Under the Resource Management Act 1991

In the matter of An appeal under clause 14(1) of the First Schedule of the Act in

relation to the Proposed Southland Water and Land Plan

Between Aratiatia Livestock Limited

Appellant

And Southland Regional Council

Respondent

Notice of wish to be a party to proceedings on behalf of Meridian Energy Limited

22 June 2018

Counsel:

Stephen Christensen

Project Barrister

PO Box 1251, Dunedin Metro 9054

P 027 448 2325

stephen@projectbarrister.nz

NOTICE OF PERSON'S WISH TO BE PARTY TO PROCEEDINGS

Section 274, Resource Management Act 1991

TO: The Registrar Environment Court Christchurch

- Meridian Energy Limited (Meridian) wishes to be a party to appeal ENV-2018-CHC-29 filed by Aratiatia Livestock Limited (Appellant) against parts of a decision of Southland Regional Council (Respondent) on the Proposed Southland Water and Land Plan (pSWLP).
- Meridian made submissions and/or further submissions on the subject matter of the proceedings and/or has an interest in the proceedings that is greater than the interest that the general public has, as an operator and owner of renewable electricity generation assets in Southland including the Manapouri hydro-electric generation scheme and White Hill wind farm near Mossburn.
- Meridian is not a trade competitor for the purposes of section 308C or 308CA of the Act.
- The parts of the proceeding Meridian is interested in, and Meridian's position in relation to the relief the Appellant seeks is as follows:

(a) Objective 10

The Appellant seeks reinstatement of the notified version of this Objective.

Meridian's position

Meridian opposes the relief the Appellant seeks and supports the rewording of Objective 10 as set out in Meridian's notice of appeal. The relief sought by the Appellant would not give effect to the higher order planning instruments, would not promote sustainable management, and would be contrary to Part 2 of the Act.

(b) Policy 26

The Appellant seeks changes to Policy 26 that introduce considerations relating to potential adverse effects as part of the Policy.

Meridian's position

Meridian opposes the relief the Appellant seeks and supports the rewording of Policy 26 set out in Meridian's notice of appeal. The relief sought by the Appellant would not give effect to the higher order planning instruments, would not promote sustainable management, and would be contrary to Part 2 of the Act.

Rule 52A

The Appellant seeks the deletion of this Rule, and of all references to the Rule elsewhere in the pSWLP.

Meridian's position

Meridian opposes the relief the Appellant seeks and supports the inclusion of Rule 52A in the form set out in Meridian's notice of appeal. Meridian supports the appropriate references to Rule 52A elsewhere in the pSWLP as this is necessary to ensure the Rule achieves its intended effect. The relief sought by the Appellant would not give effect to the higher order planning instruments, would not promote sustainable management, and would be contrary to Part 2 of the Act.

(c) Appendix E

The Appellant seeks deletion of the wording in Appendix E which recognises that some water quality parameters listed in the Appendix are unable to be met because of alterations to natural flows due to the effects of the operation of the Manapouri hydro-electric generation scheme.

Meridian's position

Meridian opposes the relief the Appellant seeks and supports retention of the wording in the decision version of the pSWLP because the alteration of natural flows due to the operation of the Manapouri hydro-electric generation scheme means that some of the water quality parameters in the Appendix cannot be met. The relief sought by the Appellant would not give effect to the higher order planning instruments, would not promote sustainable management, and would be contrary to Part 2 of the Act.

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

Dated 22 June 2018

Stephen Christensen

Counsel for Meridian Energy Limited