

BEFORE THE HEARING PANEL APPOINTED BY THE CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

Under the	Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA or Act)
-----------	---

In the matter of	Proposed Plan Change 19 to the Christchurch City Council: Marshs Road Industrial
------------------	---

Statement of Evidence of Ryan Brosnahan for Christchurch International Airport Limited

9 October 2026

INTRODUCTION

- 1 My full name is Ryan Brosnahan. I am a Director and Senior Consultant at RMG Planning Limited, a planning consultant based in Christchurch. Prior to April 2026, I was employed as a Senior Consultant at Resource Management Group Limited, and before that as a Resource Consents Planner at Christchurch City Council.
- 2 I hold a Bachelor of Arts from the University of Canterbury, and a Master of Environmental Policy from Lincoln University. I am an intermediate member of the New Zealand Planning Institute and have over 11 years' experience in resource management in New Zealand.
- 3 I have been engaged by Christchurch International Airport Limited (CIAL) to provide planning evidence on Private Plan Change 19 (PC19), Marshs Road Industrial. My evidence addresses the bird strike implications of the proposed industrial rezoning. I also prepared CIAL's submission on PC19 and am authorised to present this evidence on its behalf.
- 4 In preparing this evidence, I have reviewed the following documents, to the extent relevant to Christchurch International Airport bird strike risk and the planning matters addressed in my evidence:
 - (a) CIAL's original submission on PC19;
 - (b) Avisure Memorandum dated 10 December 2025 (**Appendix One**).
 - (c) the Council's section 42A report and recommended provisions;
 - (d) the plan change proponent's planning and avifauna evidence dated 2 October 2026;
 - (e) the evidence of Dr Leigh Bull on behalf of CIAL;
 - (f) the Christchurch District Plan,
 - (g) the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS);
 - (h) the Partially Operative Selwyn District Plan (Appeals Version);
 - (i) the Partially Operative Waimakariri District Plan (Appeals Version); and
 - (j) the Independent Hearings Panel's Decision 57 on the Christchurch Replacement District Plan.

CODE OF CONDUCT

- 5 While this is not an Environment Court hearing I have read and agree to comply with the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses in the Environment Court Practice Note 2023. This evidence is within my area of expertise, except where I state that I am relying on material produced by another person. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express.

SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

- 6 The purpose of my evidence is to:
- (a) explain the outcomes sought by CIAL as set out in its submission on PC19;
 - (b) respond to the applicant's evidence and Council's section 42A report;
 - (c) assess the relevant regional and district planning framework for managing bird strike risk;
 - (d) consider the relevance of the earlier Independent Hearings Panel decision and the provisions in the Selwyn and Waimakariri district plans; and
 - (e) assess the planning merits of CIAL's proposed bird strike provisions under either Industrial Heavy or Industrial General zoning.
- 7 I rely on the evidence of Dr Leigh Bull in relation to bird species and behaviour, bird movements, the pathways by which activities enabled by PC19 may influence bird strike risk, and the effectiveness of the proposed controls. My evidence considers the planning implications of Dr Bull's conclusions and how those conclusions should be reflected in the PC19 provisions.

CIAL'S SUBMISSION

- 8 CIAL's submission is confined to the potential for PC19 to increase bird strike risk to aircraft operating at Christchurch International Airport. CIAL did not oppose the proposed industrial rezoning in principle. Rather, its concern was that the rezoning would enable a materially different range of activities from those anticipated by the Rural Urban Fringe Zone, including activities that may introduce food sources, organic waste, open water or other features capable of attracting birds.
- 9 At the time the submission was lodged, there was no assessment accompanying PC19 which addressed the bird strike implications of the activities that would be enabled by the proposed rezoning. CIAL submitted

that, once an activity is enabled as a permitted activity, there may be no subsequent opportunity under the District Plan to assess or manage its bird strike effects. CIAL therefore sought further specialist assessment before the zoning was confirmed.

- 10 The relief sought by CIAL was deliberately framed to respond to the outcome of that assessment. In addition to seeking further information, CIAL sought appropriate provisions to address any identified bird strike risk. The submission expressly contemplated limitations on specific bird-attracting activities, additional assessment requirements for particular land uses, or other plan mechanisms which would ensure that bird strike risk was identified and appropriately managed before those activities proceeded.
- 11 CIAL's submission was informed by a high-level bird strike review undertaken by Avisure Pty Ltd in December 2025 (**Appendix One**). Avisure identified a number of activities enabled by the proposed Industrial Heavy zoning that could attract birds where access to food sources was available. It also identified the potential for stormwater management and landscaping to create bird-attracting conditions. Avisure recommended that the potential for the rezoning to increase bird strike risk be further assessed through a Bird Hazard Assessment.

