

From: [Ross Hanan](#)
To: [Submissions](#); sally@mckconsultancy.co.nz
Cc: [kate.hanan](#); [Grant Hanan](#); [Ross Hanan \(AU\)](#); [Ross Hanan](#)
Subject: Lindis Catchment Group Incorporated - RM17.301
Date: Sunday, 14 January 2018 1:46:47 p.m.
Attachments: [ORC LCG submission-Hanan-20180114.docx](#)
[ORC LCG submission-Hanan-20180114.pdf](#)

Please find attached our submission currently opposing the Resource Consent Application of the Lindis Catchment Group Ltd.

We seek responses to a range of concerns as detailed in the attached submission.

Please note that we have attached our submission in two files types in case you have difficulties opening in one of the formats.

Regards

Grant, Kate & Ross

Date: 14 January 2018

Regarding: The Resource Consent Application of the Lindis Catchment Group Ltd

File No: RM17.301

Application Number: RM17.301.01 – RM17.301.19

Submitter names: Grant Hanan, Kate Hanan & Ross Hanan

Submitter telephones: 021489961, 029934840, 0488009668

Submitter emails: kate.hanan@mac.com, ross.hanan@gmail.com, granthius@hotmail.com

Submitter Property Location: 2059 Tarras Cromwell Road, Lindis Crossing, Cromwell. This borders the Beggs Stacpoole race, State Highway 8 and the Lindis River below the Lindis Crossing bridge.

We Currently Oppose the Submission

We are looking for two core outcomes:

- a) Confidence that Best Efforts are made to ensure the continuation of water flow below the Lindis Crossing Bridge enabling us to access this water
- b) Surety that water will be able to be abstracted for domestic purposes and stock below the Bridge at Lindis Crossing (at SH8)

We note several key concerns:

- a) There is no rationing regime detailed in the plan, only a pledge that such a scheme “will be developed”. Given that mitigating the risk of low river water flow is a key aspect of the legislation – this should be a core requirement of any application.
- b) There are no technical hydrologic reports associated with the proposal that are available for public scrutiny. This creates a lack of credibility that a reduction of flow from 900 to 550m/s under the new irrigation plan will achieve similar outcomes to the original 900 m/s figure.
- c) We note there is no express commitment by LCG to keeping the river flowing. Previously the river has frequently dried up suggesting little commitment to keeping the river flowing. This should be a core criteria in the application.

d) There are no consequences for not using Best Efforts to keep the river flowing through to the confluence.

Consequently we seek the following responses from the consent authority:

1. *Does a flow rate of 550 m/s provide for a healthy river with continual flow to the confluence of the Clutha? Please provide independent scientific evidence that a flow of this rate would only dry up the river bed in extreme drought conditions. Similar tolerance levels to the '100 hundred year flood', would be a sound working variable, i.e. the river might dry up in a 100 year drought.*
2. *Please detail modelling showing the impact of global warming on the new proposed flow rate. For example, are drought conditions likely to increase?*
3. *Please provide full details of the rationing regime that will be employed. Also please respond with the m/s level when rationing begins.*
4. *Who will administer and enforce compliance and act as a representative for the river to flow through to its confluence?*
5. *Please detail what consequences will occur to the LCG should water extraction levels be too high and the minimum flow of 550 m/s isn't achieved, and water doesn't flow to the confluence.*

Background

1. Requirement that riparian provisions in the Beggs Stacpoole agreement will be enforceable under the new plan

Beggs Stacpoole – Riparian Provisions. Under the terms of the Beggs Stacpoole agreement the race was deemed to have priority over the river.

Accordingly a riparian provision was placed in this contract for small block owners to use water from the Beggs Stacpoole race. In essence the old riparian right of using the river water for "domestic purpose and stock" as well as an entitlement to water "undiminished in quantity and undiminished in quality."

We currently have direct access to a pipe in the Beggs Stacpoole race providing this entitlement.

As a reminder, the river is dry again.



