

IN THE MATTER of the Resource  
Management Act 1991  
(the Act)

AND

IN THE MATTER of applications by the  
Central Plains Water  
Trust (CPWT) and the  
Ashburton Community  
Water Trust (ACWT)

---

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE  
OF  
JULES SNOYINK**

---

**Introduction**

1. My full name is Jules Jan Snoyink. I have lived and worked in the CPW scheme area for 52 years, after emigrating here from the Netherlands in 1956. Prior to this I worked on a mixed farm which included dairying. In NZ, I have been associated with farming, shearing and horticulture. My wife Rosalie and I owned a commercial glasshouse property in Darfield, mainly growing tomatoes. The water supply was piped, metered and extra water was charged for.
2. I am a keen hunter and fisherman. I am a member of the NZ Salmon Anglers Assn and assist in a salmon enhancement programme initiated by the Salmon Anglers Assn and Fish and Game. I am a member of the Coalgate/Glentunnel Reserve Board and assist with voluntary enhancement work around the local townships. I am Secretary of the Malvern Branch of the NZ Deerstalkers Assn and a member of the Malvern Hills Protection Society Inc.

**Background**

3. My wife and I have been together for forty three years and we have resided in Glentunnel since 2001. We lived in Darfield for the previous thirty six years. We chose this area for our retirement because of its better climate, the scenery, the walkways, the Selwyn river and Glentunnel`s general peace and tranquility. We

have been fortunate to visit some different parts of the world and in some respects we appreciate living here even more.

4. We barely regained our breath from fighting off a mega dump, proposed by Transwaste for this area, when the CPW scheme was 'dumped' on us. I am not opposed to irrigation but I am against this scheme because of the impacts on our lives and on the lives of others in our community.
5. When we should have been doing more enjoyable things in our retirement we have been kept busy raising funds and organising Open Days in the Waianiwaniwa Valley. We have spent countless hours going to meetings, lobbying councillors and politicians, writing letters, submissions and reports. We have received phone calls at all hours and clocked up thousands of kilometres. I always felt strongly that the proposal was wrong and should be challenged. **In my view the CPW scheme is socially, environmentally and ethically unacceptable.**
6. My statement of evidence lists my concerns about CPW scheme, how it affects me personally and I will briefly comment on the wider environmental, social and recreational impacts. I will also call Mr Paul McOscar, Secretary of the Coalgate/Glentunnel Reserves Board, to present a statement on behalf of the Board. As Secretary of the Malvern Branch NZDeerstarkers Assn, I made a separate submission on the loss of our rifle range, and I will call Mr Graeme Williams, Chairman of the Malvern Branch of the NZDA to present a further statement on behalf of the branch. Mr Williams will also present his own personal submission.

### **General Concerns:**

#### **The Dam**

7. The impacts of the dam on the local communities will be devastating; a 15 storey high, 2km long structure will replace a beautiful treeline; the increase of heavy traffic and machinery 24/7 for several years; the noise of construction and ongoing noise from pumping water up over the dam will be especially noticeable at night; the dust during norwesters; the dam holding back 280m cubic metres of water will be towering over the locals; the ongoing unease of living below a dam which could breach during weather extremes or earthquakes. However low the risk of a dam breach, nobody can guarantee this will never happen. The engineers will be long gone.

### **The Reservoir**

8. I believe it is **wrong** to forcibly remove families from their homes in the Waianiwaniwa Valley. The reservoir will destroy a fertile, productive farming valley. There will be a dust nuisance from exposed areas during norwesters when the reservoir is drawn down in summer. The reservoir could become a breeding ground for midges? The inundation of the valley will destroy heritage sites, established trees, important remnants of indigenous vegetation and Canterbury mudfish habitat. I don't believe the reservoir will provide any recreational benefit at all.
  
9. **I have read the evidence of Dr Angus McIntosh and I have heard the evidence of Dr Colin Meurk and I endorse their submissions.**

### **Lack of scheme detail**

10. More information is required on many aspects of the scheme as the 'devil is in the detail'. I believe that CPW has still not supplied sufficient information for submitters to fully understand the impacts of the designation; the effects of the takes and the priority of takes from both rivers; the exact location and size of the head race canal and embankments; effects on groundwater quality and quantity by increased intensive farming; and on the social and recreation impacts.

