

IN THE MATTER OF the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER OF a joint application by Central Plains Water Trust and Ashburton Community Water Trust to:

Canterbury Regional Council for resource consents to take water from the Rakaia River for use by the Central Plains Water Enhancement Scheme and for use by Ashburton Community Water Trust

IN THE MATTER OF applications by Central Plains Water Trust to:

Canterbury Regional Council for resource consents to take and use water from the Waimakariri River and to use water from the Rakaia River for the Central Plains Water Enhancement Scheme and for associated consents required for the construction and operation of the Central Plains Water Enhancement Scheme; and to

Selwyn District Council for resource consents to construct and operate the Central Plains Water Enhancement Scheme

AND

IN THE MATTER OF a notice of requirement by Central Plains Water Limited to:

Selwyn District Council for the designation of land for works associated with the construction and operation of the Central Plains Water Enhancement Scheme

IN THE MATTER OF applications by Ashburton Community Water Trust to:

Canterbury Regional Council for resource consents to use and divert water from the Rakaia River for the purposes of hydro electricity generation and associated consents required for the construction and operation of the Rakaia Terrace Hydro Scheme.

**Minute of Commissioners (Number 5)
Status of submissions not heard by us**

1. We have had a communication from a submitter who raised the following concern:

We have read today, correctly or incorrectly, and with alarm, that the Commissioners are treating submitters who have not decided to speak and the hearings as being "happy" with the CPW scheme.

2. We do not know the source of this misapprehension. We would like to assure all submitters in opposition who have chosen not to be heard, that we are certainly not taking their non appearance as being an indication of non opposition. We will take all submissions into account.
3. We have identified which submitters are directly or closely affected by the proposal. Where those submissions are in opposition, but the submitter has not appeared at the hearing we will take it that the submitter remains in opposition and will have regard to the particular issues being raised.
4. We did comment that in relation to the Headrace and distribution network, that there are relatively few submissions in opposition as compared to the number of landowners/occupiers who are directly affected or in close proximity to the network. We infer from that, that there is not the same degree of concern from affected landowners about this aspect of the project. In other words, we assume that if a landowner or occupier is directly affected, and have issues, they will have raised those with us in a submission, whether or not they have been heard. We will certainly be taking care to ensure that we have had particular regard to the concerns of those most closely affected even if they have chosen not to appear.

Philip Milne

(Chair)