

## Submission Form 16 to the Otago Regional Council on consent applications

Submitter Details: (please print clearly)

This is a Submission on (a) limited notified/publicly notified resource consent application/s pursuant to the Resource Management Act 1991.

Full Name/s:	Bridget Wolter
Postal Address:	
Phone number:	Business: Private:
	Mobile:
Email address:	
I/ we wish to SUP of:	PORT OPPOSE submit a NEUTRAL submission on (circle one) the application
	tion: KL Skeggs; SA Mc Quilkin; G. MTod
whether you are i views).	on is (include: whether you support or oppose the application or specific parts of it, neutral regarding the application or specific parts of it and the reasons for your See attached document.

I/We seek the following decision from the consent authority (give precise details, including the general nature of any conditions sought)
TO NOT grant this consent application
I/we:  Wish to be heard in support of our/my submission  Not wish to be heard in support of our/my submission
If others make a similar submission, I/we will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.  ☐ Yes ☐ No
I, am am not choose one) a trade competitor* of the applicant (for the purposes of Section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991).
*If trade competitor chosen, please complete the next statement, otherwise leave blank.
I, am net (choose one) directly affected by an effect as a result of the proposed activity in the application that:  a) adversely affects the environment; and b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.
I do de not (choose one) wish to be involved in any pre-hearing meeting that may be held for this application.
I dolde not request* that the local authority delegates its functions, powers, and duties to hear and decide the application to 1 or more hearings commissioners who are not members of the local authority.
I have/haze not served a copy of my submission on the applicant.
13/01/21
Signature/s of submitter/s (Date)  (or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter/s)

Submission Opposing Consent Application to take water from Royalburn North Branch and New Chums creek by BSTGT Ltd and Trustees of the A P McQuillkin Family Trust:

Specific parts of the application my submission relates to are;

- 1. The quantity of water being sought to extract
- 2. The description of current and future land use
- 3. Total lack of consultation/acknowledgement of affected parties downstream
- 4. Not being consistent with the purpose and principles of the RMA

Reasons for opposing this application;

-1. The applicant is essentially seeking permission to run the 2 streams dry at any time of year.

They still want to take more water than actually even flows through these streams at certain times of the year. While they already have extensive water storage capacity there is no guarantee from them that the streams will continue to flow in drier periods.

Surely an independent hydrology report on actual water flows v's the actual water take by the applicant would be essential to making any decision on how much water should be allocated to whom.

The fact that they are seeking less water than what was permitted in the past is entirely irrelevant to what actually exists.

The impact of diverting huge amounts of water from the natural stream bed will (inevitably) substantially reduce the flow down stream and ground water levels on large areas of the Crown Terrace.

2. Repeatedly in the application land use is referred to as requiring water for "irrigation and domestic and stock use".

There is one single reference to a private golf corse.

Since 2009 BSTGT has been incrementally expanding the size of its private golf corse. On the QLDC website it can be seen that RM190095 gives Resource consent approval to BSTGT to extend their current golf corse to 15 holes. There is also no mention in the application of ready lawn production, on a commercial scale, that has been operating out of Barley Station in recent years. All of these activities require huge amounts of water.

Far more water than "normal" irrigation, domestic and stock use.

3. I have owned and lived at 269a Crown Range road since 1991.

In that entire time I have obtained 100% of my water supply from the lower part of the Royalburn stream through a local co-operative water scheme now known as LOFTS Water Ltd.

For the applicants to submit that "no other lawful users will be affected by the proposal" is completely false.

I, and other members of LOFTS water Ltd have exercised our legal right to a total of 25,000 lts of surface water from the Royalburn per day for decades.

The applicants do not acknowledge our existence, let alone any water rights we have.

I currently have no alternative water supply.

4. This proposal does not ensure that adverse effects on the environment are avoided – it exacerbates it.

Consistently running these creeks dry, when historically this rarely happened, harms the existing ecosystems and obviously, makes everything down stream drier also.

This proposal flies in the face of The National Policy Statement for Freshwater management 2014, in that clearly it seeks an over-allocation of water to the single applicant.

100% water use to one combined permit holder cannot be said to comply with B5,B6 or B8 of that Statement.

Lodged by Bridget Wolter