### **Dairying**

11. I believe that the scheme is very much dairy driven. I have never been against irrigation several times a year to assure farmers of a crop, but I am against irrigation for up to 8 months a year to grow grass and on some of the most porous land in Canterbury.
  
12. CPW assure us they will rectify any deterioration in drinking water quality as a result of the scheme. Who can possibly prove that contamination is a result of the CPW scheme? I am concerned that such a large scale irrigation scheme will encourage more intensive land use, and in particular intensive dairying, which will result in more pollution of surface and groundwaters and higher nitrate levels in drinking water.
  
13. From the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment's "Growing for Good" Report, October 2004.....

Page 42..... *nitrogen fertilizer use is much greater on dairy farms with irrigation (135kg of nitrogen per hectare compared to 68 kg on non-irrigated dairy farms).*

Pg 93 ..... *The waste generated by the 3000 dairy herds in the Waikato River catchment is equivalent to the waste from about 5million people or nearly 50 cities the size of Hamilton.*

Page 94.....*Cattle urine in particular, has high concentrations of nitrogen and urine patches swamp the plant's nitrogen uptake capacity which then results in nitrate leaching.*

Page 102..... The report states (Ecan 2004) *that groundwater in the Ashburton/Rakaia area widely used for private drinking water supplies is now no longer suitable for human consumption in some parts without treatment.*

14.The Clean Streams Accord by Fonterra is a weak, voluntary measure. I understand that Fonterra will collect 50c per 100 litres of milk collected from offenders, and a bit more if they still don't comply. Big deal. I have little faith in the code of compliance as suggested by CPW.

### **Dairying is a high consumer of energy**

15.Pg 42 Growing for Good..... *Irrigated dairy farms use nearly double the electricity of non-irrigated dairy farms (30.6 gigajoules per hectare compared to 16.9 ). Dairy farms and factories are large consumers of energy.*

16.I am concerned that several of our rivers are now under pressure to produce more power eg Waitaki, Wairau, Mohikinui, Rakaia

17.The farmer owned research and extension organisation, DairyNZ, *found no single gold nugget or silver bullet for the negative effects of high input dairying after 5 years of Resource Efficient Dairy (RED) trials. ( Rural News 22 January '08)*

### **Groundwater**

18.I understand that approx. 850 hectares of the ChCh groundwater recharge area has been removed from the CPW scheme area. Does that not say something?

19. There are at least 13 townships between the scheme area and Te Waihora/Lake Ellesmere. i.e. Lincoln, Dunsandel, Rolleston, Burnham, Springston, Ellesmere, Tai Tapu, Irwell, Doyleston, Leeston, Selwyn Huts, Rakaia Huts and Southbridge.
20. These towns could experience the problems reported in Springston recently with an ecoli outbreak which contaminated the town's water supply (March 2008) by rising groundwater levels as a result of the CPW scheme.

### **Changing the landscape**

21. According to the AEE, dairying is projected to double in the scheme area. Dairy support (silent conversions) will follow. We will see more shelter belts disappear to accommodate pivot irrigators, more pumpsheds and canal embankments across the central plains. These embankments and the 450km of network canals will remain unplanted to allow for maintenance. Siphons under rivers and streams will also detract from the landscape.



**Clearing of forestry blocks at Te Pirita July 2008**

### **Water metering**

22. You can't monitor what you can't measure. Richard Rennie reported in the NZ Farmers Weekly (4 February 08) that a 2006 report showed that nationally, Canterbury has the highest number of water consents at 5872 but the smallest number of meters installed, 642, just over 10%.

23. Even Mr Terry Heiler of Irrigation NZ said on National Radio Farmers Session (6 September '07), “ *there are many wells in Canterbury but we don't really know what's going on. Farmers need to monitor their own wells*”. Should we not measure what is taken first so we can monitor accurately the combined takes before consenting more water?

