From:Jackie MowattTo:Mailroom MailboxSubject:Plan Change 7 to the LWRP SubmissionDate:Tuesday, 10 September 2019 2:25:29 PM



P: 0800 163 013 F: 03 693 8015 E: office@downlandsdeer.co.nz

	FOR OFFICE USE ONLY
Regional Council Kaunihera Taiao ki Waitaha	
Submission on Proposed Plan	
Change 7 to the Canterbury	Submitter ID:
and and Water Regional Plan	File No:

Return your signed submission by 5.00pm Friday 13 September 2019 to: Proposed Plan Change 7 to the Land and Water Regional Plan

Environment Canterbury P O Box 345 Christchurch 8140

Full Name:	Kristin Worner Orange	Phone (Hm): Phone (Wk):
	KW & CJ Orange Partnership	Phone (Wk):
* the organisation that the	his submission is made on behalf of	021322622
Postal Address:	8 Woodside Road, Geraldine	Phone (Cell): 021322622 Postcode: 7991
		Postcode: 7991
Email:	kris@downlandsdeer.co.nz	Fax:
Contact name and	l postal address for service of person making	submission (if different from above):
Trade Competition	1	
competition through policy statement or a) adversely a	ule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991, a in the submission may make a submission only plan that: iffects the environment; and late to trade competition or the effects of trade co	if directly affected by an effect of the proposed
Please tick the ser	ntence that applies to you:	
I <u>could</u> gain an If you have tie	n an advantage in trade competition through this advantage in trade competition through this sub cked this box please select one of the following m directly affected by an effect of the subject ma m not directly affected by an effect of the subject	mission. ng: atter of the submission
Signature:	Mary MI	Date: 10/9/19
	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, includin	g names and addresses for service, becomes public information.
I do wish to	h to be heard in support of my submission; or be heard in support of my submission; and if so, prepared to consider presenting my submission in	

I would be prepared to consider presenting my 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
Section & Page Number	Sub-section/ Point	Oppose/support (in part or full)	Reasons	specific you can be the easier it will be for the Council to understand your concerns.)
			Livestock Exclusion from Waterbodies	
Section 14 page134	14.4. 15	Oppose	Stock exclusion from all waterbodies including man made drains is far too broad. Stock exclusion must be linked to stocking rate i.e. intensity. Properties with bigb intensity of	A better and more cost effective way is to differentiate low intensity and high intensity farms instead of the broad brush approach of all farms
	A LA		stock, (e.g 15-20 Stock units per hectare, SU/Ha)I would agree stock exclusion is warranted, however where stock	are the same. I can assure you they are not.
			intensity is low (e.g. under 8 Stock units per hectare) stock exclusion is not warranted. Excluding all deer and cattle from waterbodies would add massive cost, making	This policy is in affect going to reduce deer and cattle farming in the high country -low intensity farms in the OTOP zone.
****			these low insensity property's simply unviable to farm. Fencing deer out of every waterbody at \$25 per metre will add extra cost for no benefit. Not only fencing costs but also water reticulation would need to be factored in with	Using individual Farm Environmental Plans which identify watercodies and risks associated with them could be easily used along with water sampling and
			many kilometres of pipe and troughs needed to keep otook alive.	monitoring. Cost would be kept to a manageble level where farmers can get on with producing high
			This policy takes no account of different land classes and the intensity of stock farmed.	quality beef and venison from these low input low intensity farms.
			This also goes against the Ministry for the Environment - Draft Stock Exclusion Section 360, where stocking rates	
			are used to differentiate. Sensible .	
	0-			
-				

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

ssion is th her you su ed and the	at: Ipport or oppose the specific provisions or wish to have reasons for your views.)	(3) I seek the following decisions from Environment Canterbury:(Please give precise details for each provision. The more	
ort)	Reasons	specific you can be the easier it will be for the Council to understand your concerns.)	
	High Runoff Risk Phosphorus Zones	In the essence of fairness it would be	
	High Hunon Hisk Phosphorus Zones	sensible to limit winter grazing by a certain	
	Our objection is we question the need for a consent	percentage of the farm. Say 15% of the	
	for over 20 hectares of winter grazing for cattle and	particular farm.	
	deer. This favours small landholders disproportianly. It makes no logical sense to favour small landowners	The need for a consent is just another Road block to efficiency	
	like this and impede on larger landholders who would	anomer hoad block to emeciency.	
	generally have more stock to winter, thus needing	The use of Farm environment Plans to help	
	more winter feed.	target the best areas.	
3			
	•		
		· · · ·	
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

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