Waimakariri District Council

215 High Street Private Bag 1005 Rangiora 7440, New Zealand

Phone 0800 965 468

DEVELOPMENT PLANNING

Further Submission Form

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

1/	we	are	furt	her s	ubm	itti	ng	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

10. Walillakai III District Coulicii	
Further submitter details	
Name of further submitter:	
Organisation name and contact (if representing a group or organis	sation):
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 that	n the interest the general public has
the local authority for the relevant area	

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 pr	esenting	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 explain why you come within the category selected above:

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: Enter the details of the original submitter: • 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

Name of person making further submission:

This further submission is in relation to the <u>original submission</u> of: Enter the details of the original submitter: • name, address or email; and • submission number (and point(s), if applicable)	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

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	The particular	My/our	The reasons for my/our support/	Allow or	Give precise details of why
to the original submission of: Enter	parts of the	position on	opposition to the original	disallow the	you wish to allow/disallow
the details of the original submitter:	original	the original	submission are:	original	(in full or in part) to indicate
• name, address or email; and •	submission	submission		submission (in	the decision you want
submission number (and point(s), if	I/we support	is: Support		full or in part)	Council to make
applicable)	/oppose are:	or oppose		, ,	
Fulton Hogan - Tim Ensor	RURZ - General	Oppose in	The submitter seeks to remove	Disallow in part	NZPork support the use of
	Objectives and	part	policy seeking to ensure	,	setbacks between sensitive
041.045	Policies for all		adequate separation distances		activities and new intensive
	Rural Zones		between existing sensitive		primary production as a
c/- Tonkin & Taylor Limited			activities and new intensive		method to address reverse
PO Box 13 055 Christchurch	RURZ–P8		primary production.		sensitivity issues and policy
Attn: Tim Ensor					support for this approach.
tensor@tonkintaylor.co.nz					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.
					Disallow in part as the
					submission relates to
					intensive primary
					production.
Saunders and; Co Lawyers - Chris	GRUZ - General	Oppose	The submitter seeks a change so	Disallow	An RDA status for new
Fowler	Rural Zone		that GRUZ-BFS5 applies setback		intensive primary
			of 300m to establishment of		production which provides
057.003	GRUZ-BFS5		new intensive primary		for a case by case
			production.		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.

		1			,
			minimised. Government		
Private Bag 1005 Rangiora			agencies should work together		
PO 7440			to only allow sustainable		
com.board@wmk.govt.nz			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	Definitions	Oppose	The submitters states that a	Disallow	Disallow the submission.
Limited - Amy Hill			number of activities including		
			commercial pig farming is known		 No engagement with
254.004			to increase the risk of bird strike		the pork industry has
			if they are allowed to take place		occurred.
Address for service of submitter:			in the vicinity of the flight paths		
Christchurch International Airport			for aircraft approaching or		 No analysis is
Limited			departing from the Airport. Seeks		provided to support
c/- Amy Hill			that those activities are		the assertion that
Chapman Tripp			identified and included within a		commercial pig
60 Cashel Street			definition of 'bird strike risk		farming is known to
PO Box Christchurch 8140			activity' with a corresponding		increase the risk of
Email address:			suite of provisions controlling		bird strike.
Jo.Appleyard@chapmantripp.com /			these activities within proximity		
Amy.Hill@chapmantripp.com			of the Christchurch International		No assessment of
			Airport runways.		whether the
					objective achieves
			 No engagement with the 		the purpose of the
			pork industry has		RMA or whether the
			occurred.		method is effective
					or efficient has been
					undertaken.

			 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 dalternatives has been provided (including 		 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	No engagement with the pork industry has occurred.

Address for service of submitter:	for aircraft approaching or	• No analysis is
Christchurch International Airport	departing from the Airport. Seeks	provided to support
Limited	that those activities are	the assertion that
c/- Amy Hill	identified and included within a	commercial pig
Chapman Tripp	definition of 'bird strike risk	farming is known to
60 Cashel Street	activity' with a corresponding	increase the risk of
PO Box Christchurch 8140	suite of provisions controlling	bird strike.
Email address:	these activities within proximity	
Jo.Appleyard@chapmantripp.com /	of the Christchurch International	 No assessment of
Amy.Hill@chapmantripp.com	Airport runways.	whether the objective achieves
	No engagement with the	the purpose of the
	pork industry has	RMA or whether the
	occurred.	method is effective
		or efficient has been
	No analysis is provided to	undertaken.
	support the assertion	
	that commercial pig	No section 32
	farming is known to	assessment.
	increase the risk of bird	
	strike.	 No assessment of
		costs or benefits has
	 No assessment of 	been undertaken.
	whether the objective	
	achieves the purpose of	 No assessment of
	the RMA or whether the	alternatives has
	method is effective or	been provided
	efficient has been	(including whether
	undertaken.	district plan
		regulation is
	• No section 32	required).
	assessment.	

