

SUBMISSION ON PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 7 TO THE CANTERBURY LAND AND WATER REGIONAL PLAN

Clause 5 First Schedule, Resource Management Act 1991

TO: Proposed Plan Change 7 to the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan

Environment Canterbury
PO Box 345
Christchurch 8140

By email: mailroom@ecan.govt.nz

EC - TIM		
FILE REF:		
DOCUMENT No.		
11 SEP 2019	ACTION	INFO

Name of submitter:

- 1 <name> MARK ELORED OLDFIELD
<address> 768 SEADOWN ROAD, RD 3 TIMARU 7973
<e-mail> me.oldfield@gmail.com

Trade competition statement:

- 2 We could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

Proposal this submission relates to is:

- 3 This submission is on proposed Plan Change 7 to the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan (PC7), specifically the Orari-Temuka-Opihi-Pareora (OTOP) sub-region component of PC7, comprising "Part B" (Proposal).

The specific provisions of PC7 that this submission relates to:

- 4 This submission is confined to matters in relation to the Levels and Seadown Plains Area in the Timaru Freshwater Management Unit (FMU).

Submission

- 5 <insert here about you, your farm, how much irrigation you have, how many people you employ etc>

Decisions sought by the submitter:

- 5 We seek the following decisions from Environment Canterbury:
- ✓ 5.1 that the decisions sought in **Annexure A** to this submission be accepted; and/or
 - ✓ 5.2 alternative amendments to the provisions of PC7 to address the substance of the concerns raised in this submission; and
 - ✓ 5.3 all consequential amendments required to address the concerns raised in this submission and ensure a coherent planning document.

Wish to be Heard:

- ✓ 6 We wish to be heard in support of this submission.
- ✓ 7 We would be prepared to consider presenting a joint case with others making similar submissions at the hearing.

<signature>

MC. Olofield 11/09/19

<name> MARK ELORZO OLOFIELD

Date: 13 September 2019

OLDFIELD

Seadown, Canterbury



Century Farm
2018 NZ

1890

Frederick Richard Oldfield (born 1855) was the third son of William and Harriet Oldfield, pioneer settlers of Lyttelton, who arrived on the Cressy in 1850.

Frederick moved to South Canterbury at the age of 17, starting out as a wagoner and contractor. He married Frances Mary Hawke in 1887. In 1890, Frederick obtained 250 acres freehold and 250 acres leasehold land at Seadown, where he farmed wheat and bred and grazed stock. Frederick later manufactured a sought-after sheep dip, trademarked *The Real McKay*. In 1911, Frances won the ballot for *The Poplars* in North Canterbury, and their sons Gordon and Arthur drove stock up from Seadown. The family held the run until 1929.

Frederick's son Eldred continued working the farm at Seadown while his brothers developed *The Poplars*. After returning from WW1 and suffering the loss of a leg, Eldred married Marion Dennison. They expanded the farm to dairying, breeding and trading stock, and producing wheat and other crops. A dray of white clover, or "white gold", earned enough to build a new homestead and a sealed tennis court, and buy a new car. Horse teams and traction engines were displaced by early tractors and headers. Subdivision enabled land for Seadown School, which their children Ivan, Rita and Richard attended.

Ivan married Heather Davis and they increased the Seadown holdings to 1,000 acres, becoming early growers of Watties/McCain peas and other crops, as well as sheep, beef and dairy production. Their children, Mark, Sally-anne and Wayne grew up on the farm. Mark married Adrienne Creagh. They fully irrigated the land to support cropping, sheep, beef and dairy facilities.

Mark was a Canterbury Regional Councillor, Commissioner, EECA and NZTA board member. Adrienne is a teacher. Their children, Luke (BCom, IT in Sydney), Emily (BDance, Owner/Principal of Devonport School of Dance), William (Medical Doctor) and Lydia (BEng(Hons), Process Engineer) make up the current generation. The Oldfield family now manage the farm with a trust and have more than passed their century on their original land.



Frederick and Frances



Eldred and Marion



Ivan and Heather



Latest generation - Mark, Emily, Adrienne, Lydia, William and Luke.

