Submission on Proposed Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan

Form 5: Submissions on a Publicly Notified Proposed Policy Statement or Regional Plan under Clause 6 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Return your signed submission by 5.00pm Friday 5 October 2012 to:
Freepost 1201 Proposed Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan
Environment Canterbury
P O Box 345
Christchurch 8140

Full Name: KEITH WILLIAM STACKHOUSE
Organisation*: KW and P.W. STACKHOUSE
Postal Address: 33 BAXTERS RCH
OMIHI NO 3, R D, AMBERLEY

Phone (Hm): 03-314 5851
Phone (Wk): 0
Phone (Cell): 0274 358 139
Postcode: 7483

Email: 
Fax: 

Trade Competition

Pursuant to Clause 6 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991, a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission may make a submission only if directly affected by an effect of the proposed policy statement or plan that:

a) adversely affects the environment; and
b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Please tick the sentence that applies to you:

☑ I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission; or
☐ I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

If you have ticked this box please select one of the following:

☐ I am directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that adversely affects the environment and does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.
☐ I am not directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that adversely affects the environment and does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Signature: KW STACKHOUSE
Date: 10-10-2012

(Signature of person making submission or person authorised to sign on behalf of person making the submission)

Please note:
(1) all information contained in a submission under the Resource Management Act 1991, including names and addresses for service, becomes public information.

☐ I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission; or
☑ I do wish to be heard in support of my submission; and if so,
☐ If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.
(1) The specific provisions of the Proposed Plan that my submission relates to are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section &amp; Page Number</th>
<th>Sub-section/Point</th>
<th>Oppose/support (in part or full)</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See enclosed submissions.

1. We support any other amendments that give effect to these submissions.
2. We support the submissions of the Waipara Catchment Group.
3. We support retention of all other policies and rules as written.

(2) My submission is that: *(include whether you support or oppose the specific provisions or wish to have them amended and the reasons for your views.)*

(3) I seek the following decisions from Environment Canterbury: *(Please give precise details for each provision. The more specific you can be the easier it will be for the Council to understand your concerns.)*

Add further pages as required – please initial any additional pages.
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To: Environment Canterbury
PO Box 345
Christchurch

Name of Submitter:

KW & PW Stackhouse

This is a submission on the following proposed plan - Proposed Canterbury Land and Water Regional

I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

The specific provisions of the proposal that my submission relates to are:

Rules 5.52 to 5.54 and rules 5.133 to 5.137

My submission is:

I support the rules for fertiliser use and stock exclusion from waterways as they are written except for the unqualified use of the terms river and wetland.

My reasons are:

- River and wetland are very broadly defined in the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).
- As a result, a river includes any continually or intermittently flowing body of fresh water and a wetland includes any permanently or intermittently wet area that supports a natural ecosystem of plants and animals that are adapted to wet conditions.
- Consequently, any gully or rivulet on a hill and any wet patch on a farm paddock could be argued as having to be excluded by these rules. This is impractical, especially for extensive hill farms, and is not necessary as these areas are unlikely to be sources of drinking water, mahinga kai or hold other values. They are also often the only source of stock water on extensive hill properties.
Therefore, I do not agree the rules as written achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 or that the Council has fulfilled its duty under s32 to be satisfied that the rules in this form are the most appropriate method to achieve the plan’s objectives.

I seek the following decision from the Council:
Add a size component to each rule so they apply to:
Rivers which are over 1m in width and where water is flowing; and
Wetlands which are 0.5 hectares or greater in size.

Any consequential amendments required to give effect to this submission.

I do wish to be heard in support of my submission.

We are prepared to make a joint case with other parties.

Signature of Submitter K.W. Stackhouse

Date: 4-10-2017

Address for Service of Submitter:
KW Stackhouse
33 Baxters Road
Omihi
No 3 RD Amberley 7483
To: Environment Canterbury  
PO Box 345  
Christchurch

Name of Submitter:  
KW & PW Stackhouse

This is a submission on the following proposed plan - Proposed Canterbury Land and Water Regional  

I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

The specific provisions of the proposal that my submission relates to are:  

Policy 4.64 and Rules 5.109 to 5.111

My submission is:  
I support the policy and rules for plantation forests in flow-sensitive catchments.

My reasons are:  

- The rules applying to 15% of the area of the site rather than 15% of the catchment as a whole, is a much fairer way to allocate a land uses when the cumulative effect has to be managed than on first in first served. It is also much easier to administer and to comply with.
- In the Waipara catchment, the effects of various regulations including limits on irrigation water, afforestation, and now nutrient discharges already leave landholders with very few viable land use options.
- The 'first in-first served' approach continues to disadvantage those landholders who are already restricted in their land use options due to the effects of other land uses in the catchment.
- The rules do not prevent a person from making an applicator to plant more than 15% of their site if they can show the additional planting will not have an adverse effect on water yield.
I seek the following decision from the Council:
Retain Policy 4.64 and rules 5.109 to 5.111 as written.
Any consequential amendments required to give effect to this submission.

I do wish to be heard in support of my submission.

We are prepared to make a joint case with other parties.