APPLICANT'S EVIDENCE AND COUNCIL'S S42A REPORT

- 12 Since CIAL lodged its submission, avifauna evidence has been prepared on behalf of the applicant by Ms Elizabeth Civil. Ms Civil concludes that the rezoning is unlikely, in itself, to increase the direct bird strike risk associated with birds using the PC19 site. However, she identifies a separate secondary bird strike pathway, whereby future development may provide food sources or opportunities for feeding, perching, roosting or congregation, resulting in repeated bird movements between the site and other habitat or feeding areas.¹
- 13 Importantly, Ms Civil does not conclude that all industrial activities create such a risk. She identifies that the potential for bird attraction varies according to the activity undertaken and the manner in which a site is designed and operated. In particular, she identifies activities involving food, waste or other bird-attracting resources, together with building and infrastructure features that provide opportunities for birds to perch or roost. She recommends that future development avoid conditions which support

¹ Statement of Evidence of Elizabeth Civil, 2 October 2026, at paragraphs 83–84 and 93–97.

regular or large aggregations of birds and that these matters be addressed through an appropriate planning mechanism.

- 14 In my opinion, Ms Civil's evidence substantially narrows the planning issue raised by CIAL's submission. The question is not whether industrial development of the PC19 land should be prevented because of bird strike risk, nor whether all industrial activity at this location requires additional regulation. Rather, the issue is whether those activities and development characteristics which are capable of creating the secondary risk pathway identified by Ms Civil should be subject to appropriate controls at the time the land is rezoned.
- 15 Mr Kim McCracken, in his planning evidence, considers that the existing District Plan framework is sufficient to manage bird strike risk. In reaching that view, he refers to the existing three-kilometre Bird Strike Management Area in the Christchurch District Plan, the likely reduction in open land as industrial development occurs, the predominantly indoor nature of industrial activities, and wastewater constraints affecting the site.² I accept that conversion of the land from its present rural use to a predominantly built industrial environment may reduce some existing bird habitat, and that many industrial activities do not inherently attract birds. Those matters are also reflected in Ms Civil's evidence.
- 16 However, in my opinion they do not resolve the specific issue identified through the avifauna evidence. Industrial zoning does not itself require potentially bird-attracting components of an activity to be enclosed, prevent accessible food or organic waste from being present outdoors, control opportunities for persistent bird congregation, or manage the potential for stormwater and other water bodies to create bird-attracting conditions. The relevant planning question is therefore not the typical character of industrial development, but whether the District Plan appropriately manages those particular activities and design outcomes which have been identified as capable of increasing bird strike risk.
- 17 The section 42A reporting officer considered CIAL's submission on the information then available and did not recommend additional bird strike provisions. However, he expressly recognised that his conclusion could be revisited should further evidence be provided³. That further evidence is now before the Panel. I address below the evidence of Dr Bull and, having

² Statement of Evidence of Kim McCracken, 2 October 2026, at paragraphs 139–143.

³ Section 42A Report, section 7.12.4–7.12.9.

regard to that evidence, whether additional provisions are warranted and, if so, their appropriate form.

EVIDENCE OF DR LEIGH BULL

- 18 I rely on the evidence of Dr Leigh Bull in relation to the avifauna matters relevant to bird strike risk. Dr Bull agrees with the material conclusions reached by Ms Civil, including that future activities, site design and operations enabled by PC19 have the potential to create bird-attracting resources or features and, in turn, a secondary bird strike pathway associated with persistent bird aggregation and movement.⁴
- 19 Dr Bull's evidence is that some activities permitted under the proposed Industrial General and Industrial Heavy zoning have the potential to increase bird strike risk. She considers that this risk can be reduced through planning provisions directed at those activities and we have collaboratively developed appropriate provisions⁵.
- 20 I rely on Dr Bull's conclusion that the proposed provisions provide an appropriate means of reducing the identified bird strike risk. My remaining evidence addresses the planning framework for those provisions and whether they represent an appropriate response to the effects of the rezoning.

