

# Resources for Property Plan sub-group meeting

15 January 2016 – tabled on the day

*Section 1: Example of permitted activity rule*

*Section 2: Example of low intensity land use rule*

*Section 3: Examples of low and high intensity land use definitions*

*Section 4: Excerpt of community engagement results on property plans*

## 1 Example of permitted activity rule – Waikato Regional Plan Section 5.1 Accelerated Erosion

### 5.1.4.11 Permitted Activity Rule – Soil Disturbance, Roading and Tracking and Vegetation Clearance

1. Unless otherwise provided for by Rules 5.1.4.14, 5.1.4.15, 5.1.4.16 or 5.1.4.17, soil disturbance, roading and tracking, and vegetation clearance and any associated deposition of slash into or onto the beds of rivers and any subsequent discharge of contaminants into water or air;
2. Any roading and tracking activities associated with the installation of bridges or culverts permitted by Rules 4.2.8.1, 4.2.9.1 and 4.2.9.2, within 20 metres of that bridge or culvert and any associated deposition of slash into or onto the beds of rivers and any subsequent discharge of contaminants into water or air;
3. Vegetation clearance of planted production forest as planted at the date upon which this Plan becomes operative;

are **permitted activities** subject to the conditions in Section 5.1.5. In addition 5.1.4.11(3) is subject to the following conditions:

- a. Provided that replanting of planted production forest does not occur within:
  - i. five metres, on either side, of the bed of a water body excluding an ephemeral stream (except on the Coromandel Peninsula); and
  - ii. ten metres, on either side of the bed of a water body excluding an ephemeral stream on the Coromandel Peninsula streams greater than 50 hectares
  - iii. five metres on either side of the bed of water bodies between 20 and 50 hectares on the Coromandel Peninsula regardless of slope;
- b. On the Coromandel Peninsula where wilding pines are present at a density of greater than 50 stems per kilometre of riparian margin they will all be removed at first thinning so long as practicable from a safety perspective.

#### Advisory Notes:

- District plans may have rules which restrict land disturbance and vegetation clearance in areas outside of high risk erosion areas.
- Grazing and cultivation are excluded from the requirements of this Rule.

### 5.1.5 Conditions for Permitted Activity Rule 5.1.4.11 and Standards and Terms for Controlled Activity Rules

- a. Organic material shall not be placed in fill where its subsequent decomposition will lead to land instability.
- b. Erosion/sediment controls shall be installed and maintained on all earthworks during and on completion of the works to avoid the adverse effects of sediment on water bodies.

- c. Cut-offs or culverts shall be designed and installed to prevent scour, gulying or other erosion.
- d. Any erosion or instability of the coastal environment, or the beds of rivers and lakes or wetlands shall be avoided or remedied if it does occur.
- e. The activity shall not result in neighbouring land becoming subject to flooding.
- f. All disturbed vegetation, soil or debris shall be deposited or contained to prevent the movement of disturbed matter so that it does not result in:
  - i. the diversion, damming or blockage of any river or stream, or
  - ii. the passage of fish being impeded, or
  - iii. the destruction of any habitat in a water body or coastal water, or
  - iv. flooding or erosion.
- g. The activity shall not disturb any archaeological site or waahi tapu as identified at the date of notification of this Plan, in any district plan, in the New Zealand Archaeological Association's Site Recording Scheme, or by the Historic Places Trust except where Historic Places Trust approval has been obtained.
- h. The concentration of suspended solids in any point source discharge arising from the activity shall comply with the suspended solids standards as set out in Method 3.2.4.6. This condition applies only to permitted activity rules and excludes any non-point source discharges from roading, tracking and vegetation clearance activities (refer condition o) below).
- i. Any discharge of contaminants into air arising from the activity shall comply with the permitted activity conditions in Section 6.1.8 except where the matters addressed in Section 6.1.8 are already addressed by conditions on resource consents for the site.
- j. In the event of any waahi tapu that is not subject to g) above being identified by the Waikato Regional Council to the person undertaking the activity, the activity shall cease insofar as it may affect the waahi tapu. The activity shall not be recommenced without the approval of the Waikato Regional Council.
- k. No storage or mixing of fuels, oils, or agrichemicals shall be undertaken in areas where deliberate or inadvertent discharge is likely to enter any permanent natural surface water body.
- l. All vegetation that is being felled within five metres of a perennial water body shall be felled away from the water body, except edge vegetation, or vegetation leaning over a water body, which if necessary may be felled in accordance with safety practices.
- m. All exposed areas of soil resulting from the activity shall be stabilised against erosion by vegetative cover or other methods as soon as practical following completion of the activity and no later than six to twelve months from the date of disturbance to avoid the adverse effects of sediment on water bodies.
- n. The activity shall not be located within 20 metres of a Significant Geothermal Feature.
- o. The concentration of suspended solids in any non-point discharges from roading, tracking and vegetation clearance activities shall meet the following standards;
  - i. The activity or discharge shall not result in any of the following receiving water standards being breached:
  - ii. in Waikato Region Surface class waters - 100 grams per cubic metre suspended solids concentration
  - iii. in Indigenous Fisheries and Fish Habitat class waters - 80 grams per cubic metre suspended solids concentration
  - iv. in Trout Fisheries and Trout Spawning Habitat class waters - 25 grams per cubic metre suspended solids concentration
  - v. in Contact Recreation class waters - black disc horizontal visibility greater than 1.6 metres
  - vi. in Natural State class waters - the activity or discharge shall not increase the concentration of suspended solids in the receiving water by more than 10 percent

