

BEFORE THE ENVIRONMENT COURT

ENV-2018-CHC-000037

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of an Appeal under clause 14 of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991 in relation to the proposed Southland Water and Land Plan

BETWEEN SOUTHLAND FISH AND GAME COUNCIL

Appellant

AND SOUTHLAND REGIONAL COUNCIL

Respondent

NOTICE OF REQUEST TO BE PARTY TO PROCEEDINGS UNDER SECTION 274 OF THE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991

ROBERT GRANT

Dated this 27 day of June 2018

PRESENTED FOR FILING BY:

Counsel for the Appellant

Clare Lenihan

Barrister

102 Jed Street

INVERCARGILL 9810

Tel: (03) 214 1674

E: clare.lenihan@environmentallawyer.co.nz

Instructing Counsel

Jeff Walker

Walker Murdoch Law Ltd

PO Box 1188

INVERCARGILL 9840

Tel: (03) 214 0777

E: jeff@wmlaw.co.nz

**NOTICE OF REQUEST TO BE A PARTY TO PROCEEDINGS UNDER S274 OF THE RESOURCE
MANAGEMENT ACT BY ROBERT GRANT**

1. Robert Grant wishes to be a party to Notice of Appeal ENV-2018-CHC-000037 dated 17 May 2018 by Southland Fish and Game Council to the Environment Court (“**the Appeal**”) against the Decision of the Southland Regional Council on the Proposed Southland Water and Land Plan.

2. Robert Grant is entitled to be a party to the Appeal because:-
 - (a) He made a submission and lodged a Notice of Appeal ENV-2018-CHC-000045 dated 17 May 2018 (“**Robert Grant Appeal**”) which seeks relief on matters addressed in the Appeal.

 - (b) He owns and farms land at Otamita, Eastern Southland the management of which will be directly affected by the relief sought in the Appeal.

3. Robert Grant is not a trade competitor for the purposes of s308C or s308CA of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Interest in Appeal

4. Robert Grant is interested in the parts of the Appeal as set out below:-

Rule 20 – Farming: Intensive Winter Grazing

5. Robert Grant opposes the proposals to:
 - i. Include ephemeral or intermittent rivers (by deleting rule 20(aa) and amending Rules 20(a)(iii)(3)(C), 20(a)(iii)(4) and 20(b));
 - ii. Require stock intensively winter grazed on land with a slope greater than 4 degrees to be progressively break fed etc., Rule 20(a)(iii)(3)(A) (currently the rule refers to “sloping ground”, which isn’t defined);
 - iii. Require back fencing of stock behind temporary electric fencing when break or block feeding, Rule 20(a)(iii)(3)(B);
 - iv. Require stock be excluded from critical source areas (including swales) within the area being grazed), 20(a)(iii)(3)(F) and 20(b);

- v. Require a vegetated strip be maintained and stock excluded from increasing setback distances dependent on slope, new Rule 20(a)(iii)(4)(A)-(C);
- vi. To require a 100m setback from the outer edge of any lake, regionally significant wetland or sensitive waterbody (currently the setback is 20m), 20(a)(iii)(5);
- vii. Make farming activities that don't meet the standards a non-complying activity; and
- viii. Include a footnote that slope is the average slope from the outer edge of the bed measured horizontally to a point 20m from the outer edge.

Rule 25 - Cultivation

- 6. Robert Grant opposes the proposals to:
 - i. Include ephemeral or intermittent rivers;
 - ii. Increase setback distances for intensive winter grazing, with increasing setbacks depending on slope; and
 - iii. Exclude cultivation in critical source areas (including swales).

Rule 70 - Stock access

- 7. Robert Grant opposes the proposal to:
 - i. Include ephemeral, intermittent river and artificial drains;
 - ii. The proposal to add further performance standards; and
 - iii. make farming activities that don't meet the standards a non-complying activity.

Glossary

- 8. Robert Grant opposes the proposal to:
 - i. amend the definition of intensive winter grazing; and
 - ii. define sloping ground (but no definition has been proposed).

Appendix N

- 9. Robert Grant opposes the proposal to amend the requirements for a Farm Environmental Management Plan.

Reasons for opposition

- 10. The reasons Robert Grant opposes the relief sought are set out below.-

- 11. **Rule 20 – Farming: Intensive Winter Grazing**

(i) *Ephemeral or intermittent rivers (delete rule 20(aa) and amend Rules 20(a)(iii)(3)(C), 20(a)(iii)(4) and 20(b))*

11.1 The proposed change could mean Robert Grant would need a consent for much of its current normal operations, yet there are unlikely to be important values present or any adverse effects from the activities. A single paddock can contain multiple ephemerals therefore it would be almost impossible to adhere to this rule and would be an inefficient use of resources.

