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

Form 6: Further Submissions in support of, or in opposition to, submission on a Publicly Notified Proposed Policy Statement or Regional Plan under Clause 8 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Return your signed further submission by 5.00pm Monday 9 June 2014 to:
Freepost 1201 Variation 1 to the Proposed Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan
Environment Canterbury
P O Box 345
Christchurch 8140

Full Name: Chrisna Patricia Donald
Organisation*: Lake Ellesmere Dairy Farmer Group
Postal Address: C 123 Lower Lake Road R D S Lakeside
Email: Overthetreeto5@xero.co.nz

Phone (Hm): 03 3243400
Phone (Wk):
Phone (Cell): 0273123807
Postcode: 7683
Fax:

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

Only certain people can make further submissions. Please tick the option that applies to you:
☐ I am a person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest; or
☒ I am a person who has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest the general public has (for example, I am affected by the content of a submission); or
☐ I am the local authority for the relevant area.

☐ I do not wish to be heard in support of my further submission; or
☒ I do wish to be heard in support of my further submission; and if so,
☐ I would be prepared to consider presenting your further submission in a joint case with others making a similar submission at any hearing

Service of your further submission:
Please note: any person making a further submission must serve a copy of that submission on the original submitter no later than five working days after the submission has been provided to Environment Canterbury. If you have made a further submission on a number of original submissions, then copies of your further submission will need to be served with each original submitter.

Signature: [Signature]
Date: 6/6/14

(Please note: (1) all information contained in a submission under the Resource Management Act 1991, including names and addresses for service, becomes public information.)
1. We support the submissions of the following:

Ellesmere Irrigation Society Inc (submission C14C/42483-02)
C/- C M Barnett, Lakeside, RD 3, Leeston 7683.

Fonterra (submission C14C/44182-02)
C/- Sue Rushton, Environmental Policy Manager, P.O. Box 417, Wellington 6140.

Dairy NZ (submission C14C/43910-02)
C/- James Ryan, Regional Policy Manager, P.O. Box 85066, Lincoln University, 7647.

North Canterbury Province of Federated Farmers (C14C/43755-02)
C/- Michael Bennett, Regional Policy Advisor, P.O. Box 20448, Bishopdale, Christchurch 8543.

2. The particular parts of the submission we support are: All submission points of these submitters.
3. The reasons for my support are that the submissions made by these submitters will provide for the desired outcomes for the physical, social and economic environment in an appropriate timeframe and suitable level and type of regulation.

By identifying the area of the Cultural Landscape/Values Management Area it has a significant impact on land values and farming practices which will have a detrimental effect on our futures. We are all long term land owners in this area (some of us have farmed here for up to five generations) and we are being unfairly disadvantaged by all the development inland. Living on the lake edge we live, work, play, socialise, fish, hunt and raise our children and grandchildren around this Lake. We are closer to it than anyone else putting in submissions and as such are more affected by its health than anyone. We are the first to agree with the aims of the Variation, but it must be achievable without dire consequences to our farming viability.

In general our opposition to the Variation relates to the following:

a) Four year average for nitrate leeching is unfair to farmers caught in the development stage and anyone with a low nitrate leeching level will get penalised (We would like to see the level set at 20 rather than 15).
b) It is not practical for farmers in the “Cultural Landscape/Values Management Area” to require consents for all drains.
c) Compliance costs of meeting all these extra conditions including extra fencing requirements, consents, plantings, maintaining plantings, weed control, environmental plans, possible destocking and loss of land will all affect our financial viability.
d) Unreasonable timelines and expectations.
e) Lack of time for adequate and accurate research on submissions.
f) Effects of people up-stream with regard to the condition and management of drains and waterways over which we have no control.
g) Some submissions are vague and not specific.
h) Overseer – not accurate and unproven – only a guide. Not adequate for monitoring P loss accurately.

This Further Submission is filed on behalf of the Lake Ellesmere Dairy Farmers Group who have previously filed a submission under C14C/44493.