ANNEXURE A – REASONS FOR SUBMISSION AND DECISIONS SOUGHT

(1) The specific provisions of Proposed Plan Change 7 (PC7) that the submission relates to are:		(2) The submission is that:		(3) We seek the following decisions from Environment Canterbury:
Section & Page No.	Sub-section/ Point	Oppose/ support (in part or full)	Reasons	
Section 14.1A	Definitions	Oppose in part	A Maitaitai Protection Zone has been identified that is a substantial portion of the Levels and Seadown Plains Area. We recognize and are supportive of the catchment cultural importance however, we are seeking a clear explanation on the values of the Maitaitai Protection Zone and whether the explanation in the Ngai Tahu section of the LWRP, page 22 is also an appropriate explanation for this Zone in PC7.	Clarification on whether the Maitaitai Protection Zone as explained on page 22 of the LWRP is an appropriate explanation for this Zone in PC7 and determine if this needs to be included in a definition within this section of the plan.
Section 14.1A	Definitions	New Definition	We are looking at all options for mitigating the effects of minimum flows in our area. Augmentation of the Seadown Drain could be an option. Therefore, the plan needs to allow for this.	Augmentation means the discharge of water the Seadown Drain for the primary purpose of improving flows and/or water quality.
Section 14.4	Policies	New Policy	We are looking at all options for mitigating the effects of minimum flows in our area. Augmentation of the Seadown Drain could be an option. Therefore, the plan needs to allow for this.	Improve water quantity and/or quality by facilitating the augmentation of the Seadown Drain.
Section 14.5	Rules	New Rules	We are looking at all options for mitigating the effects of minimum flows in our area. Augmentation of the Seadown Drain could be an option. Therefore, the plan needs to allow for this.	The discharge of water into the Seadown Drain for augmentation purposes, is a restricted discretionary activity, provided the following conditions are met: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The activity does not take place on land that is listed as an archaeological site; and 2. The activity is not within a Community Drinking Water Protection Zone as defined in <u>Schedule 1</u>; and

				<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. The discharge is not within 100m of any abstraction point used for drinking water; and 4. A management plan is prepared and submitted with the application for resource consent; and 5. The discharge does not result in the erosion of the bed or banks of any receiving waterbody. <p>The exercise of discretion is restricted to the following matters:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The appropriateness of the location of the discharge points. 2. The content and quality of the management plan, and the methods proposed to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. monitor and report on the discharges to the drain; and b. manage the timing of the discharge to the drain; and 3. The appropriateness of integration with existing or planned infrastructure and water conveyance systems; and 4. Effects on people and property arising from raised groundwater levels and reduced drainage capacity in the drainage system; and 5. Effects on water quality in Washdyke Lagoon and significant habitats of indigenous flora and fauna; and 6. Effects on sites or areas of wāhi tapu, wāhi taonga or mahinga kai; and 7. The potential benefits of the activity to the community and the environment; and 8. Effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values; and 9. The rate and volume of the discharge. <p>The discharge of water into Seadown Drain for augmentation purposes that does not meet one or more of the conditions of Rule XXX is a discretionary activity.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Section 14.6.2 Environmental Flow and Allocation Regimes	Table 14(z) – Timaru Freshwater Management Unit Environmental Flow & Allocation Regimes	Oppose	Seadown Drain is managed by ECan for drainage and flood protection purposes. This means that it is subject to, for example, regular weed clearing. The amount of weed growth in the drain affects the measured flow as it impacts the water level in the drain. An assessment was completed for water users in the catchment by Ryder Consulting. This report suggested that the drain would be better managed by a water level rather than a flow. We know that this would not usually be a way of managing a water body but considering that the drain is not a normal waterbody, this made sense. The report also suggested that the flow equivalent of the level was 100 L/s. We therefore believe that the current minimum flow of 150 L/s should be amended.	Change Table 14(z) to a minimum flow of 100 L/s with partial restrictions commencing at a flow of 150 L/s.
14.6.3 Groundwater Allocation Zone Limits	Table 14(zb) – Orari Temuka Opihi Pareora Groundwater Limits	Oppose in part	There is no T allocation block proposed for the Levels Plains Groundwater Allocation Zone. Having an option to transfer surface takes or hydraulically connected groundwater should be an option for this zone given that there will be many more users subject to a minimum flow than before.	Amend Table 14(zb) for the Levels Plains Groundwater Allocation Zone to an A allocation limit of 22.9 million cubic metres per year and a T allocation limit of 10 million cubic metres per year, while retaining the total allocation for the zone of 32.9 million cubic metres per year.