



FURTHER SUBMISSION IN SUPPORT OF, OR IN OPPOSITION TO, A SUBMISSION ON NPDC'S NOTIFIED PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN

Clause 8 of Schedule 1 Resource Management Act 1991

To: New Plymouth District Council
Address: Private Bag 2025, New Plymouth 4342
Email: districtplan@npdc.govt.nz

Further Submitter Details

Name of further submitter: Omata Tank Farm Operators

Contact person (if different from above) Cam Twigley

Postal address: BTW Company Ltd

Email address for service: cam.twigley@btw.nz

Phone number: 0274544886

The Council will serve all formal documents by email. Where there is no email address provided, the documents will be posted to the postal address stated above.

I am: (please tick relevant box)

- a) 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
- b) A person who has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest of the general public.
(In this case, also explain the grounds for saying that you come within this category); or
- c) The local authority for the relevant area.

Please state the grounds as to why you come within the category selected above:

Council Hearing (please tick relevant box)

Do you wish to be heard in support of your further submission? Yes No

If others make a similar submission would you consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing? Yes No

Submission

The submission points, support or opposition, reasons and decisions sought are set out in the attached document.

Note: Any attachments to your submission should only be supporting information, not the submission.

Signature of the person making further submission

17/08/2020
Date

or the person authorised to sign on behalf of the person making further submission

Name of Further Submitter Omata Tank Farm Operators

My specific further submission(s) are as follows:

(Please only insert one further submission point per line. Add further sheets as required)

I support/oppose the submission of: <i>(State the submission no., name and address of the person making the original submission)</i>	The particular part of the submission I support/oppose are: <i>(State the Submission No./Point no. of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal)</i>			The reasons for my support / opposition are: <i>(State the nature of your further submission, giving reasons)</i>	I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed / disallowed: <i>(Give precise details of the decision you want the Council to make)</i>
Department of Conservation	550.9	Oppose in part	Definition Petroleum Production	Agree that petroleum production should have its own definition but retaining the definition as notified would not clearly provide for petroleum storage within the definition.	Part of submission is disallowed
Greymouth Petroleum	548.12	Support	Definition Petroleum Production	Agree that specifically providing for petroleum storage within the definition provides more clarity that storage is part of petroleum production.	Whole submission is allowed
OMV NZ Ltd	573.6	Support	Definition Petroleum Production	Agree that specifically providing for petroleum storage within the definition provides more clarity that storage is part of petroleum production.	Whole submission is allowed
Greymouth Petroleum Ltd	548.97	Support	MFZ -01-03	Agree that Objectives as drafted recognise the important contribution major facilities make to the economic and social wellbeing of the community	Whole submission is allowed
OMV NZ Ltd	573.83	Support	MFZ – 01-04	Agree that Objectives as drafted recognise the important contribution major facilities make to the economic and social wellbeing of the community	Whole submission is allowed

I support/oppose the submission of: <i>(State the submission no., name and address of the person making the original submission)</i>	The particular part of the submission I support/oppose are: <i>(State the Submission No./Point no. of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal)</i>			The reasons for my support / opposition are: <i>(State the nature of your further submission, giving reasons)</i>	I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed / disallowed: <i>(Give precise details of the decision you want the Council to make)</i>
OMV NZ Ltd	573.84	Support	MFZ Objectives	Agree that Omata Tank Farm should be identified as a Major Facility Zone	Whole submission is allowed
Te Kotahitanga o Te Atiawa Trust	459.350b	Oppose	MFZ Objectives	It is unclear what consequential changes the submitter wants and how they might impact on the Omata Tank Farm Operators	Whole submission is disallowed
Todd Generation Ltd	521.34	Support	MFZ Objectives	Agree that Objectives as drafted recognise the important contribution major facilities make to the economic and social wellbeing of the community	Whole submission is allowed
Climate Justice Taranaki	311.70	Oppose	MFZ – 01	Do not support removal of 'social wellbeing' as the economic contributions the activities within Omata Tank Farm contribute have a positive impact on the social wellbeing of the nation, region and district as well.	Part of the submission is disallowed
The Oil Companies	551.154	Support	MFZ – 01	Agree that Objectives as drafted recognise the important contribution major facilities make to the economic and social wellbeing of the community	Whole submission is allowed
Climate Justice Taranaki	311.95	Oppose	MFZ-03	Do not support removal of 'social wellbeing' as the economic contributions the activities within Omata Tank Farm contribute have a positive impact on the social wellbeing of the nation, region and district as well. The harmful effects on	Whole submission is disallowed

