

Resource Consent submission

To: The Chief Executive
Environment Southland
Private Bag 90116
DX20175
Invercargill

Date 25/08/2024 13:32
Online reference number RC240855225

Full name of submitter Gerrit Jan Hendrik Amtink
Postal address Section 53
Contact phone number
Email

Applicant details

Name of applicant te-runanga-o-awarua-department-of-conversation-enviroment-southland
Activity location 79 Waituna Lagoon Road, RD 5, Invercargill 9875
Application number APP-20242456

Submission details

My submission relates to the whole application
Details of my submission

Yes

I, Hennie Amtink wish to oppose to this application for the following reasons; As a farmer in the upper level off the Waituna catchment for the last 24 years and been thru the moves off an unhealthy Lagoon approximately 10 years ago I feel it's way way to dangerous for this lagoon to be committed to a 20 year consent with such extreme changes being put forward.

For now
& our future



First off all we're looking at a complete different opening regime; from regular to a maximum level, if regular opening over the last 120 years kept this lagoon in a satisfactory ecological state why would we change this? (Last spring was a clear example that she needs to be "flushed"!)

Next point Changing this water level will undoubtedly change the ecology off this important Ramsar site, we end up with birdlive especially wading birds being pushed out off their lagoon onto surrounding farmland, these birds are part off the Ramsar status to and not welcome on farmland.

- With previous high water levels , as proposed, clearly limits light to the important Ruppia growing in the floor off the lagoon.
- their will be a massive change in edges/banks around the waterway and the lagoon as the growth on these will die off followed by bank slumping and subsequently contributing to nutrient loading off the lagoon.
- Acces to the wider public is pretty much denied simply because there's no access anymore due to these higher water levels .
- there will be a complete capital destruction off the walkway thru the lagoon as the tracks be waterlogged most off the time.
- All three parties, DOC, ES & Iwi will they actually agree if things go wrong with the Lagoon? And in a timely manner??
- I think with all my raised points above truly think this consent should really only be granted for a 4 year period which will give the proof in the "pudding " that stepping away from 120 odd years off Lagoon management simply won't work.

Thanks for reading my submission, Hennie

No

No

Submission uploaded

I am a trade competitor of the applicant (for the purposes of section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991)

Outcome sought

I wish Environment Southland to make the following decision

To oppose the application.

Why I wish Environment Southland to make this decision

I, Hennie Amtink wish to oppose to this application for the following reasons; As a farmer in the upper level off the Waituna catchment for the last 24 years and been thru the moves off an unhealthy Lagoon approximately 10 years ago I feel it's way way to dangerous for this lagoon to be committed

For **now**
& **our future**



to a 20 year consent with such extreme changes being put forward.

First off all we're looking at a complete different opening regime; from regular to a maximum level, if regular opening over the last 120 years kept this lagoon in a satisfactory ecological state why would we change this? (Last spring was a clear example that she needs to be "flushed"!)

Next point Changing this water level will undoubtedly change the ecology off this important Ramsar site, we end up with birdlive especially wading birds being pushed out off their lagoon onto surrounding farmland, these birds are part off the Ramsar status to and not welcome on farmland.

-With previous high water levels , as proposed, clearly limits light to the important Ruppia growing in the floor off the lagoon.

- their will be a massive change in edges/banks around the waterway and the lagoon as the growth on these will die off followed by bank slumping and subsequently contributing to nutrient loading off the lagoon.

-Acces to the wider public is pretty much denied simply because there's no access anymore due to these higher water levels .

-there will be a complete capital destruction off the walkway thru the lagoon as the tracks be waterlogged most off the time.

-All three parties, DOC, ES & Iwi will they actually agree if things go wrong with the Lagoon? And in a timely manner??

-I think with all my raised points above truly think this consent should really only be granted for a 4 year period which will give the proof in the "pudding " that stepping away from 120 odd years off Lagoon management simply won't work.

Thanks for reading my submission, Hennie

Hearing details

I wish to be heard in support of my submission	Yes
I would consider presenting a joint case if others make a similar submission	Yes
I wish to be involved in any pre-hearing meeting that may be held for this application	Yes

For **now**
& **our future**



Confirmation

I will serve a copy of my submission on the applicant and I confirm all of the above information is correct

For **now**
& **our future**