### **Dairy Holdings and CPW Trust**

24. I object to any consents being granted to the CPW Trust for Rakaia water being used immediately by Dairy Holdings Ltd and others, until such time as a scheme is constructed, or taken over completely, if the CPW scheme is not built. The CPW Trust's lack of independence and its ability to be directed by CPW Ltd means that the benefits will be captured by dairy corporates, and not the “*future inhabitants of the regions*” (the residents of Selwyn District and Christchurch) as stated in the Trust's objectives.

### **Specific concerns**

#### **Effects of the scheme on Glentunnel**

25. Although Glentunnel is situated one and half km from the dam site construction works associated with the scheme will destroy the quality of life which was the reason we moved here in the first place. Some of the impacts will be:

- Increased heavy traffic
- Noise and dust from construction
- Possible change in the climate from a large waterbody nearby, more fog in winter.
- Disruption to traffic flow with the re-alignment of Scenic Highway 77.
- Loss of visual amenity
- Lowering of property values
- Community disruption

### **Waimakariri River**

26. Waimakariri means “river of cold rushing water” (but at fewer and fewer times). In “The Waimakariri” by Robert Logan (1987), on pg 7, it states... *The Catchment Board regarded this to be the most public river in the South Island, perhaps in NZ.*

27. The estimated adult visits annually were, already then in 1987; 78,000 by salmon angling, 64,000 by trout angling, 35,000

estuarine fishing, 13,000 whitebaiting, 30,000 jetboating, 1200 canoeing and rafting, 20,000 picnicking, walking and tramping, 14,000 swimming and a number of game shooters.

28. The numbers of kayakers and canoers would have increased significantly in my opinion, as a result of the “Coast to Coast” race. On my fishing trips they regularly pass me at any time of the day or week, so closing intakes on weekends or the day of the event is a complete nonsense.

### **Salmon Angling**

29. I have fished the Waimakariri river for salmon and trout for the last forty-five years. I know the river well. I know what flows are required for a good salmon run. It is my belief the minimum flows in the Waimakariri for salmon migration should be 60 – 70 cumecs, preferably higher.

30. A min. flow of 41 cumecs is too low for the health of the river, as stock and municipal water can still be taken below this flow with restrictions. Twenty two cumecs are already allocated for irrigation so any take above this could flat line the river for extended periods. *One hundred and thirty three consecutive days of low flows have been recorded in the past (Pg 8 Chapter 17 of Dr Glova’s evidence).*

31. During summer this will result in warmer water, deteriorating salmon passage, increased algal growth, a decrease in the braids, invasion of weeds, increased access to bird nesting by predators and 4wd’s. If low flows can happen naturally they should not be exacerbated by human activity. Furthermore, the important salmon spawning area of Hackett’s Creek will be destroyed by the crossing of the Upper Intake canal.

32. I don’t believe the Waimakariri River Regional Plan has minimum flows set to protect the river. In the PNRRP I requested that minimum flows should be raised, as well as a flow sharing regime, similar to the Rakaia River.

### **Access**

33.Both the Upper and Lower Intake canals on the Waimakariri will restrict public access to the river.

### **Recreation**

34.So clearly, the Waimakariri is of utmost importance for the well being of an ever growing number of people, especially with the increasing transport costs.

### **Rakaia River**

35.I have fished the Rakaia River for the last 45 years. For me this is the river of choice for salmon fishing. It's the closest river for access for me. It has the greatest number of salmon because of the higher flows. Usually by Christmas, that is the end of the snow melt for the Waimakariri but not for the Rakaia.

36.The Rakaia River provides a **'big river' experience**. I enjoy walking the river searching for good fishing holes. The fishing experience is not just about catching a fish, but more about the pleasure of being out there in relatively unmodified open spaces. It's about the natural landscapes and the mountain backdrops.

37.I eagerly look forward to November, when the first runs of salmon in the Rakaia are expected (the Waimakariri run usually starts later). I have introduced others to salmon fishing and once they catch their first fish, they are hooked.

38.I am passionate about preserving the salmon run, protecting the habitat and the river not just for myself and present anglers, but for the enjoyment of anglers in the future.

