) of " <i>Examples to mangement options are"</i> - to be renamed as (d) - as follows: <i>"(d) forestry planting, gully wall planting, or space-planted poplars;"</i> or words to like effect.
	F1042.173	NZ Forest Owners Assn	<i>Support</i>
	F1043.173	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.173	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
	F1074.648	Federated Farmers of NZ (Inc)	<i>Oppose</i>
8-31-50	603.174	Carter Holt Harvey Forests	Delete point (g) of " <i>Examples of management options are:"</i> from the Explanation and principal reasons
	F1042.174	NZ Forest Owners Assn	<i>Support</i>
	F1043.174	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.174	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
	F1074.649	Federated Farmers of NZ (Inc)	<i>Oppose</i>

Evaluations and reasons

334.343, 334.344, 338.301, 338.302, 352.257, 352.258, 378.300, 378.301, 413.288, 413.289, 471.343, 471.344, 539.389, 539.390, 564.282, 564.283, 573.263, 573.264: All submitters request the same changes to the Explanation to policy SCN1 to correct the numbering of paragraphs to match the policy numbering. The submitters site two examples of inconsistent numbering.

It is accepted that there is an inconsistency that needs to be corrected for each of the paragraphs numbered in the Explanation. The change does not affect the intent of the Policy or Explanation. The submissions are all accepted and an amendment is required.

603.171, F1042.171, F1043.171, F1044.171, F1074.646; 603.174, F1042.174, F1043.174, F1044.174, F1074.649: The submitter wants to delete management options (b) and (g) on the grounds of growing concerns over nutrient inputs to watercourses and the pressure on water supplies.
F1042, F1043, F1044 - support the original submissions for the reasons given by the original submitter.
F1074 opposes the original submissions as these are legitimate and effective management options under appropriate circumstances

The Explanation lists a range of alternative management options that could be considered for improving vegetation cover on hill and high country land. Any use of the options listed for soil conservation purposes would have to be consistent with any policies and rules in other chapters of the NRRP that apply to these activities. Chapters 4 and 5 of the NRRP address respectively the management of nutrient applications and the allocation of water for irrigation. This provides for an integrated approach to management. However, it is considered that the addition of a further sentence to paragraph 4 of the Explanation stating that the choice of options will be dependent on compliance with any rules in other chapters of the NRRP

or any other regional plan would clarify this integrated approach for the user of the NRRP. For the reasons set out above the submissions 603.171, 603.174 and further submissions F1042.171, F1042.174, F1043.171, F1043.174, F1044.171, F1044.174 are accepted in part. Further submissions F1074.646, F1074.649 are accepted. An amendment is required.

603.172, F1042.172, F1043.172, F1044.172, F1074.647: The submitter wants to amend management option (c) to limit over-sowing and topdressing to existing areas of pasture. No specific reasons are given for this amendment.

F1042, F1043, F1044 - support the original submission for the reasons given by the original submitter
F1074- oppose the original submission on the grounds that extension of pastoral land is a legitimate option under appropriate circumstances

There may be situations where pasture establishment would be an effective long-term option for restoration of depleted areas. Providing this meets the criteria for Policy SCN1 and Objective SCN1, and it complies with any rules in other chapters of NRRP then this should be an available option. Deciding on the appropriate option should be made on a case-by-case basis; it is not considered appropriate to limit options available for consideration where they have the potential to achieve the policy.

For the reasons set out above, the submission 603.172 and further submissions F1042.172, F1043.172, F1044.172 are rejected. Further submission F1074.647 is accepted. No amendment is required.

603.173, F1042.173, F1043.173, F1044.173, F1074.648: The submitter seeks an amendment to management option (e) to include specific tree planting options for other than plantation forestry, and to remove the reference to the risk of wilding spread. The submitter states that wilding spread is a management issue and should not limit the option.

F1042, F1043, F1044 - support the original submission for the reasons given by the original submitter
F1074 - opposes the original submission on the grounds that the current wording provides for the control of a known major pest plant.

Tree planting can be a useful method of slope stabilisation, because their deep roots and protective canopy protect the soil in situ. The amendment sought by the submitter would be a useful addition to the list of management options.

The risk of wilding spread from forestry areas will depend on a number of factors including location of the planting, the tree species planted, the force and direction of the prevailing wind, and the adjacent land use. Wildings are a recognised risk to biodiversity values in the Regional Pest Management Strategy (2005) which targets their control in high-value environmental areas. Chapter 8 does not include any control for wilding spread, so it is important that in taking a non-regulatory approach the Chapter clearly identifies risks and encourages those options that minimise the risk of wilding spread.

For the reasons set out above, submission 603.173 and further submissions F1042.173, F1043.173, F1044.173 are rejected. Further submission F1074.648 is accepted for its opposition. No amendment is required.

SCN1.31. Recommendation

334.343, 334.344, 338.301, 338.302, 352.257, 352.258, 378.300, 378.301, 413.288, 413.289, 471.343, 471.344, 539.389, 539.390, 564.282, 564.283, 573.263, 573.264, F1074.646, F1074.647, F1074.648, F1074.649: Accept

603.171, 603.174, F1042.171, F1042.174, F1043.171, F1043.174, F1044.171, F1044.174: Accept in part

603.172, 603.173, F1042.172, F1042.173, F1043.172, F1043.173, F1044.172, F1044.173: Reject

Amendment

1. Amend the paragraph numbering in Policy SCN1 Explanation and principal reasons, page 8-31 and 8-32, as follows:

1.1 On page 8-31

change paragraph 2 beginning SCN1(1)(a)	to <u>SCN1(a)(i)</u>
change paragraph 3 beginning SCN1(1)(b)	to <u>SCN1(a)(ii)</u>
change paragraph 4 beginning SCN1(2)	to <u>SCN1(b)</u>

1.2 On page 8-32

change paragraph 1 beginning SCN1(2)(a)	to <u>SCN1(b)(i)</u>
change paragraph 2 beginning SCN2(2)(b)	to <u>SCN1(b)(ii)</u>
change paragraph 3 beginning SCN1(2)(c)	to <u>SCN1(b)(ii)</u>
change paragraph 4 beginning SCN1(3)	to <u>SCN1(c)</u>
change paragraph 5 beginning SCN1(4)	to <u>SCN1(d)</u>

2. Amend paragraph 4, page 8-31, line 3 to read:

"The choice of option will depend on the physical environment and the composition of the species remaining on the ground and will have to be consistent with any policies and rules in other chapters of the NRRP that place controls on the planting of vegetation, for example the controls on forestry planting in Chapter 5 Water Quantity."

8-33-3 Methods for Policy SCN1

8-33-3	257.1589	Upper Waitaki Branch Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-33-3	289.2110	North Bank Land Owners Group	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-33-3	476.812	Christchurch City Council	Amend Methods for Policy SCN1 to indicate that a somewhat less resilient vegetation cover and higher levels of grazing may be justified where it better reduces fire risks, or maintains outstanding landscapes or species bio-diversity, such as the open landscape of the eastern Port Hills.
8-33-3	506.1581	Hugh Turnbull	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-33-3	586.1581	Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces	Retain Methods SCN1.
	F1003.9	Landco Pastoral Holdings Ltd	<i>Support in part.</i>
	F1043.3070	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.3059	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
8-33-3	669.1577	South Island High Country Section, Federated Farmers NZ	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-33-9	334.351	Selwyn District Council	Insert a new item (e) under Method SCN1(a), as follows: " <u>ensure that a wilding tree issue does not result</u> ".
	F1043.4175	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Conditionally Oppose</i>
	F1044.4135	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Conditionally Oppose</i>
8-33-9	338.309	Mackenzie District Council	See submission point 334.351.
8-33-9	352.265	Waitaki District Council	See submission point 334.351.
8-33-9	378.308	Christchurch City Council (formerly BPDC).	See submission point 334.351.
8-33-9	413.296	Waimate District Council	See submission point 334.351.
8-33-9	471.351	Selwyn Central Community Board	See submission point 334.351.
8-33-9	472.16	Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc, Mackenzie Branch	Amend Method SCN1(a) to remove the impression that studies of soil conservation are only just beginning.
8-33-9	476.815	Christchurch City Council	Amend Method SCN1(a) to expand to accommodate 'integrated catchment management plans' prepared by ECan in conjunction with the landowner / occupier as a principle method of achieving better soil management on the Port Hills.

8-33-9	539.386	Timaru District Council	See submission point 334.351.
	F1027.124	Matariki Forests	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1042.335	NZ Forest Owners Assn	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1043.4190	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Conditionally Oppose</i>
	F1044.4150	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Conditionally Oppose</i>
8-33-9	573.271	Kaikoura District Council	See submission point 334.351.
8-33-33	564.292	Hurunui District Council	See submission point 334.351.

Evaluations and reasons

476.812: The submitter says that the methods are excessive in seeking plant cover and grazing management that will "retain soils in situ". The submitter states that in the case of the Port Hills this has created internal conflicts between management required for soil conservation and the protection of natural values.

Underpinning Objective SCN1 and its policies and methods is the purpose of the RMA, to safeguard the life-supporting capacity of the soil, and the function of regional councils, through their regional plans, to manage land for soil conservation. Retaining soils in situ is crucial to achieving Objective SCN1. This is a s5 matter and therefore ranks above the matters raised by the submitter which are set out in s6-8 of the RMA. This does not mean that soil conservation will be achieved in isolation from the issues raised by the submitter. The policies and methods under Objective SCN1 provide a framework for ensuring that the protection of important values is taken into consideration in deciding the best management options for achieving Objective SCN1. The focus for Policy SCN1 is the maintenance of an intact and resilient vegetation cover to retain soils in situ. The role of the methods is to make available sufficient information for the individual landholder to identify and address any conflicts between the needs for vegetation management and the protection of values and make the best management choice in their particular situation. Method SCN1(a)(vi) specifically addresses the issues raised by the submitter by identifying sources of information on the identification of values and the requirements for protection of those values which will enable management decisions to take these matters into consideration on a case-by-case basis. It is considered that the methods under Policy SCN1 adequately provide for the concerns raised by the submitter.

For the reasons set out above the submission 476.812 is rejected and no amendment is required.

257.1589, 289.2110, 506.1581, 586.1581, F1003.9, F1043.3070, F1044.3059; 669.1577:

The submitters support the methods for Policy SCN1 as they consider that Objective SCN1 is more likely to be achieved through co-operation than by regulation.

F1003 - supports for the original submission 586 on the grounds that the methods generally achieve the outcomes sought and any change may alter those outcomes.

F1043, F1044 - support the original submission 586 for the reasons given by the original submitter.

The submissions 586.1581, 257.1589, 289.2110, 506.1581, 669.1577 and further submissions F1003.9, F1043.3070, F1044.3059 are accepted for their support. No amendment is required.

334.351, F1043.4175, F1044.4135; 338.309, 352.265, 378.308, 413.296, 471.351, 539.386, F1027.124, F1042.335, F1043.4190, F1044.4150; 573.271, 564.292:

The submitters all request the same amendment to the method to recognise that an adverse effect exists with wilding trees.

F1027, F1042, F1043, F1044 - oppose the submission 539 on the grounds that protection of s6 matters should not constrain the management of soil conservation.

The amendment as written seeks to "ensure" that a wilding risk does not result. This is not appropriate under the non-regulatory approach adopted by the Policy. The Policy already identifies the risk of wilding spread, particularly into areas of high natural and cultural value, as an adverse effect to be avoided where possible and it is accepted that the methods need to support this. There is a substantial amount of information available on minimising the risk of wilding spread. Adding this to the list of information in Method SCN1(a)(a) will be a more appropriate way to address the concerns expressed by the submitter and provide a basis for individual landholders to make management decisions that adequately address the issue of wilding spread.

The further submissions are accepted in part for their opposition to the amendment as suggested by the submitters. However as it is considered that some amendment is required, the opposition is only accepted in part.

For the reasons set out above, the original submissions 334.351, 338.309, 352.265, 378.308, 413.296, 471.351, 539.386, 573.271, 564.292 and the further submissions F1027.124, F1042.335, F1043.4175, F1043.4190, F1044.4135, F1044.4150 are accepted in part and an amendment is required.

472.16: The submitter says that Method SCN1(a) needs reassessment to identify whether it can be delivered. No specific issues are raised by the submitter to support their concerns. The role of Method SCN1(a) is to reinforce Policy SCN1 by providing practical information relating to vegetation management techniques and the requirements for protection of the range of values identified. The role of the method is to provide information as it becomes available. There is therefore no guarantee as to how much information will be available, but the method lists the areas for which information will be sought over the ten year life of the plan. In the absence of any specific amendment requested to the Method, the submission is rejected and no amendment is required.

476.815: The submitter requests the inclusion of integrated property plans as a principle method under Policy SCN1 for achieving soil conservation on the Port Hills. Method SCN1(a)(c) promotes the development of property plans to establish priorities for vegetation management and feral animal management. Dealing with vegetation management for soil conservation is probably most often achieved on an individual property basis, except in specific cases such as the Port Hills where a combination of small holdings and extensive soil erosion issues create the need for more integrated management approach. The methods under Policy SCN1 apply to all hill and high country non-arable land in the region, so the use of integrated catchment plans will not necessarily be promoted as the principal method to achieve soil conservation. However it is accepted that such catchment plans would provide another useful tool to add to Method SCN1(a)(c). For the reasons given, the submission is accepted in part and an amendment is required.

SCN1.32. Recommendation

257.1589, 289.2110, 506.1581, 586.1581, 669.1577, F1003.9, F1043.3070, F1044.3059: Accept

334.351, 338.309, 352.265, 378.308, 413.296, 471.351, 476.815, 539.386, 573.271, 564.292, F1027.124, F1042.335, F1043.4175, F1043.4190, F1044.4135, F1044.4150: Accept in part

472.16, 476.812: Reject

Amendment

1. Amend Method SCN1(a)(a), page 8-33, by adding the following sub-clause:
"(vii) techniques to minimise wilding spread from plantation forest (design, location, species); and
2. Amend Method SCN1 (a)(c), page 8-33 to read:
"(c) promote the development of property plans and integrated catchment management plans as a tool tools to identify:"

8-33-38 Method SCN1(b) Investigations

8-33-38	472.17	Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc, Mackenzie Branch	Amend Method SCN1(b) to remove the impression that studies of soil conservation are only just beginning.
---------	--------	--	--

Submission Clarification

Submission 476.816 was incorrectly coded to this provision. It has been evaluated under submission point 476.815 at 8-33-38 Methods for Policy SCN1.

Evaluations and reasons

472.17: The submitter states that although soil conservation practices have been studied for over half a century, the impression of Method SCN1(b) Investigations is that all the investigations are still to be done. There is a request to re-assess the Method. Method SCN1(b) as it is currently written includes a mix of collating existing information, and using that information to develop specific tools and processes for the management or restoration of vegetation cover on land that is vulnerable to erosion, or has already been subject to erosion and loss of topsoil. The Method recognises that there is a considerable amount of baseline information available, but that there are gaps in the interpretation and practical application of the information. This is identified by the wording of Method (b)(b) which identifies areas where "further" information is required. The process of collating existing information will identify more clearly just where the key gaps in current understanding of vegetation management are. This will be used to focus any further research or investigations.

For the reasons set out above the submission is rejected and no amendment required.

SCN1.33. Recommendation

472.17: Accept in part

Amendment

Nil

8-34-17 Method SCN1(c) Economic instruments

8-34-17	486.336	Te Runanga O Ngai Tahu	Amend Method SCN1(c) to include Papatipu runanga (as well as TRONT).
	F1043.1480	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1044.1480	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Oppose</i>
8-34-17	563.348	Te Hapu O Ngati Wheke Rapaki Runanga Inc	Support submission by Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu (refer 486).

Submission Clarification

Submission 476.816 was incorrectly coded to this provision. It has been evaluated under submission point 476.815 at 8-33-3 Methods for Policy SCN1.

Evaluations and reasons

486.336, F1043.1480, F1044.1480; 563.348: The submitters 486 and 563 support Method SCN1(b)(c) investigations to work with Te Runanga O Ngai Tahu but point out that the Method also needs to include working with each Papatipu Runanga.

F1043 and F1044 have opposed the entire submission of 486, but their reasons relate only to the control of forestry planting activities. These reasons are not relevant to the submission point raised here.

The suggestion made by the submitters is accepted as the inclusion of Papatipu Runanga will improve the effectiveness of the method.

For the reasons given above, submissions 486.336, 563.348 are accepted and further submissions F1043.1480, F1044.1480 are rejected. An amendment is required.

SCN1.34. Recommendation

486.336, 563.348: Accept

F1043.1480, F1044.1480: Reject

Amendment

Amend Method SCN1(b)(c), page 8-34, to read:

"Environment Canterbury will work with Te Runanga O Ngai Tahu and individual Papatipu Runanga to identify how land use activities"

8-34-29 Policy SCN2: Soil quality management on non-arable land

8-34-29	411.40	New Zealand Fertiliser Manufacturers Research Association Inc	Retain Policy SCN2's current approach for managing soil quality on non-arable land.
	F1003.25	Landco Pastoral Holdings Ltd	<i>Support in part.</i>
8-34-29	472.19	Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc, Mackenzie Branch	Reassess Policy SCN2 in light of comments in Appendix 1 included with the submission.
8-34-29	476.828	Christchurch City Council	Amend Policy SCN2 to make it clear that it does not apply when the land is used for urban activities, and amend the relevant environmental results anticipated to reflect this.
	F1074.650	Federated Farmers of NZ (Inc)	<i>Oppose</i>

8-34-30 Policy SCN2(1)

8-34-30	449.245	Transit New Zealand	Amend the wording of Policy SCN2 to state that it applies to agricultural practices only as follows: " <i>Encourage landholders of agricultural land in the non arable...</i> " and make necessary changes to Explanation and principal reasons to Policy SCN2.
	F1074.651	Federated Farmers of NZ (Inc)	<i>Oppose</i>

Evaluations and reasons

411.40, F1003.25: The submitter supports the approach taken in Policy SCN2 to maintain soil quality. F1003 supports the original submission subject to any amendments set out in their original submission. However, no specific points or reasons were made in their original submission that were directed to Policy SCN2.

The submission and the further submission are accepted for their support and no amendment is required.

449.245, F1074.651: The submitter supports the intent of the Policy but believes that it is intended to cover land used for farming/agricultural activities only. They request an amendment to clarify this. F1074 opposes the original submission on the grounds that soil is a limited resource and any activity that affects its value should be subject to control on an equal basis.

It is accepted that on land used for activities such as roading, building it will not be possible to maintain soil quality factors such as fertility levels, soil organic matter etc. The policy should make it clear that it applies to all land used for productive purposes or where a vegetation cover is to be maintained. This is more extensive than the "farming/agricultural practices" suggestion made by the submitter. The title of the Policy should be amended to clarify the scope of land to which it applies.

F1074 - The opposition is accepted in part, except for the point raised by the submitter regarding the need for clarification.

For the reasons set out above, the submission and further submission are accepted in part and an amendment is required.

472.19: The submitter wants Policy SCN2 reassessed on the basis of some "alternative views" on soil nutrient balances provided with their submission.

The points raised by the submitter refer to the current nutrient balances for pastoral farms as being in credit for most nutrients. This is not disputed by the Policy. The focus of Policy SCN2 is on maintaining soil quality by balancing nutrient inputs and losses, and maintaining soil quality factors such as soil organic matter levels. The use of nutrient budgets and the development of a nutrient budget model for the hill and high country will improve the ability to monitor the inputs and losses of nutrients from farming systems. It is not considered that the alternative views require the reassessment of Policy SCN2 as there does not appear to be any dispute between the policy as written and the points raised in the submission. For the reasons outlined the submission is rejected and no amendment is required.

476.828, F1074.650: The submitter points out that the Policy as currently worded includes land such as the Port Hills which is classed as hill country but is used in part for urban activities. This is seen as not being appropriate.

F1074 opposes the original submission on the grounds that soil is a limited resource and any activity that affects its value should be subject to control on an equal basis.

Policy SCN2 currently refers to all non-arable land and it is accepted that there are situations where maintaining soil quality is not a requirement to be considered. However, the removal of all "urban" land as suggested by the submitter may not be appropriate. Instead, the distinction should be made on the grounds of specific land use carried out, in this case productive use, not the urban/rural classification.

F1074 - The opposition is accepted in part, but it will not be applicable to the way land is used in urban or other non-productive situations.

For the reasons outlined above, the submission and further submission are accepted in part and an amendment is required to clarify the focus for the policy.

SCN1.35. Recommendation

411.40, F1003.25: Accept

449.245, 476.828, F1074.650, F1074.651: Accept in part

472.19: Reject

Amendment

Amend the title to Policy SCN2, page 8-34 of Chapter 8 to read:

"Policy SCN2: Soil quality management on non-arable land used for production"

8-34-32	257.1590	Upper Waitaki Branch Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-34-32	289.2111	North Bank Land Owners Group	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-34-32	506.1582	Hugh Turnbull	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-34-32	586.1582	Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces	Delete the words " <i>that would be contrary to Policies WQL4 and WQL9 in Chapter 4: Water quality</i> " from Policy SCN2 (1)(a).
	F1043.3071	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.3060	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
	F1046.173	Department of Conservation	<i>Oppose</i>
8-34-32	669.1578	South Island High Country Section, Federated Farmers NZ	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).

Evaluations and reasons

257.1590, 289.2111, 506.1582, 586.1582, F1043.3071, F1044.3060, F1046.173; 669.1578: The submitters support for Policy SCN2 is conditional on a resolution being reached in respect of their submissions on Policies WQL4 and WQL9 and their associated rules in Chapter 4 Water Quality. The submitter claims that the Chapter 4 policies and rules do not promote soil conservation and reference to them should be removed from Policy SCN2.

F1043, F1044 support the original submission 586 for the reasons given by the original submitter F1046 opposes the original submission 586 on the grounds that sedimentation can impact on in-stream ecosystem values, so the cross reference is appropriate. This is accepted.

The policies and rules referred to by submitter 586 relate to the application of fertiliser and its management to maintain water quality. Reference to the Water Quality policies in Policy SCN2 is made in recognition of the fact that all policies in the NRRP must be read together to provide for the integration of management for land and water resources. While the addition of fertiliser is promoted to balance nutrient losses resulting from land use, this must be achieved in a way and at a rate that will avoid causing adverse effects to other resources, such as the leaching of excessive nutrients through into the ground water. So it is appropriate for Policy SCN2 to alert readers to any other policies in the NRRP that may affect their interpretation of this Policy.

As a result of other submissions, there may be changes made to the Water Quality policies referred to in Policy SCN2, however the referencing between Policy SCN2 and the Water Quality policies will continue to provide guidance on the application of fertilisers to maintain water quality. Policy SCN2 should therefore retain the reference to other policies that will have a direct influence on fertiliser use.

For the reasons set out above, the submissions 586.1582, 257.1590, 289.2111, 506.1582, 669.1578 and the further submissions F1043.3071, F1044.3060 are rejected. Further submission F1046.173 is accepted. No amendment is required.

SCN1.36. Recommendation

F1046.173: Accept

257.1590, 289.2111, 506.1582, 586.1582, 669.1578, F1043.3071, F1044.3060: Reject

Amendment

Nil

8-34-37	353.1	R D Fenwick	Add new rules to provide for the management of burning activities in this Chapter and ensure that this activity stops immediately.
	F1074.638	Federated Farmers of NZ (Inc)	<i>Oppose</i>

Evaluations and reasons

353.1, F1074.638: The submitter opposes the current provision Policy SCN2(1)(b) on the grounds that there are no rules for the management of burning activities in Chapter 8.

F1074.638 has opposed submission 353.1 on the grounds that it has supported the decision taken by Environment Canterbury that it can address soil conservation issues by taking a proactive, non-regulatory approach focussing on understanding and monitoring of land use activities.

Vegetation burning activities are already managed through the operative regional plan Land and Vegetation Regional Management Plan (L&VRMP) Part IV. The L&VRMP has rules in place to control the timing, location and methods used for burning activities to maintain vegetation cover and prevent nutrient loss or erosion. While it is accepted that rules are required to control vegetation burning activities, there is no need for the NRRP to duplicate the provisions from another operative regional plan.

F1074 - while the opposition to submission 535 is accepted, the reasons provided are not accepted as Environment Canterbury already has rules for the burning of vegetation, implemented through another regional plan.

