

**IN THE ENVIRONMENT COURT  
CHRISTCHURCH REGISTRY  
I MUA I TE KOOTI TAIAO O AOTEAROA**

ENV-2021-CHC-91

**In the matter** of the Resource Management Act 1991 (**the Act**)

**and**

**In the matter** of an appeal under clause 14 schedule one of the Act

**Between** **MERIDIAN ENERGY LIMITED**

Appellant

**And** **MACKENZIE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

Respondent

---

**NOTICE OF GLEN LYON LIMITED'S WISH TO BE PARTY TO PROCEEDINGS**

**26 August 2021**

---

---

**Duncan Cotterill**  
Solicitor acting: Katherine Forward  
PO Box 5, Christchurch 8140

Phone +64 3 379 2430  
Fax +64 3 379 7097  
[katherine.forward@duncancotterill.com](mailto:katherine.forward@duncancotterill.com)

To: The Registrar  
Environment Court  
Christchurch

- 1 Glen Lyon Limited (**GLL**) wishes to become party to the abovenamed appeal.
- 2 GLL is not a submitter to Plan Change 18 (Indigenous Biodiversity) (**PC18**) to the Mackenzie District Plan that is the subject of these proceedings.
- 3 GLL own leasehold interests within the Mackenzie Basin subzone. That land is subject to the MDP and accordingly GLL have an interest in these proceedings greater than the interest that the general public has – a right in property that is directly affected by the subject matter of the appeal, and which is not remote
- 4 The relief pursued in the appeal(s) has the potential to disadvantage GLL through constraints on land use leading to direct consequences including the environmental, economic, and social costs of any change to the decision version of PC18.
- 5 GLL are not trade competitors for the purposes of section 308C or 308CA of the Act.
- 6 GLL is interested in part of the proceedings. as identified in **Appendix A**. Appendix A is not specific to this appeal and identifies GLL's position with respect to the following related appeals:
  - 6.1.1 ENV-20210-CHC-91 – Meridian Energy Ltd (**MEL**)
  - 6.1.2 ENV-20210-CHC-92 – Director-General of Conservation
  - 6.1.3 ENV-20210-CHC-93 – Royal Forest and Bird
  - 6.1.4 ENV-20210-CHC-94 – Environmental Defence Society Incorporated
- 7 GLL support the relief sought by MEL in relation to the deletion of figure 1 and subsection (c) from the definition of '*significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna*' because the map depicting

Mackenzie Basin alluvial outwash and moraine ecosystems has not been ground-truthed or adequately consulted upon.

8 For all other appeals, GLL oppose the relief sought because the outcomes have the potential to impose inappropriate restriction(s) and increased consenting obligations on the current and future farming operations at Glen Lyon Station.

9 Further, GLL consider that the relief sought:

9.1.1 Is inconsistent with the Canterbury Policy Statement 2013 (**CRPS**) and fails to provide a pathway for development and use of land in accordance with the concept of sustainable management prescribed in the Act. The decisions version of PC18 should be preferred.

9.1.2 Does not differentiate between maintenance clearance and new clearance activities, a matter of critical importance to the ongoing viability of current farming operations in the Mackenzie Basin.

9.1.3 Is inconsistent with section 32, the purposes and principals of part 2, and the requirements for district plans set out in sections 72, 74 and 75 of the Act.

9.1.4 Will not promote certainty or provisions that are capable of construction and use by non-specialist users of the MDP.

9.1.5 Is not supported by robust scientific assessment.

10 GLL agree to participate in mediation or other alternative dispute resolution of the proceedings.

Dated 26 August 2021



---

**Katherine Forward**

Counsel for Glen Lyon Limited

**Address for service:**

Attention: Katherine Forward  
Duncan Cotterill  
Level 2, Duncan Cotterill Plaza  
148 Victoria Street  
Christchurch 8013

Tel +64 3 379 2430

Email: [Katherine.forward@duncancotterill.com](mailto:Katherine.forward@duncancotterill.com)

**Advice:**

If you have any questions in relation to this notice, please contact the Environment Court in Auckland, Wellington or Christchurch.

**APPENDIX A**

<b>PROVISION APPEALED</b>	<b>EDS</b>	<b>DOC</b>	<b>FOREST &amp; BIRD</b>	<b>MEL</b>
<b>Mapping of fully converted and unconverted land</b>	Oppose	Oppose	Oppose	
<b>Definitions</b>				
<b>Improved pasture</b>	Oppose	Oppose	Oppose	
<b>Indigenous vegetation</b>			Oppose	
<b>Significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna</b>	Oppose	Oppose	Oppose	Support with respect to deletion of figure 1 and subsection (c)
<b>Vegetation clearance</b>	Oppose	Oppose	Oppose	
<b>Objectives and Policies</b>				
<b>Objective 1</b>			Oppose	
<b>Policy 2</b>			Oppose	
<b>Policy 3</b>			Oppose	
<b>Policy 4</b>	Oppose		Oppose	
<b>Policy 5</b>	Oppose		Oppose	
<b>Rules</b>				
<b>Rule 1.1.1(1)(a)</b>	Oppose regarding requested maximum clearance cap	Oppose regarding deleting stock tracks and stock crossings		
<b>Rule 1.1.1(1)(b)</b>	Oppose			
<b>Rule 1.1.1(7)</b>	Oppose	Oppose		
<b>Rule 1.3.2(1)</b>			Oppose	
<b>Rule 19.1.1</b>			Oppose	
<b>Rule 19.1.2.2</b>			Oppose	
<b>Rule 19.3.2</b>			Oppose	