



# **Proposed Timaru District Plan**

## **Section 42A Report: Rural Zones**

### **Report on submissions and further submissions**

**Author: Andrew Maclellan**

**Date: 19 June 2024**

## Contents

List of Submitters and Further Submitters Addressed in this Report:.....	5
Abbreviations Used in this Report: .....	8
1. Introduction .....	9
1.1 Experience and Qualifications.....	9
1.2 Purpose and Scope of this Report.....	9
1.3 Procedural Matters .....	11
2. Topic Overview .....	11
2.1 Summary of Relevant Provisions of the PDP .....	11
2.2 Background to Relevant Provisions .....	12
3. Overview of Submission and Further Submissions.....	14
4. Relevant Statutory Provisions.....	16
5. Statutory Instruments.....	17
5.2 National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL).....	17
5.3 National Planning Standards (NPS).....	17
5.4 Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (RPS).....	17
6. Analysis and Evaluation of Submissions .....	18
6.1 Approach to Analysis.....	18
7. Definitions.....	20
7.1 Introduction .....	20
7.2 Cultivation .....	20
7.3 Land-based primary production .....	21
7.4 Primary production .....	21
7.5 Rural residential development.....	28
7.6 Residential visitor accommodation.....	29
8. General Themes .....	30
8.1 FENZ submission .....	30
8.2 ECan submission .....	38
8.3 Waka Kotahi submission .....	39
8.4 Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu submission .....	41
8.5 Transpower submission .....	43
8.6 KiwiRail submission.....	43
8.7 Ministry of Education submission.....	44
8.8 TDC Submission – Wildfire risk .....	52
8.9 Gravel extraction overlay.....	56
9. General matters .....	57
9.1 General provisions for primary production .....	57
9.2 General provisions for reverse sensitivity.....	58

9.3	General provisions for height .....	59
9.4	General provisions for floor area .....	61
10.	General Rural Zone .....	63
10.1	Provisions where no change is sought.....	63
10.2	Objective GRUZ-O1 .....	63
10.3	Objective GRUZ-O2 – Character and qualities of the General Rural Zone .....	65
10.4	Objective GRUZ-O3 – Protecting primary production .....	69
10.5	Objective GRUZ-O4 – Protecting sensitive activities and sensitive zones .....	73
10.6	Objective GRUZ-O5 – Mining and quarrying.....	76
10.7	GRUZ-P1 – Primary production activities.....	78
10.8	GRUZ-P2 – Character and qualities of the General Rural Zone .....	81
10.9	GRUZ-P5 – Protecting primary production .....	82
10.10	GRUZ-P6 – Mining and quarrying activities .....	85
10.11	GRUZ-P7 – Industrial activities, rural industries and other activities .....	87
10.12	GRUZ-P8 – Residential activities (not including workers accommodation listed in GRUZ-P9).....	88
10.13	GRUZ-P9 – Workers accommodation .....	89
10.14	New policy - Private property rights .....	91
10.15	Rule GRUZ-R1 – Primary production and intensive primary production, not otherwise listed in this chapter .....	92
10.16	Rule GRUZ-R2 – Pig production for domestic self-subsistence home use.....	94
10.17	Rule GRUZ-R3 – Keeping of poultry for domestic self-subsistence home use.....	97
10.18	Rule GRUZ-R4 – Residential units, excluding seasonal workers accommodation and permanent workers accommodation.....	99
10.19	Rule GRUZ-R7 – Educational facilities.....	104
10.20	Rule GRUZ-R8 – Supported residential care activity.....	105
10.21	Rule GRUZ-R9 – Residential visitor accommodation .....	106
10.22	Rule GRUZ-R10 – Conservation activities .....	107
10.23	Rule GRUZ-R11 – Recreation activities .....	109
10.24	Rule GRUZ-R12 – Rural produce retail.....	111
10.25	GRUZ-R14 – Use of airstrips and helicopter landing sites .....	112
10.26	Rule GRUZ-R15 – Shelterbelts.....	123
10.27	Rule GRUZ-R16 – Quarries and quarrying activities (including the definition of quarry and quarrying activities):.....	125
10.28	Rule GRUZ-R18 – Artificial crop protection structures .....	131
10.29	Rule GRUZ-R19 – Seasonal workers accommodation.....	134
10.30	Rule GRUZ-R20 – Permanent workers accommodation .....	138
10.31	Rule GRUZ-R21 – Rural industry.....	142
10.32	Rule GRUZ-R23 – Expansion of existing consented quarries .....	145

10.33	Rule GRUZ-R29 – New Industrial activities not listed in GRUZ-21 .....	149
10.34	GRUZ - New Rural Contractor Depot rule .....	150
10.35	Standard GRUZ-S1 – Height of buildings and structures .....	150
10.36	Standard GRUZ-S3 – Boundary setbacks for buildings and structures .....	152
10.37	Standard GRUZ-S4 – Setbacks for sensitive activities .....	153
10.38	Standard GRUZ-S5 – Intensive primary production activities and new farm effluent disposal areas .....	158
10.39	GRUZ – new standards .....	159
11.	Rural Lifestyle Zone .....	160
11.1	Provisions where no change is sought .....	160
11.2	Objective RLZ-O2 – Character and qualities of the Rural Lifestyle Zone .....	160
11.3	Rule RLZ-R2 – Residential units and minor residential units .....	163
11.4	Rule RLZ-R5 – Keeping of poultry for domestic self-subsistence home use .....	166
11.5	Standard RLZ-S5 – Boundary treatment styles .....	167
	Standard RLZ-S9 – Water supply .....	168
11.6	Rezoning Submissions .....	168
11.7	Brookfield Road specific control area .....	170
11.8	Shaw and Hislop Streets Road specific control area .....	171
12.	Settlement Zone .....	172
12.1	Provisions where no changes are sought .....	172
12.2	Standard SETZ-S4 – Coverage .....	173
12.3	Standard SETZ-S6 – Sewerage treatment and disposal .....	173
12.4	Outdoor storage, display and parking areas .....	174
13.	Re-zoning requests .....	175
13.1	Waihi School .....	175
13.2	Fonterra Submission - Clandeboye site .....	182
13.3	Blandswood rezoning request .....	187
13.4	Other re-zoning requests .....	192
14.	Appendix 1 – Changes Recommended to Provisions .....	195
15.	Appendix 2 - Recommended Responses to Submissions .....	242
15.1	Table B1- Rural Definitions .....	242
15.2	General Rural Zone .....	253
15.3	Rural Lifestyle Zone .....	331
15.4	Settlement Zone .....	343
15.5	Rezone & Mapping .....	350
16.	Appendix 3 – Waihi School further information .....	357

## Appendices

Appendix 1 – Changes Recommended to Provisions

Appendix 2 – Recommended Responses to Submissions

Appendix 3 – Waihi School further information

## List of Submitters and Further Submitters Addressed in this Report:

### Original Submitters

Submitter Ref	Submitter Name	Abbreviation
1	Graeme Clarke	Clarke, G
3	Joanne Hanifin	Hanifin, J
7	Lifestyle Builds Ltd	Lifestyle Builds
10	John McKenzie	McKenzie, J
13	David George Earl and Maria Lucia	Earl and Lucia
35	Pye Group Ltd, Dialan Dairy Ltd, Grantlea Dairy Ltd, South Park Farm Ltd, South Stream Dairy Ltd	Pye Group
37	Bruce Eggleton	Eggleton, B
39	Ian Sinclair	Sinclair, I
41	Maze Pastures Limited	Maze Pastures
42	Timaru District Council	TDC
45	John Evans	Evans, J
46	Keen Oliver Forbes et al	Keen et al
53	Helicopters South Canterbury 2015 Limited	Helicopters Sth Cant.
57	Sid McAuley	McAuley, S
59	Louise Aubrey	Aubrey, L
60	Milward Finlay Lobb	MFL
61	Station Air Ltd	Station Air
64	Simon Pemberton	Pemberton, S
66	Bruce Speirs	Speirs, B
74	H B	H, B
79	Jeremy Talbot	Talbot, J
86	Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited	Ballance
87	Agnes Baekelandt	Baekelandt, A
88	Anna Morten	Morten, A
89	Dairy Holdings Limited	Dairy Holdings
94	Port Blakely Limited	Port Blakely
103	Joseph John McKenzie and Catherine Bo Choung	McKenzie and Choung
106	Minister / Ministry of Education	MoE
118	Judith Margaret Coldicott	Coldicott, J. M.

120	Leslie Raymond Rawlings	Rawlings, L. R.
121	Robert Whitham	Whitham, R
125	Russell Kenneth Brodie	Brodie, R. K.
126	Amy Alison	Alison, A
127	Nicolas John Twaddle	Twaddle, N. J
128	Warren and Elizabeth Scott	Scott, W and E
131	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	FENZ
132	New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association	NZAAA
134	New Zealand Motor Caravan Association (Inc.)	NZMCA
152	Radio New Zealand Limited	Radio NZ
153	Kenneth James Weavers	Weavers, K. J.
156	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	Forest and Bird
159	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Transpower
162	EnviroWaste Services Ltd	Enviro NZ
166	Penny Nelson Director-General of Conservation Tumuaki Ahurei	Dir. General Conservation
169	Road Metals Company Limited	Road Metals
170	Fulton Hogan Limited	Fulton Hogan
171	Fenlea Farms Limited	Fenlea Farms
172	Silver Fern Farms	Silver Fern Farms
173	Alliance Group Limited	Alliance Group
174	Rooney Holdings Limited	Rooney Holdings
177	Alastair Joseph Rooney	Rooney, A. J.
178	Rural Contractors New Zealand	Rural Contractors
179	Barkers Fruit Processors Limited	Barkers
180	Malpati Regenvanu	Regenvanu, M
182	Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc.	Federated Farmers
183	Environment Canterbury / Canterbury Regional Council	ECan
185	Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu	Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu
191	GJH Rooney	Rooney, G.J.H.
197	K J Rooney Limited	K J. Rooney Ltd
198	Bernard John O'Keefe Joy Ellen Maud O'Keefe Alan Leslie Stout & Brian Adrian Vogel	O'Keefe, S. and V.
201	Cessna 180/185 Group Aircraft owners & Pilots Association Sports Aircraft Association Recreational Backcountry Pilots Association	Cessna 180/185 Group et al
207	Simmons Trustee Company Limited	Simmons Trustee
218	David Walter & Charlotte Marie Hussey	Walter and Hussey
224	Aggregate and Quarry Association	AQA
236	Waihi School Trust Board	Waihi School
239	Ara Poutama Aotearoa The Department of Corrections	Dept. Corrections
241	J R Livestock Limited	J R Livestock
245	Horticulture New Zealand	Hort NZ
247	NZ Pork Industry Board	NZ Pork
249	Rooney Group Limited	Rooney Group
250	Rooney Farms Limited	Rooney Farms
251	Rooney Earthmoving Limited	Rooney Earthmoving

252	Timaru Developments Limited	TDL
254	Grant Coldicott	Coldicott, G
255	NZ Frost Fans Limited	NZ Frost Fans

**Original submitters partly considered within this report and deferred to another report**

Submission point no.	Submitter Name	Abbreviation	Deferred report
8	Aaron Carson	Carson, J	Open Space Zone
9	Rachel Smith	Smith, R	Open Space Zone
24	Mike Lamb	Lamb, M	Open Space Zone
67	Scott Jesen	Jesen, S	Open Space Zone
69	Ruth Melrose	Melrose, R	Open Space Zone
71	Graham John and Kathleen Veronica Collins	Collins, G J and K V	Open Space Zone
75	Miriam Jowett	Jowett, M	Open Space Zone
77	Luke Challies and Elizabeth Ireland	Challies and Ireland	Open Space Zone
93	Catharina Treeby	Treeby, C	Open Space Zone
96	Ali Bras	Bras, A	Open Space Zone
102	David Stanley Woods	Woods, D	Open Space Zone
110	Gordon & Jillian Ireland	Ireland, G and J	Open Space Zone
111	Hamish Laird	Laird, H	Open Space Zone
123	Elizabeth Jane Small and Roger Ellis Buchanan	Buchanan and Small	Open Space Zone
141	David William & Siobhan Mary Collins	Collins, D W and S M	Open Space Zone
144	Gregory Andrew and Vivienne Louise Wilkinson	Wilkinson, G A and V L	Open Space Zone
154	Christian Bras	Bras, C	Open Space Zone
195	Graham and Sharon Melrose	Melrose, G and S	Open Space Zone
232	Peter Bras	Bras. P	Open Space Zone
255.28	NZ Frost Fans Limited	NZ Frost Fans	Noise chapter
185.106, 185.107, 185.108, 185.109, 185.110	Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu	Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu	SASM

**Further Submitters**

Submitter Ref	Further Submitter Name	Abbreviation
11	Gerald Morton	Morton, G
27	Holly Renee Singline and RSM Trust Limited	Singline and RSM Trust
30	Chris & Sharon Mcknight	McKnight, C and S
33	Ford, Pyke, Andrews Talbot, Wilkins & Proudfoot, Craig, Mackenzie	Ford et al
45	John Evans	Evans, J
57	Sid McAuley	McAuley, S
60	Milward Finlay Lobb	MFL

89	Dairy Holdings Limited	Dairy Holdings
90	Hermann Frank	Frank, H
132	New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association	NZAAA
143	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Waka Kotahi
152	Radio New Zealand	Radio NZ
156	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	Forest and Bird
159	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Transpower
160	David Alexander & Susanne Elizabeth Payne	Payne, D A and S E
165	Fonterra Limited	Fonterra
166	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation Tumuaki Ahurei	Dir. General Conservation
169	Road Metals Company Limited	Road Metals
170	Fulton Hogan Limited	Fulton Hogan
172	Silver Fern Farms Limited	Silver Fern Farms
182	Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc.	Federated Farmers
185	Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu	Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu
229	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Kainga Ora
236	Waihi School Trust Board	Waihi School
245	NZ Pork Industry Board	Pork NZ
247	Horticulture New Zealand	Hort NZ
252	Timaru Developments Limited	TDL
255	NZ Frost Fans Limited	NZ Frost Fans
261	Davis Ogilvie (Aoraki) Limited	Davis Ogilvie
264	Stephanie Mercer	Mercer, S
265	New Zealand Helicopter Association	NZHA
268	McCutcheon, Tarrant, Sullivan, Sullivan and Ellery	McCutcheon et al
274	South Pacific Sera Limited	South Pacific Sera
275	John Chapman	Chapman, J
278	Rooney Group Limited, Rooney Holdings Limited, Rooney Earthmoving Limited and Rooney Farms Limited	Rooney Group et al

## Abbreviations Used in this Report:

Abbreviation	Means
ECan	Environment Canterbury/Canterbury Regional Council
NPS	National Planning Standard
NPS-HPL	National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land 2022
Operative Plan	Operative Timaru District Plan
PDP	Proposed Timaru District Plan
RMA	Resource Management Act 1991
RPS	Operative Canterbury Regional Policy Statement
TDC	Timaru District Council / territorial authority

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 Experience and Qualifications

1.1.1 My full name is Andrew Cameron MacLennan.

1.1.2 I am an Associate at the firm Incite. I hold a Bachelor of Science in Land Planning and Development from Otago University and a Masters of Resource Management from Massey University. I am an Associate Member of the New Zealand Planning Institute and a member of the Resource Management Law Association.

1.1.3 I have 10 years' planning experience working in both local government and the private sector. During this time, I have worked in policy planning roles, consent processing roles, and consent applicant roles.

1.1.4 My policy planning experience includes working for a range of councils drafting provisions for regional policy statements, regional plans, coastal plans, and district plans. I have also drafted associated section 32 evaluation reports, section 42A reports and undertaken reporting officer roles. I have experience participating in Environment Court processes such as expert conferencing, mediation, and hearings on plans and plan changes.

1.1.5 My relevant work experience includes:

- S42A reporting officer for the Waimakariri District Plan
- S42A reporting officer for the Otago Regional Policy Statement
- S42A reporting officer for the Marlborough Environment Plan
- S42A reporting officer for the Hurunui District Plan

1.1.6 Although this is a Council hearing, I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Environment Court Practice Note 2023 and that I have complied with it when preparing this report. I confirm that I have considered all the material facts that I am aware of that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express, and that this evidence is within my area of expertise, except where I state that I am relying on the evidence of another person. Having reviewed the submitters and further submitters relevant to this topic, I advise there are no conflicts of interest that would impede me from providing independent advice to the Hearings Panel.

## 1.2 Purpose and Scope of this Report

1.2.1 The purpose of this report is to provide the Hearing Panel with a summary and analysis of the submissions received on this topic and to make recommendations in response to those submissions, to assist the Hearing Panel in evaluating and deciding on the submissions.

1.2.2 This report is prepared under s42A of the RMA in relation to Rural Zones to the PDP. It covers the following matters:

- General themes
- General Rural Zone provisions
- Rural Lifestyle Zone provisions
- Settlement Zone provisions
- PREC4 - Holiday Hut Precinct within the Open Space Zone
- Definitions relating to the above provisions, including:
  - Agricultural Aviation Activities,
  - Ancillary buildings and structures (primary production)
  - Ancillary rural earthworks
  - Artificial crop protection structure
  - Cultivation
  - Day
  - Farm Quarry
  - Fertiliser
  - Frost fan
  - Helicopter Landing Area
  - Intensive Primary Production
  - Intensive Outdoor Primary Production
  - Minor Residential Unit
  - Intensive Indoor Primary Production
  - Non-Intensive Primary Production
  - Permanent workers accommodation
  - Post-harvest facility
  - Primary production
  - Quarry
  - Quarry activities
  - Residential activity Residential unit
  - Residential visitor accommodation
  - Rural Airstrip
  - Rural contractor depot
  - Rural industry
  - Rural residential development

- Rural produce manufacturing
- Seasonal workers accommodation
- Supported residential care activity

1.2.3 This report considers the submissions and further submissions that were received in relation to Rural Zones. It includes recommendations to either retain provisions without amendment, delete, add to or amend the provisions, in response to these submissions. All recommended amendments are shown by way of ~~strikeout~~ and underlining in **Appendix 1** to this Report, or, in relation to mapping, through recommended spatial amendments to the mapping. Footnoted references to the relevant submitter(s) identify the scope for each recommended change.

1.2.4 The conclusions reached and recommendations made in this report are not binding on the Hearing Panel. It should not be assumed that the Hearing Panel will reach the same conclusions having considered all the information in the submissions and the evidence to be brought before them, by the submitters.

### 1.3 Procedural Matters

1.3.1 There have been no pre-hearing conferences or expert witness conferencing in relation to submissions on this topic.

1.3.2 In order to better understand matters raised in their submissions, I have been in contact with the following submitters:

- Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu (185)
- Waihi School (236)
- Fonterra (165)
- NZAAA (132)
- MFL (60)

## 2. Topic Overview

### 2.1 Summary of Relevant Provisions of the PDP

2.1.1 This report relates to provisions associated with the Rural Zones. This section of the report provides a brief summary of the provisions relevant to this topic.

2.1.2 Three sub-chapters make up the Rural Zone chapter:

- GRUZ – General Rural Zone
- RLZ – Rural Lifestyle Zone
- SETZ – Settlement Zone

- 2.1.3 The GRUZ chapter applies to the largest zone in the district. This zone enables primary production (including intensive primary production) and a range of ancillary and associated activities that support primary production such as rural industry activities. Primary production activities are generally required to comply with standards to minimise adverse effects on sensitive activities and the environment. The GRUZ includes a range of environments including hill and high country, downlands, plains and coastal areas, each with their own associated landscapes, vegetation and ecosystems. These sensitive environments such as Outstanding Natural Landscapes, Outstanding Natural Features, Significant Natural Areas and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori are managed through the district wide chapters. In addition, the provisions of the zone allows for range of other activities including mining, quarrying, industrial activities, and small scale commercial activities where the adverse effect of the environment can be managed and the character of the rural environment is retained.
- 2.1.4 The RLZ chapter provides for areas used predominantly for a residential lifestyle within a rural environment on lots smaller than those of the General Rural Zone. This includes areas adjoining Timaru, Temuka, Geraldine and Pleasant Point. While the zone allows some primary production, it restricts intensive farming and activities that could harm the environment. New developments must integrate with the natural environment and infrastructure, following Development Area Plans and development standards.
- 2.1.5 The SETZ chapter provides for a number of small settlements dispersed throughout the rural area, including Acacia Drive, Cave, Ōrāri, Pareora, Winchester, Peel Forest, Blandwood and Woodbury. These areas have distinct characteristics, with larger land parcels and a mix of residential and non-residential uses. While most have water supply, they can lack sewerage systems. The Settlement Zone aims to support residential and complementary non-residential activities, maintaining the settlements' low-density, pleasant ambiance. It also emphasises preventing new development from straining infrastructure, necessitating upgrades, or impacting water supply sources.

## 2.2 Background to Relevant Provisions

- 2.2.1 The RMA states that the district plan must give effect to the NPS<sup>1</sup>. These standards limit the establishment of rural zones to four types: General Rural, Rural Production, Rural Lifestyle, and Settlement zones. The General Rural zone is for primary production and supporting activities, while Rural Production focuses on productive land. Rural Lifestyle allows residential living in rural areas on smaller lots, still enabling some primary production. The Settlement Zone caters to clusters of residential, commercial, and community activities in rural or coastal areas.

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 75(3)(ba)

- 2.2.2 The Operative Plan currently features seven Rural zones and Residential 3 Township zones for specific settlements. The PDP proposes to zone the Residential 3 Township settlements as Settlement zone, aligning with the National Planning Standards.
- 2.2.3 The Section 32 – Rural Zone states that the Operative Plan was developed at a time when farming in the Timaru District primarily involved sheep, cattle, and cropping with lower stocking levels and fewer inputs. However, recent developments in farming practices, such as increased irrigation and changes in farming intensity, have led to higher stocking rates, crop yields, and a rise in dairy farming<sup>2</sup>. Additionally, activities like quarrying, mining, and forestry generate noise, dust, and vibration, with occasional heavy traffic that can damage roads and disrupt communities.
- 2.2.4 The Section 32 – Rural Zone also states that the Operative Plan does not regulate most of these activities, except for factory farming, which requires consent due to its intensity. The provisions within the GRUZ continue to enable primary production and intensive primary production activities through a permitted activity framework. However, permitted standards have been introduced to manage the potential adverse effect of these activities by introducing setbacks between and intensive primary production activities and sensitive activities. Where activities do not comply with permitted activity standards, resource consent is required to ensure the effects of new and intensive primary production activities are appropriately managed.
- 2.2.5 Rural-residential development, typically featuring lot sizes between 5000m<sup>2</sup> and 2ha, offering a rural lifestyle with rural views, has spread throughout the District in a somewhat disorganised manner. The Section 32 – Rural Zone states that this decentralised development pattern has led to the emergence of "poppy seed" developments across the rural landscape, fostering expectations among landowners that the Council should extend public infrastructure services like water, sewerage, and sealed roads. This approach, however, can lead to inefficient expansion of services that are originally intended for denser urban areas.
- 2.2.6 This ad hoc rural residential development model also raises concerns about its impact on productive rural land use, potential conflicts between established productive activities and the generation of unsustainable vehicle movements, as well as uncertainties about future service demands. The greatest concentration of rural residential development is found near Timaru, followed by Temuka, Geraldine, and Pleasant Point. The PDP adopts a more concentrated approach by zoning rural residential development in designated areas near or adjacent to Timaru, Temuka, Geraldine, and Pleasant Point, in alignment with the Growth Management Strategy. This is proposed as the Rural Lifestyle Zone.
- 2.2.7 Smaller rural settlements, such as Cave, Pareora, Seadown, Ōrāri, Winchester, Peel Forest, Blandswood, and Woodbury, exhibit considerable diversity in terms of size, character,

---

<sup>2</sup> [https://www.timaru.govt.nz/data/assets/pdf\\_file/0008/668699/29-Section-32-Rural-Zones.pdf](https://www.timaru.govt.nz/data/assets/pdf_file/0008/668699/29-Section-32-Rural-Zones.pdf)

proximity to natural areas, natural hazard risks, and remoteness. While there's no apparent surge in demand for people to reside in these settlements, the PDP provisions provides for their development within the Settlement Zone while seeking to ensure their sustainability, preserve their unique character and manage challenges related to the absence of reticulated sewerage in some of these settlements.

### 3. Overview of Submission and Further Submissions

- 3.1.1 The full list of submission points addressed in this report are set out in **Appendix 2**. The following table provides a brief summary of the key issues raised in submissions, which are discussed in more detail in the 'Analysis and Evaluation of Submissions' section of this report.

ISSUE NAME	SUMMARY OF ISSUE	POSITION OF SUBMITTERS
Firefighting Water Supply	Changes sought to multiple regulations within the GRUZ, RLZ, and SETZ which are aimed at ensuring the proper safeguarding of lives, property, and the environment.	FENZ seek a variety of amendments to provisions to better enable the servicing of firefighting water supply to land use activities across the rural zones and also provide for emergency service facilities.
Educational facilities	Provision of educational facilities where there is a potential need for them within rural communities.	MoE consider "education" should be provided for within objectives of the RLZ and SETZ. They also suggest changes to specific policies (SETZ-P3 and RLZ-P9) to better align with the PDP's strategic directions.  MoE consider the current rules (GRUZ-R7, RLZ-R7, and SETZ-R3) are too restrictive for educational facilities in rural areas and seek more flexibility within the rule framework
GRZ – Intensive primary production	Submissions have been made regarding various aspects of the primary production and intensive primary production definitions.	Submitters typically seek greater simplicity and clarity as to the activities that are included within the primary production and intensive primary production definitions.

Rural industry	A number of submitters have sought greater protection of rural industry activities from reverse sensitivity effects within the objectives, policies and rules of the GRUZ.	Submitters consider rural industry activities are susceptible to reverse sensitivity effects, and seek greater protection for rural industry activities.
Airstrips and helicopter landing areas	A number of submitters consider GRUZ-R14 is overly complex and restrictive.	Submitters generally seek a more enabling regulations that allow for a broader range of activities and seek several new definitions to support amendments sought to GRUZ-R14 – Use of airstrips and helicopter landing sites.
Highly productive land	General concern about the provisions in the GRUZ Chapter, considering they must be strengthened to give effect to the NPS-HPL.	NZ Frost Fans consider the PDP lacks safeguards for highly productive land, does not prioritise its use for agricultural activities, does not effectively protect the zone from non-production uses or development and does not adequately address reverse sensitivity effects that could hinder land-based primary production.
GRUZ residential development	Submissions consider specifying a minimum site area is unnecessary and overly restrictive.	Submitters seek amendments to GRUZ-R4 to reduce the minimum site area and provide for clustering of buildings to provide more flexibility and support the resource consent process.
Blandswood zoning	Submitters opposing the inclusion of Blandswood, a long-established settlement with permanent houses and holiday homes, in the Open Space Zone and seek rezoning from Open Space Zone – Holiday Hut Precinct to Settlement Zone.	Submitter consider the OSZ is not appropriate for private land with existing dwellings and consider the OSZ will result in a vacant section not being able to be built on despite its suitability for residential development and may unduly restrict property owners to develop and improve their homes or holiday homes.

Waihi School zoning	Oppose the GRUZ zoning of Waihi School Site and also the adjoining site to the north (known as the Rolleston sites).	<p>As a private school, the Waihi School notes that they are not able to rely on a MoE designation and therefore the activities on the site must rely on existing use rights.</p> <p>They consider the Waihi or Rolleston sites are at odds with the rural character, quality and amenity values of the zone, highlighting GRUZ provisions are ill-fitting for the activities on the site. They suggest the school would better fit a Special Purpose Zone, or alternatively apply a precinct or specific control area in the GRUZ for the Waihi School and Rolleston sites.</p>
Fonterra Clandeboyne zoning	- The proposed GIZ fails to consider the unique characteristics of the Clandeboyne site and that the provisions are unsuitable for the site and community needs.	Fonterra seek amendments to introduce a new chapter for a “Special Purpose Zone - Strategic Rural Industry” (SPZ-SRI) tailored to the Clandeboyne site which would have wider application but emphasise the responsibility of individual sites to demonstrate the need or benefit of the proposed zone.

## 4. Relevant Statutory Provisions

### 4.1.1 The assessment under the RMA for the PDP includes whether:

- it is in accordance with the Council’s functions (s74(1)(a));
- it is in accordance with Part 2 of the RMA (s74(1)(b));
- it will give effect to any national policy statement or operative regional policy statement (s75(3)(a) and (c));
- the objectives of the proposal are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA (s32(1)(a));
- the provisions within the plan change are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the District Plan (s32(1)(b)).

### 4.1.2 In addition, assessment of the PDP must also have regard to:

- any proposed regional policy statement, and management plans and strategies prepared under any other Acts (s74(2));
- the extent to which the plan is consistent with the plans of adjacent territorial authorities (s74 (2)(c)); and
- in terms of any proposed rules, the actual or potential effect on the environment of activities including, in particular, any adverse effect.

## **5. Statutory Instruments**

- 5.1.1 The s32 report for the Rural Zones chapter set out the statutory requirements and relevant planning context for this topic in more detail. The section below sets out, in summary, the provisions in planning documents that are considered to be particularly relevant.

### **5.2 National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL)**

- 5.2.1 The NPSHPL aims to protect New Zealand's most fertile land from inappropriate use and development, ensuring it remains available for primary production. The provisions within the Versatile Soils Chapter (VS) of the PDP protect the highly productive land areas within the GRUZ. However, when assessing submissions seeking to rezone GRUZ land for urban purposes, the relevant provisions of the NPSHPL have considered within this report.

### **5.3 National Planning Standards (NPS)**

- 5.3.1 These Standards direct the zones that can be used in the District Plan, and include a description of each zone, which district plan provisions must be aligned with. The proposed GRUZ, RLZ, SETZ are taken from the options in the Planning Standards. The Standards also set out the spatial layers that can be used within the District Plan. These allow for the use of zones, as well as overlays, precincts, specific controls and development areas. Within this topic, two new precincts are proposed.

### **5.4 Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (RPS)**

- 5.4.1 Chapter 5 of the RPS is particularly relevant to this topic, as it provides direction in relation to land-use and infrastructure. It directs that development is located and designed so that it functions in a way that: enables rural activities that support the rural environment including primary production; and avoids conflicts between incompatible activities (Objective 5.2.1). The natural and physical resources that contribute to Canterbury's rural productive economy must maintained and enhanced by preventing development or fragmentation that hinders current or future primary production or creates conflicts limiting such production (Policy 5.3.12).

## 6. Analysis and Evaluation of Submissions

### 6.1 Approach to Analysis

6.1.1 This report firstly addresses definitions followed by broader general themes which relate generally across the Rural Zones chapter. Submissions relating to individual sub-chapters are then addressed, in the following order:

- GRUZ – General Rural Zone
- RLZ – Rural Lifestyle Zone
- SETZ – Settlement Zone.

6.1.2 For each sub-chapter I initially consider the submissions which relate to specific issues/matters. I then address submission points as they relate to:

- Objectives
- Policies
- Rules
- Standards

6.1.3 The assessment of submissions generally follows the following format:

- A brief summary of the relevant submission points.
- An analysis of those submission points.
- Recommendations, including any amendments to plan provisions and the related assessment under s32AA.

6.1.4 Further submissions have been considered in the preparation of this report, but in general, they are not specifically mentioned because they are limited to the matters raised in original submissions and therefore the subject matter is canvassed in the analysis of the original submission. Further submissions may however be mentioned where they raise a valid matter not addressed in an original submission. Further submissions are not listed within Appendix 2. Instead, recommendations on the primary submissions indicate whether a further submission is accepted or rejected as follows:

- Where a further submission supports a primary submission and the primary submission is recommended to be accepted, or where a further submission opposes a primary submission and the primary submission is recommended to be rejected, the further submission is recommended to be accepted.
- Where a further submission supports a primary submission and the primary submission is recommended to be rejected, or where a further submission opposes a primary submission and the primary submission recommended to be accepted, the further submission is recommended to be rejected.

- Where a further submission supports or opposes a primary submission and the primary submission is recommended to be accepted in part, then the further submission is recommended to be accepted in part. Further submissions have been considered in the preparation of this report, but in general, they are not specifically mentioned because they are limited to the matters raised in original submissions and therefore the subject matter is canvassed in the analysis of the original submission. Further submissions may however be mentioned where they raise a valid matter not addressed in an original submission.

## 7. Definitions

### 7.1 Introduction

7.1.1 The following definitions are assessed within this section:

Cultivation	Intensive outdoor primary production
Land-based primary production	Intensive indoor primary production
Primary production	Rural residential development
Intensive primary production	Residential visitor accommodation

### 7.2 Cultivation

7.2.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
Federated Farmers	182.9
Forest and Bird	156.12

#### Submissions

7.2.2 Forest and Bird [156.12] seek the definition be retained as notified. Federated Farmers [182.9] seek that the definition of "Cultivation" is amended to better fit the process of cultivation. The submitter seeks the deletion of the definition and replacement with:

means any process that involves the turning or tilling the land. It can include:

- Pasture renewal
- Cropping (such as maize)
- Intensive farming (such as commercial vegetable growing)

means the alteration or disturbance of land (or any matter constituting the land including soil, clay, sand and rock) for the purpose of sowing, growing or harvesting of pasture or crops.

#### Analysis

7.2.3 I note that the NPS includes the definition of "cultivation" adopted by the PDP. Clause 14.1 of the NPS states:

"Where terms defined in the Definitions List are used in a policy statement or plan, and the term is used in the same context as the definition, local authorities must use the definition as defined in the Definitions List. However, if required, they may define:

- terms that are a subcategory of, or have a narrower application than, a defined term in the Definitions List. Any such definitions must be consistent with the higher-level definition in the Definitions List.

- b. additional terms that do not have the same or equivalent meaning as a term defined in the Definitions List.”

7.2.4 I consider the suggested amendment does not achieve either a. or b. above, I therefore do not support the suggested amendment.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

7.2.5 No change to the PDP is recommended.

## **7.3 Land-based primary production**

7.3.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
Federated Farmers	182.21

### **Submissions**

7.3.2 Federated Farmers [182.21] highlight that the definition of “primary production” includes non-land-based activities as well as the initial processing of goods. They consider this definition of “primary production” is not easy to understand what activities are or are not included under this definition and seek a new definition for “land-based primary production” to align with the NPS-HPL.

### **Analysis**

7.3.3 While I acknowledge that NPS-HPL includes a definition of “Land based primary production”, I note that this phrase is not used within the PDP, therefore it is not necessary to define this term. It is not clear from the submission which part of the “primary production” definition is not easy to understand. I note that “primary production” definition is also an NPS definition and the provisions with the PDP that refer to “primary production” have been drafted with this NPS definition in mind. Therefore, I disagree the introduction of a new definition is required.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

7.3.4 No change to the PDP is recommended.

## **7.4 Primary production**

7.4.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
Helicopters Sth Cant.	53.8

NZAAA	132.8
AQA	224.3
Hort NZ	245.19, 245.11
NZ Pork	247.2, 247.5, 247.6
Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu	185.11
Federated Farmers	182.15, 182.14, 182.13, 182.19
Keen et al	46.1, 46.4
Silver Fern Farms	172.5
Alliance Group	173.5
Dairy Holdings	89.2

### Submissions

- 7.4.2 This section set out the submission points received on the following definitions: of “Primary production”, “Intensive Primary Production”, “Intensive Outdoor Primary Production”, “Intensive Indoor Primary Production”, and “Non-Intensive Primary Production”.

#### Primary production

- 7.4.3 Four submissions have been lodged in support of the definition of “Primary production” and seek it is retained as notified.<sup>3</sup> NZ Pork [247.2] seek to amend the definition to include the following table which they consider would improve interpretation of the PDP. The submitter notes that the Canterbury Regional Air Plan adopts this approach and this and the definition of primary production was also amended in the in the Hurunui District Plan via a plan change in 2021 (Plan Change 4) for Intensive Primary Production. They seek the following amendment to the definition:

<u>Primary Production</u>	<u>Intensive Primary Production</u>	<u>Intensive Indoor Primary Production</u>
		<u>Intensive Outdoor Primary Production (Pig Farming)</u>
	<u>Extensive Pig Farming</u>	

- 7.4.4 Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu [185.11] raise concern that the farming-related definitions of “Non-Intensive Primary Production”, “Intensive Primary Production”, “Intensive Outdoor Primary Production” and “Intensive Indoor Primary Production” reduce clarity and make understanding the potential effect of rules unclear.<sup>4</sup> They recognise there are only two definitions<sup>5</sup> under the NPS and seek the six new definitions developed for the PDP are

<sup>3</sup> Helicopters Sth Cant. [53.8], NZAAA [132.8], AQA [224.3], [Hort NZ [245.19]

<sup>4</sup> Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu [185.11]

<sup>5</sup> “Primary production” and “Intensive indoor primary production”.

simplified. They provide no additional suggested wording amendments. Federated Farmers [182.19] supports the definition of “Non-Intensive Primary Production”.

### ***Intensive primary production***

7.4.5 Federated Farmers [182.15] seek a broader definition which encompasses “Intensive indoor primary production”, “Intensive outdoor primary production” and “Intensively farmed stock”. They therefore seek to delete the notified definition and replace it with the following:

*Intensive primary production means:*

*Refers to any of the following:*

- (a) commercial livestock kept and fed permanently in buildings or indoor enclosures on a particular site, where the stocking density precludes the maintenance of pasture or ground cover (e.g., pig farming);*
- (b) land and buildings used for the commercial boarding and/or breeding of cats, dogs and other domestic cover*
- (c) farming of mushrooms or other fungi;*
- (d) dairy cattle, including cows, that are being milked on irrigated land;*
- (e) intensive winter grazing, that does not follow council rules.*

7.4.6 Hort NZ [245.11] considers greenhouses should be explicitly excluded from the definition of Intensive primary production and seeks amendments accordingly.

### ***Intensive outdoor primary production***

7.4.7 NZ Pork [247.6] supports the clarity of this definition and seeks it is retained as notified.<sup>6</sup>

7.4.8 Keen et al [46.1, 46.4] seek to amend the definition of “intensive outdoor primary production” to include free range poultry farming. They oppose the approach to exclude free range poultry farming from the definition for the following reasons:

- The regular feed source for the poultry is provided from off-site sources and fits the definition provided for “Intensive Outdoor Primary Production”
- The poultry are kept for their entire lives within a paddock
- The poultry's outdoor area lacks substantial permanent vegetation as their primary food source.
- The activity has significant potential adverse effects on neighbouring properties and the environment

---

<sup>6</sup> NZ Pork [247.6]

- 7.4.9 The submitter also notes that the Canterbury Air Regional Plan (CARP) has Free Range Poultry Farming individually defined and not included in the Intensive Outdoor Primary Production definition which causes some limitations on how the Timaru District Council can deal with this situation. The submission also seeks that a minimum 100m setback in induction within the PDP between for buildings used house stock and the notional boundary of a sensitive activity on a neighbouring site under different ownership. They consider this setback distance would mitigate most odour issues associated with the activity of Free Range Poultry Farming.
- 7.4.10 Federated Farmers [182.14] seek to delete the definition as it can be included within the definition of “Intensive Primary Production”.
- 7.4.11 Two submissions consider the definition needs revision to avoid categorising supplementary feeding of stock temporarily held at a meat processing plant as “Intensive Outdoor Primary Production”.<sup>7</sup> The submitters suggest that without this change, it would incorrectly trigger non-compliance under Rule GIZ-R5 within the GIZ. They therefore seek the following amendment:

*Intensive outdoor primary production*

*means primary production activities involving the keeping or rearing of livestock that principally occurs outdoors, where the regular feed source for the livestock is substantially provided from off-site sources, but excludes:*

*[...]*

- e. the feeding of supplementary feed during adverse weather events such as drought or snow or while stock are temporarily held prior to processing.*

- 7.4.12 Similarly, Dairy Holdings [89.2] consider the definition unclear and seek “farming of dairy cattle” are excluded from the definition.

***Intensive indoor primary production***

- 7.4.13 One submission has been received which supports the definition and seeks it is retained as notified.<sup>8</sup> Federated Farmers [182.13] seek to delete the definition and include it in the definition of “Intensive Primary Production”.

***Analysis***

- 7.4.14 In relation to the submission from NZ Pork seeking a table be included within the definition of “primary production” to improve interpretation, I disagree this is necessary. I note that the definitions of “intensive indoor primary production”, “intensive outdoor primary production”, and “intensive primary production” all refer to “primary production” in italics.