These photos were taken in January 2018.

With the demise of the Beggs Stacpoole race our ability to **reliably** draw water will/is deeply constrained.

The current primacy of the Beggs Stacpoole race has enabled us a high level of assurance that water will be available for domestic purposes and stock use.

The LCG Submission

1. We note that The LCG submission makes some reference to “reasonable domestic and stock drinking water purposes”, which one can approximate to the transfer back of the right from the Beggs Stacpoole Agreement.

We further note that "The rationing regime that will be developed by LCG and adhered to by all permit holders in the catchment (via conditions of consent on all permits) will support an equitable approach to sharing water during times of low flows, to ensure the effects of water shortages are equally borne throughout the catchment." While positive sounding, holds no teeth. There is no rationing regime detailed in the plan, only a pledge that such a scheme “will be developed”. Given that mitigating the risk of low river water flow is a key aspect of the legislation – *this should be a core requirement of any application*.

We need assurance that the flow of the river will out-way all other users.

2. The Proposal proposes to reduce flow of the river from 900 MI/sec to 550ml/sec. **This is a reduction of 38% of previous levels considered previously appropriate to maintain adequate flow through to confluence of the Lindis and Clutha Rivers.**

There are no technical hydrologic reports associated with the proposal available for public scrutiny. Consequently we have little confidence that this proposal will ensure permanent flowing water at the Lindis Bridge.

3. A free text search reveals that there is no reference in the LCG submission to a “continuing flowing river”, further underlying our lack of confidence in achieving water flows from the Lindis Bridge to the confluence of the Clutha. The LCG submitters should expressly state this commitment to keeping the river flowing at an environmentally sustainable rate.

4. Previously an ORC [committee](#) agreed that a minimum flow of 900 m/s would:

- protect the river’s instream values
- enhance the river’s role as an important spawning and rearing tributary of the nationally important Lake Dunstan and Upper Clutha fisheries
- encourage a co-operative approach to water use
- allow people to value and enjoy a healthy **and continually flowing river** that is connected to the Clutha River/Matau-Au
- preserve and protect the cultural relationship Ngai Tahu has with the river catchment

Once commitment to the river continually flowing to the confluence occurs, at an environmentally sustainable rate, through all but the most serious drought conditions, then all five bullet points above are likely to be achieved.

Regards,

Grant Hanan, Kate Hanan & Ross Hanan

Date: 14 January 2018

Regarding: The Resource Consent Application of the Lindis Catchment Group Ltd

File No: RM17.301

Application Number: RM17.301.01 – RM17.301.19

Submitter names: Grant Hanan, Kate Hanan & Ross Hanan

Submitter telephones: 021489961, 029934840, 0488009668

Submitter emails: kate.hanan@mac.com, ross.hanan@gmail.com, granthius@hotmail.com

Submitter Property Location: 2059 Tarras Cromwell Road, Lindis Crossing, Cromwell. This borders the Beggs Stacpoole race, State Highway 8 and the Lindis River below the Lindis Crossing bridge.

We Currently Oppose the Submission

We are looking for two core outcomes:

- a) Confidence that Best Efforts are made to ensure the continuation of water flow below the Lindis Crossing Bridge enabling us to access this water
- b) Surety that water will be able to be abstracted for domestic purposes and stock below the Bridge at Lindis Crossing (at SH8)

We note several key concerns:

- a) There is no rationing regime detailed in the plan, only a pledge that such a scheme “will be developed”. Given that mitigating the risk of low river water flow is a key aspect of the legislation – this should be a core requirement of any application.
- b) There are no technical hydrologic reports associated with the proposal that are available for public scrutiny. This creates a lack of credibility that a reduction of flow from 900 to 550m/s under the new irrigation plan will achieve similar outcomes to the original 900 m/s figure.
- c) We note there is no express commitment by LCG to keeping the river flowing. Previously the river has frequently dried up suggesting little commitment to keeping the river flowing. This should be a core criteria in the application.

d) There are no consequences for not using Best Efforts to keep the river flowing through to the confluence.