REGIONAL AND DISTRICT POLICY DIRECTION

- 21 The planning framework relevant to bird strike risk operates at both regional and district level. The CRPS provides the higher-order direction for integrating land use with strategic infrastructure and protecting the safe and efficient operation of that infrastructure. The Christchurch District Plan gives more specific effect to that direction, including through objectives and policies that expressly address bird strike risk associated with Christchurch International Airport. I address those provisions below before considering the existing rule framework and its application to PC19.
- 22 The starting point is the CRPS, to which the District Plan, including any change to it, must give effect. Christchurch International Airport is expressly identified as strategic infrastructure and falls within the CRPS definition of regionally significant infrastructure.
- 23 Chapter 5 addresses land use and infrastructure across Canterbury. Objective 5.2.1 seeks development that is compatible with, and will result

⁴ Statement of Evidence of Dr Leigh Bull, 9 October 2026, at paragraphs 14–16.

⁵ Ibid, at paragraphs 16 and 18–19.

in the continued safe, efficient and effective use of regionally significant infrastructure; avoids adverse effects on that infrastructure where practicable; and avoids conflicts between incompatible activities. In my opinion, that direction is directly relevant to the bird strike issue raised by PC19.

- 24 Chapter 6 provides the more specific framework for Greater Christchurch. Objective 6.2.1 seeks to integrate strategic and other infrastructure with land use development and to achieve development that does not adversely affect the efficient operation, use, development, appropriate upgrading and future planning of strategic infrastructure and freight hubs.
- 25 That direction is developed through Policy 6.3.5, which seeks to maintain or enhance the operational effectiveness, viability and safety of existing and planned infrastructure; only provide for new development that does not affect the efficient operation, use, development, appropriate upgrading and safety of existing strategic infrastructure; and manage the effects of land use activities that may limit its efficient and effective provision, operation, maintenance or upgrade.
- 26 In my opinion, the Chapter 5 and Chapter 6 objectives and policies are consistent in their direction. Both recognise the importance of enabling development while ensuring that land use does not compromise the safe and efficient operation of significant infrastructure. In the context of PC19, where the technical evidence identifies a pathway by which newly enabled activities may increase bird strike risk, that policy direction supports managing the identified risk through appropriate land use provisions.
- 27 The Christchurch District Plan gives more specific expression to that regional direction. Objective 3.3.13 recognises and provides for the benefits of infrastructure, including strategic infrastructure, and seeks to enable its safe, efficient and effective development, upgrade, maintenance and operation. It also seeks to protect strategic infrastructure from incompatible development and activities. In relation to Christchurch International Airport specifically, clause (b)(iv) requires the risk of bird strike to aircraft using the Airport to be managed.
- 28 Chapter 6.7 then addresses aircraft protection. Objective 6.7.2.1 seeks to ensure that aircraft are able to safely and efficiently approach, land, take off and depart. Policy 6.7.2.1.2 directs the avoidance or mitigation of the potential effects of activities that could interfere with the safe navigation and control of aircraft, expressly including activities that could increase the possibility of bird strike.

- 29 There is also relevant direction within the Industrial chapter. Policy 16.2.1.3 recognises and provides for the different functions of the Industrial General and Industrial Heavy Zones, including a broad range of industrial activities. That enabling direction is, however, qualified by Policy 16.2.1.4(b), which seeks to avoid activities in industrial zones that have the potential to hinder or constrain the establishment, ongoing operation or development of strategic infrastructure. I therefore do not consider there to be any inherent conflict between providing additional industrial capacity through PC19 and appropriately managing activities within that area that may affect Airport operations.
- 30 The existing implementation of the bird strike policies is principally through Rule 6.7.4.3 and the Bird Strike Management Area, which extends three kilometres from the runway thresholds, together with wider controls applying to new landfills. PC19 is outside that mapped Bird Strike Management Area. That is relevant, but in my opinion, it is not determinative of the present plan change.
- 31 I distinguish in this respect between the policy direction and the existing method by which that policy is implemented. Neither Objective 3.3.13(b)(iv) nor Policy 6.7.2.1.2 confines the management of bird strike risk to land within three kilometres of the runway thresholds. The three-kilometre extent is a feature of the existing rule framework. Whether an additional method is justified for the PC19 land therefore depends on the evidence concerning the effects of this particular rezoning and the appropriateness of the response proposed.
- 32 In my opinion, the combined direction of the CRPS and District Plan is therefore to enable appropriate industrial development while ensuring that land use change does not compromise the safe and efficient operation of Christchurch International Airport. The policy framework does not, by itself, establish that additional controls are required at Marshs Road. That conclusion must be supported by the technical evidence. Where such a risk is established, however, the policy framework provides clear support for managing it through appropriate District Plan provisions.

