



# Recommendation and decision on notification of resource consent application(s) under sections 95-95G of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA)

## Recommendation and decision

### Officer's recommendation

The application be processed non-notified	<input type="checkbox"/>
Public notification is required	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
The application be placed on hold while the applicant tries to obtain written approvals from the affected persons	<input type="checkbox"/>
Limited notification is required. Persons to be served notice are those listed below	<input type="checkbox"/>

Reasons for public notification recommendation:

- Under Section 95A of the Act, the applicant has requested that the application be publically notified.
- The effects from the proposal are likely to be more than minor.

Aurora Grant  
**Team Leader Consents**

**Date:** 29 March 2019

**Decision under Delegated Authority**

I agree with the recommendation	<input type="checkbox"/>
The application will be processed non-notified	<input type="checkbox"/>
The application will be publicly notified	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
The application shall be placed on hold while the applicant tries to obtain written approvals from the affected persons	<input type="checkbox"/>
The application will be limited notified. The parties to be served notice are those listed below	<input type="checkbox"/>

This decision is made under delegated authority by:



Michael Durand  
Consents Manager

Date: 3 April 2019

**Particulars**

Applicant:	Woldwide Four Limited and Woldwide Five Limited
Consents sought:	<p><b><u>Woldwide Four Limited</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Land Use Consent to use land for farming;</li><li>• Discharge permit to discharge farm dairy effluent from up to 1000 cows and winter barn slurry to land from up to 1050 cows;</li><li>• Land Use Consent to use a winter barn for up to 1050 cows;</li><li>• Land use consent to maintain and use an existing effluent storage pond and effluent treatment and transfer facilities; and</li><li>• Water Permit to take and use 100,000L of groundwater per day.</li></ul> <p><b><u>Woldwide Five Limited</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Land Use Consent to use land for farming;</li><li>• Discharge permit to discharge farm dairy effluent from up to 930 cows and winter barn slurry to land from up to 1050 cows;</li><li>• Land Use Consent to use a winter barn for up to 1050 cows;</li><li>• Land use consent to maintain and use an existing effluent storage pond and effluent treatment and transfer facilities; and</li><li>• Water Permit to take and use 100,000L of groundwater per day.</li></ul>
New consent(s) for new activity(ies) (s88)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

New consent(s) for existing activity(ies) (s88)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Change to conditions of existing consent(s) (s127)	<input type="checkbox"/>



## Processing Officer's Notification Assessment

### The Proposal

#### Overview

The applicants currently operate two separate dairy farms (Woldwide Four Limited and Woldwide Five Limited). The properties are supported by separate wintering and cut and carry operations which take place on blocks known as "Gladfield" and "Woldwide runoff". I consider these blocks make up part of the applicant's landholding, and effects from the proposal have been included in both the application and my S95 assessment.

Under this proposal the dairy units will remain separate from each other. The proposed activities will occur in multiple phases (phase 1 and phase 2), with the first phase occurring over the first five years, and then the applicants will move into phase 2.

The proposal includes an expansion onto land which has not previously been used for dairy purposes in phase 1, and an increase of cow numbers in phase 2.

The applicant's application sets out the proposal in detail.

### Reasons adverse effects on the environment are less than minor/ minor/ more than minor

#### *The existing environment*

The application details the existing environment at length, and I adopt the assessment of this for the purposes of making the notification decision. In general, water quality in the receiving environment can, overall, be considered degraded.

#### *Adverse effects of the proposed activities on the environment*

- Discharges to surface and groundwater from point and non-point sources
- Cumulative effects
- Soil degradation
- Odour

While the discharge, water take and wintering of cows currently form part of the existing environment, by entering into Rule 20 of the pSWLP, the entire farming operation is able to be assessed, rather than just the discharge and water take as consented activities, as per Policy 39 of the pSWLP.

## Effects:

The applicant's application sets out in depth details regarding possible effects and proposed mitigations for the proposal. While I consider that the applicants proposed mitigations will offset some of the potential effects from the activity, there are key issues which I consider will mean the effects from the activity could be considered more than minor.

### **Land Use Nutrient and Contaminant Losses:**

The key issues with nutrient losses with this proposal are:

- The current dairy platforms are located on soils which leach readily to groundwater and/or surface water depending on the specifics. The water quality in the receiving environment is already significantly degraded. The proposal aims to add more cows over more land to this environment.
- The proposal will see an increase of youngstock grazed at the runoff block, which is likely to cause an increase of nutrient losses. The runoff block is located in a different catchment to the dairy platforms, but water quality in that catchment is also significantly degraded.
- Expansion of the dairy platform onto land which has previously been used for sheep grazing – this will cause an increase of localised losses on these new blocks through the conversion process and ongoing use for dairy processes.
- Uncertainty regarding the use of OVERSEER for modelling losses in a regulatory context, and in particular the accuracy of the model for mapping "leaky soils".

The assessment of environmental effects contains in-depth detail on the nutrient budgets for the landholding and explains that the overall N and P losses over the landholding will decrease under the proposal. It is noted that overseer assumes good management practices are being undertaken on farm. The applicant has offered mitigations to mitigate nutrient and contaminant losses in the property.

### **Groundwater quality**

Groundwater quality in the catchment is degraded in areas, with some bore monitoring showing high groundwater nitrates. Soils in the area of the property are considered "leaky", with high risk of nutrient loss to groundwater. Due to these factors, I consider that groundwater quality is an issue to address with this application and that it is likely the effects will be more than minor.

### **Groundwater quantity**

I adopt the applications assessment of groundwater quantity and potential effects and I do not have any concerns regarding this part of the application.

### ***Adverse effects that have been disregarded***

N/A

### ***Conclusion: significance of adverse effects on the environment***

I consider that the adverse effects arising from the activity are likely to have a more than minor effect on the environment, especially when cumulative effects are considered. The objectives and policies of both the operative and proposed relative regional plans support this view, and will be discussed in depth in the later S42A report.

**Statutory Acknowledgement Areas**

---

Is the activity on or adjacent to, or may it affect, a statutory acknowledgement area?  Yes

No

---

**Reasons why adverse effects on Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu are less than minor, minor or more than minor:**  
The landholding sits within several statutory acknowledgement areas

**Are any people adversely affected?**

---

Are the adverse effects on a person minor or more than minor (but not less than minor)?  Yes

No

---

---