For the reasons set out above, submission 353.1 and further submission F1074.638 are accepted in part. No amendment is required.

SCN1.37. Recommendation

353.1, F1074.638: Accept in part

Amendment

Nil

8-34-39 Policy SCN2(2)

8-34-39	334.341	Selwyn District Council	Add the words " <i>or adversely affect the protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes</i> " after the word ' <i>biodiversity</i> ' in Policy SCN2(2).
	F1043.4180	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Conditionally Oppose</i>
	F1044.4140	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Conditionally Oppose</i>
8-34-39	338.299	Mackenzie District Council	See submission point 334.341.
8-34-39	352.255	Waitaki District Council	See submission point 334.341.
8-34-39	378.298	Christchurch City Council (formerly BPDC).	See submission point 334.341.
8-34-39	413.286	Waimate District Council	See submission point 334.341.
8-34-39	471.341	Selwyn Central Community Board	See submission point 334.341.
8-34-39	472.18	Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc, Mackenzie Branch	Delete Policy SCN2(2).
	F1046.174	Department of Conservation	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1051.152	Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society of NZ Inc	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1074.652	Federated Farmers of NZ (Inc)	<i>Support</i>
8-34-39	539.387	Timaru District Council	Amend Policy SCN2(2) by adding the words " <i>or adversely affect the protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes, and/or significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna, and/or result in a wilding tree problem</i> " after the word " <i>biodiversity</i> ".
	F1027.125	Matariki Forests	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1042.336	NZ Forest Owners Assn	<i>Oppose</i>

	F1043.4191	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Conditionally Oppose</i>
	F1044.4151	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Conditionally Oppose</i>
8-34-39	573.261	Kaikoura District Council	See submission point 334.341.
8-34-40	334.352	Selwyn District Council	Add the words " <u>, or result in a wilding tree problem</u> " after the word "biodiversity" in Policy SCN2(2).
	F1027.118	Matariki Forests	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1042.329	NZ Forest Owners Assn	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1043.4176	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Conditionally Oppose</i>
	F1044.4136	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Conditionally Oppose</i>
8-34-40	338.310	Mackenzie District Council	See submission point 334.352.
8-34-40	352.266	Waitaki District Council	See submission point 334.352.
8-34-40	378.309	Christchurch City Council (formerly BPDC).	See submission point 334.352.
8-34-40	413.297	Waimate District Council	See submission point 334.352.
8-34-40	471.352	Selwyn Central Community Board	See submission point 334.352.
8-34-40	564.293	Hurunui District Council	See submission point 334.352.
8-34-40	573.272	Kaikoura District Council	See submission point 334.352.

Evaluations and reasons

334.341, F1043.4180, F1044.4140; 334.352, F1027.118, F1042.329, F1043.4176, F1044.4136; 338.299, 338.310, 352.255, 352.266, 378.298, 378.309, 413.286, 413.297, 471.341, 471.352, 539.387, F1027.125, F1042.336, F1043.4191, F1044.4151; 564.293, 573.261, 573.272: Each of the submitters make the same points that the policy does not adequately address the tension that exists between promoting soil conservation values and protecting significant indigenous values, outstanding natural features and landscapes and ensuring that problems do not arise from wilding trees. They suggest that this matter is only addressed appropriately in Policy SCN4(b). This submission point has been addressed across Issue SCN1, Objective SCN1 and Policies SCN1, SCN2.

F1043, F1044, F1027, F1042 - oppose in part the original submissions on the grounds that while the protection of s6 matters is supported when scientifically justified, it should not constrain management of soil conservation through Chapter 8. District plans provide this protection through land use consents. F1027 also oppose the submissions on the grounds that the amendment relating to wilding trees is outside the Plan process.

The focus for Policy SCN2 is the maintenance of soil quality to protect the life-supporting capacity and the productivity of soils by replacing nutrient losses and maintaining soil organic matter levels. The purpose of Clause (2) is to give effect to the Policy without compromising other important issues and values identified for the land. With the exception of extensive pastoral activities, it is likely that fertiliser inputs will be required to balance nutrient losses from land use activities on hill and high country non-arable land. Fertiliser application has the potential to cause changes in vegetation cover or species composition by creating improved soil fertility conditions that are more conducive to the growth of some species over other species. This could have a direct effect on indigenous biodiversity if exotic species such as pasture species or pest species were provided with conditions that enabled them to spread and dominate areas of existing indigenous vegetation. It is also accepted that this change to the vegetation could have consequential effects on landscape values and this is a valid issue to add to clause (2) as a matter to provide for when deciding the best management option. The issue of wilding trees is not considered to be directly related to soil quality management - it has been addressed more appropriately under vegetation cover management in Policy SCN1.

The concerns raised by the further submitters are accepted in part as an amendment to Policy SCN2 is needed. The effect of wilding trees on important natural and landscape values is a valid issue to address through the regional plan, however it is not considered to be relevant to this policy.

For the reasons set out above, the submissions 334.352, 338.299, 352.255, 378.298, 413.286, 471.341, 539.387, 573.261 are accepted in part and submissions 334.342, 338.310, 352.266, 378.309, 413.297,

471.352, 564.293, 573.272 are rejected. Further submissions F1042.329, F1042.336, F1043.4176, F1043.4180, F1043.4191, F1044.4136, F1044.4140, F1044.4151 are accepted and F1027.118, F1027.125 are accepted in part. An amendment is required.

472.18, F1046.174, F1051.152, F1074.652: The submitter wishes to delete clause (2) from Policy SCN2 on the grounds that it should not be part of a policy for soil conservation. No specific reasons are provided in explanation.

F1046, F1051 oppose the original submission on the grounds that maintaining indigenous biodiversity values is an essential element of promoting sustainable management

F1074 supports original submission saying that the inclusion of clause (2) is superfluous.

There is a requirement under the RMA to provide for s6 matters when carrying out functions and responsibilities for sustainable management. This does not mean that s6 matters will constrain the achievement of soil conservation, but they may influence the ways in which it should be achieved. The measures set out in Policy SCN2(2) are therefore relevant to include in the Policy.

For the reasons set out above the submission 472.18 and further submission F1074.652 are rejected. Further submissions F1046.174, F1051.152 are accepted. No amendment is required.

SCN1.38. Recommendation

F1042.329, F1042.336, F1043.4176, F1043.4180, F1043.4191, F1044.4136, F1044.4140, F1044.4151, F1046.174, F1051.152: Accept

334.341, 338.299, 352.255, 378.298, 413.286, 471.341, 539.387, 573.261, F1027.118, F1027.125: Accept in part

334.352, 338.310, 352.266, 378.309, 413.297, 471.352, 472.18, 564.293, 573.272, F1074.652: Reject

Amendment

Amend Policy SCN2(2), page 8-34, to read:

"(2) The measures taken indigenous biodiversity or significant adverse effects on outstanding natural features and landscapes."

8-35-38 Methods for Policy SCN2

8-35-38	411.43	New Zealand Fertiliser Manufacturers Research Association Inc	Retain the approach of not having rules to implement Policy SCN2.
	F1003.26	Landco Pastoral Holdings Ltd	<i>Support in part.</i>

Evaluations and reasons

411.43, F1003.26: The submitter supports the current non-regulatory approach to implementing Policy SCN2.

F1003 supports the original submission on the grounds that the policy generally achieves the outcomes sought and any change to the wording could result in changes to the outcomes.

This support is accepted and no amendment is required.

SCN1.39. Recommendation

411.43, F1003.26: Accept

Amendment

Nil

8-36-1 Method SCN2(a) Information and promotion

8-36-1	411.44	New Zealand Fertiliser Manufacturers Research Association Inc	Retain Method SCN2(a)'s approach of promoting the use of nutrient budgets and nutrient budget models.
8-36-1	472.20	Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc, Mackenzie Branch	Retain Method SCN2(a) but acknowledge the size of the task.
8-36-1	565.239	Ashburton District Council	Retain Method SCN2(a), specifically the intention to promote and educate for soil health.

Evaluations and reasons

411.44, 472.20, 565.239: The submitters each support the methods to implement Policy SCN2. Submitter 472 requests a reassessment of the methods to identify if they can be delivered.

The support of the submitters is accepted. It is unclear from submitter 472 whether their concerns for delivery of the methods apply to Method SCN2(a) or SCN2(b) or both. The provision and promotion of information is an ongoing task for Environment Canterbury to maintain awareness and understanding in the community of new techniques and management tools and to contribute to informed decision-making. The areas for investigation listed in Method SCN2(b) will be undertaken in co-operation with a range of other agencies. These investigations will be prioritised on the basis of the available expertise and finances to undertake the work.

For the support given, the submissions are accepted and no amendment is required.

SCN1.40. Recommendation

411.44, 472.20, 565.239: Accept

Amendment

Nil

8-36-11 Method SCN2(b) Investigations

8-36-11	472.21	Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc, Mackenzie Branch	Retain Method SCN2(b) but acknowledge the size of the task.
8-36-14	257.1591	Upper Waitaki Branch Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-36-14	289.2112	North Bank Land Owners Group	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-36-14	411.45	New Zealand Fertiliser Manufacturers Research Association Inc	Amend Method SCN2(b)(a) to clarify what is required to be developed, ie, a nutrient budget or an additional model to undertake nutrient budgets?
8-36-14	506.1583	Hugh Turnbull	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-36-14	586.1583	Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces	Delete the words " <i>based on the Overseer model for arable soils</i> " from Method SCN2(b)(a).
	F1043.3072	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.3061	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
	F1076.460	NZ Vegetable and Potato Growers and three other organisations	<i>Support</i>
8-36-14	669.1579	South Island High Country Section, Federated Farmers NZ	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).

Evaluations and reasons

257.1591, 289.2112, 506.1583, 586.1583, F1043.3072, F1044.3061, F1076.460; 669.1579: The submitters make three comments in relation to the development of a nutrient budget model for the hill and high country:

- (i) that it is unlikely that one generic nutrient budget model will be applicable over such a widespread area
- (ii) that the Overseer model may not be adaptable for the hill and high country
- (iii) that any investigation works with other agencies to avoid duplication of work already done.

F1043, F1044, F1076 all support submission 586 for the reasons given by the submitter.

The investigation as written is to modify the existing Overseer model for use in the non-arable hill and high country. The method needs to be clarified to identify this as the first step, with further options for investigation if Overseer proves unsuitable for modification, or unsuited to the range of hill and high country management situations. Removal of the reference to the Overseer model from this investigation seems to be premature until it is shown to be unsuitable. The method currently identifies Environment

Canterbury as working with a range of other groups and agencies to develop a nutrient budget model. This should cover the concerns raised with regard to building on work already underway rather than duplicating it.

For the reasons set out above, the submissions and further submissions 257.1591, 289.2112, 506.1583, 586.1583, 669.1579, F1043.3072, F1044.3061, F1074.460 are all accepted in part and an amendment is required.

472.21: The submitter suggests that the method needs to be reassessed to determine whether it can be delivered. No specific changes are requested.

The investigations list a number of areas where there will be ongoing research into ways to improve soil quality management. These investigations recognise that Environment Canterbury will be just one of a number of parties working in the areas of research. The submitter is right to suggest that these areas involve a massive amount of work - the key to the investigations is that they will provide for the continual improvement of knowledge in the area of soil quality management. A mandatory 10-year review of the NRRP will identify just how well it has been able to deliver in each of these areas of investigation. For the reasons set out, the submission is accepted in part and no amendment is required.

411.45: The submitter wants Method (b)(a) amended to clarify whether it requires the development of a new model or a new nutrient budget for the hill and high country.

Environment Canterbury has identified the need for a nutrient budget model that can be applied to the extensive pastoral regimes of the hill and high country, and in particular to undeveloped areas used for grazing that have had little or no management inputs in the past. This method will explore the option of modifying the Overseer model, currently used on arable production systems, for use in the non-arable hill and high country. In the first instance the investigation will review an existing working model rather than develop a new model. If the result of this investigation shows that the modification of the Overseer model is not workable, then new options may be explored. The intent of the investigation could be made clearer by an amendment to the current wording to specify the modification of the current Overseer model. For the reasons set out above the submission is accepted and an amendment is required.

SCN1.41. Recommendation

411.45: Accept

257.1591, 289.2112, 472.21, 506.1583, 586.1583, 669.1579, F1043.3072, F1044.3061, F1074.460: Accept in part

Amendment

Amend Method SCN2(b)(a), page 8-36 to read:

“(a) develop a nutrient budget model, ~~based on the Overseer model for the arable soils,~~ for the ~~undeveloped parts of the non-arable~~ hill and high country, tussock grasslands that is suitable for use by landholders at a grazing block scale. Investigations will explore:

(i) the potential for modifying the Overseer model for use in the hill and high country environment; and if this is shown not to be suitable, then

(ii) the development of other models suitable for use in the non-arable hill and high country”

8-36-26 Policy SCN3: Land Improvement Agreements

8-36-26	257.1857	Upper Waitaki Branch Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586.1858).
8-36-26	289.2378	North Bank Land Owners Group	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586.1858).
8-36-26	472.22	Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc, Mackenzie Branch	Retain Policy SCN3 to the extent that existing land improvement agreements are still of assistance to soil conservation.
8-36-26	506.1850	Hugh Turnbull	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586.1858).
8-36-26	586.1858	Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces	Retain Policy SCN3.
	F1043.4246	Canterbury Forest Industry Working	<i>Support</i>

		Group.	
	F1044.4224	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
8-36-26	669.1845	South Island High Country Section, Federated Farmers NZ	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586.1858).

Evaluations and reasons

257.1857, 289.2378, 472.22, 506.1850, 586.1858, F1043.4246, F1044.4224; 669.1845: The submitters and further submissions all support the review of Land Improvement Agreements and the retention of those whose purpose is still useful. The submissions and further submissions are accepted for their support an no amendment is required.

SCN1.42. Recommendation

257.1857, 289.2378, 472.22, 506.1850, 586.1858, 669.1845, F1043.4246, F1044.4224: Accept

Amendment

Nil

8-36-29 Explanation and principal reasons Policy SCN3

8-36-29	564.284	Hurunui District Council	Amend the Explanation and principal reasons to Policy SCN3, after the first paragraph, as follows: <i>"To achieve good soil conservation objectives it is important to retain the co-operation of landowners."</i>
	F1074.653	Federated Farmers of NZ (Inc)	<i>Support</i>

Evaluations and reasons

564.284, F1074.653: The submitter requests recognition within the Explanation of the importance of continued co-operation with the landholders to maintain the conditions of LIAs.

F1074 supports the original submission as being self-explanatory.

The purpose of Policy SCN3 is to contribute to the achievement of the soil conservation outcomes in Objective SCN1 by the effective management of Land Improvement Agreements. Policy SCN3 does not seek to change the conditions of LIAs, but sets out a process to determine which of these agreements still provides benefits for soil conservation and should be maintained. This will be done co-operatively with the landholder to identify the effectiveness of the Agreement conditions. Landholders can apply to have their LIAs discharged at any time, and Method SCN3(b) would provide a basis for responding to any such request to ensure that decisions are made in the best interests of soil conservation.

A Land Improvement Agreement is a contractual agreement between a landholder and a regional council (formerly catchment authorities) whereby subsidies were provided in exchange for an agreement by the landholder to undertake specific land management activities for a specified period of time. The agreements were set up and signed with the mutual agreement and co-operation of the landholder and the Council. While it is acknowledged that a co-operative relationship between the landholder and the Council will contribute to the effective management of these agreements, they are legally binding on the landholder to maintain the conditions of the agreement.

It is considered that the amendment requested by the submitter applies to the achievement of soil conservation generally, and particularly to achievement in a non-regulatory environment. This is acknowledged and has already been included in the introductory section of the chapter (see section 8.1.1 page 8-1).

For the reasons set out above the submission is accepted in part and no amendment is required.

SCN1.43. Recommendation

564.284, F1074.653: Accept in part

Amendment

Nil

8-37-23 Policy SCN4: Stabilisation of hill country slopes subject to deep-seated erosion

8-37-23	476.823	Christchurch City Council	Add to Policy SCN4 that on the Port Hills east of Dyers Pass Road, the planting of deep-rooted vegetation will not be encouraged, except in gullies and areas where severe erosion is leading to silt entering waterways, in order to maintain the existing predominantly open landscape and species bio-diversity and reduce the risk of fire and the spread of plant pests.
8-37-23	476.829	Christchurch City Council	Amend Policy SCN4 to make it clear that it does not apply when the land is used for urban activities, and amend the relevant environmental results anticipated to reflect this.
	F1074.654	Federated Farmers of NZ (Inc)	<i>Oppose</i>
8-37-23	512.215	University of Canterbury	Amend Policy SCN4 and its explanation and principal reasons to recognise that vegetation is not always the best solution to stabilise slopes subject to erosion.
8-37-23	565.240	Ashburton District Council	Amend Policy SCN4 to recognise the largely natural process of soil erosion and that reversal of this process can only be achieved where human action precipitates erosion.

Evaluations and reasons

476.823: The submitter wants the policy to include wording to show that planting of deep-rooted vegetation will be limited on parts of the Port Hills in order to maintain the existing open landscape values and reduce the risk of fire and spread of plant pests.

Policy SCN4 addresses some of the more at risk parts of the region for soil erosion. The exception sought by the submitter to exclude the open landscape areas of the Port Hills is inconsistent with the purpose of the RMA if it fails to address soil erosion. Clause (3)(b) of the Policy currently identifies matters that need to be taken into consideration in selecting the best option for management and this includes the protection of important landscape values and regional indigenous biodiversity as well as avoiding the spread of any pest species. The extent to which this will be achieved will depend on the level of erosion risk and the options available to achieve slope stability. For example where protection of indigenous values is important, the selection of indigenous species for stabilising slopes will be encouraged where they can provide the level of stabilisation required. The policy as written provides the framework to achieve the protection of the matters raised by the submitter. Therefore the amendment suggested by the submitter is not regarded as appropriate or necessary given the current wording of the Policy. For the reasons set out above, the submission 476.823 is rejected and no amendment is required.

476.829, F1074.654: The submitter wants the policy amended to remove any land used for "urban activities". They site the Port Hills as an example.

F1074 oppose the submission on the grounds that any activity that affects soil should be subject to control on an equal basis.

The focus for Policy SCN4 is on all hill country slopes subject to deep-seated forms of erosion where a vegetation cover is to be maintained - either for productive or protective purposes. These slopes are highly vulnerable to erosion and require careful and specific management to maintain their stability under any form of disturbance. This may include areas of land around the Port Hills that are used for urban or peri-urban purposes, but still require careful management to minimise the risk of erosion and prevent runoff and sedimentation of waterways. The impacts of soil erosion from such areas can be significant because of the close proximity to large concentrations of people, together with their associated built structures and network facilities. It is not considered that the exception of land from Policy SCN4 on the basis of its use for "urban activities" is consistent with the purpose of the RMA if it fails to address soil erosion.

For the reasons given, the submission 476.829 is rejected and the further submission F1074.654 is accepted. No amendment is required.

512.215: The submitter points out that stabilisation of hill country slopes may not always be possible with the use of vegetation management, but that some structural options should also be acknowledged. Policy SCN4 deals with the stabilisation of hill country land slopes subject to deep-seated forms of erosion by encouraging the retention or establishment of a deep-rooted vegetation cover. The focus for

the Policy is to provide guidance on best practices for planting regimes, and to set targets and priorities for achievement. The submitter suggests that the use of structures or the removal of soil may be more practical than planting in some situations. It is accepted that there may be situations where such an approach is more appropriate, particularly where rapid stabilisation is not able to be achieved by planting alone, however the activities suggested by the submitter are already addressed by Policy SCN5 and do not need to be duplicated in Policy SCN4.

For the reasons given, and to the extent that the issues raised are already addressed by other policies in Chapter 8, the submission is accepted in part and no amendment is required.

565.240: The submitter wants the policy to recognise that erosion is largely a natural process and reversal can only be achieved where human activities have precipitated it.

It is not accepted that natural erosion events cannot be reversed, or that the risk of natural erosion events cannot be reduced by human action. By undertaking the establishment of deep-rooted vegetation cover on slopes susceptible to deep-seated forms of erosion, the risk of natural erosion events can be reduced. While the focus for Objective SCN1 is to undertake land management activities in ways that will minimise the risk of inducing erosion, these same land management actions can also contribute to a reduction in the incidence and severity of natural erosion events.

For the reasons outlined the submission is rejected. No amendment is required.

SCN1.44. Recommendation

F1074.654: Accept

512.215: Accept in part

476.823, 476.829, 565.240: Reject

Amendment

Nil

8-37-25 Policy SCN4(1)

8-37-25	449.246	Transit New Zealand	Amend the wording of Policy SCN4 to recognise that vegetation is not always the best solution to stabilise slopes subject to erosion as follows: "(1) On loess-mantled ...land, <u>but recognise that the use of vegetation cover when other stabilisation methods are more appropriate.</u> " and make necessary changes to Explanation and principal reasons.
8-37-25	603.175	Carter Holt Harvey Forests	Retain Policy SCN4(1) as worded.
	F1042.175	NZ Forest Owners Assn	<i>Support</i>
	F1043.175	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.175	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>

Evaluations and reasons

449.246: The submitter wants the wording of Policy SCN4 amended to recognise that vegetation is not always the most practical means to stabilise hill country slopes. The example given by the submitter involves the stabilising of slopes traversed by the State highway network. This situation is not relevant to Policy SCN4 which is addressing vegetation management on slopes subject to deep-seated forms of erosion. The concerns raised by the submitter are covered more appropriately by Policy SCN5 which deals with all earthworks and vegetation clearance activities. The submitter has also made a similar submission on the wording of Policy SCN5, so these concerns will be addressed.

For the reasons given the submission is rejected and no amendment is required to Policy SCN4.

603.175, F1042.175, F1043.175, F1044.175: The submitter seeks to retain clause (1) of the policy as written. F1042.175, F1043.175, F1044.175 - support the full original submission for the reasons given by

the submitter. The submission and further submissions are accepted for their support and no amendment is required.

SCN1.45. Recommendation

449.246: Reject

603.175, F1042.175, F1043.175, F1044.175: Accept

Amendment

Nil

8-37-32 Policy SCN4(2)(b)

8-37-32	476.819	Christchurch City Council	Amend Policy SCN4(2)(b) as follows: <i>"...to provide slope stability, plant fast growing indigenous species..."</i>
8-37-34	257.1592	Upper Waitaki Branch Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-37-34	289.2113	North Bank Land Owners Group	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-37-34	506.1584	Hugh Turnbull	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-37-34	586.1584	Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces	Delete the words: <i>"This may allow wide-spaced planting in some situations with ongoing grazing, or it may require close-spaced planting"</i> from Policy SCN4(2)(b).
	F1043.3073	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.3062	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
8-37-34	669.1580	South Island High Country Section, Federated Farmers NZ	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).

Evaluations and reasons

476.819: The submitter raises concerns with the use of "fast growing species" to provide for slope stability on the grounds that this may lead to wind throw and exacerbate instability. They are concerned that fast growing species are likely to be exotics which don't contribute to indigenous biodiversity and which may promote long-term pest management issues.

Fast growing species such as poplar have been successfully used to stabilise slopes and will provide that stability much sooner than many of the indigenous species. Local climatic and site conditions will influence the choice of species likely to be most effective. If the erosion risk or state of erosion is serious then the most rapid method of stabilisation will be required. Once the topsoil has been lost, then it will become extremely difficult to establish any vegetation cover - exotic or indigenous. The initial stabilisation phase should be the highest priority for sustainable management. Once this has been achieved, then there is the opportunity to diversify into species that can supply ongoing stability as well as enhancing other values.

Limiting initial stabilisation to indigenous species, as requested by the submitter, may not allow for the most rapid stabilisation and may therefore allow erosion to escalate before effective stability has been achieved. This would not be consistent with the RMA where the safeguarding of the life-supporting capacity of soils (s5) has a higher ranking than the provision for matters of national importance (s6). The policy as written encourages the use of indigenous species, where practical, for ongoing management once stability has been achieved.

For the reasons given, the submission is rejected and no amendment is required.