CHRISTCHURCH REPLACEMENT DISTRICT PLAN & NEIGHBOURING DISTRICT PLANS

- 33 I have considered the Independent Hearings Panel's (IHP) Decision 57⁶ on the Christchurch Replacement District Plan because it provides the basis for the existing three-kilometre Bird Strike Management Area. I have also

⁶ Independent Hearings Panel, *Decision 57 – General Rules and Procedures (Part): Noise, Airport Matters and Hagley Park*, particularly at [443]–[469].

considered the more recent approaches adopted in Selwyn and Waimakariri, as those districts share the operational environment of Christchurch International Airport.

- 34 In Decision 57, the IHP considered controls extending to eight kilometres from the Airport but concluded that the evidence before it did not demonstrate sufficient risk-management benefit to justify that wider approach, other than in relation to landfills. The IHP therefore retained the three-kilometre framework and emphasised the need for controls to be supported by evidence relevant to the particular bird species, habitats and risks involved.
- 35 In my view, Decision 57 does not establish that bird strike effects cannot arise beyond three kilometres. Rather, it demonstrates that additional controls beyond the existing management area require an adequate evidential basis. PC19 presents a different planning question: it concerns a defined area of land approximately 5.8 km from the Airport and the effects of the additional activities enabled by a specific rezoning. The evidence of Ms Civil and Dr Bull is therefore central to whether further controls are justified in this case.
- 36 I have also considered the approaches now taken in the neighbouring Selwyn and Waimakariri districts. In the Partially Operative Selwyn District Plan (Appeals Version), Policy EI-P6B expressly requires the risk of bird strike to aircraft using Christchurch International Airport to be managed within an 8 km Bird Strike Risk Management Overlay for specified activities, including larger-scale earthworks, commercial food processing, public and community wastewater treatment and disposal facilities, meat and fish processing facilities, and waste and diverted material facilities. A wider 13 km overlay applies to landfill and mineral extraction activities.⁷
- 37 The Partially Operative Waimakariri District Plan (Appeals Version) has a similar activity-based approach. Its Bird Strike Risk Management Overlay is supported by rules that require resource consent for new or upgraded bird strike risk activities within the overlay. The associated definition identifies activities including waste management and composting facilities, fish and commercial food processing where food storage or waste is accessible to birds, abattoirs and freezing works, and wastewater treatment

⁷ Partially Operative Selwyn District Plan (Appeals Version), Policy EI-P6B; *Christchurch International Airport Ltd v Selwyn District Council* [2026] NZEnvC 104 at [16]–[19].

systems incorporating features such as wetlands, lagoons and infiltration basins.⁸

- 38 The effect of these approaches is that land within the wider operational environment of Christchurch International Airport in Selwyn and Waimakariri is now subject to targeted bird strike controls extending beyond three kilometres, while comparable land within Christchurch City outside the existing Bird Strike Management Area is not. In my opinion, this creates a gap in the wider cross-boundary management of bird strike risk. Plan changes that enable new urban or industrial activities within that area provide an appropriate opportunity to consider whether that gap should be addressed through site-specific provisions.
- 39 They do not determine the appropriate outcome for PC19, which must ultimately be justified by the evidence relating to this site and the activities enabled by the rezoning.

PROPOSED PROVISIONS

- 40 Having considered the policy framework and the technical evidence, I consider that a targeted, site-specific planning response is appropriate. The provisions I recommend are included in **Appendix Two** to my evidence. They are directed specifically at the bird strike effects associated with activities enabled by PC19, rather than seeking to alter the existing city-wide Bird Strike Management Area.
- 41 The provisions would identify the land rezoned by PC19 as a Marshs Road Bird Strike Management Area on the South West Hornby Outline Development Plan in Appendix 16.8.8(ii). The controls would apply only within that area. In my opinion, this provides a clear spatial relationship between the rezoning and the additional controls sought.
- 42 Alternative provisions have been prepared for the Industrial Heavy and Industrial General zoning outcomes. This is necessary because the range of activities enabled by the two zones differs. The Industrial Heavy provisions consequently address a broader range of potentially bird-attracting activities, while the Industrial General provisions are more limited. The appropriate version would be incorporated depending on the zoning ultimately determined by the Panel.
- 43 The approach is not to prohibit the identified activities. Rather, they may establish without consent where specified standards are met, including

