BEFORE A HEARING: WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of a submission and further submission by

J Swap Limited to Waikato Regional Council - Proposed Plan Change 1 (and Variation 1) - Waikato and Waipā River

Catchments.

Submitter Number 71618

Hearing Block 3

STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF ARIELL LEANNE KING ON BEHALF OF J SWAP LIMITED 5 JULY 2019

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 My name is Ariell Leanne King. I am a qualified planning consultant, and a Principal Planner at AECOM New Zealand Limited (AECOM).
- 1.2 I hold a Bachelor of Science, a Bachelor of Commerce and Administration, a Masters in Resource and Environmental Planning, Intermediate membership of the NZPI and have over 15 years' experience in planning and policy development. I was employed by Taupo District Council from 2003 until April 2018 and held a number of roles including Senior Policy Advisor and Corporate Planning Manager. I began my employment with AECOM on 30 April 2018.
- 1.3 AECOM prepared a Submission for J Swap Limited (J Swap) on Waikato Regional Council - Proposed Plan Change 1 (and Variation 1) - Waikato and Waipā River Catchments (PPC1). This submission was lodged on 8 March 2017.
- 1.4 I assisted J Swap with the preparation of the further submission that was lodged with Waikato Regional Council (WRC) on 17 September 2018; and a copy served on each of the respective Submitters on 18 September 2018. A copy of the J Swap submission on PPC1 is Attachment A to this evidence; and the J Swap further submissions is Attachment B to this evidence.

2. CODE OF CONDUCT

I have read and agree to abide by the "Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses" issued by the Environment Court of NZ, Practice Note, 2014. This evidence has been prepared in accordance with that Code. I confirm that I have not omitted to consider material facts that I am aware of that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express and that this evidence is within my area of expertise. The evidence I am giving is within my area of expertise, except where I state I am relying on the opinion or evidence of other witnesses. I understand it is my duty to assist the Commissioners impartially on relevant matters within my area of expertise.

3. BACKGROUND AND SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

- 3.1 I am presenting this planning evidence in support of the submission and further submission by J Swap to PPC1.
- J Swap owns the Swap Group of companies which has had a long association in contracting, quarrying, heavy haulage, bulk storage and stockfeed. Within the Waikato region, J Swap operate aggregate and mineral quarries at Tauhara Quarry, 423 Broadlands Road; Waotu Quarry, 408 Waotu South Road; and Osterns Quarry, 890 Otorohanga Road (SH3).
- 3.3 These quarries individually and cumulatively provide a supply of minerals and aggregates that is crucial for the continued development of the Waikato region and to enable people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being. The quarries supply minerals and aggregate that is not only required to provide for building, construction and roading projects associated with growth, but also to maintain and redevelop existing infrastructure.
- 3.4 In preparing my evidence, I have reviewed the following:
 - (a) J Swap's submission and further submission
 - Section 42A Report Proposed Waikato Regional Plan Change 1 –
 Waikato and Waipa River Catchments Block 3 (Doc# 14285477)
 (including Appendix A Reporting Officers, Appendix B Relevant Submitters, and Appendix C Tracked Changes PC1.
 - (c) Relevant provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA)
- 3.5 My evidence focuses on the J Swap's submission and further submission relating to the following aspects of PPC1 as set out in the Section 42A Report for Hearing Block 3 matters:
 - Definitions

4. DISCUSSION

Definitions:

- 4.1 J Swap supported Policy 16 in part and requested that greater guidance was provided regarding the terms good management practices or best management practices or that these were replaced with the term best practicable option. Policy 11 for instance also utilises the term best practicable option.
- 4.2 It is noted that the Officer's Report for Hearings Block 3 now recommends that the definition for best management practices is deleted, with the Officer's supporting the term Good Farming Practices (previously included as Good Management Practices). If the definition is not deleted the Officers have recommended the following wording:

Best <u>Farming</u> management <u>pP</u>ractice/s: For the purposes of Chapter 3.11, means maximum feasible mitigation <u>beyond that undertaken in accordance</u> <u>with Good Farming Practice</u> to reduce the diffuse discharge of nitrogen, phosphorus, sediment or microbial pathogens from land use activities given <u>current technology</u>.

