



Submission on Water Conservation Order - Oreti River: (Form 30)

Section 205, Resource Management Act 1991

1. In completing your submission include:
- whether you support or oppose the Order; and the reasons for your views
 - If you support the Order, but prefer to preserve a different but related water body in the same catchment, state this and your reasons
 - If you support the Order, but prefer to preserve different features and qualities of the water body, state this and your reasons.

In giving reasons for these preferences, you must refer, if practicable, to the matters set out in sections 199, 200 and 207 of the Resource Management Act 1991. You must also describe the provisions that you think should be included in the Order and the effects that those provisions would have on the water body.

2. If you oppose the Order, you must give reasons why you consider that the Order is not justified in terms of sections 199 and 207 of the Resource Management Act 1991.
3. The Special Tribunal may require you to provide further information on your submission.
4. You must send a copy of your submission to the applicant as soon as reasonably practicable after you have served your submission on the Special Tribunal.

Submissions must be received by the Special Tribunal at its address stated below by 5pm on Wednesday 15th November 2006.

Submission: To the Special Tribunal, Oreti River Water Conservation Order

SUBMITTER'S DETAILS	
Full name:	<i>Francis John Anderson</i>
Postal Address	<i>Pine Terrace RD3 Humden</i>
Work phone:	Home phone: <i>03 248 6492</i>
Work fax:	Home fax: <i>7 1 1</i>
Mobile:	Email address: _____

SUBMISSION DETAILS (use additional pages if required)	
<input type="checkbox"/> I/we support the application	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I/we oppose the application
1. The specific parts of the application that my/our submission relates to are:	
2. My/our submission is (see notes 1 and 2):	



3. I/we seek the following decision from the special tribunal: (give precise details, including the general nature of any changes sought to the Order)	
Tick if applicable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I/we want to be heard in support of this submission	<input type="checkbox"/> If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.
Signature of submitter <i>FO Anderson</i>	Date: <i>12/11/06</i>

*Use additional pages if required
Return by 15 November to:

The Special Tribunal
Oreti River Water Conservation Order
Ministry for the Environment
Te Waipounamu House
Level 7, 158 Hereford Street
PO Box 1345
Christchurch

And as soon as practicable to:

NZ and Southland Fish & Game Councils
C/- Anderson Lloyd Caudwell
Otago House
10th Floor
Moray Place/Princes Street corner
Private Bag 1959
Dunedin

Summary of application

The applicant seeks protection of:

- the main stem of the Oreti River upstream of Mossburn
- Weydon Burn, Windley River and all other tributaries upstream of Lincoln Hill
- Groundwater connected to the surface water of the river from Mossburn upstream to the headwaters

In recognition of the following outstanding features and characteristics

- Natural state, wild and scenic
- Fishery and angling amenity
- Habitat for trout and wildlife
- Value in accordance with tikanga Maori,

The outstanding features and characteristics are to be protected by prohibiting damming; restricting the taking of surface water and groundwater, restricting alteration of river flow, form or water quality; and the maintenance of fish passage.

The applicant also seeks protection of the main stem of the Oreti between Mossburn and the bridge at Wallacetown, for:

- Its necessary contribution to the outstanding angling and fishery values upstream.
- This necessary contribution is to be protected in this stretch by a prohibition on damming, which will enable fish passage to be maintained.

The application is supplemented by further information provided to the Minister in July and August 2005.

My Submission is as follows:

Fish and Game have said that they have been through a full consultation with everyone that would be affected by a Conservation Order, but when I spoke to neighbours and other farmers that would be affected by the Conservation Order I found out that no one had been notified or told about it.

Now if in the future I chose to irrigate my land, I would be able to lodge an application that would go to the RMA and my application would go through a due process to get consent, but with a Conservation Order in place I would not even be able to place an application. If in the future I had to irrigate but was not able to, then my produce would not be as good as it could have been and then who would be responsible for compensating me for my losses.

A concern for me is that the Conservation Order seems to have no science or facts to back it up, and it has not stated whether ground water is attached to the Oreti River. Now with the Environment Council, they have knowledge and scientific facts to back up what they're saying.

As I like to use the river for recreational use, I find that the Conservation Order would stop me from doing the things I like to do, whereas with the RMA I know what I am able to do.

With the knowledge, scientific facts and a lot of time and money and full consultation with those affected, the Environment Council have been able to keep the river in the brilliant condition it is in.

Recently a large problem with the Oreti River is Diclimo. The most likely way this has polluted the Oreti River is through fishermen and the gear they use. I do not have a problem with fishermen using the Oreti River, but unfortunately the Diclimo is there. Now until someone fixes the problem, I wouldn't want a Conservation Order that would prevent the Diclimo issue from being solved.

Environment Southland has the knowledge and the staff that are kept up to date with the new chemicals and ways of keeping our rivers clean.

I am extremely disappointed with the way the information has been communicated and provided about the Conservation Order. I find the Conservation Order confusing to understand as many of the points have double meanings and the points are unclear about what they are stating.

A lot more consultation and clearer information will need to be provided before this out dated Conservation Order can go through.

Yours Sincerely
PJ Anderson