

## Janel Hau

---

**From:** Whitefield Dairies LTD <moosrwe@farmside.co.nz>  
**Sent:** Friday, 21 March 2014 3:52 p.m.  
**To:** Mailroom Mailbox  
**Subject:** TRIM: Submission for the LWRP  
**Attachments:** LWRP submission 1.pdf; LWRP submission 2.pdf; LWRP submission 3.pdf

**Categories:** Purple Category  
**HP TRIM Record Number:** C14C/43859

Any issues please ring 027 256 3443

Regards

Vaughan Beazer



## 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:

Vaughan Beazer

Phone (Hm): 03 3255096

Organisation\*:

Whitefield Farms Ltd - North Canterbury

Phone (Wk): 03 3255096

\* the organisation that this submission is made on behalf of

Redempted farmland 027 256 3443

Postal Address:

475 River Rd, Rd2, Greenpark

Phone (Cell): 027 256 3443

Lincoln, Christchurch 7672

Postcode: 7672

Email:

moo srwe@farmside.co.nz

Fax: 03255 096

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

Vaughan Beazer

### 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:

[Signature]

Date:

20/3/14

(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	
11.4.6 - 11.4.17		Oppose in Part	<p>The definition of the nitrogen baseline is too restrictive to those farms/farmers going through a development phase, and will be too restrictive when combating the effects of drought/flood or other extreme event, that would require abnormally large volumes of additional feed, to be brought onto the farm.</p> <p>Another example is my farm last year, where we took advantage of a bad payout year (2013) and did extra development or regrassing on farm. We dropped 10% of the herd post Christmas and then managed to regrow 15% of the property post Christmas. This has the effect of artificially reducing our baseline (2009-2013) when we would normally have been fully stocked.</p>	<p>I believe this can be overcome by allowing the rolling average baseline to be based on the best 4 years rolling out of the last 5. That would allow a farmer to remove/withdraw the artificially high or low years, as these extremes season already have an effect on the following season's production and finances, without being magnified by the overloading of the nitrogen baseline in a short period, that will impact on the following 4 years, in a way that could make that farming operation impractical or financially impossible.</p>

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



