

**From:** [Alistair & Mandy Hay](#)  
**To:** [Mailroom Mailbox](#)  
**Subject:** Plan Change 7 Submission - Alistair Hay  
**Date:** Thursday, 12 September 2019 10:06:18 PM  
**Attachments:** [Plan change 7 Sub. A Hay.pdf](#)

---

Please find attached my submission on the proposed plan change 7.

Regards Alistair Hay

--

Alistair & Mandy Hay

# 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](mailto:mailroom@ecan.govt.nz)

**Name of submitter:**

Alistair Peter Hay

**Address:** 1614 Clayton Road, Fairlie 7987

**Contact:** Alistair Hay

ph.0274876711

**Email:** [sherwoodhays@gmail.com](mailto:sherwoodhays@gmail.com)

**Trade competition statement:**

I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

**Proposal this submission relates to is:**

This submission is on proposed Plan Change 7 (PC7) to the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan (PC7).

**Wish to be Heard:**

I wish to be heard in support of this submission.

I would be prepared to consider presenting a joint case with others making similar submissions at the hearing.

**Signature:**



Alistair Peter Hay

Date: 13 September 2019

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

## Background about submitter:

Farmer - Family farm with my wife and 3 teenage children. 3rd generation on this property.

1000ha flat land property located on the North shore of Lake Opuha. Our property is bounded by the North and South Opuha Rivers and Lake Opuha.

400 - 450m above sea level = restrictive climate (shorter season, drought prone, high snow risk)

Running Deer, Beef and Dairy support.

30% of the property (300ha) is irrigated via Pivots and K Line

80% of the irrigation is from AA consented, OWL shared water from the South Opuha River - restricted from tributary minimum flow.

20% of the irrigation is from AN consented (non shared) water from the North Opuha River - restricted by the unmodified flow at SH1 bridge (a calculation which assumes the dam doesn't exist and what would have been flowing under the SH1 bridge if Lake Opuha wasn't augmenting the Opihi River flow).

A member of the Upper Opihi and Opuha Catchment Group

A member of the Flow and Allocation Working Party (FAWP)



## **Provisions of the proposed plan my submission relates to:**

### **14.6.2 Environmental Flow and Allocation Regimes - 14(m)**

#### **Oppose in Part**

**Reason: "AN takes" should not be included in North Opuha pro-rata restriction calculations**

**Decision Sought: Remove "AN takes" from pro-rata calculations**

#### **Narrative:**

North Opuha "AN takes" should not be included in minimum flow pro rata calculations because "AN takes" are already "catered for" with State Highway 1 (SH1) Unmodified flow restriction controls - I hold an AN consent and know full well that "AN takes" are restricted well before other takes on the river (AA) are restricted - this means that I am returning water back to the river already so AA permit holders need not be also. Including AN in pro rata calculations effectively is a "double whammy" restriction on other river consent holders. It imposes another level of restriction on AA permit holders that are already adequately controlled by tributary minimum flows not including "AN takes" in the calculation.

### **14.6.2 Environmental Flow and Allocation Regimes - 14(o)**

#### **Oppose**

**Reason: Inclusion of Step 2 is not proven to be needed to be introduced.**

**Decision Sought: Delete table 14(o)**

#### **Narrative:**

I support the FAWP proposals for flow and allocations for the tributaries of the Opihi river. I believe a well informed discussion over a period of years - which included a good number of affected parties (not just irrigators), with input from industry, ecological and economic professionals - has come up with a well balanced submission.

As such I see the inclusion of a second step, which imposes greater levels of flow and allocation restrictions - which was not at all what was put up by the FAWP - as unacceptable. This second

step has no basis at all upon which to be implemented. Step 1 needs to be implemented and assessed before a second step is even considered.

An example of what is happening on our 1000ha property:

In the last 24 months:

- \*Fenced off over 5km of waterways
- \*Ceased using 8.5km of open stock water races
- \*Put in 8km of piping for stock water
- \*Obtained a consent to farm
- \*Farm Environment Plan - B grade audit with continuing plans in place

I myself can attest to the fact that my thinking as a farmer has moved a long way in the past 18 months in regards to my attitude towards such topics as waterway fencing, clean drinking water, winter grazing management plans etc. I am finding that environmental improvements are also going hand in hand with improved ease of management of my property.

The enhancements made on our property over the past couple of seasons will be starting to flow through to the surrounding environment. As such a move to tighter and tighter controls (I'm referring to Step2) before the positive gains being made rapidly on farms at present are measured is a step-to-far too soon - an informed decision needs to be made towards the end of this plan life to see if the results of current changes are having the desired results. **ALLOW FARMERS TO IMPLEMENT THE CURRENT AND SHORTER TERM PROPOSED RULES AND MEASURE THE OUTCOMES.**