

Summary-

Irrigation is valuable for maintaining reliability of production to support social wellbeing through economic stability.

Sustainability is being able to use resources without eroding environmental values so that future generations are able to have the continued use and benefit from those resources, and in the process maintaining some equity.

My main issues with this application are due to its scale, magnitude of effects and their irreversibility. The concerns are around land use intensification, its impacts upon water quality and quantity, and biodiversity values. Granting this application will compound these issues, within this catchment, as outlined in my evidence. I am unconvinced that conditions can mitigate the impact of the scheme on what are already remnant values.

Development that lacks resilience to future changes such as that outlined in the IPCC report, and that does not fully consider liabilities in our International obligations (Kyoto protocol), is a disservice to that future. In the present, wider society subsidises the cost and the rift between rural and urban grows.

The liability and risk of this proposal for future generations is in direct conflict with sustainable management as encompassed by the Resource Management Act (1991). This is due to the cumulative effects of past decisions.

Concurrent to this hearing a number of regional councils have or are looking at variations or plan changes around land use intensification and its impacts. This supports the thinking that society is being reactive rather than proactive.

It would appear that the disbandment of public good science to market forces has not been helpful. Change has been generally driven by production orientated science, with minimal consideration for wider effects that are necessary within a more balanced approach.

For example bringing in pricing of pollutants would help us make different decisions. Economic weighting on these external factors would alter GDP and on-farm analysis. Not to, is to continue the tragedy of the commons.

Considering the gravity of issues around land use impact and water nationally, the continued development of these resources through a process without a clear statement of final intent, is at least, a folly.

Whether the Act has the ability within it to achieve desired outcome, or requires an over arching vision to work towards becomes the question. For me this is an issue of Lore, defined societally, to be upheld and protected by Law.

I believe this would achieve greater clarity to guide change and give a more robust outcome for society, beneficial to all.

This would require central government leadership with a term to the long view. Personally I would like to see a process that is more constitutionally based, i.e. requires a consensual based referendum to set and change, putting it beyond political whim of the future.

A Governmental enquiry encompassing land use intensity, water impacts, biodiversity values and International obligations seems appropriate. Past abdication of national responsibility to local government has resulted in a reactive approach resulting in only remnants of unimpaired water remaining nationally.

Science is recorded observation over time without bias. The most factual science relevant to this process is the absolute degradation, within a generation, of the lowland streams flowing into Te Waihora.

Using this scheme to mitigate the cumulative effects of previous decisions is nothing but reactive mismanagement.

Is further allocation of the groundwater wise mitigation for the mounding that is predicted, considering this would result in further intensifying the landscape between these two magnificent rivers, from which we have already abstracted the most vital water?

It appears that reasonable need only applies to this generation, as effectively this is the last of the last of the allocatable surface waters within this catchment, except its availability to future generations through transferability and tradability. Hardly equitable.

The basis of Stewardship is minimally one of maintenance, and in its fullness is about enhancement- to leave in as good, if not better condition than when received. This in itself has inter-generational resolve.

It seems, somehow, we are missing the point.

Thank you for your consideration.