

Tamina Roberts

From: 033182735 <"033182735"@faxmaker.com>
Sent: Friday, 21 March 2014 5:26 p.m.
To: GFIFaxmaker
Subject: TRIM: Fax received from 033182735
Attachments: 20140321_172517_00012.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: Purple Category
HP TRIM Record Number: C14C/43813

INCOMING FAX REPORT

Status: Received
Date/Time: 21/03/2014 5:25:21 p.m.
Speed: 9600 bps
Connection time: 02:39
Pages: 3
Resolution: Normal
Remote ID: 033182735
Line number: 1
DTMF/DID:
Description: Fax received from 033182735 Incoming Faxes: Attached

THIS WAS EMAILED BUT IN CASE IT HAS NOT SCANNED CLEARLY ENOUGH I AM FOLLOWING UP WITH A FAX.



Submission on Proposed Variation 1 to the Proposed Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

Submitter ID:
File No:

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 21 March 2014 to:

Freepost 1201 Variation 1 to pLWRP
Environment Canterbury
P O Box 345
Christchurch 8140

Full Name: Helen Frances McARTHUR Phone (Hm): 03 318 2615
Organisation*: McARTHUR FARMING Co LTD. Phone (Wk): as above
* the organisation that this submission is made on behalf of
Postal Address: 550 WHITECLIFFS RD Phone (Cell): 021 212 6691
RD 1 COALBATE Postcode: 7673
Email: steventon@extra.co.nz Fax: 03 318 2735

Contact name and postal address for service of person making submission (if different from above):

Trade Competition

Pursuant to 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
- I am not directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission

Signature: [Handwritten Signature] Date: 21 March 2014

(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,
 I would be prepared to consider presenting your submission in a joint case with others making a similar submission at any 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 | |
| Stock Exclusion page 5-37 → 5-38 | section 3 clause(a) | amend. | My reasons for making these changes are as follows: To completely exclude as control all ages of cattle (& sheep) from having access to waterways would require fencing on both sides of the waterway. To achieve this on hill country would be extremely difficult, expensive & damaging damage a much greater area than just the waterway which was supposed to be being protected. To gain access & put in a fence would require tracks being cut for equipment to get to the waterway & then alongside it on both banks. The damage to steep hillsides which are already liable to | 5.68. 3(a) amend to ... does not result in conspicuous pugging or devegetation that exposes clearly visible bare earth in the bed |
| Regional Rule 5.68 | clause(b) | support. | | 5.68. 3 (b) I support this clause. |
| | clause(c) | oppose | | 5.68. 3 (c) this clause should be deleted. |

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

if null.

| (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 | |
| | | | ...continued. | |
| | | | slippage would be considerable & not only leave vulnerable soils exposed to extensive erosion, but the soil washing off the exposed area would end up in the waterway causing on going deterioration of the water clarity. The exposed ground would also become a seed bed for noxious weeds such as broom & gorse to become established. The cost of this fencing would be completely unaffordable on sheep & beef hill country under current market conditions. There is also the added cost of replacing the natural water source with pipes & troughs etc & the associated damage installing them. | |

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

td msh.