

Comments

LTP 2021-31

Comment ID	1160
Response Date	13/04/21 7:12 AM
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.3
Files	
First name	Keith
Surname	Stackhouse
Email address	
Are you submitting on behalf of an organisation?	Yes, I'm submitting on behalf of an organisation
Which organisation are you submitting on behalf of?	Stackhouse Farm and KW & PW Stackhouse
Which age category are you in?	-
Do you have any further comments on the activities proposed in specific portfolio/s (please select all those you wish to comment on):	
Where do you live in Canterbury? Select your district below:	-
Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? Kaikoura	
Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? Hurunui	
Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? Waimakariri	

Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? Christchurch

Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? Selwyn

Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? Ashburton

Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? Mackenzie

Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? Timaru

Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? Waimate

Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? Waitaki

Do you wish to speak to your submission? No

How did you find out about giving feedback?

From:
To:
Subject: LTR SUBMISSION
Date: Sunday, 11 April 2021 4:04:50 pm
Attachments: [Canterbury 10 year plan.docx](#)

Submission on behalf of: STACKHOUSE FARM and KW & PW Stackhouse to the
Longterm Plan 2021 - 21

Keith Stackhouse

Submission on behalf of STACKHOUSE FARM and K.W. & P.W. Stackhouse to the Long Term Plan 2021 - 31.

We commend the ECan on the work they have done on plan change 1 to 7 and feel that this freshwater management act is just duplicating the work already done, at considerable cost to the rate payers.

We feel that 'one size fits all' policy should be replaced with a river catchment-based scheme. Where we live, in the Waipara River catchment the geological makeup of the soil profile is different from the Canterbury Plains. The way the water moves through the below ground profile can result in gully erosion occurring and this presents a hazard under the Health and Safety in the Workplace Act. While we support the principles of the Freshwater Management Act we are also required to remove hazards under the Health and Safety in the Workplace Act.

The fencing requirements in the 'one size fits all' approach does not meet current practice in North Canterbury. The fencing profiles on North Canterbury's Sheep & Beef farms do not meet the national criteria. Our farm of 353 hectares does not have one fence that meets the requirements. But in the 110 years the family have been farming our existing fences have given adequate stock control. The cost of fencing off gully's would require us to erect possibly 25km of new fence. Our neighbour the forestry has recently logged a forest block and the quote to erect to a new boundary fence was \$13,500 per kilometre. By using all the salvageable material we able to reduce the cost to \$9000 per kilometre. So new fencing and upgrading existing fencing would be a massive cost. We feel that if the government requires us to do the fencing, we feel we should get an interest free loan over 10 years. There should be more options as to the kind of fencing that needs to be erected.

Improving freshwater quality benefits all of the community so the costs should be funded by a uniform annual general charge. The rate rises are one of fastest growing farm costs over which we have no control and will soon be our second largest annual cost. Constantly rising rates will force existing family farms out of business.

Willow trees

These have now become a pest that is out of control. We have 2.3km of stream on our property has over 1500 willow trees. These willow trees transpire over 6 million litres of water per day. Whereas our centre pivot irrigator only used 1.5 million per day for a maximum of 60 days per year, which is the capacity of our water storage area. So, we need to remove willow trees to improve water quantity and quality. Willow roots cover sand and shingle areas that supported flounder, whitebait, perch and other fish habitats. Willow root growth has eliminated freshwater bathing sites in the Omihi Stream that I and my children had once enjoyed.

We think the plan is reasonably good but the costs should be reduced as it is too costly. Maybe ECan should look at getting a loan to reduce the cost.

Submission filed by:

Keith Stackhouse