

From: [Adrienne Stackhouse](#)
To: [Mailroom Mailbox](#)
Subject: Re Proposed changes to the CLWRP
Date: Thursday, 10 March 2016 7:23:16 a.m.
Attachments: [Re Proposed changes to the CLWRP.docx](#)
[Submission on Proposed Plan Change 5 to CLWRR- page 2.pdf](#)
[Submission on Proposed Plan Change 5 to CLWRR- page 1.pdf](#)
[Canterbury LWRR Map B037.pdf](#)

Dear folks

A submission on the proposed changes to the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan.



Submission on Proposed Plan Change 5 to the 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 11 March 2016 to:

Freepost 1201 Plan Change 5 to LWRP
Environment Canterbury
P O Box 345
Christchurch 8140

KEITH WILLIAM STACKHOUSE
 Full Name: PAUL WILLIAM STACKHOUSE Phone (Hm): 03 3145851
 and
 Organisation*: STACKHOUSE FARM Phone (Wk): _____
 * the organisation that this submission is made on behalf of
 Postal Address: 33 BAXTERS ROAD OMARE Phone (Cell): 0274 358139
NO 3 R.D AMBERLEY Postcode: 7483
 Email: JESSICA and paul @ ktrq.co.nz Fax: _____
 Contact name and postal address for service of person making submission (if different from above):
KEITH WILLIAM STACKHOUSE

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: K.W. Stackhouse Date: 9-3-16

(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	
			See accompanying notes	
Section 5				
Region Wide Rules				
Rule 5.44A				
5.54A				
5.57B				
Section 7				
Maps				

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

Re Proposed changes to the C.L.W.R.P.

On behalf of KW & PW Stackhouse and STACKHOUSE FARM LTD, I would like to make the following submissions.

Our family farm has been owned by the family for over 100 years and we are generally supportive of the good management practise and water quality outcome that ECan is advocating.

The proposed changes while making the rules simpler for the larger schemes and a large majority of land owners heap extra costs on the smaller schemes and individual land owners.

We believe all landowners should be subject to the same rules regarding overseer N.D.A - FEP water quality and good management practise.

In an attempt to simplify the rule thresholds those of us in the Waipara red zone will be held considerable extra costs to comply.

We are part of the Glenmark Irrigation Scheme development. When the government wanted out of irrigation we were one of 10 farms in the scheme that took over the partly completed work on the development.

This scheme involved on farm storage of water into dams built on farm, these are filled from winter - spring flows of streams in the district. Four different streams are used to fill the 10 completed dams.

As individual farms who are not members of an irrigation scheme would be required to do yearly overseer F.E.P - NDA and G.M.P plans to continue to use irrigation even though the family started irrigating in 1957 and have been using the present storage scheme for over 30 years. We have been quoted a cost of \$3000 per year to provide the paperwork to meet ECan rules.

Vineyards over 1ha to be included in the G.M.P and W.Q.O regulations. The grape growers are high users of water when applying water for frost protection. I understand any vineyard exporting wine under their own label already have to do this under the NZ grape growers protocols.

Section 5 region wide rules

Rules	5.44 A	red zone
	5.54 A	orange zone
	5.57 B	blue green zone

be amended to include a threshold of:

100 ha	winter grazing
100 ha	irrigation

Section 7 Planning Maps

Map B037

That the High Runoff risk phosphorus zone be deleted in the limestone creek area. Someone has drawn these lines on this map. Stackhouse family and the directors **have not** been consulted about this area.

As a family farm we cannot afford to apply more nutrients that the plants or crops can use and careful application will make the risk of runoff minimal. Also much of the Limestone creek runoff risk area is planted in forestry. Require the High runoff risk area on Map B037 Limestone creek area be deleted. See enclosed map with area to be deleted, marked.

Water Quality

While this plan deals mainly with nutrient discharge how much is the water quality in the Waipara river catchment is effected by low flow or lack of flow in the streams.

When I came home from school in the 1950's almost all farms in the Weka - Home - Spurleton and Omihi streams had dairy cows that were milked to supply homes with milk and butter etc. the cream truck called three times a week to collect the cream. Nowadays I am not aware of any dairy cow operations on these catchment so dairying cannot be blamed for the continuing drop in water quality.

Three kilometres of the Omihi Stream that flows through our property used to have shingle / sand beds and supported fish i.e. flounder, whitebait, perch - eel bullies etc. it flowed almost all year round. Today it flows intermitely depending on rainfall.

I believe the cause of this is an explosion in the growth of willow trees. The used to be less than 200 willows tree in the 3km of stream through our property and we, our neighbours and others in the community used the stream for swimming, fishing etc. to day there are in excess of 2000 willow trees in the same length of stream.

Willow trees are capable of transpiring up to 5000 litres of water per tree per day so the stream in our property can move over 10 million litres per day. This has had a dramatic effect on the stream flow. Willow tree roots now completely cover the stream bed and in some areas have grown and spread so much that the stream has moved course. The willows can move 10 million plus litres per day while our 10 span centre pivot irrigation only uses 3.5 million litres per day.

When ECan took over water control in the Waipara River catchment from the N.C.C.B. they were very P.C. and sent all landowners a letter advising that growing willow trees were special taonga and landowners were not to touch the willows. Just to make their point they took two landowners to court for cutting down their willow trees. In contrast N.C.C.B. had a policy of assisting landowners to keep streams clean and clear.

We could be happy to work with ECan to help control the spread of willows as long as we don't end up in court for doing so.

There is a need to develop a use for willows as there are a lot growing in New Zealand. May be some of Ngai Tahu bright young people should be doing this as part of their present fresh water management policy.

Replace Map Sheet B-037 in the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan - Canterbury Map Series - with the following Map Sheet:

Map B-037

