

**BEFORE THE ENVIRONMENT COURT
AT CHRISTCHURCH**

ENV - 2018 - CHC - 000035

UNDER the Resource Management Act 1991

A N D

IN THE MATTER of an appeal under cl 14(1) of Schedule 1 to the Act

BETWEEN **BEEF + LAMB NEW ZEALAND**

Appellant

A N D **SOUTHLAND REGIONAL COUNCIL**

Respondent

**NOTICE OF INTEREST UNDER SECTION 274
ON BEHALF OF FONTERRA CO-OPERATIVE GROUP LTD**

Solicitor acting:
Jason Sandford
Senior Corporate Counsel
Fonterra Co-operative Group Ltd
Private Bag 92032
Auckland 1142
Email: jason.sandford@fonterra.com

Counsel instructed:
Bal Matheson
Richmond Chambers
33 Shortland Street
PO Box 1008
Auckland 1140
Email: matheson@richmondchambers.co.nz

**TO: THE REGISTRAR
ENVIRONMENT COURT
CHRISTCHURCH**

FONTERRA CO-OPERATIVE GROUP LTD (Fonterra) wishes to be a party to the appeal by Beef + Land New Zealand (Appeal).

1. Fonterra made a submission and further submission about the subject matter of the Appeal.
2. Fonterra is not a trade competitor for the purposes of section 308C or 308CA of the Resource Management Act 1991.
3. Those parts of the Appeal in which Fonterra is interested, whether it supports or oppose those parts of the Appeal, and associated reasons, is described in Schedule 1.
4. Fonterra agrees to participate in mediation or other alternative dispute resolution of the Appeal.

FONTERRA CO-OPERATIVE GROUP LTD by its counsel:



Signature: BJ Matheson
Date: 20 June 2018

Address for Service: Bal Matheson
Richmond Chambers
PO Box 1008
Shortland Street
Auckland 1140

Telephone: (09) 600 5510

Email: matheson@richmondchambers.co.nz

TO: Registrar, Environment Court,
Christchurch

AND TO: Appellant

AND TO: All Parties

Advice to recipients of copy of notice of interest

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

SCHEDULE 1 - DESCRIPTION OF PROCEEDINGS, EXTENT OF INTEREST, SUPPORT/OPPOSE, AND ASSOCIATED REASONS

Extent of Interest		Support/Oppose Change	Reasons
Section of Plan	Provision to be changed		
Land use rules	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rule 20 (d) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The matters of discretion suggested are inappropriately phrased and are accordingly inappropriate because they: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - introduce too much uncertainty into the RDA consenting framework; and/or - propose matters that are impracticable to demonstrate; and/or - are directly or unavoidably in conflict with the granting of the resource consent.