Standard a) shall apply, except where the suspended solids concentration or black disc horizontal visibility in the receiving water is greater than the standards specified, at the time and location of discharge or of undertaking the activity. Then there shall not be any increase (i.e. further deterioration) in the receiving water suspended solids concentration or black disc horizontal visibility of more than 20% as a result of the activity or discharge.

The point at which compliance with this standard shall be measured is after reasonable mixing has occurred which in any instance does not exceed 200 metres from the point of discharge.

- p. Soil disturbance associated with the construction of a road or track within 20 metres of a culvert or bridge provided for in Rules 4.2.8.1, 4.2.8.2, 4.2.9.1, 4.2.9.2 and 4.2.9.3;
- i. Shall not occur adjacent to Significant Indigenous Fisheries and Fish Habitat Class waters during August to December inclusive and Significant Trout Fisheries and Trout Habitat class waters during May to September inclusive; and,
  - ii. Shall be stabilised against erosion by vegetative cover or other methods as soon as practical following completion of the activity and no later than two months from the date of disturbance to avoid the adverse effects of sediment on water bodies; and
  - iii. The location of the proposed soil disturbance shall be notified to the Waikato Regional Council in writing at least 10 working days prior to commencing construction.

**Advisory Note:**

- Where a waahi tapu site is identified whilst undertaking the activity, the process that Waikato Regional Council will follow in order to implement condition/standard and term j) is set out in Section 2.3.4.22 of this Plan.
- Where a structure or activity is to be located in, on, under or over the bed of a water body that is Significant Geothermal Feature, Rules 7.6.6.1 to 7.6.6.3 shall apply. Significant Geothermal Features are defined in the Glossary, and in Development and Limited Development Geothermal Systems, identified on maps in Section 7.10 of this Plan.

## **2 Example of low intensity land use rule - Waikato Regional Plan Chapter 3.10 Lake Taupo Catchment**

### **3.10.5.1 Permitted Activity Rule – Low Nitrogen Leaching Farming Activities**

The use of land in the Lake Taupo catchment that may result in nitrogen leaching from the land and entering water:

1. for farming activities which were existing as at the date of notification of this Rule (9 July 2005); and
  - i. the land has not been subject to a consent pursuant to Rule 3.10.5.3, 3.10.5.6, 3.10.5.7, 3.10.5.8 or 3.10.5.9; or
  - ii. where the land has been subject to a consent pursuant to Rule 3.10.5.3, 3.10.5.6, 3.10.5.7, 3.10.5.8 or 3.10.5.9 and the land has a Nitrogen Discharge Allowance sufficient to allow for at least 8 kilograms of nitrogen per hectare per year for farming plus 3.5 kilograms of nitrogen per year for any advanced wastewater system in accordance with Rule 3.10.6.3 or 10 kilograms of nitrogen per year for any conventional wastewater system in accordance with Rule 3.10.6.4; or

2. for land which was not used for farming activities at the date of notification of this Rule, and where any nitrogen increase has been authorised by a resource consent granted under Rule 3.10.5.7 or 3.10.5.8 and the land has a Nitrogen Discharge Allowance sufficient to allow for at least 8 kilograms of nitrogen per hectare per year for farming plus 3.5 kilograms of nitrogen per year for any advanced wastewater system in accordance with Rule 3.10.6.3 or 10 kilograms of nitrogen per year for any conventional wastewater system in accordance with Rule 3.10.6.4.

