

DEVELOPMENT PLANNING

Further Submission Form

Further submissions close on Monday, 21 November 2022 at 5pm.

I/we are further submitting on:

Proposed District Plan

Variation 1: Housing Intensification

Variation 2: Financial Contributions

Please use a separate form for each consultation.

Clause 8 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

To: Waimakariri District Council

Further submitter details

Name of further submitter: _____

Organisation name and contact (if representing a group or organisation): _____

Postal address/Address for service: _____ Postcode: _____

Email: _____ Phone: _____

Only certain persons can make a further submission. Please select the option that applies to you.

I am:

a person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest

a person who has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest the general public has

the local authority for the relevant area

Please explain why you come within the category selected above:

Hearing options

I wish to be heard in support of my further submission? Yes No

If others make a similar further submission I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing. Yes No

Signature: _____ Date: _____

(of person making submission or person authorised to make decision on behalf)

PLEASE NOTE - A signature is not required if you submit this form electronically. By entering your name in the box below you are giving your authority for this application to proceed.

Name of person making further submission: _____

This further submission is in relation to the <u>original submission</u> of: <i>Enter the details of the original submitter:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • name, address or email; and • submission number (and point(s), if applicable) 	The particular parts of the original submission I/we support /oppose are:	My/our position on the original submission is: <i>Support or oppose</i>	The reasons for my/our support/ opposition to the original submission are:	Allow or disallow the original submission (in full or in part)	Give precise details of why you wish to allow/disallow (in full or in part) to indicate the decision you want Council to make

Name of person making further submission: _____

This further submission is in relation to the <u>original submission</u> of: <i>Enter the details of the original submitter:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • name, address or email; and • submission number (and point(s), if applicable) 	The particular parts of the original submission I/we support /oppose are:	My/our position on the original submission is: <i>Support or oppose</i>	The reasons for my/our support/ opposition to the original submission are:	Allow or disallow the original submission (in full or in part)	Give precise details of why you wish to allow/disallow (in full or in part) to indicate the decision you want Council to make

Note

A copy of your further submission must be served on the original submitter within 5 working days after it is served on the Waimakariri District Council. Contact details for all submitters can be found on the Waimakariri District Council website, at waimakariri.govt.nz/planning/district-plan.

Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the authority is satisfied that at least one 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.

Privacy Act 1993

Please note information on this form and the content of your submission will be made publicly available as part of the decision-making process.

This form is in the format required by Form 6 of the Resource Management (Forms, Fees and Procedure) Regulations 2003.

Further submissions close on Monday, 21 November 2022 at 5pm.

Returning this form

You can:

- Email it to: developmentplanning@wmk.govt.nz - Subject line: Further Submission
- Post it to: Waimakariri District Council, Private Bag 1005, Rangiora 7440
- Deliver it to a Council Service Centre in Rangiora, Kaiapoi or Oxford

Name of person making further submission: NZ Pork:

This further submission is in relation to the original submission of: Enter the details of the original submitter: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • name, address or email; and • submission number (and point(s), if applicable) 	The particular parts of the original submission I/we support /oppose are:	My/our position on the original submission is: Support or oppose	The reasons for my/our support/ opposition to the original submission are:	Allow or disallow the original submission (in full or in part)	Give precise details of why you wish to allow/disallow (in full or in part) to indicate the decision you want Council to make
<p>Fulton Hogan - Tim Ensor</p> <p>041.045</p> <p>c/- Tonkin & Taylor Limited PO Box 13 055 Christchurch Attn: Tim Ensor tensor@tonkintaylor.co.nz</p>	<p>RURZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Rural Zones</p> <p>RURZ-P8</p>	Oppose in part	The submitter seeks to remove policy seeking to ensure adequate separation distances between existing sensitive activities and new intensive primary production.	Disallow in part	<p>NZPork support the use of setbacks between sensitive activities and new intensive primary production as a method to address reverse sensitivity issues and policy support for this approach. An RDA status for new intensive primary production which provides for a case by case assessment of the adequacy of a setback is an appropriate resource management response.</p> <p>Disallow in part as the submission relates to intensive primary production.</p>
<p>Saunders and; Co Lawyers - Chris Fowler</p> <p>057.003</p>	<p>GRUZ - General Rural Zone</p> <p>GRUZ-BFS5</p>	Oppose	The submitter seeks a change so that GRUZ-BFS5 applies setback of 300m to establishment of new intensive primary production.	Disallow	An RDA status for new intensive primary production which provides for a case by case assessment of the adequacy

