Submission on Proposed Variation 1 to the Proposed Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan

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 21 March 2014 to:
Freepost 1201 Variation 1 to pLWRP
Environment Canterbury
P O Box 345
Christchurch 8140

Full Name: Ross William Manson
Organisation*:  
* the organisation that this submission is made on behalf of
Postal Address: Steele Road P R d Parfield
Email:
Contact name and postal address for service of person making submission (if different from 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:
- adversely affects the environment; and
- 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: [Signature]
Date: 20 Mar 2014

(Signature of person making submission or 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 your submission in a joint case with others making a similar submission at any hearing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section &amp; Page Number</th>
<th>Sub-section/Point</th>
<th>Oppose/support (in part or full)</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Page 21 Rule 11.5</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>See attached paper.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Whole Plan</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>Not enough time from meetings to properly consider Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(6 working days)

(3) I seek the following decisions from Environment Canterbury: (Please give precise details for each provision. The more specific you can be the easier it will be for the Council to understand your concerns.)

Add further pages as required – please initial any additional pages.

R W Murray
My name is Ross Marsen and I have lived on three different properties in Selwyn.

The first farm was Deltos Road Brookside: Heavy peat with abundant springs: from 1944 – 1989.

The water supply was beautiful spring water next to the Ogoey Creek. When this water was tested by the Catchment Board it was very high in Nitrates. Our Family had no problems.

The second farm was at Mitchell's Road Te Piriata 1989 – 1995. Our water supply was a water race from the Rakaui. Not ideal but except for sludge we had few problems.

The third farm is on Steele's Road Hororata which has a piped water supply from the Selwyn Catchment. It is good water that supplies both stock and humans. Every now and then the Council chlorinates it because of perceived problems. This doesn't affect humans but can have adverse effects on livestock: lambs in particular, so the providing of good water is the basis of my submission.

One of the problems for piped water is low water at intakes which could easily overwhelm stored Tank water for livestock. So that in the future Dams to increase and or save water may be necessary, especially as the population of the district is booming: as it stands this would not be possible under the proposed Variation 1. Therefore I oppose it.

(The prohibiting of water storage in Mainstreams of Selwyn / Waikiri /iri and Waianiwana)

With only 6 working days to consider this proposal I believe that not enough time has been given to the public to properly review it. Therefore I object to the whole of Variation 1.

Ross Marsen