is a **permitted activity** if the following conditions are met:

**Advisory Note:**

- This Rule in part provides for land that has either been leaching high nitrogen levels or has resource consent to do so, to convert to low leaching land use activities (e.g. lifestyle blocks, forestry, etc.).
- a. Where the land is not used to graze stock, no more than 75 kilograms of nitrogen per hectare per year shall be applied to the land. Where the land is used to graze stock, the maximum number of animals shall be equivalent to any one row of Table 3.10.5.1 below:

**Table 3.10.5.1 – Stock Limits**

<b>Animal Type</b>	<b>Maximum number of animals permitted per hectare</b>	<b>Maximum number of animals permitted per 10 hectares</b>
Dairy cow	0.55	5.5
Beef cattle	0.8	8
Calf	3.3	33
Horse	0.8	8
Sheep	7.7	77
Deer	3.3	33
Goat	10	100
Alpaca or Llama	3.3	33
Pig (free range)	2.5	25

- b. Progeny of animals grazed under condition a) (such as lambs and calves) are permitted provided that no additional feed is brought on to the property except feed that is supplied as per standard industry practice to meet animal welfare requirements during the period of weaning and stocking rates return to the stock limits outlined in condition a) between 1 April and 31 July each year.
- c. Non-grazing domestic animals including cats, dogs, chickens and ducks that are kept for domestic purposes are permitted and are not to be taken into account for the purposes of this rule.

**and provided also that:**

Where a land use is authorized as a permitted activity by this Rule, the subject land shall not be used to offset any nitrogen leaching increase elsewhere in the catchment.

**Advisory Notes:**

- This Rule in part provides for land that has either been leaching high nitrogen levels or has resource consent to do so, to convert to low leaching land use activities (e.g. lifestyle blocks, forestry, etc.).

- The area of land used to calculate animal density excludes any area of land used for buildings, lawns or gardens.
- Wastewater systems must be authorised by the wastewater rules in section 3.10.6.
- The application of 75 kilograms of nitrogen per hectare per year in a non-grazing situation, or grazing at the limits in Table 3.10.5.1 is equivalent to 8 kilograms per hectare per year nitrogen leaching rate.

### 3 Examples of definitions of low or high intensity land use

#### Hawkes Bay Plan Change 6 Tukituki River Catchment

##### Low intensity farming system

Means farm properties or farming enterprises that contain no more than 8 stock units per hectare including permanent horticultural and viticultural crops (such as orchards, vineyards) and lifestyle properties; but does not include

- Properties used for the production of rotational vegetable crops;
- Dairy farms;
- Grazed forage crops.

#### Horizons One Plan

**Commercial vegetable growing** means using an area of land greater than 4 ha for producing vegetable crops for human consumption. It includes the whole rotational cycle, being the period of time that is required for the full sequence of crops, including any pasture phase in the rotation. Fruit crops, vegetables that are perennial, dry field peas or beans are not included.

**Cropping** means using an area of land in excess of 20 ha to grow crops. A “crop” is defined as cereal, coarse grains, oilseed, peanuts, lupins, dry field peas or dry field beans. This definition does not include crops fed to animals or grazed on by animals on the same property.

**Dairy farming** means using any area of *land*<sup>^</sup> greater than 4 ha for the farming of dairy cattle for milk production. This includes *land*<sup>^</sup> used as a dairy cattle grazing runoff but excludes any dairy grazing arrangement. A dairy grazing arrangement is a third party commercial arrangement between the owner of dairy cattle and another landowner for the purpose of temporary grazing.

**Intensive sheep and beef farming** refers to properties greater than 4 ha engaged in the farming of sheep and cattle, where any of the land grazed is irrigated.

#### Taranaki Draft Freshwater and Land Management Plan for Taranaki

**Intensive pastoral farming** means an area of land greater than 20 hectares used for the pastoral grazing, keeping, rearing and breeding of dairy or beef cattle, with a stocking rate of 14 stock units per hectare or more. Intensive pastoral farming excludes:

- intensive pig farming
- intensive poultry farming
- horticulture and cropping
- sheep farming
- deer farming.

## 4 Results from community engagement on property plans

Excerpt from Intensive Engagement Period 2 Feedback Report Document #3603167 pages 17-24.

### 9 Are you comfortable with the approach to use tailored property plans?

The full question asked was: “Are you comfortable with the approach to use tailored property plans (along with catchment wide rules) to make reductions in contaminant losses over time”? This question was asked across all forums, gathering in total 752 responses.

