

Janel Hau

From: 033182628 <"033182628"@faxmaker.com>
Sent: Friday, 21 March 2014 4:58 p.m.
To: GFIFaxmaker
Subject: Fax received from 033182628
Attachments: 20140321_165818_00006.pdf

Categories: Purple Category

INCOMING FAX REPORT

Status: Received
Date/Time: 21/03/2014 4:58:20 p.m.
Speed: 14400 bps
Connection time: 00:39
Pages: 1
Resolution: Normal
Remote ID: 033182628
Line number: 1
DTMF/DID:
Description: Fax received from 033182628 Incoming Faxes: Attached

Submission to Ecan on Stock Exclusion from Waterways, requesting an amendment to Environment Canterbury Regional Rule 5.68 of the Land and Water Regional Plan, via Proposed Variation 1 to the Plan. This submission is relating to paragraph 11.5.18 of Variation 1

**Submitter: Heather Elaine Clouston of 550 Whitecliffs Rd, RD 1, Coalgate
Email heclouston@xtra.co.nz Phone: (03) 3182608**

My submission is in OPPOSITION to this provision

My reasons for opposing this specific provision are:

- In the hill and high country natural streams are most often the only form of water available for stock.
- Cattle are necessary to maintain pasture quality for sheep grazing; if cattle are excluded land becomes untenable for sheep to graze also.
- Sheep would have to also be excluded from waterways as cattle-proof fences for adult cows would still enable calves to have access as well as sheep.
- Exclusion of cattle from natural waterways on hill country would require double fencing along the total stream length.
- Large areas of land would not be able to be grazed at all as fencing is not physically possible close to stream beds due to rough terrain and thick vegetation.
- In situations where it would be possible to erect fencing, substantial fence lines would need to be created using heavy machinery, to enable the ongoing maintenance of the fence in a stock-proof manner, and causing large potential erosion areas and weed seedbeds.
- The cost of fencing at an average \$15-17 per metre would result in unviable properties. For example our property of 865ha is comprised of 86% hill all of which is serviced by natural waterways of about 12km in total length. To be double fenced would cost \$408000.00 and involve hundreds of hectares of land to avoid unfencable terrain. A complete stock water system would also be required costing at least another \$100000.00, and impossible in some areas to physically achieve.

I seek the following decisions from Environment Canterbury:

1. Amend Environment Canterbury LWRP Regional Rule 5.68.3 Clause a) to read as follows: CONSPICUOUS pugging or de-vegetation that exposes CLEARLY VISIBLE bare earth in the bed of a lake or river
2. Retain Environment Canterbury LWRP Regional Rule 5.68.3 Clause b)
3. Delete Environment Canterbury LWRP Regional Rule 5.68.3 Clause c)

I do not wish to be heard on this Submission

Heather Clouston

21 March 2014