	1	T	T	
		 No assessment of costs or benefits has been undertaken. 		
		 No assessment of alternatives has been provided (including whether district plan 		
DUDZ. Commit	0	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	D' II .	Distillate the section of
	Oppose		Disallow	Disallow the submission.
•				Na anatana an
				No engagement with
Rurai Zones				the pork industry has
DIIDZ DO		1		occurred.
KUKZ-Po				. No suplicio is
				No analysis is
				provided to support the assertion that
				commercial pig farming is known to
				increase the risk of
				bird strike.
		·		bild strike.
				 No assessment of
				whether the
		7 m por cranways.		objective achieves
		No engagement with the		the purpose of the
				RMA or whether the
				method is effective
				or efficient has been
		No analysis is provided to		undertaken.
		1		and content
		' '		
	RURZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Rural Zones RURZ–P8	Objectives and Policies for all Rural Zones	RURZ - 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 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. PNo engagement with the pork industry has occurred. No analysis is provided to support the assertion	or benefits has been undertaken. No assessment of alternatives has been provided (including whether district plan regulation is required). RURZ - 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 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. No engagement with the pork industry has occurred. No analysis is provided to support the assertion

			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).		 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	RURZ - Matters of Discretion	Oppose	The submitters states that a number of activities including	Disallow	Disallow the submission.
254.119	for all Rural		commercial pig farming is known to increase the risk of bird strike		No engagement with
254.119	Zones		if they are allowed to take place		the pork industry has occurred.
Address for service of submitter:	Matters of		in the vicinity of the flight paths		occurreu.
Christchurch International Airport	Discretion for		for aircraft approaching or		 No analysis is
Limited	all Rural Zones		departing from the Airport. Seeks		provided to support
c/- Amy Hill			that those activities are		the assertion that

Chapman Tripp	identified and included within a	commercial pig
60 Cashel Street	definition of 'bird strike risk	farming is known to
PO Box Christchurch 8140	activity' with a corresponding	increase the risk of
Email address:	suite of provisions controlling	bird strike.
Jo.Appleyard@chapmantripp.com /	these activities within proximity	
Amy.Hill@chapmantripp.com	of the Christchurch International	 No assessment of
, , ,	Airport runways.	whether the
		objective achieves
	No engagement with the	the purpose of the
	pork industry has	RMA or whether the
	occurred.	method is effective
	0000.700.	or efficient has been
	 No analysis is provided to 	undertaken.
	support the assertion	ander takem
	that commercial pig	No section 32
	farming is known to	assessment.
	increase the risk of bird	assessiment.
	strike.	No assessment of
		costs or benefits has
	No assessment of	been undertaken.
	whether the objective	been ander taken
	achieves the purpose of	No assessment of
	the RMA or whether the	alternatives has
	method is effective or	been provided
	efficient has been	(including whether
	undertaken.	district plan
		regulation is
	• No section 32	required).
	assessment.	. 544 557.
	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	GRUZ - General	Oppose	The submitters states that a	Disallow	Disallow the submission.
Limited - Amy Hill	Rural Zone		number of activities including		
			commercial pig farming is known		 No engagement with
254.132	Activity Rules		to increase the risk of bird strike		the pork industry has
			if they are allowed to take place		occurred.
Address for service of submitter:			in the vicinity of the flight paths		
Christchurch International Airport			for aircraft approaching or		 No analysis is
Limited			departing from the Airport. Seeks		provided to support
c/- Amy Hill			that those activities are		the assertion that
Chapman Tripp			identified and included within a		commercial pig
60 Cashel Street			definition of 'bird strike risk		farming is known to
PO Box Christchurch 8140			activity' with a corresponding		increase the risk of
Email address:			suite of provisions controlling		bird strike.
Jo.Appleyard@chapmantripp.com /			these activities within proximity		
Amy.Hill@chapmantripp.com			of the Christchurch International		No assessment of
			Airport runways.		whether the
					objective achieves
			No engagement with the		the purpose of the
			pork industry has		RMA or whether the
			occurred.		method is effective
			No analysis is supplied to		or efficient has been
			No analysis is provided to		undertaken.
			support the assertion		No.
			that commercial pig		• No section 32
			farming is known to increase the risk of bird		assessment.
			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). 		 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	RLZ - Rural	Oppose	The submitters states that a	Disallow	Disallow the submission.
Limited - Amy Hill	Lifestyle Zone		number of activities including commercial pig farming is known		No ongagoment with
254.133	Activity Rules		to increase the risk of bird strike		 No engagement with the pork industry has
			if they are allowed to take place		occurred.
Address for service of submitter:			in the vicinity of the flight paths		
Christchurch International Airport			for aircraft approaching or		• No analysis is
Limited			departing from the Airport. Seeks		provided to support
c/- Amy Hill			that those activities are		the assertion that
Chapman Tripp			identified and included within a		commercial pig
60 Cashel Street			definition of 'bird strike risk		farming is known to
PO Box Christchurch 8140			activity' with a corresponding		

