

BEFORE THE HEARINGS PANEL AT RANGIORA

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act
1991 ("**the Act**")

AND

IN THE MATTER of the hearing of submissions of the
Proposed Waimakariri District Plan
Hearing Stream 10A: Christchurch
International Airport Limited – Airport
Noise Contours and Bird Strike.

STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF HANNAH RITCHIE

FOR THE NEW ZEALAND PORK INDUSTRY BOARD

25 JANUARY 2024

CONTENTS

SUMMARY STATEMENT	3
SCOPE OF EVIDENCE.....	4
THE NEW ZEALAND PORK SECTOR.....	4
BIRD STRIKE RISK.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.

SUMMARY STATEMENT

1. This evidence addresses matters raised in the New Zealand Pork Industry Board ("**NZPork**") submission on the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan relevant to Hearing 10A:
2. The scope of my evidence focuses on further submission points raised by NZPork in response to submissions from Christchurch International Airport Limited ("**CIAL**") regarding bird strike.
3. I agree with the planning officer's recommendation that there is no need for additional controls on pig farming in proposed contour zones surrounding Christchurch International Airport ("**the Airport**").
4. I respectfully request that my statement of evidence be tabled and considered by the Commissioner at the hearing, and I am happy to respond to any questions in writing that may arise.

QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

5. My name is Hannah Ritchie
6. I am currently employed as the Environment and Planning Manager at NZPork.
7. I hold the following relevant qualifications:
 - B.Sc.(Hons) in Environmental Science from the University of Southampton.
 - Post-graduate papers in Advanced Resource Management and Planning Law and Environmental Policy and Planning from Lincoln University.
8. I have 12 years of experience in various positions, including roles as an environmental advisor, policy advisor, and environmental manager, within both the local government and private sector. This has provided me with considerable experience in environmental management and policy implementation using both regulatory and nonregulatory methods.
9. I was employed for 7 years working for the Canterbury Regional Council, with positions in Pollution Prevention, Waterway Health and Biosecurity. I have also completed courses in Environmental Incident Investigation and Sustainable Nutrient Management. I have worked for NZPork for 4 years and in doing so I have particular knowledge of the pig farming sector.

SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

10. I did not prepare the submission nor further submissions for NZPork but I understand the submissions and the points made and am familiar with the proposed plan, and have read the s42A Report for this topic.
11. This evidence focuses on the submission to the proposed plan by CIAL for additional controls on pig farming activities within proposed contours zones around the Airport.

THE NEW ZEALAND PORK SECTOR

12. I am aware that NZPork has appeared with witnesses in front of the Panel at previous hearings. That evidence has explained:
 - Pig farming activity in the Waimakariri District¹.
 - The effects of pig farming and sector initiatives for Environmental Management and Good Management Practice².
 - Issues of reverse sensitivity and biosecurity³.
 - Planning related issues for pig farming activity under the Proposed Plan⁴.
13. I do not repeat the content of those statements but reiterate to the Panel the particular importance and value of pig farming activity in the Waimakariri District to the national food production system.

CIAL SUBMISSION

14. CIAL lodged 30 submission points seeking a range of amendments to the Proposed Plan specific to the issue of bird strike. These included additional definitions for bird strike and bird strike risk activity, and additional controls on activities defined as a bird strike risk.

¹ Statement of Evidence of Penelope Teri Cairns on behalf of New Zealand Pork Industry Board: Evidence number 4 presented at Hearing Streams 1 & 2.

² Statement of Expert Evidence of Ian Barugh for New Zealand Pork Industry Board: Evidence number 4 presented at Hearing Streams 1 & 2.

³ Statement of Evidence of Lynda Weastell Murchison for the New Zealand Pork Industry Board: Evidence number 8 presented at Hearing Stream 6.

⁴ Statement of Evidence by Vance Andrew Hodgson for the New Zealand Pork Industry Board: Evidence number 4 presented at Hearing Stream 1 & 2.

15. CIAL propose a new term of '*Commercial pig farming*' be included in the proposed definition of a bird strike risk activity and controls on '*commercial pig farming*' in the proposed 'bird strike risk management areas' are proposed by CIAL.
16. The further submissions of NZPork opposed the CIAL submission for the following reasons:
 - a. No engagement with the pork industry has occurred;
 - b. No analysis is provided to support the assertion that commercial pig farming is known to increase the risk of bird strike;
 - c. No assessment of whether the objective achieves the purpose of the RMA or whether the method is effective or efficient has been undertaken;
 - d. No section 32 assessment has been undertaken;
 - e. No assessment of costs or benefits has been undertaken; and
 - f. No assessment of alternatives has been provided (including whether district plan regulation is required)'
17. In my opinion the submission points remain valid.
18. The first point is particularly important. In seeking the outcome sought by CIAL NZPork would have expected prior engagement such that clarity for all parties could be achieved and actual and potential effects (informed by those with expertise in the sector) and management techniques (regulatory and non-regulatory) explored.
19. There has been no approach by CIAL in this plan change process nor the Christchurch District Plan or Selwyn District Plan change processes over recent years where CIAL sought the same outcome. The s42A (paragraphs 170 and 171) discusses the planning approach adopted in those plans. The Christchurch District Plan change process was of particular interest to NZPork given the prison farm is located on the periphery of the 3km contour zone.
20. CIAL proposed a definition of '*Commercial pig farming*'. This is not a term we have experience with in planning documents.

21. As per evidence previously presented to this Panel by NZPork⁵, there are a variety of farming systems (and planning definitions) covering both indoor and outdoor activity of an intensive and extensive nature. The CIAL submission does not explain what pig farming systems their concerns relate to. Related to the NZPork submission points about the thoroughness of assessment (section 32), the submission provides no assessment of the management techniques pig farmers currently employ to address birds and why district plan regulation is necessary and will be effective or efficient specifically in pig farming situations.
22. If left uncontrolled, birds can cause large-scale pig feed losses, damage property, and present a biosecurity risk. Feed wastage through birds can be high, particularly on outdoor pig units – costing thousands of dollars over the course of a year. Feed losses can also impact on sow productivity and piglet viability.
23. Given the risks posed to farm operations by birds, pig farmers actively manage bird populations around their property. They do this using a range of methods, including:
 - a) Reducing feed waste and spills
 - b) Trough feeding
 - c) Wet feeding
 - d) Reducing length of the feed face
 - e) Using pellets if pigeons are the main problem
 - f) Using meal if gulls are the main problem
 - g) Using bird scaring devices to discourage landing/roosting, or if farm management practices alone are not sufficient to control the risk – humane population control of pest or non-protected species.
24. Therefore, we do not agree with CIAL that district plan regulation is necessary to manage bird strike risk in relation to pig farming.
25. The planning officer has recommended that the 'suite' of CIAL's requested amendments regarding bird strike be rejected.
26. NZ Pork supports the officer's recommendations and reasons.

⁵ Statement of Expert Evidence of Ian Barugh for New Zealand Pork Industry Board: Evidence number 4 presented at Hearing Stream 1 & 2.

Hannah Ritchie
25 January 2024