C/- Adderley Head PO Box 1751, Christchurch 8140 Level 3, 77 Hereford Street, Christchurch 8011 Contact person: Chris Fowler E: chris.fowler@adderleyhead.co.nz					of a setback is an appropriate resource management response.
Saunders and; Co Lawyers - Chris Fowler 057.004 C/- Adderley Head PO Box 1751, Christchurch 8140 Level 3, 77 Hereford Street, Christchurch 8011 Contact person: Chris Fowler E: chris.fowler@adderleyhead.co.nz	GRUZ - General Rural Zone GRUZ-R17	Oppose	The submitter seeks to introduce new standards and a non-complying consent threshold for intensive primary production activities.	Disallow	An RDA status for new intensive primary production which provides for an assessment against the identified matters of discretion is an appropriate resource management response.
Saunders and; Co Lawyers - Chris Fowler 057.005 C/- Adderley Head PO Box 1751, Christchurch 8140 Level 3, 77 Hereford Street, Christchurch 8011 Contact person: Chris Fowler E: chris.fowler@adderleyhead.co.nz	GRUZ - General Rural Zone GRUZ-R18	Oppose	The submitter seeks to introduce new standards and a non-complying consent threshold for intensive primary production activities.	Disallow	An RDA status for new intensive primary production which provides for an assessment against the identified matters of discretion is an appropriate resource management response.
Oxford-Ohoka Community Board - Thea Kunkel 172.006	GRUZ - General Rural Zone GRUZ-R18	Neutral	The submitter identifies that GRUZ-R18, seeks strict criteria for resource consents to ensure emissions and effects on natural resources are	Neutral	NZPork consider GRUZ-R18 a robust resource management response for intensive primary production.

Private Bag 1005 Rangiora PO 7440 com.board@wmk.govt.nz			minimised. Government agencies should work together to only allow sustainable farming, suited to ground and weather conditions. Effects, including individual and cumulative effects, from modification to natural conditions require analysis and regulation to mitigate and minimise effects.		
Christchurch International Airport Limited - Amy Hill 254.004 Address for service of submitter: Christchurch International Airport Limited c/- Amy Hill Chapman Tripp 60 Cashel Street PO Box Christchurch 8140 Email address: Jo.Appleyard@chapmantripp.com / Amy.Hill@chapmantripp.com	Definitions	Oppose	<p>The submitters states that a number of activities including commercial pig farming is known to increase the risk of bird strike if they are allowed to take place in the vicinity of the flight paths for aircraft approaching or departing from the Airport. Seeks that those activities are identified and included within a definition of 'bird strike risk activity' with a corresponding suite of provisions controlling these activities within proximity of the Christchurch International Airport runways.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No engagement with the pork industry has occurred. 	Disallow	<p>Disallow the submission.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No engagement with the pork industry has occurred. No analysis is provided to support the assertion that commercial pig farming is known to increase the risk of bird strike. No assessment of whether the objective achieves the purpose of the RMA or whether the method is effective or efficient has been undertaken.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No analysis is provided to support the assertion that commercial pig farming is known to increase the risk of bird strike. • No assessment of whether the objective achieves the purpose of the RMA or whether the method is effective or efficient has been undertaken. • No section 32 assessment. • No assessment of costs or benefits has been undertaken. • No assessment of alternatives has been provided (including whether district plan regulation is required). 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No section 32 assessment. • No assessment of costs or benefits has been undertaken. • No assessment of alternatives has been provided (including whether district plan regulation is required).
Christchurch International Airport Limited - Amy Hill 254.014	General	Oppose	The submitters states that a number of activities including commercial pig farming is known to increase the risk of bird strike if they are allowed to take place in the vicinity of the flight paths	Disallow	<p>Disallow the submission.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No engagement with the pork industry has occurred.

