

Submitters Name: GE & CJ Coates
Submitters Address: 3789 SH 6
RD 1
Runanga 7873
Submitters Phone Number: (03)731 1805
Submission regarding: Regional Land and Water plan
Policy 4.3.6

I would like to be heard at the hearing.

Stock Crossings

I oppose the current recommended policy in the new land and water plan, policy 4.3.6. First the word cattle should be used when referring to dry stock (i.e. *This Policy also applies for dry stock cattle where more than 50 ...*). I suggest it would be unreasonable to include sheep, deer, goats etc. No other council that I know of has done this.

Secondly if the council has decided that up to 500 dairy cows crossing more than 20 times result in enough contamination to require a bridge or culvert, then the number of crossings should be higher for dry stock cattle. On most occasions the dry stock cattle are being driven through a river or creek by a person or dogs, which results in stock crossing at a faster rate. (In most situations dairy cows are allowed to drift away from the shed). This results in the dry stock cattle time in the river being many times less than dairy cows. Therefore, it stands to reason that the amount of contaminant able to be discharged in that crossing would be less. So I propose that the figure of up to 40 crossings per month would be more appropriate when up to 500 dry stock cattle cross a river or creek.

Thirdly I feel more segmented approach should be used when addressing a policy relating to stock crossings. Most dry stock cattle (when speaking to farmers) are in mobs of up to 200. However to allow for those occasions when the mob may be a little bigger then 250 cattle may be a practical figure. A policy could allow for crossings of 250 dry stock cattle to cross up to 80 times per month, and up to 500 dry stock cattle to cross up to 40 times per month.

A lot of dry stock cattle are yearling cattle which are about half the weight of a mature dairy cow. Also beef breeding cows (which I would assume for this policy are considered to be dry stock) are not fed as much as a dairy cow. A dairy cow could easily rear three calves under normal circumstances. Therefore the contaminants produced would be substantially reduced. This is another good reason for having a greater leniency for dry stock cattle.

The cost of making a bridge is also an important factor to consider. For my personal situation I would possibly need 4 bridges, with the total cost coming to about \$36,000, of which the most expensive being \$12,500. I do not feel that this cost is justified when considering the actual effect the bridges would have in reducing contaminants. I understand that I may be able to apply for a resource consent, but I suggest that this is

not a good use of the councils time and resources. I feel that the below proposal is fair, reasonable, justifiable and easy to implement.

Relief sought

I propose that the policy should read for dry stock cattle crossings: *"This Policy also applies for dry stock cattle where 50 to 250 cattle cross any river or permanently flowing creek more than 80 times per month; or 250 to 500 cattle cross any river or permanently flowing creek more than 40 times per month; or greater than 500 cattle cross any river or permanently flowing creek more than 20 times per month."*