
From: Dirk De Lu <tisberries@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 23, 2019 10:44 AM
To: Mailroom Mailbox
Subject: Proposed Plan Change 7

Categories: Cathy

Dirk De Lu 4 Tisbury Lane Chch 8022 03 338 3270

Submission

With nitrate levels currently around 0.6p/ml Canterbury is pushing close to the 0.87p/ml recent research indicates may be safe.

Given that nitrate pollution to aquifers from surface is a slow process and that excessive nitrate releases have been ongoing for decades the current levels are expected to increase.

To protect our aquifers ECan must restrict further nitrate use. Adopting the proposed Plan Change 7 will leave ECan responsible for allowing Canterbury's aquifers to become hazardous.

Responsible application of the precautionary principle requires that reasonable regulation be implemented. Plan change 7 is irresponsible and counter to the public's best interest.

The current plan change 7 will result in Canterbury's aquifers becoming toxic. That citizens have to bring this to the attention of ECan rule makers and to protest it reveals ECan as unfit to serve the public.

At the very least do not enact this change and leave a newly wholly democratically elected ECan Council to decide Canterbury's future.

--

Best, Dirk De Lu

From: [Dirk De Lu](#)
To: [Plan Hearings](#)
Subject: Re: Incomplete Submission on Proposed Plan Change 7 to the Land and Water Regional Plan
Date: Sunday, 8 September 2019 10:48:39 AM

Dirk De Lu, 4 Tisbury Lane, 8022

Greetings:

Information in lieu of form. If you want a form please provide it in Word format for easy on line completion.

Dirk De Lu, 4 Tisbury Lane, Chch 8022, 03 332 3270
tisberries@gmail.com

I attest that I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through my submission(s).

I do not wish to waste my time with an oral submission in what is so clearly a rigged process with a pre determined outcome. That the ECan board even put this to consultation without a complete analysis of impacts, most blatantly being the cost to public health and to water treatment which will not even be capable of reducing nitrates to acceptable levels makes clear that this process is nothing but a sham. The immoral nature of ECan acting in this instance merits nothing but outrage and scorn. Shame on all involved.

Sincerely, Dirk De Lu

On Tue, Sep 3, 2019 at 3:20 PM Plan Hearings <planhearings@ecan.govt.nz> wrote:

Tena koe

Thank you for your submission on Proposed Plan Change 7 to the Land and Water Regional Plan.

We note that your submission does not include all of the information required under Clause 5 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Please confirm which sentences apply to you in relation to the Trade Competition submission on [this form](#) (also attached).

In line with the attached form we also require you to confirm whether you wish to be heard in support of your submission and if so whether you would be prepared to consider presenting your submission in a joint case with others making a similar submission at any hearing.

Here are some [guidelines](#) which you may find useful when making a submission.

We look forward to your response.

Nga mihi

Tavisha Fernando

Planning Hearings Officer

Plan Hearings

Environment Canterbury

planhearings@ecan.govt.nz

PO Box 345, Christchurch 8140
Customer Services: 0800 324 636
24 Hours: 0800 76 55 88

ecan.govt.nz



--
Best, Dirk De Lu

Submission on Plan Change 7 to the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan

By **De Lu, D**

Submitter Identification number: **PC7-36**

Wishes to be heard: **No**

Would consider making a joint submission at the hearing: **No**

Submitted on: **19/08/2019**

This submission was submitted via Environment Canterbury's online submission portal. The Submissions portal generates pdf files of submissions (as attached). However, some of the information that appears in the pdf files is not consistent with information the submitter entered into the portal, specifically, where submitters have ticked:

- "I wish to be heard in support of my submission" ; and
- "If others make a similar submission I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing".

Additionally, the submissions portal has generated submitter and submission point numbers that are not consistent with the numbering applied in the Summary of Decisions Requested. Submission points in the Summary of Decisions Requested (SODR) are numbered using the following format:

PC7 – Submitter ID #.Submission point #

The correct submitter identification number and submitter information is specified above. This will be the number referred to in the SODR.

Proposed Plan Change 7 to the Land and Water Regional Plan

Form 5 Submission on publically notified proposal for policy statement or plan, change or variation

Clause 6 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

To Environment Canterbury - Tavisha Fernando
Date received 19/08/2019 2:25:51 PM
Submission #9

Address for service:

De Lu Dirk / 9
4 Tisbury Lane Cracroft Christchurch
Phone: 03 338 3270
Email: tisberries@gmail.com
Wishes to be heard? No
Is willing to present a joint case? No

Proposed Plan Change 7 has been developed to respond to emerging resource management issues, to give effect to relevant national direction, to implement recommendations from the Hinds Drains' Working Party, and to implement recommendations in the Waimakariri and Orari-Temuka-Opihi-Pareora (OTOP) Zone Implementation Programme Addenda (ZIPA).

- Could you gain an advantage in trade competition in making this submission?
 - No
- Are you directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that
 - (a) adversely affects the environment; and
 - (b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition
 - Yes

Submission points

Point 9.1

Submission

Consultation on this has all but excluded the bulk of the effected population, Christchurch. The nitrate pollution seeping into aquifers in Waimakariri will poison Christchurch's water.

In addition to poor targeting of Christchurch residents vital information is not made clear. The summary fails to alert Christchurch residents of the source of the nitrates, primarily dairying in the Waimak and how it is polluting Christchurch resident's aquifers. Instead ECan has buried the information in discourse on region wide changes. Providing information is important. Burying people with information instead of making clear what will limit their health and lives is not good, or even adequate, consultation.

Whatever merits the zone committee process might offer this consultation highlights a major shortcoming. The Waimak ZC focused on Waimak residents leaving Christchurch residents effectively excluded.

The proposed limits are entirely unacceptable. This link provides an excellent summary of why what is proposed is negligent at best. <https://chrysh.nz/index.php/2019/08/01/two-studies-to-know-about-when-looking-at-plan-change-7/>

Nitrate levels must be severely limited now. Nitrate infiltration into aquifers is a continuous process with levels increasing over time. Levels are already unacceptable based on research.

ECan is also responsible for maintaining, even improving, bio diversity. Nitrates at low levels are toxic for aquatic life.

Plan change 7 offers us a degraded environment, poisoned aquifers, negative public health outcomes and early death for some people. Why is such an obviously deficient change being consulted on? Why is ECan this irresponsible in what it offers to the public? Are vested interests truly so craven as to push for their personal wants over the health and welfare of people and the environment? Is ECan powerless to stop them or even complicit in enabling them?

I am disgusted. Why is it up to members of the public to not just monitor if ECan is up to the task of properly protecting us, but must provide the research, amplified by many informed submissions, to make ECan properly carry out its mandated tasks?

At the very least it is clear that nitrate pollution requires more study. Applying the precautionary principle one would be sensible enough not to despoil the environment based on the rationalization that research has not "proven" nitrates are a hazard.

Relief sought

Please stop this consultation process to allow it to be fully revisited and revised with the inclusion of all impacted parties including the residents of Christchurch.

The new process to be delayed until a newly elected fully democratic ECan Board is empanelled.

Section: General

Sub-section: