

**From:** [Michelle Trusttum](#)  
**To:** [Mailroom Mailbox](#)  
**Subject:** Plan Change 7 to the LWRP Submission  
**Date:** Thursday, 12 September 2019 10:20:08 PM

---

Here is my submission as a CCC and ECan ratepayer, concerned Canterbury resident, and socially responsible citizen of NZ on ECan's Plan Change 7 to the LWRP.

1. ECan must return to its core mandate, which is to protect our environment over and above private or minority interests for the greater public good. It is not, and should never have been, in the business of facilitating private business interests over the collective good of Canterbury and its peoples. The waterways and aquifers are **life sustaining** and should not be exploited as a resource - an economic input for the pecuniary advantage of the few, particularly when the damage to the waterways is significant, long-lived and detrimental to the life and health of ecological systems and the people of Canterbury.
2. Because ECan is failing in its primary duty of care to safeguard our waterways and delicate ecological systems, its councillors, executive and senior management - should be charged with **misceasance in public office**, for the dereliction of its duty of care and abandonment of its core function/mandate resulting in widespread environmental, ecological and public health damage.
3. By not setting an upper limit on nitrates and pushing out 'compliance' time frames, ECan is effectively acting on behalf of the dairy industry, big agriculture/horticulture, which is directly counter to the needs, wants and best interests of its ratepayer base and the wider population of Canterbury, and all ecologically therein. At best, we can say ECan is captured. At worst, we can level allegations of corruption.
4. The Canterbury Plains, its soils, waterways and geographical location have never been conducive to intensive dairying. The destruction of water systems, is directly on ECan - from river flows, to pollution, and the impending degradation of our aquifers because of nitrate leeching and other contaminants, which has been expressly permitted under ECan's interpretation of the legislation. This environmental disaster, this public health crisis in the making, is directly on all of you - every single one who has played a part in sanctioning this destruction, and who has continued to hide behind questionable interpretations of the RMA and failed to use all of the powers under the RMA for the public good which, as an organization, is your core reason for being. (Remember?)
5. With several reputable overseas studies having found demonstrable causal links between nitrates and cancer, and with Canterbury already presenting with some of the highest rates of bowel cancer in New Zealand, and the world (per population), ECan must err on the side of public health caution. It is untenable to adopt a 'wait and see' mentality, or indicate support for future studies, when there is even a suggestion that your actions will result in 'collateral damage' - an increase in preventable disease and death related to nitrates about which you knew, and chose to do nothing. You can hide behind all the 'scientific interpretations' and studies you want, but as humans, and an organization that must put the needs of a sustainable, healthy environment first, it is utterly inexcusable and morally bankrupt. In fact, in my view, proponents of your proposal for nitrates have blood on their hands. Stop the nonsense.
6. The economic benefits of your plan to allow for an increase in nitrate levels, which directly threaten the municipal drinking water supply, and surrounds, do not

outweigh the economic costs of continued degradation of the environment and public health. You cannot make the figures stack up any way you dice them, unless you are solely looking at the profit and loss statements for dairy companies/farmers, and the associated industries/services. Stop facilitating an economic folly and allow the market to realign with less damaging industry and business that doesn't desecrate our environment and harm (imperil) the flora, fauna and people of Canterbury.

7. And finally, it is undemocratic and ethically unsound to state your proposed changes to the LWRP are binding on an incoming council and cannot be challenged in the Environment Court or any court, except about individual points of law. This should be removed forthwith and the proposed changes should be subject to full and frank legal scrutiny in any court, and by all ratepayers and bodies acting on behalf of ratepayers and ALL the people of Canterbury. You have no right as a local authority to limit the very democratic process that provides for Ecan's very existence.

Michelle Trusttum