

Sarah Drummond

From: Lesley Te Maiharoa-Sykes <Lesley.TeMaiharoa-Sykes@ngaitahu.iwi.nz>
Sent: Thursday, 16 July 2015 2:31 p.m.
To: Sarah Drummond
Subject: Hughes Partnership Submission 260B on Proposed Plan V3

Dear Sarah

Further to your recent correspondence, I confirm that I would like my original submission on the proposed Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan to be treated as a submission on Variation 3 now.

All the points in my submission remain outstanding and in my view Ecan's current plans do not take them in to account properly and are therefore ignoring relevant information in your decision making process. I hope you'll consider my submission further and take action appropriately.

Regards

John Hughes

Cellphone: 027 211 7153

Home: 03 689 4730

CAUTION: This email and any attachment(s) contains information that is both confidential and possibly legally privileged. No reader may make any use of its content unless that use is approved by Te Rōnanga o Ngāi Tahu and its subsidiary companies separately in writing. Any opinion, advice or information contained in this email and any attachment(s) is to be treated as interim and provisional only and for the strictly limited purpose of the recipient as communicated to us. Neither the recipient nor any other person should act upon it without our separate written authorization of reliance. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately and destroy this message.

Friday 5 October 2012

John Patrick Hughes

Hughes Partnership
235 Maori Road
Morven, No 10 R.D.,
Waimate

03 6894730
027 211 7153

**Support Combined Canterbury Provinces Federated Farmers of New Zealand
Submission on Proposed Plan**

The Hughes Partnership farm over 500 hectares South Bank Waihao River, Sinclairs Creek and Morven Drain area. The property is in the Morven Glenavy Irrigation area. Part of the farm bounds the coast. First land taken up in 1899 by family.

The farm pays substantial rates to the Waihao rating district and Sinclairs Creek rating district and is also rated for Morven drain. On top of rates we have had to pay \$70,000 for upgrade of banking at the outlet of Sinclairs Creek.

On top of that money we had to pay \$12,000 in legal fees when the previous owner of the adjoining property took ECAN to the Environment Court. The problem being on our property we were involved in the court case and had to pay our own lawyer.

Property was seriously affected by flooding from these three sources of water. The coastal in property is subject to sea flooding. The land bounding the Waihao River has some of the best soils in New Zealand and will grow a wide range of crops. Land on the south side of Maori Road has been in the MGI irrigation area since original scheme was built. We run a flock of 2000 breeding ewes plus replacements. Total sheep before lambs sold can reach over 50000. Some lambs have been brought to fatten this season.

Some dairy stock are grazed in the winter from the adjoining dairy farm on 12 hectares. Border dykes dairy herd grazed in the herd rotation.

Because the family have lived and worked in the area since before 1899 we have a personal knowledge of water levels and flows of the district.

When the MGI Scheme started there were changes to water levels with water rising to the surface in some paddocks.

The most dramatic changes happened when K line irrigation was installed on the Morven Hills for dairy farming. Sinclairs Creek now has water flowing 365 days of the year. A drain on the south side of Maori Road also flows for 365 days of the year.

There are now many places on the farm where water is less than 3 metres from the surface. We currently have plans to upgrade culverts, 300 mm pipes to 1 metre Dia. pipe to stop flooding. We lost a paddock of oats last October. Total loss.

Before the development of MGI, Sinclairs Creek only flowed when there was about 40 mls of rain in the district. Now it flows 365 days of the year. As does the drain on the south side of Maori Road. Both drain to Donga at the beach on our property. We have, over the years with the other rate payers, had to front up with money to build these drains and enlarge them when water volumes exceed their capacity.

We have one irrigation bore and another well that is groundwater envelope plot - Well No 340/0045 that has been measured since 1972. The printout indicates rise in average water levels since MGI started.

Summary:

We have three different water systems - Sinclairs, Morven Drain, Waihao River and the Waitaki which is the dominant one. Deep well drilled at the Waihao River end of Byrnes Road was tested and found to be glacial water and also the well was artesian. Casing was removed.

I was involved in the hearing to grant MGI consent to discharge water into Waihao river, appearing before two commissioners, one being Emma Christmas. I was sure flow was both environmental and augmentation when MGI put the pipeline under the river for northern extension area. Contractor had to de-water the trench each side of the river and also the island between north and south of state highway bridges. They had to use three huge pumps on the south side and also had pumps on north bank. The flow of the river stream was able to be carried in 60 ml pipe over the trench while the 1.1 metre pipes were laid and welded together. That proved that there was huge amounts of water now showing up in the river stream, and that was also a very dry winter. With low river flows, where did that water come from? No one in ECAN will answer that question.

It is totally unfair that all shallow takes of water should be banned when ratepayers of this area have to bear the huge costs of controlling river flooding excess water from MGI and in drier times sit and watch it flow out to the sea along drains which we, the ratepayers, have had to pay for, including construction of protection banks around the outlet.

Meetings:

We didn't receive notice for two meetings - April / May period which were held at Waihao Marae. Did get notice to meeting on 23rd May but couldn't get to it until 7pm because we were in the

middle harvest. Mid April until 24th June (late season) and found that many other ratepayers had no notice. This was after spending two days showing Meredith McDonald around the whole district. I found Meredith to be easy to relate to and I am sure that she took all my comments back to the planners. When she went on leave I didn't hear anything until I enquired as to what were the meetings at the Marae. I could actually see cars from the combine seat.

The plan makes great comments about the whole community being involved and when a large number of ratepayers are not sent notices, there has to be questions asked of those involved.

John P Hughes



Submission on Proposed Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

Submitter ID:

File No: PLAN/LWRP/DRFT/6SU/2

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: JOHN PATRICK HUGHES Phone (Hm): 03 6894 430
Organisation*: HUGHES PARTNERSHIP Phone (Wk): 094 211 4153
* the organisation that this submission is made on behalf of
Postal Address: 235 MAORI ROAD MORVEN Phone (Cell): 027 911 4153
NO. 10 RD WAIMATE 4980 Postcode: 4980
Email: WAHAOKOAKS@TRA.CO.NZ Fax: 03 6894 430
Contact name and postal address for service of person making submission (if different from above):

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:

- 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 that adversely affects the environment and does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.
- I am not 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: John P. Hughes Date: 5th Oct 2012

(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,
- If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.

(1) The specific provisions of the Proposed Plan that my submission relates to are:	(2) My submission is that (include whether you support or oppose the specific provisions or wish to have them amended and the reasons for your views)	(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)
Section & Page Number	Sub-section/ Point	Reasons
15-3	15-4-1 15-4-5 Oppose	<p>to the water to be used for irrigation of the hills because of the increasing cost of irrigation of the hills</p> <p>Why does water from NAT not show up! Ballinacres Recorder. Have many years history has recorder have in that site.</p>
15-4-4	Oppose	<p>Recorder hasn't been recording full amount discharged by NAT because does water go to - Boulder country &</p>
15-4-6	Oppose	<p>Friction Pumping has no effect because of distance of pump from river and underground water affected NAT.</p>
15-4-7	Oppose	<p>To change water source to NAT means huge cost capital charges & no lines and changing pumping systems</p> <p>Support Suburban Farmers Submission - Don't need to see how</p>

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