

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

By **Sutherland, D**

Submitter Identification number: **PC7-534**

Wishes to be heard: **No**

Would consider making a joint submission at the hearing: **No**

Submitted on: **09/09/2019**

This submission was submitted via Environment Canterbury's online submission portal. The Submissions portal generates pdf files of submissions (as attached). However, some of the information that appears in the pdf files is not consistent with information the submitter entered into the portal, specifically, where submitters have ticked:

- "I wish to be heard in support of my submission" ; and
- "If others make a similar submission I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing".

Additionally, the submissions portal has generated submitter and submission point numbers that are not consistent with the numbering applied in the Summary of Decisions Requested. Submission points in the Summary of Decisions Requested (SODR) are numbered using the following format:

PC7 – Submitter ID #.Submission point #

The correct submitter identification number and submitter information is specified above. This will be the number referred to in the SODR.

Proposed Plan Change 7 to the Land and Water Regional Plan

Form 5 Submission on publically notified proposal for policy statement or plan, change or variation

Clause 6 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

To Environment Canterbury - Tavisha Fernando
Date received 9/09/2019 1:04:24 PM
Submission #57

Address for service:

Sutherland Daniel / 57
453 Overtons Rd RD 3 Amberley
Mobile: 02041468896
Email: danieluisutherland@gmail.com
Wishes to be heard? No
Is willing to present a joint case? No

Proposed Plan Change 7 has been developed to respond to emerging resource management issues, to give effect to relevant national direction, to implement recommendations from the Hinds Drains' Working Party, and to implement recommendations in the Waimakariri and Orari-Temuka-Opihi-Pareora (OTOP) Zone Implementation Programme Addenda (ZIPA).

- Could you gain an advantage in trade competition in making this submission?
 - No
- Are you directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that
 - (a) adversely affects the environment; and
 - (b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition
 - No

Submission points

Point 57.1

Submission

Thank you for taking the time to read my submission. It is the first time I have tried to engage in public policy so I apologise I did not break it down by subclause...

I am not a scientist, but I believe in the science we have. I will not repeat numbers that you will have had before you many times already, except to say that I am disappointed that our freshwater targets are being proposed at levels we know cause harm to our environment, and potentially to human health as well. Surely we should aspire to remain within accepted safe levels?

I want to speak for those most voiceless in this process, namely our descendants. Those that come after us in this special place will not care how strong our economy might have seemed if the land we leave behind is a blighted wasteland, its waters poisoned.

I want to stress that the damage we have already done to our land and aquifers in the name of progress is already immense. It will take generations to heal, and it is a healing that can only begin if we have the courage to act decisively now. If I am honest I fear the damage may already be too great, but we must still advocate for those who will inherit our mess. Any future damage and degradation we can prevent with strong legislation is one less problem to be dealt with by our grandchildren and beyond. I fear that the inertia our current agribusiness sector holds may be too much to claw back before the land withers beneath our hooves.

I want to speak against the doctrine of Growth itself. A mania that demands ever more from a finite world. We cannot keep trying to feed the world at the expense of our own backyards. We must not shy from the fact that this will cost money, in the old way of thinking. The full cost of environmental degradation must be realised in our economic system. To ignore the price our land and water pays (and the cost that will bring our descendants) is to ignore what amounts to billions of dollars in subsidies to the polluters. We must act strongly to remove the inherited right to pollute that seems to come with land in the country.

I want to speak against those who would dilute our efforts in protecting our environment with the promise of new technology to cure all our woes. While new advances will play a role in the next generation of farming in New Zealand, their future promise must not distract us from the changes we can make now. On this topic I would refer you to "A Short History of Progress" by Canadian Archeologist and Anthropologist Ronald Wright. Both a Book and series of Lectures which lay out the sad history of human civilisations rising and falling throughout the ages. From ancient Sumer in modern day Iraq to the Mayan of Central America, the Roman Empire to Rapanui / Easter Island and Ankor Wat. Again and again human societies isolated in time and space have

grown and flourished on the back of their environments before collapsing under their own weight. Each of these societies at some stage identified the changes going on around them, and doubled down on technology (or religion) to save them. Irrigation was invented in Sumar. The Canals of Ankor Wat were enlarged, the Romans built ever larger aquaducts fo bring fresh water from further and further afield. These measures undoubtably prolonged these civilisations, in cases by hundreds of years. Yet eventually the collapses still came. I wonder if we will be as successful, and ultimatly as futile. The Mayans, while arguably finished off by the Conquistadors were already a shadow of their former grandure when the New world collided with the Old. More sacrifices to their gods would not relieve their droughts any more than they would slow the spread of smallpox.

There are two major differences between our own culture, and those that have fallen before us. Firstly, we know of those people who came before. We can see their mistakes and learn from them, if we choose to.

Second, and most alarmingly, we have the technology now to dammage our environment far more than any other people in history. From Nuclear weapons and power (which Aotearoa was brave enough to stand against before I was even born) to intensive agriculture on porus gravel soils. the choices we make will impact on the very ability of the land to support a life worth leaving for our children. Our decisions now will impact long into the future, for better or worse.

If the concequences of our actions are considered against a much longer timeframe than that of a farms morgage then the only morally acceptable outcome is one where we give absolute protection to the basic life support systems on which we depend. The simple truth is that Canterbury cannot, and never could support the weight of human greed in its current form of intensive agriculture. It is not enough that these changes to water management may drive some farmers off thier land, or at the very least force them to change how and what they farm. Indeed thes policy changes must remove the laziest and dirtiest farmers off our delicate land. It must force farmers to change how and what they farm. Business as usual cannot continue. The time of unmitigated growth and production has ended and we must learn to live within our means, quickly.

Please have the forsight and couragenot to be strong in these policies, do not let industry, banks and fertiliser salesmen dilute our efforts toward a sustainable future. By the time these plans are reviewed again it will be too late to save what little we have left.

Sincerley

Daniel Sutherland

Relief sought

Section: General

Sub-section: General

Provision

General