

Submission on Proposed Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY RECEPTION EC - CHCH	
FILE REF:	
DOCUMENT No:	
115094 05 OCT 2012	ACTION INFO
IC: 114	
Submitter ID: 0113	
File No: PLAN/LWRP/DRFT/6SU/2 EC 137020 - EC302105	

Form 5: Submissions on a Publicly Notified Proposed Policy Statement or Regional Plan under Clause 6 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Return your signed submission by 5.00pm Friday 5 October 2012 to:
Freepost 1201 Proposed Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan
Environment Canterbury
P O Box 345
Christchurch 8140

Full Name: Mark COX (Waivepo Dairy Ltd)	Phone (Hm): _____
Organisation*: _____ <small>* the organisation that this submission is made on behalf of</small>	Phone (Wk): 027 4449288
Postal Address: 253 Waterholes Rd RD4 Christchurch	Phone (Cell): _____
Email: mark@coxco.co.nz	Postcode: 7674
Fax: _____	
Contact name and postal address for service of person making submission (if different from above): c/- 407 Hudsons Road, RD4, Christchurch 7674.	
Trade Competition	
Pursuant to Clause 6 of 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:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I <u>could not</u> gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission; or	
<input type="checkbox"/> I <u>could</u> gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.	
If you have ticked this box please select one of the following:	
<input type="checkbox"/> I <u>am</u> directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that adversely affects the environment and does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.	
<input type="checkbox"/> I <u>am not</u> directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that adversely affects the environment and does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.	
Signature: <u>M. Reddell</u>	Date: 4/10/12
<small>(Signature of person making submission or person authorised to sign on behalf of person making the submission)</small>	
<small>Please note: (1) all information contained in a submission under the Resource Management Act 1991, including names and addresses for service, becomes public information.</small>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	I <u>do not</u> wish to be heard in support of my submission; or
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I <u>do</u> wish to be heard in support of my submission; and if so,
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.

Submission on the Proposed Land & Water Regional Plan

Submitter: Mark Cox (Wairepo Dairy Ltd)

1. The specific provisions of the Proposed Plan that this submission relates to is Section 13 – Ashburton.
Table 13.6.1 sets out Environmental Flow and Allocation Limits for a number of waterways in the Ashburton catchment.
2. Our submission is that section 13.6.1 be amended to include the Hinds River. The existing minimum flow site does not provide reliability of supply in the order of what is anticipated by the PLWRP (the site is dry for a significant amount of the irrigation season). Based on hydrology information we have collected over the last twelve months, we consider that there is merit for the minimum flow site and flow to be reviewed for a change to a downstream site such as Poplar Road where flows are more consistent.

If the Hinds River is not included in table 13.6.1 then Rule 5.96 of the proposed plan will be the default position for consents being renewed, setting 50% of the 7DMALF as a minimum flow and 20% of the 7DMALF as an allocation limit. We consider that for an intermittently flowing river such as the Hinds this is too prescriptive an approach. We understand the 7DMALF for the Hinds is approximately 200L/s, which would mean an allocation limit of only 40L/s. Existing allocation is in the order of 130L/s. If the Hinds River was included in table 13.6.1 then there would be an opportunity for the allocation and minimum flow and site to be more specifically reviewed.

3. We seek the following decision from Environment Canterbury: that section 13.6.1 be amended to include the Hinds River with the allocation, minimum flow and site to be reviewed.