---

<sup>7</sup> Silver Fern Farms [172.5], Alliance Group [173.5]

<sup>8</sup> NZ Pork [247.5]

Therefore, I consider the table suggested by the submitter is not required as intensive primary production activities are clearly included within the definition of “primary production”. Similarly, “extensive pig farming” is included within the definition of “intensive indoor primary production” and is therefore clearly included within the definition of “primary production”. In addition, I note that the inclusion of such a table would be inconsistent with drafting approach in the PDP. Given this I disagree that a nested table is required within the PDP.

7.4.15 In relation to the submission from Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu, while I acknowledge that the inclusion of six definitions for various primary production activities seems unnecessary. When considering where each of these definitions is used, I agree that consolidating these definitions would assist with plan usability, while also ensuring the NPS definitions are retained. A similar issue is raised in the submission from Federated Farmers, who seek that a broader definition “Intensive primary production” is included within the PDP encompasses “Intensive indoor primary production”, “Intensive outdoor primary production” and “Intensively farmed stock”. I agree in part with this suggestion.

7.4.16 When considering the following related definitions:

- Primary production
- Intensive indoor primary production
- Intensive outdoor primary production
- Intensive primary production
- Intensively farmed stock

7.4.17 I note that “primary production” is an NPS definition, and this term is used throughout the PDP and I recommended that this definition is retained within the PDP. “Intensive indoor primary production” is also an NPS definition, and therefore I recommend it be retained within the PDP. “Intensive primary production” is also used throughout the PDP, and I recommended that this definition is retained within the PDP.

7.4.18 “Intensive outdoor primary production” is only used in the context of the definitions section of the PDP and also in MPZ-R19 which sets a non-complying activity status for “*Intensive indoor primary production, intensive outdoor primary production,...*”. Therefore, I consider “Intensive outdoor primary production” can be removed from the PDP and an amendment made to the definition of “intensive primary production” to capture the content of this definition, which will have no effect on the application on MPZ-R19.

7.4.19 The definition of “intensively farmed stock” is only used in the context of the definitions section of the PDP and also in SASM-R6. While I acknowledge that this definition is related to “intensive primary production” definition, it also captures a broader range of farming practices that are not captured within the “intensive primary production” definition. To

include “intensively farmed stock” within the definition of “intensive primary production” would broaden the scope of the “intensive primary production” across a range of provisions. Therefore, I recommend that the definition of “intensively farmed stock” is retained as notified. The use of this definition may be considered further within the SASM topic.

7.4.20 In relation to the submission from Hort NZ seeking that the definition of “intensive primary production”, exclude greenhouses, note that the NPS definition of “intensive indoor primary production” does not exclude greenhouse from the definition. Given I am recommending “intensive indoor primary production” be incorporated into the definition of “intensive primary production” I consider this exclusion would be at odds with the intention of the NPS definition of “intensive indoor primary production”. As such, I disagree with the suggested amendment.

7.4.21 In relation to the submission from Keen et al seeking to amend the definition to include free range poultry farming, within the definition of “intensive outdoor primary production”. I consider the intent of the intensive outdoor primary production provisions is to capture activities that are likely to generate effects beyond the property boundary, where those effects may conflict with an incompatible activity. I note that CARP includes a definition and rule framework for managing “intensive poultry farming”. The definition reads:

*“means the keeping, rearing or breeding of 10,000 or more birds, whether for the purpose of the production of poultry for human consumption or for the purpose of egg production, where the predominant productive processes are carried out primarily within buildings, Intensive poultry farming and includes (but is not limited to) intensive breeder poultry farming, intensive rearer poultry farming, intensive broiler poultry farming and intensive layer poultry farming, but excludes free range poultry farming and hatcheries.”*

7.4.22 Rules 7.65-7.72 of the CAP control rural discharges to air from “intensive poultry farming”. “Free range poultry farming”, is excluded from this definition and rule framework with respect to air discharges. “Free range poultry farming” is defined within the CARP as:

“means the keeping, rearing or breeding of poultry, whether for the purpose of production of poultry for human consumption or for the purpose of egg production, where:

- a. all of the birds farmed have access to open air runs; and
- b. permanent vegetation ground cover exists on the land where birds are permitted to range; and
- c. the stocking rate of the runs and weatherproof shelter to which the birds have access does not exceed the industry standard for the relevant bird type.”

7.4.23 Given “free range poultry farming”, is excluded from the definition and rule framework, I consider that it can be reasonably assumed, that this type of activity is not expected to have dust or odour effects beyond the boundary. Therefore, I consider that exempting free range poultry farming from the definition of intensive outdoor primary production is appropriate.

I consider it more efficient to align the definition with that of the CARP rather than introducing a slightly altered definition that might introduce duplication.

- 7.4.24 When considering other effects (other than dust or odour) that may be generated free-range poultry farming, such as traffic, noise, will have other effects like noise and traffic that other types of intensive farming could have. I note that GRUZ-R3 requires a setback from the notional boundary of an existing sensitive activity of 25m for any building or structure with an area of less than 50m<sup>2</sup> used to confine chickens and 100m setback for the keeping of roosters. These appear to be setbacks that are predominantly related to noise effects. I accept the point made by the submitter that there are new restrictions on an owner of less than 30 poultry, than there is for a commercial free range poultry farm. These submission points are considered further within the assessment of GRUZ-R1.
- 7.4.25 Finally, I agree with the amendment suggested by Silver Fern Farms and Alliance Group that seek an exclusion to avoid categorising supplementary feeding of stock temporarily held at a meat processing plant as “Intensive Outdoor Primary Production”. I agree that it is not the intention of the definition to capture stock temporarily held at a meat processing plant.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

- 7.4.26 No changes to the definitions of “primary production” and “intensive indoor primary production” are recommended.
- 7.4.27 I recommend the definition of “intensive outdoor primary production” be deleted from the PDP and the definition of “intensive primary production” is amended as follows:

Intensive primary production:

means primary production activities that:

1. involve the keeping or rearing of livestock that principally occurs outdoors, where the regular feed source for the livestock is substantially provided from off-site sources, but excludes:
  - a. calf-rearing for three months in any calendar year;
  - b. pig production for domestic self-subsistence home use;
  - c. extensive pig farming;
  - d. free range poultry farming; and
  - e. the feeding of supplementary feed during adverse weather events such as drought or snow or while stock are temporarily held prior to processing
2. are defined as intensive indoor primary production.

~~means any activity defined as intensive indoor primary production or intensive outdoor primary production.~~<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu [185.11], Federated Farmers [182.15]

- 7.4.28 As a consequential amendment I recommend that MPZ-R19 is amended to replace “intensive indoor primary production” and “intensive outdoor primary production” with “intensive primary production”.

### **Section 32AA**

- 7.4.29 I consider the recommended amendments to the “intensive primary production” and “intensive outdoor primary production” definitions are limited to drafting changes that will not impact the application of the provisions within the PDP. I consider this change will not have any greater environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects than the notified provisions. However, there will be benefits from plan consistency, improved plan interpretation and more efficient plan administration.

## **7.5 Rural residential development**

- 7.5.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

<b>SUBMITTER NAME</b>	<b>SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)</b>
ECan	183.11
Fonterra	165.20

### **Submissions**

- 7.5.2 ECan [183.11] and Fonterra [165.20] both highlight that the term “rural residential development” has been superseded by the NPS definition for the Rural Lifestyle Zone. ECan seek the term is deleted, also noting the definition is not used within the PDP.

### **Analysis**

- 7.5.3 I support the deletion of “rural residential development” as sought by ECan. I note that the term is not used within the PDP and therefore the definition is not required with the PDP.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

- 7.5.4 It is recommended that the definition of “rural residential development” is deleted from the PDP.

### **Section 32AA**

- 7.5.5 I consider the recommended deletion of the “rural residential development” definition will not impact the application of the provisions within the PDP. I consider this change will not have any greater environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects than the notified provisions.

## 7.6 Residential visitor accommodation

- 7.6.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
MFL	60.5

### Submissions

- 7.6.2 MFL [60.5] are concerned that the definition of ‘residential visitor accommodation’ does not include a maximum length of stay and therefore does not distinguish between long term rental and short term visitor accommodation, which they consider have different effects. As such they seek addition of a cap on the length of stay to not exceed 3 consecutive months.

- 7.6.3 They seek that the definition of “residential visitor accommodation” be amended as follows:

*“means the use of a residential unit for temporary accommodation advertised for a tariff to paying guests that is secondary and incidental to the use of the residential unit as a permanent residence. The length of stay shall not exceed 3 months consecutively.”*

### Analysis

- 7.6.4 I consider the definition of ‘residential visitor accommodation’ is clear that it applies to short-term visitor accommodation, through use of the word “temporary”, “tariff” and “paying guests”, and that this definition therefore does not encompass long-term rentals, which are residential activities. I do not consider the addition is needed.

### Definitions – Matters Arising from Hearing A

- 7.6.5 I have reviewed the Section 42A Report of Ms Hollier. In this, she discusses submissions made relating to the definition of “reverse sensitivity”<sup>10</sup>. This is relevant to this topic, because the term is used in GRUZ-O3, GRUZ-P5, and RLZ-S4. While recommending changes to the definition, Ms Hollier also noted that amendments to provisions throughout the PDP might be required to align with the recommended amendments to the definition. I have therefore considered the provisions in this topic which rely on the definition, in light of Ms Hollier’s recommended changes.

- 7.6.6 The provisions in this topic relating to reverse sensitivity are:

- GRUZ-O3 which states *“The land resource of the General Rural Zone is not diminished by activities with no functional or operational need to locate in the*

<sup>10</sup> Officer’s Report: Part 1 and Overarching Matters, paragraphs 187-207

*General rural zone, and primary production is protected from reverse sensitivity effects ~~sensitive activities~~.*

- GRUZ-P5 which states “Manage sensitive activities in the zone to ensure... they are located to avoid reverse sensitivity ~~adverse~~ effects on primary production and rural industry activities”
- RLZ-S4, matter of discretion 2. which states: “the extent of adverse effects including noise, smell, visual, character, privacy, shading, dominance and reverse sensitivity”.

7.6.7 I have considered the above provisions in light of the changes recommended by Ms Hollier. My understanding is that the effect of her recommended changes is that the direction would alter slightly, in terms of the minimisation of reverse sensitivity effects, to include minimisation of potential reverse sensitivity effects in relation to not only existing activities, but also those permitted or consented, or otherwise anticipated by the Plan. I consider that it is appropriate, because it will be more effective in protecting primary production activities within the GRUZ and RLZ as the amended definition has a wider application.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

7.6.8 No change to the PDP is recommended.

## **8. General Themes**

### **8.1 FENZ submission**

8.1.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
FENZ	131.44, 131.45, 131.46, 131.47, 131.53, 131.49, 131.50, 131.51, 131.52, 131.59, 131.60, 131.36, 131.43, 131.37, 131.58, 131.61, 131.62, 131.63, 131.68, 131.40, 131.55, 131.65, 131.41, 131.56, 131.66, 131.57, 131.67, 131.39, 131.54, 131.64, 131.69

8.1.2 FENZ support a number of provisions and seek they are retained as notified, including:

- RLZ-O4 – Compatible and complimentary activities.<sup>11</sup>
- RLZ-P1 – Residential activities.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>11</sup> FENZ [131.44]

<sup>12</sup> FENZ [131.45]

- RLZ-P5 – Emergency services, health care and community facilities.<sup>13</sup>
- RLZ-R1 – Residential activities (not listed in this chapter).<sup>14</sup>
- RLZ-R3 – Primary production (not otherwise listed in this chapter).<sup>15</sup>
- RLZ-R7 – Educational facilities.<sup>16</sup>
- RLZ-R8 – Supported residential care activity.<sup>17</sup>
- RLZ-R9 – Visitor accommodation and residential visitor accommodation.<sup>18</sup>
- RLZ-R14 – Buildings and structures (not provided in RLZ-R15 or RLZ-R16).<sup>19</sup>
- SETZ-O1 – Purpose of the Settlement Zone.<sup>20</sup>
- SETZ-P3 – Compatible non-residential activities.<sup>21</sup>

8.1.3 FENZ seek amendments to several provisions across the GRUZ, RLZ and SETZ to effectively protect lives, property and the surrounding environment as required under carry the Fire and Emergency Act 2017. These amendments are detailed and analysed below under five subheadings, including “new provisions”, “water supply”, “Emergency service facilities”, “buildings and structures” and “outdoor storage, display and parking areas”.

### **Water supply**

#### **Submissions**

8.1.4 FENZ seek a variety of amendments to servicing of firefighting water supply to land use activities across the rural zones. This includes:

- Inserting a new GRUZ policy and standard with consequential amendments to GRUZ-R1, GRUZ-R4, GRUZ-R5, GRUZ-R8, GRUZ-R9, and GRUZ-R13.<sup>22</sup>
- Amending RLZ-S9.<sup>23</sup>
- Amending SETZ-S5 to support SETZ-R1, SETZ-R3, SETZ-R8.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> FENZ [131.46]

<sup>14</sup> FENZ [131.47]

<sup>15</sup> FENZ [131.49]

<sup>16</sup> FENZ [131.50]

<sup>17</sup> FENZ [131.51]

<sup>18</sup> FENZ [131.52]

<sup>19</sup> FENZ [131.53]

<sup>20</sup> FENZ [131.59]

<sup>21</sup> FENZ [131.60]

<sup>22</sup> FENZ [131.36] [131.37] [131.43]

<sup>23</sup> FENZ [131.47]

<sup>24</sup> FENZ [131.68]

- 8.1.5 Within the General Rural Zone FENZ consider a new policy, and standard would ensure all land use activities are adequately serviced. The new policy would read as follows:

“Ensure all development and subdivision provide a suitable on-site wastewater treatment and disposal system, stormwater systems, and water supply unless an approved alternative system is available.”<sup>25</sup>

- 8.1.6 The new standard would read as follows:

“GRUZ-SX – Servicing

1. All new developments that will require a water supply must be connected to a public reticulated water supply, where one is available.

2. Where the new development will not be connected to a public reticulated water supply, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory water supply can be provided to each lot.

Note: Further advice and information about how an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply can be provided to a development can be obtained from Fire and Emergency New Zealand and the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.”<sup>26</sup>

- 8.1.7 As a consequence, they seek to amend GRUZ-R1, GRUZ-R4, GRUZ-R5, GRUZ-R7, GRUZ-R8, GRUZ-R9 and GRUZ-R13 to require compliance with their recommended new standard.<sup>27</sup>

- 8.1.8 Within the Rural Lifestyle Zone, RLZ-S9 relates specifically to water supply. FENZ generally support the standard but seek the following amendment which ensure all activities that require water supply are provided for, not just residential and visitor accommodation:

“All ~~residential and visitor accommodation~~ activities on a site ~~must be~~ that are connected to a reticulated drinking water supply and must comply with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice”<sup>28</sup>

- 8.1.9 Within the Settlement Zone, SETZ-S5 sets out water supply standards which FENZ support in part but seek amendment to reference the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008. This amendment is considered to support the notified SETZ-R1, SETZ-R3, and SETZ-R8. Specifically, they seek the following amendment:

“All activities must:

---

<sup>25</sup> FENZ [131.36]

<sup>26</sup> FENZ [131.43]

<sup>27</sup> FENZ [131.37]

<sup>28</sup> FENZ [131.58]

1. *be connected to a community drinking water supply; or*
2. *be connected to a private drinking water supply; or*
3. *store 45,000 litres of potable water on-site from another source.*
4. *If the future use of the allotment requires water supply for firefighting purposes, evidence of how onsite firefighting water supply storage will be achieved in accordance with New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.*

*Further advice and information about how an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply can be provided to each lot can be obtained from Fire and Emergency New Zealand and the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008.”*<sup>29</sup>

### **Analysis**

- 8.1.10 In relation to the inclusion of a new policy and standard sought by FENZ, I disagree this is necessary. When processing subdivision applications, I consider the provisions contained within the SUB chapter adequately provide for this, specifically SUB-P6, SUB-S2, SUB-S3 and SUB-S4. SUB-P6 requires infrastructure to be installed during subdivision and have the capacity to accommodate the new development and allows for upgrades if necessary. It also seeks to ensure connectivity to reticulated systems where available, water-sensitive design, and access to firefighting water supply. All subdivisions are required to meet specified standards. Of relevance to water, they include:
- SUB-S2 – Stormwater treatment, catchment and disposal
  - SUB-S3 – Water supply
  - SUB-S4 – Wastewater disposal
- 8.1.11 Regarding the amendments sought to RLZ-S9 and SETZ-S5 related to water for firefighting purposes, advice was sought from the TDC Infrastructure Team. They have stated that between the Timaru District Consolidated Bylaw 2018 as well as service consent and building consent processes, there are already sufficient requirements to connect to Council's network and to confirm fire-fighting supply is provided to address the matters raised in FENZ's submission.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

- 8.1.12 I recommend the PDP is retained as notified.

---

<sup>29</sup> FENZ [131.68] [131.61], [131.62], 131.63]

## **Buildings and structures**

### **Submissions**

8.1.13 FENZ have submitted on standards relating to building and structure height, their relation to boundary and their boundary setbacks.

8.1.14 Regrading standards relating to 'Height of buildings and structures', FENZ support GRUZ-S1<sup>30</sup> which allows for a maximum height of 15m. However, they seek exclusion from RLZ-S1,<sup>31</sup> noting that while fire stations are typically 8-9m in height, they would be locationally constrained by specified height restriction of 4.5m if located within 50m of the General Residential Zone. Similarly, they seek exemption from SETZ-S1<sup>32</sup> as the standard's maximum height restriction of 10m would not allow for towers and poles used for hose drying, communications, and training and are typically 12 to 15m tall. FENZ seek amendment to RLZ-S1<sup>33</sup> and SETZ-S1<sup>34</sup> stating:

*"Note: Emergency service facilities are exempt from this standard."*

8.1.15 FENZ have also sought the following exclusion to the 'Height in relation to boundary' standards GRUZ-S2<sup>35</sup>, RLZ-S2<sup>36</sup> and SETZ-S2<sup>37</sup> as they consider the recession plan requirement would not allow for crucial operations including drying hoses, communication:

*"Towers and poles associated with emergency service facilities up to 15m in height are exempt from this rule."*

8.1.16 Regarding the 'Boundary setbacks for buildings and structures' standards, FENZ support the requirements set out in RLZ-S4<sup>38</sup> and SETZ-S3<sup>39</sup>. However, within the GRUZ they consider there are logistical and operational requirements for them to locate within the above setbacks from road boundaries. They seek the following amendment to GRUZ-S3<sup>40</sup>:

*"GRUZ-S3 Boundary setbacks for buildings and structures*

*New building and structures (excluding fences, irrigators, water troughs, crop support structures and artificial crop protection structures) shall be setback the following minimum distances:*

---

<sup>30</sup> FENZ [131.40]

<sup>31</sup> FENZ [131.55]

<sup>32</sup> FENZ [131.65]

<sup>33</sup> FENZ [131.65]

<sup>34</sup> FENZ [131.66]

<sup>35</sup> FENZ [131.41]

<sup>36</sup> FENZ [131.65]

<sup>37</sup> FENZ [131.66]

<sup>38</sup> FENZ [131.57]

<sup>39</sup> FENZ [131.67]

<sup>40</sup> FENZ [131.42]

1 . ...

4. Emergency Service Facilities are exempt from the setbacks and may be located within the above setbacks from road boundaries.”

**Analysis**

Height of building and structures and setbacks

- 8.1.17 I agree in part with the amendments sought by FENZ. Given the scale and nature of towers and poles that are associated with emergency service facilities, I consider it reasonable to allow for a higher height for towers and poles. While I note that in the RLZ and GRUZ “Emergency Service Facilities” will require a consent (in terms of the activity), any buildings and structures associated with them will be managed under the relevant buildings and structures rule, and so I consider it appropriate to apply the exemption even where such a facility may not be permitted.
- 8.1.18 I consider this exemption should only apply to “Towers and poles associated with emergency service facilities” rather than the “Emergency service facilities” building as a whole.
- 8.1.19 I also disagree with the suggested amendment to exclude “Emergency Service Facilities” from the boundary setback standards within GRUZ-S3.
- 8.1.20 I consider building height and building setback standards are included within the PDP to maintain the character and qualities of the GRUZ, RLZ and SETZ as required by RLZ-P3 and SETZ-P2 and GRUZ-P2. In addition, policies RLZ-P5, SETZ-P3, GRUZ-P4 all require that emergency service facilities are designed and located to minimise adverse effects on existing activities and the character and qualities of the Zone.
- 8.1.21 I consider any application to breach these building height standards (excluding the towers and poles associated with these buildings) or the building setback standards needs to be considered on its merits. If the proposed activity is unable to comply with permitted activity standards, I consider it is appropriate that a resource consent is required as a discretionary activity where matters such as: dominance in the landscape; overlooking and loss of privacy; and shading can be considered.

Height in relation to boundary

- 8.1.22 Finally, I agree with the suggested amendment to exempt towers and poles from the height in relation to boundary standards (GRUZ-S2, RLZ-S2, and SETZ-S2). This reflects that this standard is intended to address shading and access to sunlight for adjoining properties, and in my view these structures will not unreasonably impinge on this. I note that the same relief is support by Ms White the reporting author for the RESZ and CUMZ topics. Given this, from a drafting perspective, I consider it more efficient for this exemption to be included in APP8 itself, which already contains other exemptions, rather than listing it in separate rules. This aligns with Ms White’s recommendation.

### Conclusions and Recommendations

8.1.23 I recommend that standards GRUZ-S2 and GRUZ-S3 are retained as notified.

8.1.24 I recommend that standards: RLZ-S1 and SETZ-S1 be amended as follows:

RLZ-S1	Height of buildings and structures	
<b>1. Rural Lifestyle Zone</b>	<p>The height of buildings and structures must not exceed 8m, except for buildings and structures located within 50m of a General Residential Zone, which must not exceed 4.5m in height.</p> <p><u>Towers and poles associated with emergency service facilities must not exceed 15m.</u><sup>41</sup></p> <p><i>Note: Height shall be measure from the existing ground level prior to any works commencing.</i></p>	<p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. dominance in the landscape; and</li> <li>2. overlooking and loss of privacy of adjacent residential units; and</li> <li>3. shading of adjacent residential units; and</li> <li>4. landscaping.</li> </ol>

SETZ-S1	Height of buildings and structures	
<b>Settlement Zone</b>	<p>Buildings and structures, including additions and alterations to buildings and structures, must not exceed a maximum height of 10m.</p> <p><u>Towers and poles associated with emergency service facilities must not exceed 15m.</u><sup>42</sup></p> <p><i>Note: Height shall be measure from the existing ground level prior to any works commencing.</i></p>	<p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. dominance of the surrounding area; and</li> <li>2. overlooking and loss of privacy to adjoining sites; and</li> <li>3. solar access to adjoining sites; and</li> <li>4. landscaping; and</li> <li>5. mitigation measures.</li> </ol>

8.1.25 I recommend that APP8 – Recession Planes is amended to include the following exemption:

#### Permitted projections above recession planes:

...

- d. Towers and poles associated with an emergency services facility provided that they are no more than 15m in height.<sup>43</sup>

<sup>41</sup> FENZ [131.40]

<sup>42</sup> FENZ [131.55]

<sup>43</sup> FENZ [131.41], [131.65], [131.66]

## Section 32AA

- 8.1.26 I consider the recommended amendment to RLZ-S1 and SETZ-S1 which provide more flexibility for towers and poles associated with an emergency services facility, will have economic and social benefits as they will reduce the consenting requirements for emergency services facilities. Given the limited scale of towers and poles, I consider that this will not have unreasonable costs in terms of effects on neighbouring properties. I therefore consider that the changes are more efficient, while still being effective at achieving the built form outcomes sought in each relevant zone.

### **Emergency service facilities**

#### **Submissions**

- 8.1.27 Emergency service facilities are provided for GRUZ-R22 and RLZ-R17 in the General Rural and Rural Lifestyle Zones as a restricted discretionary activity. Within the Settlement Zone SETZ-R12 provide for emergency service facilities as a controlled activity. FENZ considers such facilities should be permitted across all rural zones to achieve emergency response times and as such seek to amend the activity status of GRUZ-R22,<sup>44</sup> RLZ-R17,<sup>45</sup> and SETZ-R12<sup>46</sup> to permitted.

#### **Analysis**

- 8.1.28 I disagree emergency services facilities should be made a permitted activity. While I agree emergency service facilities may be necessary to meet the needs of the population, I consider the activity status of an activity should relate to whether the activity will implement the relevant policy direction and achieve the objectives for the zone.
- 8.1.29 I consider the activity status of emergency services facilities in the GRUZ, and RLZ are consistent with the direction provided within policies RLZ-P5, GRUZ-P4. Policies RLZ-P5 and GRUZ-P4 'only allow' and 'allow' emergency service facilities that are designed and located to minimise adverse effects on existing activities and the character and qualities of the zone. I disagree that a permitted activity status for emergency services facilities would achieve the direction within the RLZ-P5 and GRUZ-P4. I consider the restricted discretionary activity resource consent framework ensures that the potential adverse effects on existing activities and the character and qualities of the relevant zone is appropriately considered.
- 8.1.30 Regarding the Settlement Zone, Policy SETZ-P3 seeks to 'provide for' emergency services facilities. SETZ-R12 requires resource consent as a controlled activity. I consider the existing controlled activity status provides for emergency services facilities while specifying the matters of control which can be considered. Where activities are unable to achieve compliance with CON-1, they are managed as a restricted discretionary activity. I consider

---

<sup>44</sup> FENZ [131.39]

<sup>45</sup> FENZ [131.54]

<sup>46</sup> FENZ [131.64]

this resource consent framework ensures that these activities are provided for, while also that the activity supports and maintains the character and amenity values of the zone.

- 8.1.31 Finally, I recommend a clause 16(2) amendment is made to SETZ-P3(2). As notified this clause refers to “cafes, community facilities and emergency”. I consider this is a minor error and the clause should refer to “emergency service facilities”.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

- 8.1.32 I recommend that rules: GRUZ-R22, RLZ-R17 and SETZ-R12 be retained as notified.

- 8.1.33 I recommend SETZ-P3 is amended as follows:

SETZ-P3	Combatale non-residential activities
Provided for: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. industrial activities within existing buildings; and</li> <li>2. cafes, community facilities and emergency <u>service facilities</u><sup>47</sup>; and</li> <li>3. ensure they are designed and located to minimise adverse effects on existing activities and the character and qualities of the settlement.</li> </ol>	

### **Section 32AA**

- 8.1.34 I consider the recommended amendment to SETZ-P3 is very minor in nature but improves the clarity and interpretation of the provision. I do not consider the recommended amendment will have any greater environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects than the notified provisions

## **8.2 ECan submission**

- 8.2.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
ECan	183.144, 183.150, 183.152

### **Submissions**

- 8.2.2 ECan generally highlights that there are various activities that need to meet certain standards, but these standards are only mentioned in some rules across the Rural Zones chapters and not others. ECan considers it important to make sure that these built form standards are applicable to all activities, whether they have received consent or not because these standards play a significant role in defining the character of the zones and the

---

<sup>47</sup> Clause 16(2)

permitted baseline. They therefore seek to amend the activity rules of the GRUZ,<sup>48</sup> RLZ<sup>49</sup> and SETZ<sup>50</sup> chapters to ensure that the built form standards apply to all activities, regardless of activity status.

### **Analysis**

- 8.2.3 I disagree with the suggested amendments. The drafting approach taken in the PDP is to identify within each rule those standards that are relevant to that rule. As a number of standards relate to built form, they are applied to any rules that manage built form (e.g. residential units, or other buildings and structures) but are not applied to other rules which relate to activities. In some cases, a note is included in the activity-based rules, noting that any new buildings and structures associated with an activity are managed under a separate rule. For some activity-based rules, there are no applicable standards and therefore none are specified. Where a rule is subject to one or more standard, non-compliance with the standard is already specified as a restricted discretionary activity, with the matters of discretion set out in the relevant standard. Because of this, I do not consider the additional rule requested to be necessary, and it would lead to confusion as to when a zone standard is or isn't "applicable" to an activity – whereas under the current drafting, this is very clear. I also do not consider the approach proposed to be out of steps with other plans.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

- 8.2.4 No further amendments to the PDP are recommended.

## **8.3 Waka Kotahi submission**

- 8.3.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
Waka Kotahi	143.149, 143.152, 143.153, 143.154, 143.155, 143.156

### **Submissions**

- 8.3.2 Across the rural zones, Waka Kotahi seeks several amendments which they consider will support them fulfilling their role to deliver a safe and efficient transport network for customers.
- 8.3.3 Waka Kotahi have submitted on the following rules within the Settlement Zone which manage other specified activities:

---

<sup>48</sup> ECan [183.144]

<sup>49</sup> ECan [183.150]

<sup>50</sup> ECan [183.152]

- SETZ-R9 – Community facilities.<sup>51</sup>
- SETZ-R10 – Cafes.<sup>52</sup>
- SETZ-R11 – Industrial activities within existing industrial buildings.<sup>53</sup>
- SETZ-R13 – Industrial activities not listed in SETZ-R12.<sup>54</sup>

8.3.4 They also consider these rules must all require demonstration that the activity will not impact on the safe and efficient function of the state highway networks. They seek the following matter of control be added to these rules:

*“x. the extent of adverse effects on the safe and efficient operation of the transport network.”*

8.3.5 GRUZ-R12 and RLZ-R12 relate to rural produce retail. Waka Kotahi generally supports these rules.<sup>55</sup> However, they consider rural retail activities can result in additional vehicle movements and vehicle manoeuvring in locations that may not be suitable for these to occur. The submitter seeks that the speed limit for permitted rural retail activities be amended from 80km/h to 50km/h to ensure that the safe and efficient function of the state highway is maintained. This submission is opposed by NZ Pork [245.20FS] who state that most rural produce retail is in the Rural zones so will generally be in an area of open road where very few areas will have a speed limit of 50km/hr. The further submission also states that there is no evidence included as to the incidents that have occurred at rural produce retail sites.

### **Analysis**

8.3.6 I do not support the submissions of Waka Kotahi seeking additional matters of discretion to include the extent of adverse effects on the safe and efficient operation of the transport network. Regarding community facilities (SETZ-R9), cafes (SETZ-R10), industrial activities within existing industrial buildings (SETZ-R11) and Industrial activities not listed as emergency service facilities (SETZ-R13), I note that the matters of control or matters of discretion already provide discretion to consider the: ‘the location and design of buildings, parking and loading areas and access’. I consider this provides adequate discretion to consider effects such as the vehicle access, vehicle manoeuvring and includes the impact these might have on the operation of the transport network. I also note that the Transport chapter includes provisions managing: high trip generating activities (TRAN-R10), activities with new vehicle access way requirements (TRAN-R3), and vehicle access way requirements (TRAN-S10), which are also relevant. I note these provisions include discretion to consider the extent to which the safety and efficiency of road operations will be adversely affected.

---

<sup>51</sup> Waka Kotahi [143.153]

<sup>52</sup> Waka Kotahi [143.154]

<sup>53</sup> Waka Kotahi [143.155]

<sup>54</sup> Waka Kotahi [143.156]

<sup>55</sup> Waka Kotahi [143.149] [143.152]

In my opinion, inserting an additional matter of control in the SETZ chapter will result in unnecessary repetition within the PDP.

- 8.3.7 Finally, I disagree that rural produce retail activities should be amended from 80km/h to 50km/hr. As detailed in the Transport chapter, new vehicle access way requirements (TRAN-R3), approach sight triangles for public road/rail level crossings (TRAN-S9) and vehicle access way requirements (TRAN-S10) require compliance for activities such as rural produce retail. As noted above, these provisions include discretion to consider the extent to which the safety and efficiency of road operations will be adversely affected where the standard is not met. I therefore do not support the amendment sought.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

- 8.3.8 I recommend that rules: SETZ-R9, SETZ-R10, SETZ-R11, SETZ-R13, GRUZ-R12 and RLZ-R12 be retained as notified.

## **8.4 Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu submission**

- 8.4.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu	185.106, 185.107, 185.108, 185.109, 185.110

### **Submissions**

- 8.4.2 Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu considers the Rural Zones have many overlays that recognise cultural values. However, for restricted discretionary activities in these Rural zones there does not seem to be any ability to consider the values of these overlays, unless the activity also requires consent under the SASM rules. In their opinion, an additional matter of discretion should be included within the following rules:

- GRUZ-R21 – Rural industry.<sup>56</sup>
- GRUZ-R22 – Emergency services facilities.<sup>57</sup>
- GRUZ -R23 – Expansion of existing consented quarries<sup>58</sup>
- RLZ-R17 – Emergency services, health care and community facilities.<sup>59</sup>
- SETZ-R13 – Industrial activities not listed in SETZ-R12.<sup>60</sup>

- 8.4.3 The matter of discretion would read as follows:

<sup>56</sup> Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu [185.106]

<sup>57</sup> Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu [185.107]

<sup>58</sup> Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu [185.108]

<sup>59</sup> Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu [185.109]

<sup>60</sup> Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu [185.110]

10. the potential of any adverse effects on the spiritual and cultural values and beliefs of Kāti Huirapa, including measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects.

**Analysis**

- 8.4.4 I do not agree GRUZ-R21, GRUZ-R22, GRUZ-R23, RLZ-R17, or SETZ-R13 need to be amended to include an additional matter of discretion related to the potential for any adverse effects on spiritual and cultural values. In 2020, as part of the plan review, TDC commissioned a report from Aoraki Environmental Consultancy Limited which identified both sites and areas of significance to Māori and perceived threats to the values of the areas. These threats relate to the effects of land use activities. The report has supported the development of the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori (SASM) chapter, contained within Part 2 of the PDP which applies to district-wide matters, including the rural zones.
- 8.4.5 Rules within the SASM chapter are focused on activities that have been identified as being a potential threat to cultural values, including earthworks, buildings and structures, indigenous vegetation clearance, temporary events, mining and quarrying, subdivision, shelterbelts and woodlots and intensively farmed stock. Breaches of the permitted standards trigger the requirement for a resource consent where rules must be considered in any consenting framework.
- 8.4.6 SASM-R1 relates to earthworks and SASM-R2 relates to buildings and structures. In both cases activities unable to comply with stated matters of discretion will be restricted to the potential of any adverse effects on the cultural values, including measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects. I consider if an activity breaches one of the standards within SASM-R1 or R2 the potential of any adverse effects on the spiritual and cultural values will be considered within the resulting consent process. When considering the activities managed by GRUZ-R21, GRUZ-R22, GRUZ-R23, RLZ-R17, or SETZ-R13 (Rural industry, Emergency services facilities, Expansion of existing consented quarries, Emergency services, health care and community facilities, and Industrial activities) all of these activities, if established within a SASM overlay would trigger either the earthworks or building and structure rules within the SASM chapter.
- 8.4.7 I agree with the submitter that it is important that the potential effects on cultural is considered when these activities seek to establish in a SASM overlay. However, the ability to consider these effects are already provided for with the SASM chapter. I consider an additional matter of discretion related to cultural values in the SETZ, GRUZ, and RLZ would create unnecessary repetition within the PDP, therefore do not support the insertion of this matter of discretion.
- 8.4.8 If there are any changes to the SASM chapter that effect the ability for these effects to be considered within the SASM chapter, I consider the merits of this submission would need to be reconsidered.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

- 8.4.9 I recommend that rules: SETZ-R13, GRUZ-R21, GRUZ-R22, GRUZ-R23 and RLZ-R17 be retained as notified.

### **8.5 Transpower submission**

- 8.5.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
Transpower	159.97, 159.98

#### **Submissions**

- 8.5.2 Policies RLZ-P9 and SETZ-P4 manage the establishment of 'other activities' within the RLZ and SETZ. Transpower [159.97, 159.98] have submitted on both policies, emphasising that the National Grid carries high voltage electricity over long distances, traversing various zones. Due to technical requirements, minimising adverse effects is not always possible. They seek an amendment to give effect to the NPS-ET and provide a policy framework to support its operation, maintenance, upgrade, and development in all zones, especially rural areas where it's most suitable to accommodate the National Grid. They consider an amendment would only allow other activities where there is a functional or operational need for the activity to locate within the Zone.

#### **Analysis**

- 8.5.3 I disagree there is a requirement to provide a policy framework to support the National Grid's operation, maintenance, upgrade, and development in the rural zones, as I consider the policies contained within the Energy and Infrastructure chapter adequately provide for this, specifically EI-P1 and EI-P2. I also note that the national grid rules in the EI chapter take precedence over rules in the zone chapter.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

- 8.5.4 I recommend that policies RLZ-P9 and SETZ-P4 be retained as notified.

### **8.6 KiwiRail submission**

- 8.6.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
KiwiRail	187.85

### **Submissions**

- 8.6.2 KiwiRail [187.85] seek that for health and safety reasons, a consistent 5m setback is applied to all zone chapters which are adjacent to the rail corridor. This includes the GRUZ and SETZ. It states that a 5m setback from the rail corridor is appropriate in providing for vehicular access to the backs of buildings (e.g. a cherry picker) and allowing for scaffolding to be erected safely.

### **Analysis**

- 8.6.3 I have concerns with the efficiency of applying a 5m setback to any boundary with a rail corridor. This could result in a fairly substantial area being unable to be developed (in absence of applying for a resource consent) for what seems to be very limited purposes, i.e. only in relation to when vehicular access or scaffolding may be required where a building adjoins the railway corridor at the rear of the building. It is also not clear what policy such a standard would be intended to implement or what objective it would be achieving. For completeness I note that the standard has not been sought to address potential reverse sensitivity effects from noise associated with the railway line, noting that a standard to address this is proposed in the noise chapter (NOISE-R9, requiring acoustic insulation). Overall, I consider that the costs of this approach outweigh what appears to be a limited benefit.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

- 8.6.4 I do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

## **8.7 Ministry of Education submission**

- 8.7.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
MoE	106.21, 106.22, 106.23, 106.24, 106.25, 106.26, 106.27, 106.28, 106.29, 106.30

### **Submissions**

- 8.7.2 MoE consider educational facilities should be provided for where there is a potential need within rural communities. Their submission sought amendments to objectives, policies and rules within the GRUZ, RLZ, and SETZ.

8.7.3 In relation to the objectives, they generally support GRUZ-O1<sup>61</sup> and GRUZ-O4<sup>62</sup> and seek they be retained as notified. However, they seek reference to “*education*” be included within RLZ-O4<sup>63</sup>, SETZ-O1<sup>64</sup> and SETZ-O2<sup>65</sup>.

8.7.4 Regarding relevant policies, MoE seek:

- SETZ-P3<sup>66</sup> highlight a minor grammatical area and seek reference to “*educational facilities*”, and
- RLZ-P9<sup>67</sup> replace “*Only allow*” with “*Enable*” as they consider this aligns with the language used in the strategic directions of the PDP.

8.7.5 In relation to rules, MoE have submitted on GRUZ-R7,<sup>68</sup> RLZ-R7<sup>69</sup> and SETZ-R3<sup>70</sup> as they consider the rules are too restrictive. In their opinion educational facilities should be enabled as they consider them essential social infrastructure and seek flexibility in:

- Building design
- Type of education service
- Number of children attending
- Hours of operation to provide for special activities such as school balls or the use of sports fields, and
- Removal of maximum occupancy restrictions on educational facility sites.

8.7.6 They request a permitted activity status for educational facilities across the Rural Zones to provide flexibility while serving the education needs of rural areas with a default activity status of Restricted Discretionary if permitted standards are not achieved. For GRZ-R7 they seek the following amendment:

***Education facility***

***Activity status: Permitted***

***Where:***

---

<sup>61</sup> MoE [106.21]

<sup>62</sup> MoE [106.22]

<sup>63</sup> MoE [106.24]

<sup>64</sup> MoE [106.27]

<sup>65</sup> MoE [106.28]

<sup>66</sup> MoE [106.29]

<sup>67</sup> MoE [106.25]

<sup>68</sup> MoE [106.23]

<sup>69</sup> MoE [106.26]

<sup>70</sup> MoE [106.30]

**~~PER-1~~**

~~The activity is undertaken within and is ancillary to a residential unit; and The activity complies with GRUZ-S1 – GRUZ-S4~~

**~~PER-2~~**

~~The educational facility is for a childcare service or home schooling; and~~

**~~PER-3~~**

~~The maximum number of children attending at any one time is six, excluding any children who live there.~~

**Activity status where compliance not achieved: ~~Discretionary~~ Restricted discretionary**

**Matters of discretion are restricted to:**

1. Adverse effects on the rural amenity values of adjoining rural properties and the surrounding area are avoided or mitigated; and
2. The character and quality of the surrounding area is not compromised; and
3. They contribute to the health and wellbeing of people in the surrounding area; and
4. The scale, form and design of any building means the amenity values of the surrounding area are maintained; and
5. Road safety and efficiency is maintained; and
6. The activity has an operational or functional need to locate in the General Rural Zone.