Consequently we seek the following responses from the consent authority:

1. *Does a flow rate of 550 m/s provide for a healthy river with continual flow to the confluence of the Clutha? Please provide independent scientific evidence that a flow of this rate would only dry up the river bed in extreme drought conditions. Similar tolerance levels to the '100 hundred year flood', would be a sound working variable, i.e. the river might dry up in a 100 year drought.*
2. *Please detail modelling showing the impact of global warming on the new proposed flow rate. For example, are drought conditions likely to increase?*
3. *Please provide full details of the rationing regime that will be employed. Also please respond with the m/s level when rationing begins.*
4. *Who will administer and enforce compliance and act as a representative for the river to flow through to its confluence?*
5. *Please detail what consequences will occur to the LCG should water extraction levels be too high and the minimum flow of 550 m/s isn't achieved, and water doesn't flow to the confluence.*

Background

1. Requirement that riparian provisions in the Beggs Stacpoole agreement will be enforceable under the new plan

Beggs Stacpoole – Riparian Provisions. Under the terms of the Beggs Stacpoole agreement the race was deemed to have priority over the river.

Accordingly a riparian provision was placed in this contract for small block owners to use water from the Beggs Stacpoole race. In essence the old riparian right of using the river water for "domestic purpose and stock" as well as an entitlement to water "undiminished in quantity and undiminished in quality."

We currently have direct access to a pipe in the Beggs Stacpoole race providing this entitlement.

As a reminder, the river is dry again.



These photos were taken in January 2018.

With the demise of the Beggs Stacpoole race our ability to **reliably** draw water will/is deeply constrained.

The current primacy of the Beggs Stacpoole race has enabled us a high level of assurance that water will be available for domestic purposes and stock use.

The LCG Submission

1. We note that The LCG submission makes some reference to “reasonable domestic and stock drinking water purposes”, which one can approximate to the transfer back of the right from the Beggs Stacpoole Agreement.

We further note that "The rationing regime that will be developed by LCG and adhered to by all permit holders in the catchment (via conditions of consent on all permits) will support an equitable approach to sharing water during times of low flows, to ensure the effects of water shortages are equally borne throughout the catchment." While positive sounding, holds no teeth. There is no rationing regime detailed in the plan, only a pledge that such a scheme “will be developed”. Given that mitigating the risk of low river water flow is a key aspect of the legislation – *this should be a core requirement of any application*.

We need assurance that the flow of the river will out-way all other users.

2. The Proposal proposes to reduce flow of the river from 900 MI/sec to 550ml/sec. **This is a reduction of 38% of previous levels considered previously appropriate to maintain adequate flow through to confluence of the Lindis and Clutha Rivers.**

There are no technical hydrologic reports associated with the proposal available for public scrutiny. Consequently we have little confidence that this proposal will ensure permanent flowing water at the Lindis Bridge.

3. A free text search reveals that there is no reference in the LCG submission to a “continuing flowing river”, further underlying our lack of confidence in achieving water flows from the Lindis Bridge to the confluence of the Clutha. The LCG submitters should expressly state this commitment to keeping the river flowing at an environmentally sustainable rate.

4. Previously an ORC [committee](#) agreed that a minimum flow of 900 m/s would:

- protect the river’s instream values
- enhance the river’s role as an important spawning and rearing tributary of the nationally important Lake Dunstan and Upper Clutha fisheries
- encourage a co-operative approach to water use
- allow people to value and enjoy a healthy **and continually flowing river** that is connected to the Clutha River/Matau-Au
- preserve and protect the cultural relationship Ngai Tahu has with the river catchment

Once commitment to the river continually flowing to the confluence occurs, at an environmentally sustainable rate, through all but the most serious drought conditions, then all five bullet points above are likely to be achieved.

Regards,

Grant Hanan, Kate Hanan & Ross Hanan