Email address:	suite of provisions controlling	increase the risk of
Jo.Appleyard@chapmantripp.com /	these activities within proximity	bird strike.
Amy.Hill@chapmantripp.com	of the Christchurch International	
Any.rimecnapmantripp.com	No engagement with the pork industry has occurred. No analysis is provided to support the assertion that commercial pig	No assessment of whether the objective achieves the purpose of the RMA or whether the method is effective or efficient has been undertaken.
	farming is known to increase the risk of bird strike.	• No section 32 assessment.
		 No assessment of
	 No assessment of whether the objective achieves the purpose of 	costs or benefits has been undertaken.
	the RMA or whether the method is effective or efficient has been undertaken.	 No assessment of alternatives has been provided (including whether district plan
	• No section 32 assessment.	regulation is required).
	No assessment of costs or benefits has been undertaken.	
	 No assessment of alternatives has been 	

		T		I	1
			provided (including		
			whether district plan		
			regulation is required).		
Christchurch International Airport	RURZ - Matters	Oppose	The submitters states that a	Disallow	Disallow the submission.
Limited - Amy Hill	of Discretion		number of activities including		
	for all Rural		commercial pig farming is known		 No engagement with
254.144	Zones		to increase the risk of bird strike		the pork industry has
			if they are allowed to take place		occurred.
Address for service of submitter:	Matters of		in the vicinity of the flight paths		
Christchurch International Airport	Discretion for		for aircraft approaching or		 No analysis is
Limited	all Rural Zones		departing from the Airport. Seeks		provided to support
c/- Amy Hill			that those activities are		the assertion that
Chapman Tripp			identified and included within a		commercial pig
60 Cashel Street			definition of 'bird strike risk		farming is known to
PO Box Christchurch 8140			activity' with a corresponding		increase the risk of
Email address:			suite of provisions controlling		bird strike.
Jo.Appleyard@chapmantripp.com /			these activities within proximity		
Amy.Hill@chapmantripp.com			of the Christchurch International		 No assessment of
			Airport runways.		whether the
					objective achieves
			 No engagement with the 		the purpose of the
			pork industry has		RMA or whether the
			occurred.		method is effective
					or efficient has been
			 No analysis is provided to 		undertaken.
			support the assertion		
			that commercial pig		• No section 32
			farming is known to		assessment.
			increase the risk of bird		
			strike.		No assessment of
					costs or benefits has
			No assessment of		been undertaken.
			whether the objective		Seen andertaken.
		<u> </u>	Wiletier 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		No assessment of alternatives has been provided (including whether district plan regulation is required).
Christchurch International Airport Limited - Amy Hill	Planning Maps	Oppose	regulation is required). The submitters states that a number of activities including	Disallow	Disallow the submission.
254.150 Address for service of submitter:			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		 No engagement with the pork industry has occurred.
Christchurch International Airport			for aircraft approaching or		• No analysis is
Limited			departing from the Airport. Seeks		provided to support
c/- Amy Hill			that those activities are		the assertion that
Chapman Tripp			identified and included within a		commercial pig
60 Cashel Street			definition of 'bird strike risk		farming is known to
PO Box Christchurch 8140			activity' with a corresponding		increase the risk of
Email address:			suite of provisions controlling		bird strike.
Jo.Appleyard@chapmantripp.com /			these activities within proximity		
Amy.Hill@chapmantripp.com			,		

of the Christchurch International Airport runways. 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	 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 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).
No assessment of alternatives has been provided (including)	

			whether district plan		
			regulation is required).		
Christchurch International Airport Limited - Amy Hill 254.153 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	General	Oppose	whether district plan regulation is required). 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. • No engagement with the pork industry has occurred.	Disallow	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
			 No analysis is provided to support the assertion that commercial pig farming is known to increase the risk of bird 		or efficient has been undertaken. • No section 32 assessment.
			 Increase the risk of bird strike. No assessment of whether the objective achieves the purpose of 		 No assessment of costs or benefits has been undertaken.

Horticulture New Zealand - Ailsa Robertson 295.143	GRUZ - General Rural Zone GRUZ-R4	Support	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). The submitter opposes the 90m² GFA limitation for farm workers accommodation as impractical to provide for farm workers needs	Allow	No assessment of alternatives has been provided (including whether district plan regulation is required). Increase the GFA for farm workers accommodation.
Environmental Policy Advisor – South Island Horticulture New Zealand PO Box 10-232 WELLINGTON Email: rachel.mcclung@hortnz.com			where supporting a primary production activity.		
Harrison Grierson Consultants Limited - Mary McConnell 351.006	RURZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Rural Zones	Support	The submitter seeks a clear policy position as it relates to sensitive activities in rural zones.	Allow	Allow the submission.
	RURZ–P8				

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