

From: [tracy simms](#)
To: [Regional Plan](#)
Subject: Plan Change 1
Date: Thursday, 14 December 2023 9:28:11 pm

Proposed Plan Change 1 to the Natural resources Plan for the Wellington Region (Plan Change 1)

Tracy Gaye Simms



tracy.simms@yahoo.co.nz

I do not stand to gain commercial advantage from my submission
I wish to be heard in support of my submission

1. No consultation or lack of:

Approximately 757 properties that sit within the range of 4ha to 20ha have not been contacted directly regarding the changes in PC 1 and it was only by word of mouth that this information was brought to light.

2. Sanctions against property owners:

How can the GWRC apply sanctions and penalties to landowners who are both upstream and downstream along these waterways where there are very few monitoring sites? Mangaroa Catchment for example is approximately 20km from the headwaters to the single Te Marua monitoring point with all properties being assessed based on the downstream results from this single monitoring point. This is not acceptable.

3. Fencing of waterways and contradictory advice from GWRC:

Advice given at the Ohariu meeting was the set back distance as 3 meters.

Advice was then given that if a drain it was 3 meters but if it was a river then 5 meters.

Page 230, Section 32 report states a minimum of 10 meters for rivers.

4. Reduction in Sediment discharges:

GWRC want to reduce sediment discharges from farming activities within the Mangaroa and Akatarawa catchment areas but no water quality information has been gathered. There are only two monitoring points being at the confluence of the Mangaroa River and the Hutt River and the confluence of the Akatarawa River and the Hutt River. The headwaters of both catchment areas are about 20km from the monitoring points. GWRC clearly have no idea where the sediment is originating other than to say "upstream of the monitoring points ". To say that is due to farming operations is simply guessing. No one is arguing that sediment is not down to human activity but it is NOT the only contributor. Erosion and other factors have to be taken into account to the cause of erosion building up within our waterways.

More monitoring stations/points and more data is required to build a more genuine picture to establish the source of any quality reduction.

5. Registration - 4Ha or more:

Requiring a complex range of data to include stocking rates, grazing areas, mapping of boundaries and waterbodies where stock exclusion is required under new rules and location of fences in relation to waterways. GRWC also requires calculations relating to Nitrogen levels emitting from these properties. One needs a certain level of expertise to carry out the mathematical calculations necessary to produce the amount of data required and the skills needed to produce maps etc given that not all terrain is flat and easy. I don't believe GRWC has yet developed its own systems to receive this data.

I am seeking the following relief:

Based on the lack of consultation initially, the onus of registering 4ha or more as farms, the complex data required to satisfy the GWRCs' requirements, the contradictory rules regarding fencing of waterways, rules regarding stocking levels and sediment reduction - Withdraw the Plan Change completely.

END OF SUBMISSION