

IN THE MATTER

of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER

of applications for resource consents by the Central Plains Water Trust to the Canterbury Regional Council and a Notice of Requirement to Selwyn District Council for the designation of land by Central Plains Water Limited to construct and operate an irrigation scheme.

Statement of Evidence of Gillie and Tim Deans

1. Our names are George Timothy Deans and Gillian Deans. Gillie presented evidence to the Central Plains Water Hearing 5 June 2008. We live on Auchenflower, which is situated on Deans and Rowallan Roads. Both Homebush and our land will be affected by the head race canal proposed in the revised scheme and subject to the designation.
2. This is an additional statement relating to the altered scheme as proposed by CPWL. We are opposed to CPW taking our land under duress, for a scheme which appears to be less and less ~~for~~ for the benefit of shareholders, let alone the community and more about ownership of water rights and repayment of debt.
3. To quote Mr Tipler ~~the~~ the demand has not changed, but the ability of the scheme to meet demand is severely limited+
4. We are not happy about sacrificing our land and way of life for a scheme predicated on such a flimsy, ambiguous outcome.

5. Where is the research which shows how many shareholders are going to take up a scheme? For those who have existing wells, why would they pay \$2860 per hectare to achieve an unreliable summer supply?
6. Why should we allow our farm to become much more difficult to manage when estimates are made that increases in production are achieved apparently in the first case by increased dairying from 22-25,000 hectares. On the best information we can find, there would already be well in excess of that area in dairying in Canterbury. The 22,000 appears to have come from 2002 figures, and there have been many conversions since then. Will there be another 3000 hectare increase on the current figure? This seems unlikely with a scheme that cannot guarantee water through the summer period.
7. Who is going to invest \$2,860 per hectare for the scheme alone, with that sort of risk? The increase in performance will also be achieved it seems with no increase in fertiliser cost . magic fertiliser perhaps?
8. Do we give up our land for a scheme, when on the subject of nitrates, it would appear as though there are some magic cows involved here too. 4.7 cows to the hectare assessed in the economics spreadsheet, have magically become 3 cows per hectare creating nitrate pollution. I wonder how that is achieved? Perhaps they have become loaves or fishes?

Affects on Auchenflower

9. One of our major personal concerns is about the aesthetics of our property. The canal is planned to be in an area approximately 500 metres from SH 72, the main inland route north/south in the South Island. This is designated a scenic highway, and a heritage landscape, as the continuation of a landscape starting with Homebush, and continuing on around the hills right around to Sheffield.

10. This is land owned by the Deans since the 1850s and in the majority still owned and farmed by our family. Jane Deans had the original vision for the property in the mid 19th Century, and was responsible for deliberately creating a strong landscape effect. The plantations seen clearly from the road were originally planted out in the form of a Union Jack, in varying tree varieties to reflect the family's love for the mother country of those times.
11. It is very hard to see that the incursion of the canal will do other than wreck the appearance of the front of those hills for a length of approximately 600 metres, not just during construction, but permanently.
12. The canal footprint appears to be 30 metres wide with a 10 metre bank on either side; 50 metres in total at its narrowest course. The area designated for the canal is at least 100 metres wide. To achieve the minimum canal width, the front of the hillside would need to be removed, as the siting of it is above the flat, on the lower slope. There would need to be a major amount of ramping in the area, to avoid slippage, as the underlying clay is very slip prone.
13. The landscape advisor for CPW has indicated that there is no money allocated in the scheme for rehabilitation, so are we to expect a clay or shingle bank approximately 10 -15 metres high as a permanent scar along these beautiful foothills? This would be unacceptable to us.
14. A possible solution that I believe would create major savings around the hill sections of the headrace, as well as improve the aesthetic considerations to be dealt with on Homebush and Auchenflower, would be to **shift the whole canal perhaps 15-20 metres lower**. This would not necessarily involve shifting the intakes, and over much of the area, may be on land under the same ownership as at present, but would have the result of taking the headrace onto the flats.