257.1592, 289.2113, 506.1584, 586.1584, F1043.3073, F1044.3062, 669.1580: The submitters requests the removal of the last sentence in Policy SCN4(2)(b) referring to the options for spacing of tree planting, on the grounds that it is inappropriate to include conjecture on management options in policy. F1043,

F1044 support the original submission 586 for the reasons provided by the submitter. As currently written, clause (2)(b) encourages plantings at spacings that are the most effective for rapid stabilisation. The second sentence in clause (2)(b) nominates some spacing options but provides no specific guidance on the situations where each option would be appropriate. The grounds provided by the submitter that this is "conjecture" and therefore inappropriate is not accepted as the clause does not make any suggestions for where each option should be used. However this lack of guidance for use of the spacing options means that they do not add any value to the Policy. The methods for the policy identify the provision of information on appropriate species and spacings for plantings and the promotion of property plans to identify specific requirements for planting on a site-by-site basis. It is considered that the Methods provide sufficient guidance for selecting "spacings that are effective" as required in clause (2)(b) and the sentence referred to by the submitter should be removed. To the extent that the amendment requested by the submitter is accepted, but not for the reasons provided by the submitter, the submission and further submissions are accepted in part. An amendment is required.

SCN1.46. Recommendation

476.819: Reject

257.1592, 289.2113, 506.1584, 586.1584, F1043.3073, F1044.3062, 669.1580: Accept in part

Amendment

Amend Policy SCN4(2)(b) on page 8-37 by removing the last sentence:

~~"(b) on slopes where existing vegetation coverin rapidly stabilising slopes. This may allow wide-spaced planting in some situations with ongoing grazing, or it may require close spaced planting;"~~

8-37-37 Policy SCN4(2)(c)

8-37-37	603.176	Carter Holt Harvey Forests	Amend Policy SCN4(2)(c) to read as follows: <i>"(c) once slopes are stabilised, encourage the replacement of original trees with long lived species where this is necessary to provide long-term stabilisation. Where a permanent forest cover is required to stabilise the slopes, encourage natural succession <u>to achieve an indigenous forest or planting of high value crop species that will allow closed canopy selective logging; and"</u> or words to like effect.</i>
	F1042.176	NZ Forest Owners Assn	<i>Support</i>
	F1043.176	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.176	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
8-37-39	257.1593	Upper Waitaki Branch Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-37-39	289.2114	North Bank Land Owners Group	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-37-39	506.1585	Hugh Turnbull	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-37-39	586.1585	Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces	Delete the words: <i>"Preference should be given to the use of indigenous species where these will provide effective long-term stability"</i> and <i>"to restore indigenous forest cover"</i> from Policy SCN4(2)(c).
	F1043.3074	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.3063	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
	F1046.175	Department of	<i>Oppose</i>

		Conservation	
	F1051.37	Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society of NZ Inc	<i>Oppose</i>
8-37-39	669.1581	South Island High Country Section, Federated Farmers NZ	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).

Evaluations and reasons

603.176, F1042.176, F1043.176, F1044.176: The submitter claims that the preference for use of indigenous species in clause (2)(c) is inappropriate where exotic species will achieve the same soil conservation outcome. The submitter argues that the choice of species should be determined on a cost benefit basis.

F1042, F1043, F1044 support the original submission for the reasons provided by the original submitter. The focus for policy SCN4 is encouraging the use of deep-rooted vegetation to achieve the long-term stabilisation of hill slopes susceptible to deep-seated forms of erosion. These hill slopes will include some of the most erosion-prone land in the region. As a priority species should be chosen for their ability to provide effective and enduring stability. The suggestion by the submitter that species should be chosen on a cost/benefit basis will not be consistent with the RMA if this fails to provide effective stability. Once eroded, this type of land is unlikely to recover its full productive potential, even in the long-term. So the economic returns from the land will rely on maintaining the stability of the slopes.

Incorporating the use of indigenous species is part of meeting s6 obligations under the RMA and contributing to indigenous biodiversity. This is most appropriate in situations where a permanent forest cover is required to provide effective stability and the opportunity for productive use may be limited. The Policy only encourages the use of indigenous species, there is no requirement to do so. Specific provision is made under clause (2)(d) for the use and management of production forest.

The suggested amendment to include reference in clause (2)(c) to the use of cropped species in situations where a permanent forest cover is required is not considered appropriate or necessary as the Policy already provides for the use of cropped species in clause (2)(d).

For the reasons outlined the submission and the further submissions are rejected. No amendment is required.

257.1593, 289.2114, 506.1585, 586.1585, F1043.3074, F1044.3063, F1046.175, F1051.37; 669.1581:

The submitters all want reference to use of indigenous species removed from Policy SCN4 on the grounds that it is not relevant to soil conservation.

F1043, F1044 support the original submission 586 for the reasons provided by the original submitter.

F1046 opposes the original submission 586 on the grounds that the use of indigenous species is the most effective way to address the adverse effects of this erosion in accordance with the purposes of the RMA.

F1051 also opposes the original submission 586 saying that the provision reflects the importance of indigenous cover and is also consistent with maintaining indigenous biodiversity.

The focus for the policy is encouraging the use of deep-rooted vegetation in order to achieve long-term slope stability in accordance with the sustainable management principle of the RMA. The RMA also requires provision to be made for a range of other matters under s6, including the protection of important natural and cultural values, and indigenous biodiversity. Incorporating the use of indigenous species into the Policy where this will provide effective long-term stabilisation is part of meeting s6 provisions. The Policy only encourages the use of indigenous species, there is no requirement to do so. However, provision is made under clause (2)(d) for the use and management of production forest.

For the reasons outlined the submissions 586.1585, 257.1593, 289.2114, 506.1585, 669.1581 and the further submissions F1043.3074, F1044.3063 are rejected. Further submissions F1046.175, F1051.37 are accepted for their opposition to the original submission. No amendment is required.

SCN1.47. Recommendation

F1046.175, F1051.37: Accept

257.1593, 289.2114, 506.1585, 586.1585, 603.176, 669.1581 F1042.176, F1043.176, F1043.3074, F1044.176, F1044.3063 : Reject

Amendment

Nil

8-37-43 Policy SCN4(2)(d)

8-37-43	476.822	Christchurch City Council	Amend Policy SCN4(2)(d) to read: <i>"...through all stages of production through</i>
---------	---------	---------------------------	--

			<i><u>the use of management plans which are developed in consultation with Environment Canterbury</u></i>
	F1074.656	Federated Farmers of NZ (Inc)	<i>Oppose</i>

Evaluations and reasons

476.822, F1074.656: The submitter is concerned that there is potential conflict within Policy SCN4 between the encouragement of planting and harvesting of exotic species and the provision for the protection of important landscape values and biodiversity. The inclusion of management plans in consultation with Environment Canterbury is suggested as an amendment to address this concern. F1074 opposes the submission amendment on the grounds that the ability to draw up management plans to achieve the objectives of this plan is not the sole domain of Environment Canterbury.

The policy does not specifically promote the use of exotic species. Rather it promotes those species that will provide the most rapid and effective stabilisation. Exotic species have been used effectively for this purpose in the past so they should not be discounted. A key outcome is to minimise the loss of soil because once erosion occurs it will become very difficult to establish any vegetation cover, either exotic or indigenous. Once initial stability has been achieved, there are a range of options to maintain ongoing stability. Clause (2)(c) identifies a number of matters for consideration in choosing the most appropriate option to integrate slope stability with the protection of important natural values and indigenous biodiversity. Clause 3 also encourages the consideration of the effects of planting options on important natural and cultural values. Clauses (2) and (3) of the Policy are considered to provide a framework to resolve potential conflicts identified by the submitter. Territorial authorities, through provisions in their district plans, also have the power to address the issues raised by the submitter.

The suggested amendment by the submitter to require the development of management plans for any areas planted for harvest seems quite an onerous requirement and not consistent with the non-regulatory approach taken by Chapter 8. The submitter has not provided any reasons for its inclusion.

The opposition provided by the further submitter is accepted but the reasons given are not seen to be very relevant to the arguments raised by the submitter. There was no suggestion that the development of management plans was "the sole domain" of Environment Canterbury, rather that the Council should be consulted during development of the plan.

For the reasons set out above, the submission is rejected and no amendment is required. The further submission is accepted for its opposition.

SCN1.48. Recommendation

476.822: Reject

F1074.656: Accept

Amendment

Nil

8-38-1 Policy SCN4(3)(b)

8-38-1	603.177	Carter Holt Harvey Forests	Amend Policy SCN4(3)(b) to read: <i>"avoid significant adverse effects on any <u>outstanding natural features and landscape or amenity values for the area, or the loss of regional indigenous biodiversity</u>" or words of like effect.</i>
	F1042.177	NZ Forest Owners Assn	<i>Support</i>
	F1043.177	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.177	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
	F1074.657	Federated Farmers of NZ (Inc)	<i>Support</i>
8-38-2	476.826	Christchurch City Council	Amend Policy SCN4(3)(b) by deleting <i>"regional"</i> and insert <i>"<u>significant local indigenous biodiversity.</u>"</i>

Evaluations and reasons

603.177, F1042.177, F1043.177, F1044.177, F1074.657:

The submitter questions the use of the term "important natural, landscape or amenity values" and suggests the wording be changed to "outstanding natural features and landscapes" to reflect the wording in the RMA.

F1042, F1043, F1044 F1074 all support the original submission for the reasons provided by the submitter.

The point raised by the submitter is a valid one. The term "outstanding" is a recognised RMA term and there is a responsibility to provide for the protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes. The term "important" used in Policy SCN4 has not been defined in the Policy and its use may be confusing in interpreting how it relates to the statutory term. For clarity of purpose the RMA terms should be used in relation to s6 matters and this change should be made consistently throughout Chapter 8.

For the reasons set out above, the submission and further submissions are accepted and an amendment is required. Consequential amendments to other provisions in Chapter 8 will also be required for consistency.

476.826: the submitter is concerned that the term "regional" biodiversity may not provide for protection of matters of high local biodiversity importance if significance is measured at the regional level.

This is a valid concern, as the term "regional" has not been clearly defined in the Policy. The proposed NRRP Variation 1 was notified before the 2005 Amendment to the RMA that gave regional councils specific functions for biodiversity protection. Under new s30(1)(ga) of the amended RMA, regional plans should include policies for "maintaining indigenous biological diversity". To be consistent with this amendment to the Act, all policies in Chapter 8 referring to the protection of indigenous biodiversity should use the same terminology as in s30(1)(ga). This will provide for indigenous biodiversity significant at all levels, including local, regional and national values.

For the reasons set out above, the submission is accepted and an amendment is required. Consequential amendments to other provisions in Chapter 8 will also be required for consistency.

SCN1.49. Recommendation

476.826, 603.177, F1042.177, F1043.177, F1044.177, F1074.657: Accept

Amendment

1. Amend Policy SCN4(3)(b), page 8-38, to read:

"avoid significant adverse effects on any ~~important-outstanding~~ important-outstanding natural, features and landscapes or amenity values for the area, or the loss of ~~regional~~ indigenous biodiversity:"

2. Consequential changes required to other provisions in Chapter 8 that refer to "important" natural features and values :

Amend Issue SCN1(v), page 8-28 :

"(v) a loss of ~~important-outstanding~~ landscape and amenity values;"

Amend Policy SCN1(c)(iii), page 8-30:

"(iii) the current condition is causing, or is likely to cause, adverse effects on ~~important-outstanding~~ natural, features and landscapes or amenity values,....."

Amend Policy SCN1(d)(ii), page 8-30:

"(ii) significant adverse effects on ~~important-outstanding~~ natural, features and landscapes or amenity values,"

Amend Policy SCN5(2)(d)(v), page 8-41:

"(v) ~~important-outstanding~~ important-outstanding natural features and landscapes ~~features~~ and amenity values for the area;"

3. Consequential changes required to other provisions in Chapter 8 that refer to "regional indigenous biodiversity"

Amend Policy SCN1(d)(ii), page 8-30:

"(ii) significant adverse effects on or the loss of ~~regional~~ indigenous biodiversity; or"

Amend Policy SCN2(2), page 8-34:

"(2) The measures taken.....loss of ~~regional~~ indigenous biodiversity."

8-38-9 Policy SCN4(4)

8-38-9	476.824	Christchurch City	Remove Policy SCN4(4) and replace with the
--------	---------	-------------------	--

		Council	following for each area - develop integrated catchment management plans prepared by ECan in conjunction with the landowner / occupier that set realistic targets and appropriate priorities as a principle method of achieving better soil management on the Port Hills.
	F1074.658	Federated Farmers of NZ (Inc)	<i>Support in part</i>

8-38-14 Policy SCN4(5)

8-38-14	476.825	Christchurch City Council	Remove Policy SCN4(5) and replace with the following for each area - develop integrated catchment management plans prepared by ECan in conjunction with the landowner / occupier that set realistic targets and appropriate priorities as a principle method of achieving better soil management on the Port Hills.
	F1074.659	Federated Farmers of NZ (Inc)	<i>Support in part</i>

Evaluations and reasons

476.824, F1074.658; 476.825, F1074.659:

The submitters want to replace the priorities and targets as listed in clauses (4) and (5) of Policy SCN4 with a requirement for Environment Canterbury to prepare integrated catchment plans to addresses priorities and targets for soil management on the Port Hills.

F1074 supports the development of catchment plans but opposes the requirement that they be prepared by Environment Canterbury.

The priorities and targets listed in clauses (4) and (5) are region-wide outcomes to ensure that resources are directed to where the erosion risk is most critical. Where catchments or areas are identified as a high priority under this section, then the development of property plans or catchment plans may be promoted as a means to set out the site-specific management requirements to stabilise those areas. Method SCN4(a)(c) already promotes the development of property plans for this purpose. The inclusion of integrated catchment plans in the Method would be a practical inclusion to deal appropriately with different scales of erosion risk and slope stabilisation.

The replacement of clauses (4) and (5) with the submitter's request would remove the ability to set priorities and targets across the region and is not seen as an effective amendment. The focus for the submission is the Port Hills which is only one small part of the Canterbury region and has very specific needs for soil conservation that will differ from other parts of the region. It is considered that the combination of Policy SCN4 and Method SCN4(a)(c), and the addition of integrated catchment plans, will meet the concerns raised by the submitter and provide a more effective basis for meeting the overall needs of the region.

F1074 - The submitter does not include requirement for Environment Canterbury to prepare these plans, though in promoting such plans ECan will most likely have a consultative or advisory input to their development.

For the reasons outlined, the submissions and further submissions are accepted in part and an amendment is required to Method SCN4(a)(c).

SCN1.50. Recommendation

476.824, 476.825, F1074.658, F1074.659: Accept in part

Amendment

Amend Method SCN4(a)(c), page 8-40 to read:

"(c) promote the development of property plans and integrated catchment plans as a tools to:"

8-38-18 Policy SCN4(6)

8-38-18	603.178	Carter Holt Harvey Forests	Delete Policy SCN4(6).
	F1042.178	NZ Forest Owners Assn	<i>Support</i>
	F1043.178	Canterbury Forest	<i>Support</i>

		Industry Working Group.	
	F1044.178	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>

Evaluations and reasons

603.178, F1042.178, F1043.178, F1044.178: The submitter wants to delete clause (6) of Policy SCN4. No reasons are provided by the submitter.

F1042, F1043, F1044 all support submission 603 for the reasons provided by the submitter.

In the absence of any reasons provided it is unclear on what grounds the submitter wishes to delete clause (6). The clause makes an important link between policies for soil conservation in Chapter 8 and for water management in Chapter 5 for dealing with a conflict of needs should it arise. Chapter 5 identifies flow-sensitive catchments which inherently suffer extreme low flows in the summer and autumn months and where the planting of large areas of trees will cause those flows to reduce further and stay low for longer periods of time. Chapter 5 has a policies and rules to control the planting of areas of tall vegetation and plantation forestry in these catchments. Where land in these catchments is also subject to deep-seated forms of erosion, the choice of tree species and planting spacings for slope stabilisation will need to consider the effects of planting options on water yield.

It is important that policies use cross referencing to raise peoples' awareness of related matters that have to be taken into account in achieving any particular objective. Clause (6) does not necessarily assign any priority to either of the issues, but any rules for forestry planting in Chapter 5 will have to be complied with. Deleting the clause is not seen as contributing to the effectiveness of the policy or the plan as a whole.

For the reasons outlined, the submission and further submissions are rejected and no amendment is required.

SCN1.51. Recommendation

603.178, F1042.178, F1043.178, F1044.178: Reject

Amendment

Nil

8-39-39 Methods for Policy SCN4

8-39-39	257.1594	Upper Waitaki Branch Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-39-39	289.2115	North Bank Land Owners Group	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-39-39	506.1586	Hugh Turnbull	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-39-39	586.1586	Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces	Retain Methods SCN4.
	F1003.10	Landco Pastoral Holdings Ltd	<i>Support in part.</i>
	F1043.3075	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.3064	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
8-39-39	669.1582	South Island High Country Section, Federated Farmers NZ	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).

Evaluations and reasons

257.1594, 289.2115, 506.1586, 586.1586, F1003.10, F1043.3075, F1044.3064; 669.1582: All of the submitters support the methods for Policy SCN4 and want them retained as written. The support of the submissions and further submissions is accepted and no amendment is required

SCN1.52. Recommendation

257.1594, 289.2115, 506.1586, 586.1586, 669.1582, F1003.10, F1043.3075, F1044.3064: Accept

Amendment

Nil

8-39-45 Method SCN4(a) Information and promotion

8-39-45	449.247	Transit New Zealand	Retain Method SCN4(a) as worded
8-40-13	564.285	Hurunui District Council	Delete in Method SCN4(a)(e) the words " <i>such as Trees for Canterbury and Trees for Survival</i> ".

Evaluations and reasons**449.247:** The submitter supports Method SCN4(a) as written.

This support is accepted and no amendment is required.

564.285: The submitter is concerned that specifying a particular plant supplier in a plan is inappropriate when there are many potential suppliers available.

It is accepted that there are many suppliers of plant material in Canterbury and Environment Canterbury would be better to have information available on all suppliers so that individuals can make their own choice. Also suppliers are likely to come and go, so specific information on suppliers within the plan may become out of date during the life of the plan.

For the reasons outlined the submission is accepted and an amendment is required.

SCN1.53. Recommendation

449.247, 564.285: Accept

Amendment

Amend Method SCN4(a)(e), page 8-40, as follows:

"(e) facilitate links between landholders and plant suppliers, ~~such as Trees for Canterbury and Trees for Survival~~, so that landholders can have a reliable source of plant....."

8-40-33	476.820	Christchurch City Council	Amend Method SCN42(c) so that only the planting of indigenous species is assisted.
8-40-39	476.821	Christchurch City Council	Amend Method SCN42(d) so that only the planting of indigenous species is assisted.
	F1074.655	Federated Farmers of NZ (Inc)	<i>Oppose</i>

Evaluations and reasons**476.820, 476.821, F1074.655:** The submitter does not agree with the encouragement in Policy SCN4(2)(b) of the use of fast growing species for initial slope stabilisation because these trees can result in wind throw and an increased risk of erosion. The submitter suggests that fast growing species are more likely to be exotic species. To address these concerns, the submitter wishes to see the Methods SCN4(c) and SCN4(d) only assist the planting of indigenous species.

F1074 opposes submission 476 on the grounds that the most appropriate species should be used. Policy SCN4 promotes the use of those species that will provide the most rapid and effective slope stabilisation to minimise the loss of soil by erosion. Exotic species have been used effectively for this purpose in the past so they should not be discounted. The key outcome is to prevent the loss of soil as much as possible because once erosion occurs it becomes more difficult to establish any vegetation cover, either exotic or indigenous.

Method SCN4(c) will base any assistance for tree planting on evidence of a net benefit to the region. The benefits will be judged on a case-by-case basis but will be consistent with the focus for the Policy to achieve long-term stabilisation of the land. It would not be appropriate to limit assistance on the basis of the protection of natural values when these are not the focus for the Policy.

Method SCN4(d) refers to assistance from the Environment Enhancement Fund which was established specifically to assist projects that will benefit indigenous biodiversity. The assistance under this Method

will be directed to the use of indigenous species, or projects that will result in the establishment of indigenous habitats. Again this does not rule out entirely the use of exotic species as a means to enable the establishment of an indigenous habitat.

Assistance in the case of each of the Methods identified by the submitter will be decided on a case-by-case basis and it would not be appropriate for Chapter 8 to specify that any particular species is not eligible for assistance.

For the reasons set out above, the submissions are rejected and no amendment is required. The further submission is accepted.

SCN1.54. Recommendation

F1074.655: Accept

476.820, 476.821: Reject

Amendment

Nil

8-41-1 Policy SCN5: Earthworks and vegetation clearance activities

8-41-1	257.1858	Upper Waitaki Branch Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586.1859).
8-41-1	289.2379	North Bank Land Owners Group	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586.1859).
8-41-1	397.60	New Zealand Railways Corporation	Retain the approach in Policy SCN5 as it is currently written.
8-41-1	486.337	Te Runanga O Ngai Tahu	Retain Policy SCN5 unchanged.
	F1003.23	Landco Pastoral Holdings Ltd	<i>Support in part.</i>
	F1043.1481	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1044.1481	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1046.176	Department of Conservation	<i>Support</i>
	F1051.49	Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society of NZ Inc	<i>Support</i>
8-41-1	506.1851	Hugh Turnbull	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586.1859).
8-41-1	509.175	Hurunui Community Water Development Project Working Group	Retain the approach in Policy SCN5 as it is currently written.
8-41-1	510.172	MainPower NZ Limited	Retain the approach in Policy SCN5 as it is currently written.
8-41-1	563.349	Te Hapu O Ngati Wheke Rapaki Runanga Inc	Support submission by Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu (refer 486).
8-41-1	565.242	Ashburton District Council	Add new Method under Policy SCN5 of education and accreditation of earth moving contractors to improve earth-working techniques and reduce soil erosion.
8-41-1	586.1859	Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces	Retain Policy SCN5.
	F1043.4247	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.4225	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
8-41-1	615.178	Land Solutions (Otago) Limited & J T O'Connell	Supports submission by Hurunui Community Water Development Project

			Working Group (refer 509).
8-41-1	669.1846	South Island High Country Section, Federated Farmers NZ	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586.1859).

Evaluations and reasons

257.1858, 289.2379, 397.60, 486.337, F1003.23, F1043.1481, F1044.1481, F1046.176, F1051.49; 506.1851, 509.175, 510.172, 563.349, 586.1859, F1043.4247, F1044.4225; 615.178, 6691846: The submitters wish to retain the approach taken in Policy SCN5. Submitter 486 strongly supports the inclusion of clauses (2)(d)(iii) and (2)(d)(iv) in addition to general support.

F1003.23, F1046, F1051 each supports submitter 486 to retain the Policy.

F1043.4247 support submitter 586 to retain the Policy.

F1043, F1044 oppose the total submission 486 on the grounds that they oppose any increase in regulatory control of forestry activities. This reason is not relevant to the submission point raised in relation to Policy SCN5.

For the support provided, the submissions 257.1858, 289.2379, 397.60, 486.337, 506.1851, 509.175, 510.172, 563.349, 586.1859, 615.178, 669.1846 and further submissions F1003.23, F1046.176, F1051.49 are accepted. Further submissions F1043.1481, F1044.1481 in opposition are rejected. No amendment is required.

565.242: The submitter wants to include a further method to implement an accreditation system to improve earthworking techniques for all earthmoving contractors.

While this would contribute to the quality of earthworks activities it is not appropriate to introduce such a scheme under a non-regulatory Policy which covers all scales of earthworks activities from hand digging to larger scale excavations. The outcome for the Policy is to provide guidance for best practice methods and to minimise the likelihood of adverse effects on the environment. Where earthworks activities are subject to rules and conditions for compliance under other plans, due to the nature of their potential effects, then it may be appropriate to require contractors to achieve a recognised level of expertise.

For the reasons outlined, the submission is rejected and no amendment is required.