<p>Address for service of submitter: Christchurch International Airport Limited c/- Amy Hill Chapman Tripp 60 Cashel Street PO Box Christchurch 8140 Email address: Jo.Appleyard@chapmantripp.com / Amy.Hill@chapmantripp.com</p>			<p>for aircraft approaching or departing from the Airport. Seeks that those activities are identified and included within a definition of 'bird strike risk activity' with a corresponding suite of provisions controlling these activities within proximity of the Christchurch International Airport runways.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No engagement with the pork industry has occurred. • No analysis is provided to support the assertion that commercial pig farming is known to increase the risk of bird strike. • No assessment of whether the objective achieves the purpose of the RMA or whether the method is effective or efficient has been undertaken. • No section 32 assessment. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No analysis is provided to support the assertion that commercial pig farming is known to increase the risk of bird strike. • No assessment of whether the objective achieves the purpose of the RMA or whether the method is effective or efficient has been undertaken. • No section 32 assessment. • No assessment of costs or benefits has been undertaken. • No assessment of alternatives has been provided (including whether district plan regulation is required).
--	--	--	--	--	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No assessment of costs or benefits has been undertaken. • No assessment of alternatives has been provided (including whether district plan regulation is required). 		
<p>Christchurch International Airport Limited - Amy Hill</p> <p>254.096</p> <p>Address for service of submitter: Christchurch International Airport Limited c/- Amy Hill Chapman Tripp 60 Cashel Street PO Box Christchurch 8140 Email address: Jo.Appleyard@chapmantripp.com / Amy.Hill@chapmantripp.com</p>	<p>RURZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Rural Zones</p> <p>RURZ-P8</p>	Oppose	<p>The submitters states that a number of activities including commercial pig farming is known to increase the risk of bird strike if they are allowed to take place in the vicinity of the flight paths for aircraft approaching or departing from the Airport. Seeks that those activities are identified and included within a definition of 'bird strike risk activity' with a corresponding suite of provisions controlling these activities within proximity of the Christchurch International Airport runways.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No engagement with the pork industry has occurred. • No analysis is provided to support the assertion that commercial pig 	Disallow	<p>Disallow the submission.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No engagement with the pork industry has occurred. • No analysis is provided to support the assertion that commercial pig farming is known to increase the risk of bird strike. • No assessment of whether the objective achieves the purpose of the RMA or whether the method is effective or efficient has been undertaken.

			<p>farming is known to increase the risk of bird strike.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No assessment of whether the objective achieves the purpose of the RMA or whether the method is effective or efficient has been undertaken. • No section 32 assessment. • No assessment of costs or benefits has been undertaken. • No assessment of alternatives has been provided (including whether district plan regulation is required). 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No section 32 assessment. • No assessment of costs or benefits has been undertaken. • No assessment of alternatives has been provided (including whether district plan regulation is required).
<p>Christchurch International Airport Limited - Amy Hill</p> <p>254.119</p> <p>Address for service of submitter: Christchurch International Airport Limited c/- Amy Hill</p>	<p>RURZ - Matters of Discretion for all Rural Zones</p> <p>Matters of Discretion for all Rural Zones</p>	Oppose	<p>The submitters states that a number of activities including commercial pig farming is known to increase the risk of bird strike if they are allowed to take place in the vicinity of the flight paths for aircraft approaching or departing from the Airport. Seeks that those activities are</p>	Disallow	<p>Disallow the submission.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No engagement with the pork industry has occurred. • No analysis is provided to support the assertion that

<p>Chapman Tripp 60 Cashel Street PO Box Christchurch 8140 Email address: Jo.Appleyard@chapmantripp.com / Amy.Hill@chapmantripp.com</p>			<p>identified and included within a definition of 'bird strike risk activity' with a corresponding suite of provisions controlling these activities within proximity of the Christchurch International Airport runways.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No engagement with the pork industry has occurred. • No analysis is provided to support the assertion that commercial pig farming is known to increase the risk of bird strike. • No assessment of whether the objective achieves the purpose of the RMA or whether the method is effective or efficient has been undertaken. • No section 32 assessment. • No assessment of costs or benefits has been undertaken. 		<p>commercial pig farming is known to increase the risk of bird strike.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No assessment of whether the objective achieves the purpose of the RMA or whether the method is effective or efficient has been undertaken. • No section 32 assessment. • No assessment of costs or benefits has been undertaken. • No assessment of alternatives has been provided (including whether district plan regulation is required).
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No assessment of alternatives has been provided (including whether district plan regulation is required). 		
<p>Christchurch International Airport Limited - Amy Hill</p> <p>254.132</p> <p>Address for service of submitter: Christchurch International Airport Limited c/- Amy Hill Chapman Tripp 60 Cashel Street PO Box Christchurch 8140 Email address: Jo.Appleyard@chapmantripp.com / Amy.Hill@chapmantripp.com</p>	<p>GRUZ - General Rural Zone</p> <p>Activity Rules</p>	Oppose	<p>The submitters states that a number of activities including commercial pig farming is known to increase the risk of bird strike if they are allowed to take place in the vicinity of the flight paths for aircraft approaching or departing from the Airport. Seeks that those activities are identified and included within a definition of 'bird strike risk activity' with a corresponding suite of provisions controlling these activities within proximity of the Christchurch International Airport runways.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No engagement with the pork industry has occurred. No analysis is provided to support the assertion that commercial pig farming is known to increase the risk of bird strike. 	Disallow	<p>Disallow the submission.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No engagement with the pork industry has occurred. No analysis is provided to support the assertion that commercial pig farming is known to increase the risk of bird strike. No assessment of whether the objective achieves the purpose of the RMA or whether the method is effective or efficient has been undertaken. No section 32 assessment.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No assessment of whether the objective achieves the purpose of the RMA or whether the method is effective or efficient has been undertaken. • No section 32 assessment. • No assessment of costs or benefits has been undertaken. • No assessment of alternatives has been provided (including whether district plan regulation is required). 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No assessment of costs or benefits has been undertaken. • No assessment of alternatives has been provided (including whether district plan regulation is required).
<p>Christchurch International Airport Limited - Amy Hill</p> <p>254.133</p> <p>Address for service of submitter: Christchurch International Airport Limited c/- Amy Hill Chapman Tripp 60 Cashel Street PO Box Christchurch 8140</p>	<p>RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone</p> <p>Activity Rules</p>	Oppose	The submitters states that a number of activities including commercial pig farming is known to increase the risk of bird strike if they are allowed to take place in the vicinity of the flight paths for aircraft approaching or departing from the Airport. Seeks that those activities are identified and included within a definition of 'bird strike risk activity' with a corresponding	Disallow	<p>Disallow the submission.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No engagement with the pork industry has occurred. • No analysis is provided to support the assertion that commercial pig farming is known to

