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

ENV-2021-CHC-93

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	ROYAL FOREST AND BIRD PROTECTION SOCIETY OF NEW ZEALAND			
	Appellant			
And	MACKENZIE DISTRICT COUNCIL Respondent			

# NOTICE OF BALMORAL STATION (TEKAPO) LIMITED'S (INCORPORATING BALMORAL STATION AND MT HAY STATION) 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

- To: The Registrar Environment Court Christchurch
- 1 Balmoral Station (Tekapo) Limited (**BSTL**), incorporating Balmoral Station and Mt Hay Station, wish to become party to the abovenamed appeal.
- 2 BSTL is not a submitter to Plan Change 18 (Indigenous Biodiversity) (**PC18**) to the Mackenzie District Plan that is the subject of these proceedings.
- BSTL, and shareholders of BSTL, own land and leasehold interests within the Mackenzie Basin subzone. That land is subject to the Mackenzie District Plan (MDP) and accordingly BSTL 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 BSTL 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 BSTL are not trade competitors for the purposes of section 308C or 308CA of the Act.
- 6 BTSL are interested in all of the proceedings.
- 7 Without detracting from the generality of 6 above, those particular parts of the appeal in which BSTL are interested, and whether it supports or opposes those parts are identified in **Appendix A**. Appendix A is not specific to this appeal and identifies BSTL's position with respect to the following related appeals:
  - 7.1.1 ENV-20210-CHC-91 Meridian Energy Ltd (MEL)
    7.1.2 ENV-20210-CHC-92 Director-General of Conservation
    7.1.3 ENV-20210-CHC-93 Royal Forest and Bird
    7.1.4 ENV-20210-CHC-94 Environmental Defence Society Incorporated

- 8 BSTL 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.
- 9 For all other appeals, BSTL 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 Balmoral Station and Mt Hay Station.
- 10 Further, BSTL consider that the relief sought:
  - 10.1.1 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.
  - 10.1.2 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 Makenzie Basin.
  - 10.1.3 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.
  - 10.1.4 Will not promote certainty or provisions that are capable of construction and use by non-specialist users of the MDP.
  - 10.1.5 Is not supported by robust scientific assessment.
- 11 BSTL agree to participate in mediation or other alternative dispute resolution of the proceedings.

Dated 26 August 2021

Katherine Forward Counsel for Balmoral Station (Tekapo) 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: <u>Katherine.forward@duncancotterill.com</u>

## Advice:

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

### APPENDIX A

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