Overall, 83 per cent of people answering this question responded ‘yes’. Table 10 shows there was some difference in response between forums. The range was from 78 per cent ‘yes’ in the online survey to 92 per cent at the Hamilton community workshop. The two community workshops in the Upper Waikato FMU (Tokoroa and Reporoa) recorded lower agreement responses in general than at other community workshops. Part of this could be due to the format of the stakeholder workshop and community workshops which allowed table discussion. Those responding to the online survey did not have that opportunity and were provided with text information to assist their thinking.

Asked as part of the:

- stakeholder workshop
- Upper Waikato community workshops (Tokoroa and Reporoa)
- Middle Waikato community workshop (Hamilton)
- Lower Waikato community workshop (Tuakau)
- Waipa community workshop (Otorohanga)
- online survey

Table 10: Are you comfortable with the approach to use tailored property plans to make reductions in contaminant losses over time?

Are you comfortable with the approach to use tailored property plans?	Yes	No	Total
Online survey	294 (78%)	85 (22%)	<b>379</b>
Stakeholder workshop	156 (87%)	23 (13%)	<b>179</b>
Tokoroa community workshop	34 (85%)	6 (15%)	<b>40</b>
Reporoa community workshop	34 (83%)	7 (17%)	<b>41</b>
Hamilton community workshop	45 (92%)	4 (8%)	<b>49</b>
Tuakau community workshop	27 (90%)	3 (10%)	<b>30</b>
Otorohanga community workshop	31 (91%)	3 (9%)	<b>34</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>621 (83%)</b>	<b>131 (17%)</b>	<b>752</b>

Table 11: Sector responses: Are you comfortable with the approach to use tailored property plans?

<b>Are you comfortable with the approach to use tailored property plans?</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Total</b>
Arable	29 (94%)	2 (6%)	31
Central government and health	33 (85%)	6 (15%)	39
Commercial fishing	5 (100%)	-	5
Community	168 (86%)	28 (14%)	196
Dairy	288 (83%)	57 (17%)	345
Energy	14 (74%)	5 (26%)	19
Environment/NGOs	86 (84%)	17 (16%)	103
Fertiliser	39 (89%)	5 (11%)	44
Forestry	53 (84%)	10 (16%)	63
Horticulture	32 (84%)	6 (16%)	38
Industry	35 (81%)	8 (19%)	43
Irrigators	20 (87%)	3 (13%)	23
Local government	84 (83%)	17 (17%)	101
Māori interests	50 (83%)	10 (17%)	60
Rural advocacy	39 (81%)	9 (19%)	48
Rural professionals	92 (90%)	10 (10%)	102
Sheep and beef	121 (83%)	24 (17%)	145
Tourism and recreation	43 (81%)	10 (19%)	53
Water supply takes	38 (83%)	8 (17%)	46
Other (incl. education, grazing, student, bee industry, consultant, planner, research, waste water, construction, engineering etc.)	57 (84%)	11 (16%)	68

Asked as part of the:

- stakeholder workshop
- Upper Waikato community workshops (Tokoroa and Reporoa)
- Middle Waikato community workshop (Hamilton)
- Lower Waikato workshop (Tuakau)
- Waipa community workshop (Otorohanga)
- online survey

## 9.1 What assurance would you need that a property plan is appropriate and actions will take place over time?

The question asked across all forums was: “If every property was required to have a property plan, what assurance would you need that this property plan is appropriate and actions on that property will take place over time?”. Some stakeholders provided an answer to the question while others made more general remarks about tailored property plans. Responses have been themed and counts are shown by workshop event. Many of the 256 written comments had multiple themes (resulting in the total of 553 comments).

Table 12: Themed statements on assurances needed that the property plan is appropriate and actions on that property will take place over time

