

From: [Anna](#)
To: [RPS](#)
Subject: XRQL submission
Date: Friday, 12 November 2021 7:21:44 p.m.
Attachments: [XRQL Tarras.docx](#)

Hi there,

Im so sorry, I've just found this sitting in my outbox after losing internet connectivity.

I'm aware it is now two hours late, but I'm sending anyway in the hope you will accept it.

Many thanks
Anna Simmonds

“The nation that destroys its soil destroys itself.” Franklin D. Roosevelt

Proposed Otago Regional Policy Statement 2021

Further Submissions

Information for Submitters

Further Submissions must be in the prescribed form (Form 6) specified by the Resource Management (Forms, Fees, and Procedure) Regulations 2003 and must be received by Otago Regional Council **by 5pm Friday 12 November 2021**

Privacy: Be aware that **all further submissions are considered public**, including your name and address which will be uploaded to ORC website as part of this process. The Council and further submitters will use your name and contact details for correspondence in relation to the making of the Regional Policy Statement.

LODGE A SUBMISSION MANUALLY (*USING FORM BELOW*)

A template complying with the requirements of Form 6 is provided below. Once completed, please provide to ORC **by 5pm Friday 12 November 2021** by one of the following:

Email: rps@orc.govt.nz Further Submissions in MS Word (eg docx) are preferred.

Post: Otago Regional Council, Private Bag 1954, Dunedin 9054. Att: Otago Regional Council Policy Team

Hand Delivery at

Dunedin: Otago Regional Council Office, Philip Laing House, Level 2, 144 Rattray Street, Dunedin 9016, Att: Otago Regional Council Policy Team

Queenstown: Terrace Junction, 1092 Frankton Road, Queenstown, Att: Otago Regional Council Policy Team

A copy of your further submission must also be served on the original submitter within 5 working days after it is served on the local authority.

Submitter Address for Service details are provided in the Summary of Decisions Requested report.

INQUIRIES

Email: rps@orc.govt.nz

Phone: ORC Call Centre: 0800 474 082, Monday - Friday, 8am-5pm

Note to person making further submission

Please note that your further 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 further 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.

These two pages are for information and are not part of the Form and can be deleted when submitting to ORC and Original Submitters.

Further Submission Form 6 commences on the next page.

Form 6

Further submission in support of, or in opposition to, submission on notified proposed Otago Regional Policy Statement 2021

(Submissions must be received by Otago Regional Council by 5pm on Friday 12 November 2021, and by original submitters within 5 working days of service on ORC)

To: Otago Regional Council

1. Name of person making further submission

Anna Simmonds on behalf of Extinction Rebellion Queenstown Lakes

2. This is a further submission in support of (or in opposition to) a submission on the **Proposed Otago Regional Policy Statement 2021**.

3. I am (tick whichever applies and add grounds if required):

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	A person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest. In this case, also specify the grounds for saying that you come within this category; or
<input type="checkbox"/>	a person who has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest the general public has. In this case, also explain the grounds for saying that you come within this category; or
Grounds:	<p>Extinction Rebellion is a global organisation which unites people from around the world to give voice to the urgency of climate change issues and the unprecedented loss of biodiversity. Declarations that we are in a state of climate emergency must mean something.</p> <p>XRQL has read and understood the contents of the submission made by Sustainable Tarras, and we are totally in support of their submission.</p>

XRQL rejects the CIAL statements in Appendix A stating that the provision of domestic and international connectivity is a driver of social and economic prosperity cannot be maximised for the region due to capacity constraints at Queenstown within the next 10 years.

- **ORC has made climate commitments as a signatory of the Local Government Leaders Climate Change Declaration, which highlights an urgent need for responsive leadership and a holistic approach to climate change.**
- **The declarations of Climate Emergency made by CODC in September 2019; AND**
- **The declaration of Climate Emergency made by the NZ Government on behalf of all New Zealanders in December 2020, and also the many and various statements by the NZ Government that Climate Change and Carbon Emissions are significant concerns and will be a focus, and that New Zealand is committed to reducing its carbon emissions.**

We hold legitimate concerns that CIAL's submission to the RPS aims to weaken environmental protections and allow for biodiversity loss and facilitate a major industrial development in a sensitive area. We are vehemently opposed to this move by CIAL.

Without environmental protections Otago will be vulnerable to inappropriate developments. If CIAL's submitted changes are accepted into the RPS they will create more favourable conditions for a future development application permanently harming the natural environment which are members are overwhelmingly against.

4. I ~~wish/do not wish~~ (Select one) to be heard in support of my further submission. **Please note that it may be me in person, or any other member(s) of the committee of SCOA speaking to this submission in my place.**

5. If others make a similar submission, I ~~will/will not~~ (Select one) consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.

6. Further Submitter Details

a. Signature of person making further submission

(or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter. A signature is NOT required if you make your submission by electronic means).

