

From: [Kirsty Elliott](#)
To: [Mailroom Mailbox](#)
Subject: Submission on Plan Change 5 to LWRP
Date: Friday, 11 March 2016 2:21:26 p.m.
Attachments: [SC364e_C36416031114230.pdf](#)

Hi,

Received the attached submission in the Amberley office. I have also posted the hard copy.

Kind Regards

Kirsty Elliott
Biosecurity Support Officer
Business Support and Customer Services
027 703 4038
03 314 8014



FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

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

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: <u>Sty & Jen MOIR</u>	Phone (Hm): <u>03 3149665</u>
Organisation*: <u>MOIR FARMS MAIWA LTD</u> <small>* the organisation that this submission is made on behalf of</small>	Phone (Wk): <u>03 3149665</u>
Postal Address: <u>605 Double Corner Rd</u> <u>Amberley</u>	Phone (Cell): <u>0274428865</u>
Email: <u>sjmoir@farmside.co.nz</u>	Postcode: <u>7481</u>
Contact name and postal address for service of person making submission (if different from above): <u>Jen Moir</u>	
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 checked="" 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: <u>[Signature]</u>	Date: <u>9-3-16</u>
<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

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	
		OPPOSE	<p>More than 20ha winter grazing.</p> <p>We oppose this as it doesn't distinguish between large farms and small farms. If this policy goes through, then maybe it should be based on a percentage of a farm can have winter crops grazed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The time frame for basically most farmers in the affected areas to get a resource consent processed if they need more than 20ha of winter feed. - Econs ability to be able to audit this activity with staff levels remaining the same. Also the time frame for the consents to be approved. - Why should large landowners be penalised for and treated the same as small farms. - That all land owned by a farmer can be included in an accumulated number of hectares. This is only going to encourage farmers to sell 	

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	
			<p>block off to create entity within their farming business</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The cost to get a consent to farmers and the ongoing consent annual fees. It was quoted as \$1750 (at the meeting in Amberley) as the consent fee but most farms would also need to employ a Consultant to help get the consent process. 	
		OPPOSE	<p><u>MORE THAN 50 ha</u> litigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Again Ecan is penalising the large farms. - It should be based on a percentage of a farm size. - It should be on individual blocks of land, not based on the accumulative area of the land holders. - Do you plan to decrease 	

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

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	
			<p>the size of all ready irrigation land? OR will</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - this be altered on the renewal dates - the cost to the farmers as it will reduce the land values. 	
		oppose	<p><u>The PORTAL INFORMATION</u></p> <p>Will the information loaded into the portal be held & used against the farmers consents which are required at a later date.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Once entered can the portal information be changed 	
			<p>We continually struggle with the continuous talk of high phosphorus in the Waipera River catchment. We have photos of the Waipera river in 1955 with a good river flow</p>	