39.The 2007/08 salmon season was better than average. I believe this was partly because of the salmon enhancement programmes put in place by the Salmon Anglers Assn and Fish and Game. I do some voluntary work at the Montrose salmon hatchery where young salmon are raised and released into the Rakaia when they are one year old. The work involves cleaning the races, topping up feeders and general monitoring. Adipose fin clipping is carried out before the fish are released. On fin clipping days, twenty or more volunteers take part. The smolt release day is a 'family' day.

### **Access**

40. Due to the better salmon season this year many more anglers tried their luck. In my area this was especially noticeable on popular fishing access roads such as Steeles Rd and Sleemans Rd. Both of these access routes would need to be bridged for vehicle access to the river.

41. Fishing access and wild river experience are already compromised by dairy developments in this area. Large areas of the Rakaia riverbed flats have been converted to dairy pasture. I wish to elaborate more on this at the Hearing.



**New dairy development near Steeles Rd**

I object to the proliferation of man-made structures in the riverbed such as pumpsheds.



**Pump shed above Sleeman`s Rd as seen by jet boat**



**Closeup of the pump shed near Sleeman`s Rd**



### **Pump shed on Early`s Race near Steeles Road**

42. In 1988 I made submissions on the Rakaia WCO. I assumed the WCO would protect the river from inappropriate development from its source to the sea. I don't believe that the WCO is protecting the Rakaia.

43. Now the Rakaia is threatened by a further two 40 cumec concrete intake structures, power stations on the south bank, large diversion channels in the river bed, sidling canals up the river terraces and river training works by diggers and dozers on standby after each flood.

#### **Sediment Flushing**

44. It is stated in the AEE... *that sediment flushing will create a noticeable flood wave. Each intake is designed for a peak flow of 40 cumecs. The flushing will be at least double that flow rate for the first few minutes. Flushing could take an hour.* AEE 3.14.2 pg 3-70.

45. This in my view is a more than minor risk for instream users and a mere warning sign is not sufficient. The mostly fine sediments could exacerbate aggradation in the bed of the rivers if there are no high floods for a period following flushing.

### **Ponding**

46. Long periods of flat lining may result in ponding near the mouth of the rivers. In the absence of large floods and the increasing abstraction of medium flows sediment will build up at the river mouths. This ponding will cause back flooding in low areas as is the case at the Rakaia Huts settlement.

### **Didymo**

47. Knowingly spreading invasive algae by connecting waterways is not only against Tangata whenua but is illegal. Didymo has been recently detected in the Rakaia River.

### **Cumulative effects**

48. I believe the large numbers of consents granted for water takes from the Waimakariri and Rakaia rivers, and from their connected groundwater sources, are eroding the character of the rivers. Though any one effect may be insignificant in itself, at some point the accumulation of effects becomes significant.

49. I have read some of the earlier evidence on the Meadowflower application to take water from the Rakaia River, near Steeles Road, by Ian McIndoe, a Soil and Water engineer and a director of Aqualinc which states in paras 72 - 74 of his evidence that.... *there are 48 takes already from the Rakaia, nearly all of them within one km of the river, 36 takes do not have any low flow conditions at all attached to them.*

50. If these 36 consent holders, decide to increase their takes where will this leave the river?

51. The CPW take is enormous when compared to previous applications.

52. Worse still, it is the last of the water available to be allocated.

**I have read and heard the evidence of Fish and Game and NZ Salmon Anglers Assn and I endorse their submissions.**

### **Requiring Authority**

53. This contentious issue is morally repugnant. I understand 455 of the 598 submissions on the Notice of Requirement were opposing submissions. The proposed CPW scheme has not only pitted

farmer against farmer, and in some cases husbands against wives, where the subject cannot be raised in the home without an argument. It is very divisive.

54. Families in the Waianiwaniwa Valley live in limbo. Can they ever be adequately compensated for the loss of sleep and anguish caused by the worry of having their properties seized? Some have farmed here for six generations. How is it possible that a private shareholders group, masquerading as a public community scheme can put so many lives on hold? It's not about a few families holding up the project, there are large numbers of opposing submitters whose land is affected by the intakes, the reservoir and the headrace canal.

