

Submission on Proposed Plan Change 2 to the Waimakariri River Regional Plan

| FOR OFFICE USE ONLY | | |
|---------------------|--|--------|
| EC - CHCH | | |
| FILE REF: | | |
| DOCUMENT No.: | | |
| 26 AUG 2019 | | |
| | | ACTION |
| | | INFO |
| Submitter ID: | | |
| File No: | | |

Form 5: Submissions on a Publicly Notified Proposed Policy Statement or Regional Plan under Clause 5 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Return your signed submission by 5.00pm Friday 13 September 2019 to:

Proposed Plan Change 2 to the Waimakariri River Regional Plan
Environment Canterbury
P O Box 345
Christchurch 8140

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Full Name: <u>Margaret Basil-Jones</u> | Phone (Hm): <u>33 231 88</u> |
| Organisation*: _____ | Phone (Wk): _____ |
| * the organisation that this submission is made on behalf of | |
| Postal Address: <u>2/159 Barrington St</u> | Phone (Cell): <u>021 025 44 714</u> |
| <u>Somerfield Christchurch</u> | Postcode: <u>8024</u> |
| Email: <u>basil-jones@hotmail.com</u> | Fax: _____ |
| Contact name and postal address for service of person making submission (if different from above): | |
| _____ | |

Trade Competition

Pursuant to 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
- ☐ I am not directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission

Signature: M. Basil-Jones Date: 8 August 19.

(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,
- ☐ I would be prepared to consider presenting my submission in a joint case with others making a similar submission at any 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 | Oppose/support (in part or full) | Reasons | |
| Changes to 7 & 2 (Unsure of pg no's on the computer.) | | oppose | <p>This will allow more nitrates to leach into Christchurch's aquifer. Current levels are approx 0.6mg/l – at what level will enforcement/penalties occur? It appears to "kick in" at 11.3mg/l. This will affect our drinking water. Danish studies & American via meta-analysis show a link between nitrates & colorectal cancer. Nitrate levels on private wells have increased considerably. There's no central database of nitrate levels in NZ – a knowledge gap. Currently there's 32,000 active wells in Canterbury & nitrates will continue filtering from land to water for decades. Lincoln's groundwater is thought to be 60-100 yrs old. Canterbury's medical officer of health Alistair Humphreys –</p> | <p>These changes should not go ahead ie 7 & 2 whereby this would allow more leaching of nitrates into the drinking water aquifer!</p> |

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

M. Sainsbury-Jones

| (1) The specific provisions of the Proposed Plan that my submission relates to are: | | (2) My submission is that: <i>(include whether you support or oppose the specific provisions or wish to have them amended and the reasons for your views.)</i> | | (3) I seek the following decisions from Environment Canterbury: <i>(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.)</i> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Section & Page Number | Sub-section/ Point | Oppose/support (in part or full) | Reasons | |
| changes to 7.4.2. | | oppose | has stated that urgent research should be undertaken. Last month - July, Forest & Bird stated that the risk-maps the regional council relied on were out-of-date. | These changes proposed by Environment Canterbury should not go ahead, as this will allow for more leaching of nitrates into the drinking aquifer |
| (version of pg was on the computer) | | | Last year we had 1.3 million cows in Canterbury & increasing. Canterbury is basically a shingle-scrub not suitable for dairying. Back in 2003 one dairy farm applied for Goochmes, which was then half the water consumed by the Christchurch City Council. What now? | |
| | | | We are lucky, in that ABC news reported today that 17 countries - home to 25% of the global population | |

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

MS as in fore S

| (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 | Oppose/support (in part or full) | Reasons | |
| charges 7 & 2 | | oppose | are facing "extremely high stress" ie water crises with climate change - but not us - yet! | These charges should not go ahead ie 7 & 2. |
| | (insert of pg nos on the computer) | | <p>The only way nitrates can be removed from water is by using treatment processes such as ion exchange, distillation & reverse osmosis. Chlorination or mechanical filters do not not remove nitrates from water.</p> <p>E. can have certainly acknowledged nitrates by their pilot project, which is a 3 year trial at Silverstream, North Canterbury, however this is just the "canary in the cage" & dealing with one stream.</p> <p>In December, 2018 a salmon hatchery, Salmon Smolt NZ.</p> | |

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

Handwritten signature

| (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 | Oppose/support (in part or full) | Reasons | |
| charges to 7 & 2 | | oppose | was forced to split its operations up because of increasing levels of nitrates. It had been operating since 2015. | These changes should not go ahead ie 7 & 2 - this will allow more leaching of nitrates into the drinking aquifer. |
| Leisure of pg no's on the computer | | | What about algal bloom? - lakes and rivers being closed for swimming. Planktonic bloom which was in Lake Rotarua - is now being negated by the farmers being paid not to farm there. Is this what we want? Shelter belts have been ripped out of farmland, which means even more water has to be put on the land. Meanwhile a water bottling company, Cloud Ocean (previously the | |

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

M. Barnard

| (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 | Oppose/support (in part or full) | Reasons | |
| Change 2 versus of pg nos on the computer | | oppose | <p>Kaputane wood scrouver which had an existing bore of 33m) has drilled down to 170m. This is the aquifer that supplies Christchurch's drinking water. They will bottle it in a mega factory & export for private profit overseas. They may not be operating currently - but they certainly won't want nitrates in their water! Maybe they will be allowed to drill their bore just a bit further down!</p> <p>Do Ngai Tahu support the proposed plan change 2 to the Waimakareiri River Regional plan?? I think not</p> <p>It is just not acceptable</p> | <p>these changes proposed by Environment Canterbury should not go ahead as this will allow more leaching of nitrates into the drinking aquifer.</p> |

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

K. S. Jones

| (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 | Oppose/support (in part or full) | Reasons | |
| Change 2 | version of page nos on the computer | oppose | <p>for the drinking water of a large metropolitan city to be put at risk. The native fisheries Act 1938 is well gone now & we only seemed to be concerned for trout.</p> <p>We don't need any more political spins, nor fertiliser imported from Western Sahara.</p> <p><u>References</u></p> <p>① Vicky Buck, July 31st 2019 ② RNZ, Co NZ, August 2nd 2019 ③ Stuff Co NZ, August 2nd 2019 ④ Forest & Bird, July, 2019 ⑤ ABC News, 7 July, 2019 ⑥ www.cdc.gov/healthywater/drinking/private_wells/disease/nitrate.html</p> | <p>These changes proposed by Environment Canterbury should not go ahead as this will allow more leaching of the nitrates into the drinking water aquifer.</p> |

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

M. S. Jones