

From: [Dana Johnston](#)
To: [Mailroom Mailbox; baj1978@live.com](#)
Subject: Submission to Oppose Plan Change 5
Date: Thursday, 10 March 2016 11:12:07 p.m.
Attachments: [004_PC5_Submission_Form-signed.pdf](#)

Kind regards - Dana & Brad Johnston



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

Full Name: Brad & Dana Johnston	Phone (Hm): (03) 426 4274
Organisation*: _____ <small>* the organisation that this submission is made on behalf of</small>	Phone (Wk): _____
Postal Address: 638 Hakataramea Valley Road RD 1 Kurow	Phone (Cell): 021 151 7947
Email: dana_johnston@live.com	Postcode: 9498
Fax: _____	
Contact name and postal address for service of person making submission (if different from above): _____ _____	
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:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission; or	
<input type="checkbox"/> I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.	
If you have ticked this box please select one of the following:	
<input type="checkbox"/> I am directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission	
<input type="checkbox"/> I am not directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission	
Signature: <i>D Johnston</i>	Date: 10 / 3 / 2016
<small>(Signature of person making submission or person authorised to sign on behalf of person making the submission)</small>	
<small>Please note: (1) all information contained in a submission under the Resource Management Act 1991, including names and addresses for service, becomes public information.</small>	

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission; or
<input type="checkbox"/>	I do wish to be heard in support of my submission; and if so,
<input type="checkbox"/>	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: <i>(include whether you support or oppose the specific provisions or wish to have them amended and the reasons for your views.)</i>		(3) I seek the following decisions from Environment Canterbury: <i>(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.)</i>
Section & Page Number	Sub-section/ Point	Oppose/support (in part or full)	Reasons	
5.44A	1	Oppose	The Portal at this stage is only a test page. If the Plan change does not go ahead, it appears to be a time consuming Data Collection Exercise.	intensively farming. More irrigation, more fertiliser and more stock units per ha. We also feel the costs involved a huge. Financially will need to employ someone to complete overseer. The process will also cost us greatly in time and resources. The resources already absorbed by Ecan are impressive. The notification mail out. They employees. How they research, the printing costs, the travel costs, the delivery costs. The online version, the carbon footprint of the internet, the co2 emmissions, the power generated to distribute all the information. The list goes on. We are environmentally minded people. We aren't opposed to having good environmental practices on our farm, but we are opposed to they way in which this data is being collected. If and when we need to go through a consent process. The financial and emotional strain this will cause us, all because the large intensive farmers have ruined it for us small people.
5.44A	2	Oppose	We dont even have 50ha to irrigate even if we wanted.	
5.44A	3	Oppose	As per 5.44A.2	
5.44A	4	Oppose	We dont have 20ha to winter graze even if we wanted.	
5.44A	5	Oppose	Record keeping and having a plan for a farm of any scale is a smart idea. However we feel for the size of our lifestyle block (17ha), and our style of farming would be extremely low impact compared to the effects Ecan is predicting on a general scale. Each farm should be assessed individually not fall under blanket rule. Plan change 5 is so large and confusing to the average farmer. Especially to those on a small scale. Who is to say someone with a property smaller than 10ha isnt more	

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