Emerging theme	Theme counts							Totals
	Stakeholder workshop	Online survey	Hamilton workshop	Otorohanga workshop	Reporoa workshop	Tokoroa workshop	Tuakau workshop	
<b>Comment on plan design</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>253</b>
<i>Needs to be achievable/not onerous or costly</i>	19	38	1	1	7	2	2	70
<i>Needs to consider individual land use for each property</i>	16	30	7	2	5	4	5	69
<i>Needs to have clear method for measuring compliance/good data/robust science to support it</i>	20	18	6	1	1	4	3	53
<i>Needs independent input into plan development</i>	13	14	4	2	1	2	1	37
<i>Needs to be flexible</i>	8	11	-	-	2	3	-	24
<b>Comment on plan implementation</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>131</b>
<i>Property owner needs to own the plan/be consulted</i>	6	14	7	5	0	1	1	34
<i>Who pays for this?</i>	9	12	1	4	3	-	1	30
<i>Plan needs to be practical to implement</i>	4	14	2	1	3	1	1	26
<i>Property owner needs to be given assistance to develop and implement the plan/education</i>	3	10	2	-	1	-	2	18
<i>Needs to have fair implementation/not be too heavy handed</i>	4	8	-	-	1	2	-	15
<i>Consideration of the impact of urban activities on water quality</i>	1	3	2	-	-	2	-	8
<b>Comment on enforcement/ roll out of plan</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100</b>
<i>Council will need to be involved in some capacity</i>	20	26	-	-	-	1	1	48
<i>Question the resources available to implement the plan</i>	10	12	4	-	-	2	1	29
<i>Disagree with property plan generally</i>	1	17	-	1	1	2	1	23
<b>Comment on industry role</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>69</b>
<i>Needs to be fair and equitable for all</i>	14	11	4	3	4	-	2	38
<i>Should be industry led</i>	14	10	1	1	2	2	1	31
<b>Totals</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>248</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>553</b>

## 9.2 Should property plans be compulsory for all properties over 4ha?

Asked as part of the:

- stakeholder workshop
- online survey

The question asked was: “Should property plans be compulsory for all properties over 4ha?”. It was asked of stakeholders at the stakeholder workshop and of those responding via the online survey. This general topic was also covered during discussions at the community workshops but a specific question was not asked of those attending.

In total 546 responses were gathered with 379 (69 per cent) via the online survey and the remaining 167 (31 per cent) from the stakeholder workshop. Table 13 shows the headline results. Overall 70 per cent thought that property plans should be compulsory for all properties over 4ha.

Table 14 shows the results by the sector(s) stakeholders indicated they were affiliated with. As many stakeholders indicated being part of more than one sector, overall totals are not given in the table.

Table 13: Should property plans be compulsory for all properties over 4ha?

Should property plans be compulsory for all properties over 4ha?	Yes	No	Total
Online survey	254 (67%)	125 (33%)	<b>379</b>
Stakeholder workshop	127 (76%)	40 (24%)	<b>167</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>381 (70%)</b>	<b>165 (30%)</b>	<b>546</b>



Table 14: Sector responses: should property plans be compulsory for all properties over 4ha?

Should property plans be compulsory for all properties over 4ha?	Yes	No	Total
Arable	19 (68%)	9 (32%)	28
Central govt and health	28 (80%)	7 (20%)	35
Commercial fishing	4 (80%)	1 (20%)	5
Community	98 (71%)	41 (29%)	139
Dairy	165 (66%)	85 (34%)	250
Energy	12 (80%)	3 (20%)	15
Environment/NGOs	54 (72%)	21 (28%)	75
Fertiliser	21 (60%)	14 (40%)	35
Forestry	31 (70%)	13 (30%)	44
Horticulture	20 (67%)	10 (33%)	30
Industry	19 (58%)	14 (42%)	33
Irrigators	10 (59%)	7 (41%)	17
Local government	58 (75%)	19 (25%)	77
Māori interests	32 (78%)	9 (22%)	41
Rural advocacy	24 (59%)	17 (41%)	41
Rural professionals	47 (65%)	25 (35%)	72
Sheep and beef	59 (61%)	38 (39%)	97
Tourism and recreation	29 (90%)	3 (10%)	32
Water supply takes	21 (66%)	11 (34%)	32
Other (inc education, grazing, student, bee industry, consultant, planner, research, waste water, construction, engineering etc)	38 (67%)	13 (33%)	57

Asked as part of the:

- stakeholder workshop
- online survey

### 9.3 If property plans should be compulsory, by when should every property have a plan in place?

This question followed “should property plans be compulsory for all properties over 4ha”? It was asked of stakeholders attending the stakeholder workshop and of those responding to the online survey. The exact question asked was: “if property plans should be compulsory, by when should every property have a plan in place”? In total there were 405 responses (250 from the online survey and 155 from the workshop) and the breakdown of responses are shown in Table 15. Response by sector affiliation is shown in Table 16. As many stakeholders indicated being part of more than one sector, overall totals are not given in the table.

Table 15: By when should every property have a plan in place?