SCN1.55. Recommendation

257.1858, 289.2379, 397.60, 486.337, 506.1851, 509.175, 510.172, 563.349, 586.1859, 615.178, 669.1846, F1003.23, F1043.4247, F1044.4225 F1046.176, F1051.49: Accept

565.242, F1043.1481, F1044.1481: Reject

Amendment

Nil

8-41-2 Policy SCN5(1)

8-41-2	379.152	TrustPower Limited	Retain Policy SCN5(1) as presently drafted.
	F1043.643	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1044.643	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Oppose</i>
8-41-2	594.152	Rangitata Diversion Race Irrigator Forum	Retain Policy SCN5(1) as presently drafted.
8-41-2	602.159	Rangitata Diversion Race Management Ltd	Retain Policy SCN5(1) as presently drafted.
8-41-2	603.179	Carter Holt Harvey Forests	Amend Policy SCN5(1) to read: <i>"Wherever any earthworks or vegetation clearance activity is carried out that increases the risk of accelerated soil erosion, the <u>best management practices</u> for reducing the amount of erosion likely to occur as a result of that activity should be adopted"</i> or words of like effect.
	F1042.179	NZ Forest Owners Assn	<i>Support</i>
	F1043.179	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.179	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>

	F1076.461	NZ Vegetable and Potato Growers and three other organisations	<i>Support</i>
--	-----------	---	----------------

Evaluations and reasons

379.152, F1043.643, F1044.643; 594.152, 602.159: The submitters 379, 594, 602 each support clause (1) of Policy SCN5 and want it retained as written.

F1043, F1044 oppose the entire submission 379 on based on their opposition to any increase in the regulatory controls for forestry activities sought by the submitter that is unnecessary or inconsistent with the RMA. This reasoning is not relevant to the submission point raised under this provision and is therefore not accepted.

For the reasons set out, the submissions 379.152, 594.152, 602.159 are accepted for their support and no amendment is required. The further submissions F1043.643, F1044.643 are rejected.

603.179, F1042.179, F1043.179, F1044.179, F1076.461: The submitter claims that Policy SCN5 seeks a level of certainty that is unrealistic. They want the Policy amended to address accelerated erosion as a result of human activities and to recognise that erosion is a natural process that is ongoing. They want to use the term “best management practices” in recognition of established practices that have been developed to operate on a wide range of soils without significant adverse effects on the environment. F1042, F1043, F1044 each support the original submission for the reasons provides by the original submitter.

The focus for Policy SCN5 is the adoption of best practices to minimise the amount of erosion likely to occur from earthworks and vegetation clearance activities. It is considered that the Policy as written does address “accelerated” erosion rather than natural erosion processes. Earthworks and vegetation clearance activities, by their very nature, are likely to increase the risk of erosion.

It is accepted that the term “best management practices” refers to specific practices that have been developed to manage land use under particular environmental conditions. From this point of view it is more useful to specify best management practices rather than the current term “best practicable method”. The methods under the Policy refer to the provision of information on “best practices for tracking, earthworks...” etc so the use of the term best practice in the Policy would be consistent with this information.

For the reasons outlined above, the submission and further submissions are accepted in part and an amendment is required.

SCN1.56. Recommendation

379.152, 594.152, 602.159: Accept

603.179, F1042.179, F1043.179, F1044.179, F1076.461: Accept in part

F1043.643, F1044.643: Reject

Amendment

Amend Policy SCN5(1), page 8-41, to read:

“(1) Wherever any earthworks or soil erosion, ~~the best practicable method~~ the use of best management practices for reducing the amount of erosion likely to occur as a result of that activity should be adopted.”

8-41-6 Policy SCN5(2)

8-41-6	603.180	Carter Holt Harvey Forests	Amend Policy SCN5(2) to read: <i>"Earthworks and vegetation clearance activities should not be undertaken unless effective measures are in place to:"</i> or words to like effect.
	F1042.180	NZ Forest Owners Assn	<i>Support</i>
	F1043.180	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.180	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
	F1076.462	NZ Vegetable and Potato Growers and three other organisations	<i>Support</i>

8-41-10 Policy SCN5(2)(a)

8-41-10	603.181	Carter Holt Harvey Forests	Amend Policy SCN5(2)(a) to read as follows: " <u>(a) manage the risk of accelerated erosion as a result of these activities;</u> " or words to like effect.
	F1042.181	NZ Forest Owners Assn	Support
	F1043.181	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	Support
	F1044.181	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	Support

8-41-11 Policy SCN5(2)(b)

8-41-11	379.153	TrustPower Limited	Amend Policy SCN5(2)(b) to read: " <u>contain the movement of sediment transported in runoff generated from an activity site unless effective measures are in place to avoid, remedy or mitigate any sedimentation effects generated from the activity site</u> "
	F1043.644	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	Oppose
	F1044.644	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	Oppose
8-41-11	594.153	Rangitata Diversion Race Irrigator Forum	Amend Policy SCN5(2)(b) to read: " <u>contain the movement of sediment transported in runoff generated from an activity site unless effective measures are in place to avoid, remedy or mitigate any sedimentation effects generated from the activity site</u> "
8-41-11	602.160	Rangitata Diversion Race Management Ltd	Amend Policy SCN5(2)(b) to read: " <u>contain the movement of sediment transported in runoff generated from an activity site unless effective measures are in place to avoid, remedy or mitigate any sedimentation effects generated from the activity site</u> "
8-41-11	603.182	Carter Holt Harvey Forests	Amend Policy SCN5(2)(b) to read as follows: " <u>(b) Treat any sediment-laden runoff generated from the activity site;</u> " or words to like effect.
	F1042.182	NZ Forest Owners Assn	Support
	F1043.182	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	Support
	F1044.182	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	Support

8-41-13 Policy SCN5(2)(c)

8-41-13	449.248	Transit New Zealand	Amend Policy SCN5(2)(c) to read as follows: "(c) undertake land rehabilitation necessary to stabilise the site;"
8-41-13	512.216	University of Canterbury	Delete the words "and revegetate" from Policy SCN5(c).

Submission Clarification

Submissions on Policy SCN5(2), Policy SCN5(2)(a), Policy SCN5(2)(b) and Policy SCN5(2)(c) are evaluated below.

Evaluations and reasons

379.153, F1043.644, F1044.644; 594.153, 602.160: The submitters each want the wording of sub clause (b) changed to focus on sediment runoff likely to cause significant adverse effects. They claim that it is

impractical to require all runoff to be contained. Some revised wording is proposed by the submitters. F1043, F1044 oppose the entire submission 379 based on their opposition to any increase in the regulatory controls for forestry activities sought by the submitter that is unnecessary or inconsistent with the RMA. Given the non-regulatory approach taken by Chapter 8, the reasons provided are not relevant to the provisions being addressed in this submission.

It is agreed that the focus for the policy is to address significant adverse effects and put in place measures to achieve this. All sub clauses under SCN5(2) should be read together to cover the range of measures that should be in place to deal with any adverse effects. For example clause SCN5(2)(b) should contain sedimentation sufficiently to avoid causing any significant adverse effects. To this extent the reasoning provided by the submitters is accepted, and an amendment to SCN5(2)(b) to remove the requirement to contain "any" sediment would make the sub clause consistent with the rest of clause SCN5(2).

The reasoning provided by F1043, F1044 is not relevant to the submission point raised under this provision and is therefore not accepted.

For the reasons set out above, and to the extent that the submission is addressed in part by other clauses in the policy, the submissions 379.153, 594.153, 602.160 are accepted in part and an amendment is required. Further submissions F1043.644, F1044.644 are rejected.

449.248, 512.216: The submitters want to remove the suggestion in sub clause SCN5(2)(c) that revegetation will be required to stabilise all sites. They say that revegetation may not always be the best method of stabilisation, and this clause is inconsistent with SCN5(1) which just requires "the best practicable method" for reducing erosion.

Land rehabilitation will include measures to control erosion and measures to restore the protective vegetation cover to all exposed areas of land. It is accepted that structural measures may provide the most effective and most immediate stabilisation of slopes following excavations or other large-scale earthworks activities where the soil profile has been exposed. Revegetation will be encouraged wherever practical, to provide long-term protection of exposed areas of soil from the erosive elements of climate, including rain, wind and frost heave, and to restore natural and cultural values associated with the activity area.

For the reasons set out above, the submissions 449.248, 512.216 are accepted and an amendment is required.

603.180, F1042.180, F1043.180, F1044.180, F1076.462; 603.181, F1042.181, F1043.181, F1044.181; 603.182, F1042.182, F1043.182, F1044.182: The submitters want changes to Policy SCN5 to reflect a focus on the management of accelerated erosion resulting from human activities. The submitter claims that the Policy as written seeks a level of certainty that is unrealistic or unachievable.

It is considered that the policy as written does address accelerated erosion rather than natural erosion processes. Earthworks and vegetation clearance by their very nature increase the risk of erosion. The wording changes suggested by the submitters for clause (2) impose the mitigating measures listed in (a)-(d) on all earthworks and vegetation clearance activities. Policy SCN4(2) distinguishes earthworks and vegetation clearance activities on the basis of the ability to reduce the amount of erosion created. Where best practical methods cannot reduce the amount of erosion, the use of other mitigating measures are necessary as set out in subclasses (a)-(d).

The changes suggested by the submitter for subclasses (2)(a) and (2)(b) provides a lesser level of risk prevention and containment of effects and is not considered to be appropriate for such high-risk activities. The requirement to "manage" the risk of accelerated erosion in sub clause (a) does not imply any degree of minimising of that risk. It is not clear what is entailed in "treating" sediment-laden runoff, but the containment aspect is important for preventing the movement of sediment and runoff offsite where it can lead to adverse effects. It is not considered that the amendments suggested improve the clarity or the practical guidance of the Policy, nor are they likely to provide for the effective management of high-risk earthworks activities.

For the reasons set out above, the submissions and further submissions are rejected and no amendment is required.

SCN1.57. Recommendation

449.248, 512.216: Accept

379.153, 594.153, 602.160: Accept in part

603.180, 603.181, 603.182, F1042.180, F1042.181, F1042.182, F1043.180, F1043.181, F1043.182, F1043.644, F1044.180, F1044.181, F1044.182, F1044.644, F1076.462: Reject

Amendment

1. Amend Policy SCN5(2)(b), page 8-41, to read:

"(b) contain the movement of any sediment transported in runoff generated from the activity site;

2. Amend Policy SCN5 (2)(c), page 8-41, to read:

"(c) undertake land rehabilitation necessary to stabilise ~~and revegetate~~ the site, and to restore an intact vegetation cover wherever practicable; and

8-41-15 Policy SCN5(2)(d)

8-41-15	379.154	TrustPower Limited	Amend Policy SCN5(2)(d) to read: " <i>avoid, remedy or mitigate any significant adverse effects of erosion or sediment deposition on....</i> "
	F1043.645	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1044.645	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1074.660	Federated Farmers of NZ (Inc)	<i>Support</i>
8-41-15	594.154	Rangitata Diversion Race Irrigator Forum	Amend Policy SCN5(2)(d) to read: " <i>avoid, remedy or mitigate any significant adverse effects of erosion or sediment deposition on....</i> "
8-41-15	602.161	Rangitata Diversion Race Management Ltd	Amend Policy SCN5(2)(d) to read: " <i>avoid, remedy or mitigate any significant adverse effects of erosion or sediment deposition on....</i> "
8-41-19	603.183	Carter Holt Harvey Forests	Amend Policy SCN5(2)(d)(ii) to read as follows: " <i>(ii) significant areas for the protection of indigenous biodiversity, including indigenous flora, and the habitats of indigenous fauna;</i> " or words to like effect.
	F1042.183	NZ Forest Owners Assn	<i>Support</i>
	F1043.183	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.183	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
8-41-23	379.155	TrustPower Limited	Amend Policy SCN5(2)(d)(v) to read: " <i>Outstanding landscape features and amenity values for the area; and...</i> "
	F1043.646	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1044.646	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Oppose</i>
8-41-23	594.155	Rangitata Diversion Race Irrigator Forum	Amend Policy SCN5(2)(d)(v) to read: " <i>Outstanding landscape features and amenity values for the area; and...</i> "
8-41-23	602.162	Rangitata Diversion Race Management Ltd	Amend Policy SCN5(2)(d)(v) to read: " <i>Outstanding landscape features and amenity values for the area; and...</i> "
8-41-23	603.184	Carter Holt Harvey Forests	Amend Policy SCN5(2)(d)(v) to read as follows: " <i>(v) outstanding landscape features for the area; and</i> " or words to like effect.
	F1042.184	NZ Forest Owners Assn	<i>Support</i>
	F1043.184	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.184	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
	F1076.463	NZ Vegetable and Potato Growers and three other organisations	<i>Support</i>

8-41-24	379.156	TrustPower Limited	Retain Policy SCN5(2)(d)(vi) as presently drafted.
	F1043.647	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1044.647	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Oppose</i>
8-41-24	594.156	Rangitata Diversion Race Irrigator Forum	Retain Policy SCN5(2)(d)(vi) as presently drafted.
8-41-24	602.163	Rangitata Diversion Race Management Ltd	Retain Policy SCN5(2)(d)(vi) as presently drafted.

Evaluations and reasons

379.154, F1043.645, F1044.645, F1074.660; 594.154, 602.161: The submitters 379, 594, 602 say that the approach presented in sub clause (2)(d) is contrary to s5 of the RMA in that it doesn't allow effects to be remedied or mitigated. The terms avoid, remedy and mitigate should be read conjunctively as being of equal importance.

F1043, F1044 oppose the entire submission 379 on based on their opposition to any increase in the regulatory controls for forestry activities sought by the submitter that is unnecessary or inconsistent with the RMA. This reasoning is not relevant to the submission point raised under this provision and is therefore not accepted.

F1074 supports the original submission 379 on the grounds that it broadens the scope of management options to undertake earthworks and vegetation clearance activities.

The points raised by the submitters that there will be circumstances where erosion cannot be avoided are accepted, but if the effects can be remedied or mitigated then it is unlikely that significant adverse effects will be generated. It will not always be possible to remedy or mitigate significant adverse effects on the values listed in sub clause (2)(d) so the direction from the Policy is that the activities in (2) should not be undertaken unless there are measures in place to avoid such effects.

For the reasons set out above, the submissions 379.154, 594.154, 602.161 and further submission F1074.660, F1043.645, F1044.645 are rejected. No amendment is required.

379.156, F1043.647, F1044.647; 594.156, 602.163: The submitters specifically support sub clause (d)(vi) as it seeks to ensure that earthworks activities undertaken by others are managed to protect property and assets, particularly network facilities.

F1043, F1044 oppose the entire submission 379 based on their opposition to any increase in the regulatory controls for forestry activities sought by the submitter that is unnecessary or inconsistent with the RMA. This reasoning is not relevant to the submission point raised under this provision and is therefore not accepted.

The support of submissions 379.156, 594.156, 602.163 is accepted and no amendment is required. Further submissions F1043.647, F1044.647 are rejected.

379.155, F1043.646, F1044.646, 594.155, 602.162, 603.183, F1042.183, F1043.183, F1044.183; 603.184, F1042.184, F1043.184, F1044.184, F1076.463: The submitter claims that Policy SCN5 as written seeks a level of certainty that is unrealistic.

F1042, F1043, F1044, F1076 all support the entire submission 603 for the reasons provided by the original submitter.

F1043, F1044 oppose the entire submission 379 based on their opposition to any increase in the regulatory controls for forestry activities sought by the submitter that is unnecessary or inconsistent with the RMA. This reasoning is not relevant to the submission point raised under this provision and is therefore not accepted.

The changes suggested by the submitters for sub clause SCN5(2)(d) focus on providing protection consistent with the requirements under s6 of the RMA. This is accepted. The current wording of the sub clause SCN5(2)(d) varies from the RMA wording and creates uncertainty as to what is required (e.g. what does "important" mean in relation to landscapes? How does it relate to "outstanding" as used in s6 of the RMA?). It is recommended that the amended wording is taken exactly from the s6 wording, rather than the wording suggested by the submitters which still differs slightly from the RMA.

For the reasons set out above, the submissions 603.183, 603.184, 379.155, 594.155, 602.162 and further submissions F1042.183, F1042.184, F1043.183, F1043.184, F1044.183, F1044.184, F1044.647, F1076.463 are accepted in part. Further submissions F1043.646, F1044.646 are rejected. An amendment is required to clause SCN5(2)(d)(v).

SCN1.58. Recommendation

379.156, 594.156, 602.163: Accept

379.155, 594.155, 602.162, 603.183, 603.184, F1042.183, F1042.184, F1043.183, F1043.184,

F1044.183, F1044.184, F1044.647, F1076.463: Accept in part.

379.154, 594.154, 602.161, F1043.645, F1043.646, F1043.647, F1044.645, F1044.646, F1044.647, F1074.660: Reject

Amendment

Amend Policy SCN5(2)(d)(v) , page 8-41, to read:

"(v) ~~important landscape features~~ outstanding natural features and landscapes and amenity values"

8-42-14 Methods for Policy SCN5

8-42-14	257.1595	Upper Waitaki Branch Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-42-14	289.2116	North Bank Land Owners Group	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-42-14	379.157	TrustPower Limited	Retain Method SCN5 in its entirety.
	F1043.648	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1044.648	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Oppose</i>
8-42-14	506.1587	Hugh Turnbull	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-42-14	586.1587	Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces	Retain Methods SCN5.
	F1003.11	Landco Pastoral Holdings Ltd	<i>Support in part.</i>
	F1043.3076	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.3065	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
8-42-14	594.157	Rangitata Diversion Race Irrigator Forum	Retain Method SCN5 in its entirety.
8-42-14	602.164	Rangitata Diversion Race Management Ltd	Retain Method SCN5 in its entirety.
8-42-14	669.1583	South Island High Country Section, Federated Farmers NZ	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).

Evaluations and reasons

257.1595, 289.2116, 379.157, F1043.648, F1044.648, 506.1587, 586.1587, F1003.11, F1043.3076, F1044.3065; 594.157, 602.164, 669.1583: Each of the submitters wishes to retain Method SCN5 as written. Further sbmitters F1043 and F1044 have supported submission 586 and opposed the submission 379, so they are both opposing and supporting submissions to retain the method as written. The reasons they have given to oppose submission 379 relate to their opposition to increased controls on forestry planting activities. This is irrelevant to the submission point raised here so it is rejected. F1003 supports the original submission 586 because the current wording generally achieves the outcomes sought, and any change to the wording could result in changes to the outcomes. The support of submissions 586.1587, 257.1595, 289.2116, 506.1587, 669.1583, 379.157, 594.157, 602.164 and further submissions F1003.11, F1043.3076, F1044.3065 is accepted and no amendment is required. Further submissions F1043.648, F1044.648 are rejected.

SCN1.59. Recommendation

257.1595, 289.2116, 379.157, 506.1587, 586.1587, 594.157, 602.164, 669.1583, F1003.11, F1043.3076, F1044.3065: Accept

F1043.648, F1044.648: Reject

Amendment

Nil

8-42-20 Method SCN5(a) Information and promotion

8-42-20	449.249	Transit New Zealand	Retain Method SCN5(a) as worded
---------	---------	---------------------	---------------------------------

Evaluations and reasons

449.249: The submitter wishes to retain Method SCN5(a) as worded.

This support is accepted and no amendment is required.

SCN1.60. Recommendation

449.249: Accept

Amendment

Nil

8-42-34 Method SCN5(b) Investigations

8-42-34	449.250	Transit New Zealand	Amend Method SCN5(b) to provide consultation over any standards for earthworks and vegetation clearance developed.
---------	---------	---------------------	--

Evaluations and reasons

449.250: The submitter wants Method SCN5(b) amended to include them in any consultation for the setting of standards for earthworks and vegetation clearance activities on the grounds that they undertake large-scale earthworks activities that would be affected by such standards.

This is a valid submission as any investigations should include consultation with all the major parties involved in earthworks activities to provide for the range of activities undertaken in the region. The list of agencies that Environment Canterbury will work with in Method SCN5(b) should include the major network utility operators which would include the submitter.

For the reasons set out, the submission is accepted and an amendment is required.

SCN1.61. Recommendation

449.250: Accept

Amendment

Amend Method SCN5(b)(a) Investigations, page 8-42, to read:

"(a) Environment Canterbury will work with, landholders, network utility operators, and other land management agencies"

8-42-40 Method SCN5(c) Territorial authorities

8-42-40	334.345	Selwyn District Council	Delete Method SCN5(c), or replace "shall" with " <u>should, when the district plan provisions allow.</u> "
	F1043.4182	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Conditionally Oppose</i>
	F1044.4142	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Conditionally Oppose</i>
8-42-40	338.303	Mackenzie District Council	See submission point 334.345.
8-42-40	352.259	Waitaki District Council	See submission point 334.345.
8-42-40	378.302	Christchurch City Council (formerly BPDC).	See submission point 334.345.
8-42-40	413.290	Waimate District Council	See submission point 334.345.
8-42-40	471.345	Selwyn Central Community Board	See submission point 334.345.

8-42-40	476.833	Christchurch City Council	Add to Method SCN5(c) that, when preparing district plans, territorial authorities shall consider the need for rules and other methods to control all earthworks and vegetation clearance activities (i.e. not just when part of a subdivision application).
8-42-40	539.391	Timaru District Council	Delete Method SCN5(c) or amend the Method to read: <i><u>"As territorial authorities control subdivision and a range of land use activities the Regional Council would prefer that issues related to the erosion proneness of soils are addressed when activities involving earthworks and vegetation clearance are proposed. Consultation shall be entered into with territorial authorities as required under section 33 of the Resource Management Act 1991."</u></i>
8-42-40	564.286	Hurunui District Council	See submission point 334.345.
8-42-40	565.241	Ashburton District Council	Amend Method SCN5(c) to improve the explanation to identify erosion risks at time of large scale subdivision development.
8-42-40	573.265	Kaikoura District Council	See submission point 334.345.
8-42-41	448.210	Waimakariri District Council	Amend Method SCN5(c) to read: <i><u>"Environment Canterbury will work with territorial authorities to identify methods where, when administering consents for subdivision, earthworks and vegetation clearance activities, the territorial authority will address the erosion-proneness of soils."</u></i>

Evaluations and reasons

334.345, F1043.4182, F1044.4142; 338.303, 352.259, 378.302, 413.290, 471.345, 539.391, 564.286, 573.265: The submitters have requested that Method SCN5(c) be deleted on the grounds that the link between soil conservation and administering subdivision consents is tenuous. The removal of the Explanation to this method, section 8.6.6 is also requested as a consequential change. The submitters state that where subdivision is provided for as a controlled activity, it will only be possible to consider those matters already specified in any district plan. This means that some territorial authorities may not be able to implement the method. An alternative to deleting the method is to remove the status of the requirement from "shall" to "should".

539 identifies an alternative suggestion to provide for the achievement of the method through the use of transfer of powers under s33.

F1043, F1044 conditionally oppose the original submission 334 based on their stand that soil conservation should not be constrained by the protection of s6 matters. These reasons are not relevant to the submission point raised here, so the further submissions are rejected.

The submitters provide no reasons as to why they consider the link between soil conservation and administering subdivision consents to be tenuous. Land use consents for activities relating to subdivisions can address a range of matters relating to soil conservation including earthworks and vegetation clearance, sediment control and protection of natural and cultural values. The susceptibility of land to erosion will have a direct influence on determining the scale of disturbance that can be undertaken as part of a subdivision and the mitigating measures that need to be taken to manage slope stability, sediment control and runoff and rehabilitation of the activity site. Currently regional plans for the Canterbury region do not address the management of earthworks and vegetation clearance activities for subdivision purposes, preferring to leave these to territorial authorities as part of their responsibilities under the RMA and the Building Act and minimising the need for multiple consents for such activities. Where district plans currently do not take erosion proneness into account in methods to control earthworks for subdivision activities, this can be included by way of a plan change, or can be included on review of district plans. The method should be amended to identify the opportunities for inclusion of these matters in district plans.

The reasons provided by the submitters for deleting the Method SCN5(c) are not regarded as consistent

with their responsibilities under the RMA. The alternative suggestion to remove the mandatory nature of the method is accepted as the NRRP cannot require this without using the formal processes under s33. On this basis, Method SCN5(c) should be reworded to use "should" rather than "shall" in reference to territorial authorities taking erosion-proneness into account, and the Explanation for the Methods section 8.6.6 Territorial authorities does not require amendment.

For the reasons set out above the submissions 334.345, 338.303, 352.259, 378.302, 413.290, 471.345, 539.391, 564.286, 573.265 are accepted in part and an amendment is required. The further submissions F1043.4182, F1044.4142 are rejected as being irrelevant to the submission point raised.

448.210: the submitter wants to remove the requirement of the method for territorial authorities to undertake a variation or plan change to achieve the method. They suggest an amendment to use consultation rather than coercion to identify how best for territorial authorities to take these matters into consideration.