I support/oppose the submission of: <i>(State the submission no., name and address of the person making the original submission)</i>	The particular part of the submission I support/oppose are: <i>(State the Submission No./Point no. of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal)</i>			The reasons for my support / opposition are: <i>(State the nature of your further submission, giving reasons)</i>	I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed / disallowed: <i>(Give precise details of the decision you want the Council to make)</i>
				human health stated by the submitter are unsubstantiated.	
Ngati Rahiri Hapū o Te Atiawa	503.22	Oppose	MFZ-P5	While OMV support operators of Major Facility Zones having to mitigate odour emissions they do not support the addition of the effects of smell to the policy. Odour emissions are the jurisdiction of the regional council and there is no justification for containing all and any effects within the boundaries of Major Facility Zones particularly when there are existing consents in place that allow for effects outside the boundaries of the site.	Whole submission is disallowed
PEPANZ	539.17	Support	MFZ-P6	Support deleting point 7 of policy as the MFZ's are typically hazardous facilities that should not be required to provide public access to the coast and/or any waterbodies.	Part of submission is allowed
Te Kotahitanga o Te Atiawa Trust	459.350c	Oppose	MFZ-P6	It is unclear what consequential changes the submitter wants and how they might impact on the Omata Tank Farm Operators	Whole submission is disallowed
Te Kotahitanga o Te Atiawa Trust	459.350d	Oppose	MFZ-P7	It is unclear what consequential changes the submitter wants and how they might impact on the Omata Tank Farm Operators	Whole submission is disallowed

I support/oppose the submission of: <i>(State the submission no., name and address of the person making the original submission)</i>	The particular part of the submission I support/oppose are: <i>(State the Submission No./Point no. of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal)</i>			The reasons for my support / opposition are: <i>(State the nature of your further submission, giving reasons)</i>	I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed / disallowed: <i>(Give precise details of the decision you want the Council to make)</i>
The Oil Companies	551.164	Support	MFZ-P8	Agree that reverse sensitivity effects should be avoided rather than minimised given the importance and significance of the activities within the Major Facility Zones	Whole submission is allowed
NPDC	582.68	Oppose	MFZ/PREC8 – Figure 95 - Omata	No detail provided on what changes to the Precinct Plan are proposed and how this change might affect the Omata Tank Farm Operators existing and potential future development.	Whole submission is disallowed
Methanex	509.6	Support	MFZ-R3	Agree that addition to the rule will provide clarity for the removal of structures in all cases as a permitted activity	Whole submission is allowed
The Oil Companies	551.169	Support	MFZ-R3	Agree that clause 2 is unnecessary and can be deleted	Whole submission is allowed
Taranaki Energy Watch	543.10a	Oppose in Part	HAZS/Overview	It is unclear what specific changes to the Proposed District Plan the submitter is requesting. Submitter is requested to provide further information.	Part of the submission is disallowed
OMV NZ Ltd	573.43	Support	HAZS-P1	Agree that Non-District Plan layer is an appropriate mechanism for managing and communicating risk	Whole submission is allowed

I support/oppose the submission of: <i>(State the submission no., name and address of the person making the original submission)</i>	The particular part of the submission I support/oppose are: <i>(State the Submission No./Point no. of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal)</i>			The reasons for my support / opposition are: <i>(State the nature of your further submission, giving reasons)</i>	I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed / disallowed: <i>(Give precise details of the decision you want the Council to make)</i>
OMV NZ Ltd	573.42	Support	HAZS-P3	Agree that Non-District Plan layer is an appropriate mechanism for managing and communicating risk	Whole submission is allowed
OMV NZ Ltd	573.54	Support	HAZS-P4	Agree that Non-District Plan layer is an appropriate mechanism for managing and communicating risk	Whole submission is allowed
OMV NZ Ltd	573.44	Support	HAZS-P5	Agree that Non-District Plan layer is an appropriate mechanism for managing and communicating risk	Whole submission is allowed
OMV NZ Ltd	573.47	Support	HAZS-R1	Agree that Non-District Plan layer is an appropriate mechanism for managing and communicating risk	Whole submission is allowed
OMV NZ Ltd	573.45	Support	HAZS-R11	Agree that Non-District Plan layer is an appropriate mechanism for managing and communicating risk	Whole submission is allowed
OMV NZ Ltd	573.46	Support	HAZS-R12	Agree that Non-District Plan layer is an appropriate mechanism for managing and communicating risk	Whole submission is allowed