Signature of Submitter: K.W. Stackhouse

Date: 4-18-2012

Address for Service of Submitter:
KW Stackhouse
33 Baxters Road
Omihi
No 3 RD Amberley 7483
To: Environment Canterbury  
PO Box 345  
Christchurch

Name of Submitter:  
KW & PW Stackhouse

This is a submission on the following proposed plan - Proposed Canterbury Land and Water Regional

I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

The specific provisions of the proposal that my submission relates to are:

Rule 5.29 and Rule 5.125.

My submission is:

I support the rules allowing for the establishment of offal pits and the removal of small amounts of gravel from riverbeds as permitted activities. However, I oppose condition (3) of Rule 5.29 limiting farms to one 50m$^3$ offal pit per annum; and condition 4(a) of Rule 5.125 limiting the volume of gravel extracted to 5m$^3$ in any 12 month period.

My reasons are:

- Both offal pits and gravel extraction are essential parts of day to day farm management and it is sensible that they are permitted activities subject to conditions which on the whole appear reasonable.
- However, the condition restricting farms to one offal pit of no more than 50m$^3$ per annum is insufficient for extensive farming operations. It is also impractical on large farms to have only one offal pit and having to transport carcasses from one end of the farm to another.
- The limit of 5m³ for gravel is insufficient for even basic driveway repairs let alone farm tracks and is substantially less than the volume allowed in the Natural Resources Regional Plan.

Therefore, I do not agree the rules as written achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 or that the Council has fulfilled its duty under section 32 to be satisfied that the rules in this form are the most appropriate method to achieve the plan’s objectives.

I seek the following decision from the Council:
Delete Rule5.29 condition 3.
Amend Rule 5.125 condition 4(a) to read 50m³

Any consequential amendments required to give effect to this submission.

I do wish to be heard in support of my submission.

We are prepared to make a joint case with other parties.

Signature of Submitter  
K.W. Stackhouse

Date: 4-10-2012

Address for Service of Submitter:
KW Stackhouse
33 Baxters Road
Omihi
No 3 RD Amberley 7483
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To: Environment Canterbury
PO Box 345
Christchurch

Name ofSubmitter:

KW & PW Stackhouse

This is a submission on the following proposed plan - Proposed Canterbury Land and Water Regional

I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

The specific provisions of the proposal that my submission relates to are:

Definition of stock holding area (p.2-14) and rules 5.35 to 5.36

My submission is:

I oppose the definition of stock holding area and rules 5.35 to 5.36.

My reasons are:

- Rule 5.35 makes the use of land for a stock-holding area a restricted discretionary activity. From the rule it would appear this is to deal with effluent run-off and presumably aimed at dairy feed pads, dairy sheds and other areas of a farm where effluent may collect and needs to be washed down, and the run-off collected and disposed of.
- However, the definition of stock holding area in the plan includes any holding area used to confine stock for more than 30 days in any 12 month period. This definition will apply to every ordinary set of sheep or cattle yards on every farm in the Region.
- It is normal practice for sheep farmers, except possibly on very extensive high country stations, to hold some stock in their yards at least once a week for activities such as weighing finishing stock, animal health, for transport etc.
- The yards are usually dirt-based, are not washed down, and do not result in the need to collect and dispose of effluent to avoid it entering water or groundwater.
The rule as written imposes an unnecessary cost of compliance on farmers for effects which are *de minimus* and for which there is no remedy.

Therefore, I do not agree the rules as written achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 or that the Council has fulfilled its duty under s32 to be satisfied that the rules in this form are the most appropriate method to achieve the plan's objectives.

I seek the following decision from the Council:

Amend the definition of stock holding area to:
Exclude sheep and cattle yards which do not have an impervious floor area and which are used for not more than 90 days in any 12 month period.

Any consequential amendments required to give effect to this submission.

I do wish to be heard in support of my submission.

We are prepared to make a joint case with other parties.

Signature of Submitter: K.W. Stackhouse

Date: 4-10-2012

Address for Service of Submitter:
KW Stackhouse
33 Baxters Road
Omihi
No 3 RD Amberley 7483
To: Environment Canterbury
PO Box 345
Christchurch

Name of Submitter:
KW & PW Stackhouse

This is a submission on the following proposed plan - Proposed Canterbury Land and Water Regional

I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

The specific provisions of the proposal that my submission relates to are:

Rule 5.162

My submission is:

I support the rule providing for storage of hazardous substances in portable containers as a permitted activity; however I oppose condition 1 as it relates to diesel or petrol.

My reasons are:

- Condition 1 litmus the total amount of fuel able to be stored in portable containers on farm to 2000 litres, as a permitted activity.
- This amount is insufficient for rural areas, where fuel has to be stored on site in sufficient quantities to fuel farm and private vehicles, so both petrol and diesel may need to be stored.
- As more of our local rural communities are losing petrol stations, the need to store fuel on farm is increasing.

Therefore, I do not agree the rules as written achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 or that the Council has fulfilled its duty under s32 to be satisfied that the rules in this form are the most appropriate method to achieve the plan’s objectives.
I seek the following decision from the Council:
Amend Rule 5.162 condition 1 to read 5,000 litres.

Any consequential amendments required to give effect to this submission.

I do wish to be heard in support of my submission.

We are prepared to make a joint case with other parties.

Signature of Submitter

R.W. Stackhouse

Date: 4-10-2012

Address for Service of Submitter:
KW Stackhouse
33 Baxters Road
Omihi
No 3 RD Amberley 7483