

**BEFORE THE ENVIRONMENT COURT
AT CHRISTCHURCH**

ENV - 2018 - CHC - 000035

UNDER the Resource Management Act 1991

A N D

IN THE MATTER of an appeal under cl 14(1) of Schedule 1 to the Act

BETWEEN **BEEF + LAMB NEW ZEALAND**

Appellant

A N D **SOUTHLAND REGIONAL COUNCIL**

Respondent

**NOTICE OF INTEREST UNDER SECTION 274
ON BEHALF OF DAIRYNZ LTD**

Solicitor acting:

Sarah Watson
Duncan Cotterill
148 Victoria Street
P O Box 5
Christchurch 8140
Email: sarah.watson@duncancotterill.com

Counsel instructed:

Bal Matheson
Richmond Chambers
33 Shortland Street
PO Box 1008
Auckland 1140
Email: matheson@richmondchambers.co.nz

**TO: THE REGISTRAR
ENVIRONMENT COURT
CHRISTCHURCH**

DAIRYNZ LTD (DairyNZ) wishes to be a party to the appeal by Beef + Land New Zealand (Appeal).

1. DairyNZ made a submission and further submission about the subject matter of the Appeal.
2. DairyNZ is not a trade competitor for the purposes of section 308C or 308CA of the Resource Management Act 1991.
3. Those parts of the Appeal in which DairyNZ is interested, whether it supports or oppose those parts of the Appeal, and associated reasons, is described in Schedule 1.
4. DairyNZ agrees to participate in mediation or other alternative dispute resolution of the Appeal.

DAIRYNZ LTD by its counsel:



**Signature:
Date:**

**SJ Watson/BJ Matheson
22 June 2018**

Address for Service:

**Bal Matheson
Richmond Chambers
PO Box 1008
Shortland Street
Auckland 1140**

Telephone:

(09) 600 5510

Email:

matheson@richmondchambers.co.nz

**TO: Registrar, Environment Court,
Christchurch**

AND TO: Appellant

AND TO: All Parties

Advice to recipients of copy of notice of interest

If you have any questions about this notice, contact the Environment Court in Auckland, Wellington or Christchurch.

SCHEDULE 1 - DESCRIPTION OF PROCEEDINGS, EXTENT OF INTEREST, SUPPORT/OPOSE, AND ASSOCIATED REASONS

Section of Plan	Extent of Interest	Support/Oppose Change	Reasons
Land use rules	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rule 20 (d) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The matters of discretion suggested are inappropriately phrased, either: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - introducing too much uncertainty into the RDA consenting framework; and/or - proposing matters that are impracticable to demonstrate; and/or - are directly or unavoidably in conflict with the granting of the resource consent <p>and are, accordingly, inappropriate.</p>