- 4.3 It is further noted that the Officer's prefer the term good farming practices rather than best practicable option.
- 4.4 From an implementation perspective it may be challenging for those using the plan to determine the difference between 'good' and 'best'. As noted above, and in my evidence for hearings block 2, the preference would be the use of best practicable option, particularly given it is defined in the Resource Management Act.
- 4.5 Best practicable option has been applied throughout a range of industries over a long period, including quarrying and earthmoving. The meaning and implementation is well understood by regulators and operators.
- 4.6 However, if the use of 'best practicable option' is not supported in Policy 16, my opinion is that only one definition should be included to capture what is ultimately intended that the actions undertaken on properties within the

catchment reduce or minimise the impact of contaminants on the receiving

environment.

4.7 In addition, it is recommended that the definition includes the word

'management' rather than 'farming'.

4.8 This recognises that not all activities in the catchment and rural environment

are solely related to farming as is the case for J Swap quarries and for other

non-farming rural based production activities. Further it is recommended that

the words 'industry agreed and approved' be included in the definition. J Swap

rely on a number of industry agreed and approved practices including those prepared by the Waikato Regional Council, Worksafe New Zealand and

information readily available on the quality planning website including a

practice note on aggregates and quarrying.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR RELIEF SOUGHT BY J SWAP

5.1 I have attached a copy of the J Swap submission and further submissions in

Attachments A and B to my evidence, respectively; to provide full details of

the relief sought by J Swap.

5.2 It is recommended in the first instance that best practicable option is used in

Policy 16.

5.3 If a definition is included, J Swap support the use of 'best management

practices' and the inclusion of 'industry agreed and approved practices'.

Ariell Leanne King

Principal Planner AECOM New Zealand Limited

5 July 2019

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Submission on behalf of J Swap Limited

Attachment B: Further Submission on behalf of J Swap Limited

5

Submission on Proposed Waikato Regional Plan Change 1 – Waikato and Waipa River Catchments

FORM 5 Clause 6 of First Schedule, Resource Management Act 1991

To Chief Executive
Waikato Regional Council
401 Grey Street
Private Bag 3038
Waikato Mail Centre
Hamilton 3240

Name of submitter: J Swap Ltd

This is a submission on a change proposed to the following plan (the proposal):

Waikato Regional Plan.

J Swap Ltd could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

The specific provisions of the proposal, submissions and decisions sought that J Swap Ltd's submission relates to are detailed in Table 1

J Swap Ltd wish to be heard in support of its submission.

11/1

If others make a similar submission, J Swap will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.

	6 May and the second se	
Signature:		—
Date:	8 March 2017	

Address for service of submitter:

J Swap Ltd c/- AECOM, P O Box 434, Waikato Mail Centre, Hamilton 3240

Telephone: Wk - 07 958 6985 or Mb - 021 925984

Email: james.fuller@aecom.com

Contact person: James Fuller, Team Leader Waikato Planning

Introduction

This is a submission made by J Swap Ltd ("J Swap") to Proposed Plan Change 1 pursuant to clause 6 of the first schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).

J Swap owns the Swap Group of companies which has had a long association in contracting, quarrying, heavy haulage, bulk storage and stockfeed. Within the Waikato region, J Swap operate aggregate and mineral quarries at

- a. Tauhara Quarry, 423 Broadlands Road, Rotokawa 3378:
- b. Waotu Quarry, 408 Waotu South Road;
- c. Osterns Quarry, 890 Ororohanga Road (SH3), Otorohanga 3873 Te Kawa; and
- d. Taotaoroa Quarry, 410 568 Taotaoroa Road (edge of sub-catchment).

These quarries individually and cumulatively provide a supply of minerals and aggregates that is crucial for the continued development of the Waikato region and to enable people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being. The quarries supply minerals and aggregate that is not only required to provide for building, construction and roading projects associated with growth, but also to maintain and redevelop existing infrastructure. Each of the J Swap quarries listed are reliant on existing consented or permitted surface and/or ground water takes in order to efficiently operate, and mitigate effects.

Because J Swap is a significant user and developer of natural and physical resources, the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and related regulations (such as Proposed Waikato Regional Plan Change 1 (Plan Change 1)) represents a statutory regime that plays a significant role in J Swap Ltd business.

General Submission

J Swap acknowledges the work that Waikato Regional Council (Council) and the Collaborative Stakeholder Group (CSG) have put in to developing Plan Change 1.