<p>Email address: Jo.Appleyard@chapmantripp.com / Amy.Hill@chapmantripp.com</p>			<p>suite of provisions controlling these activities within proximity of the Christchurch International Airport runways.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No engagement with the pork industry has occurred. • No analysis is provided to support the assertion that commercial pig farming is known to increase the risk of bird strike. • No assessment of whether the objective achieves the purpose of the RMA or whether the method is effective or efficient has been undertaken. • No section 32 assessment. • No assessment of costs or benefits has been undertaken. • No assessment of alternatives has been 		<p>increase the risk of bird strike.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No assessment of whether the objective achieves the purpose of the RMA or whether the method is effective or efficient has been undertaken. • No section 32 assessment. • No assessment of costs or benefits has been undertaken. • No assessment of alternatives has been provided (including whether district plan regulation is required).
---	--	--	---	--	---

			provided (including whether district plan regulation is required).		
<p>Christchurch International Airport Limited - Amy Hill</p> <p>254.144</p> <p>Address for service of submitter: Christchurch International Airport Limited c/- Amy Hill Chapman Tripp 60 Cashel Street PO Box Christchurch 8140 Email address: Jo.Appleyard@chapmantripp.com / Amy.Hill@chapmantripp.com</p>	<p>RURZ - Matters of Discretion for all Rural Zones</p> <p>Matters of Discretion for all Rural Zones</p>	Oppose	<p>The submitters states that a number of activities including commercial pig farming is known to increase the risk of bird strike if they are allowed to take place in the vicinity of the flight paths for aircraft approaching or departing from the Airport. Seeks that those activities are identified and included within a definition of 'bird strike risk activity' with a corresponding suite of provisions controlling these activities within proximity of the Christchurch International Airport runways.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No engagement with the pork industry has occurred. • No analysis is provided to support the assertion that commercial pig farming is known to increase the risk of bird strike. • No assessment of whether the objective 	Disallow	<p>Disallow the submission.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No engagement with the pork industry has occurred. • No analysis is provided to support the assertion that commercial pig farming is known to increase the risk of bird strike. • No assessment of whether the objective achieves the purpose of the RMA or whether the method is effective or efficient has been undertaken. • No section 32 assessment. • No assessment of costs or benefits has been undertaken.

			<p>achieves the purpose of the RMA or whether the method is effective or efficient has been undertaken.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No section 32 assessment. • No assessment of costs or benefits has been undertaken. • No assessment of alternatives has been provided (including whether district plan regulation is required). 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No assessment of alternatives has been provided (including whether district plan regulation is required).
<p>Christchurch International Airport Limited - Amy Hill</p> <p>254.150</p> <p>Address for service of submitter: Christchurch International Airport Limited c/- Amy Hill Chapman Tripp 60 Cashel Street PO Box Christchurch 8140 Email address: Jo.Appleyard@chapmantripp.com / Amy.Hill@chapmantripp.com</p>	Planning Maps	Oppose	The submitters states that a number of activities including commercial pig farming is known to increase the risk of bird strike if they are allowed to take place in the vicinity of the flight paths for aircraft approaching or departing from the Airport. Seeks that those activities are identified and included within a definition of 'bird strike risk activity' with a corresponding suite of provisions controlling these activities within proximity	Disallow	<p>Disallow the submission.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No engagement with the pork industry has occurred. • No analysis is provided to support the assertion that commercial pig farming is known to increase the risk of bird strike.

