

Janel Hau

From: Ian McIndoe <i.mcindoe@aqualinc.co.nz>
Sent: Friday, 21 March 2014 2:21 p.m.
To: Mailroom Mailbox
Subject: TRIM: Submission on LWRP Variation 1
Attachments: I McIndoe submission on Variation 1.pdf

Categories: Purple Category
HP TRIM Record Number: C14C/43735

Attached.

Please note that I registered on line but did not receive a verification email to allow me to submit on-line.
Kind regards,


[Ian McIndoe](#) BE (Hons), Dip Bus Stud (Finance)
PRINCIPAL ENGINEER / i.mcindoe@aqualinc.co.nz

Aqualinc Research Ltd
DD +64 3 964 6512 Gen +64 3 964 6521
Level 2, 11 Deans Ave, Riccarton, Christchurch
PO Box 20-462, Bishopdale, Christchurch 8543, NZ
www.aqualinc.com | myirrigation.info



CAUTION: This email and attachment(s) are confidential and possibly legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or copying of this email and attachment(s) is prohibited. This email and attachment(s) are not to be forwarded to third parties without the prior permission of the author. If you have received this email and attachment(s) in error, please delete them and notify me. Thank you.

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

Full Name: Ian McIndoe		Ph 03 3478532
Organisation: I & CM McIndoe Partnership		Wk 03 9646521
Postal address: 102 Tricketts Road, West Melton,		Cell 021478532
RD6, Christchurch		Postcode 7676
Email: mcindoei.c@clear.net.nz		Fax 9646520
Contact name and address: As above.		
Trade competition: I could not gain an advantage through this submission.		
Signed:		Date: 21 Mar 2014

I wish to be heard in support of my submission.	

(1) The specific provisions of the Proposed Plan that my submission relate to are:		(2) My submission is that:		(3) I seek the following decisions from Environment Canterbury:
Section & Page Number	Sub-section	Oppose/ support	Reasons	
9 P3-1	Text before 9.1	Oppose	Retaining the zones (as described in the text and in the Section 32a report) for the reasons given, is unwarranted. It has never been a high irrigation water use area and never will be.	Delete any references to the West Melton Special Zone in Section 9 and other parts of the plan – e.g. 11.4.33, 11.5.32(4) and Table 11(h)
P3-1	9.1A	Oppose	The West Melton Special Zone boundaries traverse across the Christchurch-West Melton and Selwyn-Waimakariri zones despite the fact that groundwater allocation is adequately dealt with in the two groundwater allocation zones. This area is no different to many other areas in Canterbury.	If the zone is retained, at the very least align the southern boundary with the groundwater allocation zones or the Selwyn-Waihora nutrient zone boundary.
P3-1	9.4.8	Oppose	There is no evidence given whatsoever to show that applying trigger levels to all takes in the zone above 10 m ³ /day will protect the reliability of domestic, stock and community use.	Delete Section 9.4.8
P3-1	9.5.10	Oppose	The justification given is unwarranted.	Delete 9.5.10
P3-1	9.5.11	Oppose	The justification given is unwarranted.	Delete 9.5.11
P 3-2	9.6.2	Oppose	The whole concept of trigger levels, how they were set up and why, is historical, at the time based on a very poor understanding of how the groundwater system worked, the amount of irrigation water pumped and the effect that irrigation water use had on groundwater levels and incidentally, Christchurch City water supplies.	Delete the table and any references to West Melton Special Zone/ trigger levels in Section 9.6.2
11 P 4-5	11.1A	Oppose	See 9.1A above.	Delete the reference to West Melton Special Zone from the table of definitions.
P 4-9	11.4.33	Oppose	See 9.4.8 above	Delete Section 11.4.33
P4-17	11.5.32 (4)	Oppose	See above	Delete Section 11.5.32(4)
P4-34	Table 11(h)	Oppose	The methodology for setting trigger levels is seriously flawed.	Delete the table and surrounding text.