Not required

b. Signatory name, position, and organisation *(if signatory is acting on behalf of a submitter organisation or group referred to at Point 1 above)*

Name Anna Simmonds

Position Leading member

Organisation Extinction Rebellion Queenstown Lakes

c. Date

12 November 2021

Address for service of person making further submission *(This is where all correspondence will be directed)*

d. Contact person *(name and designation, if applicable)*

Anna Simmonds XRQL

e. Email: *(this is our preferred means of contact)*

annasimmonds@gmail.com

f. Telephone:

021426166

g. **Postal address** (or alternative method of service under [section 352](#) of the Act):

7. My further submission is:

I ~~support~~/oppose the submission of:

**Christchurch International Airport Limited c/- Amy Hill
Chapman Tripp
Level 5, PwC Centre
60 Cashel Street
PO Box 2510
Christchurch 8140**

Submission ID 307

NOTE: Please use a new further submission form for each different original submission you support/oppose

The particular parts of the submission I support (or oppose) are:

Original submission point number	Support OR Oppose	The reasons for my support/opposition are:	I seek that the whole (or part [describe part]) of the submission be allowed (or disallowed): [Please state].
14 ECO-P6 – Maintaining indigenous biodiversity	Oppose	Removes or substantively reduces protection for Bendigo Wetlands and Mata-Au/Clutha River. The Bendigo wetlands are located approximately 6-10km from the proposed airport and well within the Civil Airport Authority	Disallow in part – deletion of section 5(b)

		<p>recommended a 13km bird strike management zone.</p> <p>Airport safety standards require reductions and/or removal of native bird life via various techniques including culling, removal of food sources including native plant life, restrictions on farming, water ponding and grass seed choices.</p> <p>These actions will permanently change the local area, impact bird, insect and plant life indigenous only to Central Otago.</p> <p>A reasonable person would say these impacts are not less than minor or de minimis.</p> <p>In addition, CIAL’s request reflects an organisation with little understanding of and respect for the perilous nature of New Zealand’s indigenous biodiversity and the urgent need with which the effects management hierarchy needs to be strengthened. The ORC has appropriately adopted the hierarchy as is expressed by Te Mana o te Wai in the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (2020), and which is being considered as part of the Natural and Built Environments Bill.</p>	
20	Oppose	Removes or substantively reduces protection currently available to the Tarras community and surrounding	Disallow whole

EIT-INF-P13 – Locating and managing effects of infrastructure		<p>environment. The broader Tarras environment is one of outstanding natural beauty and includes significant natural areas, outstanding natural features and landscapes, natural wetlands, etc. Again, CIAL has demonstrated their lack of understanding of the need to avoid further degradation of New Zealand’s natural environment and the degree of step change needed in order to do so. We support ORC’s consistent application of ‘avoid’ as the first priority.</p> <p>Locating infrastructure such as an international airport on a 750 ha campus in Tarras does not serve the Tarras community or surrounding Central Otago district. Questions from the community on any direct or indirect benefits to Tarras and surrounding district remain unanswered over a 15-month period, as to questions about potential environmental impacts and how they would be mitigated, if at all.</p> <p>The lower South Island would have ~7% of the population but 50% of the international capable airports, with significant spare capacity well into the future in the existing 4 available airports (Queenstown, Dunedin, Invercargill, Christchurch).</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>Further, there is no “evidence” that passenger numbers will “bounce back” beyond pre-covid levels, and there is also huge uncertainty as to how international movement into New Zealand will be allowed.</p> <p>A reasonable person would say the sense of urgency and need to reduce protections to the environment is unwarranted and unjustified. We strongly oppose this.</p>	
<p>12</p> <p>IM-P14 – Human impact</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>With less than 13% of the local Tarras community supporting the Christchurch airport proposal, and obvious levels of concern running through the wider community, asking to set aside the community’s view (or indeed the wider view of other affected communities with the ORC district) and trading this off against unknown tangible or intangible important public benefits is unconscionable.</p> <p>Selectively trading off human impacts from functional or operational needs (from building and operating an international airport) against the environment creates a risk and unnecessary discussion of where the boundaries are or should be drawn.</p> <p>Imposing functional or operational restrictions (which to date are unknown) on a local community for</p>	<p>Disallow in part – addition of item 3</p>

		<p>public benefit can ultimately be used to remove or minimise compensation to these communities for these restrictions.</p>	
<p>6</p> <p>IM-P2-Decision priorities</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>Our membership clearly values its natural environment over and above currently proposed (and unquantified) economic benefits provided by an international airport in the community.</p> <p>Our members value preserving the natural environment over and above the benefits proposed with the Tarras international airport.</p> <p>Proposing that economic benefits have equal priority to securing long term life-supporting capacity and mauri of the natural environment may create unnecessary conflicts between communities who do not evenly share or gain any of the benefits or may have much of the negative impact.</p> <p>It also silences the voices of future generations by trading off present day economic gain for the long-term sustainability of the environment.</p> <p>CIAL’s referencing to ‘balance these goals’ perpetuates the ill-informed approach to our management of the natural environment which has delivered the climate crisis and</p>	<p>Disallow in part – the deletion of the words “firstly”, ‘secondly”, “thirdly”.</p>

		biodiversity crisis we are currently experiencing.	
--	--	---	--

Note: Additional rows for each separate further submission point should be added as required.