15. Presumably the present siting was originally dictated by the necessity to have the canal at the base of the dam. The relocated headrace would also be less of an eyesore from Coalgate. There would be a small issue of extra pumping required to cover land which would become upstream of the canal, but those expenses would presumably be much less than some other aspects of the scheme that have been mooted then dropped. Has this possibility been considered by CPW since the dam, or even earlier the idea of pumping into the dam, has been canned? We have been unable to find any information in the revised scheme details about possible alternatives that would alleviate any of the problems arising from the current canal site.
16. Another major on farm effect for us will be the subdivision of the property in two separate areas. In the first canal area described above, it will bisect effectively the top section of our farm, so that stock access from one paddock to the next which is achieved at present by opening a gate could only be achieved by driving stock a kilometre round trip via a bridge on Rowallan Road. We have no assurance from CPW that other than 1 bridge will be provided for the property, presumably on Rowallan Road, a public road on the north side of our property. In combination with the other bisection of the flats towards Cullenø Road, (which will create orphan land for which we will have no conceivable access, except via the canal and Cullenø Road bridge), this will become a permanent management problem, not accounted for by even 1.5 times compensation for the land lost.
17. Are there other areas of orphan land in the scheme as well, and what does CPW plan to do about them?

18. Our property is at present leased, and it is hard to envisage that a lessee in the future will be prepared to pay a normal per hectare rate for a farm with very messy access issues.
19. Another concern that we have is with runoff from the hills above the headrace. Have the engineers taken into account the very considerable flows that come out of the clay in a wet winter? Somehow that flow has to be channelled past the canal, or there will be considerable ponding on the top side, and creation of boggy conditions to the further detriment of farm access in those areas. The access issue and seepage problems could be assisted by providing underpasses below the headrace for stock access and water flows. Once again we can find no information about these issues in the revised scheme data.
20. There is also a creek on the boundary with Rowallan on our Northern boundary, which can contain considerable flows in late winter. We have had no discussion with CPW on the likely future route to be taken by the creek, as at the moment it would flow along the line of the canal. It cannot just be allowed to flow in an uncontrolled fashion below the Rowallan Road bridge, if that is the plan.
21. We would also like to make some comments on items that arise from the Commissioners' minute 10
22. As much as anyone in the Waianiwaniwa Valley, we would like certainty in our lives. There was a suggestion that those along the headrace canal were not as concerned about this project. We think that is a very much mistaken belief. Gillie and I and also the Homebush and Rowallan Deans are extremely concerned about the effect on our properties, as well as the Bull Family and John Austin (who have submitted against it). **We are even more concerned now that we may be sacrificing our land, our lifestyle and our livelihood for a very second rate scheme. Indeed a**

scheme which doesn't appear to offer the best and most efficient use of our scarce resource –water.

23. We would like to take up the suggestion of legal counsel for CPW that CPW not carry out any compulsory purchases but instead negotiate with those on the headrace on a willing buyer willing seller basis. We suggest they should just withdraw the designation altogether.

24. In minute 10, 9.10 we believe the same factors apply to us, i.e. that our family have had the longest association of anyone in the area with the land, and that we should receive equal treatment to those who have had the threat lifted already.

e. We note that in 9.31 in the discussion of heritage landscapes, you commented that the Waianiwaniwa Valley is ~~isolated~~ and not a route frequented by travellers. We would like to remind you that the very opposite is the case for Deans Road . SH 72. It is in fact the main inland scenic route for the South island. Very frequently people will stop along our road to photograph the hills and mountains behind, in some cases to paint them, and very often stop casually for a lunch break.

f. In 12.12 an exact parallel applies in our situation . we have little need for an unaffordable irrigation scheme, the larger area of our farm is above the defined area of the scheme, and so we are dealing with all the disadvantages of the intrusion, for no benefit. If we want irrigation, we can dam a creek on our property to achieve that.

25. As you will see from the above, we believe that there are considerable issues to deal with, for us personally, and also it would appear for the larger scheme. We believe that with much greater consultation in the first place and some sensitivity that has been completely lacking from CPW, a much better scheme could have been developed. We are implacably opposed to the scheme in its present form, notwithstanding the removal of the reservoir from it.

26. As part of our original evidence we asked that the Notice of Requirement be withdrawn from Auchenflower and in this submission we repeat that request.

Tim & Gillie Deans

Dated: 13 October 2009