

From: [ECInfo](#)
To: [Mailroom Mailbox](#)
Subject: FW: Long-Term Plan submission form [#37] EMAIL:02922248
Date: Monday, 23 March 2015 2:34:41 p.m.
Importance: Low

----- Original Message -----

From: no-reply@wufoo.com
Received: 23/03/2015 2:21 p.m.
To: ECInfo; Environment Canterbury; Services Customer; Services Customer; Webmaster@ecan.govt.nz
Subject: Long-Term Plan submission form [#37]

Your name * Leslie Forrester

Address *

Postcode

Contact phone number *

Mobile number

Email

Date Monday 23 March 2015

Contact details • I do not wish my contact details to be made public

Your submission

E Can or ratepayers should not be required to provide any funding at all for the fencing of waterways through private land where privately owned stock is grazing and whose effluent has any adverse effect on the water downstream.

Landowners and or farmers who have stock which can have an effect on waterways should be compelled to fence those waterways.

Any waterways that require stock crossing areas on private land should be bridged and any effluent contained so as to eliminate any downstream pollution.

This also should be totally at the landowners expense.

I make this submission only for the reason that other ratepayers should not have to foot the cost of providing fencing for the protection of waterways to keep stock effluent from polluting them through private land.

Landowners are compelled to fence their land to avoid stock wandering onto public roads or highways.

I see public roads and waterways as similar things and I am sure E Can does not contribute to private landowners fencing needs where containing stock is the objective.

What do you want Environment Canterbury to do?

By laws should be instigated immediately by the commissioners while they still have the ability to initiate serious action.

E Can should adopt a zero tolerance policy on this issue.

A deadline of 31 December 2015 should be initiated and landowners advised that stock effluent in waterways will not be tolerated.

Fencing should be completed by the deadline or penalties should follow.
I suggest \$20,000 instant fine. Followed by a \$50,000 fine if demands are ignored.
This action will oblige farmers and landowners to make water quality their responsibility while that water passes through their land.
As a concession or a trade off landowners may possibly be allowed greater take-off where waterways are supplied from a spring.
