

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of resource consent applications and notices of requirement for the Central Plains Water Scheme

STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF AVERIL FAYE BULL

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 My full name is Averil Faye Bull. I live at 3486 Old West Coast Road, Sheffield ("Glenrowan"). I am a trustee and beneficiary of the AM & AF Bull Family Trust and speak on behalf of the Trust and the Bull family. My children, Richard and Belinda, are also present at the hearing and able to answer any questions. A PowerPoint presentation has been prepared and forms part of this evidence. It will be presented by Richard.

1.2 I was brought up on a farm in Eastern Southland and have been involved in farming for all but 2 years of my life when I qualified as a hairdresser at The International College of Hairdressing in Christchurch, then worked for Alan and Pam Richards at Windwhistle as a land girl for 5 years.

1.3 I have lived and worked on the Glenrowan Property since my marriage to Anthony Miles Bull ("Miles") in 1971. As I have mentioned, we have two adult children, both involved in farming. Both Miles and myself have been involved with various committees in the district over the years. The Bull family has a longstanding association with the area, as will be discussed by Richard.

2. GLENROWAN

2.1 Glenrowan has been owned by the Bull family for over 50 years (since 1955, with additional land acquired in 1969). The AM & AF Bull Family Trust owns the property and part owns adjoining titles with Mark Hamish Bull on the south bank of the Waimakariri River, situated on the Old West Coast Road between Pinegrove Road to Redmond's Road. The farm also comprises together titles on the Waimakariri river bank and river bed.

2.2 The soil type for the property is mainly Hatfield Silt Loam, with the river flats comprising Barrhill Silt Loam. The property is situated in an area which has an average rainfall of 34 inches.

- 2.3 Glenrowan has been run as a Mixed Cropping farm (Grain/potatoes etc) and is presently being conservatively farmed as a Sheep/Beef breeding and finishing farm with a small area of crop. Part of the farm is leased by my son, Richard Bull, who also leases "Toro Neen" on the Main West Coast Road, between Pinegrove Road & Deans Road, which is owned by Mark H Bull.
- 2.4 The Glenrowan yards are jointly used by the Bull family and the infrastructure on Glenrowan still supports both Glenrowan and Toro Neen.
- 2.5 The property has been not only a farm, but has also brought to the entire family and friends many years of enjoyment i.e. hunting, shooting, fishing, horse riding, motor cycling and in summer months having a big swimming pool (the Waimakariri River), all on our own doorstep. Future plans for this property are for it to continue to be farmed by the Bull family.
- 2.6 The Bull family have been involved in farming and business in the Malvern district since the mid 1860s (as will be seen from the PowerPoint presentation). We would like to think we were able to continue farming well into the future, making improvements to the land and contributing to the district and its amenities as in the past.

3. THE CENTRAL PLAINS WATER SCHEME

Reason for buying CPW shares

- 3.1 After lengthy discussions with Belinda, Richard, fellow Trustees (Malcolm Perkins & Neil Baxter) it was decided due to the locality of our property it was important not to compromise the value of the land if the CPW Scheme went ahead. We therefore purchased shares in the Scheme. At that stage we did not realise we would be adversely affected by the Scheme.
- 3.2 At the present time it is not our desire to irrigate the land. I do not wish to take on the debt which would be accrued to set up for irrigation. Future generations may wish to do so, but only if we have enough land left to irrigate.

Consultation with CPW

- 3.3 We have had some limited consultation with CPW representatives. I have also attended various meetings held by CPW at Darfield Recreation Centre, as well as a drop in meeting at the Sheffield Hall. To date, our concerns or questions have not been satisfactorily answered.

- 3.4 At no stage prior to Requiring Authority being sought, did anyone from CPW visit our property to discuss how we would be affected. It seems to me that CPW themselves are still very uncertain about the ultimate location of the headrace canal and intake areas.
- 3.5 Doug Catherwood visited our property in December 2005, and, after inspecting the bank adjacent to the river, he advised that an engineer visit would be required. Later that month Walter Lewthwaite from URS visited our property and indicated that the area necessary for the scheme could stretch some 100 metres from the edge of the bank into our farm, and that the shelterbelt would have to go. He advised that he would forward some sketches to us before Christmas 2005 of how the bank would look after construction of the canal. As at the time I wrote this evidence (10 July 2007), nothing had been received.
- 3.6 In June 2006, Erin Jamieson phoned me to organised a site meeting with CPW directors. This was attended by Pat Morrison, Willie Palmer, Jeff Stevenson, Doug Catherwood and Cliff Tipler. At that meeting, we were told that the area potentially affected by the scheme could in fact be up to 300 metres, as a buffer (not 100 metres we had previously been told). Given that the length of our property along the river boundary is approximately 3.5km, this equates to about 105ha in total of potentially lost land. Later that month, I called Erin Jamieson to ask for a site meeting with all directors. That on-site meeting has not yet occurred. In June 2008, Doug Catherwood phoned me to outline when the hearings were to reconvene and that if we were wishing to be heard and to see that we were informed as to the procedure.