J Swap in principal support the Vision and Strategy for the Waikato and Waipa Rivers (Vision and Strategy) and the direction it sets for restoring and protecting the Waikato and Waipa Rivers.

In respect of Plan Change 1, the issues J Swap is interested in include:

- That plan change 1 reflects the objectives of the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPSFM);
- Makes provisions for people and communities to continue to provide for their economic and social wellbeing, while giving effect the Vision and Strategy; and
- Ensuring the provisions for point source discharges will be practicable for industrial operators such as J Swap Ltd.

In light of the above, the specific parts of Proposed Plan Change 9 that the J Swap submission relates to are outlined in the following table.

Table 1: Specific Submissions on Plan Change 1

Amendments proposed to the text of Plan Change 1 are shown in red text with deletions struck-out and additions <u>underlined</u>. For convenience, the amendments shown below are also shown in the attached marked up version of Plan Change 1.

SUBMISSION POINTS

Page No.	Reference (e.g. issue, Policy, Objective, Rule, Method or Objective number)	Support/Oppose	Submission	Decision Sought Say what changes to the plan you would like
Multiple	Various	Support in part	J Swap Ltd supports the Vision and Strategy and Plan Change 1. However, we are concerned that the terminology used in Plan Change 1 is inconsistent with the NPSFM. This creates confusion for plan readers. The NPSFM defines the term "freshwater objective" and importantly, where a freshwater objective is not being met, Policy A2 of the NPSFM requires regional councils to set targets designed to meet the freshwater objective and take action to ensure those targets are met.	Amend the text in Plan Change 1 to ensure that the definitions and terms in the NPSFM are applied consistently as shown in the attached marked up version of the document.
SECTION	DBJECTIVES			
27	Objective 2	Support in part	J Swap Ltd supports the intent of Objective 2 which, in part, seeks to ensure that people and communities can continue to provide for their social, economic and cultural wellbeing while the restoration and protection of the rivers is taking place. J Swap Ltd suggests a	Amend Objective 2 as follows: Objective 2: Social, economic and cultural wellbeing is maintained in the long term Waikato and Waipa communities and their economy benefit from the restoration and

			minor amendment to make the intent of Objective 2 clearer.	protection of water quality in the Waikato River catchment, which and the restoration and protection is undertaken in a way and at a rate that enables the people and communities to continue to provide for their social, economic and cultural wellbeing.
27	Objective 3	Support in part	J Swap Ltd supports the intent of Objective 3 to achieve 10 percent of the total required change sought by Objective 1, by 2026 but suggests a minor amendment to the text to improve the clarity and certainty of the objective. An amendment to this objective is also required to give effect to submission point 1 above.	Amend Objective 3 as follows: Objective 3: Short-term improvements in water quality in the first stage of restoration and protection of water quality for each sub-catchment and Freshwater Management Unit Actions put in place and implemented by 2026 to reduce discharges of nitrogen, phosphorus, sediment and microbial pathogens, are sufficient to achieve ten percent of the required change between current water quality and the 80-year desired water quality states attributed targets in Table 3.11-1. A ten percent change towards the long term desired water quality states improvements is indicated by Objective 3the short term water quality attributed targets in Table 3.11-1.
27	Objective 4	Support in part	J Swap Ltd supports the intent of Objective 4 but suggests a minor amendment to make it clear which values and uses are being referred to. An amendment to this objective is also required to give effect to submission point 1 above.	Amend Objective 4 as follows: Objective 4: People and community resilience A staged approach to change enables people and communities to undertake adaptive management to continue to provide for their social, economic and cultural wellbeing in the short term while: a) considering the values and uses identified

Section P	olicies			in section 3.11.1 when taking action to achieve Objectives 1 and 3the attribute^ targets^ for the Waikato and Waipa Rivers in Table 11-1; and recognising that further contaminant reductions will be required by subsequent regional plans and signaling anticipated future management approaches that will be needed to meet Objective 1.
33	10	Support in part	J Swap Ltd supports the inclusion of Policy 10 to provide for point source discharges associated with regionally significant activities. However, in its current unqualified form, Policy 10 appears inconsistent with Objective 3, the NPSFM and the Vision and Strategy. This inconsistency can be rectified by making reference to Policies 11 & 12 as shown. In addition, the policy potentially implies that only existing regionally significant infrastructure and industry is provided for expansion of existing activities, or new activities do not appear to be contemplated. Given the likely need for people and communities to find alternative means of providing for their economic and social wellbeing over time, J Swap Ltd considers it appropriate to amend the policy to ensure that expansion of existing and development of	Amend Policy 10 as follows: Policy 10: Provide for point source discharges from activities of regional significance When deciding resource consent applications for point source discharges of nitrogen, phosphorus, sediment and microbial pathogens to water or onto or into land, subject to Policy 11 and Policy 12 provide for the: a) Continued operation and development of regionally significant infrastructure; and b) Continued operation and development of regionally significant industry.

