

**IN THE MATTER** of the Resource Management Act 1991  
**AND**  
**IN THE MATTER** of the hearing of submissions on Proposed Plan  
Change 5 (Nutrient Management and Waitaki  
Sub-region) to the Canterbury Land and Water  
Regional Plan

**BY** **GLENTANNER STATION LIMITED**  
Submitters

**TO** **CANTERBURY REGIONAL COUNCIL**  
Local authority

---

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF ROSS IVEY**

Dated: 22 JULY 2016

---

---

## **INTRODUCTION**

1. My name is Ross Ivey. My son, Mark and I operate a sheep, cattle and deer business at Glentanner Station, Aoraki-Mt Cook. Part of that business is a 484-hectare dryland runoff at the outlet of Lake Pukaki called Catherine Fields.

## **SCOPE OF EVIDENCE**

2. My evidence will provide information about our farming operation and how the proposed rules under Plan Change 5 will affect us. My evidence primarily relates to the development and sustainability of Catherine Fields with some background as to the need for irrigation.

## **OUR FARMING OPERATION**

3. Glentanner presently carries approximately 9000 stock units of merino sheep, Hereford cattle and red deer. Catherine Fields carries approximately 2000 stock units of sheep grazing on an all year basis. This carrying capacity is highly variable because of regular dry season growing conditions. It is used for the wintering of young sheep from Glentanner, lambing older ewes and has 600 stud ewes all year.
4. The present covers are grass mixes, Lucerne, ryecorn and oat crops. Catherine Fields has been farmed and cultivated for a long period. It was part of the Lake Pukaki Hotel block and was intensively dryland farmed by Ian Wardell in the 1960's, and closely aligned with Grasslands Research at Lincoln. We direct drill as much as possible to mitigate soil losses from wind erosion.
5. Catherine Fields became part of Glentanner Station in 1984 as part of the Waitaki Catchment Board soil and water run plan. A large portion of the Glentanner Land Use Class 7 and 8 high country was retired from grazing in exchange for the inclusion of Catherine Fields into the Glentanner pastoral lease. Catherine Fields is now a subdivided free hold title.
6. It became apparent 20 years ago that irrigation was necessary at Catherine Fields. The dryland is totally unreliable at providing the pasture or crop growth needed for sheep. Without the flexibility of Glentanner, it would be impossible to farm Catherine Fields as a standalone unit. It is simply too dray and subject to regular droughts. Essentially, the run plan failed.

## **CONSENT PROCESS**

7. Glentanner applied for water for irrigation under two consent applications. CRC071362 was to take and use water from Lake Pukaki or the Lake Pukaki canal

and CRC083609 was to take and use water from the Tekapo stilling basin. The reason for the two consents was to allow for the flexibility to irrigate independently out of Lake Pukaki or to be part of the Pukaki Irrigation Company, a proposed community gravity based scheme with neighbouring properties. And, we needed as much certainty as possible that Catherine Fields would be irrigated. Both consents were called in under the Waitaki Act and became part of the Upper Waitaki hearings in 2009.

8. Very few submissions were received on our applications as the farm has a long history of farming activity, could not be seen from public roadways, was already highly modified and irrigation was to occur well away from any waterways.
9. Both CRC071362 and CRC083609 were finally granted in 2012, but neither could be used because of a condition stating that “there shall be no levelling of glacial moraine landforms to enable use of centre pivot irrigation”
10. Subsequently, the decisions were appealed to the Environment Court. All parties involved in the mediation that followed agreed to allow minor levelling of moraines, yet still no decision was forthcoming from the Court.
11. Because of the delays from the Court in issuing decisions, we worked with ECan to by-pass the court. In August 2014 we applied for a new consent, CRC151017, which essentially replaced the two consents still held up by the court. This was processed in three months on a non-notified basis with the same water quality conditions as the two consents under appeal.
12. Earthworks to give effect to the consent began in February 2015 and were completed in April 2016. This included the earthworks to level the moraines as well as some minor contouring and ramps built. The earthworks are neat and tidy - extra expense has been incurred by us to achieve ‘visual appeal’. A house has been started and will be completed this year.
13. Also in 2015, we applied for a variation to increase the irrigation area from 200 hectares to 260 hectares but with no increase in the Nutrient Discharge Allowance (NDA). This was demonstrated by Farm advisors to be necessary for scale and economic sustainability. Environment Canterbury subsequently issued this consent (CRC163408) on 18 February 2016.
14. In order to obtain bank funding, a viable farm system has to be demonstrated. Our bank approval has been based on our ability to farm utilising our consented NDA.
15. The costs of the earthworks, fencing, housing and water supply are fixed. The earthworks cost has been approximately \$1000/hectare. Importantly, our consent

costs are also now well over \$1000/hectare, between legal services, irrigation and resource management consultants and Environment Canterbury. Our charges to Environment Canterbury alone for the Upper Waitaki consent hearing in 2009 were over \$100,000.

16. We absolutely need the certainty of the consented NDA to continue to invest and give full effect to our consent.

#### **MY EXPECTATIONS OF PLAN CHANGE 5**

17. I have begun development under the premise that the NDA granted on our water permits would continue until at least expiry of the water permit.
18. Throughout all of the PC5 meetings that were held, ECan always indicated to us that those with consented NDA's would be allowed to continue without the need to go through yet another consenting process.
19. Therefore, I am disappointed that the plan hasn't allowed for this, and is placing even more consenting burdens on us when there is absolutely no need for that.

#### **CONCLUSION**

20. We applied for irrigation consents more than 10 years ago and were finally issued with a useable consent.
21. The time and energy that it took to obtain our consents, and the sheer costs incurred have been far more than can be considered reasonable.
22. In all honesty, we cannot afford, and mentally, do not need another round of consenting, when our irrigation consent has an NDA and expires in 2025, only nine years away.
23. I have read the evidence of Ms. Keri Johnston and Dr Greg Ryder and agree with the relief sought.

**Ross Ivey**

Date 22 July 2016