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: 
Phone (Hm): 
Phone (Wk): 
Phone (Cell): 0212726300
Fax: 
Postal Address: 694 Waterholes Rd 1208
Email: xtraphresh@xtra.co.nz
Contact name and postal address for service of person making submission (If different from above):

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:

- adversely affects the environment; and
- 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: M. 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.
<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>Page 169 Schedule 7</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>Overuse is a system that was not designed for this purpose and it has many flaws to be seen as gospel for such an important measurement tool.</td>
<td>Ecan can not take the information from overuse as a solid stance basis and other factors must be taken into consideration when consents are being processed on the subject of nutrient leaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 85 5:107 5th et al</td>
<td>Oppose fully</td>
<td>We supported Ecan when pressure came on from certain corporate farmers to not allocate any more water in a red zone where the Environment Court overturned. We have invested in water consents and the over allocation (red zoned) of areas was an arbitrary figure in the beginning and has little sense. To prove the area is over allocated anyway I don't believe we should not be penalized for any more water being allocated. People who invested in consents and traded water within zone, to take a portion of this for no good reason should be against the law and the people who were doing the right thing for the catchment will now be penalized to try to fix at all when traded. An issue that was raised by others, including our council.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>