⁸ Partially Operative Waimakariri District Plan (Appeals Version), Rule HIZ-R13, definition of *Bird Strike Risk Activity*, and Bird Strike Risk Management Overlay.

requirements directed at preventing birds from accessing food, animal products, organic waste and other potential attractants. Where those standards cannot be met, restricted discretionary activity status provides for the resulting bird strike risk and proposed mitigation to be assessed.

- 44 The provisions also address new stormwater basins and water bodies, including the existing District Plan thresholds and design standards intended to reduce their attractiveness to birds. Those standards draw on the approach in Rule 6.7.4.3, including requirements relating to the combined area of nearby stormwater basins and water bodies, drainage, ponding, planting, basin form and features capable of providing bird habitat or perching opportunities.⁹
- 45 In my opinion, the proposed approach appropriately responds to the evidence before the Panel. It is confined both geographically and in terms of the activities affected, while providing a clear consent pathway where the permitted activity standards cannot be achieved. Importantly, it addresses the particular secondary bird strike pathway identified in the avifauna evidence rather than imposing additional controls on industrial development generally.

CONCLUSION

- 46 CIAL does not oppose the industrial rezoning of the PC19 land in principle. The issue raised through its submission is whether the rezoning would enable activities or development features capable of increasing bird strike risk without an appropriate mechanism to manage that risk.
- 47 The avifauna evidence now before the Panel identifies a potential secondary bird strike pathway associated with future activities, site design and operations that provide food, waste, open water, roosting or other bird-attracting opportunities. In my opinion, the regional and district planning framework requires that identified risk to be appropriately managed so that the safe and efficient operation of Christchurch International Airport is not compromised.
- 48 I have had regard to Decision 57 and the existing three-kilometre Bird Strike Management Area. I do not consider either precludes a site-specific response beyond that area, where supported by evidence. The provisions proposed by CIAL are confined to the PC19 land and to those activities and development characteristics identified as having the potential to create bird-attracting conditions.

⁹ Christchurch District Plan, Rule 6.7.4.3.1 P3.

49 For those reasons, I support PC19 proceeding subject to the inclusion of the bird strike provisions set out in **Appendix Two** to my evidence. In my opinion, those provisions provide an appropriate and proportionate planning response to the effects of the rezoning while continuing to enable industrial development of the site.

Dated this 9th day of October 2026

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ryan Brosnahan', is written over a horizontal line.

Ryan Brosnahan

On behalf of Christchurch International Airport Limited

Memorandum

Name	Jesse Aimer
Company	Christchurch International Airport Limited
Date	10 December 2025
From	Phil Shaw (reviewed by Alexandra Stone)
Reference	Review of potential Birdstrike Risk for Private Plan Change 19 - Marshs Road Industrial
Project Number	Project Number 251006

Introduction

This memorandum has been prepared by Avisure Pty Ltd to provide a high level review of the bird hazards to aviation for the proposed rezoning of Marshs Road to Industrial Heavy Zone (IH). The site occupies 23 hectares generally at the intersection of Marshs Road and the Main South Road (SHNo1), Hornby.

We reviewed notification documents that we believed to be relevant to the development application and birdstrike risk to aircraft operating at and in the vicinity of Christchurch International Airport (CIA). This includes but is not limited to, the Request and Section 32 Evaluation, Annexures A to K inclusive, and the Public Notice Dated 21st November 2025¹.

Legislation and guidance

The site is approximately 6.2km from the nearest active runway at CIA and is therefore beyond the 3km Birdstrike Management Area as defined under the Christchurch District Plan. However, as determined by the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO)², best practice is to examine land use that could affect birdstrike risk up to at least 13km from an aerodrome. The New Zealand Civil Aviation Authority³ advises aerodrome operators to work with local authorities where activities near aerodromes are likely to influence bird populations that could be hazardous to air transportation.

