

under: the Resource Management Act 1991

in the matter of: of an appeal under clause 14(1) of Schedule 1 to the
Act

and: of the Proposed Southland Water and Land Plan

between: **Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New
Zealand Inc**
Appellant

and: **Southland Regional Council**
Respondent

Notice of Dairy Holdings Limited's wish to be party to proceedings

Dated: 7 June 2018

REFERENCE: Ben Williams (ben.williams@chapmantripp.com)

Chapman Tripp
T: +64 3 353 4130
F: +64 3 365 4587

60 Cashel Street
PO Box 2510, Christchurch 8140
New Zealand

www.chapmantripp.com
Auckland, Wellington,
Christchurch



NOTICE OF DAIRY HOLDINGS LIMITED'S WISH TO BE PARTY TO PROCEEDINGS

Section 274, Resource Management Act 1991

- To** The Registrar
Environment Court
Christchurch
- 1 Dairy Holdings Limited (*DHL*) wishes to be a party to the following proceedings:
 - 1.1 the appeal by Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc (the *Appellant*) to the Environment Court against the decisions of the Southland Regional Council on the Proposed Southland Water and Land Plan (the *Decisions*, the *Council* and the *Proposed Plan*).
 - 2 DHL made a submission and further submission on the Proposed Plan.
 - 3 DHL is not a trade competitor for the purposes of section 308C or 308CA of the Resource Management Act 1991.
 - 4 DHL is interested in all the proceedings.
 - 5 Without limiting the above, DHL is interested in the following particular issues:
 - Objectives 13, 13A, and 13B**
 - 5.1 DHL is supportive of Objectives 13, 13A, and 13B of the decisions version of the Proposed Plan. Although it is neutral to the merging of these Objectives, it is opposed to the reinsertion of Objective 13(c) (or the insertion of a similar clause) of the notified version of the Proposed Plan (the *Notified Plan*).
 - Physiographic Zone Policies**
 - 5.2 The provision for dairy farming and intensive winter grazing in the decisions version of the Proposed Plan without unnecessary restriction from physiographic zone policies.
 - Policy 16**
 - 5.3 The wording of Policy 16 (Farming activities that may affect water) in the decisions version of the Proposed Plan and whether it is adequate and reasonable.

Rules 13, 15, and 24

- 5.4 DHL opposes the relief sought for Rule 13 – Discharge from subsurface drainage systems, Rule 15 – Discharge of stormwater, and Rule 24 – Incidental discharges from farming.

Rule 14

- 5.5 The provision for the discharge of fertiliser in the decisions version of the Proposed Plan without unnecessary restriction in Rule 14 – Discharge of fertiliser.

Rule 20

- 5.6 The provision for intensive winter grazing in the decisions version of the Proposed Plan without unnecessary restriction in Rule 20 - Farming.

Rule 25

- 5.7 The provision for cultivation on sloping ground in the decisions version of the Proposed Plan without unnecessary restriction in Rule 25 – Cultivation on sloping ground.

Rule 70

- 5.8 DHL opposes the relief sought for Rule 70 – Stock exclusion from waterbodies.

Ephemeral and intermittent rivers

- 5.9 The wording of the decisions version of the Proposed Plan generally excluding ephemeral rivers and whether this is adequate and reasonable.

- 6 DHL opposes the relief sought (unless otherwise stated) because:

Objective 13

- 6.1 DHL supports the use and development of land and soils within appropriate limits. Objective 13 is primarily an enabling objective and therefore the overly broad and restrictive wording proposed by the Appellant creates an internal conflict in the Objective and is not appropriate.

Physiographic Zones

- 6.2 DHL owns a number of properties that span a number of physiographic zones (although they are generally not zones that are sensitive from a water quality perspective). It is important that dairy farming and intensive winter grazing are enabled within all of these zones.
- 6.3 The changes to the physiographic zone policies sought by the Appellant are overly restrictive and burdensome.

Farming activities that affect water quality

- 6.4 DHL is supportive of Policy 16 (Farming activities that affect water quality) as it stands in the decisions version of the Proposed Plan.
- 6.5 DHL considers that the wording proposed by the Appellant for Policy 16 would be wholly inappropriate and unnecessarily restrictive. There should not be a blanket ban on farming activities that affect water, they should be assessed based on the actual effects of farming activities. If effects can be remedied or mitigated then there is no need to 'avoid' an activity.

Rules 13, 15, and 24

- 6.6 DHL supports discharges from subsurface drainage systems and of stormwater as a permitted activity with appropriate conditions. Sub-surface drains are a common feature on DHL's properties.
- 6.7 The changes to Rules 13, 15, and 24 sought by the Appellant make the conditions to these rules burdensome and inappropriate.

Discharge of fertiliser

- 6.8 DHL has already fenced off the vast majority of waterways on its properties, and these fence-lines are used as guidelines for cultivation and fertilisation. These fences are generally the required 3 metres away from the outer edge of the waterbody.
- 6.9 It is noted that DHL did not specifically submit on Rule 14 but opposes the relief sought by the Appellant on the basis that it is within the scope of DHL's wider submissions on wintering and dairy farming.
- 6.10 An increase in the required setback distance would be difficult to implement, and would unduly restrict DHL's existing on-farm practices. Where waterways are particularly susceptible to cultivation activity this can be managed through the farm environment plan.

Intensive winter grazing

- 6.11 DHL utilises an efficient wintering system whereby (typically) 5-40ha of forage crops are planted on their dairy farms to allow cows to be brought off wintering blocks earlier in the season. This model means that intensive winter grazing affects not only DHL's wintering blocks, but also potentially its dairy farms.

6.12 The changes to Rule 20 sought by the Appellant impose inappropriate and burdensome conditions for intensive winter grazing as a permitted activity.

Cultivation

6.13 DHL repeats its reasons at paragraphs 6.8 and 6.10 above.

6.14 The changes sought to Rule 25 by the Appellant impose inappropriate and burdensome conditions for cultivation on sloping ground as a permitted activity.

Stock exclusion from waterbodies

6.15 The changes sought to Rule 70 by the Appellant are inappropriate and burdensome and do not reflect realistic on-farm practices.

Ephemeral and intermittent rivers

6.16 Ephemeral and intermittent rivers are a common feature in Southland. DHL owns a number of properties which contain such rivers. The Appellant seeks the inclusion of ephemeral and intermittent rivers in a number of policies and rules in the Proposed Plan.

6.17 DHL strongly opposes such a change as it would render a large majority of the rules overly burdensome and impossible to achieve.

7 DHL agrees to participate in mediation or other alternative dispute resolution of the proceedings.

Signed for and on behalf of Dairy Holdings Limited by its solicitors and authorised agents Chapman Tripp



Ben Williams
Partner
7 June 2018

Address for service of person:

Dairy Holdings Limited
c/- Ben Williams
Chapman Tripp
5th Floor, PwC Centre
60 Cashel Street
PO Box 2510
Christchurch 8140
Email address: Ben.Williams@chapmantripp.com

Advice

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