8.7.7 Similar amendments are sought for the RLZ-R7.

8.7.8 SETZ-R3 currently controls educational facilities where compliance is not achieved and MoE seek the following amendment:

*Education facility*

*Activity status: Permitted*

*Where:*

**~~PER-1~~**

~~The activity is undertaken within and is ancillary to a residential unit; and~~

**~~PER-2~~**

~~The educational facility is for a childcare service or home schooling; and~~

~~PER-3~~

~~The maximum number of children attending at any one time is six, excluding any children who live there; and~~

~~PER-4 PER-1~~

All the Standards of this chapter are complied with.

Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1, ~~PER-2~~ or ~~PER-3~~: Controlled Restricted discretionary

Where:

CON-1

the activity complies with **PER-4**.

~~Matters of control are restricted to:~~

- ~~1. the location and design of buildings and any proposed car parking and loading areas and access; and~~
- ~~2. hours of operation; and~~
- ~~3. noise, disturbance and loss of privacy of neighbours; and~~
- ~~4. screening and landscaping; and~~
- ~~5. waste treatment and disposal.~~

~~Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-4: Restricted Discretionary~~

~~Matters of discretion are restricted to:~~

- ~~1. the matters of discretion of any infringed standard.~~

~~Activity status where compliance not achieved with CON-1: Restricted Discretionary~~

Matters of discretion are restricted to:

1. the matters of discretion of any infringed standard; and
2. the location and design of buildings and any proposed car parking and loading areas and access; and
3. hours of operation; and

4. noise, disturbance and loss of privacy of neighbours; and
5. screening and landscaping; and
6. waste treatment and disposal.”

### Analysis

8.7.9 The following assessment has considered the amendment to each of the three zones RLZ, GRUZ, and SETZ.

8.7.10 Turning firstly to the amendments sought to the RLZ, I disagree “education” should be included in the list of activities provided for within RLZ-O4. I note that the introduction to the RLZ states:

*“The Rural Lifestyle Zone provides a lifestyle choice and meets the demand for rural living. It is provided in areas adjoining Timaru, Temuka, Geraldine and Pleasant Point...”*

8.7.11 Given the location of the RLZ adjoining the larger towns of Timaru, Temuka, Geraldine and Pleasant Point, I note these towns already provide a range of educational facilities. While I acknowledge future population growth may necessitate a requirement for additional education facilities, I consider the purpose of the RLZ is to predominantly provide for residential lifestyle activities and not for educational facilities.

8.7.12 In relation to RLZ-P9, I consider replacing “only allow” with “enable” is at odds with the intent of the objectives in the RLZ chapter. The drafting approach used across the PDP, is for the word “enable” to be used at a policy level to support permitted and controlled activities – being those activities that are anticipated in a particular zone or area. Within the RLZ chapter, this is reflected in policies that seek to enable residential activities, minor residential units and supported residential care (RLZ-P1), reflecting the purpose of these zones (and reflected in the related objective). Conversely, where activities are not expected to be appropriate in all instances, but may be in some cases, the policy direction used is “only allow... where”, with the policy subsequently directing matters that must be satisfied in order for such an activity to be allowed. This is then generally implemented through restricted discretionary and discretionary activity status for such activities, with the policy providing clear guidance as to what must be met in order for consent to be granted. I consider that “enabling” these activities – which are not the main activities anticipated in these zones - would not be consistent with the objectives relevant to these zones. For these reasons, I do not support the amendment proposed by MOE.

8.7.13 In relation to RLZ-R7, as noted in the assessment of RLZ-O4 above, the Rural Lifestyle Zone is located adjoining the towns of Timaru, Temuka, Geraldine, and Pleasant Point which already offer various educational facilities. In my opinion this zone is not intended to accommodate all educational facilities which would unlikely preserve the purpose, character, and amenity values anticipated and as such disagree that amendment to this rule is required.

- 8.7.14 I consider the intent of RLZ-R7 is to permit small at home education facilities with larger educational facilities requiring a resource consent. I consider this rule framework is appropriate and ensures that the potential effects of a larger education facilities are managed through a resource consent process. However, I consider there is merit in amending the default activity status within RLZ-R7 from discretionary to restricted discretionary to provide plan users with greater direction as to the effects the rule is seeking to manage. I consider the matters of discretion listed within SETZ-R3 provide a reasonably comprehensive list of matters to be considered within a resource consent process within the GRUZ, and I prefer these matters to the matters of discretion supported by MoE, with the exception of one matter of discretion. MoE's submission sought the inclusion of the following matter of discretion:

*"The activity has an operational or functional need to locate in the General Rural Zone."*

- 8.7.15 I agree with the introduction for this matter of discretion. I consider this amendment activity status for activities that breach the permitted standards will ensure that the direction within RLZ-P3 and RLZ-P9 will be achieved.
- 8.7.16 Regarding the amendment sought to GRUZ-R7, I also disagree with the amendment sought by MoE. As with RLZ-R7, I consider the intent of GRUZ-R7 is to permit small at home education facilities with larger educational facilities requiring a resource consent. I consider this rule framework is appropriate and ensures that the potential effects of a larger education facilities are managed through a resource consent process. Therefore, I consider the same default restricted discretionary activity status should be incorporated within GRUZ-R7. I consider this amended activity status for activities that breach the permitted standards will ensures that the direction within GRUZ0-P2 and GRUZ-P7(1) will be achieved.
- 8.7.17 Regarding the amendments sought to SETZ-O1, SETZ-O2 and SETZ-P3, I note both SETZ-O1 and SETZ-O2 anticipates a mixture of activities and the list of activities within both SETZ-O1 and SETZ-O2(3) is not exclusive. Therefore, I disagree that "educational facilities" need to be explicitly included within these objectives.
- 8.7.18 When considering the amendment sought to SETZ-P3 I agree that agree educational facilities should be included within clause (2). I note that SETZ-P3 includes an exclusive list of activities and if educational facilities are not included within SETZ-P3 they will then be managed by SETZ-P4. I consider effects of an educational facility are well-known and can be managed to align with clause 3 of SETZ-P3. I also note that the inclusion of educational facilities within SETZ-P3 largely aligns with the approach taken to community facilities which are often similar in nature to educational facilities. I also support the amendment to correct a minor drafting error.
- 8.7.19 Regarding SETZ-R3, I recognise the Settlement Zones are located throughout rural areas and not within close proximity to larger urban centres. As discussed above, I have recommended an amendment to SETZ-P3 to clarify the that educational facilities are anticipated within the settlement zone. However, I disagree with the amendment to SETZ-R3 sought by MoE. I

consider the intent of SETZ-R3 is to permit small at home education facilities with larger educational facilities requiring a resource consent as either a controlled or restricted discretionary. I consider this rule framework is appropriate as it requires that larger education facilities are managed through a resource consent process which will ensure that the characters and qualities of the SETZ set out in SETZ-O3 and SETZP3(3) are retained.

### Conclusions and Recommendations

8.7.20 I recommend SETZ-O1 and SETZ-O2 be retained as notified.

8.7.21 I recommend SETZ-P3 is amended as follows:

SETZ-P3	Compatible <sup>71</sup> non-residential activities
<p>Provided<sup>72</sup> for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. industrial activities within existing buildings; and</li> <li>2. cafes, community facilities, <u>educational facilities</u>,<sup>73</sup> and emergency <u>service facilities</u><sup>74</sup>; and</li> <li>3. ensure they are designed and located to minimise adverse effects on existing activities and the character and qualities of the settlement.</li> </ol>	

8.7.22 I recommend RLZ-R7 is amended as follows:

RLZ-R7	Educational facilities	
Rural Lifestyle Zone	<b>Activity status: Permitted</b>  <b>Where</b>  <b>PER-1</b> The activity is undertaken within an existing residential unit and is ancillary to the use of that residential unit; and  <b>PER-2</b> The education facility is for a childcare service or home school; and  <b>PER-3</b> The maximum number of children attending at any one time is six, excluding any children who live in the residential unit.	<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with: <u>Restricted</u> Discretionary</b>  <b><u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u></b>  <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>the matters of discretion of any infringed standard; and</u></li> <li>2. <u>the location and design of buildings and any proposed car parking and loading areas and access; and</u></li> <li>3. <u>hours of operation; and</u></li> <li>4. <u>noise, disturbance and loss of privacy of neighbours;</u></li> <li>5. <u>screening and landscaping;</u></li> <li>6. <u>waste treatment and disposal; and</u></li> <li>7. <u>whether the activity has a operational or functional need to locate in the RLZ.</u><sup>75</sup></li> </ol>

8.7.23 I recommend GRUZ-R7 is amended as follows:

<sup>71</sup> MoE [106.29]

<sup>72</sup> MoE [106.29]

<sup>73</sup> MoE [106.29]

<sup>74</sup> Clause 16(2)

<sup>75</sup> MoE [106.26]

GRUZ-R7	Educational facilities	
General Rural Zone	<p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b> The activity is undertaken within, and ancillary to the use of, an existing principal residential unit; and</p> <p><b>PER-2</b> The education facility is for a childcare service, or home schooling; and</p> <p><b>PER-3</b> The maximum number of children attending at any one time is six, excluding any children who live there.</p>	<p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with: <u>Restricted</u> Discretionary</b></p> <p><b><u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>the matters of discretion of any infringed standard; and</u></li> <li>2. <u>the location and design of buildings and any proposed car parking and loading areas and access; and</u></li> <li>3. <u>hours of operation; and</u></li> <li>4. <u>noise, disturbance and loss of privacy of neighbours;</u></li> <li>5. <u>screening and landscaping;</u></li> <li>6. <u>waste treatment and disposal; and</u></li> <li>7. <u>whether the activity has a operational or functional need to locate in the GRUZ.</u><sup>76</sup></li> </ol>

### Section 32AA assessment

- 8.7.24 I consider the recommended amendment to SETZ-P3 introducing 'education facilities' provides greater clarity that these activities are anticipated with the SETZ while also ensuring that the character and qualities of the SETZ are retained. I consider the recommended amendment to SETZ-P3 is consistent with, and achieves the outcome sought by SETZ-O2 and will ensure this particular non-residential activity supports the function of local communities while maintaining the amenity of the zone. I consider the recommended amendments will not have any greater environmental, economic, or cultural effects but will provide social benefit to the local community.
- 8.7.25 I consider the recommended amendment to RLZ-R7 is consistent with, and achieves the outcome sought by RLZ-P9 as it will ensure that applications for educational facilities in the RLZ will assess whether the activity has an operational or functional need to locate in the zone as part of the consenting process. I consider the recommended amendments will not have any greater environmental, social, or cultural effects but will provide an economic benefit as both plan users and decision makers will have a clear understanding of the effects the rule is managing, which will lead to a more efficient resource consent process.
- 8.7.26 I consider the recommended amendment to GRUZ-R7 is consistent with, and achieves the outcome sought by GURZ-O1 and GURZ-P7 as it will ensure that applications for educational facilities in the GURZ will assess whether the activity requires a rural location as part of the

<sup>76</sup> MoE [106.23]

consenting process. I consider the recommended amendments will not have any greater environmental, social, or cultural effects but will provide an economic benefit as both plan users and decision makers will have a clear understanding of the effects the rule is managing, which will lead to a more efficient resource consent process.

## 8.8 TDC Submission – Wildfire risk

- 8.8.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
TDC	42.46

### Submissions

- 8.8.2 TDC [42.46] highlights the risk of wildfires and associated risks of fire from vegetation planting close to where people live, and work is expected to increase due to climate change. They consider this matter is not sufficiently addressed in the PDP and seek amendments to the introduction within the GRUZ chapter as follows:

“Many people also live in the General Rural Zone and are accustomed to a level of amenity and the character of the zone. These people also need to be protected from amenity and fire risk effects associated with rural land uses such as woodlots and shelterbelts.”

- 8.8.3 TDC seeks a new policy as follows:

“GRUZ-PXX

Manage the planting of any woodlot or shelterbelt if it is located in a position that it increase the wildfire risk on any neighbouring residential property.”

- 8.8.4 Additionally, they seek to amend GRUZ-R15 – Shelterbelts and woodlots as follows by adding an additional permitted standard and matter of discretion:

“PER-3

Any shelterbelt or woodlot shall comply with the following separation distances, measured from the outside extent of the canopy:

a) 30m from any residential unit or other principal building on an adjoining property;  
and

b) 30m from any zone that is not a rural zone; and

c) 5m from any adjoining legally established accessway to a residential unit or other principal building.

Matters of discretion are restricted to:

[...]

5. wildfire risk on buildings"

- 8.8.5 Hort NZ [245.6FS] and South Pacific Sera Limited [274.1FS] have lodged further submissions opposing the proposed additions. They state that shelterbelts are an integral part of primary production in rural areas and consider residential activities should be setback from shelterbelts – not the other way around. They consider a 30m setback from the boundary for a residential unit is the appropriate way to manage the risk of wildfire.

### **Analysis**

- 8.8.6 I agree in part with the submission from TDC. I agree in principle with the addition of a new policy and rule that manages the planting of any woodlot or shelterbelt if it is located in a position that increases the wildfire risk on any neighbouring residential property. When considering the drafting of the proposed policy, I have recommended drafting which I think better reflects the intent of the policy.
- 8.8.7 When considering the proposed rule, I disagree that the rule needs to apply a 5 metres setback from an accessway or a 30 metre setback from a zone boundary. I consider the proposed setback from a residential unit or other principal building is sufficient to achieve the intent of the proposed policy.
- 8.8.8 I acknowledge the points made in the further submissions from Hort NZ and South Pacific Sera Limited, and I agree that shelterbelts are an integral part of primary production in rural areas. I consider the recommended 30 metre setback from a residential unit or other principal building strikes the right balance between enabling primary production activities while also managing potential wildfire risk. I also note that existing use rights set out within Section 10 of the RMA will apply to existing shelterbelts and therefore the proposed rule will only apply to the establishment of new shelterbelt planting.
- 8.8.9 I disagree that an amendment is required to the introduction for the chapter that describes this matter. I note that the introduction provides a high-level summary of the GRUZ and doesn't attempt to describe every rule and standard. As such, I disagree that the fire risk effects associated with rural land uses such as woodlots and shelterbelts need to be referred to within the introduction.
- 8.8.10 I have also considered whether this additional policy and rule package would be better located within the HAZ chapter given fire is included within the definition of "natural hazard". Given there is an existing shelterbelt rule within the GRUZ chapter I consider from

a plan usability perspective, it is appropriate that the additional policy and rule package is located in the GRUZ chapter.

- 8.8.11 Finally, I recommend a clause 16(2) amendment is made to GRUZ-R15 PER-1 and PER-2. The title of the rule refers to “shelterbelts” but PER-1 and PER-2 refer to “trees”. To avoid confusion, I recommended that the word “trees” is replaced with “shelterbelts” within PER-1 and PER-2.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

- 8.8.12 I recommend the following policy GRUZ-P11 and permitted activity standard GRUZ-R15(3) be included within the GRUZ as follows:

#### **GRUZ-P11     Wildfire risk**

Control the location of woodlots and shelterbelts to reduce the wildfire risk to neighbouring residential properties<sup>77</sup>

<b>GRUZ-R15</b>	<b>Shelterbelts <u>and woodlots</u><sup>78</sup></b>	
<b>General rural zone</b>	<p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b> The height of any <u>shelterbelt trees</u><sup>79</sup> located within 100m of a residential unit on an adjoining site are contained within an envelope defined by a recession plane of 1m vertical for every 3.5m horizontal that originates from the closest point of the residential unit; and</p> <p><b>PER-2</b></p>	<p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved: Restricted Discretionary</b></p> <p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. height and setback of trees from property boundaries and roads; and</li> <li>2. shading of houses; and</li> <li>3. shading of roads; and</li> <li>4. traffic safety; and</li> <li>5. tree species-; <u>and</u></li> </ol>

<sup>77</sup> TDC [42.46]

<sup>78</sup> TDC [42.46]

<sup>79</sup> Clause 16(2) of the RMA

	<p><u>Shelterbelts Trees</u><sup>80</sup> are not in such a position that they cause icing of a road as a result of shading the road between 10 am and 2 pm on the shortest day.</p> <p><b><u>PER-3</u></b>  <u>Any shelterbelt or woodlot shall be setback 30m from any residential unit or other principal building on an adjoining property.</u><sup>81</sup></p>	<p>6. <u>wildfire risk on buildings.</u><sup>82</sup></p>
--	--	---

### Section 32AA

- 8.8.13 I consider the recommended addition of a new policy and rule within the PDP will ensure that the location of woodlots and shelterbelts in the GURZ is controlled achieving NH-O1, which requires that risk to human life and significant risk to property from natural hazards is avoided in high hazard areas, and avoided or mitigated elsewhere to an acceptable level.
- 8.8.14 The recommended amendments will not have any greater environmental, or cultural effects when compared to the notified provisions. This additional policy and permitted standard may have some economic costs, as there will be an additional setback standard to comply with which may result in increased resource consent applications. In contrast, there will be a social benefit as the GRUZ will be more resilient to the of risk wildfires. On balance, I consider these additional provisions are more effective in achieving NH-O1 while also still achieving GRUZ-O1.

<sup>80</sup> Clause 16(2) of the RMA

<sup>81</sup> TDC [42.46]

<sup>82</sup> TDC [42.46]

## 8.9 Gravel extraction overlay

- 8.9.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
Rooney Holdings	174.5
Rooney, G.J.H.	191.5
Rooney Group	249.5
Rooney Farms	250.5
Rooney Earthmoving	251.5
TDL	252.5

### Submissions

- 8.9.2 Six submitters<sup>83</sup> consider land-based gravel extraction is important to continuity of supply and consistency of gravel quality. The submitters request that the PDP introduce a gravel extraction overlay across land where existing land-based gravel extraction and clean fill deposition occurs. They consider such a layer should recognise and provide for this activity as well as protecting the sites from encroachment of sensitive activities in a way that the PDP has recognised and protected primary production. No details of the location of the proposed overlay were provided as part of the submission.
- 8.9.3 Fulton Hogan [170.6FS] and Road Metals [169.6FS] both lodged a further submission supporting the inclusion of a gravel extraction overlay and note that aggregate resources are locationally constrained (rock and sand can only be obtained where they occur naturally), and agree that it would be helpful to have an overlay to show where aggregate resources are located. They note that identifying the locations and availability of aggregates would help applicants and Council to assess resource consent applications against national regulations and policies such as the NPS-HPL, which includes an assessment of “aggregate extraction that provides a significant national or regional public benefit”.
- 8.9.4 DoC [166.31FS] and Forest and Bird [156.244FS] both lodged a further submission opposing the proposed overlay. These further submitters do not consider the overlay is necessary as there are other provisions of the PDP managing gravel extraction. DoC also note they would be concerned if gravel extraction was permitted in areas in or near to SNAs or other sensitive areas such as habitats of threatened or at-risk species.

---

<sup>83</sup> Rooney Holdings [174.5], Rooney, G.J.H. [191.5], Rooney Group [249.5], Rooney Farms [250.5], Rooney Earthmoving [251.5], TDL [252.5]

## Analysis

8.9.5 I agree in part with the submitters. I agree that land-based gravel extraction is important to continuity of supply and consistency of gravel quality. However, I disagree that an additional gravel extraction overlay is required within the PDP. I note that land where existing land-based gravel extraction and clean fill deposition occurs will either have an existing resource consent to operate or will have existing use rights. In either case, the activity will be able to continue under the PDP without the need for an additional overlay. I also note that the provisions of the GRUZ chapter protect primary production<sup>84</sup> activities from reverse sensitivity effects through both GRUZ-P5 and GRUZ-S4 which requires new sensitive activities be setback 500m from a lawfully established quarry or mine. Given this, I do not consider that the suggested overlay is required.

## Conclusions and Recommendations

8.9.6 No further amendments to the GRUZ chapter are recommended.

## 9. General matters

### 9.1 General provisions for primary production

9.1.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
Ballance	86.14
Dairy Holdings	89.23
Federated Farmers	182.1
Eggleton, B	37.2
NZ Pork	247.18

---

<sup>84</sup> Primary production is defined as:

- any aquaculture, agricultural, pastoral, horticultural, mining, quarrying or forestry activities; and*
- includes initial processing, as an ancillary activity, of commodities that result from the listed activities in a);*
- includes any land and buildings used for the production of the commodities from a) and used for the initial processing of the commodities in b); but*
- excludes further processing of those commodities into a different product.*

**Submissions**

- 9.1.2 Ballance [86.14] generally supports the PDP's acknowledgment of the importance of safeguarding primary production and related activities in rural zones. Similarly, NZ Pork [247.18] generally supports the provisions for intensive primary production.
- 9.1.3 Dairy Holdings [89.23] seek the retention of objectives, policies, and rules in the PDP that support and enable farming activities. They argue that maintaining support for farming activities, including those related to intensively farmed stock, aligns with the purposes of the RMA. Similarly, Federated Farmers [182.1] seek a resource management policy framework that supports existing primary production in rural areas and minimises barriers for establishing new primary production activities.
- 9.1.4 Eggleton, B [37.2] opposes that farming now requires another form of consent when there are already requirements for consents from ECan.

**Analysis**

- 9.1.5 In response to the submission from Dairy Holdings and Federated Farmers, I consider the provisions of the GRUZ chapter acknowledges the importance of safeguarding primary production and minimises barriers for establishing new primary production activities. Therefore, no further amendments to the GRUZ chapter are recommended in this regard.
- 9.1.6 In response to Eggleton, B, I note that farming is enabled and protected within the provisions of the GRUZ, therefore I disagree any additional amendments are required.

**Conclusions and recommendations**

- 9.1.7 No additional amendments to the GRUZ chapter are recommended.

**9.2 General provisions for reverse sensitivity**

- 9.2.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
Hort NZ	245.1, 245.2

**Submissions**

- 9.2.2 Hort NZ [245.1], request the Council acknowledges the possibility of reverse sensitivity effects and establishes a strong policy framework to ensure proper activity placement, therefore preventing any adverse impacts from reverse sensitivity. They highlight the need to address food security and preserve the values of highly productive land and raise concern about urban and lifestyle development in horticultural areas, causing pressures on crop

rotations, limiting orchard expansion, raising land prices, and creating social tension from complaints about horticultural activities.<sup>85</sup>

### Analysis

9.2.3 I consider the provisions of the GRUZ chapter address the possibility of reverse sensitivity effects in the GRUZ, namely by GRUZ-O3 and GRUZ-P5 which require that primary production is protected from reverse sensitivity effects by managing sensitive activities to ensure they avoid adverse effects on primary production. Given this I consider no further amendments to the GRUZ chapter are required.

9.2.4 I consider this approach is consistent with the policy direction within the RPS managing reverse sensitivity effects on primary production. Policy 5.3.12(1)(a) and(b) states:

*“Maintain and enhance natural and physical resources contributing to Canterbury’s overall rural productive economy in areas which are valued for existing or foreseeable future primary production, by:*

1. *avoiding development, and/or fragmentation which;*
  - a. *forecloses the ability to make appropriate use of that land for primary production; and/or*
  - b. *results in reverse sensitivity effects that limit or precludes primary production.*

*...”*

9.2.5 I consider the direction within GRUZ-O3 and GRUZ-P5 gives effect to the requirements of the RPS.

## 9.3 General provisions for height

9.3.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
ECan	183.4

### Submissions

9.3.2 The submitter notes that across the whole plan, that references to "height" of buildings or structures do not make reference to where height is measured from. They seek that all references to the height of buildings across the PDP are reviewed to ensure that height is measured from “ground level” (which is a national planning standard term).

---

<sup>85</sup> Hort NZ [245.2]

## Analysis

- 9.3.3 I have reviewed the relevant standards in each of the GRUZ, SETZ, and RLZ<sup>86</sup>, and note that SETZ-S1 and RLZ-S1 include the following note:

*“Note: Height shall be measure from the existing ground level prior to any works commencing.”*

- 9.3.4 Whereas GRUZ-S1 incorporates the same text into the drafting of the rule.

- 9.3.5 I have also reviewed the relevant height standards in other zones within the PDP. In each in each of the RESZ and CMUZ chapters<sup>87</sup>, rather than including a note, the requirement to measure from the ground level to the highest part of the building is included within the drafting standard. While I consider the effect of these two drafting styles is the same, it is better drafting practice to include the requirements of a standard within the standard rather than within a note. As such, I recommend an amendment to SETZ-S1 and RLZ-S1 to ensure consistency across the zone chapters of the PDP. I also recommend a minor grammatical amendment is made to the standards under clause 16(2) of the RMA.

## Conclusions and Recommendations

- 9.3.6 I recommend that RLZ-S1 and SETZ-S1 be amended as follows:

RLZ-S1	Height of buildings and structures	
<b>1. Rural Lifestyle Zone</b>	<p>The height of buildings and structures must not exceed 8m, except for buildings and structures located within 50m of a General Residential Zone, which must not exceed 4.5m in height.</p> <p><b>Note:</b><sup>88</sup> Height shall be measured<sup>89</sup> from the existing ground level prior to any works commencing.</p>	<p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. dominance in the landscape; and</li> <li>2. overlooking and loss of privacy of adjacent residential units; and</li> <li>3. shading of adjacent residential units; and</li> <li>4. landscaping.</li> </ol>

SETZ-S1	Height of buildings and structures	
<b>Settlement Zone</b>	<p>Buildings and structures, including additions and alterations to buildings and structures, must not exceed a maximum height of 10m.</p>	<p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. dominance of the surrounding area; and</li> <li>2. overlooking and loss of privacy to adjoining sites; and</li> <li>3. solar access to adjoining sites; and</li> <li>4. landscaping; and</li> <li>5. mitigation measures.</li> </ol>

<sup>86</sup> GRUZ-S1, SETZ-S1, RLZ-S1

<sup>87</sup> GRZ-S1, MRZ-S1, NCZ-S1, LCZ-S1, LFRZ-S1, MUZ-S1, TCZ-S1, CCZ-S1

<sup>88</sup> ECan [183.4]

<sup>89</sup> Clause 16(2) RMA

**Note:**<sup>90</sup> Height shall be measured<sup>91</sup> from the existing ground level prior to any works commencing.

### Section 32AA

- 9.3.7 I consider the recommended deletion of the note will not impact the application of the standards. I consider this change will not have any greater environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects than the notified provisions

## 9.4 General provisions for floor area

- 9.4.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
ECan	183.1

### Submissions

- 9.4.2 ECan [183.1] notes that a large number of rules in the PDP use variable terminology to define floor areas of buildings, often with the term undefined, so that it is not clear what is being measured. It is necessary to review all references to size of buildings and consider whether a clear definition is required linking development to either the "building footprint" or "gross floor area", which are defined National Planning Standard terms, and then create exclusions from those terms within the rules if necessary.

### Analysis

- 9.4.3 I have reviewed the relevant standards in each of the SETZ and RLZ<sup>92</sup>, and note that:

*"SETZ-S4 – Coverage" states:*

*"The maximum combined building and impervious surface coverage of the site must be 35%."*

*"RLZ-S3 – Building Coverage" states:*

*"The footprint of all buildings on the site shall not exceed 10% site coverage."*

- 9.4.4 For completeness, I note the GRUZ does not contain a building coverage rule.

<sup>90</sup> ECan [183.4]

<sup>91</sup> Clause 16(2) RMA

<sup>92</sup> GRUZ-S1, SETZ-S4, RLZ-S1

- 9.4.5 I agree with the submitter that there is inconsistency as to how these standards are drafted. I consider the drafting of SETZ-S4 and RLZ-S4 should be amendment to align with the drafting style of the other chapters in the PDP.
- 9.4.6 I have discussed the above standards with Ms White (author of the GRZ and MRZ s42A report). Within her Hearing B report she has assessed this submission in the context of GRZ-S5 and MRZ-S5. She notes that that these standards each use clearly defined terms (“building coverage” and “gross floor area”), but with respect to GRZ-S5 and MRZ-S5, the standard itself repeats the definition (by reference in the standards to the “net site area” – despite this being within the definition of “building coverage” already). She consider this to be unnecessary and therefore recommends removal of reference to net site area from within the standard.
- 9.4.7 I agree with the amendments recommended by Ms White. I consider the drafting of SETZ-S4 and RLZ-S4 should be amendment to align with the drafting style of GRZ-S5 and MRZ-S5. I note that SETZ-S4 is intended to capture both the building and impervious surface coverage. Therefore, I consider the drafting within SETZ-S4 needs to refer to both building coverage and impervious surface coverage.

### Conclusions and Recommendations

- 9.4.8 I recommend that RLZ-S3 and SETZ-S4 be amended as follows:

RLZ-S3	Building coverage	
<b>Rural Lifestyle Zone</b>	<del>The footprint of all buildings on the site shall not exceed 10% site coverage.</del> <u>The building coverage of any site must not exceed 10%.<sup>93</sup></u>	<b>Matters of discretion restricted to:</b> 1. adverse effects on the character and qualities of the zone; and 2. landscaping and screening.

SETZ-S4	Coverage	
<b>Settlement zone</b>	<del>The maximum combined building and impervious surface coverage of the site must be 35%.</del> <u>The combined building coverage and impervious surface coverage of any site must not exceed 35%.<sup>94</sup></u>	<b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b> 1. availability of land for the purpose of treatment and/or disposal of sewage, stormwater, greywater or trade waste; and 2. compatibility with the character and qualities of the zone; and 3. visual dominance of buildings; and 4. mitigation measures.

### Section 32AA

- 9.4.9 I consider the recommended amendments will not impact the application of the standards. I consider this change will not have any greater environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects than the notified provisions

<sup>93</sup> ECan [183.1]

<sup>94</sup> ECan [183.1]

## 10. General Rural Zone

### 10.1 Provisions where no change is sought

10.1.1 The following provisions included within General Rural Zone were either not submitted on, or any submissions received sought their retention. As such, they are not assessed further in this report, and I recommend that the provisions are retained as notified:

- The definition of: “artificial crop protection structure”, “extensive pig farming” “fertilizer”, “residential unit”, “rural produce manufacturing” , “farm quarry” .
- Introduction.<sup>95</sup>
- GRUZ-O6.<sup>96</sup>
- GRUZ-P3.<sup>97</sup>
- GRUZ-P4.<sup>98</sup>
- GRUZ-P10.<sup>99</sup>
- GRUZ-R13.<sup>100</sup>
- GRUZ-R17.<sup>101</sup>
- GRUZ-R24.<sup>102</sup>
- GRUZ-R27.<sup>103</sup>
- GRUZ-S2.<sup>104</sup>

### 10.2 Objective GRUZ-O1

10.2.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
NZ Frost Fans	255.17, 255.18
Dairy Holdings	89.15

<sup>95</sup> Hort NZ [245.102]

<sup>96</sup> Dir. General Conservation [166.126], Federated Farmers [182.186]

<sup>97</sup> Federated Farmers [182.189]

<sup>98</sup> Federated Farmers [182.190], FENZ [131.35]

<sup>99</sup> Helicopters Sth Cant. [53.23], NZAAA [132.29], Dir. General Conservation [166.127]

<sup>100</sup> Radio NZ [152.56], Hort NZ [245.116]

<sup>101</sup> Hort NZ [245.119]

<sup>102</sup> AQA [224.10]

<sup>103</sup> Silver Fern Farms [172.126], Alliance Group [173.124]

<sup>104</sup> Horticulture New Zealand [245.128]

Silver Fern Farms	172.110
Alliance Group	173.112
Federated Farmers	182.181
Fenlea Farms	171.1
Rooney, A. J.	177.3
K J. Rooney Ltd	197.1
FENZ	131.34
Radio NZ	152.52
Fonterra Limited	165.124
Road Metals	169.38
Fulton Hogan	170.40
Rural Contractors	178.4
Hort NZ	245.104
NZ Frost Fans	255.18
Clarke, G	1.2

### Submissions

- 10.2.2 12 submissions support GRUZ-O1 and seek it be retained as notified..<sup>105</sup>
- 10.2.3 Clarke, G [1.2] suggests the objective is overly focused on primary production and seeks amendments to instead focus on a range of activities which support rural communities' potential to alter and diversify income..<sup>106</sup>
- 10.2.4 NZ Frost Fans [255.18] consider that to give effect to the NPS-HPL, clear provisions are needed to separate non-productive from productive activities, ensuring that non-productive uses do not interfere with productive operations..<sup>107</sup> This would include GRUZ-O1, among several provisions, which would avoid the establishment of non-production uses, separation and noise insulation requirements for sensitive and non-productive uses. They seek to amend GRUZ-O1 to give effect to the NPS-HPL or retain as notified..<sup>108</sup>

---

<sup>105</sup> Dairy Holdings [89.15], FENZ [131.34], Radio NZ [152.52], Fonterra [165.124], Road Metals [169.38], Fulton Hogan [170.40], Silver Fern Farms [172.110], Alliance Group [173.112], Rural Contractors [178.4], Federated Farmers [182.181], Hort NZ [245.104], NZ Frost Fans [255.18]

<sup>106</sup> Clarke, G [1.2]

<sup>107</sup> NZ Frost Fans [255.17]

<sup>108</sup> NZ Frost Fans [255.18]

- 10.2.5 Three submissions seek that the objective provide for primary production, intensive primary production and intensively farmed stock.<sup>109</sup> They highlight GRUZ-O1 allows for primary and intensive primary production within the General Rural Zone and consider it should be amended to also allow for intensively farmed stock, which they believe aligns with this zone's character and activities.

### **Analysis**

- 10.2.6 In relation the submission from Clarke, G I disagree that the objective should be amended to focus on a range of activities which support rural communities. I note that the objective also provides for “a limited range of activities that support primary production” and also provides for “other activities that require a rural location”. I consider these elements of the objective sufficiently provide for activities other than primary production that support rural communities.
- 10.2.7 I disagree with the submission from NZ Frost Fans seeking amendments to GRUZ-O1. I acknowledge that the sole objective within the NPS-HPL states:

*“Highly productive land is protected for use in land-based primary production, both now and for future generations.”*

- 10.2.8 This provides clear direction that “highly productive land” is to be “protected for use in land-based primary production”. However, the GRUZ applies to the whole of the GRUZ some of which will meet the definition of “highly productive land” and areas that won't. Therefore, I disagree that the objective should be amended to avoid the establishment of non-production uses throughout the whole zone. Instead, I consider it is the role of the VS – Versatile Soils chapter to protect the highly productive land areas within the GRUZ.
- 10.2.9 In relation to the submitter seeking that the intensive primary production and intensively farmed stock be added to the objective, I note that the definition of primary production includes both intensive primary production and intensively farmed stock. Therefore, I do not consider that any amendments to the objective are required.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

- 10.2.10 I recommend that GRUZ-O1 is retained as notified.

## **10.3 Objective GRUZ-O2 – Character and qualities of the General Rural Zone**

- 10.3.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
----------------	----------------------------

<sup>109</sup> Fenlea Farms [171.1], Rooney, A. J. [177.3], K J. Rooney Ltd [197.1]

NZ Frost Fans	255.17, 255.19
Dairy Holdings	89.16
Radio NZ	152.53
Road Metals	169.39
Fulton Hogan	170.41
Silver Fern Farms	172.111
Alliance Group	173.113
Rural Contractors	178.5
Federated Farmers	182.182
Speirs, B	66.36
Helicopters Sth Cant.	53.19
Ballance	86.10
NZAAA	132.23
NZ Pork	247.19
Hort NZ	245.105

### Submissions

- 10.3.2 14 submissions have been received regarding GRUZ-O2, eight support the objective and seek it be retained as notified..<sup>110</sup>
- 10.3.3 Regarding clause (1), Spiers, B [66.36] seeks its deletion because he considers it inappropriate to refer to “large” allotments when many of the allotments in this zone vary in size.
- 10.3.4 With regards to reverse sensitivity, three submitters suggest that sensitive activities locating in the rural environment should not anticipate a higher level of amenity in a working rural production environment..<sup>111</sup> They therefore seek to amend clause (2) to refer directly to activities in support of primary production. Two submitters<sup>112</sup> also seek to delete clause (3).
- 10.3.5 NZ Frost Fans [255.17, 255.19] consider that to give effect to the NPS-HPL, clear provisions are needed to separate non-productive from productive activities, ensuring that non-productive uses do not interfere with productive operations. This would include GRUZ-O2, among several provisions, which would avoid the establishment of non-productive uses,

<sup>110</sup> Dairy Holdings [89.16], Radio NZ [152.53], Road Metals [169.39], Fulton Hogan [170.41], Silver Fern Farms [172.111], Alliance Group [173.113], Rural Contractors [178.5], Federated Farmers [182.182]

<sup>111</sup> Helicopters Sth Cant. [53.19], Ballance [86.10], NZAAA [132.23]

<sup>112</sup> Helicopters Sth Cant. [53.19], NZAAA [132.23]

separation and noise insulation requirements for sensitive and non-productive uses. They seek the following amendment GRUZ-O2 to give effect to the NPS-HPL:<sup>113</sup>

*“The character and qualities of the General Rural Zone comprise:*

*[...]*

- 2. a working environment of mostly utilitarian buildings, machinery and structures where primary production generates noise, odour, light overspill and traffic, often on a cyclic and seasonable basis; and*
- 3. higher levels of amenity immediately around ~~sensitive activities and~~ zone boundaries; and*

*[...]”*

- 10.3.6 In relation to amenity values, NZ Pork [247.19] seek clause (3) is deleted as they consider amenity to be subjective and able to reflect a range of characteristics. Hort NZ [245.105] consider the following amendments to highlight that the character and amenity of the GRUZ also reflects the primary production nature of the environment:

*“The character and qualities of the General Rural Zone comprise:*

*1. rural character and amenity consistent with primary production.*

*~~1.2.~~ large allotments with large areas of open space; and*

*~~2.3.~~ a working environment of mostly utilitarian buildings and structures where primary production generates noise, odour, light overspill and traffic, often on a cyclic and seasonable basis; and*

*~~3.4.~~ higher levels of diverse amenity values immediately around sensitive activities and zone boundaries; and*

*~~4.5.~~ vegetation, pasture, crops and forestry and livestock across a range of landscapes.”*

### **Analysis**

- 10.3.7 In relation to the submission from Spiers, B, I acknowledge that the GRUZ does have a variety of sites sizes. However, I also note that the predominant character of the GRUZ is one of large allotments with large areas of open space. In addition, GRUZ-R4 requires a minimum site area of 40 hectares per residential unit unless the site was created before the notification of the PDP, which acknowledges that the creation of smaller sites will be less common in the future. Given this, I disagree with the deletion of clause (1).

---

<sup>113</sup> NZ Frost Fans [255.19]

- 10.3.8 I disagree with the submitters seeking the deletion of clause (3). I consider it is important that the GRUZ also recognises that sensitive activities such as residential dwellings are anticipated with the GRUZ, provided the permitted standards can be achieved. I consider the removal of clause (3) would be at odds with the suite of rules and standards within the GRUZ that protect the amenity of sensitive activities within the GRUZ.
- 10.3.9 As set out in the assessment of GRUZ-O1 above, I disagree with the submission from NZ Frost Fans seeking amendments to GRUZ-O2 to give effect to the NPS-HPL. GRUZ-O2 applies to the whole of the GRUZ some of which will meet the definition of “highly productive land” and some that won’t. Therefore, I consider it is the role of the VS – Versatile Soils chapter to protect the highly productive land areas within the GRUZ. In relation to the specific amendment to GRUZ-O2(2) sought by NZ Frost Fans, I agree with the insertion of “machinery” as I acknowledge that there is a range of machinery that operates within the GRUZ that generates noise, light, etc that would not be captured by the definition of “structure”.
- 10.3.10 Finally in response to the suggested amendment to clause (3) sought by both NZ Pork and NZ Frost Fans, I disagree that an additional clause is necessary within the objective. I consider the suggested additional clause does not further describe the character and qualities of the GRUZ. I also disagree that an amendment to clause (3) is required. I consider it is appropriate that “higher levels of amenity immediately around sensitive activities and zone boundaries” are sought by the PDP. I consider the requirement for increased amenity required by this clause helps to achieve Section 7(c) of the RMA as it ensures that the amenity of sensitive activities in the GRUZ and within zones adjoining the GRUZ are maintained.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

- 10.3.11 I recommend that GRUZ-O2 be amended as follows:

GRUZ-O2	Character and qualities of the General Rural Zone
	<p>The character and qualities of the General Rural Zone comprise:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. large allotments with large areas of open space; and</li> <li>2. a working environment of mostly utilitarian buildings, <del>and structures</del> <u>and machinery</u><sup>114</sup> where primary production generates noise, odour, light overspill and traffic, often on a cyclic and seasonable basis; and</li> <li>3. higher levels of amenity immediately around sensitive activities and zone boundaries; and</li> <li>4. vegetation, pasture, crops and forestry and livestock across a range of landscapes.</li> </ol>



### **Section 32AA**

- 10.3.12 I consider the recommended amendment to the objective is reasonably minor in nature. The recommended amendment provides greater clarity as to the character and qualities of the General Rural Zone. I consider that the recommended amendment to the objective is the most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA.