The current wording of the method requires a more formal process through s33 to require territorial authorities to assume these responsibilities. The amendment suggested by the submitter provides for a consultative approach which is accepted as providing a more effective basis for identifying and achieving the desired level of control of these activities.

For the reasons set out above the submission is accepted in part and an amendment is required.

476.833: The submitter wants to amend the Method SCN5(c) to require territorial authorities to extend the consideration of erosion controls to all earthworks and vegetation activities rather than just to subdivision activities.

It is agreed with the submitter that the same issues for erosion can arise from activities that are not part of a subdivision and the authority administering consents should address the issue of erosion consistently across all activities. Regional councils have the primary responsibility to address the need for controls for earthworks and vegetation clearance activities for soil conservation purposes. District councils also have a responsibility under the RMA to take an integrated approach to managing the effects of land use activities. This should be seen as addressing the effects of all earthworks and vegetation clearance activities where they are of significance.

The reason for specifying subdivision activities in the Method was to recognise that regional plans for the Canterbury region currently do not address the management of earthworks and vegetation clearance for subdivision activities, preferring to leave these to territorial authorities who already administer land use consents for these activities pursuant to rules in district plans, and thereby minimising the need for multi-agency consents for such activities. However as recognised in the evaluation of submission points 334, 338, 352 etc above, the NRRP cannot require the territorial authorities to address these matters except through a formal s33 process. This is not the intention of the policy and a more co-operative approach should be included to provide for these matters to be addressed. The extension of the method to address all earthworks and vegetation clearance activities would provide for a more consistent approach.

For the reasons outlined the submission is accepted in part, and an amendment is required.

565.241: The submitter wants to amend Method SCN5(c) to explain more adequately the link between subdivision development and earthworks and vegetation clearance generating soil erosion.

The scale of the earthworks likely to result in soil erosion issues will depend on the soil type and the physical environment where the subdivision occurs. Restricting erosion controls to large scale subdivisions as requested by the submitter is not considered appropriate as this may not be sufficient to address all situations where there is a significant risk of erosion. By their nature, however, large scale subdivisions will have a much greater potential to result in erosion problems if not managed carefully. This needs to be recognised as just one of the factors of "erosion proneness" when dealing with subdivision consents.

For the reasons outlined above, the submission is accepted in part but no amendment is required to address this submission.

The suggestions made by all of the submitters on this provision have been considered together in providing an amendment to the method wording.

SCN1.62. Recommendation

334.345, 338.303, 352.259, 378.302, 413.290, 448.210, 471.345, 476.833, 539.391, 564.286, 565.241, 573.265: Accept in part

F1043.4182, F1044.4142: Reject

Amendment

Amend Method SCN5(c), page 8-42, to read:

"When administering subdivision or land use consents, territorial authorities ~~shall~~ should take the erosion-proneness....."

8-43-1 Objective SCN2: Arable lands

8-43-1	215.7	K W & P W Stackhouse	Retain Objective SCN2
8-43-1	378.310	Christchurch City Council (formerly BPDC).	Insert a new policy under Arable Lands Objective SCN2 that is consistent with the versatile soils approach found in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.
	F1076.464	NZ Vegetable and Potato Growers and three other organisations	<i>Oppose</i>
8-43-1	378.311	Christchurch City Council (formerly BPDC).	Amend Objective SCN2 to ensure the irreversible effects of land use activities on land comprising versatile soils are minimised so as to be consistent with Chapter 7 Objective 2 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.
	F1076.465	NZ Vegetable and Potato Growers and three other organisations	<i>Oppose</i>
8-43-1	449.251	Transit New Zealand	Retain Objective SCN2 as worded
	F1003.38	Landco Pastoral Holdings Ltd	<i>Support in part.</i>
8-43-1	476.834	Christchurch City Council	Amend Objective SCN2 to make it clear that they do not apply when the land is currently used and is proposed to be used for urban activities. Amend the relevant environmental results anticipated to reflect this.
	F1074.661	Federated Farmers of NZ (Inc)	<i>Oppose</i>
8-43-1	594.185	Rangitata Diversion Race Irrigator Forum	Retain Objective SCN2.
8-43-1	602.165	Rangitata Diversion Race Management Ltd	Retain Objective SCN2 without modification / change.

Evaluations and reasons

215.7, 449.251, F1003.38, 594.185, 602.165: The submitters and further submitter wish to retain Objective SCN2 as worded. This support is accepted and no amendment is required.

378.310, F1076.464, 378.311, F1076.465: The submitter claims that insufficient attention has been given in Chapter 8 to the maintenance of versatile soils. The submitter disagrees with the statements in section 8.3.2.1 that versatile soils are adequately addressed in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and wants the issue to be specifically addressed in Chapter 8.

F1076 - oppose the original submissions on the grounds that the focus in the RMA and the plan is on all soils, not some particular attributes of those soils.

Versatile soils possess a unique set of physical and chemical characteristics that make them suitable for the widest range of productive uses, both currently and into the future. However, this resource can be irreversibly lost when land is changed from rural (productive use) to urban or industrial purposes. This change is brought about by a zone change, predominantly, and consequential removal or permanent hard surfacing of the soil as part of building developments. While the loss of this soil is irreversible, the extent and location is generally of a local nature. Urban subdivision is managed through policies and rules in a district plan.

The CRPS contains objectives and policies addressing the protection of versatile soils. These objectives and policies were considered adequate for that purpose by the parties involved in bringing the CRPS to its operative state. Under the RMA, district plans must give effect to the CRPS, including the maintenance of versatile soils. The submitter has not provided any substantive examples of the CRPS of District Plans failing to meet the objective or policy requirements.

More recently there have been some Courts decisions that have ruled that the provisions in the CRPS dealing with versatile soils are ultra vires and a review is required to reappraise the objective and policies (C66/03, C9/02). That review process is currently underway and if the results of the review indicate a

need for the NRRP to include provisions for the protection of versatile soils, then this will be achieved by way of a variation to the plan. Until that review is completed, however, it will not be appropriate to consider any amendments to Chapter 8 in relation to the management of versatile soils.

The reasons put forward by the further submitter in opposition are accepted in part: the CRPS and NRRP both recognise that particular soils are capable of a range of uses and that land use should, as far as practicable, sustain the potential of those soils for present and future generations. This is consistent with the purpose of the Act. However as set out above, the issue of the loss of versatile soils is a localised issue that is appropriately addressed by district plans.

For the reasons outlined, submissions 378.310, 378.311 and further submissions F1076.464, F1076.465 are accepted in part and no amendment is required.

476.834, F1074.661: The submitter wants the objective to recognise that some areas of arable soils are zoned for urban use and under urban development will not be able to maintain the life-supporting capacity and quality of these soils.

F1074 opposes the original submission on the grounds that soils are a limited resource and should be subject to control on an equal basis.

It is accepted that the requirement for urban expansion will mean that some encroachment onto arable soils will be inevitable with the consequential permanent loss of the productivity of these soils. The focus for Objective SCN2 is maintaining the quality and quantity of soils used for farming through the uptake of best management practices for arable farming. Therefore the objective should be reworded to explicitly focus on land used for farming activities. This will exclude land used for urban use and satisfy the concerns raised by the submitter. The reasons provided by the further submitter are not accepted given the specific focus for the Objective.

For the reasons set out above, the submission is accepted and an amendment is required. The further submission is rejected.

SCN1.63. Recommendation

215.7, 449.251, 476.834, 594.185, 602.165, F1003.38, F1076.464, F1076.465: Accept

378.310, 378.311, F1074.661: Reject

Amendment

Amend the first line of Objective SCN2, page 8-43, to read:
"On all arable land used for farming activities:"

8-43-5 Objective SCN2(a)(i)

8-43-5	540.308	Canterbury Growers Society Ltd	Retain the phrase " <i>maintaining or enhancing</i> " in Objective SCN2(a)(i).
8-43-5	541.308	NZ Vegetable & Potato Growers Federation Inc et al	Retain the phrase " <i>maintaining or enhancing</i> " in Objective SCN2(a)(i).

Evaluations and reasons

540.308, 541.308: The submitters support the wording in Objective SCN2(a)(i) to recognise that maintaining existing soil quality is sometimes all that is required.

This support is accepted and no amendment is required.

SCN1.64. Recommendation

540.308, 541.308: Accept

Amendment

Nil

8-43-6 Objective SCN2(a)(ii)

8-43-6	540.309	Canterbury Growers Society Ltd	Insert the word " <i>induced</i> " before the words "erosion" wherever they occur in Objective SCN2(a)(ii).
8-43-6	540.310	Canterbury Growers Society Ltd	Retain the reference to a 25-year timeframe in Objective SCN2(a)(ii).
8-43-6	541.309	NZ Vegetable & Potato Growers Federation Inc et al	Insert the word " <i>induced</i> " before the words "erosion" wherever they occur in Objective SCN2(a)(ii).

8-43-6	541.310	NZ Vegetable & Potato Growers Federation Inc et al	Retain the reference to a 25-year timeframe in Objective SCN2(a)(ii).
--------	---------	--	---

Evaluations and reasons

540.309, 541.309: The submitters want the Objective SCN2(a)(ii) to specify that the focus is "induced" levels of erosion which can be reduced by appropriate management practices, rather than natural erosion which will always occur.

The emphasis on the induced nature of the erosion is clearly explained in the Explanation to the Objective. However it is accepted that the wording of the Objective does not explicitly make this clear. The concern for soil conservation is to minimise the loss of topsoil as a result of undertaking farming activities so this should be included in the Objective to make the link clear. The request by the submitter to insert "induced" before the word "erosion" wherever it occurs in Objective SCN2(a)(ii) is not considered to provide the clarification desired. Linking topsoil loss to farming activities provides a clearer link.

For the reasons set out above the submissions are accepted in part and an amendment is required.

540.310, 541.310: The submitters support the use of a long timeframe to enable development and application of new technologies to be achieved.

This support is accepted and no amendment is required.

SCN1.65. Recommendation

540.310, 541.310: Accept

540.309, 541.309: Accept in part

Amendment

Amend Objective SCN2(a)(ii), page 8-43, to read:

" (ii) progressively reducing the loss of topsoil by wind or water erosion as a result of farming activities to as close as possible to zero....."

8-43-13 Explanation and principal reasons Objective SCN2

8-43-13	257.1596	Upper Waitaki Branch Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-43-13	289.2117	North Bank Land Owners Group	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-43-13	506.1588	Hugh Turnbull	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-43-13	586.1588	Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces	Delete the words; " <i>particularly where cultivation is undertaken</i> " in the first sentence of the Explanation to Objective SCN2
	F1043.3077	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.3066	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
8-43-13	669.1584	South Island High Country Section, Federated Farmers NZ	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).

Evaluations and reasons

257.1596, 289.2117, 506.1588, 586.1588, F1043.3077, F1044.3066; 669.1584:

The submitter 586 wants to retain the Objective as written but remove the reference to cultivation in the Explanation on the grounds that the use of the term is inappropriate.

257, 289, 506, 669 and F1043, F1044 - each support the submission 586 for the reasons provided by the submitter.

The amendment requested by the submitter is based on their submission to include a definition of "cultivation" to encompass all the stages involved in the preparation and production of crops.

The Oxford dictionary includes several definitions for cultivation including preparing the soil for crops, and raising crops. Chapter 8 has used cultivation in the former context to focus on those soil preparation activities most likely to contribute to the risk of soil erosion. It is accepted that the meaning of the term should be clear in the context that it is used in the chapter. It is not considered useful to include a specific definition for cultivation, but the Explanation to Objective SCN2 should be amended to clarify the use of the term in Chapter 8.

For the reasons outlined, the submissions and further submissions are all accepted in part and an amendment is required.

SCN1.66. Recommendation

257.1596, 289.2117, 506.1588, 586.1588, 669.1584, F1043.3077, F1044.3066: Accept in part

Amendment

Amend Objective SCN2 Explanation and principle reasons, page 8-43, by inserting a new sentence after the first sentence in paragraph 1 to read:

"It is accepted that, particularly where cultivation is undertaken. Cultivation includes the range of soil preparation methods that involve exposure and disturbance of the soil."

8-44-1 Policy SCN6: Soil quality management on arable soils

8-44-1	215.8	K W & P W Stackhouse	Retain Policy SCN6
8-44-1	257.1859	Upper Waitaki Branch Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586.1860).
8-44-1	289.2380	North Bank Land Owners Group	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586.1860).
8-44-1	449.252	Transit New Zealand	Amend Policy SCN6 to clearly distinguish between land that is farmed and other arable land: or in the alternative amend the definition of arable land (see submission point 449.89)
	F1076.466	NZ Vegetable and Potato Growers and three other organisations	<i>Oppose</i>
8-44-1	476.835	Christchurch City Council	Amend Policy SCN6 to make it clear that they do not apply when the land is currently used and is proposed to be used for urban activities. Amend the relevant environmental results anticipated to reflect this.
	F1074.662	Federated Farmers of NZ (Inc)	<i>Oppose</i>
8-44-1	506.1852	Hugh Turnbull	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586.1860).
8-44-1	512.217	University of Canterbury	Amend Policy SCN6 to clearly distinguish between land that is farmed and other arable land.
8-44-1	540.311	Canterbury Growers Society Ltd	Retain the 10-year timeframe and use of the phrase "maintain or enhance" in the wording of Policy SCN6.
8-44-1	541.311	NZ Vegetable & Potato Growers Federation Inc et al	Retain the 10-year timeframe and use of the phrase "maintain or enhance" in the wording of Policy SCN6.
8-44-1	586.1860	Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces	Retain Policy SCN6.
	F1043.4248	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.4226	Selwyn Plantation Board	<i>Support</i>

		Limited	
8-44-1	594.186	Rangitata Diversion Race Irrigator Forum	Retain Policy SCN6.
8-44-1	602.166	Rangitata Diversion Race Management Ltd	Retain Policy SCN6 without modification / change.
8-44-1	669.1847	South Island High Country Section, Federated Farmers NZ	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586.1860).

Evaluations and reasons

215.8, 257.1859, 289.2380, 506.1852, 540.311, 541.311, 586.1860, F1043.4248, F1044.4226; 594.186, 602.166 669.1847: The submitters and further submission in support, support the current wording of the Policy SCN6 and wish to have it retained. The support of the submitters is accepted and no amendment is required.

449.252, F1076.466; 512.217:

The submitters want Policy SCN6 amended to distinguish between land that is farmed and other arable land. They point out that the policy is clearly intended only for farmed land, but not all landowners of arable land are farmers. Alternatively they suggest amending the definition for arable land.

F1076 opposes the original submission 449 on the grounds that the principles of resource management apply regardless of land use.

The point raised by the submitters is a valid one and the policy should clarify the extent of arable land that is subject to the provisions. It is accepted that the focus for Policy SCN6 is the uptake of best management practices for farming activities to maintain soil quality and minimise the risk of erosion. An amendment made to the Objective to specify that it applies to "all arable land used for farming activities" will set the framework for the land covered by the policies, so further specification in the policies is not necessary.

The alternative suggestion to amend the definition of arable land is not considered necessary or appropriate if the scope of the Objective and Policy is clarified. "Arable land" is defined on the basis of its capability for use, not the particular use made of it at any point in time.

The reasons put forward by the further submitter do not appear to be relevant to the submission point raised. Land that is used for farming purposes will require different management practices for sustainable management than land used for other purposes, such as the creation and maintenance of network utilities such as roading.

For the reasons outlined, the submissions are accepted in part and no amendment is required to Policy SCN6. The further submission is rejected.

476.835, F1074.662:

The submitter wants the policy to recognise that some areas of arable soils are zoned for urban use and under urban development will not be able to maintain the life-supporting capacity and quality of these soils.

F1074 opposes the original submission on the grounds that soils are a limited resource and should be subject to control on an equal basis.

It is accepted that the requirement for urban expansion will mean that some encroachment onto arable soils will be inevitable with the consequential permanent loss of the productivity of these soils. An amendment made to Objective SCN2, in response to the same concern raised, to specify that it applies to "arable land used for farming activities" provides the context for the policies under Objective SCN2, so no further specification of the policies is necessary. This will exclude land used for urban use and satisfy the concerns raised by the submitter. The reasons provided by the further submitter are not accepted given the specific focus for the Policy.

For the reasons set out above, the submission is accepted in part and no amendment is required. The further submission is rejected.

SCN1.67. Recommendation

215.8, 257.1859, 289.2380, 476.835, 506.1852, 540.311, 541.311, 586.1860, 594.186, 602.166, 669.1847, F1043.4248, F1044.4226: Accept

449.252, 512.217: Accept in part

F1074.662, F1076.466: Reject

Amendment

Nil

8-44-41 Methods for Policy SCN6

8-44-41	257.1597	Upper Waitaki Branch Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-44-41	289.2118	North Bank Land Owners Group	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-44-41	506.1589	Hugh Turnbull	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-44-41	586.1589	Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces	Retain Methods SCN6.
	F1003.12	Landco Pastoral Holdings Ltd	<i>Support in part.</i>
	F1043.3078	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.3067	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
8-44-41	669.1585	South Island High Country Section, Federated Farmers NZ	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).

8-45-4 Method SCN6(a) Information and promotion (paragraph 1)

8-45-4	540.312	Canterbury Growers Society Ltd	Insert after "resource care groups" in Method SCN6(a) the words " <u>Canterbury grower associations.</u> "
8-45-4	541.312	NZ Vegetable & Potato Growers Federation Inc et al	Insert after "resource care groups" in Method SCN6(a) the words " <u>Canterbury grower associations.</u> "

8-45-29 Method SCN6(b) Investigations

8-45-29	540.313	Canterbury Growers Society Ltd	Retain Method SCN6(b).
8-45-29	541.313	NZ Vegetable & Potato Growers Federation Inc et al	Retain Method SCN6(b).

Submission Clarification

The provisions included in this Evaluation are:
Methods for Policy SCN6; MethodSCN6(a); Method SCN6(b)

Evaluations and reasons

257.1597, 289.2118, 506.1589, 586.1589, F1003.12, F1043.3078, F1044.3067; 669.1585: The submitters and further submitters all support the current wording of Method SCN6 and wish it to be retained.

An amendment has been made to the method as the result of other submissions, but to the extent that this amendment does not change the overall focus for the method, the support from the submitters and further submitters is accepted in part.

540.312, 541.312: The submitters identify that the groups listed under Method SCN6(a) do not include the various Canterbury grower associations who form a major part of the primary production community to which this policy applies.

The current list of people specified in Method SCN6(a) that Environment Canterbury will work includes a range of individual and groups related to arable farming, but it does not include any of the associations representing specific production industries. The suggestion made by the submitters is a useful one

because the Canterbury grower associations will cover a number of key industry groups that the Plan will wish to target. This will be achieved most effectively by involving these groups in the preparation and promotion of information on best practices.

For the reasons outlined, the submissions are accepted and an amendment is required.

540.313, 541.313: The submitters want Method SCN6(b) retained as written.

The support from the submitters is accepted and no amendment is required.

SCN1.68. Recommendation

540.312, 540.313, 541.312, 541.313: Accept

257.1597, 289.2118, 506.1589, 586.1589, 669.1585, F1003.12, F1043.3078, F1044.3067: Accept in part

Amendment

Amend Method SCN6(a) Information and promotion, page 8-45, to read:

"To increase the awarenessEnvironment Canterbury will work with landholders, resource care groups, Federated Farmers, Canterbury grower associations and land management agencies to:"

8-46-1 Policy SCN7: Wind erosion risk

8-46-1	215.9	K W & P W Stackhouse	Retain Policy SCN7 but recognise that conversion to no tillage technique should occur under its own merits.
8-46-1	257.1860	Upper Waitaki Branch Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586.1861).
8-46-1	289.2381	North Bank Land Owners Group	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586.1861).
8-46-1	449.253	Transit New Zealand	Amend Policy SCN7 to clearly distinguish between land that is farmed and other arable land or in the alternative amend the definition of arable land (see submission point 449.89)
8-46-1	506.1853	Hugh Turnbull	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586.1861).
8-46-1	540.314	Canterbury Growers Society Ltd	Retain the wording of Policy SCN7: Wind erosion risk.
8-46-1	541.314	NZ Vegetable & Potato Growers Federation Inc et al	Retain the wording of Policy SCN7: Wind erosion risk.
	F1003.31	Landco Pastoral Holdings Ltd	<i>Support in part.</i>
8-46-1	565.243	Ashburton District Council	Retain Policy SCN7, specifically the promotion of methods that reduce soil erosion at times of cultivation.
8-46-1	586.1861	Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces	Retain Policy SCN7.
	F1043.4249	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.4227	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
8-46-1	594.187	Rangitata Diversion Race Irrigator Forum	Retain Policy SCN7.
8-46-1	602.167	Rangitata Diversion Race Management Ltd	Retain Policy SCN7 without modification / change.
8-46-1	669.1848	South Island High Country Section, Federated Farmers NZ	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586.1861).

Evaluations and reasons

257.1860, 289.2381, 506.1853, 540.314, 541.314, F1003.31; 565.243, 586.1861, F1043.4249,

F1044.4227; 594.187, 602.167, 669.1848: The submitters and further submitters wish to retain Policy SCN7 as written. The support of the submitters and further submitter is accepted and no amendment is required.

215.9: The submitter supports the aims of Policy SCN7 but wants the promotion of no-tillage techniques to be limited to those situations where it has merit. The submitter points out that in North Canterbury there are few days when the conditions are ideal for no-tillage practice.

The policy as written provides for the promotion of no-tillage techniques "where practicable". Further, in the Explanation to the Policy it is stated that "no one regime can be applied to all situations". It is considered that the wording of the Policy and the Explanation cover the concerns raised by the submitter. For the reasons set out above, the submission is accepted in part for its support, and no amendment is required.

449.253: The submitter wants to amend the Policy SCN7 to specify which arable soils are intended to be addressed by the policy. They point out that the policy is directed to farmers, but not all landowners of arable soils are farmers. The alternative suggestion is to amend the definition of arable land.

The point raised by the submitters is a valid one and the policy should clarify the extent of arable land that is subject to the provisions. It is accepted that the focus for Policy SCN7 is the uptake of best management practices for farming activities to minimise the risk of wind erosion. As a result of submissions on Objective SCN2 an amendment is recommended to specify that it applies to "all arable land used for farming activities". As Objective SCN2 sets the framework for the land covered by the policies, so further specification in the policies is not necessary.

The alternative suggestion to amend the definition of arable land is not considered necessary or appropriate if the scope of the Objective and Policy is clarified. "Arable land" is defined on the basis of its capability for use, not the particular use made of it at any point in time.

For the reasons outlined above, the submission is accepted in part and no amendment is required.

SCN1.69. Recommendation

257.1860, 289.2381, 506.1853, 540.314, 541.314, 565.243, 586.1861, 594.187, 602.167, 669.1848, F1003.31, F1043.4249, F1044.4227: Accept

215.9, 449.253: Accept in part

Amendment

Nil

8-47-18 Method SCN7(a) Information and promotion (paragraph 1)

8-47-18	540.315	Canterbury Growers Society Ltd	Insert after " <i>resource care groups</i> " in Method SCN7(a) the words " <u>Canterbury grower associations.</u> "
8-47-18	541.315	NZ Vegetable & Potato Growers Federation Inc et al	Insert after " <i>resource care groups</i> " in Method SCN7(a) the words " <u>Canterbury grower associations.</u> "

Evaluations and reasons

540.315, 541.315: The submitters identify that the groups listed under Method SCN7(a) do not include the various Canterbury grower associations that form a major part of the primary production community to which this policy applies.

The current list of people specified in Method SCN7(a) that Environment Canterbury will work with, includes a range of individual and groups related to arable farming, but it does not include any of the associations representing specific production industries. The suggestion made by the submitters is a useful one because the Canterbury grower associations will cover a number of key industry groups that the NRRP aims to target. This will be achieved most effectively by involving these groups in the preparation and promotion of information on best practices.

For the reasons outlined, the submissions are accepted and an amendment is required.

