Waimakariri District Council
215 High Street
Private Bag 1005
Rangiora 7440, New Zealand
Phone 0800 965 468

DISTRICT PLAN REVIEW

Proposed Waimakariri District Plan - Submission

Clause 6 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

Submitter details

*(Our preferred methods of corresponding with you are by **email** and **phone**).*

Full name: Rayonier Matariki Forests

Email address: andy.fleming@rayonier.com

Phone (Mobile): 06 9741282 Phone (Landline): 06 9741282

Postal Address: Hawkes Bay Regional Office, PO Box 12134, Ahuriri, Napier Post Code: 4144

Physical address: Ground Floor, 6B Ossian Street, Ahuriri, Napier Post Code: 4144
(if different from above)

Please select one of the two options below:

☑ I **could not** gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission *(go to Submission details, you do not need to complete the rest of this section)*

☐ I **could** gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission *(please complete the rest of this section before continuing to Submission details)*

Please select one of the two options below:

☑ I **am** directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:

A) Adversely affects the environment; and

B) Does not relate to trade competition or the effect of trade competition.

☐ I **am not** directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:

A) Adversely affects the environment; and

B) Does not relate to trade competition or the effect of trade competition.

2106170979 46 - Version 1.0 - August 2021

Submission details

The specific provisions of the proposal that my submission relates to are as follows: *(please give details)*

see attached schedule

My submission is that: *(state in summary the Proposed Plan chapter subject and provision of your submission. Clearly indicate whether you support or oppose the specific provisions or wish to have amendments made, giving reasons) (please include additional pages as necessary)*

see attached schedule

I/we have included: _____ additional pages

I/we seek the following decision from the Waimakariri District Council: *(give precise details, use additional pages if required)*

see attached schedule

Submission at the Hearing

☑ I/we wish to speak in support of my/our submission

☐ I/we do not wish to speak in support of my/our submission

☑ If others make a similar further submission, I/we will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing

Signature

Of submitters or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter(s)

Signature _____ Date 26 November 2021

(If you are making your submission electronically, a signature is not required)

Important Information

1. The Council must receive this submission before the closing date and time for submissions.

2. Please note that submissions are public. Your name and submission will be included in papers that are available to the media and public. Your submission will only be used for the purpose of the District Plan review process.

3. Only those submitters who indicate they wish to speak at the hearing will be emailed a copy of the planning officers report (please ensure you include an email address on this submission form).

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the authority is satisfied that at least 1 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.

Send your submission to: Proposed District Plan Submission
Waimakariri District Council
Private Bag 1005, Rangiora 7440

Email to: developmentplanning@wmk.govt.nz

Phone: 0800 965 468 (0800WMKGOV)

You can also deliver this submission form to one our service centres:

Rangiora Service Centre: 215 High Street, Rangiora

Kaiapoi Service Centre: Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre, 176 Williams Street, Kaiapoi

Oxford Service Centre: 34 Main Street, Oxford

Submissions close 5pm, Friday 26 November 2021
Please refer to the Council website waimakariri.govt.nz for further updates

Submission Schedule Proposed Waimakariri District plan

Provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Relief
Part 1 National Environmental Standards "An NES prevails over District Plan rules unless expressly stated that it does not"	**Support** with regard to the National Environmental Standard for Plantation Forestry (NESPF)	The NESPF provides specific provision for certain plantation forestry activities and has considered the adverse effects on the environment and provided appropriate standards for the Waimakariri district. Often the PDP refers to Plantation Forestry but that is only certain forests over 1ha in area. The NESPF provides for specific forestry activities such as earthworks, harvesting, replanting. Certain provisions within the PDP do not appear to align with the statement set out in Part 1. They do not	Submissions below will more specifically identify where there is lack of clear alignment with the NESPF. Rather than refer to Plantation forestry to specifically identify which forestry activity within the NESPF is applicable. Clear identification with each topic if the NESPF applies or does not.
ECO-introduction	Oppose as no comment on alignment with the NESPF	There is no statement if the NESPF prevails over the PDP rules with regard to plantation forestry activities within SNAs and with regard to the clearance of indigenous vegetation. This is despite some of the rules referring to indigenous understorey within plantation forestry	Clearly provide that indigenous vegetation clearance provisions of the NESPF prevail
ECO-Introduction SNAs second bullet point reference to Unmapped SNAs	oppose	Unmapped SNAs provides no certainty for plantation forestry especially with regard to the clearance of indigenous vegetation set out in regulation 93 of the NESPF. The proposals with regard to significant habitat for indigenous fauna, would especially for mobile fauna include plantation forests Any unmapped SNAs must be verified as to significance and boundaries	With regard to plantation forestry delete all references to Unmapped SNAs