---

<sup>114</sup> NZ Frost Fans [255.19]

## 10.4 Objective GRUZ-O3 – Protecting primary production

10.4.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
NZ Frost Fans	255.20
Road Metals	169.40
Fulton Hogan	170.42
Rural Contractors	178.6
Federated Farmers	182.183
ECan	183.145
Hort NZ	245.106
NZ Pork	247.20
Helicopters Sth Cant.	53.20
Ballance	86.11
NZAAA	132.24
Fonterra	165.125
Silver Fern Farms	172.112
Alliance Group	173.114

### Submissions

10.4.2 13 submissions have been received regarding GRUZ-O3, seven of these submitters support the objective and seek it be retained as notified.<sup>115</sup>

10.4.3 Three submissions support the protection of primary production in rural zones but seek the addition of “reverse sensitivity effects” within the objective as follows:<sup>116</sup>

*“The land resource of the General Rural Zone is not diminished by activities with no functional or operational need to locate in the General rural zone, and primary production is protected from reverse sensitivity effects and sensitive activities.”*

<sup>115</sup> Road Metals [169.40], Fulton Hogan [170.42], Rural Contractors [178.6], Federated Farmers [182.183], ECan [183.145], Hort NZ [245.106], NZ Pork [247.20]

<sup>116</sup> Helicopters Sth Cant. [53.20], Ballance [86.11], NZAAA [132.24],

- 10.4.4 Fonterra [165.125]<sup>117</sup> support the protection of primary production in rural zones but seek that this protection should also be afforded to rural industry that is located in the general rural zone. They seek the following amendment:

*“The land resource of the General Rural Zone is not diminished by activities with no functional or operational need to locate in the General Rural Zone, and primary production is and rural industry are protected from sensitive activities.”*

- 10.4.5 Two submitters<sup>118</sup> consider it is appropriate to provide strong directions about the types of activities that should be excluded from the GRUZ. Therefore, they seek the following amendment to clarify this:

*“The land resource of the General Rural Zone is not diminished by activities with no functional or operational need to locate in the General rural zone, and primary production is protected from encroachment by sensitive activities.”*

- 10.4.6 NZ Frost Fans [255.20] consider the objective partly aligns with the NPS-HPL by prioritising land-based primary production on highly productive land and addressing reverse sensitivity effects on these activities, but seeks the following amendments to clarify this:

*“The land resource of the General Rural Zone, and the ability to undertake land based primary production, is not diminished by activities with no functional or operational need to locate in the General rural zone, and primary production is protected from sensitive activities.”*

### **Analysis**

- 10.4.7 In relation to the submitters seeking the introduction of the phrase “reverse sensitivity”, I agree in part with this amendment. The objective requires that “primary production is protected from sensitive activities”. However, I think the outcome intended by the objective is that primary production is protected from “reverse sensitivity effects”, as primary production activities do not require “protection” from sensitive activities. However, if a sensitive activity was established near a primary production activity there is the potential for the sensitive activity to create reverse sensitivity effects. Given this I consider that it would add clarity to the objective if it referred to protection from “reverse sensitivity effects” rather than protection from “sensitive activities”. I disagree that the addition of “encroachment by” sensitive activities is required. I consider that this captured by the reference to primary production being protected “reverse sensitivity effects”.
- 10.4.8 In relation to the amendment sought by Fonterra Limited, I note that the introduction to the GRUZ chapter states that:

---

<sup>117</sup> Fonterra [165.125],

<sup>118</sup> Silver Fern Farms [172.112], Alliance Group [173.114]

*“...this chapter seeks to enable primary production (including intensive primary production) and a range of ancillary and associated activities that support primary production” (emphasis added)*

10.4.9 In addition, GRUZ-O1 states that:

*“The General Rural Zone predominantly provides for primary production, including intensive primary production, as well as a limited range of activities that support primary production, including associated rural industry, and other activities that require a rural location.” (emphasis added)*

10.4.10 When considering the direction within the RPS I note Policy 5.3.2 of the RPS provides direction on reverse sensitivity. It states:

*“To enable development including regionally significant infrastructure which:*

*2. avoid or mitigate:*

- b. reverse sensitivity effects and conflicts between incompatible activities, including identified mineral extraction areas;”*

The explanation to Policy 5.3.2 states:

*The standards under Policy 5.3.2(1) address a range of the implications resulting from development that require careful management so as to avoid the potential for adverse effects. This includes the need to avoid the encroachment of sensitive activities into rural areas that may result in reverse sensitivity effects on established rural activities or regionally significant infrastructure. Regard is also to be had to the prospect of the reduced productivity of the region’s soil resources, through further fragmentation or a move to a more urban character”.*

10.4.11 “Rural activities” are not defined within the context of the Wider Region within the RPS, but there is a definition within the “Definitions for Greater Christchurch” which states:

*“Rural activities: means activities of a size, function, intensity or character typical of those in rural areas and includes:*

- Rural land use activities such as agriculture, aquaculture, horticulture and forestry. Businesses that support rural land use activities.*
- Large – footprint parks, reserves, conservation parks and recreation facilities. Residential activity on lots of 4 ha or more.*
- Quarrying and associated activities.*
- Strategic infrastructure outside of the existing urban area and priority areas for development.”*

- 10.4.12 While the above definition is not relevant to the Wider Region within the RPS it does provide a helpful understanding of the intention of Policy 5.3.2 and the associated explanation. I consider this policy provide recognition that “established rural activities”, which includes rural industries should also be protected from reverse sensitivity effects.
- 10.4.13 Given this I consider there is an argument that rural industries should be included within GRUZ-O3 to ensure that rural industries located in the GRUZ are protected from reverse sensitivity effects.
- 10.4.14 The counter argument to that is that the SD-O9 (including the amendments recommended by Mr Willis within Hearing A) limits the management of reverse sensitivity effects sensitive activities on primary production, and this does not extend to managing the reverse sensitive effects of rural industry. Additionally, Policy 5.3.12(1)(a) and (b) of the RPS states:

*“Maintain and enhance natural and physical resources contributing to Canterbury’s overall rural productive economy in areas which are valued for existing or foreseeable future primary production, by:*

*1. avoiding development, and/or fragmentation which;*

*a. forecloses the ability to make appropriate use of that land for primary production; and/or*

*b. results in reverse sensitivity effects that limit or precludes primary production.”*

- 10.4.15 Policy 5.3.12(1) is specific to the rural productive economy and only requires the avoidance of development and fragmentation which results in reverse sensitivity effects that limit or precludes “primary production” and does not include reverse sensitivity effects that limit or preclude “rural industries”.
- 10.4.16 On balance, given the direction within SD-O9 and the RPS, I consider disagree with the submitter that “rural industry” should be included within GRUZ-O3. I consider the RPS provides specific direction within Policy 5.3.12 requiring avoidance of development which results in reverse sensitivity effects on “primary production”. I consider that should be a focus of the objective. I am not opposed to provisions within the PDP that protect rural industries within the GRUZ from reverse sensitivity effects. However, I don’t think these need to be elevated to the objective level.
- 10.4.17 I disagree the amendments sought by NZ Frost Fans are required. I consider it is the role of the VS chapter give effect to the NPS-HPL. I consider it is important to acknowledge that the GRUZ chapter applies to a broad geographic area, some of which will meet the definition of “highly productive land” while others won’t. Therefore, I disagree that the GRUZ-O3 should be amended to put a greater emphasis on land based primary production uses. Instead, I consider it is the role of the VS – Versatile Soils chapter to protect the highly productive land areas within the GRUZ.

## Conclusions and Recommendations

10.4.18 I recommend that GRUZ-O3 is amended as follows:

### **GRUZ-O3 Protecting primary production**

The land resource of the General Rural Zone is not diminished by activities with no functional or operational need to locate in the General rural zone, and primary production is protected from reverse sensitivity effects ~~sensitive activities~~.<sup>119</sup>

### Section 32AA

10.4.19 I consider the amendments recommended to GRUZ-O3 are minor in nature provide greater clarity as to how reverse sensitivity effects on primary production activities are to be managed, enabling the efficient use and development of the GRUZ as required by Section 7(b). In addition, I consider the amendments ensure consistent language between GRUZ-O3 and SD-O9.

## 10.5 Objective GRUZ-O4 – Protecting sensitive activities and sensitive zones

10.5.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
Federated Farmers	182.184
Helicopters Sth Cant.	53.21
NZAAA	132.25
Hort NZ	245.107
Road Metals	169.41
Fulton Hogan	170.43
Silver Fern Farms	172.113
Alliance Group	173.115
NZ Frost Fans	255.21

### Submissions

10.5.2 NZ Frost Fans [255.21] consider the objective does not give effect to the NPS-HPL and seek to delete or amend GRUZ-O4 to recognise reverse sensitivity effects on land based primary production activities on highly productive land.

<sup>119</sup> Helicopters Sth Cant. [53.20], Ballance [86.11], NZAAA [132.24]

- 10.5.3 Two submissions<sup>120</sup> consider clause (1) appears to require rural activities to respond to encroachment by incompatible sensitive activities, which is inconsistent with the direction of GRUZ-O3. Additionally, they state it is not appropriate for policy to constrain primary production, mining, or quarrying if a new sensitive activity establishes in the area. Finally, they consider clause (2) to be ambiguous which would impact consenting and compliance processes. They therefore seek the following amendment:

*“Intensive primary production, mining, quarrying, rural industry and other intensive activities avoid or minimise ~~generates no or minimal~~ adverse effects on:*

1. *existing sensitive activities; and*
2. *~~land close to in~~ Residential, ~~Rural~~ Settlement, Māori Purpose and Open space zones.”*

- 10.5.4 Federated Farmers [182.184] supports in part the objective but raise concern regarding the impacts on private landowners. They additionally seek minor amendments to better represent the rural zone as follows:

*“Intensive primary production, mining, quarrying and other intensive activities generates no or minimal adverse effects on:*

1. *sensitive activities; and*
2. *land close to Residential, Rural settlement, Māori Purpose and Open space zones, unless the existing activities still occur.”*

- 10.5.5 Three submissions<sup>121</sup> consider the objective unclear, as “intensive activities” is not defined. Similarly, they question what “land close to residential, rural settlement, Māori purpose and Open space zones” would be and suggest management of the boundary interface should use setbacks. To resolve their concerns, they seek to delete GRUZ-O4 and replace it with the following:

*“Sensitive activities locating in the General Rural Zone anticipate effects that are generated by primary production activities and the boundary of the rural zones are managed through setbacks.”*

- 10.5.6 Two submissions<sup>122</sup> consider the objective should acknowledge quarrying activities are anticipated in the rural zones and therefore should not be held to a higher standard than other activities in the zone. They seek the following amendment:

---

<sup>120</sup> Silver Fern Farms [172.113], Alliance Group [173.115]

<sup>121</sup> Helicopters Sth Cant. [53.21], NZAAA [132.25], Hort NZ [245.107]

<sup>122</sup> Road Metals [169.41], Fulton Hogan [170.43]

*“Effects from Intensive primary production, mining, quarrying and other intensive activities ~~generates no or minimal adverse effects~~ on:*

1. *sensitive activities; and*
2. *land close to Residential, Rural settlement, Māori Purpose and Open space zones avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects.”*

### **Analysis**

- 10.5.7 In relation to the amendments sought by Silver Fern Farms and Alliance Group, I agree in part with the amendment suggested. I agree with the replacement of “generates no or minimal” with “avoid or minimise” as I consider these terms are more commonly used and understood within RMA planning documents. I have also considered how the phrase “avoid or minimise” would be implemented within the policies and rule that achieve this objective. I.e. when is avoidance required and when is minimisation required? I note that GRUZ-P1(3) which implements the primary production aspect of this objective does not require the avoidance of adverse effects, it enables a range of primary production activities, where they: “meet the standards and requirements to minimise adverse effects on sensitive activities and the environment”. However, GRUZ-P6(2)(a) which implements the mining and quarry aspect of this objective requires “adverse effects on sensitive environment and sensitive activities are avoided, or if avoidance is not possible minimise”.
- 10.5.8 Given this, I consider using the phrase “avoid or minimise” is appropriate in the context of an objective as the policies that achieve this objective can specify when avoidance or minimisation is required. I also agree with the introduction of “existing” sensitive activities. I note that the section 42A report for the Strategic Directions chapter recommends the addition of “existing” sensitive activities within SD-O9(ii) as he considered this addition helps to clarify the intent of the objective. I agree with Mr Willis, and I also recommend the addition of “existing” within GRUZ-O4(1).
- 10.5.9 In relation to clause (2) I agree in part with the amendments sought by Silver Fern Farms and Alliance Group. I agree the phrase “close to” is unnecessary. As drafted clause (2) requires the management of effects within the GRUZ itself (i.e. on GRUZ land close to those listed zones) when the more appropriate outcome is to manage the effects on the listed zone. However, I consider that the listed zones should include both the RLZ and SETZ as they are both potentially susceptible to effects from primary production, mining, quarrying and other intensive activities. In relation the suggestion that “rural industry” be included within the objective, I note that the definition of rural industry is broad and includes a variety of activities, some of which may have effect similar to those listed and others that will not. As such, I disagree with the suggested amendment.
- 10.5.10 I consider the recommended inclusion of “existing” within clause (1) achieves the outcome sought by Federated farmers.

10.5.11 I disagree with the amendments sought by Helicopters Sth Cant, NZAAA, Hort NZ, Road Metals and Fulton Hogan. I consider the recommended re-drafting of clause (2) provides greater clarity as to the intention of the objective.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

10.5.12 I recommend that GRUZ-O4 be amended as follows:

#### **GRUZ-O4 Protecting sensitive activities and sensitive zones**

Intensive primary production, mining, quarrying and other intensive activities avoid or minimise ~~generates no or minimal~~ adverse effects on:

1. existing sensitive activities; and
2. land ~~close to~~ in Residential, Rural Lifestyle, Settlement, Māori Purpose and Open space zones.<sup>123</sup>

### **Section 32AA**

10.5.13 I consider the recommended amendments to the objective are reasonably minor in nature. The recommended amendments provide greater clarity as to how intensive primary production, mining, quarrying and other intensive activities are to be managed, enabling the efficient use and development of the GRUZ as required by Section 7(b). I consider that the recommended amendments to the objective are the most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA.

## **10.6 Objective GRUZ-O5 – Mining and quarrying**

10.6.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
Federated Farmers	182.185
AQA	224.1 224.6
Road Metals	169.42
Waka Kotahi	143.146
Fulton Hogan	170.44

### **Submissions**

10.6.2 Federated Farmers [182.185] supports the objective and seeks it be retained as notified.

<sup>123</sup> Silver Fern Farms [172.113], Alliance Group [173.115]

- 10.6.3 The AQA [224.1] acknowledge the PDP generally supports quarrying activities but seeks clarification to eliminate uncertainty. They emphasise the location-specific nature of aggregate resources and seek a clear policy framework which identifies and protects aggregate resources from other development to ensure access. The AQA [224.6] supports reference to “where the resource exists” as this implicitly acknowledges that quarrying resources are locationally constrained. They seek amendments to enable quarrying activities where any adverse effects can be mitigated under the effects management hierarchy detailed in GRUZ-P6.
- 10.6.4 Waka Kotahi [143.146] support GRUZ-O5 which allows mining and quarrying activities where it can be demonstrated that this will not impact on the safe and efficient function of the state highway networks but seeks amendments to insert reference to the “transport network” to align with GRUZ-P6.<sup>124</sup>
- 10.6.5 Two submissions<sup>125</sup> consider the objective holds quarrying to a higher standard than other activities that are appropriate for the zone and seek the following amendment:

*“Mining and quarrying occurs in the General Rural Zone where the resource exists and where ~~it will have no or minimal~~ adverse effects on the sensitive environments and sensitive activities are avoided, remedied or mitigated.”*

### Analysis

- 10.6.6 I disagree with the submission from the AQA seeking a reference to GRUZ-P6. I consider it is the role of the objective to set out the desired outcome for the management of quarrying and mining within the district. It is then the role of the policies to set out how this outcome will be achieved. Given this I disagree amendment is required.
- 10.6.7 Regarding the submission from Waka Kotahi, I recognise GRUZ-O5 provides for such activities “where the resource exists and where it will have no or minimal adverse effects on the sensitive environments and sensitive activities”. I note that neither “sensitive environments” or “sensitive activities” include reference to the transport network. I agree including reference to the “transport network” aligns with GRUZ-P6, specifically clause (2)(c), therefore I support the suggested amendment.
- 10.6.8 Finally, I disagree that mining and quarrying are held to a higher standard than other activities that are considered appropriate within the GRUZ. I consider these activities are only considered “appropriate” within the GRUZ if their effects are managed to a standard that achieves the outcome set within GRUZ-O5. As noted in the assessment of GRUZ-O4 above, I agree that the phrase “generates no or minimal” adverse effects is not commonly used within RMA planning documents. To ensure consistency with GRUZ-O4 I recommend that the phrase “generates no or minimal” is replaced with “avoid or minimise”.

<sup>124</sup> Waka Kotahi [143.146]

<sup>125</sup> Road Metals [169.42], Fulton Hogan [170.44]

## Conclusions and Recommendations

10.6.9 I recommend that GRUZ-O5 be amended as follows:

GRUZ-O5	Mining and quarrying
Mining and quarrying occurs in the General Rural Zone where the resource exists and where it will <u>avoid or minimise</u> <del>generates no or minimal</del> adverse effects on the sensitive environments, <del>and sensitive activities and the transport network</del> <sup>126</sup> .	

### Section 32AA

10.6.10 I consider the recommended amendments to the objective are reasonably minor in nature. The recommended amendments provide greater clarity as to how mining and quarrying activities are to be managed while also ensuring that effects of the transport network are considered. These amendments assist in enabling the efficient use and development of the GRUZ as required by Section 7(b) while also maintaining the amenity of sensitive activities as required by Section 7(c) of the RMA. I consider that the recommended amendments to the objective are the most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA.

## 10.7 GRUZ-P1 – Primary production activities

10.7.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
NZ Frost Fans	255.22
Helicopters Sth Cant.	53.22
Dairy Holdings	89.17
NZAAA	132.26
Silver Fern Farms	172.114
Alliance Group	173.116
Federated Farmers	182.187
ECan	183.146
Hort NZ	245.108
NZ Pork	247.21

<sup>126</sup> Waka Kotahi [143.146]

## Submissions

- 10.7.2 Three submissions support this policy and seek it is retained as notified.<sup>127</sup> Federated Farmers support the policy but seek to amend clause (1) as they consider it should go further than “allowing” primary production rather it should “enable” it, to give effect to the enabling intent of Section 5 of the RMA.<sup>128</sup>
- 10.7.3 Two submissions consider it important to ensure the establishment of new incompatible activities in the GRUZ do not inadvertently receive policy support and seek to amend clause (3) to specifically reference “existing” sensitive activities.<sup>129</sup>
- 10.7.4 NZ Frost Fans [255.22] generally considers the policy suitable, but highlights it fails to fully implement the NPS-HPL by not prioritising land-based primary production on highly productive land and not adequately addressing reverse sensitivity effects on these activities.<sup>130</sup> They seek the following amendment to address this:

*“Enable a range of primary production activities, where they:*

*[...]*

3. ~~*meet the standards and requirements to minimise adverse effects on sensitive activities and the environment, and prioritise them over activities that do not have a functional or operational need to locate in the General Rural Zone.*~~

- 10.7.5 Three submissions support the enabling of primary production activities but seeks to have agricultural aviation acknowledged as part of rural character and seek the following amendment:<sup>131</sup>

*“Enable a range of primary production and associated activities, where they:*

1. *allow for the ongoing productive use of land for present and future generations;*  
*or*
2. *maintain the character and qualities of the General Rural Zone; and*
3. *meet the standards and requirements to ~~minimise~~ avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on sensitive activities and the environment.*
4. *enabling a range of compatible activities that support primary production activities, including ancillary activities, and agricultural aviation.”*

---

<sup>127</sup> Dairy Holdings [89.17], ECan [183.146], NZ Pork [247.21]

<sup>128</sup> Federated Farmers [182.187]

<sup>129</sup> Silver Fern Farms [172.114]

<sup>130</sup> NZ Frost Fans [255.22]

<sup>131</sup> Helicopters Sth Cant. [53.22], NZAA [132.26], Hort NZ [245.108]

## Analysis

- 10.7.6 I disagree with the submission of Federated Farmers seeking an amendment to clause (1) of the policy. I note that the chapeau of the policy “enables a range of primary production activities”. I consider the direction within the policy is suitably enabling of primary production.
- 10.7.7 I agree an amendment to clause (3) is required, as sought by Silver Fern Farms and Alliance Group to include “existing”. I consider that clause (3) has been drafted to achieve GRUZ-O4 and provide policy support for setbacks within the GRUZ chapter that require that certain primary production activities must be setback from sensitive activities. This policy will be engaged when a new primary production activity is seeking to establish near a sensitive activity. At this point the primary production activity will only need to consider the existing sensitive activities, the setback rules will not apply to future sensitive activities. As such, I consider the introduction of the phrase “existing” within the policy will align with the recommended drafting of GRUZ-O4 and better achieve the intent of the policy.
- 10.7.8 I disagree with the submission from NZ Frost Fans seeking that primary production activities should be explicitly prioritised over activities that do not have a functional or operational need to locate in the GRUZ. In my view, the management of activities is achieved by reading the provisions of the chapter to understand which activities are anticipated. For example, primary production is enabled via GRUZ-P1, small-scale commercial activities as provided for in particular situations, and rural industries and other activities are only allowed in specific situations. Given this, I disagree an amendment to GRUZ-P1 is required.
- 10.7.9 Finally, I disagree with the submitter seeking acknowledgment of agricultural aviation within the policy. The intention of GRUZ-P1 is to enable primary production activities. I disagree that the scope of GRUZ-P1 should be broadened to include activities that support primary production. In my view agricultural aviation would be considered a “rural industry” which is managed by GRUZ-P7. I also disagree with the suggestion that “minimise” be replaced by “avoid, remedy or mitigate”. I consider the phrase “avoid, remedy or mitigate” provides little direction as to the outcome sought within the policy. In addition, I consider the retention of “minimise” better achieves the direction within GRUZ-O4.

## Conclusions and Recommendations

- 10.7.10 I recommend that GRUZ-P1 is amended as follows:

### **GRUZ-P1 Primary production activities**

Enable a range of primary production activities, where they:

1. allow for the ongoing productive use of land for present and future generations; or
2. maintain the character and qualities of the General Rural Zone; and
3. meet the standards and requirements to minimise adverse effects on existing<sup>132</sup> sensitive activities and the environment.

<sup>132</sup> Silver Fern Farms [172.114]

## Section 32AA

- 10.7.11 I consider the recommended amendments to the policy are reasonably minor in nature. The recommended amendments provide greater clarity as to how primary production activities will be managed. I consider the changes will be more effective than the notified provision in achieving GRUZ-O4 and SD-O9(ii) as the language within the policy now aligns with the drafting within these objectives.
- 10.7.12 The recommended amendments will not have any greater environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects than the notified provisions. However, there will be benefits from plan consistency, improved plan interpretation and more efficient plan administration.

## 10.8 GRUZ-P2 – Character and qualities of the General Rural Zone

- 10.8.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
Speirs, B	66.37
Dairy Holdings	89.18
NZAAA	132.27
Radio NZ	152.54
Silver Fern Farms	172.115
Alliance Group	173.117
Federated Farmers	182.188
Hort NZ	245.109
NZ Pork	247.22

### Submissions

- 10.8.2 Eight submissions support the policy and seek it is retained as notified.<sup>133</sup>
- 10.8.3 Spiers, B [66.37] considers many of the smaller allotments in the GRUZ have ample open space around buildings, therefore it is inaccurate to include reference to “large minimum” and seeks this is deleted from clause (1).

<sup>133</sup> Dairy Holdings [89.18], NZAAA [132.27], Radio NZ [152.54], Silver Fern Farms [172.115], Alliance Group [173.117], Federated Farmers [182.188], Hort NZ [245.109], NZ Pork [247.22]

## Analysis

- 10.8.4 In relation to the submission from Spiers, B, as noted with the analysis of GRUZ-O2 above, I acknowledge that the GRUZ does have a variety of sites sizes. However, I also note that the predominant character of the GRUZ is one of large allotments with large areas of open space. In addition, GRUZ-R4 requires a minimum site area of 40 hectares per residential unit unless the site was created before the notification of the PDP, which acknowledges that the creation of smaller sites will be less common in the future. Given this, I disagree with the deletion of “large minimum”.

## Conclusions and Recommendations

- 10.8.5 I recommend that GRUZ-P2 is retained as notified.

## 10.9 GRUZ-P5 – Protecting primary production

- 10.9.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
Ballance	86.12
Dairy Holdings	89.19
NZAAA	132.28
Silver Fern Farms	172.116
Rural Contractors	178.7
Federated Farmers	182.191
Hort NZ	245.110
NZ Pork	247.23
NZ Frost Fans	255.23

## Submissions

- 10.9.2 Five submissions support the policy and seek it be retained as notified.<sup>134</sup> Federated Farmers supports the policy but seeks to amend clause (1) as they consider it should go further than “avoiding” adverse effects on primary production rather it should “enable management of adverse effects on primary production” it, to give effect to the enabling intent of Section 5 of the RMA.<sup>135</sup>

<sup>134</sup> Ballance [86.12], Dairy Holdings [89.19], NZAAA [132.28], Hort NZ [245.110], NZ Pork [247.23]

<sup>135</sup> Federated Farmers [182.191]

- 10.9.3 Two submissions consider the policy needs to be broadened to ensure rural, industry and other activities that support primary production are protected from potential reverse sensitivity effects arising from the establishment of nearby sensitive activities.<sup>136</sup>
- 10.9.4 NZ Frost Fans [255.23] generally support the policy but consider it does not fully comply with the NPS-HPL. They suggest it lacks emphasis on land-based primary production on highly productive land and does not effectively address reverse sensitivity effects on such activities. They seek the following additional clause to support this:

3. that they do not locate in the General Rural Zone unless they have a functional or operational need to.

### **Analysis**

- 10.9.5 I disagree with the amendment sought by Federated Farmers. The intent of the policy is to ensure that sensitive activities are managed to avoid reverse sensitivity effects on primary production, which achieves the outcome sought by GRUZ-O3. Replacing “avoid” with “enable management of” weaken the policy, which will not achieve the outcome sought by GRUZ-O3. In addition, the suggested amendment will not achieve Policy 5.3.12 of the RPS which requires the maintenance and enhancement of natural and physical resources contributing to Canterbury’s overall rural productive by “avoiding development, and/or fragmentation which”, “results in reverse sensitivity effects that limit or precludes primary production”.
- 10.9.6 In relation to the submitters seeking an amendment to the policy to manage reverse sensitivity effects on “rural industry” activities, at the policy level, I agree with the submitters seeking that policy be broadened include rural industry activities. Within my assessment of GRUZ-O3 I have included an assessment of both the RPS and SD-O9. While I acknowledge SD-O9 has not included “rural industry” and Policy 5.3.12 of the RPS focuses on reverse sensitivity effects on “primary production”, I consider there is direction within the RPS (Policy 5.3.2) that requires protection for “established rural activities” from reverse sensitivity effects. As such, at the policy level, I agree with the submitters seeking that policy be broadened include rural industry activities. I consider an amendment to GRUZ-P5 to include rural industry activities would achieve the outcomes sought within GRUZ-O1 which provides for limited range of activities that support primary production, including associated rural industry, GRUZ-O2(3) which requires higher levels of amenity immediately around sensitive activities and zone boundaries.
- 10.9.7 For completeness, I note that GRUZ-P2(3) already ensures that: “activities that can generate significant adverse effects and sensitive activities are well separated from each other”. I consider this policy direction achieves in part the outcome sought by submitters by ensuring that incompatible activities are well separated from each other.

---

<sup>136</sup> Silver Fern Farms [172.116], Rural Contractors [178.7]

- 10.9.8 I also recommend a consequential amendment to the title of the policy replacing “Protecting primary production” with “Reverse sensitivity” and also replacing “adverse effects” with “reverse sensitivity effects” to better reflect the recommended change to the policy.
- 10.9.9 I note that this policy achieves the direction within GRUZ-O3. Within GRUZ-O3 I have recommended the replacing “adverse effects” with “reverse sensitivity effects” to better reflect the intention of the objective. I consider a consequential amendment to GRUZ-P5 is required to align with the language within GRUZ-P5.
- 10.9.10 Finally, in relation to NZ Frost Fan submission, as set out within the analysis on GRUZ-O1 above, I consider it is important to acknowledge that the GRUZ chapter applies to a broad geographic area, some of which will meet the definition of “highly productive land” while others won’t. Therefore, I disagree that the GRUZ-P5 should be amended to put a greater emphasis on land based primary production uses. Instead, I consider it is the role of the VS – Versatile Soils chapter to protect the highly productive land areas within the GRUZ.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

- 10.9.11 I recommend that GRUZ-P5 be amended as follows:

#### **GRUZ-P5      ~~Protecting primary production~~ Reverse sensitivity <sup>137</sup>**

Manage sensitive activities in the zone to ensure:

1. they are located to avoid ~~reverse sensitivity~~ adverse <sup>138</sup> effects on primary production and rural industry activities <sup>139</sup>; or
2. if avoidance is not possible, the sensitive activity includes mitigation measures so that there is minimal potential for adverse effects on the sensitive activity from primary production or rural industry <sup>140</sup> activities.

### **Section 32AA**

- 10.9.12 I consider the recommended amendments improve the consistency of the PDP and provide greater certainty as to how rural industry activities are to be managed. I consider the PDP will be more effective than the notified provisions in achieving GRUZ-O1, GRUZ-O2(3).
- 10.9.13 The recommended amendments will not have any greater environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects than the notified provisions. However, there will be benefits from plan consistency, improved plan interpretation and more efficient plan administration.

<sup>137</sup> Consequential amendment to Silver Fern Farms [172.116], Rural Contractors New Zealand [178.7]

<sup>138</sup> Consequential amendment to Silver Fern Farms [172.116], Rural Contractors New Zealand [178.7]

<sup>139</sup> Silver Fern Farms [172.116], Rural Contractors [178.7]

<sup>140</sup> Silver Fern Farms [172.116], Rural Contractors [178.7]

## 10.10 GRUZ-P6 – Mining and quarrying activities

10.10.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
Waka Kotahi	143.147
Dir. General Conservation	166.129
Road Metals	169.43
Fulton Hogan	170.45
Federated Farmers	182.192
AQA	224.7

### Submissions

10.10.2 Two submissions support the policy and seek it is retained as notified.<sup>141</sup>

10.10.3 The AQA [224.7] understands the policy provides a consenting pathway for medium and large-scale quarry activities using an effects hierarchy and finds the listed conditions reasonable and applicable to most rural quarrying activities. However, the submitter believes the primary intent of GRUZ should be to permit rural quarrying, except when adverse effects cannot be adequately controlled and, while specific amendments are not sought, they seek amendments which:

- Allow for quarrying in rural areas unless the adverse effects cannot be managed; and
- Provide for a case-by-case assessment to be done of each quarrying proposal that is made and the opportunity for any adverse effects to be mitigated.

10.10.4 Federated Farmers [182.192] support the policy but seek amendments to enable landowners to use their land to diversify their income which they consider would give effect to the enabling intent of Section 5 of the RMA. They seek the following amendments:

"1 ...

2. *Only allow mining and other quarry activities in the General rural zone where:*

- a. *adverse effects on sensitive environment and sensitive activities are ~~avoided~~ managed, or if ~~avoidance~~ management is not possible minimised; and*

<sup>141</sup> Waka Kotahi [143.147], Dir. General Conservation [166.129]

- b. ...
- c. ...
- d. *adverse effects on protected rock art and archaeological sites are ~~avoided~~ minimised; and*
- e. *adverse effects on local character and qualities are minimised; and*
- f. ...”<sup>142</sup>

10.10.5 Two submissions consider the wording of the policy could be improved to give effect to recognise mining and quarrying are appropriate in the rural zone and seek the following amendment:<sup>143</sup>

“2. ~~Only allow~~ Provide for mining and other quarry activities in the General rural zone where:”

### **Analysis**

10.10.6 In relation to the submission from AQA, I consider the notified drafting of the policy appears to largely achieve the outcomes sought by the submitter. I consider the policy does allow for quarrying activities in rural areas, only where the adverse effects can be managed. This allows a case-by-case assessment to be made for each quarry proposal. Therefore, I disagree any additional amendments are required.

10.10.7 I disagree with the submitters seeking to replace “only allow” with “provide for”. I also disagree with the submission from Federated Farmers seeking to replace references to “avoid” with “manage” or “minimise”. I consider the restrictive nature of the policy is required to achieve the outcomes set out within GRUZ-O5 which requires that mining and quarrying occurs where it will avoid or minimise adverse effects on the sensitive environments and sensitive activities. I consider the phrases “only allow” and “avoid” are required to ensure this outcome will be achieved.

10.10.8 I have suggested a minor amendment to GRUZ-P6(2)(a) to add a “s” onto “environments”. I consider this amendment can be made as a clause 16 amendment.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

10.10.9 Notwithstanding the minor amendment to GRUZ-P6(2)(a), I recommend that GRUZ-P6 is retained and notified.

<sup>142</sup> Federated Farmers [182.192]

<sup>143</sup> Road Metals [169.43], Fulton Hogan [170.45]

### 10.11 GRUZ-P7 – Industrial activities, rural industries and other activities

10.11.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
Port Blakely	94.12
Waka Kotahi	143.148
Radio NZ	152.55
Transpower	159.96
Fonterra Limited	165.126
Dir. General Conservation	166.130
Silver Fern Farms	172.117
Rural Contractors	178.8
Federated Farmers	182.193
Hort NZ	245.11

#### Submissions

10.11.2 Six submissions support the policy and seek it is retained as notified.<sup>144</sup> Fonterra [165.126] generally supports the proposed wording of this policy but considers that the word “only” should be deleted.

10.11.3 Federated Farmers [182.193] supports the policy with amendments to “enable” primary production.<sup>145</sup>

10.11.4 Transpower [159.96] highlights the technical requirements of the National Grid and acknowledges that it is not always possible to minimise its adverse effects. They suggest that due to the national importance of the National Grid and to align with the NPSET, the PDP should include a policy “pathway” to support the operation, maintenance, upgrade, and development of the National Grid in all zones, rather than potentially hindering it. They seek the following amendment:

“1. Only allow rural industries and other activities (not listed in the rules) in the General Rural Zone where:

x. the activity is regionally significant infrastructure;”

<sup>144</sup> Waka Kotahi [143.148], Radio NZ [152.55], Dir. General Conservation [166.130], Silver Fern Farms [172.117], Rural Contractors [178.8], Hort NZ [245.111]

<sup>145</sup> Federated Farmers [182.193]

- 10.11.5 Port Blakely [94.12] seeks amendments to recognise heavy vehicles operating for rural industries requires the use of the roading network through the district.

### **Analysis**

- 10.11.6 I disagree with the submission of Fonterra seeking the removal of “only”. I consider retaining “only” ensures that the presumption of the policy is that rural industries and other activities will only be allowed where the specific policy tests in GRUZ-P7 can be achieved.
- 10.11.7 In relation to the amendment sought by Federated Farmers, I disagree an amendment is required. I consider, as notified, clause (1)(a)(i) ensures that rural industries and other activities are only allowed where they “support” primary production. I disagree that “enable” is the right word to describe the relationship between rural industries and primary production.
- 10.11.8 In response to the submission from Transpower, I agree that the PDP should include a policy pathway to support the operation, maintenance, upgrade, and development of the National Grid. I consider that pathway is clearly articulated within the EI – Energy, and Infrastructure Chapter. I consider the introduction of a clause within GRUZ-P7 would be at odds with the architecture of the PDP which does not refer to other matters that are set out in the other chapter of the PDP. Instead, the GRUZ chapter is to be read alongside the other chapters of the PDP, including the EI chapter.
- 10.11.9 In response to the submission from Port Blakely, I disagree an amendment to GRUZ-P7 is required. GRUZ-P7 provides policy direction managing industrial, rural industry and other activities within the GRUZ. The use of the roading network is managed by the provisions with the TRAN chapter of the PDP.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

- 10.11.10 I recommend that GRUZ-P7 is retained and notified.

## **10.12 GRUZ-P8 – Residential activities (not including workers accommodation listed in GRUZ-P9)**

- 10.12.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

<b>SUBMITTER NAME</b>	<b>SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)</b>
NZ Frost Fans	255.17, 255.24
Federated Farmers	182.194

### **Submissions**

- 10.12.2 Federated Farmers [182.194] generally support the policy but suggest amending it to promote income diversification for farmers in response to evolving agricultural conditions.

They consider this would require enabling land subdivision for generating revenue and ensuring long-term generational use. They seek that “avoided” be replaced with “managed”.

- 10.12.3 NZ Frost Fans [255.17, 255.24] consider that to give effect to the NPS-HPL, clear provisions are needed to separate non-productive from productive activities, ensuring that non-productive uses do not interfere with productive operations.<sup>146</sup> This would include GRUZ-P8, among several provisions, which would avoid the establishment of non-production uses, separation and noise insulation requirements for sensitive and non-productive uses. They seek the following amendment GRUZ-P8 to give effect to the NPS-HPL:<sup>147</sup>

*“Provide for residential activities in the General rural zone where:*

*[...]*

*5. the undertaking of land-based primary production is prioritised.”*

### **Analysis**

- 10.12.4 I disagree with the amendment sought by Federated Farmers seeking greater flexibility for residential activities where this would fragment rural land. I consider the suggested amendment would not achieve GRUZ-O1 which ensures that GRUZ predominantly provides for primary production.
- 10.12.5 I also disagree with the amendment sought by NZ Frost Fans. I consider GRUZ-P9(1) ensures that fragmentation of rural land for non-primary production activities is avoided. In addition, I note that GRUZ-P1 enables a range of primary production activities. Therefore, I consider the suggested addition to GRUZ-P8 is not required.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

- 10.12.6 I recommend that GRUZ-P8 is retained and notified.

## **10.13 GRUZ-P9 – Workers accommodation**

- 10.13.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
Silver Fern Farms	172.118
Alliance Group	173.118
Federated Farmers	182.195
Hort NZ	245.112

<sup>146</sup> NZ Frost Fans [255.17]

<sup>147</sup> NZ Frost Fans [255.19]

NZ Pork	247.24
---------	--------

### Submissions

10.13.2 Four submissions support the policy and seek it is retained as notified..<sup>148</sup>

10.13.3 NZ Pork [247.24] supports the specific provision for workers accommodation but seeks the following amendments as they consider a 40ha qualifier is unworkable for pig farming activity:

*“Provide for permanent workers accommodation and seasonal workers accommodation to support primary production where:*

1. *the site has an area of least ~~40~~ 20 hectares for permanent workers accommodation, or 20ha for seasonal workers accommodation; or*

*[...]”*

### Analysis

10.13.4 I disagree with the submission from NZ Pork, I consider that the 40-hectare minimum area requirement for workers accommodation aligns with the minimum area requirements for a residential dwelling, which ensures that the open space character of the GRUZ is maintained. I note that if a site cannot meet the 40-hectare minimum area requirement, clause (2) of the policy states that:

*“Provide for permanent workers accommodation and seasonal workers accommodation to support primary production where:*

1. *...*
2. *on smaller sites where it can be demonstrated that it is required to meet the needs of the site’s primary production activity; and”*

10.13.5 Given this, I consider there is an alternative consenting pathway provided for smaller sites via a restricted discretionary consent process where the merits of the application can be assessed.