I support/oppose the submission of: <i>(State the submission no., name and address of the person making the original submission)</i>	The particular part of the submission I support/oppose are: <i>(State the Submission No./Point no. of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal)</i>			The reasons for my support / opposition are: <i>(State the nature of your further submission, giving reasons)</i>	I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed / disallowed: <i>(Give precise details of the decision you want the Council to make)</i>
Horticulture NZ	457.39	Support	NOISE-S1	Agree that using the notional boundary as a measurement point for noise for receiving sites within the Rural Production Zone is more practical and will provide clarity.	Whole submission is allowed
Marshall Day Acoustics	176.1a	Support	NOISE-S1	Agree that using two measurements for measuring noise for receiving sites in the Rural Production Zone does not represent best practice.	Whole submission is allowed
OMV NZ Ltd	573.61	Support	NOISE-S1	Agree that using the notional boundary measurement point as the sole measurement point for receiving sites in the Rural Production Zone is the most practical approach.	Whole submission is allowed
PEPANZ	539.11	Support	NOISE-S1	Agree that night time noise limit of 45dBA measured at the notional boundary is an appropriate noise limit and a practical measurement point	Whole submission is allowed
PEPANZ	539.13	Support	NOISE-S1	Agree that using the notional boundary measurement point as the sole measurement point for receiving sites in the Rural Production Zone is the most practical approach.	Whole submission is allowed

I support/oppose the submission of: <i>(State the submission no., name and address of the person making the original submission)</i>	The particular part of the submission I support/oppose are: <i>(State the Submission No./Point no. of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal)</i>			The reasons for my support / opposition are: <i>(State the nature of your further submission, giving reasons)</i>	I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed / disallowed: <i>(Give precise details of the decision you want the Council to make)</i>
PEPANZ	539.3	Support	NOISE-S1	Agree that using the notional boundary measurement point as the sole measurement point for receiving sites in the Rural Production Zone is the most practical approach.	Whole submission is allowed
Todd Energy Ltd	511.17	Support	NOISE-S1	Agree that 45dBA night time noise limit at the notional boundary is an appropriate noise limit for receiving sites in the Rural Production Zone and there is no basis for reducing the permitted limit by 2.5 times.	Whole submission is allowed
Todd Generation Ltd	521.41	Support	NOISE-S1	Agree that the proposed 40dBA night time noise limit at the notional boundary does not provide for existing rural based industry activities that have to operate during night hours.	Whole submission is allowed
The Oil Companies	551.82a	Support	Planning Maps	Agree that the coastal environment overlay boundary is inconsistent and should be aligned with Centennial Drive	Whole submission is allowed

Note to Further Submitter

This further submission on the Proposed District Plan must be received by the New Plymouth District Council by **5pm on Tuesday 25 August 2020**.

To get your further submission to us, either:

Post to: New Plymouth District Council, Reply Paid DX, DX Box NX10026, New Plymouth.

Attention: District Planning Team

Deliver to: Civic Centre, Liardet Street, New Plymouth
or to library and service centres at Bell Block, Inglewood or Waitara

Email to: districtplan@npdc.govt.nz

Visit our website: newplymouthnz.com/eplan

A copy of your further submission MUST be served on the original submitter within 5 working days after it is served on the local authority. Contact details for all submitters can be found on our Proposed Plan page at newplymouthnz.com/eplan.

Please note all information provided in your submission, including your personal information, will be made publicly available.

Your submission (or part of it) may be struck out if the authority is satisfied that at least 1 of the following applies to the submission (or part of it):

- 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.