

Submission on the Proposed Canterbury Air Regional Plan

RECEPTION	
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	
DOCUMENT NO:	C15C/62492
01 MAY 2015	ACTION INFO
EC360169	
1320	
Submitter ID:	
File No:	

Form 5: Submissions on a Publicly Notified Proposed Policy Statement or Regional Plan under Clause 6 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Return your signed submission by 5.00pm, Friday 1 May 2015 to:

Freepost 1201
Proposed Canterbury Air Regional Plan.
Environment Canterbury
P O Box 345
Christchurch 8140

A

Full Name: Lawrence John Manion

Phone (Hm): 3478830

Organisation*: _____

Phone (Wk): _____

* the organisation that this submission is made on behalf of

Postal Address: 57 Weedons Ross Road
5 RD. Christchurch

Phone (Cell): _____

Postcode: 7675

Email: _____

Fax: _____

Contact name and postal address for service of person making submission (if different from above):

Trade Competition

Pursuant to Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991, a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission may make a submission only if directly affected by an effect of the proposed policy statement or plan that:

- a) adversely affects the environment; and
- b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Please tick the sentence that applies to you:

- ☒ I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission; or
- ☐ I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission. **If you have ticked this box please select one of the following:**
- ☐ I am directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission
 - ☐ I am not directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission

Signature: _____

Date: 1/5/15

(Signature of person making submission or person authorised to sign on behalf of person making the submission)

Please note:

(1) all information contained in a submission under the Resource Management Act 1991, including names and addresses for service, becomes public information.

B

- ☐ I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission; or
- ☒ I do wish to be heard in support of my submission; and if so,
- ☒ I would be prepared to consider presenting your submission in a joint case with others making a similar submission at any hearing

6. Policies

6.6, 6.7, & 6.8. (Amendments)

Under these general policies most expansion of intensive chicken farms are large. New sheds are 30,000 plus bird size, so in many cases in Selwyn they are surrounded by lifestyle blocks of 4 hectare or less. Therefore they have a major detrimental effect on these neighbouring properties.

Policies by Canterbury Air Regional Plan should be promoting expansion of intensive chicken farms away from areas in the district plan of 4 hectare blocks and less, towards areas in the district plan of 20 hectares plus size properties, so that the discharge of contaminants (odour) from intensive chicken farms, pig farms, mushroom farms can be contained within the boundaries on the said farms.

7. Rules

Rural discharges to air (Oppose)

The following rules should be amended.

7.6 (2) "The discharge of odour is within the boundary of the intensive poultry farm, pig farm and mushroom farm,"

7.61 The discharge of contaminants into air from intensive poultry farming, intensive pig farming or mushroom farming that does not comply with one or more of conditions in rule 7.6 **is a prohibited activity at any point within 300m of neighbouring boundary at any point beyond 300 metres it is a discretionary activity.**

7.62 (1) The discharge is located at least 300 metres from a neighbours boundary.

7.63 The discharge of contaminants into air from intensive poultry farming, intensive pig farming or mushroom farming located less than 300 metres from neighbouring boundary is a prohibited activity.

Reverse Sensitivity Issues

In the proposed Canterbury Air Regional Plan, if 200 metres from a sensitive activity is going to be the trigger point for intensive chicken farms to be a discretionary activity, then local council rules regarding the reverse sensitivity issue of new dwellings not permitted within 300 metres of chicken sheds without a land use consent, should be brought into line with the proposed Canterbury Air Regional Plan.

Selwyn's requirement to put on LIM reports on 4 hectare lots that it is not a permitted activity for new dwellings to put within 300 metres of chicken sheds, should be changed retrospectively to within 200 metres of chicken sheds. Therefore if Selwyn stays with the 300 metre rule the air plan should still have the 300 metre as its trigger point to keep uniformity in treatment of intensive chicken farmers and the neighbouring properties of said chicken farmers.