10.13.6 I recommend a minor grammatical amendment to GRUZ-P9 which I consider can be made as a clause 16 amendment.

### Conclusions and Recommendations

10.13.7 I recommend that GRUZ-P9 amended as follows:

---

<sup>148</sup> Silver Fern Farms [172.118], Alliance Group [173.118], Federated Farmers [182.195], Hort NZ [245.112]

**GRUZ-P9 Workers accommodation**

Provide for permanent workers accommodation and seasonal workers accommodation to support primary production where:

1. the site has an area of at<sup>149</sup> least 40 hectares for permanent workers accommodation, or 20ha for seasonal workers accommodation; or
2. on smaller sites where it can be demonstrated that it is required to meet the needs of the site's primary production activity; and
3. measures are put in place to ensure the workers accommodation cannot be subdivided off or sold separately to the site; and
4. the necessary infrastructure is provided and adverse effects on adjoining sites are minimised; and
5. the requirements of GRUZ-P5 are met, except for seasonal workers accommodation.

**Section 32AA**

10.13.8 I consider the recommended amendment to GRUZ-P9 is minor in nature but improves the clarity and interpretation of the provision. I do not consider the recommended amendments will have any greater environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects than the notified provisions.

**10.14 New policy - Private property rights**

10.14.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
Federated Farmers	182.180

**Submissions**

10.14.2 Federated Farmers [182.180] considers that the PDP has strayed into private property rights by dictating what can and cannot be done on rural production land. They seek to amend or insert new provisions within the General Rural Zone chapter to recognise and provide for private property rights and allow landowners to subdivide land for specific purposes, such as creating lifestyle lots and lots for family members. No specific wording for this new provision was provided within the submission.

**Analysis**

10.14.3 In response to the submission from Federated Farmers, I disagree a new provision is required. The RMA enables territorial authorities to restrict the activities that landowners are able to undertake on their land, provided that it meets the requirements of the RMA.

---

<sup>149</sup> Clause 16(2) RMA

## Conclusions and Recommendations

10.14.4 No additional provisions are recommended to be added to the GRUZ chapter.

### 10.15 Rule GRUZ-R1 – Primary production and intensive primary production, not otherwise listed in this chapter

10.15.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
Keen et al	46.3
Spiers, B	66.38
Dairy Holdings	89.20
Silver Fern Farms	172.119
Federated Farmers	182.196
Hort NZ	245.113
NZ Pork	247.25
Fenlea Farms	171.1
Rooney, A. J.	177.3
K J. Rooney Ltd	197.1

### Submissions

10.15.2 Seven submissions have been received regarding GRUZ-R1, four of which support the rule and seek it be retained as notified.<sup>150</sup> Spiers, B [66.38] does not agree with restricting the application of GRUZ-R1 to land adjoining the Māori Purpose Zone and seeks this be deleted from PER-3, and Federated Farmers [182.196] seek the deletion of the 50m and 200m setbacks from PER-3 and PER-4.

10.15.3 Keen et al [46.3] also oppose PER-4 as they highlight that a GRUZ property which borders a Residential Zone on one side needs a 200m setback for animal housing but if bordering a GRUZ property on the other side only needs a 10m setback.<sup>151</sup> They consider buildings used to house or feed stock should be located at least 100m from the notional boundary of an existing sensitive activity on a property under different.

<sup>150</sup> Dairy Holdings [89.20], Silver Fern Farms [172.119], Hort NZ [245.113], NZ Pork [247.25]

<sup>151</sup> Keen et al [46.3]

- 10.15.4 Three submissions<sup>152</sup> seek amendments to GRUZ-R1 to permit primary production, intensive primary production and intensively farmed stock.

### Analysis

- 10.15.5 In response to the submitters seeking the removal of the setbacks within GRUZ-R1 PER-3, 4, and 5, I disagree that the removal of these setback would achieve the outcome within GRUZ-O2(3) which requires that the GRUZ comprises higher levels of amenity immediately around sensitive activities and zone boundaries. It would also not achieve the outcome within GRUZ-O4 that requires that intensive primary production avoid or minimise adverse effects on sensitive activities and land close to Residential, Rural settlement, Māori Purpose and Open space zones.
- 10.15.6 In response to the submitters seeking an additional setback be included within PER-4 requiring that milking sheds and buildings used to house or feed stock are setback 100m from all existing sensitive activities. I note that GRUZ-S5 requires that intensive primary production activities and new farm effluent disposal areas are setback 500m from the notional boundary of an existing sensitive activity on a separate site under different ownership. However, I acknowledge that milking sheds and buildings used to house or feed stock not captured by GRUZ-S5 are only required to be setback 10 metres from site boundary in a different ownership. I agree that this 10 metre setback does not achieve the amenity outcomes set out within GRUZ-O2(3) and GRUZ-O4. Given this, I agree that an additional 100 metre setback be included within PER-4 as requested by the submitter.
- 10.15.7 In relation to the submitters seeking that intensively farmed stock should be a permitted activity under GRUZ-R1, I note that primary production and intensive primary production are provided for as permitted activities within GRUZ-R1 provided the permitted standards are achieved. I disagree any further amendments are required.

### Conclusions and Recommendations

- 10.15.8 I recommend that GRUZ-R1 is amended as follows:

GRUZ-R1	Primary production and intensive primary production, not otherwise listed in this chapter	
General Rural Zone	<p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b> The activity does not include any offensive trade; and</p> <p><b>PER-2</b> GRUZ-S5 is complied with; and</p>	<p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-3: Restricted Discretionary</b></p> <p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the ability to manage grazing practices to ensure amenity effects on adjoining neighbours are minimised.</li> </ol>

<sup>152</sup> Fenlea Farms [171.1], Rooney, A. J. [177.3], K J. Rooney Ltd [197.1]

	<p><b>PER-3</b> For grazing of stock within 50m of a residential unit under different ownership located in the Māori Purpose Zone, permanent ground cover of no less than 90% must be maintained, except during crop renewal or resowing.</p> <p><b>PER-4</b> For milking sheds and buildings used to house or feed stock are located at least:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 200m from any land in the Māori Purpose Zone, Settlement Zone and Residential Zones; and</li> <li>2. 100m from the notional boundary of an existing sensitive activity on a separate site under different ownership.<sup>153</sup></li> </ol> <p><b>Note:</b> any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with GRUZ-R13.</p>	<p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-4: Restricted Discretionary</b></p> <p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. any adverse effect on adjoining properties; and</li> <li>2. mitigation measures.</li> </ol> <p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1 or PER-2: Discretionary</b></p>
--	--	--

### Section 32AA

10.15.9 I consider the recommended addition to PER-4 ensures that the provisions of the GRUZ chapter effectively achieve GRUZ-O4. I consider it also improves the consistency of the PDP as it provides for greater protection for existing sensitive activities in the GRUZ.

10.15.10 The recommended amendments will not have any greater environmental or cultural effects than the notified provisions. This additional permitted standard may have some economic costs, as there will be an additional setback standard to comply with which may result in increased resource consent applications. In contrast, there will be a social benefit as the amenity of existing sensitive activities within the GRUZ will better protected. On balance, I consider that the benefits outweigh the costs and that these additional provisions are more effective in achieving GRUZ-O4.

### 10.16 Rule GRUZ-R2 – Pig production for domestic self-subsistence home use

10.16.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
Federated Farmers	182.197

<sup>153</sup> Keen et al [46.3]

## Submissions

- 10.16.2 Federated Farmers [182.197] consider the rule is overly prescriptive and unsupportive of landowners wishing to diversify their income. They consider a 100m boundary is unworkable and inconsistent with other district plans which require a 50m boundary and seek the following amendment:

*"[...]"*

### ***PER-1***

*~~The pigs are for the subsistence of the people residing on the site; and are not sold to anyone not residing on the site; and~~*

### ***PER-2***

*There are no more than ~~six~~ twenty five pigs located on the site and the pigs are setback a minimum distance of 25m from a building containing an existing sensitive activity on a separate site under different ownership; or*

### ***PER-3***

*There is ~~between 7 and~~ 25 pigs on the site and the pigs are setback a minimum distance of:*

- (a) 50m of a building containing an existing sensitive activity on a separate site under different ownership; and*
- (b) ~~100m~~ 50m of the boundary with a Residential, Rural Lifestyle, Rural Settlement, Māori Purpose or Open Space."*

## Analysis

- 10.16.3 Before responding to the specific submissions on GRUZ-R2, I consider it is helpful to explain the relationship between the "primary production" and "pig production for domestic self-subsistence home use" which both manage pig farming at different scales within the PDP. Primary production is the catch-all definition for any agricultural activity managed by GRUZ-R1. Pig production for domestic self-subsistence home use is managed by GRUZ-R2.
- 10.16.4 For completeness I note that the PDP also defines "intensive outdoor primary production" which is a subsection of primary production and is also managed by GRUZ-R1 and includes the keeping or rearing of livestock that principally occurs outdoors. However, it excludes "extensive pig farming" and "pig production for domestic self-subsistence home use". Extensive pig farming is not specifically managed within the GRUZ but a specific rule is included within RLZ-R3 managing this activity. The PDP also defines "intensively farmed stock". Intensively farmed stock (includes pig farming but excludes pig farming for domestic self-subsistence home use) is only referred to within SASM-R6. In summary, within the GRUZ pig farming is managed by either GRUZ-R1 – Primary production or GRUZ-R2 - Pig production for domestic self-subsistence home use.

- 10.16.5 Given the above explanation, there are two rules within the GURZ that manage pig farming, GRUZ- R1 – Primary production and GRUZ-R2 - Pig production for domestic self-subsistence home use. The intent of these rules is to enable both in domestic pig production and primary production in the GRUZ with different permitted standards related to the scale and effects of the activity.
- 10.16.6 Turning to the Federated farmers submission seeking the deletion of PER-1, I disagree with the suggested amendment. I consider that the requirement that the pigs are for the subsistence of the people residing on the site is included to differentiate the activity from the rules that manage primary production.
- 10.16.7 In relation suggested amendment to PER-2, to increase the permitted numbers from six to 25, I disagree with this amendment. I consider the intention of the rule is to ensure that pig numbers are kept below six when located near an adjoining sensitive activity to ensure that the amenity outcomes set out within GRUZ-O2(3) are achieved.
- 10.16.8 In relation to the suggested amendment to the setback within PER-3, I acknowledge that there is no ‘right’ setback distance to include within a district plan to ensure that the amenity of sensitive activities is retained. I consider the 100m setback ensures that GRUZ-O2(3) and GRUZ-O4 will be achieved. It does not mean that these will not be achieved by a lesser setback, but acts as a trigger point for more specific assessment of a lesser distance. Beyond this threshold a resource consent is required as a discretionary activity where a case-by-case assessment is undertaken to determine the effects of a particular proposal. I consider this approach is appropriate.
- 10.16.9 Finally, I suggest a minor amendment to PER-2 and PER 3 replacing “is” with “are”. I consider this amendment can be made as a clause 16 amendment.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

- 10.16.10 I recommend that GRUZ-R2 is amended as follows:

<b>GRUZ-R2</b>	<b>Pig production for domestic self-subsistence home use</b>	
<b>General Rural Zone</b>	<b>Activity status: Permitted</b>  <b>Where:</b>  <b>PER-1</b> The pigs are for the subsistence of the people residing on the site and are not sold to anyone not residing on the site; and  <b>PER-21</b>	<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved: Discretionary</b>

<p>There <del>is</del> <u>are</u><sup>154</sup> no more than six pigs located on the site and the pigs are setback a minimum distance of 25m from a building containing an existing sensitive activity on a separate site under different ownership; or</p> <p><b>PER-32</b></p> <p>There <del>is</del> <u>are</u><sup>155</sup> between 7 and 25 pigs on the site and the pigs are setback a minimum distance of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. 50m of a building containing an existing sensitive activity on a separate site under different ownership; and</li> <li>b. 100m of the boundary with a Residential, Rural Lifestyle, Rural Settlement, Māori Purpose or Open Space zone.</li> </ul> <p><b>Note:</b> any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with GRUZ-R13.</p>	
--	--

### Section 32AA

10.16.11 I consider the recommended amendment to GRUZ-R2 is minor in nature but improves the clarity and interpretation of the provision. I do not consider the recommended amendments will have any greater environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects than the notified provisions.

### 10.17 Rule GRUZ-R3 – Keeping of poultry for domestic self-subsistence home use

10.17.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
Spiers, B	66.39
Federated Farmers	182.198

### Submissions

10.17.2 Spiers, B [66.39] considers the application of the rule requires clarification to ensure its correct interpretation and seeks minor wording amendments.

<sup>154</sup> Clause 16(2) RMA

<sup>155</sup> Clause 16(2) RMA

- 10.17.3 Federated Farmers [182.198] considers PER-4 is over prescriptive and creates regulation that is not in line with other district plans. They state that requiring roosters to be kept at least 100m from boundaries of an existing sensitive activity would severely restrict small farmland blocks and seek the following amendments:

*“PER-4*

*No roosters are kept within ~~100m~~25-50m from the notional boundary of an existing sensitive activity on a separate site under different ownership; and...”*

### **Analysis**

- 10.17.4 I agree with the amendment proposed by Spiers, B, to improve clarification and interpretation of the rule.
- 10.17.5 In response to the Federated Farmers submission, as noted in the discussion associated with the setbacks within GRUZ-R1, I acknowledge that there is no ‘right’ setback distance to include within a district plan to ensure that the amenity of sensitive activities is retained. I consider the 100m setback ensures that GRUZ-O2(3) and GRUZ-O4 will be achieved in all cases. It does not mean that these will not be achieved by a lesser setback, but acts as a trigger point for more specific assessment of a lesser distance. Beyond this threshold a resource consent is required as a discretionary activity where a case-by-case assessment is undertaken to determine the effects of a particular proposal. I consider this approach is appropriate.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

- 10.17.6 I recommend that GRUZ-R3 is amend as follows:

<b>GRUZ-R3</b>	<b>Keeping of poultry for domestic self-subsistence home use</b>	
<b>General Rural Zone</b>	<b>Activity status: Permitted</b>  <b>Where:</b>  <b>PER-1</b> The poultry are for the subsistence of the people residing on the site and <u>the poultry and their eggs</u> <sup>156</sup> are not sold to anyone not residing on the site; and  [...]	<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved: Discretionary</b>

### **Section 32AA**

- 10.17.7 I consider the recommended amendment to GRUZ-R3 is minor in nature but improves the clarity and interpretation of the provision. I do not consider the recommended amendments

<sup>156</sup> Spiers, B [66.39]

will have any greater environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects than the notified provisions.

### 10.18 Rule GRUZ-R4 – Residential units, excluding seasonal workers accommodation and permanent workers accommodation

10.18.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
Silver Fern Farms	172.120
Alliance Group	173.119
Hort NZ	245.124
Rooney Holdings	174.83
Rooney, G.J.H.	191.83
Rooney Group	249.83
Rooney Farms	250.83
Rooney Earthmoving	251.83
TDL	252.83
Maze Pastures	41.5
MFL	60.42
Pye Group	35.6
Spiers, B	66.40
Lifestyle Builds	7.1
Rawlings, L. R.	120.1
NZ Frost Fans	255.25

#### Submissions

10.18.2 15 submissions have been received regarding GRUZ-R4, three of which support the rule and seek it be retained as notified..<sup>157</sup>

10.18.3 Six submissions..<sup>158</sup> all state a minimum site area of 40ha is unnecessary and overly restrictive. They seek a minimum site area of 10ha and provision for clustering of residential units on a

<sup>157</sup> Silver Fern Farms [172.120], Alliance Group [173.119], Hort NZ [245.124]

<sup>158</sup> Rooney Holdings [174.83], Rooney, G.J.H. [191.83], Rooney Group [249.83], Rooney Farms [250.83], Rooney Earthmoving [251.83], TDL[252.83]

site comparable to the overall property size where a farm comprises multiple records of title. They consider changes to PER-1 would provide more flexibility to farm owners and avoid unnecessary and costly resource consents.

- 10.18.4 Two submissions highlight PER-1 needs to allow for approved subdivision consents issued by TDC before the District Plan is fully operative.<sup>159</sup> Spiers, B [66.40] considers the following amendment is required to better reflect the intent of the rule:

*“PER-1*

*There is a minimum site area of 40 hectares per residential unit unless the site was created before the 22 September 2022 and does not contain an existing residential unit; This is for the construction of the sole residential unit on a site; and*

*[...]”*

- 10.18.5 Lifestyle Builds [7.1] consider the rule should be aligned with the Waimakariri District Plan and seeks PER-3 include a gross habitable floor area of 80m<sup>2</sup> which excludes terrace, sun decks, garages, verandas.
- 10.18.6 Rawlings, L. R. [120.1] considers the rule should be limited to relocatable construction and sites that are no less than 20ha in area and provide additional transparency in criteria. He believes such limitations provide for the impacts on neighbouring houses.
- 10.18.7 Pye Group [35.6] seek to understand the difference between Residential Units and Permanent Workers Accommodation. If there is no clear difference, the submitter seeks to delete GRUZ-R20 and amend GRUZ-R4 to remove the reference to Permanent Workers Accommodation.
- 10.18.8 NZ Frost Fans [225.25] seek amendments to ensure non-compliance with PER-3 results in a non-complying activity.

### **Analysis**

- 10.18.9 In relation to the submitters seeking a reduction to the minimum area requirement for a dwelling from 40 hectares per dwelling to 10 hectares and provide for the clustering of residential units on a site regardless of the site, I disagree this amendment will achieve GRUZ-O2, which requires large allotments with large areas of open space. This is supported by GRUZ-P2 which states that the character and qualities of the GRUZ are maintained by requiring a large minimum allotment size that ensures ample open space around buildings. In addition, GRUZ-P8 provides for residential activities in the GRUZ where fragmentation of rural land for non-primary production activities is avoided, and the character and qualities of the General rural zone are maintained.

---

<sup>159</sup> Maze Pastures [41.5], MFL [60.42]

10.18.10 I consider the 40 hectare minimum area requirement for residential dwellings ensures that the open space character in the GRUZ is maintained. If this minimum area requirement was reduced to 10 hectares, I consider this could result in a proliferation of residential dwellings within the GRUZ which is not supported by the objectives and policies of the chapter. I note that this 40 hectare minimum area requirement for residential dwellings aligns with the minimum net site area of 40ha required for subdivision set out within SUB-S1(4) of the PDP.

10.18.11 In addition, I note that TDC adopted the Timaru District 2045 Growth Management Strategy on 22 May 2018.<sup>160</sup>, as part of the Growth Management Strategy there is a section on F:7 Rural which describes the operative plan provisions which enables the establishment of relatively small rural allotments, referred to as the ‘allowance approach’. It states that:

*“Maintaining this current ‘allowance approach’, coupled with a strong ongoing demand for rural lifestyle and residential development, would provide for a continuation of the development trends that have occurred over the last 25- 30 years. Such an outcome is contrary to the consolidation approach set down by the Canterbury Regional Council and would see a continuation of the issues associated with rural residential growth in our District.”*

*The existing district policy framework seeks to avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of intensive rural development. However, the ‘allowance approach’ has been providing for a dispersed approach to rural residential development. A continuation of that approach would provide no certainty as where rural residential development should occur, nor promote alignment with our settlements, or integration with our (mainly transport) infrastructure. While the Council has adopted the Rural 4A (Geraldine Downs) Zone, and the Rural Residential (Brookfield) Zone, these actions alone, are unlikely to address this growth management issue. These zones are also unlikely to accommodate the future growth and demand for rural residential development across the District over the next 30 years.*

*In order to appropriately respond to this issue, a review of the existing rural subdivision provisions is required to replace the ‘allowance approach’ with the more directed enablement of rural residential development in the district.”*

10.18.12 In response to this critique of the operative plan provisions, the PDP has developed a Rural Lifestyle zone adjoining Timaru, Temuka, Geraldine and Pleasant Point to enable some rural lifestyle development while ensuring that the character and qualities of the GRUZ are maintained. I consider this is an appropriate planning response.

10.18.13 In relation to the suggestion from the submitters that clustering of residential dwellings should be enabled within the GRUZ provisions, I note that on larger sites i.e. with 80 hectares

---

<sup>160</sup> [https://www.timaru.govt.nz/data/assets/pdf\\_file/0003/204375/Growth-Management-Strategy-Adopted-Low-Resolution-08052018.pdf](https://www.timaru.govt.nz/data/assets/pdf_file/0003/204375/Growth-Management-Strategy-Adopted-Low-Resolution-08052018.pdf)

or greater, the clustering of residential dwellings is enabled provided the density of 1 dwelling per 40 hectares is achieved.

- 10.18.14 In relation to the submitter seeking acknowledgement within PER-1 needs to allow for approved subdivision consents issued by TDC before the District Plan is fully operative, I agree that the timeframe associated with PER-1 should refer to the date the PDP becomes operative as this is the date this rule will have legal effect.
- 10.18.15 In response to the submission from Speirs, B, I agree the suggested amendment better reflects the intent of the rule. I consider the intent of the rule is to provide for one dwelling per 40 hectares unless the site is vacant and was created before the 22 September 2022. I consider the removal of the 40 hectare minimum will not achieve the outcome sought within GRUZ-O2.
- 10.18.16 In response to the submission from Lifestyle Builds seeking alignment with the Waimakariri District Plan, the approach taken in proposed Waimakariri District Plan permits “the maximum ground floor area of 90m<sup>2</sup> (excluding any area required for a vehicle garage or carport up to a maximum of 40m<sup>2</sup>). This is similar to the approach proposed within the PDP which sets a maximum gross floor area of 80m<sup>2</sup> for minor residential units.
- 10.18.17 In my view there is no ‘right’ number to include within a district plan for minor residential units. I consider the 80m<sup>2</sup> permitted standard sets threshold for the size of a minor residential unit that will achieve the direction within GRUZ-P8 which directs that minor residential unit’s are ancillary and subordinate to the site’s principal residential unit. Beyond this threshold a resource consent is required as a non-complying activity where a case-by-case assessment is undertaken to determine the effects of a particular proposal.
- 10.18.18 In response to the submission from Pye Group, I understand the intention of the seasonal workers accommodation and permanent workers accommodation rules are to enable, one principal dwelling, one minor dwelling and worker’s accommodation on a site of 40 hectares or greater. This is the direction included within GRUZ-P9. Given this, I consider excluding seasonal workers accommodation and permanent workers accommodation from GRUZ-R4 is appropriate as these activities are instead managed by GRUZ-R19 and GRUZ-R20.
- 10.18.19 In response to the submission from NZ Frost Fans seeking an amendment to ensure non-compliance with PER-3 results in a non-complying activity, I consider this is already the case within the PDP. No additional amendments to the rule are considered necessary.
- 10.18.20 It has been brought to my attention by TDC consenting staff that there is a slight drafting error within GRUZ-R4. As notified PER-1 and PER-2 state:

*PER-1*

*There is a minimum site area of 40 hectares per residential unit unless the site was created before the 22 September 2022 and does not contain an existing residential unit; and (emphasis added)*

**PER-2**

*There is a maximum of one minor residential unit per principal residential unit provided under PER-1; and*

10.18.21 PER-1 refers to a “minimum site area of 40 hectares per residential unit”. The definition of residential unit.<sup>161</sup> is sufficiently broad as to include “principal residential units” and “minor residential units”. If read independently of PER-2, PER-1 could therefore be interpreted as meaning that the establishment of a “principal residential unit” and a “minor residential unit” requires a minimum site area of 80 hectares (40 hectare per residential unit). However, it is clear when GRUZ-R4 is read in its entirety, this is not the intention of the proposed rule. In particular, PER-2 provides for a minor residential unit *per principal residential unit provided for in PER-1*.

10.18.22 It would assist to clarify interpretation of the plan, and with plan administration and efficiency, if PER-1 were amended to specifically include a reference to "principal residential unit" to make it clear that a minimum of 40 hectares is required per principle residential unit. When read together with PER-2 this amendment would make it clear that one “minor residential unit” is allowed per “principal residential unit” on a minimum 40ha site. I consider this amendment can be made under Clause 16(2) of the RMA because it clarifies the intention of the PDP and is of minor effect.

**Conclusions and Recommendations**

10.18.23 I recommend that GRUZ-R4 is retained and notified.

<b>GRUZ-R4</b>	<b>Residential units, excluding seasonal workers accommodation and permanent workers accommodation</b>	
<b>General Rural Zone</b>	<b>Activity status: Permitted</b>  <b>Where:</b>  <b>PER-1</b> There is a minimum site area of 40 hectares per <u>principle</u> <sup>162</sup> residential unit unless the site was created before <del>the 22 September 2022</del> [the date this rule was made Operative] <sup>163</sup> and does not contain an existing <u>principle</u> <sup>164</sup> residential unit; and	<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-5: Restricted Discretionary</b>  <b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the matters of discretion of any infringed standard.</li> </ol>
		<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-6: Discretionary</b>

<sup>161</sup> Residential unit: means a building(s) or part of a building that is used for a residential activity exclusively by one household, and must include sleeping, cooking, bathing and toilet facilities.

<sup>162</sup> Clause 16(2) RMA

<sup>163</sup> Maze Pastures [41.5], MFL [60.42]

<sup>164</sup> Clause 16(2) RMA

<p><b>PER-2</b> There is a maximum of one minor residential unit per principal residential unit provided under <b>PER-1</b>; and</p> <p><b>PER-3</b> The minor unit has a maximum gross floor area of 80m<sup>2</sup>; and</p> <p><b>PER-4</b> Access to the minor residential unit, including any car parking area provided for the minor residential unit is accessed from the same access as the principal residential unit; and</p> <p><b>PER-5</b> GRUZ-S1, GRUZ-S2, GRUZ-S3 and GRUZ-S6 are complied with; and</p> <p><b>PER-6</b> GRUZ-S4 is complied with.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> any accessory building to the residential unit must be constructed in accordance with GRUZ-R13.</p>	<p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1 to PER-4: Non-complying</b></p>
--	--

### Section 32AA

10.18.24 I consider the recommended amendment to GRUZ-R4 is minor in nature but improves the clarity and interpretation of the provision. I do not consider the recommended amendments will have any greater environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects than the notified provisions.

### 10.19 Rule GRUZ-R7 – Educational facilities

10.19.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
Hort NZ	245.125
NZ Pork	247.26

### Submissions

10.19.2 Two submissions have been received regarding GRUZ-R7 and both suggest educational facilities would be sensitive to the effects of primary production and more appropriately

managed through a consent process to avoid compromising primary production activities..<sup>165</sup>  
They seek the permitted activity status within the notified version of the Plan be amended to restricted discretionary but provide no suggested matters of discretion.

### **Analysis**

10.19.3 In response to the submissions from Hort NZ and NZ Pork, I disagree that all “educational facilities” should be managed through a consent process. I note that “educational facilities” permitted under GRUZ-R7 are required to be undertaken within an existing principal residential unit. I consider the introduction of an educational facility within the existing principal residential unit will not increase the sensitivity of the activity to the effects of primary production to such an extent that it would warrant the need for a consent application. If the Hearing Panel did consider the separation of educational facilities and primary production was required, I consider a better approach would be to require educational facilities meet permitted standard GRUZ-S5. This would ensure permitted educational facilities are setback from intensive primary production activities, farm effluent disposal areas, and a lawfully established quarries or mines. However, my view is that this additional standard is not required for an educational facility as I consider the sensitivity of this activity would be similar to that of a residential activity.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

10.19.4 I recommend that GRUZ-R7 is retained as notified.

## **10.20 Rule GRUZ-R8 – Supported residential care activity**

10.20.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
Hort NZ	245.126
NZ Pork	247.27

### **Submissions**

10.20.2 Two submissions have been received regarding GRUZ-R8 and both suggest a residential care activity would be sensitive to the effects of primary production and more appropriately managed through a consent process to avoid compromising primary production activities..<sup>166</sup>  
They seek the permitted activity status within the notified version of the Plan be amended to restricted discretionary but provide no suggested matters of discretion.

<sup>165</sup> Hort NZ [245.125], NZ Pork [247.26]

<sup>166</sup> Hort NZ [245.126], NZ Pork [247.27]

### Analysis

10.20.3 In response to the submissions from Hort NZ and NZ Pork, I disagree that all “Supported residential care activity” should be managed through a consent process. I note that “Supported residential care activity” permitted under GRUZ-R8 are required to be undertaken within an existing principal residential unit. I consider the introduction of a supported residential care activity within the existing principal residential unit will not increase the sensitivity of the activity to the effects of primary production to such an extent that it would warrant the need for a consent application. If the Hearing Panel did consider the separation of supported residential care activities and primary production was required, I consider a better approach would be to require supported residential care activity meet permitted standard GRUZ-S5. This would ensure permitted supported residential care activity are setback from intensive primary production activities, farm effluent disposal areas, and a lawfully established quarries or mines. However, my view is that this additional standard is not required for a supported residential care activity as I consider the sensitivity of this activity would be similar to that of a residential activity.

### Conclusions and Recommendations

10.20.4 I recommend that GRUZ-R8 is retained and notified.

### 10.21 Rule GRUZ-R9 – Residential visitor accommodation

10.21.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
Silver Fern Farms	172.121
Alliance Group	173.120
NZ Pork	247.28
Hort NZ	245.127

### Submissions

10.21.2 Three submissions have been received, two of which support the rule and seek it be retained as notified.<sup>167</sup>

10.21.3 NZ Pork [247.28] considers visitor accommodation is likely to be sensitive to the effects of primary production and more appropriately managed through a consent process. They seek the permitted activity status within the notified version of the Plan be amended to restricted discretionary. Similarly, Hort NZ [245.127] consider that residential visitor accommodation

---

<sup>167</sup> Silver Fern Farms [172.121], Alliance Group [173.120]

is sensitive to the effects of primary production and is best managed through a consent process.

### **Analysis**

10.21.4 In response to the submissions from Hort NZ and NZ Pork, I disagree that all “Residential visitor accommodation” should be managed through a consent process. I note that “Residential visitor accommodation” permitted under GRUZ-R8 are required to be undertaken within an existing principal residential unit. I consider the introduction of visitor accommodation within the existing principal residential unit will not increase the sensitivity of the activity to the effects of primary production to such an extent that it would warrant the need for a consent application.

10.21.5 If the Hearing Panel did consider the separation of residential visitor accommodation and primary production was required, I consider a better approach would be to require residential visitor accommodation meet permitted standard GRUZ-S5. This would ensure permitted residential visitor accommodation are setback from intensive primary production activities, farm effluent disposal areas, and a lawfully established quarries or mines. However, my view is that this additional standard is not required for a residential visitor accommodation activity as I consider the sensitivity of this activity would be similar to that of a residential activity.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

10.21.6 I recommend that GRUZ-R9 is retained and notified.

## **10.22 Rule GRUZ-R10 – Conservation activities**

10.22.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
Dir. General Conservation	166.128
Helicopters Sth Cant.	53.24
NZAAA	132.30
Federated Farmers	182.199

### **Submissions**

10.22.2 Dir. General Conservation [166.128] supports the rule and seeks it be retained as notified.<sup>168</sup>

---

<sup>168</sup> Dir. General Conservation [166.6]

10.22.3 Two submissions have been received seeking amendments to provide for equipment used for weed and pest control.<sup>169</sup> The submitters seek the addition of “machinery, vehicles and aircraft”. Similarly, Federated Farmers [182.199] highlight that many farmers believe conservation is a way to ensure their land is protected and left in a better state for future generations to enjoy. They seek amendments to PER-1 to specifically permit “agricultural aviation conservation”.

### Analysis

10.22.4 I agree with the submitters seeking amendments to PER-1 to include additional methods for undertaking conservation activities, such as “equipment, machinery, vehicles and aircraft”. I also agree with the addition of “weed” to enable weed control within the permitted activity. I consider these amendments will achieve a similar outcome to that sought within the Federated Farmers submission.

10.22.5 I also recommend a slight formatting amendment, replacing the bullet points in GRUZ-R10 with numbers to ensure the format of the rule is consistent with the other rules in the PDP. I consider this change can be made as a clause 16 amendment.

10.22.6 I acknowledge that the definition of “Conservation activity” has been assessed within the s42A report for the Overarching matters Proposed Timaru District Plan: Part 1 - Introduction and General Definitions. I have reviewed the recommendation within this report. The amendments proposed to the GRUZ-R10 below align with the recommendation made by Ms Hollier.

### Conclusions and Recommendations

10.22.7 I recommend that GRUZ-R10 be amended as follows:

GRUZ-R10	Conservation activities	
General Rural Zone	<p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b>  <u>Land, buildings, and structures, equipment, machinery, vehicles and aircraft</u><sup>170</sup> are used for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>1.</u> preservation, protection, restoration, promulgation or enhancement of indigenous species or habitats of indigenous fauna; or</li> <li>• <u>2.</u> <u>weed or</u><sup>171</sup> pest control; or</li> </ul>	<p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1:</b>  <b>Discretionary</b></p>

<sup>169</sup> Helicopters Sth Cant. [53.24], NZAAA [132.30]

<sup>170</sup> Helicopters Sth Cant. [53.24], NZAAA [132.30]

<sup>171</sup> Helicopters Sth Cant. [53.24], NZAAA [132.30]

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>3.</u> conservation education; or</li> <li>• <u>4.</u> observation or surveying; or</li> <li>• <u>5.</u><sup>172</sup> walking tracks, board walks, pedestrian bridge.</li> </ul> <p><b>Note:</b> any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with GRUZ-R13.</p>	
--	--

### Section 32AA

10.22.8 I consider the recommended amendment to GRUZ-R10 is minor in nature but improves the clarity and interpretation of the provision. I consider the recommended amendments will have an environmental benefit as it will provide a greater ability to undertake conservation activities as a permitted activity. I do not consider the recommended amendments will have any greater economic, social, and cultural effects than the notified provisions.

### 10.23 Rule GRUZ-R11 – Recreation activities

10.23.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
Rooney Holdings	174.84
Rooney, G.J.H.	191.84
Rooney Group	249.84
Rooney Farms	250.84
Rooney Earthmoving	251.84
TDL	252.84
Hort NZ	245.114
NZ Pork	247.29

### Submissions

10.23.2 Eight submissions have been received regarding GRUZ-R11, six of which request the rule provide for commercial activities that are predominantly non-motorised, such as guided hunting and recreational tours, to be undertaken as a permitted activity..<sup>173</sup>

<sup>172</sup> Clause 16 RMA

<sup>173</sup> Rooney Holdings [174.84], Rooney, G.J.H. [191.84], Rooney Group [249.84], Rooney Farms [250.84], Rooney Earthmoving [251.84], TDL[252.84]

- 10.23.3 Two submitters consider recreation activities are likely to be sensitive to the effects of primary production and are more appropriately managed through a consent process.<sup>174</sup> They seek the permitted activity status within the PDP be amended to restricted discretionary but provide no suggested matters of discretion.

### Analysis

- 10.23.4 In relation to the submitters seeking commercial activities such as guided hunting and recreational tours be permitted by the rule, I agree that the rule appears overly restrictive. I note that there is a rule within the Queenstown Lakes District Plan<sup>175</sup> that provides for commercial recreational activities as a permitted activity provided the activity is undertaken outdoors and involves no more than 15 people in any one group. I consider a similar additional permitted standard within GRUZ-R11 would be appropriate to ensure that small scale commercial recreational activities such as guided hunting and recreational tours are permitted by GRUZ-R11. I also recommend an additional definition be included within the PDP limiting the proposed permitted standard to “commercial recreational activities”. I consider this additional permitted standard and definition helps to achieve GRUZ-P3 as it provides for a small-scale commercial activity that support, or are ancillary to primary productive activities and are compatible with the character and qualities of the GRUZ.
- 10.23.5 In response to the submissions from Hort NZ and NZ Pork, I consider that the majority of activities included within the definition of “recreational activities” would not be considered sensitive activities and therefore I disagree that recreational activities should be managed through a consent process.

### Conclusions and Recommendations

- 10.23.6 I recommend that GRUZ-R11 is amended as follows:

GRUZ-R11	Recreation activities	
General Rural Zone	<p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b> The activity is not operated as a commercial activity; and</p> <p><b>PER-1A</b> <u>Notwithstanding PER-1 above, any commercial recreation activity that is undertaken outdoors and involves less than 15 people.</u><sup>176</sup></p>	<p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with: Discretionary</b></p>

<sup>174</sup> Hort NZ [245.114], NZ Pork [247.29]

<sup>175</sup> Rule 21.9.1

<sup>176</sup> Rooney Holdings [174.84], Rooney, G.J.H. [191.84], Rooney Group [249.84], Rooney Farms [250.84], Rooney Earthmoving [251.84], TDL [252.84]

<p><b>PER-2</b> Any organised sports comply with GRUZ-S4, 'sensitive activity' in this standard should be read as 'organised sports'; and<sup>177</sup></p> <p><b>Note:</b> any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with GRUZ-R13.</p>	
--	--

10.23.7 I recommend that a new definition of “Commercial Recreational Activity” is included within the PDP as follows:

Commercial Recreational Activities

Means the commercial guiding, training, instructing, transportation or provision of recreation facilities to clients for recreational purposes.<sup>178</sup>

### Section 32AA

10.23.8 I consider the recommended amendment to GRUZ-R11 provides more flexibly within the rule for small scale commercial recreational activities as a permitted activity. This helps to achieve GRUZ-O1 which provides for a limited range of “other activities” that require a rural location. These additions also help to implement GRUZ-P3 which provides for a small-scale commercial activity that support or are ancillary to primary productive activities and are compatible with the character and qualities of the GRUZ. I consider the recommended amendments will have an economic benefit as it will ensure that small scale commercial recreational activities are not required to obtain a resource consent for an activity with little or no adverse effects on the environment. I do not consider the recommended amendments will have any greater environmental, social, and cultural effects than the notified provisions.

## 10.24 Rule GRUZ-R12 – Rural produce retail

10.24.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
Hort NZ	245.115
Federated Farmers	182.200

<sup>177</sup> RMA Clause 16

<sup>178</sup> Rooney Holdings [174.84], Rooney, G.J.H. [191.84], Rooney Group [249.84], Rooney Farms [250.84], Rooney Earthmoving [251.84], TDL [252.84]

### Submissions

10.24.2 Hort NZ [245.115] supports the rule and seeks it be retained as notified.<sup>179</sup>

10.24.3 Federated Farmers [182.200] consider rural producers need favourable conditions to access consumer markets directly and state the setback of 10m is too prescriptive and not obtainable on all highways and byways in the district. They seek the setback be amended to 8m, “where deemed safe”. This submission is opposed by Waka Kotahi [143.17F] who considers that the proposed amended wording of “where deemed safe” is open to interpretation and is not direct enough as a rule to manage this activity. The current proposed setback of 10m is sufficient and any reduction to this should be subject to the resource consent process where safety is then considered.

### Analysis

10.24.4 In response to the submission from Federated Farmers, I disagree that the amendment proposed is suitable as a permitted standard. I agree with Waka Kotahi that the permitted standards need to be clear as to whether an activity will comply or not. A phrase such as “where deemed safe” requires a judgment to be made as to the safety of a particular activity. I consider the 10-metre setback is appropriate, and any reduction of this setback can be considered on a case-by case basis through a resource consent process.

### Conclusions and Recommendations

10.24.5 I recommend that GRUZ-R12 is retained and notified.

## 10.25 GRUZ-R14 – Use of airstrips and helicopter landing sites

10.25.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
Sinclair, I	39.1
Evans, J	45.1
Helicopters Sth Cant.	53.2, 53.5, 53.7, 53.25
McAuley, S	57.1
Aubrey, L	59.1
Station Air	61.1
Pemberton, S	64.1
Talbot, J	79.1

<sup>179</sup> Hort NZ [245.115]

Ballance	86.1, 86.2, 86.3, 86.13
Coldicott, J. M.	118.1
Brodie, R. K.	125.1
FENZ	131.38
NZAAA	132.1, , 132.4, 132.9, 132.31
Rooney Holdings	174.85
Federated Farmers	182.201
Rooney, G.J.H.	191.85
Cessna 180/185 Group et al	201.1
Hort NZ	245.34, 245.117
Rooney, G.J.H.	191.85
Rooney Group	249.85
Rooney Farms	250.85
Rooney Earthmoving	251.85
TDL	252.85
Coldicott, G	254.1

### Submissions

10.25.2 Considered within this analysis are submissions related to:

- The definition of “Agricultural aviation activities”
- The definition of “Day:”
- The definition of “Rural airstrip”: and
- GRUZ-R14

### Definitions

10.25.3 Four submissions seek to include the following new definition of “agricultural aviation activities” to support primary production, biosecurity, and conservation activities undertaken by agricultural aviation:<sup>180</sup>

#### Agricultural aviation activities:

means the intermittent operation of an aircraft from a rural airstrip or helicopter landing area for primary production activities, and; conservation activities for biosecurity, or

<sup>180</sup> Ballance [86.1], Helicopters Sth Cant. [53.2], NZAAA [132.1] Federated Farmers [182.201]

biodiversity purposes; including stock management, and the application of fertiliser, agrichemicals, or vertebrate toxic agents (VTA's). For clarity, aircraft includes fixed-wing aeroplanes, helicopters, and unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV's).

