

Submission on Proposed Waipara Catchment
Environmental Flow and Water Allocation Regional Plan

Plan 6-2009-17-6
FILE REF: 10 Environment
DOCUMENT No. Canterbury
Regional Council

Full Name: THOMAS MICHAEL PORTER Phone: 03 314 6013 JUN 2010 78923
Organisation: TM + SE PORTER Phone: 02 1067 1490
Postal Address: 306 GEORGES ROAD Fax: 03 314 6073
BD2 AMISERLEY Date: 11-06-2010

* the organisation that this submission is made on behalf of.
email TM PORTER3@HOTMAIL.COM

Postal address for service of person making submission (if different from above):

Signature: T.M. Porter

(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.

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

- ☐ Tick this box if you do not wish to be heard in support of your submission;
- ☒ Tick this box if you do wish to be heard in support of your submission; and,
- ☒ Tick this box if you would be prepared to consider presenting your submission in a joint case with others making a similar submission at any hearing.

Return your signed submission by Monday 14th June 2010 to:

Freepost 1201
Proposed Waipara Catchment Environmental Flow and Water Allocation Regional Plan
Environment Canterbury
P O Box 345
Christchurch

Email: mailroom@ecan.govt.nz

(1) The specific provisions of the variation that my submission relates to are: (Specify page number and subsection numbering for each separate provision).

SEE ATTACHED TM+SE PORTER SUBMISSION 2 PAGES.

(2) My submission is that: (State concisely: the nature of your submission, and clearly indicate whether you support or oppose each separate provision being submitted on, or wish to have amendments made, giving reasons.)

SEE ATTACHED TM+SE PORTER SUBMISSION 2 PAGES

(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.)

SEE ATTACHED TM+SE PORTER SUBMISSION 2 PAGES.

PROPOSED WAIPARA CATCHMENT ENVIRONMENTAL FLOW
AND WATER ALLOCATION REGIONAL PLAN.

April 2010

T M & S E Porter Submission

Page 13 Part 6 Policy 1.1

Add:

Excluding any takes which have a stream depleting effect of 3 l/s or less
From Ground Water takes, galleries, bores, springs and ponds.

All excavated takes in the Upper Waipara A Block are variously named springs, ponds, bores or galleries and are situated at least 70 meters and up to 300 meters from the river. There is inconsistency in their definition. Some are recorded as groundwater takes others as surface water takes. Given that they are all takes from 'below the surface of the ground' (NRRP definition) they should be classified as Ground Water takes.

The figure of 3 l/s is already a reduction from 5 l/s which is the NRRP norm for other Canterbury rivers. Instream values are well protected by that change alone.

Takes from Springs Ponds Bores or Galleries with less than 3 l/s stream depleting effect are within the margin of error for gauging of stream flows and are undetectable, they should therefore not require management.

Page 14 Part 6 Policy 1.8

Amend:

To limit the amount of water allocated in any new consent that replaces an expiring consent to take water within the A Block set out in Table 1, to no greater than the previous take, provided that regard must be had to allow existing consents to utilize water for future development which is not yet implemented i.e. maturing Grapes and Olive Trees, planned plantings of these and crops being planted in stages as well as improved technical efficiency in the use of water.

Page 14. Part 6. Policy 1.10.

Amend

- (a) end sentence after " Table 1." Delete "and "
- (b) delete all.

To be consistent with our submission for Page 18 Part 7. Rules : Rule 2.2
It is not necessary to increase the minimum flow for such activities.
Water harvesting and storage should be encouraged. This provision is seen as a disincentive to install storage, and is also punitive towards existing abstractors who have storage.

Page 15 Part 6. Policy Section 2 Groundwater

Amend to

Note: Groundwater abstraction with a stream depleting effect greater than 3 l/s is managed as a surface water allocation in accordance with Policy 1.1 and the definitions in Part 9.

To be consistent with this plan

Page 18 Part 7 Rules: Rule 2.2

Oppose.

Delete (c) (i) (b).
(ii) (b).

Because the deleted sections discriminated against frost protection and storage.

The proposed minimum flow of 80 l/s for takes to storage and frost protection in the Upper Waipara is a highly restrictive proposal that could have extremely serious financial consequences for Vineyards and Olive Groves in years when the takes from the river are stopped for say up to 40 days at 50 l/s minimum flow. Existing storage volume for irrigation is calculated to cope with anticipated stoppage days assuming current restriction of 50 l/s a change to 80 l/s could leave a serious shortfall in water at a most critical time.

This seems to me a totally new proposal and has not been discussed in any previous Staff Reports or consultations with abstractors as far as I am aware. So far all consultation has been to encourage the use of storage, strangely this proposal will actually discourage abstractors from putting it in.

Page 19 Rule 6.1 (c)

This provision is inconsistent with the definition of hydraulically connected groundwater – see definitions page 22.

This rule should be amended to show:

If the ground water take has a stream depletion effect of greater than 3 l/s on any surface water body in the Waipara River Catchment, the groundwater take, singularly or in combination with other lawfully established take, complies with the environmental flow and allocation regime for that surface water body as set out in Table 1

Page 21 Table I

Amend:

Delete note at bottom of Table 1 “Frost Protection and A Block storage minimum flow: Lower Waipara = 200l/s, Upper Waipara 80 l/s”

Penalizes the present frost protection at Pegasus Bay

The best approach is to look at future takes to storage/ frost protection on an individual basis.

See also comments under Page 18 Part 7 Rule 2.2 above

Variation 17.

We support the amendments and additions to the Proposed NRRP as shown in Variation 17 to allow the Waipara River plan to stand alone.