SCN1.70. Recommendation

540.315, 541.315: Accept

Amendment

Amend Method SCN7(a), page 8-47, to read:

"Environment Canterbury will work with landholders, resource care groups, Federated Farmers, Canterbury grower associations and agencies involved in arable research and land management:"

8-48-5 Method SCN7(b) Investigations

8-48-5	540.316	Canterbury Growers Society Ltd	Retain Method SCN7(b).
8-48-5	541.316	NZ Vegetable & Potato Growers Federation Inc et al	Retain Method SCN7(b).
8-48-8	257.1599	Upper Waitaki Branch Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-48-8	289.2119	North Bank Land Owners Group	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-48-8	506.1590	Hugh Turnbull	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-48-8	586.1590	Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces	Amend Method SCN7(b)(a) sub heading to read " <i>ensure investigation of.</i> "
	F1043.3079	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.3068	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
8-48-8	669.1586	South Island High Country Section, Federated Farmers NZ	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).

Evaluations and reasons

540.316, 541.316: The submitters wish to retain the method as written. The support of the submitters is accepted and no amendment is required.

257.1599, 289.2119, 506.1590, 586.1590, F1043.3079, F1044.3068; 669.1586:

The submitters have all supported Method SCN7(b) on the grounds that the co-operation of the parties listed will increase the achievement of the objectives for arable land management. The submitters also point out that some work is already being undertaken and the Council should determine what research has been done first.

F1043, F1044 - support the original submission 586 for the reasons given by the original submitter.

No specific reasons have been given for the amendment requested to the method so it is not clear why they want the wording change. The method cannot "ensure" that the investigations are undertaken - this will depend to a large extent on the availability and co-operation of the groups listed to contribute to the work. The current wording indicates that Environment Canterbury will be providing encouragement to get the work done - this is as much as can be expected from a non-regulatory framework. Working co-operatively with other groups involved in arable farming research is considered to provide the greatest certainty that areas of research will not be duplicated.

For the reasons outlined above, the submissions and further submissions are all accepted in part for their support, but no amendment is required.

SCN1.71. Recommendation

540.316, 541.316: Accept

257.1599, 289.2119, 506.1590, 586.1590, F1043.3079, F1044.3068; 669.1586: Accept in part

Amendment

Nil

8-48-20 Issue SCN2: Widespread soil contamination

8-48-20	486.333	Te Runanga O Ngai Tahu	Add a method that requires ECan to undertake a comprehensive investigation of the location of the Region's contaminated sites within five years of the Proposed NRRP being made operative.
---------	---------	------------------------	--

	F1043.1477	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1044.1477	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Oppose</i>
8-48-20	486.338	Te Runanga O Ngai Tahu	Retain Issue SCN2 unchanged.
	F1003.24	Landco Pastoral Holdings Ltd	<i>Support in part.</i>
	F1043.1482	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1044.1482	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Oppose</i>
8-48-20	540.317	Canterbury Growers Society Ltd	New issue, after Issue SCN2: Widespread Soil Contamination, dealing with localised land or soil contamination, and worded so as to give sufficient background and rationale to the inclusion of the following provisions from Chapter 4: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule WQL3 - Activities that use or store hazardous substances • Policy WQL11 - Management of contaminated land • Methods WQL11(a) - (i) - Territorial local authorities • Rule WQL53 - Investigation of contaminated land • Rule WQL54 - Excavation of land or discharge to groundwater from land • Rule WQL59 - Use of land for certain activities.
	F1002.126	Selwyn District Council.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1004.126	Kaikoura District Council.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1006.126	Timaru District Council.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1009.126	Hurunui District Council.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1011.126	Mackenzie District Council.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1018.126	Ashburton District Council.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1063.126	Christchurch City Council (formerly BPDC)	<i>Oppose</i>
8-48-20	541.317	NZ Vegetable & Potato Growers Federation Inc et al	New issue, after Issue SCN2: Widespread Soil Contamination, dealing with localised land or soil contamination, and worded so as to give sufficient background and rationale to the inclusion of the following provisions from Chapter 4: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule WQL3 - Activities that use or store hazardous substances • Policy WQL11 - Management of contaminated land • Methods WQL11(a) - (i) - Territorial local authorities • Rule WQL53 - Investigation of contaminated land • Rule WQL54 - Excavation of land or discharge to groundwater from land • Rule WQL59 - Use of land for certain activities.

	F1002.129	Selwyn District Council.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1004.129	Kaikoura District Council.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1006.129	Timaru District Council.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1009.129	Hurunui District Council.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1011.129	Mackenzie District Council.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1018.129	Ashburton District Council.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1063.129	Christchurch City Council (formerly BPDC)	<i>Oppose</i>
8-48-20	563.345	Te Hapu O Ngati Wheke Rapaki Runanga Inc	Support submission by Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu (refer 486).
8-48-20	563.350	Te Hapu O Ngati Wheke Rapaki Runanga Inc	Support submission by Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu (refer 486).

Evaluations and reasons

486.333, F1043.1477, F1044.1477; 563.345: The submitters are opposed to the lack of regulation regarding soil contamination. They want a Method added that requires Environment Canterbury to investigate all contaminated sites in Canterbury within five years of the plan becoming operative. F1043, F1044 - oppose the entire submission 486 based on their opposition to any increase in the regulatory controls for forestry activities sought by the submitter that is unnecessary or inconsistent with the RMA. This reasoning is not relevant to the submission point raised under this provision and is therefore not accepted

Chapter 8 deals only with issues of widespread contamination that pose a risk to the sustainable management of soils on a regional scale. Site contamination issues are generally small and localised and do not necessarily have a significant effect on the regional soil resource. They often involve the risk of contaminants moving into water bodies so they have been addressed in Chapter 4 Water Quality. Chapter 4 has provisions that already address the issues raised by the submitter: Policy WQL11 establishes a process for the establishment of a register of contaminated sites and a strategy for the management of contaminated land; Rules WQL53, WQL54, implement Policy WQL11 for the identification and management of sites of contaminated land, and rules WQL55 and WQL59 will control activities that risk future contamination of land. It is not necessary to move these provisions into Chapter 8 as all chapters of the NRRP should be read together to provide for the integrated management of resources.

It is considered that the current provisions in Chapter 4 and 8 adequately provide for the issues raised by the submitter. However, to improve the linkages between these chapters, a sentence should be added to the Explanation to Issue SCN2 and Objective SCN3 to direct readers to Chapter 4 Policy WQL11. The Explanation should also reinforce the focus for the Issue by always referring to "widespread contamination" in relation to Chapter 8.

For the reasons outlined above, the submissions 486.333, 563.345 are accepted in part and an amendment is required. The further submissions F1043.1477, F1044.1477 are rejected.

486.338, F1003.24, F1043.1482, F1044.1482; 563.350: The submitters and F1003 all support the Issue SCN2 in its current form with particular reference to retaining clause (c).

F1043, F1044 - oppose the entire submission 486 based on their opposition to any increase in the regulatory controls for forestry activities sought by the submitter that is unnecessary or inconsistent with the RMA. This reasoning is not relevant to this provision and is therefore not accepted.

The submissions 486.338, 563.345, and further submission F1003.24 are accepted for their support and no amendment is required. Further submissions F1043.1482, F1044.1482 are rejected.

540.317, F1002.126, F1004.126, F1006.126, F1009.126, F1011.126, F1018.126, F1063.126; 541.317, F1002.129, F1004.129, F1006.129, F1009.129, F1011.129, F1018.129, F1063.129: The submitters want a number of provisions relating to soil contamination transferred from the Chapter 4 Water Quality into Chapter 8 Soil Conservation on the grounds that they relate, in the first instance to land, and users of the plan are more likely to look for such issues in a land chapter.

F1002, F1004, F1006, F1009, F1011, F1018, F1063 each oppose both of the original submitters on the grounds that the provisions are already in Chapter 4 of the NRRP and they do not need to be repeated in Chapter 8. They also consider that the relief sought is not necessary to achieve the objectives and policies of Chapter 8, or to achieve the purpose of the RMA.

Soil contamination issues in Chapter 8 focus on contaminants that are widespread in their application, immobile, persistent within the soil, and toxic in a way that affects soil organism functioning or affects the availability of soils for productive uses. Many soil contamination issues do not fall within this framework and they have been addressed either in other chapters of the NRRP, or through other means such as non-statutory strategies and registers. The issue of localised land or soil contamination raised by the submitters is currently addressed in Chapter 4 because these contaminants are likely to be more of a threat to water quality if they are able to move through the soil into groundwater. They will have little impact on the soil resource on a regional scale.

Chapters in the NRRP are not designed to be implemented in isolation, rather they should work together to provide for the integration of resources and their management. In the end it makes no difference whether land contamination issues are dealt with in one chapter or across several chapters, provided that they are clearly identified and cross referenced between the chapters to enable readers to readily identify those issues of concern for them. In the NRRP, issues have been placed within the chapter that address the major focus for management. Where land contamination is an issue for water quality, the matter is addressed in Chapter 4; where the contamination creates an issue for the soil resource on a regional scale, it is addressed in Chapter 8. Localised land contamination issues are currently addressed in the Water Quality chapter because of the potential risk they pose to the contamination of surface or ground water resources.

If there is some confusion for readers in deciding where issues are addressed then this should be dealt with by improving the referencing in each chapter to the placement of issues. Transferring provisions from Chapter 4 to Chapter 8 as suggested by the submitters may just create further confusion if some water quality issues have to be addressed through the Soil Conservation chapter. It would also result in the inclusion of rules in the Soil Conservation chapter that address water quality management. The submissions are not favoured for this reason. However the submitters have identified an area for amendment to improve the integration of the NRRP chapters. Including a sentence in the Explanation to Issue SCN2 and Objective SCN3 to direct readers to Chapter 4 Policy WQL11 for localised soil contamination management would be helpful. The Explanation should also reinforce the focus for the Issue by always referring to "widespread contamination" in relation to Chapter 8.

For the reasons outlined above, the submissions 540.317, 541.317 are accepted in part and an amendment is required. The further submissions F1002.126, F1002.129, F1004.126, F1004.129, F1006.126, F1006.129, F1009.126, F1009.129, F1011.126, F1011.129, F1018.126, F1018.129, F1063.126, F1063.129 are accepted for their opposition and for the reasons provided.

SCN1.72. Recommendation

486.338, 563.350, F1002.126, F1002.129, F1003.24, F1004.126, F1004.129, F1006.126, F1006.129, F1009.126, F1009.129, F1011.126, F1011.129, F1018.126, F1018.129, F1063.126, F1063.129: Accept

486.333, 540.317, 541.317, 563.345: Accept in part

F1043.1477, F1043.1482, F1044.1477, F1044.1482: Reject

Amendment

Amend the Explanation and principle reasons to Objective SCN3, page 8-49, by amending the last sentence and adding a further sentence after it as follows:

"The reason for this objective is to avoid creating any widespread soil contamination problems that cannot be remedied. The identification and management of localised site contamination is addressed in Chapter 4 Water Quality, Policy WQL11."

8-48-28 Objective SCN3: Contaminant accumulation

8-48-28	257.1598	Upper Waitaki Branch Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-48-28	289.2120	North Bank Land Owners Group	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-48-28	449.254	Transit New Zealand	Retain Objective SCN3 as worded
	F1003.39	Landco Pastoral Holdings Ltd	<i>Support in part.</i>
8-48-28	476.836	Christchurch City Council	Amend Objective SCN3 to make it clear that they do not apply when the land is used or proposed to be used for urban activities. Amend the relevant environmental results anticipated to

			reflect this.
8-48-28	486.339	Te Runanga O Ngai Tahu	Retain Objective SCN3 unchanged.
	F1043.1483	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1044.1483	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Oppose</i>
8-48-28	506.1591	Hugh Turnbull	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-48-28	540.318	Canterbury Growers Society Ltd	Amend Objective SCN3: Contaminant Accumulation, so as to give sufficient background and rationale to the inclusion of the following provisions from Chapter 4: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule WQL3 - Activities that use or store hazardous substances • Policy WQL11 - Management of contaminated land • Methods WQL11(a) - (i) - Territorial local authorities • Rule WQL53 - Investigation of contaminated land • Rule WQL54 - Excavation of land or discharge to groundwater from land • Rule WQL59 - Use of land for certain activities.
	F1002.127	Selwyn District Council.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1004.127	Kaikoura District Council.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1006.127	Timaru District Council.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1009.127	Hurunui District Council.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1011.127	Mackenzie District Council.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1018.127	Ashburton District Council.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1063.127	Christchurch City Council (formerly BPDC)	<i>Oppose</i>
8-48-28	541.318	NZ Vegetable & Potato Growers Federation Inc et al	Amend Objective SCN3: Contaminant Accumulation, so as to give sufficient background and rationale to the inclusion of the following provisions from Chapter 4: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule WQL3 - Activities that use or store hazardous substances • Policy WQL11 - Management of contaminated land • Methods WQL11(a) - (i) - Territorial local authorities • Rule WQL53 - Investigation of contaminated land • Rule WQL54 - Excavation of land or discharge to groundwater from land • Rule WQL59 - Use of land for certain activities.
	F1002.130	Selwyn District Council.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1004.130	Kaikoura District Council.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1006.130	Timaru District Council.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1009.130	Hurunui District Council.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1011.130	Mackenzie District	<i>Oppose</i>

		Council.	
	F1018.130	Ashburton District Council.	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1063.130	Christchurch City Council (formerly BPDC)	<i>Oppose</i>
8-48-28	563.351	Te Hapu O Ngati Wheke Rapaki Runanga Inc	Support submission by Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu (refer 486).
8-48-28	586.1591	Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces	Retain Objective SCN3.
	F1043.3080	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.3069	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
8-48-28	669.1587	South Island High Country Section, Federated Farmers NZ	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).

Evaluations and reasons

257.1598, 289.2120, 449.254, F1003.39; 486.339, F1043.1483, F1044.1483; 506.1591, 563.351, 586.1591, F1043.3080, F1044.3069; 669.1587: The submitters all want the Objective retained as written. F1003, support the original submitters for the reasons given by the submitters. F1043, F1044 support original submitter 586, but oppose original submitter 449, based on reasons relating to the application of rules to control forestry plantings. These reasons are not relevant to the issues raised by the original submitters and are rejected. The submitters 257.1598, 449.254, 506.1591, 563.351, 586.1591, 669.1587 and further submitter F1003.39 are accepted and no amendment is required. The further submitters F1043.1483, F1043.3080, F1044.1483, F1044.3069 are rejected.

476.836: The submitter is concerned that urban development could fall within the definition of "contaminant" and therefore the objective would effectively oppose any zoning of rural land for future urban expansion.

It is not clear from the submission how urban expansion could fall within the definition of contaminant, though some factors associated with urban development may do so if they involve discharges of substances to land or water likely to change the physical, chemical or biological condition of the land or the water. However, Chapter 8 is concerned with contaminants that are widespread in their application, immobile, persistent and toxic within the soil. These contaminants are of concern for their potential to affect the availability and quality of soils on a large scale. Localised soil contamination effects of urban expansion are the responsibility of District Councils to address through their district plan provisions, or where they pose a risk to water quality they have been addressed in Chapter 4 Water quality, under Policy WQL11.

For the reasons outlined above, the submission is rejected and no amendment is required.

540.318, F1002.127, F1004.127, F1006.127, F1009.127, F1011.127, F1018.127, F1063.127; 541.318, F1002.130, F1004.130, F1006.130, F1009.130, F1011.130, F1018.130, F1063.130: The submitters want a number of provisions relating to soil contamination transferred from the Chapter 4 Water Quality into Chapter 8 Soil Conservation on the grounds that they relate, in the first instance to land, and users of the plan are more likely to look for such issues in a land chapter.

F1002, F1004, F1006, F1009, F1011, F1018, F1063 each oppose both of the original submitters on the grounds that the provisions are already in Chapter 4 of the NRRP and they do not need to be repeated in Chapter 8. They also consider that the relief sought is not necessary to achieve the objectives and policies of Chapter 8, or to achieve the purpose of the RMA.

Soil contamination issues in Chapter 8 focus on contaminants that are widespread in their application, immobile, persistent within the soil, and toxic in a way that affects soil organism functioning or affects the availability of soils for productive uses. Many soil contamination issues do not fall within this framework and they have been addressed either in other chapters of the NRRP, or through other means such as non-statutory strategies and registers. The issue of localised land or soil contamination raised by the submitters is currently addressed in Chapter 4 because these contaminants are likely to be more of a threat to water quality if they are able to move through the soil into groundwater. They will have little impact on the soil resource on a regional scale.

Chapters in the NRRP are not designed to be implemented in isolation, rather they should work together

to provide for the integration of resources and their management. In the end it makes no difference whether land contamination issues are dealt with in one chapter or across several chapters, provided that they are clearly identified and cross referenced between the chapters to enable readers to readily identify those issues of concern for them. In the NRRP, issues have been placed within the chapter that addresses the major focus for management. Where land contamination is an issue for water quality, the matter is addressed in Chapter 4; where the contamination creates an issue for the soil resource on a regional scale, it is addressed in Chapter 8. Localised land contamination issues are currently addressed in the Water Quality Chapter because of the potential risk they pose to the contamination of surface or ground water resources.

If there is some confusion for readers in deciding where issues are addressed then this should be dealt with by improving the referencing in each chapter to the placement of issues. Transferring provisions from Chapter 4 to Chapter 8 as suggested by the submitters may just create further confusion if some water quality issues have to be addressed through the Soil Conservation Chapter. It would also result in the inclusion of rules in the Soil Conservation Chapter that address water quality management. The submissions are not favoured for this reason. However the submitters have identified an area for amendment to improve the integration of the NRRP chapters. Including a sentence in the Explanation to Issue SCN2 and Objective SCN3 to direct readers to Chapter 4 Policy WQL11 for localised soil contamination management would be helpful. The Explanation should also reinforce the focus for the Issue by always referring to "widespread contamination" in relation to Chapter 8.

For the reasons outlined above, the submissions 540.318, 541.318 are accepted in part and an amendment is required. The further submissions F1002.127, F1002.130, F1004.127, F1004.130, F1006.127, F1006.130, F1009.127, F1009.130, F1011.127, F1011.130, F1018.127, F1018.130, F1063.127, F1063.130 are accepted for their opposition and for the reasons provided.

SCN1.73. Recommendation

257.1598, 289.2120, 449.254, 486.339, 506.1591, 563.351, 586.1591, 669.1587, F1002.127, F1002.130, F1003.39, F1004.127, F1004.130, F1006.127, F1006.130, F1009.127, F1009.130, F1011.127, F1011.130, F1018.127, F1018.130, F1063.127, F1063.130: Accept

540.318, 541.318: Accept in part

476.836, F1043.1483, F1043.3080, F1044.1483, F1044.3069: Reject

Amendment

Amend the Explanation and principle reasons to Objective SCN3, page 8-49, by amending the last sentence and adding a further sentence after it as follows:

"The reason for this objective is to avoid creating any widespread soil contamination problems that cannot be remedied. Identification and management of localised site contamination is addressed in Chapter 4 Water Quality, Policy WQL11."

8-49-5 Policy SCN8: Cadmium accumulation

8-49-5	257.1600	Upper Waitaki Branch Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-49-5	289.2121	North Bank Land Owners Group	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-49-5	506.1592	Hugh Turnbull	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-49-5	586.1592	Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces	Retain Policy SCN8.
	F1003.13	Landco Pastoral Holdings Ltd	<i>Support in part.</i>
	F1043.3081	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.3070	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
	F1076.467	NZ Vegetable and Potato Growers and three other organisations	<i>Support</i>
8-49-5	669.1588	South Island High Country Section, Federated Farmers NZ	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).

8-49-8	411.46	New Zealand Fertiliser Manufacturers Research Association Inc	Amend Policy SCN8 to make it compatible with the RMA rather than Policy 7 of CRPS Chapter 7.
	F1076.468	NZ Vegetable and Potato Growers and three other organisations	<i>Support</i>

Evaluations and reasons

257.1600, 289.2121, 506.1592, 586.1592, F1003.13, F1043.3081, F1044.3070, F1076.467; 669.1588:

The submitters want to retain Policy SCN8 as written, but request that the approach taken by the fertiliser industry to minimise cadmium accumulation is supported by Environment Canterbury.

F1003, F1043, F1044, F1076 each support the original submitter 586 for the points made and the reasons provided by the original submitter.

The Explanation to Policy SCN8 already acknowledges and supports the steps taken by the fertiliser industry to reduce the amount of cadmium contained in phosphate fertilisers. It is accepted, though, that the wording of the Policy does not reflect this. Changing the wording of the policy to encourage the adoption of new techniques to minimise cadmium accumulation would build on the progress that has been made. The Explanation would then serve to clarify what gains have been made to date.

For the reasons set out above, the submissions and further submissions are all accepted in part and an amendment is required.

411.46, F1076.468: The submitter considers that Chapter 7, Policy 7 of the CRPS is not compatible with the RMA because it does not allow for adverse effects of cadmium to be remedied or mitigated. They submit that the CRPS policy needs to be amended to be consistent with the RMA and Policy SCN8 needs to reflect this change.

F1076 supports the submission on the grounds that the amendment sought provides a better focus to the policy.

It is considered that Objective SCN3 and Policy SCN8 are already consistent with the CRPS and the RMA by encouraging all steps to minimise the amount of cadmium added to the soil so that it does not approach the levels likely to be toxic to the health of humans, animals or soil biota. Cadmium does not break down in the soil, nor are there any effective ways of removing cadmium from the soil, so it is not possible to effectively remedy or mitigate the effects of cadmium once it has accumulated in the soil. The policy recognises that fertilisers are necessary for ongoing production from Canterbury soils, so the focus needs to be on education and investigations into ways to limit cadmium accumulation as a by-product of farming.

Changes to the CRPS are beyond the scope of submissions on the NRRP. The CRPS is currently undergoing review so the public will have the opportunity to make submissions on changes to that document in the near future. Until that review is completed and the revised CRPS is operative, regional and district planning documents must give effect to the current CRPS. The following discussion will therefore focus on Policy SCN8 of the NRRP.

For the reasons outlined above, the submission and further submission are rejected and no amendment is required.

SCN1.74. Recommendation

257.1600, 289.2121, 506.1592, 586.1592, 669.1588, F1003.13, F1043.3081, F1044.3070, F1076.467: Accept in part

411.46, F1076.468: Reject

Amendment

Amend Policy SCN8, page 8-49, to read:

"Encourage manufacturers and users of phosphatic fertilisers to continue to explore and adopt new programmes and techniques to minimise the accumulation of cadmium in soils."

8-49-34 Methods for Policy SCN8

8-49-34	257.1601	Upper Waitaki Branch Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-49-34	289.2122	North Bank Land Owners Group	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-49-34	411.47	New Zealand Fertiliser Manufacturers Research	Retain the approach of not having rules to implement Policy SCN8.

		Association Inc	
	F1076.469	NZ Vegetable and Potato Growers and three other organisations	<i>Support</i>
8-49-34	506.1593	Hugh Turnbull	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-49-34	586.1593	Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces	Retain Methods SCN8.
	F1003.14	Landco Pastoral Holdings Ltd	<i>Support in part.</i>
	F1043.3082	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.3071	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
8-49-34	669.1589	South Island High Country Section, Federated Farmers NZ	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).

Evaluations and reasons

257.1601, 289.2122, 411.47, F1076.469; 506.1593, 586.1593, F1003.14, F143.3082, F1044.3071; 669.1589:

The submitters and further submitters all wish to retain the current non-regulatory approach to implementing Policy SCN8.

The support of the submitters and further submitters is accepted and no amendment is required.

SCN1.75. Recommendation

257.1601, 289.2122, 411.47, 506.1593, 586.1593, 669.1589, F1003.14, F1043.3082, F1044.3071, F1076.469: Accept

Amendment

Nil

8-49-42 Method SCN8(a)(a) Advocacy

8-49-42	540.319	Canterbury Growers Society Ltd	Amend Method SCN8(a) Advocacy (a) to read: " <u><i>promote the use of the Fertiliser Code of Practice and the steps it contains for minimising the accumulation of cadmium in the soil.</i></u> " or words to that effect.
8-49-42	541.319	NZ Vegetable & Potato Growers Federation Inc et al	Amend Method SCN8(a) Advocacy (a) to read: " <u><i>promote the use of the Fertiliser Code of Practice and the steps it contains for minimising the accumulation of cadmium in the soil.</i></u> " or words to that effect.
8-49-43	411.48	New Zealand Fertiliser Manufacturers Research Association Inc	Amend Method SCN8(a) to require that all phosphate fertilisers comply with the industry voluntary standard of 280mg Cd/kg P.
8-49-45	411.49	New Zealand Fertiliser Manufacturers Research Association Inc	Amend Method SCN8(a) to delete the requirement for labeling.

