

**28<sup>th</sup> March 2018 - MWWUG applications water use volumes – notified volumes, NRC recommendations, Applicant evidence requested changes, and NRC response PLUS property area (canopy vs total)**

NOTES: TA = total area, CA = canopy area, NS = not stated whether canopy or total, NC = no change; Applicant's (ML and JW evidence) requested changes to NRC Recommendations **in yellow** highlight

Application Number	Applicant Name	Land area applied for and notified (ha)			Volumes notified		NRC Recommendations		Applicant's requested changes in hearing documents				NRC Response			
		Original application		MWWUG Notified (Change wrt application Highlighted in green)	Daily (m <sup>3</sup> )	Annual (m <sup>3</sup> )	Daily (m <sup>3</sup> )	Annual (m <sup>3</sup> ) (reductions from applied for in blue)	Area	Daily equivalent (m <sup>3</sup> )	Weekly (m <sup>3</sup> ) Note: NRC disagree with weekly	Annual (m <sup>3</sup> )	Agree/disagree	Canopy area	Annual (m <sup>3</sup> )	Comments
		Total property area	Canopy (if stated)													
APP.038610.01.01	Mapua Avocados Limited C/- Murray Forlong	206 (TA)	160 (CA)	160 (CA)	5,000	745,000	5000	624,000	200 (NS but likely TA)	5000	35000	745000	Disagree Inc by 3000 pa	163.2ha (assumed 80% of total property area of 204ha)	627,000	Additional proposed property only adds 16.1 ha.  Using average of all existing orchards (which gives higher than SPASMO) still only gives annual of 627,000.
APP.038471.01.01	Honeytree Farms Limited C/- Tony Hayward	75 NS either, but assumed canopy from TA available)		110 (NS, informed app negotiating to purchase more land)	3,500	521,500	2200	200000 (app requested reduction before hearing)	93 (NSs, but likely TA)	3500	24500	372000	Partial agree: inc by 85,000 m <sup>3</sup> /a And 800 m <sup>3</sup> /d to allow for drought event	74ha (assumed 80% of total property area of 93ha)	285,000	Recommend increase to 285000 annual, 3000 daily, based on the average of all existing water use data (which gives values higher than SPASMO). Need to add Secs 54 and 55 to legal descriptions.
APP.038410.01.01	Georgina Tui & Mate Nickolas Covich	NS > 95 ha available)	70 (CA)	70 (CA)	1,500	223,500	1500	223,500	NC	NC	10500	NC				
APP.038420.01.01	Largus Orchard Limited Partnership C/- Murray Forlong	NS (75 available)	60 (CA)	60 (CA)	1,300	193,700	1300	193700	NC	NC	9100	NC				
APP.038513.01.01	Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Takoto C/- Rangitane Marsden	NS 708 theoretically available	60 (NS, assumed CA)	60 (CA)	1,300	193,700	1300	193700	NC	NC	9100	NC				
APP.039332.01.01	Logan King Ltd ex Candy Corn	17 (NS but assumed canopy as 25.7 ha TA available)		20 (CA)	537	80,000	537	80,000	21.5 (CA?)	NC	3758	NC	agree			No change in volume requested. Only change to planted area. Property size is 25.6 ha
APP.038454.01.01	Elbury Holdings Limited C/- Kevin & Fiona King	20 (NS, but assumed canopy as ~ 200 ha TA available)		30 (CA)	763	113,700	763	113,700	NC	NC	5342	NC				
APP.038328.01.01	Bernard Kim & Sheryl Dianne Shine	10 ha (NS, assumed TA as original property area was 9.9 ha TA With additional property requested in ML evidence to add, brings TA to 12.25.		10 (CA)	268	40,000	268	40,000	12.5 (TA)	NC	1879	50184	disagree	10ha (80% of total property area of 12.5ha)		Increased area by 2.25 with adjacent property, FNDC approved subdivision However, the increased allocation is higher than notified, and may have resulted in more submissions, localised drawdown effects of increase not assessed in AEE.  Also 12.5 ha is not canopy area. 80% of 12.5 ha is 10 ha. Therefore, agree to the addition of the property in the legal description, but same allocation should suffice.
APP.027391.01.02	Ivan Anthony Stanisich	40 NS, but assumed canopy as has 600 ha TA available)		17 (estimated equivalent)	430	64,070	1150	64,070	17 (CA)	430	3010	NC	Same difference			1150 is total to go on changed consent (existing 720 + 430) from two bores
APP.039244.01.01	Kevin & Dani Thomas	16 NS, but assumed TA as property area is 16.6		16 (TA)	400	59,600	400	59600	16 (TA)	NC	2800	NC				

APP.038589.01.01	Neil & Alma Violet Thompson and Steven & Josephine Suzanne Thompson	9 NS, but assumed TA, as property area is 9.6 ha.	8 NS, assumed CA,	9 (CA-see comments)	320	47,680	320	39,350	9 (CA)	NC	2240	NC				Applicants change of CA to 9 in notification OK as GIS measured existing orchard at 8.5 ha
APP.038650.01.01	Tony and Diane Hewitt	10 (NS, assumed 'canopy', as property areas is 11.2 ha)		10 (CA)	270	40,230	270	40,230	10 (CA)	NC	1890	NC				
APP.038591.01.01	Cypress Hills Ltd C/- Alan Anderson & Carolyn Dawn Smith	9 (NS, assumed canopy, as property TA on PAR-ID is 10, orchard measured on GIS is 8.5 ha)		9 (CA)	280	41,720	280	41,720	9 (CA)	280	1960	NC				
APP.039345.01.01	Ongare Trust C/- Ian McLarnon & Jason McLarnon	6 (NS, assume TA as property size is 6.2 ha)		6 (TA)	200	29,800	200	23,370	6 (TA)	200	1400	24000	Disagree	5ha (80% of 6.2ha)		The recommended volume was already high relative to the location, soil type, and property size, Increase not justified.
APP.38732.01.01	Kathy Valadares	NS has ~140 ha total available in notified properties. But ML Evidence change to lot 3 DP 477138 with TA of 12.3 ha	8 (NS, but assumed CA)	8 (CA)	150	22,350	150	22,350	12 (TA)	150	1050	48000	Disagree			The newly requested annual volume equates to a 320 day season at that daily rate. This volume was not notified; there is a significantly affected neighbouring properties who may have submitted if this volume was notified.
APP.038380.01.01	Daimen & Katherine Holloway	6 (TA)	4 (CA)	4	100	14,900	100	14,900	4 (CA)	100	700	14900				
APP.039381.01.01	Johno and Carol Brien (Lamb Road)	NS (TA of lot is 4.8 ha)	4 (CA)	4	100	14,900	100	14,900	4 (CA)	100	700	14900				

Notes:

1. Honeytree requested before hearing reduction of area to 70 ha and annual volume to 200, 000 m3, no daily volume specified. They have now requested an increase in hearing evidence, but is still a reduction relative to what was applied for.