To Marlborough District Council

PO Box 443

Blenheim 7240

Submission on application for a resource consent

**Submitter Details**

Submitter: Port Underwood Association

Address for Service: PO Box 59

 Blenheim 7240

e-mail: port.underwood.association@gmail.com

Telephone: 0221 306 508

Contact Person: John Davison (Chairman)

**Application details**

Application number: U161036

Applicant: Burleigh Estate Ltd

Address: Robin Hood Bay

 Port Underwood

Description or proposal: Water Permit (Take Water) Water Permit (Use Water) Land Use (River surface or bed activity)

We **oppose** the application See details below.

We wish to speak at the hearing in support of our application

Signature: Date:

**Reasons for opposing the application:**

1. There is insufficient data provided to approve the extraction of water.
2. The report produced on behalf of the applicant by Pattle Delamore Partners Ltd states in its recommendations that to “… provide a better indication of flows …….. as well as losses from the Creek to the underlying gravels it is recommended that flow gauges are undertaken…..”. It is suggested that no consent can be given until this work is undertaken. The application is made using desk top reviews based on estimates from far field sites and supposition. This is insufficient for the granting of a resource consent to take water.
3. As noted in section 5 of the Pattle Delamore Partners Ltd report, changes in the expected rainfall significantly impact the volumes for irrigation. Also, at section 4 the report states that no flow data is available for Staces Creek. Thus, without undertaking actual investigations of rainfall and flows no solid conclusions can be made. Thus, further work needs to be undertaken before any consent can be given.
4. The experience of members is that the creek goes dry during the summer and this indicates there is insufficient water for extraction.
5. The report produced on behalf of the applicant by Pattle Delamore Partners Ltd states in its recommendations that “…it would be useful to quantify these losses to gain a better understanding of how a potential take from Staces Creek may influence the duration and frequency of drying of the riverbed.” This supports the conclusion that the consent should not be granted until further work is undertaken.
6. It was also noted in the report that the losses may impact fish migration and the availability of habitat for in-stream ecology.
7. The report by Pattle Delamore Partners Ltd also states that it is necessary to understand surface flows to understand the underlying water table. The depth and quality of the water table and the impact of abstraction must be understood before there is any abstraction. It is suggested that no consent should be given until this work is undertaken.
8. The extraction of water from underground gravels may cause saltwater intrusion from the bay. No consent should be granted until it can be shown there will be no salt water intrusion.
9. Val Wadsworth (MDC’s environmental scientist – hydrology) notes that the water extracted can potentially be taken over a short period and this would compromise in-stream habitat. Thus, no consent should be granted unless extraction is both restricted to a maximum of 3 litres per second (as recommended by Val Wadsworth). Conditions should also be placed to ensure that this is monitored through a meter. This is confirmed by comments by Peter Hamill.
10. The use of a diesel pump over a long period (12 hours as suggested by Val Wadsworth) will create a significant noise intrusion on an area that is a significant tourist resource and DOC campsite. It is suggested that this noise intrusion is inappropriate in this area.
11. Although the application is for water to irrigate 20 hectares, there will be 80 hectares of vineyard. How is it proposed that this extra area is to be irrigated, if at all? How is this irrigation to be monitored? It is suggested that the consent should not be considered in isolation to the full extent of the proposed vineyard. Given the lack of this information it is suggested that the consent should not be granted.
12. Whilst the application is for a quarter of the vineyard, how is it proposed that the rest of the farm will use water? Is there a proposal of how the balance of the farm, currently livestock, is to obtain and use water? It is suggested that the consent should not be considered in isolation to the full extent of the proposed land use. Given the lack of this information it is suggested that the consent should not be granted.
13. Whilst the consent is for water extraction and use, the proposal for a 80 hectare vineyard will inevitably mean significant extra traffic on the winding, narrow and unsealed Port Underwood Road. Harvesters will be required for thinking, pruning and harvesting grapes. Harvesters are very slow moving vehicles, such slow moving traffic would be a hazard. If they are to be brought in on trailers this also would be a hazard on this road. How is it proposed that these large, slow moving vehicles will be brought in to such a remote site? Furthermore, when the grapes are harvested large trucks will be required to move grapes. The road is wholly unsuitable for large trucks towing trailers and no grape trucks should be permitted to tow a trailer. Similar problems will arise when the grapes vines are installed. It is suggested that no consent can be given unless this roading issue is resolved.
14. Grape spill issues are a known road safety issue in Marlborough. The effect of a grape spill on the steep, winding sealed section of the Port Underwood Road would be potentially life threatening. In the Association’s view this is a serious matter and needs to be addressed before any consents can be granted.
15. It is also noted that the application is for the removal of gorse, including the application of herbicides. In addition, it is to be expected that there will be spraying of the vineyard when it is established. The use of herbicides and other chemicals in the vicinity of a creek that leads to a well-used tourist beach should not be permitted. Any consent should not be granted unless there is a plan to contain the chemicals used.

END