			new regionally significant industry or infrastructure is also provided for as long as the achievement of Objectives 1 and 3 is not compromised. J Swap Ltd notes that industrial development is also subject to Policy 6.14 of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement (Adopting Future Proof land use pattern). A definition of regionally significant industry is also required as the definition in the Waikato Regional Policy Statement directs that regionally significant industry will be identified in district and regional plans. J Swap Ltd has proposed a definition in the Definitions section	
33	11	Support in Part	J Swap Ltd supports the application of the best practicable option concept to point source discharges as it is consistent with the RMA and Policy A3 of the NPSFM and therefore an appropriate consideration when assessing the discharge of contaminants. J Swap Ltd also supports the use of offsetting. In order to achieve the reductions in loads of nitrogen, phosphorus, sediment or microbial pathogens likely to be required from industrial sites like J Swap Ltd quarries, offsetting would be a useful tool to have available. It would provide flexibility for industries such as J Swap Ltd to implement reductions where the greatest positive impact on the Waikato and Waipa Rivers can be achieved, for the least	Amend Policy 11 as follows: Policy 11: Application of Best Practicable Option and mitigation or offset of effects to point source discharges Require any person undertaking a point source discharge of nitrogen, phosphorus, sediment or microbial pathogens to water or onto or into land in the Waikato and Waipa River catchments to adopt the Best Practicable Option* to avoid or mitigate the adverse effects of the discharge, at the time a resource consent application is decided. Policy 11A: Offsetting the effects of point source discharges Where it is not practicable to avoid or mitigate all—any significant adverse effects, an offset measure may be proposed in an alternative

cost over time.

- J Swap Ltd does not consider it appropriate to combine these two concepts in a single policy as they are separate, albeit potentially related matters.
- J Swap Ltd therefore proposes Policy 11 is split into two policies to separate Best Practicable Option from offsetting. A consequential amendment to the title of Policy 11 is required together with a new Policy 11A and associated title.
- J Swap Ltd also proposes that re-numbered Policy 11A is amended to include new subclause d) to replace the sentence deleted in the chapeau (i.e. "ensure positive effects....to lessen any residual effects"...etc.). This improves the clarity and readability of the subclause and ensures the offset measure is monitored to confirm its effectiveness.
- J Swap Ltd also proposes amendments to sub-clause (e). A consent condition may not always be the most appropriate mechanism for securing an offset. For example, a covenant could be used which may provide greater protection for the offset measure than a consent condition.

Further minor amendments are proposed as shown for clarity.

location or locations to the **point source discharge**, for the purpose of ensuring positive effects on the environment to lessen any residual adverse effects of the discharge(s) that will or may result from allowing the activity provided that the:

- a) The Pprimary discharge does not result in any significant toxic adverse effect at the **point source-discharge** location; and
- b) The Ooffset measure is for the same contaminant; and
- c) The Ooffset measure occurs preferably within the same or upstream of the subcatchment in which the primary discharge occurs and if this is not practicable, then within the same Freshwater Management Unit^ or a Freshwater Management Unit^ located upstream;, and
- d) The offset measure is monitored and results in a net reduction in adverse environmental effects on the Waikato or Waipa River catchment caused by nitrogen, phosphorus, sediment and/or microbial pathogens; and

<u>The **Ooffset**</u> measure remains in place for the duration of the consent and is secured by consent condition or another legally binding mechanism.