Effects of the CPW Scheme

- 3.7 The Lower Waimakariri Intake Canal, from what can be surmised from the resource consent applications and Notice of Requirement, will have significant and unacceptable adverse implications on our property.
- 3.8 Particular concerns we have are with the impacts on the Bull family's ability to provide for their own social and economic well being, and that of future generations, which will result from construction activities, loss of land, shelter, infrastructure and resultant farm income.
- 3.9 The current improvements on the property are:
- Rimu Lined 3 Stand Woolshed, built by the family and capable of holding 560 - 600 ewes;
 - Sheep Yards;
 - Cattle Yards;
 - Large Implement Shed – workshop;
 - Tool Storage (Silo);
 - Large Storage Shed;
 - Hay Barns;

- Grain Silos;
- Cottage, down by the yards;
- Homestead, adjacent to Old West Coast Road;
- Various other farm storage sheds all which are used for specific purposes;
- Extensive Fencing; and
- Mature shelter belts which provide important protection from the prevailing north-westerlies and the southerlies.

3.10 We stand to lose virtually all of this infrastructure, with the only buildings not affected by the proposed canal system being the:

- Homestead;
- 1 hay shed;
- 1 implement shed;
- Cattle yards.

3.11 The Bull family all take great pride in the asset that has been created by them. The buildings which we will potentially lose have all, with the exception of one, been constructed by the Bull family in the past 50 years.

3.12 The Scheme in its current form will require removal of mature farm shelter along the full length of the property (approx 3.5km) and also parts of shelterbelts which run North-South. This will result in exposure to adverse climatic conditions wind, rain, and frost dust generation and soil erosion with implications for further loss of farm productivity.

3.13 On the river side of the farm the soil is approximately 1 metre deep, compared with the road side of the property where it is approximately 30cm deep. We do not wish to lose this soil as it is some of the finest cropping soil on the Canterbury Plains.

3.14 We also stand to lose two titles in the riverbed which are used for protection of the river bank, informal access to the river and have future potential for tourism activities. These titles appear to be dissected in two by the designation.

3.15 The Selwyn District Council presently has a tunnel and open water race system from the Waimakariri River on the 235m contour (which the proposed CPW headrace canal appears to follow). The SDC tunnel runs under and through Glenrowan. This system has been in operation since the 1950s and provides stock water to us and many farmers on the east and south east of our farm. We question how these two schemes can both operate, should the CPW scheme go ahead, or is the stock water to be lost?

3.16 Due to the way the property lies, it will be almost impossible to carry out any normal farming operations during the construction period. There will be disruption from the loss of fences and the size of the machinery that will be necessary to carry out such a major earth moving exercise. We are concerned that the heavy machinery will cause major problems with the compaction of land elsewhere on our property.

3.17 The actual width and location of the headrace canal still seems very uncertain. We cannot see why the site investigations could not have been done before the Notice of Requirement was lodged, so that alternative routes and methods could be considered properly. Our concerns may well be dealt with if the headrace canal is to be piped, provided that construction effects do not disrupt our farming activities. We also understand that use of the Upper Waimakariri Intake (rather than both Intakes) is an option that is currently being considered, with water from the headrace canal then being piped north from Tramway Road (as outlined in the supplementary evidence of Mr Walter Lewthwaite). We would obviously support this option.

4. CONCLUSION

4.1 We have only had limited consultation with CPW representatives, even though our property is one of those most seriously affected on the Lower Waimakariri Intake and headrace canal.

4.2 The CPW scheme, in its current form, will have the following significant effects on our property:

a. Loss of land - We believe we are to lose approx 300 metres of land in width and 3.5 km in length, which equates to approx 105 ha. On a property of this size this is a major part of our productive land with resultant loss of income for present and future generations of the Bull family.

b. Loss of key infrastructure – supporting two farms, Glenrowan and Toro Neen.

c. Loss of shelter - the shelter along the river bank is approx 3.5km of mature shelter the river bank, plus some of our North South Shelter.

4.3 The CPW Scheme has also had a personal impact on the Bull family. Watching my husband die a painful death of terminal cancer in 2003 was not a pleasant experience for us as a family. To now be faced with the possibility that all the many hours of hard labour of his entire working life will be demolished for the construction of the Lower Waimakariri Intake headrace canal, I personally find very difficult to come to terms with. The last five years have been very stressful for me and have taken a toll on my health.

4.4 We therefore ask the Commissioners to decline the resource consent applications and recommend that the Notice of Requirement is withdrawn.

Averil Bull

July 2008