

Resource Consent submission

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

Date 01/09/2024 20:15
Online reference number RC240900368

Full name of submitter
Postal address
Contact phone number
Email

Karen Stanley

Section 53

Applicant details

Name of applicant

Te Rūnanga o Awarua, Department of Conservation, and
Environment Southland (APP-20242456)

Activity location

Section 53

Application number

reference APP-20242456

Submission details

My submission relates to the whole application

Yes

Submission uploaded

Waituna Lagoon.docx (14 kb)

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

No

For now
& our future



Outcome sought

I wish Environment Southland to make the following decision To oppose the application.
Why I wish Environment Southland to make this decision Insufficient knowledge about the lagoon and ignoring testimonials from locals.

Hearing details

I wish to be heard in support of my submission No
I wish to be involved in any pre-hearing meeting that may be held for this application Yes

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**



Lagoon Opening

The opening of the lagoon over the last 120 years at a level well below 2.5m has been a stabilizing influence on the lagoon.

Allowing the lagoon to rise so much that it floods adjacent farmland is inviting valuable nutrients from farmland to be dragged into the lagoon. This would be a loss/loss position for farmers and the lagoon in that-

A waste of valuable fertility and unwanted nutrients into the lagoon. Nutrient run off from farmland is not a permitted activity. Why would DOC, ES and iwi be actively chasing this scenario?

Landowners will be adversely affected financially – land being unable to be used because it is actively flooded, financial waste of the cost of fertilizer, geese and black swans settling in paddocks for a short term leaving excrement on paddocks and robbing farm animals of their feed.

Flooded vegetation results in death of the same and hence rotting vegetation being channeled back into the lagoon.

The death of the rupia because of the greater depth of the lagoon, being the opposite to what DOC, Es and iwi are attempting to improve.

Erosion of the lagoon surrounds.

Unwanted nutrients into the lagoon.

The resultant mess being disrespectful to the food gatherers who have accessed the lagoon for generations.

Tourists on the Southern Scenic Route if the lake is allowed up to a 2.5m level, won't have access to the track, the lookout/ viewing platform.

The opening of the lagoon is known to have a beneficial flushing affect to prevent algal blooms.

With an opening of the lagoon, trout and eels will be less affected by nutrients and eels will have an easier access to the sea.

Allowing the lagoon to rise to 2.5 metres is such a big risk. It seems to me that DOC, ES and iwi have insufficient knowledge to be able to make an informed judgment on this matter. The thinking appears to be – let it flood and hope for the best, regardless of the consequences for anyone else and indeed the lagoon and its surrounds too. It has been opened over the years and locals have observed what works and what doesn't. DOC, ES and iwi are not concerned about the adverse implications for the farmers and yet there is no accountability if a poor decision is made. If the lagoon becomes degraded along with the surrounds, who will pay for any poor decisions? I suggest it will be surrounding farmers and ratepayers. When will the laws of the land make those who are making poor decisions like this (and at the same time being paid to make those decisions) have to stump up and pay a penalty? At risk of a financial penalty, I suggest DOC, ES and iwi might examine more carefully the testimonies of locals who have a long association with the lagoon.

Russell and Karen Stanley

