



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: 3 April 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 One Limited and Woldwide Two Limited
Consents sought:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Discharge of dairy shed effluent from up to 1500 cows and winter barn effluent from up to 1250 cows to land• Discharge of winter barn slurry effluent from up to 1250 cows to land• Abstraction and use of 180 cubic metres of groundwater per day• The use of land to use two winter barns for up to 625 cows in each winter barn• The use of land for dairy farming that did not exist as of June 2016 by increasing cow numbers
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 One Limited and Woldwide Two Limited). The properties are supported by separate wintering and cut and carry operations which take place on blocks known as "Woldwide Runoff" and "Horner Block". I consider that Woldwide Runoff makes up part of the applicant's landholding, and effects from the proposal have been included in both the application and my S95 assessment. The Horner Block is not considered to be part of the landholding, however, the effects of the activities on this block are considered.

Under this proposal the milking platforms will combine into one dairy unit, however they will effectively be operating as two separate dairy units, as two milking sheds and milking herds will be operated separately.

The Horner Block will continue to be used as a cut and carry silage block only, and winter barn slurry will be discharged onto the block. The applicant has applied for a separate discharge permit for this activity.

The 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. There is some detail regarding soil types and investigation in the application that I do not agree with, which adds uncertainty to the proposal and potential effects, however this factor will be addressed in the S42A report. 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 dairy farm is also located in close proximity to the Aparima River. The proposal aims to add more cows to this environment.
- The proposal will see an increase of young stock 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.
- 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 on the property.

Groundwater quantity

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

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.

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?

Sections 95B and 95E deal with whether any person is affected and whether limited notification is required. However, section 95B only applies “if the application is not publicly notified under section 95A.” Section 95E only applies “for the purpose of giving limited notification”.

The applicant has requested public notification.

Therefore:

- there is no opportunity to limited notify the application, and
- there is no opportunity to assess whether any person is an affected person.