

From: [Matthew Hall](#)
To: [Mailroom Mailbox](#)
Subject: Plan Change 7
Date: Friday, 13 September 2019 4:52:46 PM
Attachments:

Hi there,
Please find attached a submission on Plan Change 7.
Sincerely,
Matthew Hall



FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

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

Submitter ID:

File No:

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: Matthew Chadlow Hall

Organisation*: Not Applicable

* the organisation that this submission is made on behalf of

Phone (Wk): 03 3084897

Postal Address: 11A Carters Terrace Ashburton

Phone (Cell): _____

Postcode: 7700 Email: Mchadhall @ Xtra.co.nz

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;

☐ Signature: [Signature] MNZM Date: 13th September 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.

Salmon Spawning sites.

Some of these have been listed however it must be recognised that stream conditions and factors that prevail at the time salmon are returning to spawn dictate where salmon may end up spawning. Trout appear to spawn in a wider range of waters and the RMA recognises the requirement to have regard to the protection of habitats for both salmon and trout.

Hinds Drains

I favour the move to deep ground water for abstractors so long as this is sustainable in the long term, supported by science and the purpose and use of the water will not have any adverse effect on the environment (beyond quality and use limits that are set)

OTOPs Sub Region

Science should lead the setting of the minimum flows, which must secure healthy streams. Minimums must be set to at all times secure the standard.

The plan needs to recognise the changes that Central Government may impose on nutrient loads. There should be sufficient flexibility around the application of the plan to cope with change.

Fish Passage 4.102

Salmon and Trout must by definition be excluded from definition of invasive or pest species. These species and native species have co-existed for many years, If populations have been affected look to the cause – Human intervention- the blame of population loss should not be placed on the species. Naturally there are sites species prefer that means that they are not competing with each other. This should be recognised.

If this policy is intended to exclude salmon and trout I am not sure of the authority/ jurisdiction the Canterbury Regional Council has in this matter. I cannot see Fish and Game agreeing.

MAR

In speaking with ECan Councillors the impression given was MAR was a trial and I understand the trial period is still running. The plan appears to anticipate the results. In an overallocated catchment MAR may be taken as a solution to the problem of overallocation however that solution is not a solution if it uses water from that catchment and the over allocation is not fully addressed. In these circumstances MAR could be seen as securing a better outcome for irrigation and nutrient dilution at the expense of a healthy river.

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