If so, by when should every property have a plan in place	Within 2 years	Within 5 years	Within 10 years	Within 20 years	Longer than 20 years	Total answering question
Online survey	68 (27%)	110 (44%)	59 (24%)	7 (3%)	6 (3%)	250
Stakeholder workshop	22 (14%)	75 (48%)	47 (30%)	8 (5%)	3 (2%)	155
<b>Total</b>	<b>90 (22%)</b>	<b>185 (46%)</b>	<b>106 (26%)</b>	<b>15 (4%)</b>	<b>9 (2%)</b>	<b>405</b>

Table 16: Sector responses: By when should every property have a plan in place?

If so, by when should every property have a plan in place?	Within 2 years	Within 5 years	Within 10 years	Within 20 years	Longer than 20 years	Total answering question
Arable	5 (28%)	10 (56%)	3 (17%)	-	-	18
Central govt and health	10 (36%)	12 (43%)	4 (14%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	28
Commercial fishing	3 (75%)	-	-	1 (15%)	-	4
Community	28 (29%)	41 (42%)	25 (26%)	3 (3%)	-	97
Dairy	26 (15%)	84 (48%)	51 (29%)	11 (6%)	2 (1%)	174
Energy	4 (36%)	4 (36%)	2 (18%)	-	1 (9%)	11
Environment/NGOs	19 (31%)	31 (51%)	11 (18%)	-	1 (2%)	61
Fertiliser	6 (23%)	15 (58%)	4 (15%)	1 (4%)	-	26
Forestry	10 (29%)	15 (43%)	7 (20%)	1 (3%)	2 (8%)	35
Horticulture	8 (33%)	10 (42%)	4 (17%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	24
Industry	9 (39%)	12 (52%)	2 (9%)	-	-	23
Irrigators	3 (23%)	7 (54%)	2 (15%)	1 (8%)	-	13
Local government	13 (20%)	32 (50%)	14 (22%)	4 (6%)	1 (2%)	64

Māori interests	8 (23%)	17 (49%)	7 (20%)	-	3 (9%)	35
Rural advocacy	6 (21%)	15 (52%)	6 (21%)	1 (3%)	1 (3%)	29
Rural professionals	8 (15%)	28 (52%)	16 (30%)	2 (4%)	-	54
Sheep and beef	14 (23%)	29 (47%)	17 (27%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	62
Tourism and recreation	15 (54%)	10 (36%)	2 (7%)	1 (4%)	-	28
Water supply takes	8 (36%)	8 (36%)	5 (23%)	1 (5%)	-	22
Other (inc education, grazing, student, bee industry, consultant, planner, research, waste water, construction, engineering etc)	15 (38%)	19 (48%)	6 (15%)	-	-	40



Asked as part of the:

- stakeholder workshop
- online survey

## 9.4 What particular implications do you think the CSG should consider?

Those attending the stakeholder workshop or engaging via the online survey were asked an additional question in relation to property plans: “What particular implications do you think the CSG should consider?”. The 337 responses have been themed in Table 17.

Table 17: Themes of implications for the CSG to consider in relation to tailored property plans

Emerging theme	Theme counts		
	Stakeholder workshop	Online survey	Total
<b>Comment regarding the need for variation in plans</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>128</b>
<i>An allowance for industry variation in pollution, e.g., Dairy vs Beef and Sheep vs Hort.</i>	16	20	36
<i>Comment regarding the 4ha cut off</i>	30	2	32
<i>The economic viability of implementing the plan for a given business</i>	3	26	29
<i>The property's specific nuances, e.g., land contour, soil type, current practice, historic actions</i>	9	5	14
<i>Flexibility to change if needed</i>	4	5	9
<i>Should include horticulture/ smaller property as well</i>	5	3	8
<b>Comment regarding plan introduction</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>124</b>
<i>Resource available to actually implement or develop the plans</i>	30	29	59
<i>Availability of property maps/ plans</i>	14	20	34
<i>Minimising administration costs</i>	12	2	14
<i>Incentives for compliance</i>	3	6	9
<i>The need for cultural engagement/input</i>	2	2	4
<i>All property owners should be treated the same</i>	1	2	3
<i>Cost of implementation</i>	-	1	1
<b>Comment regarding plan timings</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>47</b>
<i>Shortening the timeframe/achieving as many as possible early on</i>	12	8	20
<i>Prioritisation of high polluters first</i>	9	5	14
<i>How the plans can be introduced/phased in</i>	8	1	9
<i>Timeframes need to be longer</i>	2	2	4
<b>Comment regarding monitoring</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>38</b>
<i>How to best enforce plan compliance</i>	14	8	22
<i>The frequency of monitoring required</i>	10	6	16
<b>Totals</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>337</b>