

From: [Jessica Tuilaepa](#)
To: [Mailroom Mailbox](#)
Cc: [Tim Harris](#); [Cameron Wood](#); [Jesse Burgess](#)
Subject: SDC further submission
Date: Friday, 10 July 2015 3:16:50 p.m.
Attachments: [image003.png](#)
[SDC further submission to proposed Canterbury Air Regional Plan.pdf](#)

Good Afternoon,

Please find attached a further submission from Selwyn District Council in relation to the proposed Canterbury Air Regional Plan.

Kind Regards,

Jessica



JESSICA TUILAEPa
STRATEGY AND POLICY PLANNER
*B.Com, Dip.Grad Tour, M.Env Pol,
NZPI.Grad*

Selwyn District Council, 2 Norman Kirk Drive, Rolleston 7614; Post: PO Box 90, Rolleston 7643, Christchurch
Phone: (03) 347-2800 or (03) 318-8338, Fax: (03) 347-2799
www.selwyn.govt.nz | m.selwyn.govt.nz | www.selwynlibrary.co.nz | www.selwyngetsready.net



FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

Further Submission on Proposed Canterbury Air Regional Plan

Submitter ID:

File No:

Form 6: Further Submissions in support of, or in opposition to, submission on a Publicly Notified Proposed Policy Statement or Regional Plan under Clause 8 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Return your signed further submission by 5.00pm Friday 10 July 2015 to:

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

Full Name: <u>DAVID WARD</u>	Phone (Hm): _____
Organisation*: <u>SELWYN DISTRICT COUNCIL</u>	Phone (Wk): <u>03 3472 800</u>
* the organisation that this further submission is made on behalf of	
Postal Address: <u>PO BOX 90</u>	Phone (Cell): _____
<u>ROLLESTON</u>	Postcode: <u>7643</u>
Email: <u>jessica.tuilapea@selwyn.govt.nz</u>	Fax: _____
Contact name and postal address for service of person making further submission (if different from above):	
<u>JESSICA TUILAPEA CI-SDC PO BOX 90</u>	
<u>ROLLESTON 7643</u>	

Only certain people can make further submissions. Please tick the option that applies to you:

☐ I am a person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest; or

☐ I am a person who has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest the general public has (for example, I am affected by the content of a submission); or

☒ I am the local authority for the relevant area.

☐ I do not wish to be heard in support of my further submission; or

☒ I do wish to be heard in support of my further submission; and if so,

☒ I would be prepared to consider presenting your further submission in a joint case with others making a similar submission at any hearing

Service of your further submission:

Please note: any person making a further submission must **serve a copy of that submission on the original submitter no later than five working days after the submission has been provided to Environment Canterbury**. If you have made a further submission on a number of original submissions, then copies of your further submission will need to be served with each original submitter.

Signature: [Signature] Date: 10 July 2015

(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.

Submitter Name	Point ID	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Request
Ashburton District Council	pCARP – 869	Support	SDC supports submission point pCARP-869	That Council accept this submission
Ashburton District Council	pCARP – 874	Support	SDC supports submission point pCARP-874	That Council accept this submission
Ashburton District Council	pCARP – 875	Support	SDC supports submission point pCARP-875	That Council accept this submission
Christchurch City Council	pCARP – 2544	Support	SDC supports submission point pCARP-2544	That Council accept this submission
Christchurch City Council	pCARP – 2550	Support	SDC supports submission point pCARP-2550	That Council accept this submission
Christchurch City Council	pCARP – 2551	Support	SDC supports submission point pCARP-2551	That Council accept this submission
Christchurch City Council	pCARP – 2555	Support	SDC supports submission point pCARP-2555	That Council accept this submission
Christchurch City Council	pCARP – 2557	Support	SDC supports submission point pCARP-2557	That Council accept this submission
Christchurch City Council	pCARP – 2576	Support	SDC supports submission point pCARP-2576	That Council accept this submission
Helston Partnership	pCARP - 1665	Support	SDC supports submission point pCARP-1665	That Council accept this submission
Kaikoura DC	pCARP - 1820	Support	SDC supports submission point pCARP-1820	That Council accept this submission
Waimakariri District Council	pCARP – 1309	Support	SDC supports submission point pCARP-1309	That Council accept this submission
Waimakariri District Council	pCARP – 1312	Support	SDC supports submission point pCARP-1312	That Council accept this submission
Waimakariri District Council	pCARP – 1346	Support	SDC supports submission point pCARP-1346	That Council accept this submission
Combined Canterbury Provinces, Federated Farmers of NZ PO BOX 414 Ashburton 7740 lhume@fedfarm.org.nz	pCARP – 3032	Oppose	SDC Disagree that the threshold is too low and that numbers need to be raised. If people with pet pigs or those supplying meat to friends and family are not operating at a scale to classify them as being extensive pig farming operation then they should be subject to these rules.	That Council reject this submission
NZ Pork Industry Board	pCARP -393	Oppose	The definition of “extensive farming activities” relates basically to free range pig farming activities. The problem with this definition is that it	That Council reject t this submission

			may not be clearly obvious as the alternative to "intensive pig farming". Free range poultry farming is quite obviously the alternative to intensive poultry farming. There is also some confusion as to what densities of pigs would still be considered 'extensive', the definition refers to the maintenance of groundcover.	
Poultry Industry Association of New Zealand (Inc); Egg Producers Federation of New Zealand (Inc) c/- Harrison Grierson Consultants	pCARP - 1726	Oppose	The definition of "free range poultry farming" does not include a recommended maximum bird number. It refers to an industry standard, but makes no specific reference to which standard it means.	That Council reject this submission
GL Bowron	pCARP - 1263	Oppose	SDC Opposes submission point pCARP-1263	That Council reject this submission