## BEFORE THE ENVIRONMENT COURT AT CHRISTCHURCH

ENV-2018-CHC-000047

IN THE MATTER the Resource Management Act 1991 ("RMA")

AND

IN THE MATTER of an appeal under clause 14(1) of the First Schedule of

the RMA in relation to the Proposed Southland Water and

Land Plan

BETWEEN Waihopai Runaka, Hokonui Runaka, Te Runanga O

Awarua, Te Runanga O Oraka Aparima, and Te

Runanga O Ngai Tahu (collectively Ngai Tahu)

Appellant

A N D Southland Regional Council

Respondent

## NOTICE OF WISH TO BE PARTY TO PROCEEDINGS UNDER SECTION 274 OF RMA

ARATIATIA LIVESTOCK LIMITED

Dated this State of June 2018

ELLIS GOULD Level 17 Vero Centre

LAWYERS 48 Shortland Street, Auckland AUCKLAND Tel: 09 307 2172 / Fax: 09 358 5215

PO Box 1509 DX CP22003

REF: Douglas Allan AUCKLAND

## Notice of wish to be party to proceedings under section 274 RMA by Aratiatia Livestock Limited

- 1. Aratiatia Livestock Limited ("Aratiatia") wishes to be a party to Notice of Appeal ENV-2018-CHC-000047 dated 17 May 2018 by Waihopai Runaka, Hokonui Runaka, Te Runanga O Awarua, Te Runanga O Oraka Aparima, and Te Runanga O Ngai Tahu (collectively Ngai Tahu) c/- james.winchester@simpsongrierson.com to the Environment Court ("the Appeal") against the decision of the Southland Regional Council on the Proposed Southland Water and Land Plan.
- 2. Aratiatia is entitled to be a party to the Appeal because:
  - (a) It lodged Notice of Appeal ENV-2018-CHC-000029 dated 16 May 2018 ("Aratiatia Appeal") which seeks relief on matters addressed in the Appeal.
  - (b) It owns and farms land on the right (western) bank of the Waiau River, the management of which will be directly affected by the relief sought in the Appeal.
- Aratiatia is not a trade competitor for the purposes of section 308C or 308CA of the RMA.
- 4. Aratiatia is interested in those aspects of the Appeal set out in **Schedule 1** and variously supports or opposes the items of relief identified in **Schedule 1** to this notice.
- 5. The reasons for Aratiatia's support of the items of relief identified in Schedule 1 are:
  - (a) The relief sought in the Appeal which is supported by Aratiatia is appropriate in terms of section 32 of the RMA and consistent with the purpose, principles and provisions of the RMA, to the extent it is consistent with the relief sought in the Aratiatia Appeal.
  - (b) The grounds set out in the Appeal.
  - (c) The grounds set out in the Aratiatia Appeal.
  - (d) The additional reasons set out in Schedule 1.
- 6. The reasons for Aratiatia's opposition to the items of relief identified in Schedule 1 are:

- (a) The relief sought in the Appeal which is opposed by Aratiatia is inappropriate in terms of section 32 of the RMA and inconsistent with the purpose, principles and provisions of the RMA.
- (b) The relief sought in the Appeal which is opposed by Aratiatia will generate unnecessary and inappropriate adverse effects on the environment and in particular on land management practices within the Waiau River catchment.
- (c) The grounds set out in the Aratiatia Appeal.
- (d) The additional reasons set out in Schedule 1.
- 7. Aratiatia agrees to participate in mediation or other alternative dispute resolution of the proceedings.

Signed for and on behalf of Aratiatia Livestock Limited by Its solicitors and duly authorised agents Ellis Gould:

D A Affan

Dated this | J day of | U. L 2018

Address for Service of Section 274 Party: The offices of Ellis Gould, Solicitors, Level 17, The Vero Centre, 48 Shortland Street, Auckland (PO Box 1509, Auckland, 1140), DX CP22003, Phone: 09 307-2172, Facsimile, 09 358-5215. Attention: D A Allan, Email: dallan@ellisgould.co.nz

## Schedule 1 showing relief in Appeal that is opposed and supported

Aratiatia's position regarding item of relief sought by Appellant	Additional Reasons for Aratiatia's position
Oppose	The definition of ephemeral river in the pSWLP is sufficiently uncertain that it could be interpreted to include any area of relief within a paddock that carries water in high rainfall events.
Oppose	Primary production's contribution to the Southland economy relative to other regions warrants its explicit mention.
Oppose	"Overall" is consistent with the NPSFM
Support	Consistent with the Aratiatia Appeal
Oppose	Primary production's contribution to the Southland economy relative to other regions warrants its explicit mention.
Support	Consistent with the Aratiatia Appeal
Oppose	As for the General Point above. Aratiatia also opposes the relief sought regarding the limit of 20 Ha for oxidising soils.
Support	Generally consistent with the relief sought in the Aratiatia Appeal.
Support	Consistent with the Aratiatia Appeal
Support	
	regarding item of relief sought by Appellant  Oppose Oppose Support Oppose Support Oppose Support Support