34	12	Support in part	J Swap Ltd supports the intent of Policy 12 but considers that stronger terminology is needed in order to give effect to the NPSFM and Vision and Strategy. J Swap Ltd proposes that the word "Consider" be replaced with "Assess." An amendment to this objective is also required to give effect to submission point 1.	Amend Policy 12 as follows: Policy 12: Additional considerations for point source discharges in relation to water quality targets Consider Assess the contribution made by a point source discharge to the nitrogen, phosphorus, sediment and microbial pathogen catchment loads and the impact of that contribution on the likely achievement of the short term or targets in Objective 3 or the progression towards the desired 80 year water quality statestargets in Objective 1, taking into account: c. The ability to stage future mitigation actions to allow investment costs to be spread over time and contribute to meeting Objectives 1 and 3the water quality targets specified above; and
34	13	Support in part	J Swap Ltd strongly supports the intent of Policy 13 as long term consent durations provide operational and investment certainty for its activities, however considers that a consent term of 35 years is warranted where the requirements of Policies 11, 11A and 12 are complied with. J Swap Ltd also suggests some minor amendments to improve the clarity and robustness of the policy.	Amend Policy 13 as follows: Policy 13: Point sources consent duration When determining an appropriate duration for any consent granted consider the following matters: A consent term exceeding 25of 35 years, where the applicant demonstrates the approaches set out in that Policies 11, 11A and 12, will be metcomplied with; and

35, 36	16	Support in Part	The proposed plan change makes reference to Good Management Practice (GMP) in relation to Certified Industry Schemes and Best Management Practice (BMP) in relation to Policy 16. The inclusion of these terms suggest the plan could be interpreted as suggesting BMP and GMP are differing levels of obligation on resource users to avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of water use in each case. The reference to "good" and "best" management implies the obligation in these instances is different to the best 'practicable' option and at an extreme, that the obligation could be impractical.	Provide greater guidance on these terms or replace references to 'BMP' and 'GMP' with "BPO". If necessary, amend the definition of BPO to include as a Schedule to the Plan, WRC's 'guidance' material as representing the BPO in respect of diffuse source discharges.
38	Monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of Chapter 11	Support in Part	The proposed plan change makes reference to working with industry to collate information on the functioning and success of any Certified Scheme. No methods or rules are proposed at this stage around existing	That any method or rule around consent renewal is assessed on a case-by-case basis for regionally significant industry — to take into account existing industry infrastructure investment to date.
			infrastructure and treatment for regionally significant industry. The concern from J Swap as a regionally	Regionally significant industry develops infrastructure on a business basis and this is generally for longer time periods than the duration of resource consent(s).
			significant industry is that the history of the activity and the investment in infrastructure and treatment to minimise the effects on water quality are not taken into account in any future resource consent renewal process. Due	Acknowledging this infrastructure investment will help lead to a balanced assessment of effects at the time of consent renewal notwithstanding the BPO and offsetting approaches discussed under Policy 11 above.

			to the nature of Regionally Significant Industries investment decisions in infrastructure and treatment made on extended timeframes than those permitted under the RMA. For Regionally Significant Industries to operate and provide economic and social benefits to the Waikato Region, continuity of the resource consents needs to be addressed in Plan Change 1 to the Waikato Regional Plan.	3.11.4.11 Waikato Regional Council Will: a. Review and report f. Recognise current infrastructure investment by Regionally significant industry, when assessing resource consent renewals for existing activities; and g. Recognise the level of treatment provided by Regionally significant industry infrastructure under any existing resource consents and apply a BPO approach when assessing resource consent renewals for those existing activities. The above should be encapsulated into a new Controlled Activity Rule, Rule 3.11.5.5 for renewals of resource consents associated with Regionally significant industries or relief to that effect is sought.
83	Regionally Significant Industry	Support	The definition of regionally significant industry in the Waikato Regional Policy Statement indicates that regionally significant industry is expected to be defined in regional plans (see page G-9 of the RPS). Regionally significant industry is referred to in Plan Change 1 but is not defined. J Swap Ltd therefore proposes a new definition for regionally significant industry.	Include a new definition of regionally significant infrastructure as follows: Regionally significant industry - means an economic activity based on the use of natural and physical resources in the region which have benefits that are significant at a regional or national scale. These may include social, economic or cultural benefits. Regionally significant industry includes: a) Dairy manufacturing sites; b) Meat processing plants; c) Pulp and paper processing plants; and d) Mineral extraction activities.