55. I disagreed with Dr Wylie's words that "we had to get this authority otherwise some landowners might have held the scheme to ransom". In my opinion it is CPW who is holding the landowners to ransom.

56. At present the Notices of Requirement apply only to the major components of the scheme, but will CPW at some later date, seek to compulsorily acquire the land needed for the network canals as well? The scheme should be one that is **wanted** by the whole community, and not just by a few who stand to benefit.

57. I believe CPW Ltd has breached Section 167 4(b) of the RMA requiring them *to give proper regard to the interests of those affected and to the interests of the environment.*

58. I agree with independent SDC consultant Mr Nick Boyes's recommendation that the applications for the Notices of Requirement be withdrawn. If the application is not withdrawn, a precedent will have been set that anyone can take his neighbour's property without due regard. This will mean the end of private property rights.

#### **Lack of consultation**

59. CPW have constantly talked up the benefits of the scheme. To say there has been a lack of consultation with directly affected parties is an understatement. I attended the early Consultative Working Party meetings in 2001, and whilst they listened to us, I felt that the adversely affected parties were not taken seriously.

60. As Secretary of the local branch of NZDA, I made a submission to oppose the loss of our Centre Fire Range facility on a property in the Waianiwaniwa Valley which belongs to one of our members. To date I have not been personally approached by CPW on this matter.
61. As Acting Secretary of the Coalgate/Glentunnel Reserve I discovered that part of the Coalgate Public Reserve may be covered by the designation. Again I have seen no one from CPW.
62. The lack of consultation over the years resulted in increasing anger. At a meeting with the CPW Trust in Coalgate (2003), the message came through loud and clear that the scheme was not wanted. The parting words of Waianiwaniwa Valley farmer, Mr Brian Deans to the CPW Trust were, "go away and shut the gate behind you". Yet CPW bulldozed on. Landowners were ignored.

### **The RMA Process**

63. I have felt compelled to make submissions on a number of previous applications to take water for irrigation schemes and especially on the CPW scheme. I find the process time consuming, stressful and intrusive. I feel we are having to defend a position that should be largely guaranteed by the Councils' planning documents, and in the absence of a robust Water Management Plan, I feel none of us can sit back and accept the continuing deterioration of Canterbury's water bodies.
64. The resource consent process allows for views to be heard, and we have no other option than to be part of the process in order to try to protect the values that are so important to us.
65. Submitting in opposition to an application can lead to a breakdown in community relationships. This is regretful. This aspect of the RMA process does nothing for the social cohesion of an area. Unfortunately, we are left with no other choice.
66. The CPW scheme is having a more than minor effect on me, my family, property and community. I believe the scheme will have a significant adverse effect on the region's rivers and aquifers.
67. It states in the RMA that proper regard be given to the effects on people and on the environment.

### **Part 2.**

- Section 5 (c ) Requires the **avoidance**, remedy or mitigation of any adverse effects of activities on the environment.
- Section 6 (a) requires recognition and provision for the preservation of the natural character of the wetlands, lakes and rivers and their margins, and the protection of them from inappropriate use and development.
- Section 6 (b) requires the protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes.
- Section 6 (c) requires the protection of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna.
- Section 6 (d) requires the maintenance and enhancement of public access to and along rivers.
- Section 7 (c ) requires the maintenance and enhancement of amenity values.
- Section 7 (f) requires the maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the environment.
- Section 7 (h) requires the protection of the habitat of trout and salmon.

### **Part 3.**

- Section 17 (1) Every person has a duty to avoid, remedy, or mitigate any adverse effect on the environment arising from an activity carried on by or on behalf of that person, **whether or not the activity is in accordance with a rule in a plan....**

### **Conclusion**

It is my view the CPW proposal contravenes almost every aspect of these sections of the RMA and that the effects are more than minor.

I feel that there is insufficient knowledge of what is happening to our groundwater and that the **precautionary principle** should apply.

I believe we owe it to future generations not to plunder braided rivers such as the Waimakariri and the Rakaia, as they are a part of our heritage. I ask the Commissioners to **Withdraw** the Notices of Requirement and to decline all of the associated CPW applications.

**J.J. Snoyink 20 July 2008**

