

RECEIVED
02 APR 2009

05

**Further submission in support of, or in opposition to,
submission on the publicly notified proposed national policy
statement on Freshwater Management**

To The Chairperson
Board of Inquiry

Name of person making further submission:
[full name and address]

Peter Grant
96 Warrsbeck Street
Dunedin

This is a further submission in support of, or in opposition to, a submission on the proposed national policy statement for freshwater management (the proposal).

I support/oppose, the submission of:
[name and address of original submitter and submission number of original submission]

Environment Canterbury
58 Kilmore Street
Christchurch 6

The particular parts of the submission I support/oppose are:
[clearly indicate which parts of the original submission you support or oppose together with any relevant provisions of the proposal. Please append any additional text]

as enclosed

The reasons for my support or opposition are:
[give reasons and append any additional text]

as enclosed

I seek that the whole (or part [describe part]) of the submission be allowed/disallowed
[give precise details and append any additional text]

as enclosed

I wish (or do not wish) to be heard in support of this submission.

* If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.

* Delete if you would not consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.

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

.....
Date

(A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means.)

Address for service of submitter:	96 Wansbeck St ORMSTON
Telephone:	(03) 4341289
Fax/email:	mountcookmove@netspeed.net.nz
Contact person: [name and designation, if applicable]	Peter Grant.

Person Making Submission

Peter Grant
96 Wansbeck Street
Oamaru

This is a further submission in support of :-

Environment Canterbury
58 Kilmore Street
Christchurch
Submission No. 6

I support Environment Canterbury,s submission.

Ref: 1.2 Cummulative Effect Environment Canterbury requests that Central Government provide the tools to measure and set limits. Regional Councils will not have the expertise to undertake these tasks. A specialised task force should be set up to be available to the various Regional Councils to utilise.

Ref: 1.3 Setting of environmental water quality standards / flows when there is uncertainty of information. This applies particularly to rivers not yet affected by diffuse pollution, yet have proposals in place to intensify land development and / or introduce new dairy development into the catchment. Example being the iconic Manuherikea River Valley in Central Otago. Councils should be able to pre set limits to land activity based on similar models, yet biased on the side of conservative.

The example of the Fisheries Act of 1966 Section 13 (2 a) . What is implied, is that like the Fisheries Act, land use activities , particularly so intensive Dairy operations, Should have a quota system specifically aimed at setting limits on stock numbers, fertiliser applications per annum and the inter relationship with soil types and irrigation inputs. This should be at least discussed on a Catchment basis with close co operation with affected farming groups, scientific advisors, and the appropriate Regional Council. The implications for existing over allocated river catchments are the reduction of stock numbers and the resultant devaluation of farm properties in the affected zone. Obviously not a popular scenario, but one that our Fisheries Industry has fronted up to and pursued for the sake of a sustainable future for the resource.

I seek that the whole of the Environment Canterbury submission be endorsed.

I do not wish to be heard in support of this submission.

Yours Faithfully

Peter Grant
96 Wansbeck Street
Oamaru
Ph 03 4341289

mountcookmove@netspeed.net.nz