- 10.25.4 Four submissions<sup>181</sup> seek to include the following new definition of “day” to support the proposed interpretation of GRUZ-R14:

Day:

means as it relates to agricultural aircraft activities; means 10.5 hours aircraft hours conducted between the beginning of civil morning twilight (MCT) and the end of civil evening twilight (ECT). NOTE. A day is defined in the Civil Aviation rules as: the hours between—

- (1) the beginning of morning civil twilight, which is when the centre of the rising sun's disc is 6 degrees below the horizon; and
- (2) the end of evening civil twilight, which is when the centre of the setting sun's disc is 6 degrees below the horizon.

- 10.25.5 Four submissions note the term “rural airstrip” is used in the PDP rules but is not defined, and they seek to include the following new definition:<sup>182</sup>

Rural airstrip:

means any defined area of land intended or designed to be used, whether wholly or partly, for the landing, departure, movement, or servicing of aircraft in the rural area.

- 10.25.6 A number of other further submitters supported the introduction of the above definitions. I have not referenced them here.

#### GRUZ-R14

- 10.25.7 FENZ [131.38] supports the rule and seeks it be retained as notified.

- 10.25.8 Two submitters consider the rule overly complex and unduly restrictive.<sup>183</sup> They seek that the rule be amended as follows:

#### ***GRUZ-R14 Use of Rural airstrips and helicopter landing sites areas***

***Activity status: Permitted***

<sup>181</sup> Helicopter Sth Cant. [53.5], Ballance [86.2], NZAAA [132.4]. Farmers [182.201].

<sup>182</sup> Helicopters Sth Cant. [53.7], Ballance [86.3], NZAAA [132.9], Hort NZ [245.34]

<sup>183</sup> Helicopters Sth Cant. [53.25], NZAAA [132.31]

**Where:**

**~~PER-1~~**

**~~PER-2~~**

**~~PER-3~~**

**PER-1**

Agricultural aviation activities for the purpose primary production or conservation on a seasonal, temporary or intermittent basis for a period up to 30 days in any 12 month period or 315 aircraft hours (whichever is the greater).

**Activity status where compliance not achieved:** Restricted Discretionary

- 10.25.9 Federated Farmers [182.201] seek PER-1 and PER-2 are deleted and replaced with alternative wording as follows:

**GRUZ-R14 Use of airstrips and helicopter sites areas**

**Activity status: Permitted**

**Where:**

**~~PER-1~~**

**~~PER-2~~**

**~~PER-3~~**

**PER-1**

Agricultural aviation activities of the purpose of primary production or conservation on a seasonal temporary or intermittent basis for a period up to 30 days in any 12 month period or 315 aircraft hours (whichever is greater).

**~~PER-3~~ 2**

*Take offs or landings must ...*

- 10.25.10 Hort NZ [245.117] consider the use of aircraft for primary production should be provided as a permitted activity and seek deletion of permitted standards within PER-2.

- 10.25.11 Ballance [86.13] consider the rule conflicts with GRUZ-O3 which aims to protect primary production. They consider permitted standards on the number of days a rural airstrip can be used over a certain period does not take into account delays associated with inclement weather, the use of one airstrip for more than one farm, the number of take-offs and landings required in one hour or day of operation. They consider the rule does not consider

the use of airstrips for a range of different activities including fertiliser spreading, soil conditioning, herbicide, fungicide and insecticide spraying - all of which need to take place at different times of the year. They seek that GURZ-R14 is replaced with a new rule that requires:

*“Aircraft and helicopter movements are limited to between the hours of Morning Civil Twilight and Evening Civil Twilight as defined in the Civil Aviation rules.*

*A log detailing the time and date of all aircraft movements and helicopter movements shall be maintained and made available to the Council at its request.”*

10.25.12 Eight submissions consider the rule overly restrictive and limits existing use rights.<sup>184</sup> They seek amendment to allow private airstrip owners to use their airstrip at any time and under any circumstances if the airstrip is located nearby a noise sensitive activity owned by the airstrip or helicopter landing site operator. Additionally, they seek deletion of PER-3 as they consider limitations on take-off and landing unjustified. This view is supported by Russel Kenneth Brodie who considers the status quo should be retained as per the Operative plan.

10.25.13 Talbot, J [79.1] considers the rule overly restrictive for owners of small light aircraft on a small property which is used for a range of activities including flight training, farming, transportation and social events. He considers the 500m setback unworkable due to space or location constraints. He seeks amendments which remove take-off and landing and boundary requirements.

10.25.14 Seven submissions seek a permitted standard to provide for take-off and landings associated with commercial and non-commercial recreational activities.<sup>185</sup> A number of other further submitters made similar further submissions supporting this submission. I have not referenced them here.

### **Analysis**

10.25.15 The submissions on the above provisions are reasonably wider ranging and there are a number of different approaches proposed to amend GRUZ-R14 and the associated definitions. All the submitters on the GRUZ-R14 and the associated definitions seek greater flexibility over the use of airstrips and helicopter landing sites. Following a review of the submissions I have been in contact with several of the submitters and we have been discussing how GRUZ-R14 and associated definitions within the PDP can be amended to provide greater clarity and flexibility.

10.25.16 I consider the intent of the rule and associated definitions are to balance the requirements within GRUZ-O1 to provide for primary production activities, with the requirement within

---

<sup>184</sup> Evans, J [45.1], McAuley, S [57.1], Aubrey, L [59.1], Station Air [61.1], Pemberton, S [64.1], Cessna 180/185 Group et al [201.1], Coldicott J. M. [118.1], Coldicott, G [254.1]

<sup>185</sup> Sinclair, I [39.1], Rooney Holdings [174.85], Rooney, G.J.H. [191.85], Rooney Group [249.85], Rooney Farms [250.85], Rooney Earthmoving [251.85], TDL [252.85],

GRUZ-O2(2) to provide higher levels of amenity immediately around sensitive activities and zone boundaries.

10.25.17 I consider there is some uncertainty within the notified provisions as to what is captured by GRUZ-R14. GRUZ-R14 relates to the use of airstrips and helicopter landing sites but neither “airstrip” nor “helicopter landing site” is defined within the PDP. Following a review of the submission on GRUZ-R14, and discussions with the submitters I consider there are two types of activities that GRUZ-R14 needs to manage. Firstly, there are permanent airstrip or helicopter landing sites which are areas intended or designed to be used, whether wholly or partly, for the landing, departure, movement, or servicing of aircrafts. Then there are aircraft and helicopter movements which are a single aircraft flight (either landing or departure). I consider the two activity types have considerably different effects as permanent airstrip or helicopter landing site will be used continuously or periodically throughout the year. Whereas aircraft and helicopter movements may occur once on a property as part of a particular activity and then never return. Therefore, I consider the two types of activities should be managed with separate standards within GRUZ-R14. Based on this understanding of the effects of the two activities, I have assessed the submissions points related to each type of activity.

#### Permanent airstrip or helicopter landing sites

10.25.18 In relation to the submitters<sup>186</sup> that seek the deletion of rule and replacing it with a single limit of 30 days in any 12-month period or 315 aircraft hours (whichever is the greater) without any setback requirements, I disagree with the suggested amendments. As noted above, I consider the intent of the rule is to balance the requirements within GRUZ-O1 to provide for primary production activities with the requirement within GRUZ-O2(2) to provide higher levels of amenity immediately around sensitive activities and zone boundaries. To do this PER-2(1) limits the use of the airstrip or helicopter landing site (associated with primary production) to a maximum of seven days within any three-month period where a setback of between 500 metres and 1000 metre is provided. Where the setback is greater than 1000 metres from residential zones or building containing a noise sensitive activity, PER-2(1) provides for unlimited use of the airstrip or helicopter landing site for primary production activities.

10.25.19 While I acknowledge the permitted standard proposed by the submitters includes a maximum permitted threshold of 30 days in any 12-month period or 315 aircraft hours (whichever is the greater), this rule framework does not include any setbacks from residential zones and sensitive activities and therefore I disagree that this rule would give effect to the requirement within GURZ-O2(2).

10.25.20 I agree with the submitters seeking the removal of PER-3 which limits non-primary production activities to 10 take-off of landings per month. I agree that the rule needs to

---

<sup>186</sup> Helicopters Sth Cant. [53.25], NZAAA [132.31], Federated Farmers [182.201], Talbot, J [79.1]

provide greater flexibility for helicopter operators while also ensuring that the amenity immediately around sensitive activities and zone boundaries is maintained.

10.25.21 In relation to the submission from Hort NZ seeking the deletion of PER-2, I disagree with this suggested amendment. As noted above I consider the PER-2 is required to give effect to GRUZ-O2(2) which requires that higher levels of amenity immediately around sensitive activities and zone boundaries with provided with the GRUZ. In my view deletion of PER-2 would not achieve this.

10.25.22 In relation to the group of submitters that seek the introduction of new definitions related to “Agricultural aviation activities” and “Day”, given I have not supported the proposed re-drafting of the rule which introduces these terms, consequentially, I disagree that these additional definitions are required.

10.25.23 I agree in part with the submission from Ballance seeking greater flexibility within the permitted standard. I agree that the permitted standard within PER-2(1) does not provide enough flexibility given the seasonal nature of these activities. As such, I agree that the maximum permitted threshold of seven days within any three-month period should be replaced by the threshold suggested by Federated Farmers of 30 days in any 12-month period, provided the setback requirements within PER-2(1) are retained.

10.25.24 I also agree with the removal of PER-1. I consider this standard is better placed within the aircraft and helicopter movements rule.

10.25.25 In relation to the submitters<sup>187</sup> seeking that the default activity status within GRUZ-R14 should be restricted discretionary rather than discretionary, I agree in part with this suggestion. While I note that the submitters have not suggested matters of discretion, I have considered the matters of discretion included within NOISE-R10 of the PDP which manages helicopter landing sites not addressed by GRUZ-R14. I consider the matters of discretion listed within NOISE-R10 to be suitable and with some minor amendments to align with the drafting of GRUZ-R14. I consider this will assist both applicants and decision makers as there will be a common understanding of the potential effects the consent process is seeking to manage.

10.25.26 In relation to the submitters<sup>188</sup> that consider the rule overly restrictive and limits existing use rights, I note that the rules within the PDP will not affect the existing use rights of submitters provided:

- the use was lawfully established before the rule became operative or the PDP was notified; and

---

<sup>187</sup> Helicopters Sth Cant. [53.25], NZAAA [132.31]

<sup>188</sup> Evans, J [45.1], McAuley, S [57.1], Aubrey, L [59.1], Station Air [61.1], Pemberton, S [64.1], Cessna 180/185 Group et al [201.1], Coldicott, J. M. [118.1], Coldicott, G [254.1]

- the effects of the use are the same or similar in character, intensity, and scale to those which existed before the rule became operative or the PDP was notified..<sup>189</sup>

10.25.27 In relation to the submitters that seek amendments to allow private airstrip owners to use their airstrip at any time and under any circumstances if the airstrip is located nearby a noise sensitive activity owned by the airstrip or helicopter landing site operator, I agree in part with the suggested amendment. I note that for other rules within the PDP related to setbacks the PDP uses the phrase:

*“Setback a minimum distance of xxm from a building containing an existing sensitive activity on a separate site under different ownership;”*

10.25.28 This wording ensures that existing sensitive activities on different sites under the same ownership are not required to meet the setback requirements. I consider the same phrase should be used in GRUZ-R14 PER-1, PER-2 and PER-3 to resolve the submitter’s concerns.

10.25.29 Finally, in relation to the submitters<sup>190</sup> that seek a permitted standard to provide for take-off and landings associated with commercial and non-commercial recreational activities, while I disagree with the suggested amendment, I consider the amendments proposed above, removing PER-3, will resolve the submitters concerns

#### Aircraft and helicopter movements

10.25.30 In relation to the submitters seeking the introduction of new definition for a “Rural airstrip”, I agree in part with this suggested addition. I consider defining both “permanent airstrip or helicopter landing site” and “aircraft and helicopter movements” is required to different the two activities. I acknowledge that this definition has been assessed within the s42A report for the Overarching matters Proposed Timaru District Plan: Part 1 - Introduction and General Definitions. Ms Hollier’s recommendation was that no additional definition was required. I have discussed this recommendation with Ms Hollier and we both agree that a definition of “permanent airstrip or helicopter landing site” and also “aircraft and helicopter movements” is required to different the two activities.

10.25.31 I note that the proposed Selwyn District Plan uses the following definitions:

#### *HELICOPTER LANDING AREAS*

*Any area of land, building or structure intended or designed to be used, whether wholly or partly, for helicopter movement or servicing, including heliports and helipads*

#### *HELICOPTER MOVEMENT*

<sup>189</sup> Section 10(1)(a)(i) and (ii) of the Resource Management Act 1991.

<sup>190</sup> Sinclair, I [39.1], Rooney Holdings [174.85], Rooney, G.J.H. [191.85], Rooney Group [249.85], Rooney Farms [250.85], Rooney Earthmoving [251.85], TDL [252.85],

*A single helicopter flight operation (landing or departure) of any helicopter. Maintenance procedures are excluded.*

#### **AIRFIELD**

*Any area of land intended or designed to be used, whether wholly or partly, for aircraft movement or servicing, excluding helicopters.*

10.25.32 Taking the key components of these three definitions I recommended the following definitions be included with the PDP:

#### **Permanent airstrip or helicopter landing site**

*Means any defined area of land intended or designed to be used, whether wholly or partly, used for the landing or departure of aircraft.*

#### **Aircraft and helicopter movement**

*Means a single aircraft flight operation (landing or departure). Maintenance procedures are excluded.*

10.25.33 Finally, when considering the permitted standards that should apply to aircraft and helicopter movements, I consider a more lenient rule framework can be adopted given the effects of these activities are temporary and sporadic. As such, I have recommended that the intention of PER-1 and PER-2 within the notified version of GRUZ-R14 are included within this additional rule to ensure aircraft and helicopter movements are used for emergency purposes or associated with purposes ancillary to rural production are enabled. Then all other aircraft and helicopter movements must be setback greater than 100m from residential zones and existing noise sensitive activities.

10.25.34 I consider this rule framework to balance the requirements within GRUZ-O1 to provide for primary production activities with the requirement within GRUZ-O2(2) to provide higher levels of amenity immediately around sensitive activities and zone boundaries.

10.25.35 Through several conversations with submitter, it appears this recommended rule package largely resolves the concerns of submitters. However, I understand that there are some residual concerns that the setback distances for permanent airstrips.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

10.25.36 I recommend that GRUZ-R14 be amended as follows:

**GRUZ-  
R14**

**Use of permanent airstrips and helicopter landing sites**

General Rural Zone	<b>Activity status: Permitted</b>  <b>Where:</b>	<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved: <u>Restricted Discretionary</u></b> <sup>194</sup>
	<p><b>PER-1</b>  <del>The flights are for emergency purposes such as medical evacuations, search and rescue, firefighting or civil defence; or</del></p> <p><b>PER-2</b>  <del>The <u>permeant airstrip or helicopter landing site</u> is use is for primary production including spraying, stock management, fertiliser application or frost protection for:</del></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>1. used for a maximum of 30 <u>seven</u> days within any 12<u>three</u> month period where the airstrip or helicopter landing site is setback between 500m-1,000m from:</del> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>a. any Residential zone; and</del></li> <li><del>b. the notional boundary of a building containing an <u>existing</u> noise sensitive activity, <u>on a separate site under different ownership not located on the site of the airstrip or helicopter land site</u>;<sup>191</sup> or</del></li> </ol> </li> <li><del>2. the airstrip or helicopter landing site is setback greater than 1,000m from:</del> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>a. any Residential zone; and</del></li> <li><del>b. the notional boundary of a building containing an <u>existing</u> noise sensitive activity, <u>on a separate site under different ownership not located on the site of the airstrip or helicopter land site</u>;<sup>192</sup> or</del></li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p><b>PER-3</b>  <del>Take-offs or landings must not exceed 40 per month; and the airstrip or landing site is setback a minimum of 500m from:</del></p>	<p><u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>the extent of non-compliance with PER-2 and PER-3; and</u></li> <li>2. <u>the extent to which helicopter noise limits specified within Table 1 of NZS6807:1994 are complied with; and</u></li> <li>3. <u>the level, duration and character of the noise; and</u></li> <li>4. <u>proximity and nature of nearby activities and the adverse effects they may experience from the noise; and</u></li> <li>5. <u>the existing noise environment; and</u></li> <li>6. <u>effects on amenity values and anticipated character of the receiving environment; and</u></li> <li>7. <u>effects on health and well-being of people; and</u></li> <li>8. <u>noise mitigation measures; and</u></li> <li>9. <u>the practicality of utilising alternative sites.</u></li> </ol>

<sup>191</sup> Evans, J [45.1], McAuley, S [57.1], Aubrey, L [59.1], Station Air [61.1], Pemberton, S [64.1], Cessna 180/185 Group et al [201.1], Coldicott, J. M. [118.1], Coldicott, G [254.1]

<sup>192</sup> Evans, J [45.1], McAuley, S [57.1], Aubrey, L [59.1], Station Air [61.1], Pemberton, S [64.1], Cessna 180/185 Group et al [201.1], Coldicott, J. M. [118.1], Coldicott, G [254.1]

<sup>194</sup> Helicopters Sth Cant. [53.25], NZAAA [132.31]

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. any Residential zone; and</li> <li>2. the notional boundary of a building containing a noise sensitive activity, not located on the site of the airstrip or helicopter land site.<sup>193</sup></li> </ol>	
--	--	--

<b>GRUZ-R14A</b>	<b>Aircraft and Helicopter Movements</b>	
<b>General Rural Zone</b>	<p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b>  <u>Aircraft and Helicopter Movements are used for emergency purposes only such as medical emergencies, search and rescue or firefighting; or</u></p> <p><b>PER-2</b>  <u>Aircraft and Helicopter Movements are associated with purposes ancillary to rural production including topdressing, spraying, stock management, fertiliser application, and frost mitigation, including the incidental landing and take-off of helicopters during their normal course of operation, or</u></p> <p><b>PER-3</b>  <u>All other aircraft and helicopter movements must be setback greater than 100m from:</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. any Residential zone; and</li> <li>2. the notional boundary of a building containing an existing noise sensitive activity, on a separate site under different ownership.<sup>195</sup></li> </ol> </p>	<p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved: Restricted Discretionary</b></p> <p><u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>the extent to which helicopter noise limits specified within Table 1 of NZS6807:1994 are complied with; and</u></li> <li>2. <u>the level, duration and character of the noise; and</u></li> <li>3. <u>proximity and nature of nearby activities and the adverse effects they may experience from the noise; and</u></li> <li>4. <u>the existing noise environment; and</u></li> <li>5. <u>effects on amenity values and anticipated character of the receiving environment; and</u></li> <li>6. <u>effects on health and well-being of people; and</u></li> <li>7. <u>noise mitigation measures; and</u></li> <li>8. <u>the practicality of utilising alternative sites.</u><sup>196</sup></li> </ol>

10.25.37 I recommended the following definitions be included with the PDP:

Permanent airstrip or helicopter landing site

<sup>193</sup> Helicopters Sth Cant. [53.25], NZAAA [132.31], Federated Farmers [182.201], Talbot, J [79.1]

<sup>195</sup> Helicopters Sth Cant. [53.25], NZAAA [132.31], Federated Farmers [182.201], Talbot, J [79.1]

<sup>196</sup> Helicopters Sth Cant. [53.25], NZAAA [132.31], Federated Farmers [182.201], Talbot, J [79.1]

Means any defined area of land intended or designed to be used, whether wholly or partly, used for the landing or departure of aircraft.

Aircraft and helicopter movement

Means a single aircraft flight operation (landing or departure). Maintenance procedures are excluded.<sup>197</sup>

### Section 32AA

10.25.38 I consider the recommended amendment to GRUZ-R14 provides more flexibly within the rule for airstrips and helicopter landing sites as a permitted activity. I consider the rule framework provides balances the requirements within GRUZ-O1 to provide for primary production activities, activities that support primary production, and other activities that require a rural location, with the requirement within GRUZ-O2(2) to provide higher levels of amenity immediately around sensitive activities and zone boundaries. I consider the recommended amendments will have an economic benefit as it will ensure that there is more flexibility within the permitted standards for the operation of airstrips and helicopter landing sites. I do not consider the recommended amendments will have any greater environmental, social, and cultural effects than the notified provisions.

### 10.26 Rule GRUZ-R15 – Shelterbelts

10.26.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
Silver Fern Farmers	172.122
Hort NZ	245.118
Federated Farmers	182.202
H, B	74.3
MFL	60.43

#### Submissions

10.26.2 Silver Fern Farms [172.122] supports GRUZ-R15 and seeks it be retained as notified.

10.26.3 Hort NZ [245.118] oppose the rule which controls the distance a building must be setback from a property boundary. They argue that in rural areas, lots are typically large enough

---

<sup>197</sup> Helicopters Sth Cant. [53.25], NZAAA [132.31], Federated Farmers [182.201], Talbot, J [79.1]

according to the existing subdivision rules, to ensure enough setback. They consider additional daylight rules unnecessary and suggest the rule could have negative effects on existing shelterbelts that are important for primary production activities. They therefore seek the removal of clause PER-1.

10.26.4 Federated Farmers [182.202] seek deletion of the rule in its entirety, noting the Property Law Act already regulates this activity. They consider the rule overly prescriptive for what they consider a “minor effect”.

10.26.5 H, B [74.3] considers indigenous vegetation along State Highway 1 would improve driver experience and seek insertion of the following additional permitted standard:

*“No trees or shelterbelts shall be planted within 15m of SH1 unless they are of an indigenous variety”*

10.26.6 MFL [60.43] submission considers the rule as notified is unclear regarding existing use rights and seeks clarification prior to the PDP becoming operative.<sup>198</sup>

### **Analysis**

10.26.7 In relation to the submitters seeking the removal of some or all of the GRUZ-R15, I disagree with these submissions. I consider this rule gives effect to GRUZ-O4 and GRUZ-P1(3) which ensure that intensive primary production, avoids or minimises adverse effects on sensitive activities. I consider PER-1 and PER-2 strike the right balance between enabling shelterbelts as part of a working rural farm and ensuring that new shelterbelts are not planted in locations that will adversely affect residential units on adjoining property's and ensuring the safety of the land transport infrastructure as required by TRAN-O1.

10.26.8 In relation the submission of H, B, I disagree with the suggested amendment. I note there are no restrictions on planting indigenous vegetation adjoining SH1 for amenity purposes. I disagree there is justification to prevent non-indigenous trees or shelterbelts adjoining SH1 over and above the matters listed within GRUZ-R15.

10.26.9 Finally, in relation to the submission from MFL, I note that existing use rights will apply to existing shelterbelts and therefore this definition and rule will only apply to the establishment of new shelterbelts. As such, I disagree any amendment is required.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

10.26.10 I recommend that the definition of ‘shelterbelt’ be retained as notified and no further amendments are made to GRUZ-R15 (noting that I have recommended an addition to this rule in response to a submission from TDC).

---

<sup>198</sup> MFL [60.43]

### 10.27 Rule GRUZ-R16 – Quarries and quarrying activities (including the definition of quarry and quarrying activities):

10.27.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
Federated Farmers	182.7, 182.22, 182.23, 182.203
ECan	183.147
Road Metals	169.3, 169.4, 169.44
Fulton Hogan	170.3, 170.4, 170.46
AQA	224.4, 224.5, 224.8
Rooney Holdings	174.11, 174.86
Rooney, G.J.H.	191.11, 191.86
Rooney Group	249.11, 249.86
Rooney Farms	250.11, 250.86
Rooney Earthmoving	251.86
TDL	252.11, 252.86
Dairy Holdings	89.1
Transpower	159.4
Hort NZ	245.5
NZ Pork	247.4

10.27.2 Considered within this analysis are submissions related to:

- The definition of “Quarry”:
- The definition of “Quarrying activities”:
- The definition of “Ancillary rural earthworks”:
- Rule GRUZ-R16 – Quarries and quarrying activities

#### ***Submissions***

##### Quarry definition

- 10.27.3 Three submissions have been received which support the definition of “Quarry” and seek it is retained as notified..<sup>199</sup> Federated Farmers [182.22] support the inclusion of the definition but consider that “Farm quarries” should be specifically excluded and seek amendments to provide for this by cross-referencing with “Farm quarries”.

Quarry activities definition

- 10.27.4 The AQA [224.5] supports the definition and seeks it be retained as notified.
- 10.27.5 Federated Farmers [182.23] support the inclusion of the definition but consider that “Farm quarries” should be specifically excluded and seek amendments to provide for this by cross-referencing with “Farm quarries”.
- 10.27.6 Two submitters<sup>200</sup> support the broad definition of quarrying activity but highlights challenges in its application, particularly concerning clean fill material and rehabilitation. The current definition, derived from the NPS, restricts quarry operators in rehabilitating areas due to the narrow scope of clean fill material, limited to virgin material. They identify the PDP requires resource consent for rehabilitation involving non-compliant material. Additionally, they consider the definition does not adequately address resource recovery in waste minimisation efforts, hindering opportunities for material recovery at quarry sites. They seek that the definition be retained but amendments made to align better with waste minimisation goals and the potential benefits of quarry remediation, enabling planned urban, residential, and rural growth.
- 10.27.7 Five submissions<sup>201</sup> support in part the definition but seek amendments to include the removal of overburden material, not just the deposition.

Ancillary rural earthworks definition

- 10.27.8 Three submissions have been lodged in support of the definition of “ancillary rural earthworks” and seek it is retained as notified..<sup>202</sup>
- 10.27.9 Hort NZ [245.5] supports the PDP’s approach to ancillary rural earthworks but seeks that the reference to “farming” is replaced with “primary production” as farming is not defined within the PDP.
- 10.27.10 Federated Farmers [182.7] seeks the deletion of the proposed definition of “Ancillary Rural Earthworks” and its replacement with a new definition which encompasses commonplace activities that should not have to apply for resource consent. They seek the following amendment:

---

<sup>199</sup> Road Metals [169.3], Fulton Hogan [170.3], AQA [224.4]

<sup>200</sup> Road Metals [169.4], Fulton Hogan [170.4],

<sup>201</sup> Rooney Holdings [174.11], Rooney, G.J.H. [191.11], Rooney Group [249.11], Rooney Farms [250.11], TDL [252.11]

<sup>202</sup> NZ Pork [247.4], Dairy Holdings [89.1], Transpower [159.4]

*Ancillary Rural Earthworks*

- any earthworks or disturbance of soil associated with cultivation, land preparation (including the establishment of sediment and erosion control measures), for planting and growing operations of crops and pasture;
- the harvesting of agricultural and horticultural crops (farming) and forests (forestry); and planting trees, removing trees and horticultural root ripping;
- the maintenance and construction of facilities typically associated with farming and forestry activities. This includes (but is not limited to): farm/forestry tracks, roads, vehicle manoeuvring areas and landings, stock marshalling yards, stock races, silage pits, offal pits, farm effluent ponds, feeding pads, digging post holes, fencing and sediment control measures, drilling bores, the installation and maintenance of services such as water pipes and troughs, off-stream farm water storage dams, hard stand areas for stock, fertiliser storage pads, airstrips and helipads; and
- farm quarries where quarry winnings are only used within the farm quarry.

~~means any earthworks associated with the maintenance and construction of facilities typically associated with farming activities, including, but not limited to, farm tracks/roads (up to 6m wide), landings, stock races, silage pits, farm drains, farm effluent ponds, feeding pads, fencing and erosion and sediment control measures, and burying of material infected by unwanted organisms (as declared by Ministry for Primary Industries Chief Technical Officer or an emergency declared by the Minister under the Biosecurity Act 1993).~~

GRUZ-R16

10.27.11 Federated Farmers [182.203] support the rule and seek it be retained as notified.

10.27.12 ECan [183.147] supports the intent of the rule but highlight beds of lakes and rivers are not under District Council jurisdiction and seeks this be deleted from the title. This submission is supported by Road Metals [169.4FS] and Fulton Hogan [170.4FS] who consider this will reduce the potential for confusion about which Council should be referred to for works in the river bed

10.27.13 Two submitters also seek amendments to the rule subject heading also noting that the rule unnecessarily duplicates consent requirements set out by ECan.<sup>203</sup> Additionally, they seek the following amendments to allow inert fill which does not fall within the definition of cleanfill and consider the distance of 500 meters for a sensitive receptor is uncommon in Canterbury and should be adjusted to align with the common distance of 250 meters.

*GRUZ-R16 Quarries and quarrying activities including backfilling with managed fill:*

*[....]*

*PER-3*

---

<sup>203</sup> Road Metals [169.44], Fulton Hogan [170.46]

*The quarry is not located within ~~500~~ 250m of an existing sensitive activity located on another site or the boundary of any of the Residential zones, Rural lifestyle zone, Rural settlement zone, Māori Purpose zone or Open Space and recreation zones; and*

*[...]*

10.27.14 AQA [224.8] support the permitted activity status relating to small quarrying in the bed of the river but considers where compliance is not achieved the activity status should be changed from discretionary to restricted discretionary.

10.27.15 Six submissions consider the SASM areas in the PDP are extensive and the Accidental Discovery Protocol commitment should be required only where a SASM has been identified...<sup>204</sup> They seek the following clarifier to be inserted within PER-4 to reflect this:

*"Where located in a SASM the Accidental Discovery Protocol commitment form ..."*

### **Analysis**

10.27.16 In relation to the submission from Federated Farmers seeking that that "farm quarries" should be specifically excluded from the definition of "quarry" and "quarrying activities", I disagree with the suggested amendments. I note that the Federated Farmers have sought that "farm quarries" be included within the definition of "ancillary rural earthworks". "Ancillary rural earthworks" are managed under the EW chapter (EW-S1). There are no volume limits for ancillary rural earthworks, which would mean that "farm quarries" in the GURZ and RLZ would be permitted with no area or volume limit and no requirement to comply with the permitted standards within GRUZ-R16.

10.27.17 While I acknowledge that farm quarries will be of a smaller scale to that of a commercial quarry, I consider it is still appropriate that permitted standards are imposed on this activity to ensure the effects are appropriately managed. I note that the permitted threshold for a quarry in the GRUZ is up to 2,000m<sup>2</sup> which is a considerable size for a farm quarry. Given this I disagree with the suggested amendments to the definition of "quarry" and "quarrying activities".

10.27.18 In relation to the submissions from Federated Farmers seeking amendments to the definition of "Ancillary rural earthworks" I disagree with the suggested amendments. I note that the intention of the definition is to capture "earthworks associated with the maintenance and construction of facilities typically associated with farming activities" and there is a separate standard within EW-S1 for earthworks associated with "any primary production activity". I consider the suggested amendments broaden the definition to capture earthworks associated with primary production activities which is not necessary. I also disagree that farm quarries should be included within the definition for the reasons set

---

<sup>204</sup> Rooney Holdings [174.86], Rooney, G.J.H. [191.86], Rooney Group [249.86], Rooney Farms [250.86], Rooney Earthmoving [251.86], TDL [252.86]

out above. I agree with the submission from Hort NZ seeking that “farming” be replaced with “primary production” as that is a defined term within the PDP.

10.27.19 Turning to the submissions on GRUZ-R16, I agree with the submitters seeking amendments to GRUZ-R16 to ensure that it does not duplicate consent requirements set out by ECan.

10.27.20 In relation the submitters seeking that the Accidental Discovery Protocol standard only apply to SASM areas, I disagree with this amendment. I note that Quarry activities within a SASM overlay are already managed by SASM-R5. I consider the intent of PER-4 is to ensure that outside of the SASM overlays there is an understanding and awareness that that sites of significance may be uncovered during the quarrying process. This extends to all archaeological material and is not limited to pre-European sites. As such, I consider the standard should be retained.

10.27.21 In relation to the suggestions that definition of “Quarrying activity”, or GRUZ-R16 should enable “backfilling with managed fill” I disagree with this suggested amendment. I note the definition of “Quarrying activities” is a NPS definition, and it appears to be intentional with its use of the phrase “cleanfilling of the quarry” as opposed to “backfilling with managed fill”. I note that “cleanfill material” is also a NPS definition and states:

*“means virgin excavated natural materials including clay, gravel, sand, soil and rock that are free of:*

- a. combustible, putrescible, degradable or leachable components;*
- b. hazardous substances and materials;*
- c. products and materials derived from hazardous waste treatment, stabilisation or disposal practices;*
- d. medical and veterinary wastes, asbestos, and radioactive substances;*
- e. contaminated soil and other contaminated materials; and*
- f. liquid wastes.”*

10.27.22 I understand the phrase “managed fill” is broader than “cleanfill material” and includes deposit of cleanfill material, contaminated clay, soil, rock and other inert materials that may have contaminants that exceed background concentrations such as construction and demolition waste materials. I consider the backfilling of a quarry with managed fill should trigger the requirement for a resource consent to determine the potential effects of the backfilling activity. As notified, GRUZ-R16 does not manage the backfilling of a quarry with managed fill, and therefore this activity would then be captured by the catch-all discretionary activity rule GRUZ-R28.

10.27.23 In relation to the suggestion that the default activity status should be changed from discretionary to restricted discretionary, I disagree with the suggested amendment. I consider the effects of a quarrying activities can be varied and wide ranging depending on the nature and scale of the quarrying activity. As such, I consider it is appropriate that the default activity status remain discretionary.

10.27.24 In relation to the suggestion that the setbacks between a quarry and an existing sensitive activity be reduced from 500m to 250m, I disagree with this amendment. I consider the 500m separation distance is required to retain the amenity of the existing sensitive activity as required by GRUZ-O2(3).

### Conclusions and Recommendations

10.27.25 I recommend that the definition of “quarry” and “quarrying activities” be retained as notified.

10.27.26 I recommend that the definition of “Ancillary rural earthworks” be amended as follows:

*means any earthworks associated with the maintenance and construction of facilities typically associated with ~~farming~~ primary production<sup>205</sup> activities, including, but not limited to, farm tracks/roads (up to 6m wide), landings, stock races, silage pits, farm drains, farm effluent ponds, feeding pads, fencing and erosion and sediment control measures, and burying of material infected by unwanted organisms (as declared by Ministry for Primary Industries Chief Technical Officer or an emergency declared by the Minister under the Biosecurity Act 1993).*

10.27.27 I recommend that GRUZ-R16 be amended as follows:

<b>GRUZ-R16</b>	<b>Quarries and quarrying activities up to 2,000m<sup>2</sup>:</b> <del>1. up to 2,000m<sup>2</sup> (not in the bed of a river); and</del> <del>2. in the bed of a river, which is authorised under the Regional Plan either as a permitted activity, or through a resource consent having been obtained from the Canterbury Regional Council.<sup>206</sup></del>	
<b>General Rural Zone</b>	<b>Activity status: Permitted</b>  <b>Where:</b>  <b>PER-1</b> The quarry is not within 10m of a site boundary; and  <b>PER-2</b> The quarry in not within 50m of a rock art site; and  <b>PER-3</b>	<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved: Discretionary</b>

<sup>205</sup> Hort NZ [245.5]

<sup>206</sup> ECan [183.147], Road Metals [169.44], Fulton Hogan [170.46]

<p>The quarry is not located within 500m of an existing sensitive activity located on another site or the boundary of any of the Residential zones, Rural lifestyle zone, Rural settlement zone, Māori Purpose zone or Open Space and recreation zones; and</p> <p><b>PER-4</b> The Accidental Discovery Protocol commitment form, contained within APP4 - Form confirming a commitment to adhering to an Accidental Discovery Protocol, has been completed and submitted to Council, at least 2 weeks prior to the commencement of any earthworks.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with GRUZ-R13.</p>	
--	--

### Section 32AA

10.27.28 I consider the recommended amendments to GRUZ-R16 are minor in nature but improve the clarity and interpretation of the provision as the drafting now aligns with the drafting style of the rest of the PDP, and the amendments remove the duplication with the CLWRP provisions. I do not consider the recommended amendments will have any greater environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects than the notified provisions.

### 10.28 Rule GRUZ-R18 – Artificial crop protection structures

10.28.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
Federated Farmers	182.204
Hort NZ	245.120, 245.6

#### Submissions

10.28.2 Federated Farmers [182.204] support the rule and seek it be retained as notified.

10.28.3 Hort NZ [245.120] support a permitted activity rule for primary production, but consider the proposed rule is unworkable and overly restrictive. They suggest there is confusion about the need for dark green or black cloth on vertical surfaces and uncertainty regarding setbacks and structural length control. They highlight artificial crop protection structures are

necessary to achieve policy objectives and enable primary production and seek the following amendments:

“[....]

*PER-2*

*Dark green or black cloth is used for ~~all~~ vertical faces when within 10m of a road or existing residential unit; and*

*PER-3*

*The structure meets the following setback:*

*~~1. For structure(s) less than 4m high, the structure(s) are setback a distance of:~~*

*~~a. 10m from road boundaries;~~*

*~~b. 20m from road boundaries that are a national, regional or district arterial road;~~*

*~~c. 15m from a non-road boundary of a site in different ownership; and~~*

*~~2. For structure(s) greater than 4m in height, then the horizontal setback distance between the boundary and the structure should increase a further 5m than that stated above for every 2m increase in height; and~~*

*3. For structure(s) less than 6m high, the structure(s) are setback a distance of: 3m from the boundary.*

*PER-4*

*~~The structure(s) are collectively no longer than 100m (measured parallel to any common boundary with a site in different ownership)."~~*

### **Analysis**

10.28.4 I agree in part with the submission of Hort NZ. I agree that the dark netting on vertical faces should only be required in certain locations where greater amenity is anticipated within the PDP. Rather than limiting the standard to road boundaries and existing dwellings, I consider the dark cloth requirement should apply within 20m of a property boundary.

10.28.5 I disagree with the amendments to PER-3. I consider the graduated setback standards depending on the height of the structure ensure that the amenity of the sites adjoining the artificial crop protection structures is retained.

10.28.6 In relation to the removal of the removal of PER-4, I agree with the submitter that artificial crop protection structures are necessary to achieve GRUZ-O1 and GRUZ-P1 which enable primary production activities.

### Conclusions and Recommendations

10.28.7 I recommend that GRUZ-R18 be amended as follows:

GRUZ-R18	Artificial crop protection structures	
General Rural Zone	<p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b> The structure(s) are open at the side; or</p> <p><b>PER-2</b> Dark green or black cloth is used for all vertical faces <u>located within 20m of the boundary of the site;</u><sup>207</sup> and</p> <p><b>PER-3</b> The structure meets the following setback:            1. For structure(s) less than 4m high, the structure(s) are setback a distance of:                a. 10m from road boundaries;                b. 20m from road boundaries that are a national, regional or district arterial road;                c. 15m from a non-road boundary of a site in different ownership; and            2. For structure(s) greater than 4m in height, then the horizontal setback distance between the boundary and the structure should increase a further 5m than that stated above for every 2m increase in height; and</p> <p><del><b>PER-4</b> The structure(s) are collectively no longer than 100m (measured parallel to any common boundary with a site in different ownership).</del><sup>208</sup></p>	<p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved: Restricted discretionary</b></p> <p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The extent of visual impacts including: limiting view shafts and panoramas from properties and public areas; changing the character of a location; changing the naturalness of the landscape; and creating an incongruous colour variation; and</li> <li>2. the extent of shading adverse effects on adjoining sites, activities and roads; and</li> <li>3. mitigation measures.</li> </ol>

### Section 32AA

10.28.8 I consider the recommended amendment to GRUZ-R18 is minor in nature but provides greater flexibility in the construction of artificial crop protection structures while retaining

<sup>207</sup> Hort NZ [245.120]

<sup>208</sup> Hort NZ [245.120]

the amenity of the GRUZ. I do not consider the recommended amendments will have any greater environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects than the notified provisions.

