



RECEPTION EC - CHCH			
FILE REF:	PLAN / WTAK / IP / 650	2	
DOCUMENT No:			
	11 MAR 2016	ACTION	INFO
	Ken Kirkwood		
	Brett Aldridge		
Submitter ID:			
File No:			

  

RECEPTION EC - CHCH			
FILE REF:			
DOCUMENT No:			
	11 MAR 2016	ACTION	INFO

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

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

☒ 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

## Submission on Proposed Plan Change 5 to the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		RECEPTION EC - CHCH	
FILE REF:		ACTION	INFO
DOCUMENT No:			
11 MAR 2016 Ken Kirkwood			
Submitter ID:			
File No:			

  

RECEPTION EC - CHCH		ACTION		INFO	
FILE REF:		ACTION	INFO		
DOCUMENT No:					
11 MAR 2016					

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: Kim Brian Neal Phone (Hm): 03 3290955  
 Organisation\*: \_\_\_\_\_ Phone (Wk): \_\_\_\_\_  
 \* the organisation that this submission is made on behalf of  
 Postal Address: 663 Kaituna Valley Phone (Cell): \_\_\_\_\_  
RD 2 Christchurch Postcode: 7672  
 Email: neal663@hotmail.co.nz 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:

- ☒ 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: KB Neal Date: 10.3.2016

(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

How is it to be decided how much fertiliser a farm can put on. It is unfair to have it on a percentage of what fertiliser a farmer has applied in the past. Some people have chosen to farm environmentally for years with little fertilizer use, when others have put as much as they can on. A percentage system would be rewarding

the worst offending farmers and penalising the more environmental ones.

Is the "overseer" fertiliser system really that reliable.

There have been a number of cases where it has shown very variable and different results than what was expected. Sometimes it is being used in circumstances it was not designed for. Should so much be based on this system.

E. Can's map showing unacceptable water quality in the Kaituna Valley Catchment on Banks Peninsula seems contradicting when an E. Can representative went to Wellington to receive an award on behalf of the Kaituna River because of its good water quality. If people are going to be forced to spend thousands of dollars on fencing rivers, planting and new stock water systems shouldn't there be some honest reliable scientific proof that what people are being forced to do in already good catchment water quality areas is really going to make a difference to the over all water quality in Te Waihora. Maybe the water quality in parts of this river is good because a lot of farmers have chosen low input systems already over the years.

If farmers are required to have a farm environment plan because of perceived poor water quality in rural areas shouldn't urban people have environment plans to stop pollutants from their businesses and life styles in the city where some of New Zealand's most polluted water ways are. Every time it rains in Christchurch how much vehicle exhaust emissions and pollutants from

business yards and other work site premmises end up in the storm water which leads into the Avon, Heathcote and other rivers around these built up areas.  
It is <sup>not</sup> just farmers that are down grading water quality.

The whole water quality issue is losing crediability when the Gduvernment announces that the acceptable level for waterways could be waderable and boating, no longer swimming.

What sort of message does that send to people when E. Can is now run by Government approved people.

RECEPTION		
EC - CHCH		
FILE REF:		
DOCUMENT No:	ACTION	INFO
11 MAR 2016		