

## Submission on Proposed Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan

### FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

EC - CHCH	
FILE REF:	
DOCUMENT No.	
- 8 OCT 2012	
117186	
Submitter ID: 0377	
File No: PLAN/LWRP/DRFT/6SU/2	
EC 143804 - EC 118178	

**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: Mr + Mrs MA + KE Williams + JC De la Raba Phone (Hm): \_\_\_\_\_  
 Organisation\*: Fern Grove Trust Phone (Wk): 03 3445524  
\* the organisation that this submission is made on behalf of  
 Postal Address: 694 Waterholes Rd Phone (Cell): 021 2266300  
RDB Christchurch Postcode: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Email: ferngrovetrust@gmail.com Fax: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Contact name and postal address for service of person making submission (if different from above):  
Mark + Kelsey Williams

### 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: MA Williams Date: 4/10/12

(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:		(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.)
Section & Page Number	Sub-section/ Point	Oppose/support (in part or full)	Reasons	
Page 169	Schedule 7	Oppose	OVERSEER is a system that was not designed for this purpose and it has many flaws <del>to</del> to be seen as gospel for such an important measurement tool.	Ecan can not take the information from OVERSEER on a stand alone basis and other factors must be taken into consideration when consents are being processed on the subject of nutrient leaching.
Page 85	5.107 5b, c+d	Oppose fully	We supported Ecan when pressure came on from certain corporate farmers to not allocate any more water in a red zone which the Environment Court overturned. We have invested in water consents & traded water within zone. To take a portion of this for no good reason should be against the law as the people who were doing the right thing for the catchment will now be penalised to try a fix an issue that was caused by others, including our own courts.	The over allocation (red zoning) of areas was an arbitrary figure in the beginning and has little science to prove the area is over allocated anyway. I don't believe any more water should be allocated but people who invested in consents should not be penalized for deeds of stupidity by people in the past. There should be no surrender of portions of consents at all when traded.

Add further pages as required – please initial any additional pages.

Freeport 1201 PCLWPP  
Ecan  
P.O. Box 345  
Christchurch 8140

>>> >>> >>> >>> >>> >>> >>> >>> >>> >>>  
 >>> NEW ZEALAND POST >>>  
 04.OCT.12 910-19 191236

60 - CHQM	
FILE REF:	
DOCUMENT No.	
- 8 OCT 2012	ACTION
	INFO