## 10.29 Rule GRUZ-R19 – Seasonal workers accommodation

10.29.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
Silver Fern Farms	172.123
Alliance Group	173.121
Hort NZ	245.24, 245.31, 245.103, 245.121
Spiers, B	66.41

### Submissions

10.29.2 Considered within this analysis are submissions related to:

- The definition of “seasonal workers accommodation”
- A new definition of “post-harvest facility” and
- GRUZ-R19

10.29.3 Hort NZ [245.24] support the definition of “seasonal workers accommodation” and seek it is retained as notified. However, the submitter notes that it refers to “post-harvest facility” which they consider should therefore be included as a defined term..<sup>209</sup> They seek the following:

*“Post-harvest facility*

*Building operated by any number of growers and used for the storage, packing, washing, inspecting and grading of eggs, fruit, vegetables, or other (natural and unprocessed) primary produce brought to the post-harvest facility from a range of locations, and includes all activities that are an integral aspect of post-harvest operations.*

*Includes:*

- *use of the site for the collection and distribution of horticultural products;*
- *slicing and dicing agricultural products in preparation for distribution to retail outlets, including the disposal of associated waste material from these activities;*

---

<sup>209</sup> Hort NZ [245.31]

- preparation and shrink-wrapping horticultural products in preparation for distribution to retail outlets;
- collection and distribution of agricultural products including the cross loading of trucks used in the collection and delivery of horticultural products; and
- the on-site servicing and maintenance of vehicles and equipment associated with the activities.”

10.29.4 Regarding GRUZ-R19, two submissions support the rule and seek it be retained as notified.<sup>210</sup>

10.29.5 Hort NZ [245.121] supports the rule framework for permanent and seasonal workers accommodation but consider the following amendments to PER-1 are required to provide a consenting pathway which can consider individual cases:

“PER-1

*It is located on a site larger than ~~40~~ 10 hectares unless the site:*

*[...]”*

10.29.6 Spiers, B [66.41] seeks the following wording amendments to PER-1 which they consider better reflects the intent of the rule:<sup>211</sup>

“PER-1

*The accommodation is to be on a site of at least 20 ha area and no existing household unit is present. ~~It is located on a site larger than 40 hectares unless the site: ...”~~*

### **Analysis**

10.29.7 In relation to the inclusion of a definition of “post-harvest facility” I agree with the suggested definition. I consider it adds clarity to the permitted standard.

10.29.8 I disagree with the suggested amendment to PER-1. I consider the first part of the PER-1 is required to enable one principle dwelling and one seasonal workers accommodation on a site of 40 hectares or more. Then PER-1(1)-(3) provides for the establishment of seasonal workers accommodation on site less than 40 hectares, provided (1) to (3) can be achieved. I consider this achieves the direction within GRUZ-P9.

10.29.9 I note that there is a gap in the permitted standards listed within GRUZ-R19, as there is no requirement to comply with GRUZ-S1, GRUZ-S2, GRUZ-S3, and GRUZ-S6 which control the bulk and location of buildings in the GRUZ. I note that matter of discretion (7) within GRUZ-R19 refers to GRUZ-S1, GRUZ-S2, GRUZ-S3, and GRUZ-S6, so I presume this is an oversight

---

<sup>210</sup> Silver Fern Farms [172.123], Alliance Group [173.121]

with the drafting. As such, I have recommended the inclusion of an additional permitted activity rule to ensure GRUZ-S1, GRUZ-S2, GRUZ-S3, and GRUZ-S6 are complied with as a permitted activity. I consider this amendment can be made under Clause 16(2) of the RMA because it clarifies the intention of the PDP and is of minor effect.

### Conclusions and Recommendations

10.29.10 I recommend that the following definition of “Post-harvest facility” is included within the PDP:

#### Post-harvest facility

Building operated by any number of growers and used for the storage, packing, washing, inspecting and grading of eggs, fruit, vegetables, or other (natural and unprocessed) primary produce brought to the post-harvest facility from a range of locations, and includes all activities that are an integral aspect of post-harvest operations.

#### It includes:

- use of the site for the collection and distribution of horticultural products;
- slicing and dicing agricultural products in preparation for distribution to retail outlets, including the disposal of associated waste material from these activities;
- preparation and shrink-wrapping horticultural products in preparation for distribution to retail outlets;
- collection and distribution of agricultural products including the cross loading of trucks used in the collection and delivery of horticultural products; and
- the on-site servicing and maintenance of vehicles and equipment associated with the activities.<sup>212</sup>

10.29.11 I recommend that GRUZ-R19 is retained as notified.

GRUZ-R19	Seasonal workers accommodation	
General Rural Zone	<b>Activity status: Permitted</b>  <b>Where:</b>  <b>PER-1</b> It is located on a site larger than 40 hectares unless the site: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. was created before the 22 September 2022; and</li> <li>2. does not contain an existing household unit; and</li> </ol>	<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1 to PER-7, and PER-9<sup>214</sup>: Restricted Discretionary</b>  <b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. adequacy of drinking water supply; and</li> <li>2. adequacy of water supply for firefighting purposes; and</li> <li>3. the size of the site to accommodate a discharge to ground; and</li> </ol>

<sup>212</sup> Hort NZ [245.24]

<sup>214</sup> Clause 16(2) RMA

<p>3. is located on a site larger than 20ha; and</p> <p><b>PER-2</b> The site or buildings are occupied for a period not exceeding 180 days per year (occupancy records must be kept by the owner and made available to Timaru District Council upon request); and</p> <p><b>PER-3</b> The site/buildings are not used for visitors accommodation; and</p> <p><b>PER-4</b> All employees residing in the seasonal worker accommodation are employed in a primary production, rural industry or post-harvest facility located on, or off the site; and</p> <p><b>PER-5</b> No more than 20 people live in the seasonal worker accommodation; and</p> <p><b>PER-6</b> The total gross floor area of all buildings used for seasonal worker accommodation is less than 500m<sup>2</sup>; and</p> <p><b>PER-7</b> Any camping area has a maximum area of 1,000m<sup>2</sup> and is setback a minimum distance of 100m from the nearest residential unit located on another site; and</p> <p><b>PER-8</b> GRUZ-S4 is complied with.</p> <p><b>PER-9</b> <u>GRUZ-S1, GRUZ-S2, GRUZ-S3, and GRUZ-S6 is complied with.</u> <sup>213</sup></p> <p><b>Note:</b> any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with GRUZ-R13.</p>	<p>4. methods to manage effects on existing activities, including the provision of screening, landscaping, and methods for noise management; and</p> <p>5. extent to which the design and management of facility complies with the Code of Practice for Able Bodied Seasonal Workers; and</p> <p>6. extent to which future subdivision around the seasonal worker accommodation is restricted; and</p> <p>7. the matters of discretion listed in GRUZ-S1, GRUZ-S2, GRUZ-S3 and GRUZ-6 if any of those standards are infringed.</p> <p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-8: Discretionary</b></p>
--	--

### Section 32AA

10.29.12 I consider the recommended inclusion of a “Post-harvest facility” definition and the minor amendments to the rule provides greater clarity to the PDP. I do not consider the

<sup>213</sup> Clause 16(2) RMA

recommended amendments will have any greater environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects than the notified provisions.

### 10.30 Rule GRUZ-R20 – Permanent workers accommodation

10.30.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
Dairy Holdings	89.21
Silver Fern Farms	172.124
Alliance Group	173.122
Hort NZ	245.122
NZ Pork	247.30
Rooney Holdings	174.10, 174.87
Rooney, G.J.H.	191.10, 191.87
Rooney Group	249.10, 249.87
Rooney Farms	250.10, 250.87
Rooney Earthmoving	251.10, 251.11, 251.87
TDL	252.10, 252.87
Pye Group	35.5

#### **Submissions**

10.30.2 Considered within this analysis is also submissions related to:

- the definition of “Permanent workers accommodation”.
- GRUZ-R20

10.30.3 Hort NZ [245.17] support the definition of “Permanent workers accommodation” and seek it be retained as notified. Three submitters<sup>215</sup> oppose the definition as they consider it only provides for full-time workers accommodation. The submitters seek an amendment to the definition to provide for the accommodation of part-time workers of a primary production activity, or a rural industrial activity.

---

<sup>215</sup> Rooney Holdings [174.10], Rooney, G.J.H. [191.10], Rooney Group [249.10], Rooney Farms [250.10], Rooney Earthmoving [251.10], Rooney Earthmoving [251.11], TDL [252.10].

- 10.30.4 Three submissions support the GRUZ-R20 and seek it be retained as notified..<sup>216</sup>
- 10.30.5 Hort NZ [245.122] supports the policy and rule framework for permanent and seasonal workers accommodation which they consider vital for primary production. They suggest it is appropriate to have a consenting pathway for cases where the minimum parent lot area requirements are not met but consider the 80ha threshold is overly restrictive and does not align with how these activities are typically provided for in a primary production context. They seek the 80ha is replaced by 10ha.
- 10.30.6 Six submissions argue that multiple residential units are valuable for both workers and non-employees, and limiting their use is wasteful of resources..<sup>217</sup> They also raise concern that the 80ha qualifier in PER-1 is too restrictive and consider a 40ha limit more appropriate if tied to property size, allowing flexibility for clustering units. They propose the following amendments:
- “PER-1*
- It is located on a site larger than ~~40~~ 80 hectares; or that where a property comprises more than one record of title, the sum of the titles is greater than 40 hectares. The overall density shall not be greater than 1 unit per 40 hectares that comprises the property; and*
- PER-2*
- An employment contract for the permanent full time worker(s) who will reside in the worker's accommodation is provided to Timaru District Council at the time of a building consent application and is available upon request; and*
- PER-3*
- It is located on the same site where the permanent full worker is employed.*
- [...]”*
- 10.30.7 NZ Pork [247.30] consider the rule should align with GRUZ-P9 and seasonal workers accommodation should be permitted where located on a site larger than 20ha rather than 80ha, as notified.
- 10.30.8 Pye Group [35.5] seeks to understand the difference between Residential Units and Permanent Workers Accommodation. If there is no clear difference, the submitter seeks to delete GRUZ-R20 and amend GRUZ-R4 to remove the reference to Permanent Workers Accommodation.

---

<sup>216</sup> Dairy Holdings [89.21], Silver Fern Farms [172.124], Alliance Group [173.122]

<sup>217</sup> Rooney Holdings [174.87], Rooney, G.J.H. [191.87], Rooney Group [249.87], Rooney Farms [250.87], Rooney Earthmoving [251.87], TDL [252.87]

## Analysis

- 10.30.9 In relation to the submissions of GRUZ-R20 I agree in part with the submission from Rooney et al. I note that this rule seeks to achieve the direction within GRUZ-P9 which provides for permanent workers accommodation and seasonal workers accommodation to support primary production. I note that GRUZ-P9(1) provides for these activities where the site has an area of least 40 hectares for permanent workers accommodation, or 20ha for seasonal workers accommodation. Given this I consider the minimum area requirement for a permanent workers accommodation should be 40 hectares rather than 80 hectares. I disagree that the rule should be amended to allow for a density of one permanent workers accommodation activity per 40 hectares. I consider the intention is to provide for one permanent workers accommodation on a site. I note that GRUZ-R4 enables one residential unit per 40 hectares, so for larger sites there is greater flexibility to establish multiple residential units on a site provided this density is complied with.
- 10.30.10 Pye Group that the difference between Residential Units managed by GRUZ-R4 and Permanent Workers Accommodation managed by GRUZ-R20 is not clear. In my view these rules appear to be managing the same activity with different permitted standards. Given this, I agree with the deletion of GRUZ-R20 and the consequential deletion of the reference to GRUZ-R20 within GRUZ-R4.
- 10.30.11 I disagree with the submitters seeking that the minimum area requirement be reduced to 10 or 20 hectares. As noted above, GRUZ-P9(1) provides for these activities where the site has an area of least 40 hectares for permanent workers accommodation. I consider a reduction below 40 hectare would not achieve GRUZ-P9(1).
- 10.30.12 Given the above assessment, I disagree with the Pye Group that GURZ-R20 should be deleted.
- 10.30.13 I note that there is a gap in the permitted standards listed within GRUZ-R20, as there is no requirement to comply with GRUZ-S1, GRUZ-S2, GRUZ-S3, and GRUZ-S6 which control the bulk and location of buildings in the GRUZ. I note that matter of discretion (10) within GRUZ-R19 refers to GRUZ-S1, GRUZ-S2, GRUZ-S3, and GRUZ-S6, so I presume this is an oversight with the drafting. As such, I have recommended the inclusion of an additional permitted activity rule to ensure GRUZ-S1, GRUZ-S2, GRUZ-S3, GRUZ-R4 and GRUZ-S6 are complied with as a permitted activity. I have also recommended that if compliance with GRUZ-S4 is not achieved, the rule defaults to a discretionary activity. This aligns with both GRUZ-R4 and GRUZ-R19. I consider these amendments can be made under Clause 16(2) of the RMA because it clarifies the intention of the PDP and is of minor effect.

## Conclusions and Recommendations

- 10.30.14 I recommend the GRUZ-R20 be amended as follows:

<b>GRUZ-R20</b>	<b>Permanent workers accommodation</b>
-----------------	--

<b>General Rural Zone</b>	<b>Activity status: Permitted</b> <b>Where:</b>	<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1, <del>or</del> PER-2, or PER-4 : Restricted Discretionary</b>
	<b>PER-1</b> It is located on a site larger than <del>80</del> <u>40</u> hectares; and	<b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b>
	<b>PER-2</b> An employment contract for the permanent full time worker(s) who will reside in the worker's accommodation is provided to Timaru District Council at the time of a building consent application and is available upon request; and	1. the suitability of any documentary evidence that confirms the accommodation is provided for people that are employed on the site; and 2. the extent to which the permanent workers accommodation is required to be provided on site to meet the needs of the site's primary production activity; and
	<b>PER-3</b> It is located on the same site where the permanent full worker is employed.  <b>PER-4</b> <u>GRUZ-S1, GRUZ-S2, GRUZ-S3, and GRUZ-6 is complied with.</u> <sup>218</sup>  <b>PER-5</b> <u>GRUZ-S4 is complied with.</u> <sup>219</sup>  <i><b>Note:</b> any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with GRUZ-R13.</i>	3. the extent of subject workers accommodation provided on the site; 4. the location of workers accommodation; 5. adequacy of drinking water supply; and 6. adequacy of water supply for firefighting purposes; and 7. the size of the site to accommodate a discharge to ground; and 8. methods to manage effects on existing activities, including the provision of screening, setbacks, landscaping, and methods for noise management; and 9. extent to which future subdivision around the workers accommodation is restricted; and 10. the matters of discretion listed in GRUZ-S1, GRUZ-S2, GRUZ-S3 and GRUZ-S4 <sup>6</sup> if any of those standards are infringed.
		<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-3: Non-Complying</b>
		<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-4: Discretionary</b> <sup>220</sup>

### Section 32AA

10.30.15 I consider the recommended amendments to GRUZ-R20 ensure consistency across the GRUZ chapter. I consider the recommended amendments will have an economic benefit as it will ensure that there is more flexibility within the permitted standards for the establishment of

<sup>218</sup> Clause 16(2) RMA

<sup>219</sup> Clause 16(2) RMA

<sup>220</sup> Clause 16(2) RMA

permanent workers accommodation. I do not consider the recommended amendments will have any greater environmental, social, and cultural effects than the notified provisions.

### 10.31 Rule GRUZ-R21 – Rural industry

10.31.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
Waka Kotahi	143.150
Fonterra	165.19, 165.128
Alliance Group	173.123
Federated Farmers	182.205
Maze Pastures	41.3
MFL	60.44
Silver Fern Farms	172.125
Clarke, G	1.3
Road Metals	169.6
Fulton Hogan	170.6
Rural Contractors	178.2
Hort NZ	245.22

#### Submissions

10.31.2 Considered within this analysis are submissions related to:

- The definition of “*Rural industry*” and
- GRUZ-R21

10.31.3 Five submissions have been received and while all recognise the definition of “*rural industry*” aligns with the NPS, only three seek it is retained as notified.<sup>221</sup> Two submissions support in part the definition and seek it is retained on the basis that the definition encompasses the storage of vehicles and machinery associated with quarrying, but seek to amend the definition to recognise these activities which they state support and service primary production activities, are permitted in the GRUZ.<sup>222</sup>

<sup>221</sup> Fonterra [165.19], Rural Contractors [178.2], Hort NZ [245.22]

<sup>222</sup> Road Metals [169.6], Fulton Hogan [170.6]

- 10.31.4 Regarding GRUZ-21, four submissions support the rule and seek it be retained as notified..<sup>223</sup>  
Two submissions seek the following amendment to clarify existing use rights..<sup>224</sup>

*“RDIS-1*

*The activity is not an offensive trade and existing use rights apply for all Rural Industry established prior to the District Plan being fully operative.*

*[...]”*

- 10.31.5 Silver Fern Farms [60.44] consider offensive trades associated with rural industry are likely to locate in rural areas to achieve suitable separation from incompatible activities and the functional need of the industry. They consider the non-complying activity status for offensive trades associated with rural industry is onerous and seek it be amended to discretionary.
- 10.31.6 Clarke, G [1.3] considers the rule needs amendment to allow for diversified land use within the zone and seeks matters of discretion be restricted to:

*“1. the suitability of the ~~location~~, site design and layout; and*

*2. [...]”*

### **Analysis**

- 10.31.7 In relation the submitters seeking confirmation that storage of vehicles and machinery associated with quarrying is included within the definition of “Rural industry”. Given both “mining” and “quarrying” are included within the definition of primary production, I consider the storage of vehicles and machinery associated with quarrying would be included within the definition of “Rural Industry”. I do not recommend any amendments to the definition.
- 10.31.8 In relation to the submitters..<sup>225</sup> that seek an addition to the rule confirming that existing use rights apply to existing rural industry activities, I disagree with this suggested amendment. I note that the rules within the PDP will not affect the existing use rights of submitters provided:
- the use was lawfully established before the rule became operative or the PDP was notified; and
  - the effects of the use are the same or similar in character, intensity, and scale to those which existed before the rule became operative or the PDP was notified..<sup>226</sup>

<sup>223</sup> Waka Kotahi [143.150], Fonterra [165.128], Alliance Group [173.123], Federated Farmers [182.205]

<sup>224</sup> Maze Pastures [41.3], MFL [60.44]

<sup>225</sup> Road Metals [169.6], Fulton Hogan [170.6]

<sup>226</sup> Section 10(1)(a)(i) and (ii) of the Resource Management Act 1991.

10.31.9 I do not consider this needs to be specifically referred to within GRUZ-R21.

10.31.10 In relation to the submission from Silver Fern Farms seeking a discretionary activity status, I agree with the suggested amendment. I note that GRUZ-R1 requires that primary production and intensive primary production activities that include any offensive trade require a resource consent as a discretionary activity. I also note that GRUZ-R6 requires that home businesses that involve offensive trade require a resource consent as a discretionary activity. To align with the direction within GRUZ-R1 and GRUZ-R6, I agree that the default activity status for rural industries that include offensive trade should also be discretionary.

10.31.11 In relation to the submission of Clarke, G, I disagree with the suggested amendment. I consider the inclusion of 'location' within matter of discretion (1) ensures that the location of the rural industry can be considered at part of the resource consent process.

### Conclusions and Recommendations

10.31.12 I recommended that GRUZ-R21 be amended as follows:

<b>GRUZ-R21</b>	<b>Rural industry</b>	
<b>General Rural Zone</b>	<p><b>Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>RDIS-1</b> The activity is not an offensive trade.</p> <p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the suitability of the location, site design and layout; and</li> <li>2. the intensity and scale of the activity; and</li> <li>3. the extent of adverse effects on existing or permitted activities; and</li> <li>4. the extent of adverse effects on the safe and efficient operation of the road network, and suitability of onsite loading, manoeuvring and access; and</li> <li>5. the provision of infrastructure to service the activity; and</li> <li>6. measures to avoid, mitigate or remedy adverse effects.</li> </ol> <p><i>Note:</i></p>	<p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved: <del>Non-complying</del> <u>Discretionary</u></b><sup>227</sup></p>

<sup>227</sup> Silver Fern Farms [60.44]

- |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | 1. <i>any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with GRUZ-R13.</i> |  |
|--|--|--|

### Section 32AA

10.31.13 I consider the recommended amendments to GRUZ-R21 ensure consistency across the GRUZ chapter as other activities that contain offensive trade require resource consent as a discretionary activity. I do not consider the recommended amendments will have any greater environmental, social, economic or cultural effect than the notified provisions.

### 10.32 Rule GRUZ-R23 – Expansion of existing consented quarries

10.32.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
AQA	224.9
Road Metals	169.45
Fulton Hogan	170.47
Federated Farmers	182.206
Waka Kotahi	143.151

#### Submissions

10.32.2 AQA [224.9] support the rule and seek it be retained as notified.

10.32.3 Two submissions highlight the rule as notified fails to provide for lawfully established, un-consented quarries and seek amendments for clarity.<sup>228</sup> They also recommend using the term "*quarrying activity*" instead of "*quarry operation*," as it is a defined term. They suggest distinguishing between extraction and processing activities in the rule due to differing potential effects on nearby sensitive activities and propose the following amendment:

*"GRUZ-R23 Expansion of existing lawfully established ~~consented~~ quarries.*

*Activity status: Restricted Discretionary*

*RDIS-1*

---

<sup>228</sup> Fulton Hogan [170.47], Road Metals [169.45]

*The entirety of the existing quarrying activity operation has an existing land use consent from Timaru District Council or is otherwise lawfully established; and*

*RDIS-2*

*The expansion of the existing quarry does not increase:*

- a) the rate of production beyond existing lawfully established ~~consented~~ levels, and*
- b) the hours of operation; and*

*RDIS-3*

*The expansion does not occur within:*

- a) i. 500m for processing activities; and*

*ii. 200m for any excavation activity;*

*of an existing sensitive activity located on another site, or the boundary of a Residential, Rural Lifestyle, Rural Settlement, Māori Purpose or Open Space zone; or 20m of a site boundary*

*[...]"*

- 10.32.4 Federated Farmers [182.206] believe farm quarries should be clearly distinguished from industrial extractive quarries and while they acknowledge there is a separate definition for farm quarries, they should be explicitly excluded from this definition and seek the following amendment:

*"RDIS-1*

*The entirety of the existing quarry operation has an existing land use consent from Timaru District Council, on all land, excluding farm quarries; and*

*[...]"*

- 10.32.5 Waka Kotahi [143.151] seek to amend GRUZ-R23 by including an additional matter of discretion requiring any quarry expansion activity to demonstrate that the activity will not impact on the safe and efficient function of the state highway networks.

### **Analysis**

- 10.32.6 I agree in part with the submission from Fulton Hogan and Road Metals. I agree that the reference to "quarrying operation" should be replaced by "quarrying" which is a defined term. I disagree with submitters seeking that the rule be broadened to include "lawfully established quarries", as I consider this may inadvertently capture a wide range of lawfully established quarries that could expand and still be within the permitted thresholds listed in

GURZ-R16, for example small farm quarries. If all “lawfully established quarries” were included within the rule, the expansion of permitted quarries would require resource consent under GRUZ-R23. I also disagree with the suggestion that the permitted setback for extraction activities should be reduced from 500 metres to 200 meters. I note that the 500 metre setback within GRUZ-R23 is consistent with the 500 metre setback within GRUZ-R16(3) and ensures that the amenity of existing sensitive activities and areas zone for residential purposes is maintained.

10.32.7 I disagree with the Federated Farmers submission seeking that “farm quarries” be excluded from this GRUZ-R23. I consider this is unnecessary as I consider it is unlikely that “farm quarries” are of a scale that would require resource consent and would therefore not be captured by the rule that only applies to “consented quarries”. If a “farm quarry” was of a scale that would require resource consent, GRUZ-R23 provides a more permissive activity status (restricted discretionary rather than discretionary under GRUZ-R16) to continue the with the activity provided the matters within GRUZ-R23 can be achieved. I consider this is appropriate.

10.32.8 I agree with the submission from Waka Kotahi seeking an additional matter of discretion relating to the impact the activity will have on the safe and efficient function of the state highway networks. I note that the Waka Kotahi submission point on the matters of discretion relates only to effects on the “state highway networks”. However, Waka Kotahi’s submission point on GRUZ-O5 relates to effects on the “transportation network” more broadly. The reference to the “transportation network” is also included within the GRUZ-P6 (2)(e). Given this, in order to achieve the amendment recommended to GRUZ-O5 I recommend that reference to effects on the “transportation network” is included within GRUZ-R23.

### Conclusions and Recommendations

10.32.9 I recommend that GRUZ-R23 be amended as follows:

GRUZ-R23	Expansion of existing consented quarries	
General Rural Zone	<p><b>Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</b></p> <p><b>RDIS-1</b> The entirety of the existing quarry operation<sup>229</sup> has an existing land use consent from Timaru District Council; and</p> <p><b>RDIS-2</b> The expansion of the existing quarry does not increase:</p>	<p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved: Discretionary</b></p>

<sup>229</sup> Fulton Hogan [170.47], Road Metals [169.45]

- a. the rate of production beyond existing consented levels, and
- b. the hours of operation; and

**RDIS-3**

The expansion does not occur within:

1. 500m of an existing sensitive activity located on another site, or the boundary of a Residential, Rural Lifestyle, Rural Settlement, Māori Purpose or Open Space zone; or
2. 20m of a site boundary; or
3. 100m of a riparian margin; or
4. the mapped drinking water protection overlay; or
5. an outstanding natural landscape or feature, significant natural area, high naturalness water body, visual amenity landscape, the coastal environment, a site or area of significance to Māori and a heritage item or setting.

**Matters of discretion are restricted to:**

1. adverse effects on the visual amenity and landscape character and the location and scale of any buildings; and
2. the extent of dust nuisance, land instability, and contamination; and
3. adverse effects on the margins of water bodies; and
4. rehabilitation of the site; and
5. the commitment to implement appropriate accidental discovery protocol, in accordance with the commitment form contained within APP4 - Form confirming a commitment to adhering to an Accidental Discovery Protocol.
6. the extent of adverse effects on the safe and efficient operation of the road network.<sup>230</sup>

**Note:** any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with GRUZ-R13.

<sup>230</sup> Waka Kotahi [143.151]

## Section 32AA

10.32.10 I consider the recommended amendments to GRUZ-R22 are minor in nature but ensure that all the relevant matters can be considered when assessing the effects of an application. I do not consider the recommended amendments will have any greater environmental, social, economic or cultural effect than the notified provisions.

### 10.33 Rule GRUZ-R29 – New Industrial activities not listed in GRUZ-21

10.33.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
Hort NZ	245.123
Enviro NZ	162.17
Clarke, G	1.4

#### Submissions

10.33.2 Hort NZ [245.123] supports the rule and seeks it be retained as notified.

10.33.3 Enviro NZ [162.17] raises concern that clean fills and landfills are considered a non-complying activity under GRUZ-R29 but understands there is no clear pathway for this activity in the GRUZ. They consider the GRUZ is the most likely zone to accommodate such activities to allow for residential, commercial, industrial and rural growth and suggest a discretionary activity status would support achievement of GRUZ-P7.

10.33.4 Clarke, G [1.4] considers the rule to be overly restrictive and seeks the non-complying activity status be amended to restricted discretionary.

#### Analysis

10.33.5 I disagree with the submission from Enviro NZ. I consider new industrial activities not listed in GRUZ-21 are not anticipated within the GRUZ and therefore the non-complying activity status associated with these activities is appropriate. I consider this rule framework is required to achieve GRUZ-P7 which directs that other activities (not listed in the rules) should only be allowed in the GRUZ where the specific matters listed in GRUZ-P7(1) are achieved. I consider there is a consenting pathway for these activities, provided they can demonstrate that they can achieve the matters listed within GRUZ- P7(9).

10.33.6 I disagree with the amendment suggested by Clarke, G, as noted in the paragraph above, I consider new industrial activities not listed in GRUZ-21 are not anticipated within the GRUZ and therefore the non-complying activity status associated with these activities is appropriate.

### Conclusions and Recommendations

10.33.7 I recommend that GRUZ-R29 be retained as notified.

### 10.34 GRUZ - New Rural Contractor Depot rule

10.34.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
Rural Contractors	178.1, 178.9, 178.10, 178.11

#### Submissions

10.34.2 Rural Contractors [178.1, 178.9, 178.10, 178.11] seeks to include a new permitted rule to provide for a rural contractor depot, with a restricted discretionary default. As a consequential amendment, the submitter seeks to amend GRUZ-R21 - Rural industry to specifically exclude a rural contractor depot. They also seek to include the following definition for “*Rural contractor depot*” to support implementation:

“Rural contractor depot

means the land and buildings used for the purposes of storing or maintaining machinery, equipment and associated goods and supplies associated with a rural contracting business that directly supports, services or is dependent on primary production.”

#### Analysis

10.34.3 I disagree that an additional new permitted activity rule and definition for rural contractor depots are required. I consider that it is appropriate that a rural contractor depot that meets the definition of a “rural industry” as defined within the PDP be managed through a restricted discretionary activity framework to ensure that adverse effects of the activity are adequately managed. I consider this rule framework is required to give effect to GRUZ-P7 which states that rural industries are only allowed in the GRUZ where the specific matters listed in GRUZ-P7(1) are achieved.

### Conclusions and Recommendations

10.34.4 I recommend no further amendments to the GRUZ.

### 10.35 Standard GRUZ-S1 – Height of buildings and structures

10.35.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
----------------	----------------------------

NZ Frost Fans	255.26
Radio NZ	152.57

### **Submissions**

10.35.2 NZ Frost Fans [255.26] support the standard and seek it be retained as notified.

10.35.3 Radio NZ [152.57] seek the following amendments to address the electromagnetic radiation safety risks of tall structures within 1,000m of the submitter's facility at Fairview and includes an advice note to ensure the submitter is notified or consulted about the construction of elevated structures near the submitter's facilities:

*"The height of buildings and structures must not exceed:*

*[...]*

4. 49m within 1000m of RNZ's Facilities at Fairview.

*Matters of discretion are restricted to:*

*[...]*

7. Risk of electromagnetic radiation effects from radiocommunication activities conducted at RNZ's Facilities at Fairview."

10.35.4 The applicants also seek an additional advice note to ensure Radio NZ is notified or consulted about the construction of elevated structures near Radio NZ's facilities.

### **Analysis**

10.35.5 In relation to the submission from Radio NZ, I note that GRUZ-S1 sets a maximum height of 9 metres for residential units, 15m for other buildings and structures, (except silos) and 25m for silos. Any breach of these standards requires resource consent as a restricted discretionary activity. Given this I disagree that a new standard is required within GRUZ-S1 specifically for the Radio NZ facility. However, I note that the matters of discretion associated with GRUZ-S1 do not include an ability to consider potential effects on radiocommunication conducted at Radio NZ's facilities at Fairview. As such, I recommend that a new matter of discretion be included in GRUZ-S1 to provide discretion for these effects to be considered through the restricted discretionary activity consent process. I consider this additional matter of discretion will help achieve EI-P3(1) which requires that new incompatible activities are appropriately located or designed so they do not compromise or constrain the safe, effective and efficient operation, of any lifeline utility.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

10.35.6 I recommend that the matters of discretion associated with GRUZ-S1 be amended as follows:

<b>GRUZ-S1</b>	<b>Height of buildings and structures</b>	
<b>General Rural Zone</b>	<p>The height of buildings and structures must not exceed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 9m for residential units.</li> <li>2. 15m for other buildings and structures, except silos.</li> <li>3. 25m for silos.</li> </ol> <p>Height shall be measured from the ground level prior to any works commencing.</p>	<p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. dominance in the landscape; and</li> <li>2. overlooking and loss of privacy of adjacent residential units; and</li> <li>3. shading of adjacent residential units; and</li> <li>4. landscaping; and</li> <li>5. adverse effects on existing primary production facilities; <del>and</del></li> <li>6. measures to avoid or mitigate adverse effects; <u>and</u></li> <li>7. <u>effects on radiocommunication activities conducted at the radiocommunication facilities at Fairview.</u><sup>231</sup></li> </ol>

### Section 32AA

10.35.7 I consider the recommended amendment to GRUZ-S1 is minor in nature but ensure that the unique matters related to radiocommunication activities conducted at Fairview can be considered when assessing the effects of an application. I do not consider the recommended amendments will have any greater environmental, social, economic or cultural effect than the notified provisions.

### 10.36 Standard GRUZ-S3 – Boundary setbacks for buildings and structures

10.36.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
Clarke, G	1.1
NZ Pork	247.31, 247.3
Maze Pastures	41.6
Hort NZ	245.129
MFL	60.45

### Submissions

10.36.2 Considered within this analysis are submissions related to:

---

<sup>231</sup> Radio NZ [152.57]

- A new definition of “Ancillary buildings and structures (Primary Production)”
- GRUZ-S3

10.36.3 Two submissions support the standard and seeks it be retained as notified.<sup>232</sup>

10.36.4 Two submissions seek an amendment to exempt water tank/s from setback requirements, noting that GRUZ-S2 will require water tanks to meet recession plane requirements.<sup>233</sup>

10.36.5 NZ Pork [247.31] seeks exemption for buildings and structures related to movable pig shelters including farrowing huts less than 30m<sup>2</sup> in area and mobile pig shelters less than 2m in height. They also consider that partially, or fully roofed mobile pig shelters would fall within the NPS definition of building and structure and therefore would be capture by the setback rule. As such they seek to include a new definition of “Ancillary buildings and structures (Primary Production)” for ancillary buildings and structures that support primary production and seek mobile pig shelters to be included in this definition.<sup>234</sup> No suggested wording for the definition is provided.

### ***Analysis***

10.36.6 In relation to the submitters seeking an exemption for water tanks, I disagree with the suggested addition. Given the size of the sites in the GURZ, I think there should be ample room to locate a water tank outside of the setback requirements.

10.36.7 In relation to the submission from NZ Pork, I note that the exemptions within the boundary setback standard include fences, irrigators, water troughs, crop support structures and artificial crop protection structures, all small structures or structures that are visually permeable. I consider a 30m<sup>2</sup> mobile pig shelter is a greater scale than the other structures that are exempted from the standard and may affect the amenity of the GRUZ. As such, I disagree with the suggested addition.

10.36.8 I also disagree that a new definition and exemption for “Ancillary buildings and structures (Primary Production)” should be included within the PDP. As noted above, I consider mobile pig shelters should be include within the buildings and structures setback standard.

### ***Conclusions and Recommendations***

10.36.9 I recommend that GRUZ-S3 be retained as notified.

## **10.37 Standard GRUZ-S4 – Setbacks for sensitive activities**

10.37.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

<sup>232</sup> Hort NZ [245.129], Clarke, G [1.1]

<sup>233</sup> Maze Pastures [41.6], MFL [60.45]

<sup>234</sup> NZ Pork [247.3]

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
NZ Frost Fans	255.27
Road Metals	169.46
Hort NZ	245.32, 245.130
Fulton Hogan	170.48
AQA	224.11
NZ Pork	247.32
Silver Fern Farms	172.127
Alliance Group	173.125
Rural Contractors	178.11
Barkers	179.19
J R Livestock	241.32
Fonterra Limited	165.129
Rooney Holdings	174.88
Rooney, G.J.H.	191.88
Rooney Group	249.88
Rooney Farms	250.88
Rooney Earthmoving	251.88
TDL	252.88

### Submissions

10.37.2 Considered within this analysis are submissions related to:

- The definition of “Frost Fan”;
- New frost fan planning layer; and
- GRUZ-S4

10.37.3 Four submissions support the standard and seek it be retained as notified.<sup>235</sup> NZ Frost Fans [255.27] generally supports the standard but states that it falls short in implementing the NPS-HPL by not prioritising land-based primary production on highly productive land. This failure to address reverse sensitivity effects hampers land-based primary production activities in such areas. They seek the following additional clause to address this:

---

<sup>235</sup> Road Metals [169.46], Fulton Hogan [170.48], AQA [224.11], NZ Pork [247.32]

“[...]

4. No new building for a sensitive activity may be established within 300m of an existing or consented frost fan.”

10.37.4 NZ Frost Fans [255.28] also seek that a new non-statutory planning map layer is included within the PDP identifying the location of frost fans to support the proposed reverse sensitivity provisions.

10.37.5 Hort NZ sought the following amendment to GRUZ-S4(2):

*“2. No new building for a sensitive activity may be erected within 20m from any other site boundary in a different ownership where a primary production activity is being conducted, ~~unless the site existed prior to 22 September 2022, in which case a 10m setback applies;~~”*

10.37.6 Two submitters<sup>236</sup> seek amendments to GRUZ-S4 ensure that the setback for new sensitive activities also apply to “rural industry” which are also vulnerable to reverse sensitivity effects. They seek “rural industry” be included within both GRUZ-S4(1)(a) and GRUZ-S4(2).

10.37.7 Rural Contractors [178.11], seek a new clause be included within GRUZ-S4 requiring that:

“No new building for a sensitive activity may be erected within 50m of a rural contractor depot (including associated vehicle access, parking and manoeuvring areas).”

10.37.8 Barkers [179.19] seek a new clause be included within GRUZ-S4 requiring that:

“No new sensitive activity shall be established, and no new building for a sensitive activity shall be erected within 100m from the boundary of the General Industrial Zone at 72 Shaw Road (Lot 3 DP58430).”

10.37.9 J R Livestock [241.32] seek a new clause be included within GRUZ-S4 requiring that:

“No new sensitive activity shall be established, and no new building for a sensitive activity shall be erected within 100m from the boundary of the General Industrial Zone.”

10.37.10 Six submissions seek the standard exclude rural water tanks as they consider these to be a building by definition and predominately located on boundaries adjoining fence lines.<sup>237</sup>

10.37.11 Hort NZ [245.32] seek new rules within NOISE chapter of the PDP to allow use of frost fans which they explain are used to protect vulnerable crops from frost. To support these amendments Hort NZ seek to include the following definition:

---

<sup>236</sup> Silver Fern Farms [172.127], Alliance Group [173.125]

<sup>237</sup> Rooney Holdings [174.88], Rooney, G.J.H. [191.88], Rooney Group [249.88], Rooney Farms [250.88], Rooney Earthmoving [251.88], TDL [252.88]

"Frost Fan

Frost fans means a land-based device designed or adapted to mitigate frost damage by fanning warmer air over potentially frost-affected surfaces, and includes any motive source, the support structure and power source."

**Analysis**

10.37.12 In relation to the submission from NZ Frost Fans, I agree that the establishment of new sensitive activities near existing or consented frost fans can create considerable reverse sensitivity effects. I also note that setbacks from frost fans are common in other district plans where viticulture is prominent (i.e., Hurunui District and Marlborough District). These plans require sensitive activities be setback from frost fans as a method to manage potential reverse sensitivity effects. Within these Councils, an internal GIS layer is used to keep a record of frost fans locations. They also include the converse standard that requires that new frost fans are setback from existing sensitive activities.

10.37.13 I note that any additional setback standards within the GRUZ would likely need to be accompanied by amendments to the NOISE chapter, which have been sought as part of the NZ Frost Fan submission. The NOISE chapter of the PDP is not being heard until Hearing Stream F. As such, I am hesitant to recommend changes prior to the NOISE provisions being heard. In relation to the GRUZ chapter, my initial view is that the following additions to the GRUZ chapter would manage the reverse sensitivity effects of frost fans on sensitive activities:

- A definition of 'frost fan' be included within the PDP.
- An amendment is made to GRUZ-S4 requiring sensitive activities be setback 300m from an existing or consented frost fan.

10.37.14 I note that submissions have been made on the NOISE chapter that would control the effects of frost control fans. I consider the recommendations within the NOISE chapter will need to be consistent with any amendments to the GRUZ chapter, and as such, I recommend that GRUZ-S4 is revisited following the NOISE chapter hearing to ensure consistency between the two chapters.

10.37.15 In relation to the submitters seeking setbacks from "Rural industry", conceptually I agree that setbacks are appropriate method of managing reverse sensitivity effects. I consider they are an efficient and effective method of achieving GRUZ-O1 which provides for rural industry and GRUZ-O2(3) which requires that higher levels of amenity are provided immediately around sensitive activities and zone boundaries. I consider they will also assist in achieving both GRUZ-P2(3) which ensures activities that can generate significant adverse effects and sensitive activities are well separated from each other and the recommended amendments to GRUZ-P5.