Evaluations and reasons

540.319, 541.319: The submitters want specific reference to the Fertiliser Code of Practice to promote the practices outlines for managing cadmium accumulation.

It is accepted that the current wording of Method SCN8(a)(a) does not recognise the 2002 amendments made to the Code of Practice to provide information and recommended practices for fertiliser use to minimise cadmium accumulation in the soil. Method SCN8(a)(a) should be deleted and instead the promotion of the use of the Fertiliser Code of Practice should be included in Method SCN8(b).

For the reasons outlined above, the submission is accepted and an amendment is required to Method SCN8(a)(a) and to Method SCN8(b).

411.48, 411.49: The submitter wants to make changes to Methods SCN8(a)(a) and SCN8(a)(b) with regard to the manufacture and labelling of phosphate fertilisers. Their submission claims that the

requirements to label SSP fertiliser products may be impractical due to the variations between batches of product, and the fact that most of the fertiliser is sold in bulk, so there is no label as such. They point out that cadmium has been included in the "Fertmark" registration so all "Fertmark" registered products must now comply with the 280mg Cd/kg P standard.

The submitter has made some useful suggestions that should be incorporated into the Methods to improve their practicality. Advocating for the manufacturers to gain "Fertmark" registration would provide a high level of confidence in the cadmium content of phosphate fertilisers and would reduce the need for labelling the product. This should be promoted particularly for sales of bulk product. As a non-regulatory policy, the methods for Policy SCN8 cannot require compliance with any standards, but have to use advocacy, education and promotion to encourage uptake of registration. For manufacturers without "Fertmark" registration, there still needs to be some form of identification of the cadmium content of their fertiliser product. If it is possible for "Fertmark" registered manufacturers to guarantee that their product complies with the "Fertmark" standard for cadmium content, then it should be possible for all manufacturers to provide information on the cadmium content of their fertiliser, particularly whether it complies with the "Fertmark" standard. Where it is not appropriate to label product, then some other form of information should be available to provide certainty for the user of the product. The focus for the method is to provide information and certainty to the buyer and encouragement to the industry to meet quality standards.

For the reasons outlined above the submissions are accepted in part and an amendment is required.

SCN1.76. Recommendation

540.319, 541.319: Accept

411.48, 411.49: Accept in part

Amendment

1. Amend Method SCN8(a), page 8-49, as follows:

1.1 Delete clause (a) and replace with:

"(a) advocate to the fertiliser industry to encourage manufacturers of all fertiliser products to gain "Fertmark" registration;"

1.2 Amend clause (b)

"(b) advocate to fertiliser manufacturers to clearly identify whether their phosphate fertiliser product complies with the "Fertmark" standard for cadmium content. ~~clear labelling of cadmium concentrations on all fertiliser products, including compliance with the "Fertmark" standard where this is achieved.~~"

2. Amend Method SCN8(b), page 8-50 by including the following sub-clause:

"(d) promote the use of the fertiliser Code of Practice and the steps it contains for minimising the accumulation of cadmium in the soil."

8-50-2 Method SCN8(b) Information and promotion

8-50-2	540.320	Canterbury Growers Society Ltd	Insert after "resource care groups" in Method SCN8(b) the words " <u>Canterbury grower associations.</u> "
8-50-2	541.320	NZ Vegetable & Potato Growers Federation Inc et al	Insert after "resource care groups" in Method SCN8(b) the words " <u>Canterbury grower associations.</u> "

Evaluations and reasons

540.320, 541.320: The submitters identify that the groups listed under Method SCN8(b) do not include the various Canterbury grower associations who form a major part of the primary production community to which this policy applies.

The current list of people that Environment Canterbury will work with has included a range of individual and groups related to arable farming, but it does not include any of the associations representing specific production industries. It is considered by staff that the Canterbury grower associations should be included as they will include a number of key industry groups relevant to the method and groups that the plan will wish to target. This will be achieved most effectively by involving these groups in the preparation and promotion of information on best practices.

For the reasons outlined, the submissions are accepted and an amendment is required.

SCN1.77. Recommendation

540.320, 541.320: Accept

Amendment

Amend Method SCN8(b), page 8-50, to read:

"Environment Canterbury will work with landholders, resource care groups, Federated Farmers, Canterbury grower associations and land management agencies to minimise....."

8-50-23 Policy SCN9: Avoid future contamination

8-50-23	257.1602	Upper Waitaki Branch Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-50-23	289.2123	North Bank Land Owners Group	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-50-23	476.837	Christchurch City Council	Amend Policy SCN9 to make it clear that they do not apply when the land is used or proposed to be used for urban activities. Amend the relevant environmental results anticipated to reflect this.
8-50-23	506.1594	Hugh Turnbull	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-50-23	512.219	University of Canterbury	Amend Policy SCN9 to read: "...widespread and persistent contamination of soils <u>from the use of hazardous substances</u> should not be ...".
8-50-23	583.19	Landcare Research New Zealand Ltd (J Cavanagh)	Retain Policy SCN9.
8-50-23	586.1594	Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces	Retain Policy SCN9.
	F1003.15	Landco Pastoral Holdings Ltd	<i>Support in part.</i>
	F1043.3083	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.3072	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
8-50-23	669.1590	South Island High Country Section, Federated Farmers NZ	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-50-24	449.255	Transit New Zealand	Amend Policy SCN9 to read as follows: "...widespread and persistent contamination of soils <u>from the use of hazardous substances</u> should not be..." and make all subsequent changes required.
	F1076.470	NZ Vegetable and Potato Growers and three other organisations	<i>Oppose</i>

Evaluations and reasons

257.1602, 289.2123, 506.1594, 583.19, 586.1594, F1003.15, F1043.3083, F1044.3072, 669.1590:

The submitters wish to retain the policy as worded. Submitter 583 supports taking a preventative approach.

F1003, F1043, F1044 all support the original submitter 586

The support of the submitters 257.1602, 506.1594, 583.19, 586.1594, 669.1590 and further submitters F1003.15, F1043.3083, F1044.3072 is acknowledged, however as an amendment to the Policy has been recommended in response to submitter 449 on this provision, the submissions are accepted in part for their support. No amendment is required.

476.837: The submitter is concerned that urban development could fall within the definition of "contaminant" and therefore the policy would effectively oppose any zoning of rural land for future urban expansion.

It is not clear how the submitter considers that urban expansion could fall within the definition of contaminant, though some factors associated with urban development may do so if they involve discharges of substances to land or water likely to change the physical, chemical or biological condition of the land or the water. However, Chapter 8 is concerned with a very limited and specific range of contaminants that are widespread in their application at a regional scale, and that are immobile and toxic within the soil. These contaminants are of concern for their potential to affect the availability and quality of soils on a large scale. Localised soil contamination effects of urban expansion are the responsibility of District Councils to address through their district plan provisions, or where they pose a risk to water quality they have been addressed in Chapter 4 Water quality, under Policy WQL11.

Policy SCN9 does not have any rules or advocacy for its implementation so it could not "oppose" any zoning of land as suggested by the submitter. The focus for the Policy is to increase peoples' awareness of soil contamination issues and to put in place a process to identify any potential new contaminants before they are used in ways that could result in the widespread contamination of soil.

For the reasons outlined above, the submission is rejected and no amendment is required.

512.219, 449.255, F1076.470: The submitters suggest there is an apparent inconsistency between the Policy and the Explanation. They say that the Policy uses the term "contamination" broadly whereas the Explanation reads as though the policy is only intended to cover land use activities where hazardous substances are used. They want the policy reworded to reflect the intent of the Explanation. F1076 opposes the submission 449 on the grounds that it is not clear why the submitter requests the amendment.

Staff do not accept that the Policy or the Explanation are limited to contaminants that are classed as "hazardous substances". The policy includes any land use that could result in contamination of the soil that meets the criteria set out in Objective SCN3. The Explanation identifies the screening process undertaken by ERMA as one example of an agency capable of identifying the soil contaminants of concern under Policy SCN8. The Explanation goes on to emphasise the need to integrate the work of all agencies involved in the introduction and management of new substances to effectively reduce the risk of any further occurrences of widespread soil contamination. However, amending Policy SCN9 to include the "use of any substance" likely to result in contamination would help prevent any misinterpretation. For the reasons outlined above, the submission is accepted in part and an amendment is required. The further submission is accepted in part for its opposition to the amendment requested.

SCN1.78. Recommendation

257.1602, 289.2123, 449.255, 506.1594, 512.219, 583.19, 586.1594, 669.1590, F1003.15, F1043.3083, F1044.3072, F1076.470: Accept in part

476.837: Reject

Amendment

Amend Policy SCN9, page 8-50, to read:

"Any future land use, or use of any substance, that has the potential to result in the widespread, and persistent and toxic contamination of soils should not be ~~established or continued~~ undertaken unless effective measures"

8-50-35 Explanation and principal reasons Policy SCN9

8-50-35	411.50	New Zealand Fertiliser Manufacturers Research Association Inc	Amend the Explanation to Policy SCN9 if necessary to correct the claim that FAR has worked on the removal of Cadmium from phosphate fertilizers.
	F1076.471	NZ Vegetable and Potato Growers and three other organisations	<i>Support</i>

Evaluations and reasons

411.50, F1076.471: The submitter questions the statement made in the Explanation that the FAR has been involved in research on the removal of cadmium from phosphate fertilisers.

F1076 supports the original submission to ensure information in the plan is correct.

Staff accept that the sentence referred to by the submitter is not directly relevant to Policy SCN9, which is addressing new forms of soil contamination, and should be deleted. Policy SCN8 already addresses cadmium contamination and management, including investigating opportunities for further reductions in cadmium concentrations in fertilisers.

For the reasons set out above, the submission and further submission are accepted in part and an amendment is required.

SCN1.79. Recommendation

411.50, F1076.471: Accept in part

Amendment

Amend Policy SCN9 Explanation and principal reasons, page 8-50, by deleting the 4th sentence beginning:

"The Foundation for Arable research (FAR) is funded..."

8-50-40 Methods for Policy SCN9

8-50-40	257.1603	Upper Waitaki Branch Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-50-40	289.2124	North Bank Land Owners Group	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-50-40	411.51	New Zealand Fertiliser Manufacturers Research Association Inc	Retain the approach of not having rules to implement Policy SCN9.
8-50-40	506.1595	Hugh Turnbull	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-50-40	586.1595	Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces	Retain Methods SCN9.
	F1003.16	Landco Pastoral Holdings Ltd	<i>Support in part.</i>
	F1043.3084	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.3073	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
	F1076.472	NZ Vegetable and Potato Growers and three other organisations	<i>Support</i>
8-50-40	669.1591	South Island High Country Section, Federated Farmers NZ	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).

Evaluations and reasons

257.1603, 289.2124, 411.51, 506.1595, 586.1595, F1003.16, F1043.3084, F1044.3073, F1076.472; 669.1591: The submitters and further submitters all wish to retain the non-regulatory approach taken to implement Policy SCN9. The support from the submitters and further submitters is accepted and no amendment is required.

SCN1.80. Recommendation

257.1603, 289.2124, 411.51, 506.1595, 586.1595, 669.1591, F1003.16, F1043.3084, F1044.3073, F1076.472: Accept

Amendment

Nil

8-54-1 8.7 Environmental results anticipated

8-54-1	433.52	Glendore (New Zealand) Ltd	Amend Chapter 8 to reformat the plan to include specific Anticipated Environmental Results for implementing each policy and method.
--------	--------	----------------------------	---

Evaluations and reasons

433.52: The submitter claims that the detail contained in the Environmental Results Anticipated (ERA) in Chapters 4-8 of the NRRP is of little value in determining the desired results of implementing policies and methods. Specific ERA are needed for each policy and method.

Policies identify the progress required to meet the objectives. The methods are a suite of actions to implement the policies. The ERA provide a framework for measuring achievement of the policies and progress towards the objectives.

In Chapter 8 the ERAs are already specific to each policy. The ERA identify progress expected to be

made by each policy during the 10 year life of the plan. Where appropriate, specific targets have been identified that are measurable. The review of the plan after 10 years will enable progress monitored to be compared against the ERA to establish a measure of the effectiveness of the policies and methods. It is considered that the current ERAs in Chapter 8 already address the concerns raised by the submitter. However, staff consider that it would be helpful to clearly indicate which policies are linked to each ERA by specifically referencing the Policy in the heading for each ERA. For the reasons outlined above, the submission is accepted in part and an amendment is required.

SCN1.81. Recommendation

433.52: Accept in part

Amendment

1. Amend 8.7 Environmental results anticipated by adding the following sentence after the opening sentence:

"...within 10 years of this plan becoming operative, unless otherwise stated, The policies addressed by each environmental result are listed below."

2. Amend the heading for each Environmental result anticipated, page 8-54, as follows:

- 8.7.1 Environmental result anticipated - Policy SCN1(a)
- 8.7.2 Environmental result anticipated - Policy SCN1(b)
- 8.7.3 Environmental result anticipated - Policy SCN2
- 8.7.4 Environmental result anticipated - Policy SCN3
- 8.7.5 Environmental result anticipated - Policy SCN4
- 8.7.6 Environmental result anticipated - Policy SCN5
- 8.7.7 Environmental result anticipated - Policy SCN6
- 8.7.8 Environmental result anticipated - Policy SCN7
- 8.7.9 Environmental result anticipated - Policy SCN8
- 8.7.10 Environmental result anticipated - Policy SCN9

8-55-1 8.8 Monitoring

8-55-1	257.1604	Upper Waitaki Branch Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-55-1	289.2125	North Bank Land Owners Group	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-55-1	506.1596	Hugh Turnbull	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
8-55-1	586.1596	Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces	Ensure that any funding requirements instigated by the monitoring schedule contained in Section 8.8 Monitoring is a charge against the general rate.
	F1043.3085	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.3074	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
8-55-1	669.1592	South Island High Country Section, Federated Farmers NZ	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).

Evaluations and reasons

257.1604, 289.2125, 506.1596, 586.1596, F1043.3085, F1044.3074; 669.1592: Submitter 586 supports the indicators and monitoring frequency proposed in Chapter 8 for measuring achievement of the objectives. The submitter seeks clarification on whether the monitoring will require specific input from the farming community in terms of information collection or funding. The submitter states that their support is conditional on no such imposition of requirements for farmers to collect information or fund monitoring requirements over and above the general rate.

The submitters 257, 506, 669 and the further submitters F1043, F1044 all endorse the original

submission 586 for the same reasons as provided by that submitter.

The amount and source of funding committed to monitoring is beyond the scope of the NRRP to deal with, rather it is an issue that is addressed each year through the annual plan and the LTCCP process. The monitoring of indicators listed in the NRRP will be carried out by Environment Canterbury staff and will be used to review the effectiveness of the policies and the non-regulatory approach taken by Chapter 8.

For the reasons set out the submissions and further submissions are all accepted in part for their support, but not for the reasons provided as constraints to that support. No amendment is required.

SCN1.82. Recommendation

257.1604, 289.2125, 506.1596, 586.1596, 669.1592, F1043.3085, F1044.3074: Accept in part

Amendment

Nil

8-56-1 Table SCN2: Monitoring of environmental results anticipated for soil conservation

8-56-1	540.321	Canterbury Growers Society Ltd	Retain in Table SCN2 the clear connection between indicators and environmental results (and the objectives and policies leading to these).
8-56-1	541.321	NZ Vegetable & Potato Growers Federation Inc et al	Retain in Table SCN2 the clear connection between indicators and environmental results (and the objectives and policies leading to these).
8-56-1	559.119	Te Taumutu Runanga	Amend Chapters 4-8 so that wherever environmental monitoring is referred to in the NRRP, reference is made to the use of cultural monitoring as an additional method.
8-56-1	609.23	Te Runanga O Arowhenua Society Inc.	With regard to limits and standards, ensure that the <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * limits and standards are appropriately established and sufficient to ensure values held by Ngāi Tahu are not adversely affected; * objectives for the environment are achieved; and that * Te Runanga O Arowhenua and Te Runanga O Ngai Tahu are appropriately involved in establishing the limits and standards, in consideration and monitoring of the effects of activities, and in monitoring and assessing the effectiveness of the plan in achieving the objectives of the plan and the outcomes sought by Ngai Tahu.
8-56-1	609.24	Te Runanga O Arowhenua Society Inc.	Ensure values of significance to Ngāi Tahu are considered in the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * enabling and controlling activities under the rules in the plan; * assessment and monitoring the effects of those activities; and * in monitoring the environment and effectiveness of the NRRP to achieve the objectives set out and the outcomes sought by Ngai Tahu.
8-56-2A3	472.24	Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc, Mackenzie Branch	Provide for remote sensing information used to monitor Environmental Result Anticipated SCN1(b) in Table SCN2 to also be available at no charge to affected landholders.
8-56-2A4	472.23	Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc, Mackenzie Branch	Add sulphur to the elements monitored for Environmental Result Anticipated SCN2 in Table SCN2.

Evaluations and reasons

540.321, 541.321: The submitters support the close agreement between the indicators and the environmental results in Table SCN2 and wants this connection retained on the basis that monitoring is expensive so it is important that the indicators chosen are closely related to the environmental results. The support of the submitters is accepted and no amendment is required.

472.23: The submitter says that sulphur is of equal importance as phosphorus for soil quality monitoring and identifies that research findings indicate a relationship with pasture yields and stock grazing capacity. The focus for soil quality monitoring in Chapter 8 is the hill and high country non-arable land and particularly the undeveloped parts of the hill and high country which do not receive nutrient inputs for vegetation management. The criteria being monitored under Objective SCN1 are vegetation vigour and soil quality factors for the maintenance of an intact and resilient vegetation cover. Much of the monitoring work has developed from the national monitoring programmes such as the Land Management Index (which looked at both environmental and productive indicators) and the 500 Soils programme. Sulphur was not included as an indicator for either of these programmes so Sulphur monitoring has not been established across the range of sites set up in Canterbury.

Staff do not dispute the importance of Sulphur as an indicator of soil quality, but agree with the findings stated by the submitter that its importance is primarily related to the productivity of the soil and for boosted productivity for grazing capacity. The focus of Chapter 8 on soil quality monitoring in the undeveloped hill and high country land will relate to achieving a sward sufficient to protect the soils from erosion, but not achieving higher productivity levels. The submitter identifies that the recommendation for sulphur monitoring is the EOS levels. Currently there is not the same degree of universal acceptance of EOS as a soils quality monitor as, for example, Olsen P monitoring for phosphate levels. If future land management research indicates that sulphur monitoring is necessary for sustainable management of the undeveloped hill and high country land, then this can be in the suite of indicators for Chapter 8. However at this point in time, staff do not consider that there is a specific need for Sulphur monitoring for the environmental soil quality values of concern for Chapter 8.

For the reasons stated, the submission is rejected and no amendment is required.

559.119, 609.23, 609.24:

The submitters consider that the reliance on only western scientific monitoring will not ensure their own cultural values associated with the environment will be adequately monitored. Wherever reference is made to "environmental monitoring" the submitter seeks the inclusion of reference to the use of cultural monitoring as an additional monitoring method.

The values held by Te Runanga o Arowhenua and Ngai Tahu whanui are explicitly recognised through Chapter 8 in the Background discussion of issues for soil conservation, and in the policy provisions that seek to avoid significant adverse effects on Ngai Tahu cultural values, including sites of significance to Ngai Tahu and sources of mahinga kai as a consequence of induced erosion or widespread soil contamination. This is consistent with the requirements of the RMA to provide for the matters addressed in s6.

To check whether the Chapter is being effective in providing for these values, it is appropriate that the Chapter include a specific cultural monitoring provision. The inclusion of a specific environmental result anticipated for cultural values would provide the basis for monitoring the effectiveness of the policies in Chapter 8. The focus for monitoring for the first ten years of the NRRP will be the effects of induced erosion on cultural values. The level of cadmium in soils in Canterbury is currently very low and not likely to have any adverse effect on values held by Ngai Tahu. Monitoring soil cadmium levels over the next ten years will identify whether there is any change to this situation.

The reference to standards for rules does not apply to Chapter 8 which has taken a non-regulatory approach to soil conservation and therefore has no rules implementing the policies.

For the reasons set out above the submission is accepted and an amendment is required to sections 8.7 Environmental results anticipated and 8.8.2 Monitoring of environmental results anticipated.

472.24: The submitter wants individual landholders to have access to remote sensing information held by Environment Canterbury at request and at no cost.

Remote sensing imagery bought by Environment Canterbury is generally accompanied by copyright provisions which restrict the on selling or provision of that information to other parties. The interpretation of the remote sensing imagery which is undertaken by staff is the property of Environment Canterbury and can be made available to the public as requested. Addressing the provision of this information is outside the scope of the NRRP.

For the reasons outlined the submission is rejected and no amendment is required.

SCN1.83. Recommendation

540.321, 541.321, 609.23, 609.24: Accept

472.23, 472.24, 472.25: Reject

Amendment

1. Add a new Environmental result anticipated, page 8-54, to read:

"8.7.11 Environmental result anticipated - all policies
Induced erosion does not impact significantly on Ngai Tahu cultural values."

2. Amend Table SCN2 Monitoring of environmental results anticipated for soil conservation, page 8-57, by adding a new environmental result as follows:

"8.7.11 Environmental result anticipated - all Policies:

Indicator: Ngai Tahu perception of the effect of induced erosion on their values
Location of monitoring: Region wide
Method of monitoring: In consultation with Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu
Frequency of monitoring: A survey every five years
Method of reporting: A report to Environment Canterbury of the survey results"

8-59-1 Appendix SCN1 (Soil environment group overviews)

8-59-1	603.185	Carter Holt Harvey Forests	Delete all references to wilding pines and landscape and natural character effects in Appendix SCN1.
	F1042.185	NZ Forest Owners Assn	<i>Support</i>
	F1043.185	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.185	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
	F1074.663	Federated Farmers of NZ (Inc)	<i>Oppose</i>
8-59-1	603.186	Carter Holt Harvey Forests	Delete all references to " <i>related issues</i> " in Appendix SCN1.
	F1042.186	NZ Forest Owners Assn	<i>Support</i>
	F1043.186	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.186	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
	F1076.473	NZ Vegetable and Potato Growers and three other organisations	<i>Support</i>
8-60-1	472.25	Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc, Mackenzie Branch	Amend text on page 8-60 and elsewhere by replacing 'reduce indigenous biodiversity' with 'reduce indigenous biodiversity but increasing total biodiversity'
8-60-3C2	472.26	Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc, Mackenzie Branch	Delete " <i>intensity</i> " from the phrase " <i>high intensity rainfall</i> " in (a) High Country, Natural Stresses (p8-60).
8-61-3C3	472.27	Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc, Mackenzie Branch	Delete " <i>nutrient decline</i> " under Key Issues for Soil Conservation, second row (p8-61).

Evaluations and reasons

603.185, F1042.185, F1043.185, F1044.185, F1074.663; 603.186, F1042.186, F1043.186, F1044.186, F1076.473: The submitter opposes Appendix SCN1 on the grounds that it contains statements that are inappropriate, unnecessary and not relevant to the issues of soil conservation. In particular the submitter claims that the risk and effects of wilding pines is overstated and not a key issue for soil conservation. F1042, F1043, F1044 - each support the original submission for the reasons provided by the submitter. F1076 - supports the original submission on the grounds that the change sought will provide greater clarity

Appendix SCN1 provides a background to the issues discussed in Chapter 8. First and foremost it describes the range of soil types and physical environments covered by each soil environment group and

the range of natural and induced pressures those environments are subject to. This provides a framework for identifying key issues for soil conservation. Soil conservation needs to be integrated with the management of the wider environment to ensure that the effects of soil management do not adversely affect the management of other resources or the protection of the wider values identified for the environment. This will include management of water quality and quantity, air quality, and the protection of significant natural, cultural and amenity values as required under s6 of the RMA. The Appendix SCN1 covers these concerns by identifying for each group the key issues for soil conservation, together with a range of "related issues" that could be affected by the way in which soils are managed. Examples of this are sedimentation of water bodies from erosion, changes to landscapes and indigenous biodiversity through changes to the vegetation cover.

