FURTHER SUBMISSION TO CANTERBURY REGIONAL COUNCIL ON SUBMISSIONS TO THE
PROPOSED CANTERBURY AIR REGIONAL PLAN

TO: Environment Canterbury
    PO Box 345
    Christchurch 8140
    New Zealand

SUBMITTER: NZ Pork Industry Board – Submitter ID Number 61382

CONTACT DETAILS:
NZPork
Anita Murrell
New Zealand Pork
PO Box 4048
WELLINGTON 6140

Email: anita.murrell@pork.co.nz
Phone: 04 917 4752
Mobile: 029 220 3300

NZPork has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest the general public has.

NZPork wishes to be heard in support of this further submission. If others make a similar submission, we will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.

I am authorised to act and represent NZ Pork in making this submission.

Anita Murrell
9 July 2015
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I support/oppose the submission of:</th>
<th>The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:</th>
<th>Support/oppose</th>
<th>The reasons for my support or opposition are:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pCARP-387 Selwyn District Council</td>
<td>3 – definition of extensive pig farming</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>The definition of extensive pig farming proposed by Environment Canterbury aligns with industry agreed good management practice and the parameters agreed in the MGM project, which further define levels of acceptable ground cover maintenance and stocking rates. Free Range is a legally defined term used for marketing that is not consistent with the extensive pig farming definition and should not be used in a regulatory context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pCARP-3032 Combined Canterbury Provinces, Federated Farmers of New Zealand</td>
<td>Definition of intensive pig farming</td>
<td>Support in part</td>
<td>The definition of intensive pig farming should not be based on numbers of stock but environmental effects, such as maintenance of ground cover in accordance with industry agreed good management practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pCarp-3033</td>
<td>Policy 6.10</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Good management practices is more appropriate terminology for rural activities and would improve consistency with other proposed plans, programmes and initiatives in the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pCARP-3034</td>
<td>Rule 7.68</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Timing for preparation of odour management plans should be consistent with that of farm environment plans under the pLWRP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pCARP-1054 Horticulture New Zealand</td>
<td>Introduction 1.1</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>NZPork agrees with the proposed inclusion of a provision for rural production activities and growth in rural areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Territorial Authorities</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Reverse sensitivity is an important consideration as part of land use change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pCARP-243 Johnston B</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>Non-compliance with rules or resource consents should be dealt with via existing complaints, compliance monitoring and regulatory procedures, not by introduction of prohibited activity rules. Reverse sensitivity issues where urban or rural residential growth causes conflicts with existing lawfully established rural activities should be managed by ensuring appropriate policies are included in planning documents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pCARP-659, 660, 661 Manion L J</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>Rather than ensuring intensive farming is sited away from rural lifestyle blocks, regional planning documents should ensure that reverse sensitivity is managed to avoid rural residential growth conflicts regarding existing lawfully established rural activities and the future growth of these activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pCARP-662</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>Odours can be reasonably expected to occur in rural areas. While an expectation that neighbours are not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>affected by offensive and objectionable odour is not unreasonable, it is unreasonable to expect absolutely no odour effect beyond the boundary. It is also unreasonable to prohibit a rural activity in a rural area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another replacement for air please ☝️ same as with LPC

Hi Sarah,

Very sorry about using the wrong reference numbers in my further submission. Hopefully this updated copy clarifies things for you!

Kind regards,

Anita Murrell
Environmental Advisor
Level 4
94 Dixon Street
PO Box 4048
Wellington 6014
T: +64 4 917 4752 M: + 64 29 220 3300
W: pork.co.nz | nzpork.co.nz
E: anita.murrell@pork.co.nz
@NZPork @NZPork @NZ_Pork
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Even if you burn it, she'll love it.

DISCLAIMER: This electronic message together with any attachments is confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, do not copy, disclose or use the contents in any way. Please also advise NZPork by return email that you have received the message and then please destroy. NZPork is not responsible for any changes made to this message and/or any attachments after sending by NZPork. We use virus software but exclude all liability for viruses or anything similar in this email or any attachment.