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

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 7 to the Land and Water Regional Plan
Environment Canterbury
P O Box 345
Christchurch 8140

Full Name: John Edward Taylor
Organisation: Morelea Farm
Postal Address: Box 129
Lake Tekapo
Email: morelea morelea @xtra.co.nz

Phone (Hm): 03 680 6685
Phone (Wk): 
Phone (Cell): 0272 903 815
Fax: 

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: John Edward Taylor
Date: 9/9/2019

(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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section &amp; Page Number</th>
<th>Sub-section/ Point</th>
<th>Oppose/support (in part or full)</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(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.)

Add further pages as required – please initial any additional pages.
Background to Morelea Farm

Morelea Farms sheep, cattle and tourists with a small amount of dairy grazing.

Overseas tourists come to Morelea to experience rural life. With simple demonstration, we explain our natural grass feed farming systems. We also explain how NZ is endowed with fresh water but we have to be clever how we use that water for all of the communities' benefit.

Irrigation on Morelea

We are lower intensity irrigators – spreading the irrigation water over a greater area than originally proposed.

The irrigation equipment needs upgrading but Morelea won't be doing any proposed.

Stream Life

The main stream that crosses Morelea and the stream that we extract our irrigation water from (Glenfield or Gillies) is one of main growing areas for the native long finned eel. There are many eels, some of which I have tamed and feed on a regular basis. There are some smaller fish but they must be under pressure from the eels. I enclose photos.

Grazing Streams

Morelea has a policy of fencing out cattle from the streams but allow lambs to trim the banks. This way we eliminate mechanical clearing of the streams.
As irrigators we accept Table 149 reluctantly as it reduces our realiability. The regime was negotiated between all affected parties and represented middle ground.

Table 149

We are disappointed to see this table, and are intrigued where has it come from as there has been no consultation, or economic and ecological studies. More likely will take a big hit on realiability.

If we look at the figures from 2014/15 season which was a very dry season. out of the 242 available irrigation days

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present regime</th>
<th>Full water days</th>
<th>No water days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>128</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1 14P</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 142</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation
Delete table 149.
The definition of pro rata to be amended to require restrictions to start at the minimum flows plus the A.A. & B.A. allocation clock.
Nitrogen

The Fourie Basin is in a high concentration area and that was signaled in our own independent water tests. The N levels changed when farming intensified after irrigation water came available.

Morelea has a low GMP number (approx 20) so it will be hard to reduce the N loss number and keep the production maintained.

Morelea uses cereal straw as a big proportion of the winter diet of cattle. We are trying to build up the N and sequester it back to the soil. This has made a big difference to the texture and structure of our soil.

Recommendation

There needs to be a reduction in N loss but target the high loss farmers through Farm Environment and Management Plans.
Phosphate.

In 2014 a group of Fairlie Basin Farmers came together to do some independent water tests on the 2 main drainage creeks of the basin. It showed up very low to low levels of dissolved Reactive Phosphate.

The phosphate map that has been produced includes much land that is low intensity stocking and low input of P. Morelea has changed its application of P — we are using more soil testing and applying more efficient fertilizers to provide P.

Morelea grows alot of clovers & lucerne for stock feed so needs P but we use very little N. A more natural type of farming.

Recommend

To do more testing; revise the maps and follow up on Farm Management Plans.
Opuha Dam.

I was a director on the farming company that facilitated the building of the Opuha Dam. With the proposed water flow regime the integrity of the efficient water use in under attack which I find disappointing.

The South Canterbury community has a working system of the Dam where all sections of the community are happy with the results. These results are far superior to pre Dam conditions.

The Dam was a catalyst for positive change in Sth. Canterbury after the challenges of the eighties & nineties.

O.F.F.R.A.G.

As the workings of the Dam has developed over the years esp. dry seasons once again all the affected parties have come together and formed Opuha Environmental Flow Release Advisory Group to make the best decisions to get most efficient use of the stored water. It has worked well and is now the envy of other storage Dams.

Recommendation: To leave the operation of the Dam as is.