

Submission Form 16 to the Otago Regional Council on consent applications

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

Submitter Details:

(please print clearly)

Full Name/s:

Philip Blakely Mary Wallace

Postal Address:

[Redacted]

Post Code:

Phone number:

Business:

Private:

Mobile:

[Redacted]

Email address:

[Redacted]

I/ we wish to **SUPPORT** / **OPPOSE** / submit a **NEUTRAL** submission on (circle one) the application of:

Applicant's Name:

BTSUT Ltd &

And/or Organisation:

AR McQuilkin Family Trust.

Application Number:

A1363473

Location:

Purpose:

The specific parts of the application/s that my submission relates to are: (Give details)

The entire application in particular related to the North Royal Burn.

My/Our submission is (include: whether you support or oppose the application or specific parts of it, whether you are neutral regarding the application or specific parts of it and the reasons for your views).

Oppose application
(refer submission attached)

✓ We seek the following decision from the consent authority (give precise details, including the general nature of any conditions sought)

Decline 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~~ **am not** (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~~ **do not** (choose one) wish to be involved in any pre-hearing meeting that may be held for this application.

I ~~do~~ **do 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~~ **have not** served a copy of my submission on the applicant.



28/7/2020

Signature/s of submitter/s
(or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter/s)

(Date)

APPLICATION TO TAKE AND USE SURFACE WATER FROM THE ROYAL BURN FROM BSTGT LIMITED AND McQUILKIN FAMILY TRUST

SUBMISSION BY PHILIP BLAKELY AND MARY WALLACE

We have owned the property at the base of the Crown Range either side of the Royal Burn for 30 years. We have a share in Water Permit 97402 on the main stem of the lower Royal Burn.

There has been a noticeable reduction in flow in the Royal Burn in recent years during the dry summer months and in 2017 dried up completely for the first time. The reduction in flow we believe coincided with the change of ownership of Barley Station on the Crown Terrace to BSTGT Ltd and its water take of upper reaches of the Royal Burn especially for the use for its private golfcourse.

Our submission is as follows:

1. We oppose the limited notification of the application. The Upper Royal Burn tributaries affect and feed the aquifer, springs, seeps, wetlands and on the Crown Terrace. The wider community especially on the Crown Terrace is affected and rightfully have an interest in the effects on these aspects and in stream health generally.
2. The application is inadequate.
 - (a) The assessment of Environmental Effects is inadequate and fails to adequately address the Fourth Schedule - Assessment of Effects especially 6&7.
 - b) The intended use of the water and area to be irrigated is vague and lacks transparency.
 - c) Is not supported by solid hydrological data or study.
3. It is erroneous for the Applicants to suggest that they will taking less water than their current allocation in the Deemed Permit when it is commonly known that historic deemed permits including the Royal Burn are over allocated and there is not enough water to sustain the allocation. The current allocation (as pointed out in the application) is not achievable and it is understood that the water taken at present takes all the water that there is in the creek.
4. The application will result in effectively continuing to take all the water from the North Royal Burn which is more than the creek can sustain albeit the take is less than the deemed permit allocation. There is no provision to sustain a reasonable minimum flow. We support the principle of minimum flow and retention of instream values.
5. The Application fails to benefit the economic wellbeing of the community through the provision of productive economic opportunities. There is mention of irrigation, stock water and domestic use and only a brief reference to the private golfcourse.

We understand that most of the water used is for the private golfcourse and as stated above the marked decrease in the water in the Royal Burn coincided with the development of this golfcourse. This is not a productive use and does not sustain or benefit economic wellbeing of the community.

6. We consider 25 years is inappropriate.

We oppose the entire application in its current form. The information provided is inadequate. The deficiencies in the application need to be addressed and the application fully notified to allow input from others in the community affected.

The assessment and granting of any new application needs to be based on sound hydrological data and in accordance with retention of a reasonable minimum flow and well as fully notified application.

July 31, 2020