From: Sven & Glenys Koops/kerr

To: Mailroom Mailbox

Subject:Plan Change 7 to the LWRP SubmissionDate:Friday, 13 September 2019 2:05:13 PM



## Submission on Proposed Plan Change 7 to the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan

submission at any hearing

| FOR OFFICE USE ONLY |
|---------------------|
|                     |
|                     |
|                     |
|                     |
| Submitter ID:       |
| File No:            |

Form 5: Submissions on a Publicly Notified Proposed Policy Statement or Regional Plan under Clause 5 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

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: Sven Koops Organisation*: Neil Kerr Ltd  * the organisation that this submission is made on behalf of Postal Address: 83 Tulls Road, RD 3 Rangiora  | Phone (Hm): 03-3127029 Phone (Wk): 03-3127029 Phone (Cell): 021-332610 Postcode: 7473 |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| Email: koops.kerr@gmail.com  | Fax:  |  |  |  |  |
| Contact name and postal address for service of person making submission (if different from above):  Sven Koops, as 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: Date: 13 September 2019   |   |  |  |  |  |
| (Signature of person making submission of 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 my submission in a joint case with others making a similar  |   |  |  |  |  |

| (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 &<br>Page Number   | Sub-section/<br>Point | Oppose/support (in part or full)   | Reasons   | specific you can be the easier it will be for the Council to understand your concerns.)                                    |
| 8, p. 66   | 8.4.24                | Oppose   | Climate change will mean historical use will  | Remove   |
|  |                       |  | Be lower than future requirements. Any  | 116111046  |
|  |                       |  | Reductions in permitted take will negatively  |  |
|  |                       |  | Impact ability to farm. ZIPA outcome 6 is confi   | adicted with this rule.  |
| 8, p.80  | 8.5.21                | Oppose   | A Even with 5 ha or less there can be high  | Increase minimum block size to 30ha  |
| - The state of the |                       |  | Stocking rates and irrigation, winter grazing.  |  |
|  |                       |  | B Compliance costs associated with 5ha block<br>Resource consents, etc. are prohibitive and | Increase minimum block size to 30 ha.  |
|  |                       |  | Will make farming ever more uneconomic.   |  |
| 8, p.90  | 8.7.1                 | Oppose   | For saltwater creek current minimum flow  | Continue use of Factory road measu-  |
|  |                       |  | measuring site is at Factory road,  | Ring site and don't alter current  |
|  |                       |  | downstream from proposed toppings road.   | Minimum flow.  |
|  |                       |  | Downstream from toppings are additional   |  |
|  |                       |  | creeks feeding into saltwater creek. Depen-   |  |
|  |                       | ,  | Ding on Toppings road will trigger restric-   |  |
|  |                       |  | Tions before they are actually necessary,   |  |
| A. A   |                       |  | Thereby leading to unnecessary water  |  |
|  |                       | *  | Restrictions for our groundwater wells/   |  |
|  |                       |  | Permit CRC971717.1  |  |
|  |                       |  |   |  |
|  |                       |  |   |  |
|  |                       |  |   |  |

Mody