

Make Submission

Consultee	Mr Guy Martin (52179)
Email Address	guymartin@xtra.co.nz
Address	219 Carters Road R D 4 Christchurch 7674
Event Name	Proposed Variation 1 to the Proposed Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan
Submission by	Mr Guy Martin
Submission ID	V1pLWRP-99
Response Date	21/03/14 12:25 PM
Consultation Point	7. MANDATORY INFORMATION - HAVE YOUR SAY (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Letter
Version	0.2
To Be Heard	
Please select the appropriate option from the following:	I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my submission; or
If so	

Make Submission

Consultee	Mr Guy Martin (52179)
Email Address	guymartin@xtra.co.nz
Address	219 Carters Road R D 4 Christchurch 7674
Event Name	Proposed Variation 1 to the Proposed Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan
Submission by	Mr Guy Martin
Submission ID	V1pLWRP-70
Response Date	21/03/14 11:00 AM
Consultation Point	Proposed Variation 1 to the Proposed Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1

State concisely whether you support or oppose the provision being submitted on, or wish to have amendments made.

My submission is that: Oppose

Please state your reasons for supporting/opposing/amendments sought

My reason(s) for supporting, opposing or requesting amendments to this specific provision are:

As a relatively new land owner in the Te Waihora catchment (but have lived in the area for the last 7 years) and after experiencing a very wet winter last year I would like make the following comments to the proposed variation.

1. The lack of consulting. I never received the invitation to the public meeting held mid-march.
2. The lack of time to make submissions - trying to plough through all information which affects the livelihood of myself and my family.
3. The proposed variations to the discharge of drain water and the ability to maintain existing drains. Without the ability to drain our land we won't have any suitable farming land. It will be a swamp. If you want to maintain a 'viable land based economy' and 'prosperous communities' as you've outlined in your Information Sheet of February 2014, we as land owners and councils need to have a common sense approach to managing the Te Waihora lake level.
4. The lack of good information around phosphate and nitrogen leaching. Phosphate leaching is very negligible in most NZ soils. However, fast available phosphorous should be avoided in some well drained soils. To stop or reduce the amount of phosphate put on to the land, especially slow-acting ones like

RPR, would severely limit the amount of nitrogen clover can fix in the soils. As phosphate is the limiting nutrient in the soil that stops nitrogen fixing naturally. To quote Tim Jenkins of the Biological Husbandry Unit at Lincoln University "Provide sufficient phosphorous and the legumes will often fix a lot more nitrogen to push the whole system along." Which brings me to my next point...

5. We need to severely limit the use of Urea and other artificial nitrogen applications to one application per year per farm. Many farmers are under the illusion that urea grows more grass while it doesn't. The excess nitrogen strips away a lot of the soil structure before ending up in our ground water. It is not needed in our farming system. I have been farming in this area for 6 years and have a zero nitrogen policy. Which in turn reduces my carbon footprint and I don't want to be lumped in with heavy users of urea for contaminating our ground water and wrecking our precious soils. A nitrogen use directory or system needs to be formed and those not using it can get some sort of rate rebate or benefit and those using it can be taxed heavily like cigarettes and alcohol as it is poison for our soils. It is a well known fact, additional use of nitrogen is unnecessary for pasture growth. For crop establishment, some strategic use of nitrogen is acceptable (15- 30kgs of nitrogen per ha per year). I would be very interested in discussing this further.

Please give precise details for each provision. The more specific you can be the easier it will be for the Council to understand the outcome you are seeking.

I seek the following decisions from Environment Canterbury:

I hope enough time has been allocated to make informed and sound decisions.

I hope common sense prevails with the decision on the level of lake Te Waihora.

Not all farmers use fertiliser the same. And there is a vast difference between good and bad fertiliser. Land using fertiliser properly won't leach any phosphorous or nitrogen into waterways. As in the case of the Berryman property near Rotorua, it has been known to take nitrates out of waterways running through their farm. I would like to see a system which penalises the overuse of the wrong phosphate and artificial nitrogen rather than all farmers being under the same banner.