			<p>of the Christchurch International Airport runways.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No engagement with the pork industry has occurred. • No analysis is provided to support the assertion that commercial pig farming is known to increase the risk of bird strike. • No assessment of whether the objective achieves the purpose of the RMA or whether the method is effective or efficient has been undertaken. • No section 32 assessment. • No assessment of costs or benefits has been undertaken. • No assessment of alternatives has been provided (including 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No assessment of whether the objective achieves the purpose of the RMA or whether the method is effective or efficient has been undertaken. • No section 32 assessment. • No assessment of costs or benefits has been undertaken. • No assessment of alternatives has been provided (including whether district plan regulation is required).
--	--	--	---	--	--

			whether district plan regulation is required).		
<p>Christchurch International Airport Limited - Amy Hill</p> <p>254.153</p> <p>Address for service of submitter: Christchurch International Airport Limited c/- Amy Hill Chapman Tripp 60 Cashel Street PO Box Christchurch 8140 Email address: Jo.Appleyard@chapmantripp.com / Amy.Hill@chapmantripp.com</p>	General	Oppose	<p>The submitters states that a number of activities including commercial pig farming is known to increase the risk of bird strike if they are allowed to take place in the vicinity of the flight paths for aircraft approaching or departing from the Airport. Seeks that those activities are identified and included within a definition of 'bird strike risk activity' with a corresponding suite of provisions controlling these activities within proximity of the Christchurch International Airport runways.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No engagement with the pork industry has occurred. • No analysis is provided to support the assertion that commercial pig farming is known to increase the risk of bird strike. • No assessment of whether the objective achieves the purpose of 	Disallow	<p>Disallow the submission.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No engagement with the pork industry has occurred. • No analysis is provided to support the assertion that commercial pig farming is known to increase the risk of bird strike. • No assessment of whether the objective achieves the purpose of the RMA or whether the method is effective or efficient has been undertaken. • No section 32 assessment. • No assessment of costs or benefits has been undertaken.

			<p>the RMA or whether the method is effective or efficient has been undertaken.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No section 32 assessment. • No assessment of costs or benefits has been undertaken. • No assessment of alternatives has been provided (including whether district plan regulation is required). 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No assessment of alternatives has been provided (including whether district plan regulation is required).
<p>Horticulture New Zealand - Ailsa Robertson</p> <p>295.143</p> <p>Environmental Policy Advisor – South Island Horticulture New Zealand PO Box 10-232 WELLINGTON Email: rachel.mcclung@hortnz.com</p>	<p>GRUZ - General Rural Zone</p> <p>GRUZ-R4</p>	Support	The submitter opposes the 90m ² GFA limitation for farm workers accommodation as impractical to provide for farm workers needs where supporting a primary production activity.	Allow	Increase the GFA for farm workers accommodation.
<p>Harrison Grierson Consultants Limited - Mary McConnell</p> <p>351.006</p>	<p>RURZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Rural Zones</p> <p>RURZ-P8</p>	Support	The submitter seeks a clear policy position as it relates to sensitive activities in rural zones.	Allow	Allow the submission.

<p>Egg Producers Federation of New Zealand and the Poultry Industry Association of New Zealand</p> <p>PO Box 1130 Queenstown, Attn: Mary McConnell m.mcconnell@harrisingrierson.com</p>					
<p>Department of Conservation - Amy Young</p> <p>419.132</p> <p>Department of Conservation Te Papa Atawhai Attn: Amy Young, RMA Planner Kaiwhakamahere Penapenarawa ayoung@doc.govt.nz</p>	<p>GRUZ - General Rural Zone</p> <p>GRUZ-BFS5</p>	Oppose	<p>The submitter seeks that Seek that composting facilities and intensive primary production activities are set back from waterbodies, Significant Natural Areas (SNAs), reserves and QEII covenant areas, and seek new rule to ensure that composting facilities and intensive indoor primary production or in intensive primary production activity are set back from SNA boundaries by at least 20m.</p>	Disallow	<p>The submitter provides no evidence to justify the effect of concern or need for a 20m setback from these features in Waimakariri or s32 evaluation to support the request.</p>