

24 September 2021

**Customer Services**  
**P. 03 353 9007 or 0800 324 636**

200 Tuam Street

PO Box 345  
Christchurch 8140

[www.ecan.govt.nz/contact](http://www.ecan.govt.nz/contact)

Stock Exclusion Regulations: proposed changes to the low slope map  
Ministry for the Environment  
PO Box 10362  
**Wellington 6143**

Tēnā koutou,

**Environment Canterbury submission on the Stock Exclusion Regulations:  
Proposed changes to the low slope map**

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment on the proposals contained in the *Stock Exclusion: Proposed changes to the low slope map* discussion document. Environment Canterbury's submission on the *Stock Exclusion: Proposed changes to the low slope map* is attached.

We welcome the opportunity to continue to work with the Ministry for the Environment and Ministry for Primary Industries to share our experiences and help develop practical solutions to support the implementation of the Stock Exclusion Regulations.

For all enquiries please contact:

Fiona Myles  
Principal Strategy Advisor  
Phone: 027 327 6194  
Email: [fiona.myles@ecan.govt.nz](mailto:fiona.myles@ecan.govt.nz)

Yours sincerely



**Jenny Hughey**  
Chair, Environment Canterbury

Encl: Submission to the Ministry for the Environment on Stock Exclusion Regulations:  
Proposed changes to the low slope map

Our ref:  
Your ref:  
Contact:

# **Submission to the Ministry for the Environment**

---

## **Stock Exclusion Regulations: Proposed changes to the low slope map**

### **Introduction**

1. Environment Canterbury welcomes the opportunity to comment on the intended direction set out in the *Stock exclusion regulations: Proposed changes to the low slope map* discussion document.
2. This submission is presented in relation to Environment Canterbury's roles, functions and responsibilities under the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA).
3. Environment Canterbury welcomes the opportunity to continue to work with the Ministry for the Environment (MfE) and Ministry for Primary Industries (MPI) to share our experiences and help refine details of implementation.

### **Specific questions from the discussion document**

#### ***Submission Question 1: Do you agree with our framing of the issue. If not why not?***

4. Environment Canterbury agrees with the framing of the issue and the need for changes to be made to the low slope map.

#### ***Submission Question 2: What other information should we consider?***

5. Environment Canterbury has identified that the definition for a "permanent fence" provided in Schedule 1 of the stock exclusion regulations is not well aligned to the types of fences used within the Canterbury region. The current definition describes a post and batten fence commonly used in the North Island. The wording appears to exclude post and waratah fences that are typical of permanent fencing used in our region.
6. We ask that MfE consider amending this definition to include a broader range of fence types, or remove the definition altogether and leave it up to the discretion of regional councils to define what a permanent fence is.
7. We believe that this change would greatly improve the practicality of the stock exclusion regulations in Canterbury.

#### ***Submission Question 3: Do our objectives and criteria focus on the right things? If not, what would you change and why?***

8. Environment Canterbury agrees with the focus of the objectives and criteria as outlined in the discussion document.

***Submission Question 4: Do you think the changes to the low slope map more accurately capture low slope land?***

9. Environment Canterbury agrees that the proposed changes more accurately capture low slope land than the current map.

***Submission Question 5: Do you agree that the 500 metre altitude threshold should be added?***

10. Environment Canterbury agrees that the 500 metre altitude threshold should be added.

***Submission Question 6: Do you agree that the regulations and FW-FPs are complementary ways to manage the need to exclude stock from waterways? If not, why not?***

11. Environment Canterbury agrees that the regulations and FW-FPs are complementary. We support the proposal for land with an average slope of 5 degrees or less below 500 metre altitude (which is captured by the proposed low slope map) will be required to comply with the regulations; and stock exclusion requirements on land not captured by the proposed low slope map will be managed by FW-FPs. The ability for FW-FPs to manage stock exclusion not captured by the regulations, will allow a risk-based approach to be applied and provide more discretion in those areas.
12. Given the important relationship between the regulations and FW-FPs, we consider it important that the timeline for implementation between the two sets of regulations is well integrated. We recognise the timeline and transition approach for the FW-FPs is still undecided, but we request greater clarity is provided on the timelines for implementation to ensure a smooth transition of stock exclusion management takes place.

***Submission Question 7: If you own land captured by the map, does the proposed low slope map layer reflect what you would expect to be captured?***

13. Environment Canterbury considers the map layer provides sufficient detail as to be expected by a landowner.

***Submission Question 8: Do you agree with the preferred approach? If not, why not?***

14. Environment Canterbury agrees with the preferred approach. This is an improvement from the current low slope map in terms of its ability to be implemented and the proposal provides more discretion for effective livestock exclusion on slopes greater than 5 degrees in areas above 5 degrees average slope (and also in areas above 500 metres in altitude) through FW-FPs. The ability for FW-FPs to better direct investment that would have otherwise gone to mandatory stock exclusion to other

actions on farms that may more effectively address higher priority issues in that catchment is supported.

***Submission Question 9: What other information should we consider?***

15. Environment Canterbury has no further information to be considered.

***Submission Question 10: What are the likely impacts and cost implications of the preferred approach (Option 2) compared with status quo (Option 1)?***

16. Environment Canterbury considers Option 2 to be more practical for implementation than Option 1 and better recognises the net benefits of (mandatory) stock exclusion are less certain in all cases, particularly outside of low slope map areas.

***Submission Question 11: Do you agree our proposed changes to the low slope map address the need for stock exclusion requirements to have some flexibility? If not, why not?***

17. Environment Canterbury agrees that the management of stock exclusion through the FW-FP in areas above 5 degrees average slope (and also in areas above 500 metres in altitude) provides greater flexibility to enable more effective implementation.

***Submission Question 12: Do you agree with our estimation of the costs and benefits?***

18. Environment Canterbury agrees with the estimation of costs and benefits as outlined in the discussion document at a high level are generally appropriate.

***Submission Question 13: What other information should we consider?***

19. Environment Canterbury has no further information to be considered.