ECO-SCHED1	Oppose in part	It is not clear in the overlays if Oxford and Mt Thomas plantation forests are included in the overlay	Ensure that Oxford and Mt Thomas plantation forests are not included as a mapped SNA
ECO-Introduction and ECO-SHED2	oppose	The proposals with regard to significant habitat for indigenous fauna, would especially for mobile fauna include plantation forests. There has been no assessment of the economic impacts of this upon plantation forests being able to continue operations	SCHED2 not to be applicable to plantation forestry
ECO-P2	Support in part	There is no alignment with the NESPF and recognition that its provisions provide appropriate provisions for this policy intent	Add new provision-"8 support the NESPF provisions as providing appropriate provisions for the maintenance of indigenous vegetation and significant habitats" Or similar words
ECO-P4	Support in part	There is no alignment with the NESPF and recognition that its provisions provide appropriate provisions for this policy intent	Add new provision-"5 support the NESPF provisions as providing appropriate provisions for the maintenance of indigenous vegetation and significant habitats" Or similar words
ECO-P8	oppose	The policy too absolute with word "avoid" and uncertain with the word "near".	Amend by replacing with: "managing the indigenous vegetation with the setbacks".
ECO-rules	Support in part	The rules are an example of the lack of clarity of alignment with the NESPF.	Insert statement at beginning of rules that the NESPF prevail.
ECO-R7	Support in part	Concerned if Oxford and Mt Thomas plantation forests are mapped within the mapped SNAs	Ensure that Oxford and Mt Thomas plantation forests are not included in any mapped SNA.
NATC-P4-3.	Oppose in part	The policy is not clear as to what activities within the NESPF are applicable. In other words, does the policy apply to afforestation or replanting or	Limit the policy to afforestation and provide for existing plantation

		earthworks, harvesting activities. It is meaningless to just refer to plantation forestry.	forestry and its activities to dealt with under the NESPF.
NATC-R2	Support in part	It is not clear how this rule relates to plantation forestry activities in existing plantation forestry and the impact if replanting cannot occur.	Add new provision " 4. Enable replanting of plantation forests" or similar words
NATC-R10	Oppose in part	The policy is not clear as to what activities within the NESPF are applicable. In other words, does the policy apply to afforestation or replanting or earthworks, harvesting activities. It is meaningless to just refer to plantation forestry.	Limit the rule to afforestation and provide for existing plantation forestry and its activities to dealt with under the NESPF.
NATC-S1 and all the schedules	oppose	It is unclear as to the alignment with the NESPF setbacks.	Amend to clarify that the setbacks for the various plantation forestry activities as set out in the NESPF prevail
NFL-P1 5	oppose	It is meaningless to just refer to plantation forestry. If features already include plantation forestry then they should be able to continue as well as be replanted	Amend to clarify limited to afforestation of plantation forests
NFL-P3-4	oppose	It is meaningless to just refer to plantation forestry. If Landscapes already include plantation forestry then they should be able to continue as well as be replanted	Amend to clarify limited to afforestation of plantation forests
NFL-P4-4	oppose	While afforestation for outstanding features and landscapes can be limited the council pursuant to the NESPF can not restrict plantation forestry in other amenity areas.	Delete any reference to planation forestry
NFL -R13	oppose	It is meaningless to just refer to plantation forestry It is not clear if the provision relates to any existing plantation forests.	Limit the rules to afforestation

Part 2 Noise R7	Oppose in part	It is not clear if the NESPF provisions prevail.	Add statement that with regard to the plantation forestry activities that the NESPF provisions prevail
Part 3-Rural Zone and rules	Support in part	While primary production includes forestry there is nothing specific as to whether or not the provisions for forestry activities under the NESPF prevail. There is reference to farm quarries but no reference to forestry quarries under the NESPF.	Add statement that with regard to the plantation forestry activities that the NESPF provisions prevail
Part 3 earthworks EW-AN1	Support in part	Support the reference to the alignment with the NESPF	retain