The deletion of all "related issues" , and in particular all references to wilding pines and changes to landscape and natural character as requested by the submitter, is not considered to be consistent with the responsibilities under the RMA to take into account such matters of national significance when undertaking any use or development of the land. The Appendix identifies where each of these matters is most likely to be affected by land use activities and soil conservation management. As stated in Policy SCN1 Explanation, on page 8-32, the degree to which adverse effects will be addressed in any situation will depend on whether those effects outweigh the benefits of the soil conservation measures being undertaken. Wilding pines are a potential adverse effect of forestry plantations, and particularly so in the open, expansive landscapes of the high country and inland basins. It is appropriate that the Appendix identifies this as a potential issue to be taken into account when assessing the option of forestry plantings for erosion control or vegetation management.

For the reasons outlined above, the submission and further submissions are rejected and no amendment is required.

472.25: The submitter suggests that total biodiversity is probably of more relevance than indigenous biodiversity for ecosystem function, but neither concept has much relevance to soil conservation. The reason for addressing indigenous biodiversity in the "related issues" is in recognition of the specific responsibilities under s6 of the RMA to provide for the protection of significant habitats of indigenous flora and fauna when undertaking any use or development of land. This is part of an integrated approach to management where the management of any one resource cannot be undertaken in isolation from the rest of the environment.

The amendment as suggested by the submitter is not considered to be consistent with responsibilities under the RMA.

For the reasons outlined above, the submission is rejected and no amendment is required.

472.26: The submitter wants to delete the term "intensity" from references to "high intensity rainfall" in Appendix SCN1 on the basis that New Zealand's rainfall is not considered to be "intense" by world standards.

Staff accept this assessment of the relative "intensity" of rainfall in New Zealand and the term should only be used in reference to cyclonic storms or rainstorms. Deleting the word "intensity" from Appendix SCN1 except from references to cyclonic storms and rainstorms would address the concern raised by the submitter.

For the reasons outlined above, the submission is accepted in part and an amendment is required.

472.27: the submitter wants the reference to "nutrient decline" deleted from Appendix SCN1(a) or modified on the basis that there is no real evidence for nutrient decline in high country soils.

The discussion of resource management issues in section 8.4 of Chapter 8 describes an overall decline in soil nutrient levels over the history of pastoral farming in the undeveloped parts of the high country. This is based on scientific evidence. Recent monitoring has indicated a cessation and even a reversal of this decline over the last 30 years. The Appendix correctly identifies an overall decline of soil nutrient levels, but it is accepted by staff that it does not distinguish between the historical and current trends in soil nutrient levels. An amendment to Appendix SCN1(a) to reflect the present situation would improve the accuracy of these references.

For the reasons outlined, the submission is accepted in part and an amendment is required.

SCN1.84. Recommendation

472.25, 603.185, 603.186, F1042.185, F1042.186, F1043.185, F1043.186, F1044.185, F1044.186, F1074.663, F1076.473: Reject

472.26, 472.27: Accept in part

Amendment

Amend Appendix SCN1, page 8-60, by making the following changes:

1. In Appendix SCN1(a) High country: moist mountain ranges, page 8-60, 3rd column Natural stresses:

In 1st paragraph amend bullet 2 to read: "Very high ~~intensity~~-rainfall"

In 2nd paragraph amend bullet 3 to read: "High ~~intensity~~-rainfall"

In 3rd paragraph amend bullet 3 to read: "High ~~intensity~~-rainfall"

2. In Appendix SCN1(a) High country: moist mountain ranges, page 8-61, 2nd column Effects/trends:

In 2nd paragraph amend bullet 3 to read: "Long-term soil nutrient decline in undeveloped areas."

3. In Appendix SCN1(a) High country: moist mountain ranges, page 8-61, 3rd column Key issues for soil conservation:

In 2nd paragraph amend bullet 2 to read: "Soil quality: nutrient decline if grazed; without inputs"

4. In Appendix SCN1(b) High country: dry mountain ranges, page 8-63, 2nd column Effects/trends:

In 1st paragraph amend bullet 3 to read: "Very slow decline in soil nutrient status in undeveloped areas."

In 2nd paragraph amend bullet 2 to read: " Slow soil nutrient decline in undeveloped areas"

0-3-0#8[1] Definition of terms for Chapters 4 to 8 - which relate to Chapter 8 matters

0-3-0#8[1]	476.830	Christchurch City Council	Add a new definition stating that "high country" means all land above 900 metres altitude.
------------	---------	---------------------------	--

Evaluations and reasons

476.830: The submitter wants to include a definition for "high country" to clarify the term as used in Objective SCN1. The submitter suggests a definition based on the Explanation to Objective SCN1 and the existing definition for "hill country".

It is agreed by staff that all land above 900 metres is included in the category "high country"; however the lower boundary is not always rigid and may include land at lower altitudes where the environment experiences extreme conditions that impose similar limitations for use as land at higher altitude. For example some of the inland basins are included as high country although they may extend below 900 metres.

Rather than include a definition for high country, it would be more useful to clarify the use of the term as described above within the Explanation to Objective SCN1, as part of the explanation of "hill and high country land" to establish the context for the Objective.

For the reasons given, the submission is accepted in part and an amendment is required to the Explanation and principal reasons for Objective SCN1.

SCN1.85. Recommendation

476.830: Accept in part

Amendment

Amend Explanation and principal reasons, Objective SCN1, page 8-29, paragraph 1, by adding a new sentence after the third sentence as follows:

"(regardless of altitude). High country includes all land above 900 metres and may extend to lower altitudes in areas where the physical environment is severely limiting, such as parts of the Mackenzie Basin. Non-arable land refers to"

0-3-0#8[2]	257.1645	Upper Waitaki Branch Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586.1638).
0-3-0#8[2]	506.1638	Hugh Turnbull	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586.1838).
0-3-0#8[2]	586.1638	Federated Farmers NZ	Insert a new definition of " <u>Cultivation</u> " to

		Inc, Canterbury Provinces	read: <i>"means all activities involved in the preparation and use of soil for crop production and the raising and production of crops and other vegetation for managed primary production"</i> .
	F1027.8	Matariki Forests	Oppose
	F1042.219	NZ Forest Owners Assn	Oppose
	F1043.3126	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	Support
	F1044.3115	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	Support
	F1076.18	NZ Vegetable and Potato Growers and three other organisations	Support
0-3-0#8[2]	669.1633	South Island High Country Section, Federated Farmers NZ	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586.1838).

Evaluations and reasons

257.1645, 506.1638, 586.1638, F1027.8, F1042.219, F1043.3126, F1044.3115, F1076.18; 669.1633:

The submitters want a definition for "cultivation" included to assist with the reading of Chapter 8.

F1027, F1042 - oppose submission on the grounds that the definition proposed is too wide and likely to capture activities that are not intended

F1043, F1044 - support the original submission for the reasons provided by the submitter.

F1076 - supports the original submission on the grounds that the definition makes it clear that cultivation includes all aspects of crop production.

The Oxford dictionary includes several definitions for cultivation including preparing the soil for crops, and raising crops. Chapter 8 has used cultivation in the former context to focus on those soil preparation activities most likely to contribute to the risk of soil erosion. It is accepted that the meaning of the term should be clear in the context that it is used in the chapter. It is not considered useful to include a specific definition for cultivation, but the Explanation to Objective SCN2 should be amended to clarify the use of the term in Chapter 8. Applying the definition suggested by the submitter may confuse the sense in which the word has been used by including a wider range of activities associated with the term than has been applied in Chapter 8. It is considered that the current use of the term "cultivation" in Chapter 8 complies with the definition provided by the Oxford dictionary and therefore there is no reason to include it in a definition of terms.

For the reasons outlined above, the submission 586.1638 and the further submissions F1043.3126, F1044.3115, F1076.18 are accepted in part and an amendment is required to the Explanation and principal reasons to Objective SCN2. . Further submissions F1027.8, F1042.219 are accepted for their opposition and reasons.

SCN1.86. Recommendation

257.1645, 506.1638, 586.1638, 669.1633 F1043.3126, F1044.3115, F1076.18: Accept in part

F1027.8, F1042.219: Accept

Amendment

Amend Objective SCN2 Explanation and principle reasons, page 8-43, by inserting a new sentence after the first sentence in paragraph 1 to read:

"It is accepted that, particularly where cultivation is undertaken. Cultivation includes the range of soil preparation methods that involve exposure and disturbance of the soil."

0-3-41#8 Definitions - "Arable land"

0-3-41#8	257.1617	Upper Waitaki Branch Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
0-3-41#8	449.89	Transit New Zealand	Amend the definition of arable land to: <i>"Arable land means all land used for</i>

			<i>cultivation or cropping,"</i>
0-3-41#8	506.1610	Hugh Turnbull	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
0-3-41#8	512.218	University of Canterbury	If the request to amend Policy SCN6 is not accepted, amend the definition of "arable land".
0-3-41#8	540.323	Canterbury Growers Society Ltd	Amend the definition of "arable land" to make it clear which soil groups are defined as "arable" for the purposes of this plan.
0-3-41#8	541.323	NZ Vegetable & Potato Growers Federation Inc et al	Amend the definition of "arable land" to make it clear which soil groups are defined as "arable" for the purposes of this plan.
0-3-41#8	586.1610	Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces	Retain the definition of "Arable land".
	F1043.3098	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.3087	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
0-3-41#8	669.1605	South Island High Country Section, Federated Farmers NZ	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).

Evaluations and reasons

257.1617, 506.1610, 586.1610, F1043.3098, F1044.3087; 669.1605:

The submitters support the retention of the definition as written.

The support for the definition is accepted and therefore the submissions can be accepted and no amendment is required.

449.89, 512.218:

The submitters want the definition for arable land to be limited to land that is being used for arable purposes - cultivated and cropped. The main reason given was to ensure that policies SCN6 and SCN7 for managing arable soils were restricted to those areas of arable land being farmed.

"Arable land" is defined on the basis of its capability for use, not the particular use made of it at any point in time. Land uses can change over time, and whenever arable soils are used for farming purposes they should be used in accordance with the best management practices listed in policies SCN6 and SCN7.

The concerns raised by the submitters are accepted on the grounds that Policies SCN6 and SCN7 may not be relevant where arable soils are used for purposes other than farming. An amendment made to Objective SCN2, in response to similar submissions by the same submitters, to specify that it applies to "all arable land used for farming activities" will set the framework for land addressed by Policies SCN6 and SCN7. It is considered that limiting the focus for the policies is a more appropriate way to provide for the concerns raised by the submitters than altering the definition for arable soils.

For the reasons set out above, the submissions are rejected and no amendment is required.

540.323, 541.323: The submitters want the definition for arable land to make clear the connection with the soil groups discussed in Chapter 8. They suggest that arable land is "all land excluding that classified as hill and high country".

Arable land is defined according to its suitability for use. The soil environment groups are based on their location within the landscape. There is no simple relationship between the two soil groupings, so it would not be appropriate to include the relationship as part of the definition for arable land.

The relationship between the two groupings has been included as a new section within section 8.2.2 as a result of submissions on that section. It is considered that this will provide the information requested by the submitters.

For the reasons outlined above, and to the extent that the issues raised have already been addressed elsewhere in Chapter 8, the submissions are accepted in part and no amendment is required.

SCN1.87. Recommendation

257.1617, 506.1610, 586.1610, 669.1605, F1043.3098, F1044.3087: Accept

540.323, 541.323: Accept in part

Amendment

Nil

0-3-81#8 Definitions - "Downlands"

0-3-81#8	257.1658	Upper Waitaki Branch Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
0-3-81#8	506.1651	Hugh Turnbull	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
0-3-81#8	586.1651	Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces	Amend the definition of "Downlands" to read: <i>"include all rolling foothill country below 600 metres altitude."</i>
	F1043.3139	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.3128	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
0-3-81#8	669.1646	South Island High Country Section, Federated Farmers NZ	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).

Evaluations and reasons**257.1658, 506.1651, 586.1651, F1043.3139, F1044.3128, 669.1646:**

The submitters want to delete part of the definition for downlands that identifies the slope range; however no reasons are given to explain why this should be done.

F1043, F1044 support the original submission 586 for the reasons provided by the submitter.

The slope range included with the definition identifies clearly the separation between downlands and hill country, and the lower limits of downlands where it adjoins the plains. It is considered to provide practicality and clarity to the definition. Staff consider that removing the clause sought by the submitter would cause confusion.

For the above reasons, the submissions and further submissions are rejected and no amendment is required.

SCN1.88. Recommendation

257.1658, 506.1651, 586.1651, F1043.3139, F1044.3128, 669.1646: Reject

Amendment

Nil

0-3-87#8 Definitions - "Earthworks"

0-3-87#8	257.1664	Upper Waitaki Branch Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
0-3-87#8	506.1657	Hugh Turnbull	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
0-3-87#8	540.11	Canterbury Growers Society Ltd	Add the following to the end of the definition of earthworks: <i><u>"Earthworks does not include cultivation of the soil for the establishment of crops or pasture."</u></i>
0-3-87#8	540.322	Canterbury Growers Society Ltd	Add a sentence at the end of the definition of "Earthworks" that reads: <i><u>"Earthworks do not include cultivation."</u></i> Add the words <i><u>"as</u></i>

			<i>part of normal farming practice</i> " after "cultivation" to improve clarity.
0-3-87#8	541.11	NZ Vegetable & Potato Growers Federation Inc et al	Add the following to the end of the definition of earthworks: <i>"Earthworks does not include cultivation of the soil for the establishment of crops or pasture."</i>
0-3-87#8	541.322	NZ Vegetable & Potato Growers Federation Inc et al	Add a sentence at the end of the definition of "Earthworks" that reads: " <i>Earthworks do not include cultivation.</i> " Add the words " <i>as part of normal farming practice</i> " after "cultivation" to improve clarity.
	F1027.9	Matariki Forests	<i>Oppose</i>
	F1042.220	NZ Forest Owners Assn	<i>Oppose</i>
0-3-87#8	586.1657	Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces	Amend the definition of "Earthworks" to read: " <i>means the excavation of and/or filling with topsoil, subsoil, sediments, rock and/or other underlying materials on which the soil is formed Earthworks include, but is not limited to, the construction of roads, tracks, firebreaks and landings, and ground shaping recontouring, root raking and blading but excludes cultivation and tillage</i> ".
	F1043.3145	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.3134	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
0-3-87#8	669.1652	South Island High Country Section, Federated Farmers NZ	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).

Evaluations and reasons

257.1664, 506.1657, 540.11, 541.11, 586.1657, F1043.3145, F1044.3134; 669.1652, 540.322, 541.322, F1027.9, F1042.220: 257, 506, 586, 669 - The submitters have requested that the definition for earthworks specifically exclude all cultivation activities associated with the preparation and establishment of crops. The reason given by the submitters is to reduce any uncertainty.
540, 541 - recognise that the current wording of the definition does not specifically include cultivation, but want a specific statement added for the avoidance of doubt and improvement of clarity.
F1043, F1044 - support the original submission 586 for the reasons provided by the original submitter.
F1027, F1042 - oppose the submission 541.322 as it is not clear what constitutes "normal farming practice".

The current definition for earthworks focuses on excavation and filling activities that expose or bury the surface and subsurface layers of the soil profile. This does not include cultivation activities associated with crop production. It is accepted that without specific exclusion of cultivation there could be some uncertainty. The wording provided by submissions 540.11 and 541.11 is considered to provide the greatest clarity and certainty to the definition. The inclusion of the phrase "as part of normal farming practices" as suggested by submissions 540.322 and 541.322 is open to interpretation and therefore fails to improve the clarity of the definition. The opposition by F1027, F1042 to the inclusion of this wording is accepted in part as this wording was only part of the original submission.

For the reasons outlined above, submissions 540.11, 541.11 are accepted, submissions 257.1664, 506.1657, 586.1657, 540.322, 541.322, 669.1652, and further submissions F1027.9, F1042.220, F1043.3145, F1044.3134 are accepted in part and an amendment is required.

SCN1.89. Recommendation

540.11, 541.11: Accept

257.1664, 506.1657, 586.1657, 540.322, 541.322, 669.1652, F1027.9, F1042.220, F1043.3145, F1044.3134: Accept in part

Amendment

Amend the definition of "Earthworks", page 7-82, by adding the following words to the end of the definition:

"...Earthworks does not include cultivation of the soil for the establishment of crops."

0-3-108#8 Definitions - "Fodder banks"

0-3-108#8	257.1684	Upper Waitaki Branch Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
0-3-108#8	506.1677	Hugh Turnbull	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
0-3-108#8	586.1677	Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces	Delete the definition of "Fodder Banks" or amend to read: " <i>are reserves of crops stockpiled for stock food.</i> "
	F1043.3165	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.3154	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
0-3-108#8	669.1672	South Island High Country Section, Federated Farmers NZ	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).

Evaluations and reasons

257.1684, 506.1677, 586.1677, F1043.3165, F1044.3154; 669.1672:

The submitters oppose the definition on the grounds that they have not found any use of the word in the NRRP. If it is used they request an amendment to remove the reference to drought periods. No reasons are provided for deleting part of the definition.

F1043, F1044 - support the original submission 586 for the reasons provided by the submitter.

Fodder banks are included in Policy SCN7 as a practice to maintain some vegetation cover over non-irrigated soils during times of drought when the growth or regrowth of pasture will be minimal. The wording of the definition refers specifically to their use during times of drought and should be retained. In the absence of any reasons provided to delete reference to stockpiling during periods of drought, the submissions and further submissions are rejected and no amendment is required.

SCN1.90. Recommendation

257.1684, 506.1677, 586.1677, 669.1672, F1043.3165, F1044.3154: Reject

Amendment

Nil

0-3-125#8 Definitions - "Hill country land"

0-3-125#8	257.1699	Upper Waitaki Branch Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
0-3-125#8	402.16	Coastal Conway Landcare Group (B. MacFarlane)	Amend definition of 'Hill Country land' by increasing the slope to 25% or greater.
0-3-125#8	506.1692	Hugh Turnbull	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
0-3-125#8	586.1692	Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces	Amend the definition of " <i>Hill country land</i> " to read: " <i>includes land between 300 and 900 metres altitude</i> ".
	F1043.3180	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>

	F1044.3169	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
	F1076.45	NZ Vegetable and Potato Growers and three other organisations	<i>Support</i>
0-3-125#8	669.1687	South Island High Country Section, Federated Farmers NZ	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).

Evaluations and reasons

257.1699, 506.1692, 586.1692, F1043.3180, F1044.3169, F1076.45; 669.1687: The submitters seek the inclusion of a lower altitudinal limit for hill country land on the grounds that the definition needs to be more certain. No other reasons are given to substantiate the change.

F1043, F1044 - support the submission 586 for the reasons provided by the submitter.

F1076 - support submission 586 on the grounds that by inserting a lower limit it is clear that flatter land is not included as hill country.

Hill country as defined includes all land steeper than 20 degrees, and all land above 600 metres up to an altitudinal limit of 900 metres. Adding a lower altitude limit of 300m may exclude some areas of land with slopes greater than 20 degrees, such as coastal hill country which shares similar characteristics and requires similar management to other areas of hill country land. In the absence of any reasons by the submitter for setting this limit, other than for certainty, it is not considered that the amendment requested improves the usefulness of the definition from a management point of view. The current definition uses "and/or" between the two criteria which are not necessary and may be confusing. This will be amended to "or" to make it clear that either criteria (slope or altitude) is sufficient to include land within the definition". The reasons provided for support by F1076 are not accepted as land below 300 metres is not necessarily "flatter land" and the definition states that all land steeper than 20 degrees is included in the definition. For the reasons outlined above, the submissions and further submissions are accepted in part and an amendment is required.

402.16: The submitter wants the slope threshold for hill country land to be raised to 25 degrees or greater on the grounds that a 20 degree slope is gentle enough not to be prone to adverse environmental effects from the use of land.

The existing definition for hill country land is based on the Land Use Capability (LUC) classes of land with slopes ranging from 20 - 28 degrees. Raising the threshold to 25 degrees would exclude a large proportion of all this land, including soft rock hill country slopes that are highly susceptible to erosion and require careful management of any land use that disturbs or exposes the topsoil to the erosive elements of wind and water. The LUC threshold of 20 degrees was set as a practical limit to slopes that could be cultivated safely and hence suitable for arable use. The submitter makes no suggestion as to how slopes excluded from the definition should be classified. It is not considered that the amendment suggested would provide for a more practical definition, and may well exclude some land that would be highly prone to erosion. For the reasons set out, the submission is rejected and no amendment is required.

SCN1.91. Recommendation

257.1699, 402.16, 506.1692, 586.1692, 669.1687, F1043.3180, F1044.3169, F1076.45: Accept in part

Amendment

Amend the definition of "hill country land", page 8-84, to read:

"Hill country land includes all non-arable land below 900 metres altitude that is:

- (a) greater than 20 degrees in slope ~~and/or~~
- (b) greater than 600 metres above sea level."

0-3-182#8 Definitions - "Non-arable land"

0-3-182#8	257.1751	Upper Waitaki Branch Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
0-3-182#8	506.1744	Hugh Turnbull	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
0-3-182#8	540.324	Canterbury Growers	Amend the definition of "non-arable land"

		Society Ltd	to make it clear which soil groups are defined as “non-arable” for the purposes of this plan.
0-3-182#8	541.324	NZ Vegetable & Potato Growers Federation Inc et al	Amend the definition of “non-arable land” to make it clear which soil groups are defined as “non-arable” for the purposes of this plan.
0-3-182#8	586.1744	Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces	Retain the definition of “ <i>non-arable land</i> ”.
	F1043.3234	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.3221	Selwyn Plantation Board Limited	<i>Support</i>
0-3-182#8	669.1739	South Island High Country Section, Federated Farmers NZ	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).

Evaluations and reasons

257.1751, 506.1744, 586.1744, F1043.3234, F1044.3221; 669.1739: The submitters all wish to retain the definition for non-arable land as written.

F1043, F1044 - support the original submission 586 for the reasons given by the submitter.

The support of the submitters and original submitters is accepted and no amendment is required.

540.324, 541.324: The submitters want the definition for non-arable land to be amended to clarify the link between non-arable soils and the soil groups discussed in the introduction to Chapter 8.

Non-arable land is currently defined as all land that is not suitable for cultivation or cropping. While non-arable land includes almost all hill and high country land, it is not confined to this but may also include areas of the plains, downs and inland basins where soil depth, stoniness or texture makes the soil unsuitable for cultivation. Variations in soil characteristics can occur over short distances, even within a single paddock, so the major landforms and broad soil groupings discussed in the Background section and in Appendix SCN1 cannot be directly related to the arable and non-arable soil categories. A discussion of this relationship has already been included as an amendment to section 8.2.2 in the Background section of the Chapter and that should provide the clarification sought by the submitters. For the reasons outlined above, and to the extent that the issues raised are addressed elsewhere in Chapter 8, the submissions are accepted in part. No amendment is required.

SCN1.92. Recommendation

257.1751, 506.1744, 586.1744, 669.1739, F1043.3234, F1044.3221: Accept

540.324, 541.324: Accept in part

Amendment

Nil

0-3-196#8 Definitions - "Plant stature"

0-3-196#8	257.1765	Upper Waitaki Branch Federated Farmers Of New Zealand Inc	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
0-3-196#8	506.1758	Hugh Turnbull	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).
0-3-196#8	586.1758	Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces	Delete the definition of “ <i>Plant stature</i> ”.
	F1043.3248	Canterbury Forest Industry Working Group.	<i>Support</i>
	F1044.3235	Selwyn Plantation	<i>Support</i>

		Board Limited	
0-3-196#8	669.1753	South Island High Country Section, Federated Farmers NZ	Supports submission from Federated Farmers NZ Inc, Canterbury Provinces (refer 586).

Evaluations and reasons

257.1765, 506.1758, 586.1758, F1043.3248, F1044.3235; 669.1753: The submitters want to delete the definition for plant stature on the grounds that it does not appear in the NRRP chapters 4-8.

F1043, F1044 - support submission 586 for the reasons given by the submitter.

Plant stature (i.e. height) is a measure of vegetation resilience and is listed in Objective SCN1(b)(i) together with plant vigour and plant biomass. To provide certainty of interpretation of the term it is necessary to have a definition in the NRRP.

For the reasons set out above, the submissions and further submissions are rejected and no amendment is required.

SCN1.93. Recommendation

257.1765, 506.1758, 586.1758, 669.1753, F1043.3248, F1044.3235: Reject

Amendment

Nil