90 3.5 Discharges Background and Explanation	The sentence proposed to be included in Section 3.5 appears incomplete and refers to "Discharges associated with Farming Land Use" when Chapter 3.11 also has policies addressing point source discharges. J Swap Ltd considers that the text requires amendment to better reflect the actual intention of Chapter 3.11. Amend the text of the Background and Explanation section as follows: Discharges in the Waikato and Waipa River
--	---

FURTHER SUBMISSION FORM



IN SUPPORT OF, OR IN OPPOSITION TO, SUBMISSION/S ON NOTIFIED:

PROPOSED WAIKATO REGIONAL PLAN CHANGE 1: WAIKATO AND WAIPĀ RIVER CATCHMENTS AND VARIATION 1 TO PROPOSED WAIKATO REGIONAL PLAN CHANGE 1: WAIKATO AND WAIPĀ RIVER CATCHMENTS

Save this PDF to your computer before answering. If you edit the original form from this webpage, your changes will not save. Please check or update your software to allow for editing. We recommend Acrobat Reader.

Council needs to receive your further submission by 5pm, Monday, 17 September 2018. Please read the notes on making a Further Submission at the end of this form before completing your submission.

IMPORTANT NOTE

A copy of your further submission must be served on the original submitter/s within 5 working days of being lodged with council. An address list of all submitters is included with the summary of decisions requested documents and is available at waikatoregion.govt.nz/healthyrivers

YOUR NAME, ADDRESS FOR SERVICE AND CONTACT DETAILS (MANDATORY INFORMATION)

Name of submitter (individual/organisation)		
Contact person (if applicable)		
Agent (if applicable)		
(
Email address for service		
Postal address for service		
		Post code:
Phone number/s	Home:	Business:
	Mobile:	Fax:

IN ACCORDANCE WITH SCHEDULE 1 OF THE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT:

I am	c.
\circ	A person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest. In this case, also specify the grounds for saying that you come within this category; or
\circ	A person who has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest the general public has. In this case, also explain the grounds for saying that you come within this category; or
0	The local authority for the relevant area.

PLEASE INDICATE WHETHER YOU WISH TO SPEAK AT A HEARING
Yes, I wish to speak at the hearing in support of my further submission.
O No, I do not wish to speak at the hearing in support of my further submission.
JOINT SUBMISSION
If others make a similar submission, please tick this box if you would consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.
IF YOU HAVE USED EXTRA SHEETS FOR THIS SUBMISSION PLEASE ATTACH THEM TO THIS FORM AND INDICATE BELOW
Yes, I have attached extra sheets. No , I have not attached extra sheets.
SIGNATURE - NOTE A SIGNATURE IS NOT REQUIRED IF YOU MAKE YOUR SUBMISSION BY ELECTRONIC MEANS
Signed Date Type name if submitting electronically
FURTHER SUBMISSIONS CAN BE SENT BY
Chief Executive, 401 Grey Street, Private Bag 3038, Waikato Mail Centre, Hamilton 3240
Waikato Regional Council, 401 Grey Street, Hamilton East, Hamilton
(07) 859 0998
healthyrivers@waikatoregion.govt.nz Please note: Submissions received by email must contain full contact details.
PLEASE CHECK that you have provided all of the information requested and if you are having trouble filling out this form, phone Waikato Regional Council on 0800 800 401 for help.

Personal information is used for the administration of the submissions process and will be made public. All information collected will be held by Waikato Regional Council, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information.

Form 6 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991.

My reasons are (i.e. grounds for selection above):

NOTES ON MAKING A FURTHER SUBMISSION

1. Serving a copy of your further submission

A copy of your further submission must be served on the original submitter within 5 working days after it is served on (i.e. received by) Waikato Regional Council.

2. Further submission content review

Please note that your further submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the authority is satisfied that at least 1 of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):

- · it is frivolous or vexatious
- · it discloses no reasonable or relevant case
- it would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further
- · it contains offensive language
- it is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence, but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

3. Privacy information

The Waikato Regional Council will make all submissions and further submissions including name and contact details publicly available on Council's website. Under the RMA, any further submission supporting or opposing an original submission is required to be served on the original submitter after it is served on council therefore your contact details must be made available.

Personal information will also be used for administration relating to the subject matter of the submissions, including notifying submitters of hearings and decisions. All information will be held by the Waikato Regional Council with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information.

Contact us for more information
Phone: 0800 800 401
Email: healthyrivers@waikatoregion.govt.nz

