

**BEFORE THE ENVIRONMENT COURT                      ENV-2020-AKL**

**AT AUCKLAND**

**I MUA I TE KOOTI TAIAO O AOTEAROA TĀMAKI MAKĀURAU**

**IN THE MATTER**                      of the Resource Management Act 1991

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER**                      of appeals under clause 14(1) of Schedule 1 to the Act

**BETWEEN**                              the appellants listed in Paragraph 1

**AND**                                      WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL  
Respondent

.....

**NOTICE OF WISH TO BE A  
PARTY TO PROCEEDINGS UNDER SECTION 274  
GRAHAM C. PINNELL**

9 November 2020

.....

**To the Registrar**  
Environment Court  
Auckland, Wellington, and Christchurch

1. I, Graham Charles Pinnell, wishes to be a party to an appeal by the following appellants against the decision of the Waikato Regional Council ("Council") on Proposed Plan Change 1 to the Waikato Regional Plan ("PC 1"):
  - ENV-2020-AKL-000084 Fonterra Ltd
  - ENV-2020-AKL-000090 Waikato River Authority
  - ENV-2020-AKL-000096 Director-General of Conservation
  - ENV-2020-AKL-000097 Dairy NZ Ltd
  - ENV-2020-AKL-000098 Wairakei Pastoral Ltd
  - ENV-2020-AKL-000099 Beef and Lamb NZ Ltd
  - ENV-2020-AKL-000100 Waikato and Waipa River Iwi
  - ENV-2020-AKL-000101 Auckland Waikato and Eastern Fish and Game Council
  - ENV-2020-AKL-000102 Federated Farmers of NZ Inc
  - ENV-2020-AKL-000149 Lochiel Farmlands Ltd
2. I am a person who made a submission about the subject matter of the proceedings.
3. I am not a trade competitor for the purposes of [section 308C](#) or [308CA](#) of the Resource Management Act 1991.
4. I am interested in all of the proceedings.
5. Without limiting the generality of Paragraph 4, I am interested in the following particular sections of PC1, noting that any amendments often would require consequential changes to other sections:
  - Objective 2
  - Policy 4
  - Rule 3.11.4.3
  - Schedule C
  - Schedule D
  - Table 3.11.1
6. I support (*or* oppose *or* conditionally oppose) the relief sought for the reasons stated in my submission and hearing presentations on PC1. Where I oppose the relief sought by the Appellants listed in Paragraph 1, I consider that such relief does not appropriately give effect to the relevant higher order documents to PC1, has not balanced environmental, economic, social, cultural and health and safety considerations in a reasonably practicable manner, or is not the most efficient and effective means of achieving the objectives of the plan change. Particular reasons are summarised in the table attached to this notice.

7. I agree to participate in mediation or other alternative dispute resolution of the proceedings.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'G Pinnell', written in a cursive style.

Signature of person wishing to be a party

345 Brunskill Rd, RD4, Cambridge 3496  
Telephone: 07 8278697  
Email: g.pinnell@xtra.co.nz  
Contact person: Graham Pinnell

9 November 2020

<b>Provision appealed</b>	<b>Appellant Number</b>	<b>Relief sought by Appellant</b>	<b>Support/Oppose</b>	<b>Reason</b>
Objective 2	000098 and 000102	Actions to be completed within 10 years, not achievement of the Table 3.11.1 short term numeric water quality values.	Support	As expressed by Appellants.
Policy 4	000096	No sub-catchment tailoring.	Oppose	Sub-catchment tailoring taking account of downstream impacts is the most effective means.
Policy 4 and Rule 3.11.4.3	000084, 000097 and 000100	N controls on all farms.	Oppose	The most efficient means is to take a risk-based approach. I support the Decision version of PC1.
Rule 3.11.4.4	000096	Amend from controlled to restricted discretionary activity.	Oppose	Controlled activity is the most efficient.
Schedule C	000096	Include statement of environmental benefits of	Oppose, otherwise should include environmental	Consistency with the sustainability purpose of

<b>Provision appealed</b>	<b>Appellant Number</b>	<b>Relief sought by Appellant</b>	<b>Support/Oppose</b>	<b>Reason</b>
		riparian fencing.	detriments and other sustainability impacts.	the RMA.
Schedule C	000090, 000096, 000098, 000099, 000100, 000101, 000102 and 000149	Slope, stocking rate, setbacks, water bodies, compliance timeframes.	Various	Provisions must be reasonably practicable and the most effective and efficient.
Schedule D - CFEP	000084 and 000097	All FEPs should be certified.	Oppose	The most efficient means is to take a risk-based approach.
Schedules D1 and D2 - CFEP	000102	Cost effective and efficient compliance framework.	Support	More feasible and efficient.
Schedule D1	000096, 000099, 000102 and 000149	Cultivation and grazing restrictions based on LUC	Various	Decision version unnecessarily restrictive.
Table 3.11.1	000090 and 000102	Amend short term water quality values.	Various	Values that are 10% of the journey is more feasible.

