

IN THE MATTER OF the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER OF a primary submission and further submissions on the Proposed Environment Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan

BY the Poultry Industry Association of New Zealand (Inc) ('PIANZ') and Egg Producers Federation of New Zealand (Inc) ('EPFNZ')
Submission numbers: C15C/153037

IN RESPECT OF Plan Change 4 of Environment Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan

SUPPLEMENTARY EVIDENCE OF EMMA-JANE HAYWARD

17 MARCH 2016

1. I have the qualifications and experience as stated in my evidence dated 29 January 2016.
2. Following my presentation at the hearing on 16 March 2016, I have prepared this supplementary evidence. This is in accordance with the original submission, dated 1 May 2016.
3. As the panel will recall, the relief the submission sought was to permit poultry wash-down water through the amendment of the 'animal effluent' definition. As the Chairman observed yesterday, the amendment I presented would not achieve the intended permitted status due to Rule 5.6 of the Land and Water Regional Plan, which by default would apply a Discretionary status to any activity not otherwise provided for.
4. I have given further consideration as to how to achieve the outcome sought by the submission within its scope.
5. If the Chairman and Panel members are in favour of the intended permitted status for low volume poultry wash-down water, I recommend a consequential amendment to Rule 5.35, which will overcome the defaulting to Rule 5.6 and achieve the intended permitted status for poultry wash-down water, and a further amend to the definition of animal effluent to limit the less than 500m³ exclusion to only poultry wash-down water.
6. The proposed amendment to Rule 5.35, is as follows (additional text shown underlined and deleted text shown ~~strikeout~~):

5.35 The discharge of animal effluent or water containing animal effluent and other contaminants originating from a stock truck holding tank onto or into land where a contaminant may enter water is a permitted activity, provided the following conditions are met:

1. The discharge is expressly excluded from the definition of animal effluent, or:

2. The maximum volume discharged does not exceed 100 m³ per property in any 12 month period; and

3. The discharge of animal effluent or water containing animal effluent and other contaminants:

(a) is not within 20 m of a surface water body (other than a wetland constructed primarily to treat animal effluent); or

(b) within 20 m of a bore used for water abstraction, the Coastal Marine Area, or the boundary of the property.

7. The additional amendment to the definition of animal effluent is as follows (additional amendment shown double underlined, amendment presented yesterday shown underlined, note the typo identified yesterday has also been corrected):

Animal effluent means faeces and urine from animals other than humans, including associated process water, wash-down water, contaminants and sludge but excluding solid animal waste. For the purposes of this definition, it does not include poultry washwater with volume less than 500m³ within any 12 month period per farm and nor incidental animal effluent present in livestock processing waste streams.

8. This consequential and additional amendments will be in accordance with and within the scope of the alternative relief sought by the original submission and will achieve the desired outcome.
9. In conclusion, if the Panel is supportive of the intended outcome of the submission, I recommend that in addition to the amendment to the definition presented yesterday, that the amendments shown above be made.



Emma-Jane Hayward

17 March 2016