

Janel Hau

From: Tim & Lucy Cookson <tim.lucy@xtra.co.nz>
Sent: Friday, 21 March 2014 4:23 p.m.
To: Mailroom Mailbox
Cc: Susan Goodfellow
Subject: Submission on Proposed Variation 1 to the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan
Attachments: Tim Cookson 1 001.jpg; Tim Cookson 2 001.jpg

Categories: Purple Category

Hi

My submission attached

Regards

Tim Cookson

Tim & Lucy Cookson
"Pinewoods"
Hororata
RD2 Darfield
Canterbury 7572

Ph 03 3180718
Tim 0274 344458
Lucy 0272 047563

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

To: Canterbury Regional Council

By email: mailroom@ecan.govt.nz

Name of Submitter:

Mr. Tim Cookson

Pinewoods

Hororata

169 Leaches Road

RD 2 Darfield, 7572

Background

My name is Tim Cookson and I am a shareholder and owner of Pinewoods farm that operates in the Te Pirita area on the Central Canterbury Plains, within the Selwyn Waihora Zone

Pinewoods property is located within the Stage 1 area of the Central Plains Water Scheme and the company owns shares (both ordinary shares and construction shares) in Central Plains Water Ltd.

Pinewoods has supported and contributed to funding CPWL to obtain the consents that include detailed conditions around the management of farm nutrients and the provision of farm environmental plans. I am supportive of the improvements required to farm management practices to support the water quality improvements sought through the v1 pLWRP. In fact, many of the implementation strategies sought are included in CPW's existing consents.

I have been involved in the stakeholder focus group sessions coordinated by Environment Canterbury as part of the collaborative stakeholder engagement process since it commenced in December 2011. This process appeared to be collaborative and the participants including myself were of the impression that the proposals reached were a middle ground that satisfied both stakeholders and Environment Canterbury requirements. However, the notified plan and the errors that occurred prior to the notification on the 22nd February, have undermined the effort that I and the other 83 stakeholders have invested in this process. More importantly, the confidence that I had in the process and the achievability of the proposals reached has eroded to the point of complete lack of faith.

I and other CPW shareholders have and are continuing to invest considerable sums of money in the development of the scheme and on-farm infrastructure to be ready to take water by 1st September 2015. The Proposed Plan puts the scheme's viability at risk.

Submission

The specific provisions of the Proposed Plan that my submission relates to are:

Submission Point 1:

Of key concern as a CPW shareholder is the impact that the proposed total scheme nitrogen allocation on the viability of the scheme.

Table 11(j) Irrigation Scheme Nitrogen and Phosphorus Limit

(Proposed nitrogen allocation and timeframes)

Relief Sought:

Until such time that the scheme nitrogen allocation can be validated, and the matrix of good management is defined, replace the scheme allocation with a method requiring the Council to commit to the development of the Good Management Practice Nitrogen and Phosphorous Loss Rates for inclusion in a subsequent notified plan variation (with an expectation that those rates will be complied with from 2017).

Reasons:

1. I have concerns that the figures presented in Table 11(j) are based on assumptions of 2009 to 2013 irrigated and dryland baseline leaching for CPW shareholder land.
2. Providing an allocation to the scheme that has not been confirmed on a farm by farm basis is unacceptable.
3. The viability of the scheme is at risk until this number is confirmed.
4. The matrix of good management will not be available until mid-2015 and yet we are required to accept the aggregated scheme allocation included in Table 11(j) without this industry tested and developed set of numbers.
5. There is a risk of creating tension between farmers on heavy and light soils and between irrigators and non-irrigators as perceptions could arise of some shareholders subsidising others.
6. There is a risk that there will not be enough Nitrogen to enable the full scheme to develop, given that the scheme will be developed in stages.
7. I have concerns that the mitigation measures that underpin the scheme allocation include measures that are not available today, for example Eco-N. The affordability of the mitigation proposals has not been adequately addressed or accounted for.
8. I am concerned that the impact on the scheme viability could impact on the future of the family scale farm which will not be viable if the Nitrogen allocation is insufficient. This is likely to result in more and larger corporate farms developing within the scheme area. This has significant adverse effects for the local communities. Like me, many of the family farmers have been in the communities for generations. The fabric of a community is significantly altered as a result of corporate farms that bring in migrant workers that have no or very little vested interest in integrated into the local community within which they work. This impacts on a wide range of community based resources such as schools and local businesses which we live and work in on a daily basis.

Therese 20/3/14

Tim Cookson..