11.2 Where land is to be cultivated or intensively winter grazed, the Farm Environmental Management Plan is required to identify these areas and include good management practices for the reduction of sediment and nutrient losses from these areas (Appendix N3(l)(i) and 5(b)(i)).

(ii) *Require stock intensively winter grazed on land with a slope greater than 4 degrees to be progressively break fed etc., Rule 20(a)(iii)(3)(A)*

11.3 4-degree land is regarded as flat land. As a large proportion of Robert Grant's land, and land in Southland, is above 4 degrees, this proposal will be onerous – it is an inefficient use of resource and will create an inability to winter graze Robert Grant's Stock.

(iii) *Require back fencing of stock behind temporary electric fencing when break or block feeding, Rule 20(a)(iii)(3)(B)*

11.4 This proposal can lead to concentration of stock in one area and animal welfare issues where there is no shelter and they can get stuck in muddy areas.

(iv) *Require stock be excluded from critical source areas (including swales) within the area being grazed), 20(a)(iii)(3)(F) and 20(b)*

11.5 There are various policies in the Proposed Plan already providing guidance for management of these areas. Excluding stock completely is not one of them – strategic grazing is.

11.6 Critical source areas need to be identified and managed as required by the Farm Environmental Management Plan. Robert Grant supports this approach and opposes the change sought by the Appellant.

(v) *Require a vegetated strip be maintained and stock excluded from increasing setback distances dependent on slope, new Rule 20(a)(iii)(4)(A)-(C)*

11.7 The setbacks proposed:

- i. are not practical;
- ii. will create an inefficient use of land;
- iii. will result in loss of productive land and increase breeding grounds for weeds and pest; and
- iv. will result in greatly increased costs of maintenance.

(vi) *To require a 100m setback from the outer edge of any lake, regionally significant wetland or sensitive waterbody (currently the setback is 20m), 20(a)(iii)(5)*

11.8 This proposal is excessive and there is no clear rationale for it. This is an inefficient use of resources.

(vii) *Make farming activities that don't meet the standards a non-complying activity*

11.9 There is no rationale provided to make farming that doesn't meet standards non-complying, versus the proposed discretionary activity.

11.10 It would be overly burdensome and costly.

(viii) *Include a footnote that slope is the average slope from the outer edge of the bed measured horizontally to a point 20m from the outer edge*

11.11 It is unclear what the purpose of this amendment is or what the benefit would be, therefore it is opposed.

12. Rule 25 - Cultivation

- 12.1 The proposed change to include ephemeral or intermittent rivers is opposed for the reasons set out in paragraphs 11-12 above.
- 12.2 The proposed change seeking increased setback distances for intensive winter grazing, with added increasing setbacks depending on slope (not currently proposed as a requirement) is opposed for the reasons set out above in paragraph 16.
- 12.3 The proposed change to exclude cultivation in critical source areas (including swales) is opposed because these areas are required to be identified and adverse effects managed via the Farm Environmental Management Plan and good management practices.

13. Rule 70 - Stock access

- 13.1 The proposal to include ephemeral, intermittent river and artificial drains is opposed for reasons set out in paragraphs 11-12 above.
- 13.2 The proposed additional performance standards are overly burdensome, and it is unclear what added benefit they will achieve.
- 13.3 The proposal to make farming activities that don't meet the standards a non-complying activity is opposed for the reasons set out in paragraphs 20-21.

14. Glossary

Intensive winter grazing

- 14.1 The proposal to amend the definition of "intensive winter grazing" is opposed. This matter is covered in the Robert Grant Appeal

Sloping ground

- 14.2 The proposal definition of "sloping ground" is opposed as it is far reaching and unclear why the proposed gradients were chosen. Although there is no definition of sloping ground in the Proposed Plan, Rule 25 Cultivation on Sloping Ground refers to cultivation not occurring at an altitude greater than 800m amsl and not on land with

a slope greater than 20 degrees. The Appellant isn't seeking to change these gradients, so there appears to be an inconsistency.

15. Appendix N

15.1 The proposed amendments to Appendix N are extensive, complex, difficult to understand, lacking in clarity in places and will be costly to prepare.

15.2 Robert Grant agrees to participate in mediation or other alternative dispute resolution of the proceedings.

Signed for and on behalf of Robert Grant:-



Clare Lenihan
Counsel

Dated this 22 day of June 2018

Address for service of s274 party:

The offices of Clare Lenihan
Barrister
102 Jed Street
Invercargill 9810
Tel: (03) 214 1674
E: clare.lenihan@environmentallawyer.co.nz