The rezoning and bird strike risk

The proposed rezoning does not provide detail on the activities that will occur at the site. Potential uses for Heavy Industrial Activity as defined under the Christchurch District Plan, include:

- blood or offal treating; bone boiling or crushing; dag crushing; fellmongering; fish cleaning or curing; gut scraping and treating; and tallow melting;*
- flax pulping; flock manufacture or teasing of textile materials for any purpose; and wood pulping;*

¹ Site accessed 09/12/2025: <https://letstalk.ccc.govt.nz/PC19>

² ICAO Doc 9137 Airport Services Manual, Part 3 – Wildlife Hazard Management Fifth Edition, 2020.

³ CAA of New Zealand Advisory Circular 139.C-16, November 2025.

3. *storage and disposal of sewage, septic tank sludge or refuse;*
4. *slaughtering of animals; storage, drying or preserving of bones, hides, hoofs or skins; tanning; and wool scouring;*
5. *the burning of waste oil in the open air or in any combustion processes involving fuel-burning equipment;*
6. *any other processes involving fuel-burning equipment, which individually or in combination with other equipment, have a fuel-burning rate of up to 1000 kg/hr;*
7. *the open burning of coated or covered metal cable or wire, including metal coated or covered with varnish, lacquers, plastic or rubber;*
8. *any activity with the potential to discharge asbestos to air, including the removal or disposal of friable asbestos, except where it complies with the [Health and Safety in Employment \(Asbestos\) Regulations 1998](#) and is supervised and monitored by Occupational Safety and Health staff;*
9. *burning out of the residual content of metal containers used for the transport or storage of chemicals;*
10. *the burning of municipal, commercial or industrial wastes, whether by open fire or the use of incinerators for disposal of waste;*
11. *any industrial wood pulp process in which wood or other cellulose material is cooked with chemical solutions to dissolve lining, and the associated processes of bleaching and chemical and by-product recovery; and*
12. *crematoriums and embalming services.*

Several of these uses could be attractive to birds, including species that are known to be hazardous to air traffic at CIA. Where access is available to a potential food source, the following activities could be particularly bird attracting: *blood or offal treating; bone boiling or crushing; dag crushing; fellmongering; fish cleaning or curing; gut scraping and treating; and tallow melting; storage and disposal of sewage, septic tank sludge or refuse; and, slaughtering of animals; storage, drying or preserving of bones, hides, hoofs or skins; tanning; and wool scouring.*

In addition, the site as a whole and individual sites may be subject to stormwater management that leave open water which could become attractive to birds. Landscaping also has the potential to allow roosts to form and/or provide food, nesting and sheltering areas for birds.

Conclusion

Based on our review of the proposed rezoning, we consider the applicant should address the potential for the rezoning to increase the risk of birdstrike. Given the proximity to the CIA and nature of the potential uses, as well as the stormwater management and landscaping that may be incorporated into the site, the applicant should prepare a Bird Hazard Assessment which identifies potential bird hazards and recommends how they should be addressed.

Chapter 16 Industrial

16.2 Objectives and Policies

No amendment to existing objectives and policies appears necessary. Policy 16.2.1.4(b) addresses activities that could constrain strategic infrastructure, and Objective 6.7.2.1 and Policy 6.7.2.1.2 address aircraft safety and bird strike. The consent pathway remains consistent with Policy 16.2.1.3.

Appendix 16.8.8 South West Hornby Industrial Area

Amend the main ODP and Appendix 16.8.8(ii) to show the land subject to the below provisions with a distinct boundary and legend entry labelled “Marshs Road Bird Strike Management Area”. The area should cover land rezoned industrial by PPC19, excluding any frontage land retained as Rural Urban Fringe. The map identifies where the Chapter 16 rules apply; their activity controls need not be repeated on the ODP.

16.5.4.1 Area-specific activities - Industrial Heavy Zone (South West Hornby)

16.5.4.1.1 Area-specific permitted activities

Activity		Activity specific standards
P4	Within the Marshs Road Bird Strike Management Area identified on the outline development plan in Appendix 16.8.8(ii), any of the following activities: a) waste management facilities and composting facilities; b) blood or offal treating; bone boiling or crushing; dag crushing; fellmongering; fish cleaning or curing; gut scraping and treating; or tallow melting; c) storage or disposal of sewage, septic tank sludge or refuse; d) slaughtering of animals, abattoirs or freezing works; e) fish or commercial food processing; f) poultry hatcheries; and g) manufacture, processing, bulk storage or distribution of animal feed.	a. All receipt, unloading, storage, processing, loading and disposal of food, animal feed, animal by-products and waste associated with the activity takes place within enclosed buildings. b. There is no disposal of effluent onto land associated with the plant or works.
P5	Within the Marshs Road Bird Strike Management Area identified on the outline development plan in Appendix 16.8.8(ii), any of the following activities: a) Creation of a new: i. stormwater basin; or	a. The combined area of all stormwater basins and/or water bodies, that are wholly or partly within 0.5km of the proposed water body or stormwater basin's edge, shall not exceed 1000m².

