BEFORE THE ENVIRONMENT COURT AT AUCKLAND ENV-2020-AKLIN

Ι ΜυΑ Ι ΤΕ ΚΟΟΤΙ ΤΑΙΑΟ

THE MATTER	of the Resource Management Act 1991		
AND			
IN THE MATTER	of appeals under clause 14(1) of the First Schedule of the Act in relation to Waikato Regional Plan Change 1		
BETWEEN	THE APPELLANTS LISTED IN Table 1		
	Appellant		
AND	WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL Respondent		

SECTION 274 NOTICE BY GENETIC TECHNOLOGIES LTD

28TH September 2020

SECTION 274 NOTICE

- TO: The Registrar Environment Court AUCKLAND
 - Genetic Technologies Ltd wishes to be a party to the following appeals in respect of the Waikato Regional Council's ("WRC") decision on Waikato Regional Council's Plan Change 1 (PC1)
 - a. Director-General of Conservation v WRC (ENV-2020-AKL-000096)
 - b. Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited v WRC (ENV-2020-AKL-000093)
 - c. DairyNZ Limited v WRC (ENV-2020-AKL-000097)
 - d. Beef & Lamb New Zealand Limited v WRC (ENV-2020-AKL-000099)
 - e. Federated Farmers of New Zealand Incorporated v WRC (ENV-2020-AKL000102)

f. Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated v WRC (Env-2020-AKL000094)

2. Genetic Technologies Ltd made a submission and further submissions on PC1.

3. Genetic Technologies Ltd is not a trade competitor for the purposes of section 308C or 308D of the Resource Management Act 1991.

4. Genetic Technologies Ltd.'s interest, position and reasons are set out in Table 1 below.

5. Genetic Technologies Ltd agrees to participate in mediation or other alternative dispute resolution of the proceedings.

Dated 28 September 2020

Ian Williams

Environment and Farm Systems Specialist

Genetic Technologies Ltd

Address: Ian Williams, Genetic Technologies Ltd P.O. Box 105-303 Auckland 1143 Email: <u>iwilliams@genetic.co.nz</u> Ph. 0274950789

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

т	а	h	ما	1
I.	a	D	ie	т

Appellant	Provision	Oppose/support	Reasons
Ballance Agri- Nutrients Ltd (0093)	Schedule C Clause 6	Support	Appears that the words "to pasture" have been omitted.
			Science supports application rates higher than 30kgN/ha to some crops with no deleterious effects
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	Objectives 1,2	Oppose	Time frames and water quality improvement levels proposed by Forest and Bird are too onerous and unrealistic
Incorporated (0094)	Policy 5	Oppose	The removal of references to offsetting and compensation takes away the ability of businesses with limited capital to prioritise actions based on sub catchment priorities. It also acknowledges mitigations already undertaken
Director General of Conservation (0096)	Schedule C Clause 10	Oppose	Lack of robustness of science behind the proposal to extend cultivation setbacks from 5m to 10m
DairyNZ (0097)	Objectives 1,2	Support	Consideration must be made that takes into account the cost and "achievability" of targeted improvement changes
	Schedule C Point 7	Support	The change suggested by DairyNZ more accurately reflects the science behind the industry best practice.
			Also specifying a soil temperature would make it almost impossible to police, whereas a date range that reflects best practice will improve farmer compliance
Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd (0099)	Policy 5	Support	Acknowledging sub-catchment priorities enables farmers to target spending toward higher priority issues. It also acknowledges changes farmers have already made.

Federated Farmers of New Zealand Incorporated	Schedule C. Clause 10	Support	A blanket cultivation within 5m is too blunt an instrument to limit adverse effects of cultivation. The distance of setback needs to be determined as part of the FEP as this will better reflect the farming type and environment and therefore determine more accurately the risk of contaminant loss. The inclusions of strip tillage in the definition of no tillage would make the rule more in line with
			make the rule more in line with international definitions.