	ii. water body (including wastewater oxidation pond) which exceeds 500m² in area.	b. Any stormwater basin has been designed by a suitably qualified person, with experience in stormwater management systems, to the following standards: i. Stormwater infiltration basins shall be designed to fully drain within 48 hours of the cessation of a 2% AEP storm event; ii. Sufficient rapid soakage overflow capacity shall be provided to minimise any ponding of stormwater outside the infiltration area(s); and iii. Plant species used shall be limited to those listed in Appendix 6.11.9. c. Any water body has been designed by a suitably qualified person, with experience in stormwater management systems, to the following standards: i. Side slopes shall be at least as steep as 1H:4V except for: A. any side slope treated with rock armouring; or B. any area required for vehicle access, provided that such access has a gradient of at least 8H:1V: ii. No permanent island features shall be included, that could provide perching sites for birds; and iii. Plant species used shall be limited to those listed in Appendix 6.11.9.
--	---	--

16.5.4.1.3 Area-specific restricted discretionary activities

Activity		The Council's discretion shall be limited to the following matters:
RD7	Any activity listed in Rule 16.5.4.1.1 P4 or P5 that does not meet one or more of the activity specific standards.	a. Scale and significance of bird strike risk likely to be created at the location proposed. b. Mitigation of bird strike risk including by design measures, operation or management procedures, direct intervention practices and monitoring

OR IF THE INDUSTRIAL GENERAL ZONING IS THE PREFERRED ZONING.

16.4.9 Area-specific rules - Industrial General Zone (South West Hornby)

16.4.9.1.1 Area-specific permitted activities

Activity		Activity specific standards
P3	Within the Marshs Road Bird Strike Management Area identified on the outline development plan in Appendix 16.8.8(ii), any of the following activities: a) manufacture, processing, bulk storage or distribution of animal feed; and b) fish or commercial food processing;	a. All receipt, unloading, storage, processing, loading and disposal of food, animal feed, animal by-products and waste associated with the activity takes place within enclosed buildings. b. There is no disposal of effluent onto land associated with the plant or works.
P4	Within the Marshs Road Bird Strike Management Area identified on the outline development plan in Appendix 16.8.8(ii), any of the following activities: a) Creation of a new: i. stormwater basin; or ii. water body (including wastewater oxidation pond) which exceeds 500m² in area.	a. The combined area of all stormwater basins and/or water bodies, that are wholly or partly within 0.5km of the proposed water body or stormwater basin's edge, shall not exceed 1000m². b. Any stormwater basin has been designed by a suitably qualified person, with experience in stormwater management systems, to the following standards:

		i. Stormwater infiltration basins shall be designed to fully drain within 48 hours of the cessation of a 2% AEP storm event; ii. Sufficient rapid soakage overflow capacity shall be provided to minimise any ponding of stormwater outside the infiltration area(s); and iii. Plant species used shall be limited to those listed in Appendix 6.11.9. c. Any water body has been designed by a suitably qualified person, with experience in stormwater management systems, to the following standards: i. Side slopes shall be at least as steep as 1H:4V except for: C. any side slope treated with rock armouring; or D. any area required for vehicle access, provided that such access has a gradient of at least 8H:1V: ii. No permanent island features shall be included, that could provide perching sites for birds; and iii. Plant species used shall be limited to those listed in Appendix 6.11.9.
--	--	---

16.4.9.1.3 Area-specific restricted discretionary activities

Activity		The Council's discretion shall be limited to the following matters:
RD2	Any activity listed in Rule 16.4.9.1.1 P3 or P4 that does not meet one or more of the activity specific standards.	a. Scale and significance of bird strike risk likely to be created at the location proposed.

		b. Mitigation of bird strike risk including by design measures, operation or management procedures, direct intervention practices and monitoring
--	--	--