10.37.16 Turning to the specific amendment sought by the submitter, I note that the definition of rural industry reads as follows:

*“means an industry or business undertaken in a rural environment that directly supports, services, or is dependent on primary production.”*

10.37.17 I consider this definition is broad and could contain a wide variety of activities. Some of which may have effects that are considerable enough to warrant the requirement that sensitive activities are setback from the activity. But others are unlikely to require that same setback standard, or could be managed via other mitigation measures. As such, I consider requiring sensitive activities be setback 500 metres from all rural industry activities is not an efficient method of achieving GRUZ-O2(3).

10.37.18 I consider there could be merit in developing a more bespoke rule framework that specifies setbacks from some rural industry activities based on the nature of the activities. To develop this, I consider further information is required from submitters setting out:

- the potential effects associated with the particular rural industry activity that requires a setback,
- to what extent these effects should/could be internalised within the site,
- what other provisions within the PDP manage this effect (noise, light, bulk and location, etc)
- justification for the specific setback distance.

10.37.19 I consider this further information will assist in developing appropriate setback provisions within the GRUZ.

10.37.20 In response to the submitters seeking sensitive activities be setback 100m from the boundary of the GIZ, or a specific site within the GIZ, as noted the assessment above, conceptually, I agree that incompatible activities should be setback from each other. However, I consider the same further information set out in the paragraph above is required from submitters to justify the inclusion of a setback.

10.37.21 In response to the submission from Rural Contractors, I note that they have sought a more bespoke setback standard. I agree in principle with a setback from these activities. As set out above, I consider more information is required as to potential effects associated with the rural contractor depot that require a setback, and also justification as to why those effects require a setback distance of 50 metres.

10.37.22 As such, I have not recommended any amendments to the standard in response to these submissions at this stage.

10.37.23 In relation to the amendment sought by Hort NZ, I disagree the amendment is required. I consider it is appropriate for a reduced setback to apply to existing sites.

10.37.24 Finally, in relation to the submitter seeking an exemption for rural water tanks, I disagree this addition is required. I note that GRUZ-S4 relates to new buildings for sensitive activities. Given a water tank is not used for a sensitive activity this standard will not apply to water tanks.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

10.37.25 I recommend that GRUZ-S4 be retained as notified at this stage subject to submitters providing further evidence to justify a setback.

10.37.26 I support an amendment to GRUZ-S4 requiring sensitive activities be setback from frost fans but I have not recommended any specific amendments as I consider these need to be integrated with any amendments to the NOISE chapter related to frost fans.

### **10.38 Standard GRUZ-S5 – Intensive primary production activities and new farm effluent disposal areas**

10.38.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
Silver Fern Farms	172.128
Alliance Group	173.126
NZ Pork	247.33
Pye Group	35.7
Dairy Holdings	89.22

### **Submissions**

10.38.2 Three submissions support the standard and seek it be retained as notified.<sup>238</sup>

10.38.3 Two submissions consider the standard inappropriate, stating the matters it seeks to control are more appropriately managed by the regional council.<sup>239</sup> They seek the standard be deleted in its entirety.

### **Analysis**

10.38.4 I disagree with the submissions that consider GRUZ-S5 is inappropriate. I consider this standard gives effect to GRUZ-P1(3) which requires that primary production activities are

<sup>238</sup> Silver Fern Farms [172.128], Alliance Group [173.126], NZ Pork [247.33]

<sup>239</sup> Pye Group [35.7], Dairy Holdings [89.22]

enabled where they meet standards and requirements to minimise adverse effects on sensitive activities.

- 10.38.5 I consider the retention of GRUZ-S5 is required to achieve GRUZ-P1(3). In response to the suggestion that this is a regional council function, I note that Rule 7.73 of the Canterbury Air Regional Plan<sup>240</sup> provides for the discharge of contaminants into air from the collection, storage, treatment and application of liquid and slurry animal effluent or solid animal effluent onto production land as a permitted activity provided a number of permitted standards are achieved. I consider this permitted activity rule ensures that the odour effects associated with farm effluent disposal area are managed. However, in my view the GRUZ-S5 extends beyond just the management of farm effluent disposal areas and ensures that the effects of intensive primary production activities more broadly, are also setback from sensitive activities.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

- 10.38.6 I recommend that GRUZ-S5 be retained as notified.

### **10.39 GRUZ – new standards**

- 10.39.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
ECan	183.148

### **Submissions**

- 10.39.2 ECan [183.148] seek a new standard to limit building coverage to 10% of the net site area with corresponding restricted discretionary assessment matters, like those used in other zones.

### **Analysis**

- 10.39.3 I disagree an additional building coverage standard within the GRUZ is required. Instead, I consider the activity specific controls that limit the types of activities that can be established in the GRUZ are appropriate to ensure the character and qualities of the GRUZ are maintained.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

- 10.39.4 No change to the GRUZ is recommend.

<sup>240</sup> <https://www.ecan.govt.nz/your-region/plans-strategies-and-bylaws/canterbury-air-regional-plan/>

## 11. Rural Lifestyle Zone

### 11.1 Provisions where no change is sought

11.1.1 Federated Farmers [182.207] support the RLZ Chapter in its entirety.

11.1.2 The following provisions included within the RLZ Chapter only received submission seeking their retention:

- RLZ-P5<sup>241</sup>
- RLZ-R1<sup>242</sup>
- RLZ-R3<sup>243</sup>
- RLZ-R8<sup>244</sup>
- RLZ-R9<sup>245</sup>
- RLZ-R14<sup>246</sup>
- RLZ-R16<sup>247</sup>
- RLZ-S4<sup>248</sup>

11.1.3 All other provisions within RLZ Chapter either received no submissions or the submission points have been considered within General Themes section. Notwithstanding any recommendations discussed within the General Themes section. I recommend the provision listed above be retained as notified.

### 11.2 Objective RLZ-O2 – Character and qualities of the Rural Lifestyle Zone

11.2.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
ECan	183.149

#### Submissions

11.2.2 ECan [183.149] raises concern that RLZ-O2(4) in the draft Plan has been removed from the notified Plan objective. The submitter seeks insertion of a clause in RLZ-O2 concerning

<sup>241</sup> FENZ [131.46]

<sup>242</sup> FENZ [131.47], Waka Kotahi [143.152]

<sup>243</sup> FENZ [131.49]

<sup>244</sup> FENZ [131.51]

<sup>245</sup> FENZ [131.52]

<sup>246</sup> FENZ [131.53]

<sup>247</sup> Federated Farmers [182.208]

<sup>248</sup> McKenzie and Choung [103.4], FENZ [131.57]

reticulated network connections and a co-ordinated pattern of development to ensure the approach to Rural Lifestyle Zoning is consistent with the NPS-HPL.

### **Analysis**

11.2.3 I note that RLZ-O2 within the draft Plan read as follows:

*“The character and qualities of the Rural lifestyle zone comprise:*

- 1. residential development that integrates with the natural and rural character of the area; and*
- 2. a generally high level of amenity and environmental quality consistent with rural lifestyle living; and*
- 3. the operation of compatible rural activities; and*
- 4. a coordinated pattern of development at a density that is capable of efficiently connecting to reticulated network sewer and water infrastructure.*

11.2.4 The notified version of RLZ-O2 in the PDP reads:

*“The character and qualities of the Rural Lifestyle Zone comprise:*

- 1. natural character and openness; and*
- 2. residential buildings, trees and landscaping that integrate with the natural and rural character of the area; and*
- 3. a high level of amenity, outlook, access to sunlight and environmental quality; and*
- 4. a pastoral landscape and the presence of compatible primary production.”*

11.2.5 I note that both the draft and the proposed versions of the objective share the common goal of defining the character of the RLZ. While I believe the PDP provides a comprehensive overview of the desired characteristics, I note the draft provides more explicit guidance regarding development patterns and infrastructure connections.

11.2.6 Regarding clause (4) of the draft objective, I disagree it is required to give effect to the NPS-HPL, as the RLZ is not identified as highly productive land within clause 3.5.(7) of the NPS-HPL as it is not zoned rural general or rural production. Therefore, the NPS-HPL does not apply.

11.2.7 However, I do consider inclusion of the clause (4) is necessary to give effect to Policy 5.3.5 of the RPS. This states:

*Within the wider region, ensure development is appropriately and efficiently served for the collection, treatment, disposal or re-use of sewage and stormwater, and the provision of potable water, by:*

- 1. avoiding development which will not be served in a timely manner to avoid or mitigate adverse effects on the environment and human health; and*
- 2. requiring these services to be designed, built, managed or upgraded to maximise their on-going effectiveness.*

11.2.8 I consider the draft clause (4) ensures the effective and efficient provision of sewage and water services within the RLZ, in line with environmental and public health considerations. By seeking a coordinated pattern of development at a density capable of connecting to sewer and water infrastructure, the clause addresses the requirement to avoid adverse effects on the environment and human health by ensuring timely service delivery. For these reasons, I support the insertion of draft clause (4) in the objective to align with the RPS which requires responsible development practices while safeguarding the wellbeing of the community and the environment.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

11.2.9 I recommend that RLZ-O2 be amended as follows:

RLZ-O2	Character and qualities of the Rural Lifestyle Zone
	<p>The character and qualities of the Rural Lifestyle Zone comprise:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. natural character and openness; and</li> <li>2. residential buildings, trees and landscaping that integrate with the natural and rural character of the area; and</li> <li>3. a high level of amenity, outlook, access to sunlight and environmental quality; and</li> <li>4. a pastoral landscape and the presence of compatible primary production; <u>and</u></li> <li>5. <u>a coordinated pattern of development at a density that is capable of efficiently connecting to sewer and water infrastructure.</u><sup>249</sup></li> </ol>

### **Section 32AA**

11.2.10 I consider the recommended amendments to the objective improves the effectiveness of the provisions as they give full effect to higher order documents. The recommended amendments provide greater clarity as to how residential activities are to be managed. I consider that the recommended amendments to the objective are the most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA.

<sup>249</sup> ECan [183.149]

### 11.3 Rule RLZ-R2 – Residential units and minor residential units

- 11.3.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
FENZ	131.48
MFL	60.46
Spiers, B	66.42
Lifestyle Builds	7.2

#### Submissions

- 11.3.2 FENZ [131.48] support the rule and seeks it be retained as notified.
- 11.3.3 MFL [60.46] considers the rule fails to take into account subdivision consents that were already approved by TDC before the PDP was notified and seeks the following amendment:<sup>250</sup>

*“PER-2*

*There is a minimum site area of 5,000m<sup>2</sup>, unless the site ~~existed before 22 September 2022~~ is subject a subdivision consent approved by Council before the date the Timaru District Plan becomes fully operative; and*

*[...]”*

- 11.3.4 Spiers, B [66.42] understands TDC already possess the authority to prohibit land divisions of less than 5,000m<sup>2</sup> after the specified date and considers the rule is therefore redundant and seeks to delete PER-2.
- 11.3.5 Lifestyle Builds [7.2] consider the PDP provides limited guidance regarding what constitutes a minor dwelling and seeks amendment of the definition of “Minor Residential Unit”. It is understood that the maximum allowable area is 80m<sup>2</sup> including living space and any attached garage or covered outdoor area, however they consider this restricts rural properties requiring additional space for storage and work purposes. The submitter seeks a similar approach taken by Waimakariri District Council which provides for minor residential buildings as a permitted activity where the maximum gross floor area is less than 90m<sup>2</sup> (excluding any area required for a vehicle garage or carport up to a maximum of 40m<sup>2</sup>).

---

<sup>250</sup> MFL [60.46]

## Analysis

- 11.3.6 Regarding PER-2, I agree with the amendment sought by Milward Finlay Lobb. I agree that this permitted standard should be amended to reflect the date on which this rule becomes operative.
- 11.3.7 With respect to Spiers, B, the provisions of the subdivision chapter include a 5000m<sup>2</sup> minimum area requirement within the RLZ (if there is a sewer connection). The 5000m<sup>2</sup> requirement for a residential dwelling supports this. Therefore, I do not support the deletion of PER-2.
- 11.3.8 In relation to submissions seeking an amendment to the definition of “Minor Residential Unit”, I note that the definition within the PDP reads:

*“a self-contained residential unit that is ancillary to the principal residential unit, and is held in common ownership with the principal residential unit on the same site.”*

This is a definition taken from the NPS, I note that Section 14.1 of the NPS states:

*“Where terms defined in the Definitions List are used in a policy statement or plan, and the term is used in the same context as the definition, local authorities must use the definition as defined in the Definitions List. However if required, they may define:*

- a. terms that are a subcategory of, or have a narrower application than, a defined term in the Definitions List. Any such definitions must be consistent with the higher level definition in the Definitions List.*
- b. additional terms that do not have the same or equivalent meaning as a term defined in the Definitions List.”*

- 11.3.9 I consider the suggested amendment does not achieve either a. or b. above, I therefore do not support an amendment to the definition.
- 11.3.10 Regarding the management of minor residential units, the approach taken in proposed Waimakariri District Plan permits *“the maximum ground floor area of 90m<sup>2</sup> (excluding any area required for a vehicle garage or carport up to a maximum of 40m<sup>2</sup>)*. This is similar to the approach proposed within the PDP which sets a maximum gross floor area of 80m<sup>2</sup> for minor residential units.
- 11.3.11 In my view there is no ‘right’ number to include within a district plan. I consider the 80m<sup>2</sup> permitted standard sets threshold for the size of a minor residential unit that will achieve the direction within RLZ-P1(3) which requires that any minor residential unit is subordinate to the principal residential unit. Beyond this threshold a resource consent is required as a non-complying activity where a case-by-case assessment is undertaken to determine the effects of a particular proposal.

11.3.12 I consider the approach within the PDP achieves the outcome set within RLZ-O2(2) which directs that residential buildings integrate with the natural and rural character of the area.

### Conclusions and Recommendations

11.3.13 I recommend RLZ-R2 – PER-2 is amended to reflect the date on which the PDP becomes operative.

RLZ-R2	Residential units and minor residential units	
Rural Lifestyle Zone	<p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b> There is a maximum of one residential unit per site and one minor residential unit per site; and</p> <p><b>PER-2</b> There is a minimum site area of 5,000m<sup>2</sup>, unless the site existed before <u>22 September 2022 [the date this rule was made Operative]</u><sup>251</sup>; and</p> <p><b>PER-3</b> The minor unit has a maximum gross floor area of 80m<sup>2</sup>; and</p> <p><b>PER-4</b> Access to the minor residential unit, including any car parking area provided for the minor residential unit, is from the same access as the principal residential unit; and</p> <p><b>PER-5</b> All the Standards of this chapter are complied with.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> Any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with RLZ-R14.</p>	<p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-5: Restricted Discretionary</b></p> <p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the matters of discretion of any infringed standard.</li> </ol> <p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1, PER-2, PER-3, or PER-4: Non-complying</b></p>

### Section 32AA

11.3.14 I consider this recommended amendment to RLZ-R2 is reasonably minor in nature. The recommended amendment will provide greater clarity as to how residential units and minor

<sup>251</sup> MFL [60.46]

residential units are to be managed. It will not have any greater environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects than the notified provisions.

#### 11.4 Rule RLZ-R5 – Keeping of poultry for domestic self-subsistence home use

11.4.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
Spiers, B	66.43

##### Submissions

11.4.2 Spiers, B [66.43] seeks the following amendment to clarify the intent of the rule:

*“PER-1*

*The poultry are for the subsistence of the people residing on the site and they or their eggs are not sold to anyone not residing on the site; and*

*[...]”*

##### Analysis

11.4.3 I support the submission of Spiers, B, and agree the amendment sought supports interpretation and clarification of RLZ-R5.

##### Conclusions and Recommendations

11.4.4 I recommend RLZ-R5 is amended as follows:

RLZ-R5	Keeping of poultry for domestic self-subsistence home use
Rural Lifestyle Zone	<p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b>  The poultry are for the subsistence of the people residing on the site and <u>the poultry and their eggs</u><sup>252</sup> are not sold to anyone not residing on the site; and</p> <p>[...]</p>

##### Section 32AA

11.4.5 I consider the recommended amendment to RLZ-R5 is minor in nature but improves the clarity and interpretation of the provision and therefore more effective in achieving RLZ-O3.

---

<sup>252</sup> Spiers, B [66.43]

I do not consider the recommended amendments will have any greater environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects than the notified provisions.

## 11.5 Standard RLZ-S5 – Boundary treatment styles

11.5.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
Spiers, B	66.44

### Submissions

11.5.2 Spiers, B [66.44] considers a post and netting fence is more appropriate in many situations and seeks the following amendment:

*“Boundary treatments must be limited to:*

*[...]*

*2. post and wire fences and post and netting fences; or*

*[...]”*

### Analysis

11.5.3 I support in part the amendment sought by Spiers, B, as I consider it provides greater flexibility while also ensuring that the character of the RLZ is maintained.

### Conclusions and Recommendations

11.5.4 I recommend RLZ-S5 is amended as follows:

RLZ-S5	Boundary treatment styles	
<b>Rural Lifestyle Zone</b>	<p>Boundary treatments must be limited to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. post and rail fences; or</li> <li>2. post and wire fences <u>(including netting)</u><sup>253</sup>; or</li> <li>3. hedges; and</li> </ol> <p>The height of hedges must not exceed 1.2m.</p>	<p><b>Matters of discretion are limited to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. adverse effects on the character and qualities of the zone; and</li> <li>2. security of livestock; and</li> <li>3. the location, height and design of fences or hedges</li> </ol>

<sup>253</sup> Spiers, B [66.44]

**Section 32AA**

- 11.5.5 I consider the recommended amendment to RLZ-S5 is minor in nature but improves the clarity and interpretation of the provision and is therefore more effective in achieving RLZ-O2. I do not consider the recommended amendments will have any greater environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects than the notified provisions.

**Standard RLZ-S9 – Water supply**

- 11.5.6 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
FENZ	131.58
ECan	183.151

**Submissions**

- 11.5.7 ECan [183.151] supports the standard and seeks it be retained as notified, or its original intent preserved.
- 11.5.8 FENZ [131.58] seek amendments to ensure all activities that require water supply are provided for, not just residential and visitor accommodation.

**Analysis**

- 11.5.9 As discussed above in Section 8, I disagree with the amendments proposed by FENZ and recommend that RLZ-S9 is retained as notified.

**Conclusions and recommendations**

- 11.5.10 I recommend RLZ-S9 be retained as notified.

**11.6 Rezoning Submissions**

- 11.6.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
Speirs, B	66.2
O’Keefe, S. and V.	198.1
Hanifin, J	3.3
Weavers, K. J.	153.1

### Submissions

- 11.6.2 One submission supports the rezoning of two identified sites from “Rural One Zone” to “RLZ” and seeks it be retained as notified.<sup>254</sup>
- 11.6.3 Speirs, B [66.2] considers the RLZ to be inconsistent with Policy 6 of the NPS-HPL and seeks RLZ to be deleted wherever highly productive soils are present.
- 11.6.4 Two submitters understand their land description has been changed from Rural 2 to Rural Lifestyle Zone.<sup>255</sup> They are concerned that they have not been informed of this change and the implications it may have for their property. They seek further information and request a call to discuss these issues.

### Analysis

- 11.6.5 In response to the submission from Speirs, B I note that Policy 6 of the NPS-HPL states:

*“The rezoning and development of highly productive land as rural lifestyle is avoided, except as provided in this National Policy Statement.”*

- 11.6.6 Part 3 of the NPS-HPL then sets out when the rezoning of highly productive land to rural lifestyle is provided. Part 3.5 of the NPS-HPL directs how highly productive land is to be identified.

- 11.6.7 Clause (7) states:

*“Until a regional policy statement containing maps of highly productive land in the region is operative, each relevant territorial authority and consent authority must apply this National Policy Statement as if references to highly productive land were references to land that, at the commencement date:*

*(a) is*

*(i) zoned general rural or rural production; and*

*(ii) LUC 1, 2, or 3 land; but*

*(b) is not:*

*(i) identified for future urban development; or*

*(ii) subject to a Council initiated, or an adopted, notified plan change to rezone it from general rural or rural production to urban or rural lifestyle.*

<sup>254</sup> O’Keefe, S. and V. [198.1]

<sup>255</sup> Hanifin, J [3.3], Weavers, K. J. [153.1]

- 11.6.8 The PDP was notified on 22 September 2022, and the NPS-HPL came into force on 17 October 2022. Therefore, any area zoned RLZ within the PDP is not considered “highly productive” in the context of the NPS-HPL. As such, I disagree that RLZ is inconsistent with Policy 6 of the NPS-HPL.
- 11.6.9 In response to Hanifin, I and Weavers, K. J. concerns about the consultation process, I note the District Plan Review has involved public and stakeholder engagement which has been outlined in the s32 Report document.<sup>256</sup> In response to the questions from the submitters as to what has changed with their property being re-zoned from Rural 2 to RLZ, the purpose of the Rural 2 zone was to protect highly versatile soils by including the land containing Class I and II soils in a specific zone. The purpose of the RLZ is to provide for areas used predominantly for a residential lifestyle within a rural environment on lots smaller than those of the general rural zones, while still enabling primary production to occur. Since receiving this submission, Council staff have made contact with both submitters and explained the process and the implications. Both submitters are now informed about the district plan review process.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

- 11.6.10 No amendments to the PDP are recommended.

## **11.7 Brookfield Road specific control area**

- 11.7.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
MFL	60.47, 60.48

### **Submissions**

- 11.7.2 MFL [60.47] raises concern regarding RLZ-S3, highlighting the rule conflicts with an existing land use consent for a specified area. Specifically, the permitted building coverage outlined in the rule exceeds the limit of 10% of the total site area specified in the land use consent. The submitter seeks amendment to clarify that the 10% site coverage as notified does not apply to Brookfield Road specific control area and insert an additional clause stating that the footprint of all buildings on the Brookfield Road specific control area site shall not exceed 12.5% of the net site area.
- 11.7.3 The submitter also considers RLZ-S8 conflicts with a specified subdivision consent and seeks that the tree provisions for the Brookfield Road specific control area are retained from the current Rural Residential (Brookfield Road) zone.<sup>257</sup>

<sup>256</sup> [https://www.timaru.govt.nz/\\_\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0008/668699/29-Section-32-Rural-Zones.pdf](https://www.timaru.govt.nz/__data/assets/pdf_file/0008/668699/29-Section-32-Rural-Zones.pdf)

<sup>257</sup> MFL [60.48]

## Analysis

- 11.7.4 As a brief background, Plan Change 20 introduced the rural living (Brookfield Road) zone into the Operative District Plan. There are currently no building coverage requirements in the Brookfield Road rural residential zone. Instead, there is a maximum total area of building footprint per allotment standard (350m<sup>2</sup> for a household unit and 80m<sup>2</sup> for accessory buildings). This standard has not been carried over into the PDP and instead a 10% site coverage requirement has been included. Section sizes in Brookfield Road range from 0.5ha to 1.89 ha.
- 11.7.5 I disagree with the submitter that the standards within the PDP should align with the requirements of a specific resource consent decision. If this approach was taken throughout the district there would be countless site-specific standards included within the PDP, which is a very inefficient approach. I note that existing consents granted under an operative district plan, prior to the notification of the PDP, will prevail regardless of whether the proposed district plan is more stringent or lenient. Section 10 of the RMA allows land to be used in a manner that contravenes a rule in a district plan or proposed district plan if both the use was lawfully established before the rule became operative or the PDP was notified, provided the effects of the use are the same or similar in character, intensity and scale.

## Conclusions and Recommendations

- 11.7.6 No amendments to the PDP are recommended.

## 11.8 Shaw and Hislop Streets Road specific control area

- 11.8.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
McKenzie, J	10.2
Baekelandt, A	87.2
McKenzie and Choung	103.2, 103.3, 103.4, 103.5, 103.6, 103.7
Regenvanu, M	180.3, 180.4, 180.5, 180.6, 180.7, 180.8
Hussey, D and C	218.3, 218.4, 218.5, 218.6, 218.7, 218.8

## Submissions

- 11.8.2 Five submitters<sup>258</sup> seek that 2, 4, 6, 12 Shaw Street and 6 & 6A Hislop Street are rezoned from RLZ to GRZ. The re-zoning submission points are being consider as part of Ms White's

<sup>258</sup> McKenzie, J [10.2], Baekelandt, A [87.2], McKenzie & Choung [103.2, 103.3, 103.4, 103.5, 103.6, 103.7], Regenvanu, M [180.3, 180.4, 180.5, 180.6, 180.7, 180.8], Hussey, D and C [218.3, 218.4, 218.5, 218.6, 218.7, 218.8]

Residential s42A report. If this rezoning is not accepted, they seek that the standards within the RLZ exclude lots exiting at the time notification which are less than 2001m<sup>2</sup> in area.

### **Analysis**

- 11.8.3 As noted above, the re-zoning relief is being considered as part of Ms White's Residential s42A report. She has recommended accepting the re-zoning relief. As such no further amendments to the PDP are recommended.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

- 11.8.4 No amendments to the PDP are recommended.

## **12. Settlement Zone**

### **12.1 Provisions where no changes are sought**

- 12.1.1 Federated Farmers [182.209] support the SETZ Chapter in its entirety.

- 12.1.2 The following provisions included within the SETZ Chapter only received submission seeking their retention:

- SETZ-O2<sup>259</sup>
- SETZ-O3<sup>260</sup>
- SETZ-P1<sup>261</sup>
- SETZ-P4 – Other activities<sup>262</sup>
- SETZ-R1<sup>263</sup>
- SETZ-R14 – Any activities not otherwise stated SETZ-R14<sup>264</sup>
- SETZ-S3<sup>265</sup>
- SETZ-S5 – Water supply Settlement Zone<sup>266</sup>

- 12.1.3 All other provisions within SETZ Chapter either received no submissions or the submission points have been considered within General Themes section. Notwithstanding any

---

<sup>259</sup> Silver Fern Farms [172.129]

<sup>260</sup> ECan [183.153]

<sup>261</sup> Silver Fern Farms [172.130]

<sup>262</sup> Silver Fern Farms [172.131]

<sup>263</sup> Silver Fern Farms [172.132]

<sup>264</sup> Silver Fern Farms [172.133]

<sup>265</sup> FENZ [131.67]

<sup>266</sup> ECan [183.154]

recommendations discussed within the General Themes section. I recommend the provision listed above be retained as notified.

## 12.2 Standard SETZ-S4 – Coverage

- 12.2.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
MFL	60.41

### **Submissions**

- 12.2.2 MFL [60.41] considers that the maximum building and impervious surface coverage standard of 35% set out within SETZ-S4 limits innovative modern design, resulting in homogenous dwellings built on the maximum site coverage limit and seeks the standard is deleted.

### **Analysis**

- 12.2.3 I do not support the deletion of SETZ-S4 as sought. In my opinion, the maximum site coverage standard set out within SETZ-S4 is essential to ensure that the character and qualities of the SETZ are maintained as required by SETZ-P1(2). I note that maximum site coverage standards are very common within district plans as it is an effective method of ensuring that the built form maintains the amenity and character of the zone. I disagree with the submitter that this standard limits innovative modern design, resulting in homogenous dwellings. I consider this standard provides design flexibility, and applications can be made as a restricted discretionary activity to breach this standard where a case-by-case assessment is undertaken to determine the effects of a particular proposal.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

- 12.2.4 I recommend that SETZ-S4 be retained as notified.

## 12.3 Standard SETZ-S6 – Sewerage treatment and disposal

- 12.3.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
ECan	183.155

### **Submissions**

- 12.3.2 ECan [183.155] supports the requirement to connect to a reticulated sewerage system. However, they consider the wording of clause (2) makes it unclear whether a certificate of

compliance is required if the activity is permitted under the Regional Plan and seek the following amendments to support clarification and implementation:

*“Any activity must:*

- 1. be connected to an available sewerage network where one exists; or*
- 2. be served by an on-site treatment and sewage disposal system that has been consented or ~~approved~~ permitted by the Canterbury Regional Council.”*

### **Analysis**

12.3.3 Regarding the amendments sought to SETZ-S6(2), I agree that replacing the word “approved” with “permitted” clarifies the requirement that an on-site treatment and sewage disposal system must be permitted under the Canterbury Regional Plan. I have also suggested a slight grammatical change to the suggested amendment.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

12.3.4 I recommend SETZ-S6 is amended as follows:

SETZ-S6	Sewage treatment and disposal	
<b>Settlement Zone</b>	Any activity must: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. be connected to an available sewerage network where one exists; or</li> <li>2. be served by an on-site treatment and sewage disposal system that <u>is permitted or has been consented</u> <del>or approved</del><sup>267</sup> by the Canterbury Regional Council.</li> </ol>	<b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. adverse effects on domestic water supplies; and</li> <li>2. contamination of soil and water.</li> </ol>

### **Section 32AA**

12.3.5 I consider the recommended amendment to SETZ-S6 is minor in nature but improves the clarity and interpretation of the provision and is therefore more effective in achieving SETZ-O3. I do not consider the recommended amendments will have any greater environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects than the notified provisions.

## **12.4 Outdoor storage, display and parking areas**

12.4.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

<sup>267</sup> ECan [183.155]

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
FENZ	131.69

**Submission**

- 12.4.2 FENZ [131.69] seek amendments to SETZ-S8 to ensure screening requirements of outdoor storage areas do not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves or other emergency response facilities.<sup>268</sup> They consider the need to maintain the visibility and accessibility of these critical elements should take precedence over any requirements for mitigation that might hinder them.

**Analysis**

- 12.4.3 Standard SETZ-S8 states that outdoor storage, display, and parking areas that fall within the specified building setbacks as defined in SETZ-S3 must be permanently screened by landscape planting. I do not consider that the exemption is necessary. The requirement applies within private sites, requiring that storage areas are screened from adjoining sites and roads. It is not clear from the submission how such fencing could obscure the identified emergency response facilities, given such facilities would not, to my understanding, be located on the private site where the screening is required. In addition, the fencing is to sure outdoor storage is not visible; it does not require that these areas are made inaccessible.
- 12.4.4 It would be helpful if the submitter could provide additional detail to clarify the specific scenarios where such emergency or safety infrastructure could be situated within these setback areas.
- 12.4.5 In the absence of further explanation, I disagree an amendment to RLZ-R8 is required.

**Conclusions and Recommendations**

- 12.4.6 I recommend that SETZ-S8 is retained as notified until further information can be provided by the submitter.

**13. Re-zoning requests****13.1 Waihi School**

- 13.1.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
Waihi School	236.1
	236.2

---

<sup>268</sup> FENZ [131.69]

### Submission

- 13.1.2 Waihi School [236.1, 236.2] oppose the General Rural Zoning of Waihi School at 611 Temuka-Orari Highway and also the adjoining site to the north (referred to as the Rolleston Site). The submission notes that the Waihi School site has been used as a school site since 1907. The Rolleston Site has historically been used as for rural purposes but has not operated as an economically viable business since at least 2014. The Rolleston site is used for education and recreational purposes including a pump track, low ropes, and a golf driving range. As a private school, the submitter notes that they are not able to rely on a MoE designation and therefore the activities on the site must rely on existing use rights.
- 13.1.3 They consider the Waihi or Rolleston sites are at odds with the rural character, quality and amenity values of the zone, highlighting GRUZ provisions are ill-fitting for the activities on the site. They suggest the school would better fit a Special Purpose Zone under National Planning Standards due to its significance, impracticality to manage in GRUZ, and the limitations of spatial layers to provide a comprehensive management policy framework. They therefore seek to rezone the sites as Special Purpose (School) Zone, or alternatively apply a precinct or specific control area in the GRUZ for the Waihi School and Rolleston sites.
- 13.1.4 The submission also note that a resource consent has been applied for on the Rolleston site.

### Analysis

- 13.1.5 When considering the submission from Waihi School I consider it is important to assess the proposed re-zoning against the VS chapter and the NPS-HPL before considering the merits of the submission.
- 13.1.6 Based on the information provided within the submission the potential future activities on the Waihi School and Rolleston sites may include: additional educational activities, additional boarding facilities for students and additional recreation activities. Educational activities on the Waihi School site are existing but the Rolleston site remain largely a rural land use with some recreational land use comprising of a pump track, low ropes, and a golf driving pump track and driving range.
- 13.1.7 When considering the implications of the VS chapter and the NPS-HPL, I note that the Waihi School site and Rolleston site are both located within the Versatile Soils overlay within the PDP and Land Use Capability Class (LUC) 2. Therefore, these sites will be considered a “Highly Productive” under clause 3.5.7 of the NPS-HPL. Given this, the relevant provisions of the VS chapter and the NPS-HPL need to be addressed as part of the re-zoning request.
- 13.1.8 VS-O1 states:

*Versatile soils remain available for non-intensive primary production and are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.*

13.1.9 This is supported by VS-P2 which states:

*Maintain the availability of versatile soils for non-intensive primary production within the Versatile Soils Overlay by:*

- 1. limiting areas covered by buildings or other impervious surfaces; and*
- 2. encouraging land use practices that reduce the potential for erosion; and*
- 3. requiring earthworks be undertaken in a manner that restores the properties of the soil to the levels they were prior to the earthworks being undertaken; and*
- 4. ensuring any subdivision results in allotment sizes which retain the productive capacity for non-intensive primary production; and*
- 5. only allowing activities that foreclose the ability to use versatile soils for non-intensive primary production where:*
  - a. the activity is necessary to support non-intensive primary production; or*
  - b. there are significant wider public benefits from the activity and there is a functional, technical or operational need to be located in overlay; or*
  - c. it is provided for by VS-P3.*

13.1.10 VS-R1 manages buildings and impervious surfaces and requires that the maximum area covered by buildings and impervious surfaces must not exceed 10% of that portion of the site within the overlay or 2000m<sup>2</sup> within the overlay, whichever is the lesser. Breaching this rule requires resource consent as a restricted discretionary activity.

13.1.11 The relevant provisions of the NPS-HPL include:

- Objective: Highly productive land is protected for use in land-based primary production, both now and for future generations.
- Policy 5: The urban rezoning of highly productive land is avoided, except as provided in this National Policy Statement.
- Policy 8: Highly productive land is protected from inappropriate use and development.

13.1.12 The above objective and policies are achieved through the directions within Part 3: Implementation. Clauses 3.6(4) and (5) state:

- (4) *Territorial authorities that are not Tier 1 or 2 may allow urban rezoning of highly productive land only if:*

- (a) *the urban zoning is required to provide sufficient development capacity to meet expected demand for housing or business land in the district; and*
  - (b) *there are no other reasonably practicable and feasible options for providing the required development capacity; and*
  - (c) *the environmental, social, cultural and economic benefits of rezoning outweigh the environmental, social, cultural and economic costs associated with the loss of highly productive land for land-based primary production, taking into account both tangible and intangible values.*
- (5) *Territorial authorities must take measures to ensure that the spatial extent of any urban zone covering highly productive land is the minimum necessary to provide the required development capacity while achieving a well-functioning urban environment.*

13.1.13 'Urban' is defined with the NPS-HPL as:

*'urban, as a description of a zone, means any of the following zones:*

- (a) *low density residential, general residential, medium density residential, large lot residential, and high density residential:*
- (b) *settlement, neighbourhood centre, local centre, town centre, metropolitan centre, and city centre:*
- (c) *commercial, large format retail, and mixed use:*
- (d) *light industrial, heavy industrial, and general industrial:*
- (e) *any special purpose zone, other than a Māori Purpose zone:*
- (f) *any open space zone, other than a Natural Open Space zone:*
- (g) *sport and active recreation."*

13.1.14 The proposed re-zoning to a Special Purpose (School) Zone or the introduction of a precinct or specific control area in the GRUZ would be considered "Urban" within the NPS-HPL.

13.1.15 I note that the submission has not provided a detailed assessment of the NPS-HPL as part of the proposed re-zoning request. Based on the information provided within the submission I consider the school site a re-zoning could be appropriate as it would be a continuation of an existing activity under 3.11 of the NPS-HPL<sup>269</sup>. For the Rolleston site, it appears this site is

---

<sup>269</sup> I note this conclusion is supported by a report from provided to TDC by the submitter from Stuart Ford from The AgriBusiness Group (attached to this report within Appendix – 3).

still used for rural purposes and some educational activities. Therefore, re-zoning the whole site would not be a continuation of existing activity under 3.11 of the NPS-HPL.

13.1.16 The submission has suggested Clause 3.9(2)(g) may apply. I disagree this exemption would apply to re-zoning the Rolleston site as any further development of this site will have an impact on the productive capacity of the site. To rezone the whole of the Rolleston site, I consider the matters in clause 3.10 need to be achieved.

13.1.17 As alternative relief, the submission sought that a precinct or specific control area in the GRUZ for the Wahi School and Rolleston sites could be included. The use of a precinct or specific control area would not be considered a re-zoning under the HPS-HPL as the underlying zoning would remain GRUZ. As such, Clauses 3.6(4) and (5) of the NPS-HPL would not apply. However, Clause 3.9 of the NPS-HPL would still apply. I consider applying a precinct or specific control area over the Rolleston site would not comply with any of the matters listed within Clause 3.9(2) of the NPS-HPL. Therefore, to include a precinct or specific control area over the Rolleston site, I consider the submitter needs to demonstrate that the matters within clause 3.10 can be achieved.

13.1.18 I have discussed this with the submitter, and the submitter has provided additional evidence from Stuart Ford from The AgriBusiness Group (attached to this report within Appendix – 3) which addresses each of the matters required to be considered in clause 3.10 of the NPS-HPL. I have reviewed this report and consider it provides justification that the Rolleston site achieves the exemptions included within clause 3.10 of the NPS-HPL. With this additional evidence I consider that a precinct or specific control area in the GRUZ for the Wahi School and Rolleston sites would comply with the requirements of the NPS-HPL.

13.1.19 Turning how these activities would be managed by the provisions of the GRUZ, I note that GRUZ O1 states:

*The General Rural Zone predominantly provides for primary production, including intensive primary production, as well as a limited range of activities that support primary production, including associated rural industry, and other activities that require a rural location.*  
(emphasis added)

13.1.20 This is supported by GRUZ-P7 which states:

1. *Only allow rural industries and other activities (not listed in the rules) in the General Rural Zone where:*

a. *the activity*

i. *was legally established use not permitted in the zone; or*

ii. *supports primary production; or*

iii. *has a functional or operational need for the activity to locate within the Zone;*  
*and*

- iv. the activity is compatible or complimentary with the character and qualities of the Zone; and

b. ...

13.1.21 GRUZ-R7 then sets a permitted activity status for “Educational facilities” up to a maximum of six children. As notified, educational facilities or more than six children require resource consent as a discretionary activity. Based on the submission from MoE I have recommended that the default activity status is amended to a restricted discretionary activity to provide more certainty as to the effects the PDP is seeking to manage.

13.1.22 Additional residential activities (i.e. additional boarding houses) on the site will be managed by GRUZ-R5 and GRUZ-R13 which provides for residential activities as a permitted activity provided bulk and location standards are achieved. For completeness, I note that GRUZ-R4 manages “Residential units” which is defined as:

*“means a building(s) or part of a building that is used for a residential activity exclusively by one household, and must include sleeping, cooking, bathing and toilet facilities.”*

13.1.23 Additional boarding houses on the site would not be captured by the residential unit definition and therefore would not be captured by GRUZ-R4.

13.1.24 GRUZ-R11 sets a permitted activity status for “Recreation activities” with a default discretionary activity status.

13.1.25 Given the assessment, above I disagree with the submitter that the provisions of the GRUZ are at odds with the activities undertaken on the Waihi School and Rolleston sites. I consider the proposed provisions of the GRUZ provide a consenting pathway for these activities. However, given the education facility is existing on the site, I agree with the submitter that seeking a resource consent for every new expansion of the education facility is not efficient planning response. Therefore, I agree amendments are required to the PDP to better enable education facilities on the Waihi School and Rolleston sites.

13.1.26 The submission has sought that a special purpose zone could be incorporated into the PDP based on the Christchurch District Plan Specific Purpose (School) Zone. This zone sets a permitted activity for a range of education activities and education facilities subject to meeting a range of built form standards.

13.1.27 I have been in contact with the Waihi School to better understand the best planning approach to provide a permitted activity framework for education facilities on these sites. The submitter has suggested the inclusion of a “specific control area” with an associated policy and permitted activity framework. I largely agree with the drafting proposed by the submitters.

13.1.28 I have reviewed the provisions of the PDP to ensure the architecture used in response to this submission is consistent with the approach taken in other parts of the PDP. I note that both

“Specific control areas” and “Precincts” have both been used within the PDP (see SCHED16 of the PDP). “Specific control areas” are used where specific rules or standards apply but no changes to objectives or policies are required to support the specific control area. “Precincts” have been used where additional objectives or policies are also required to support the specific character of the precinct. I agree with you the submitter that an additional site-specific policy will be required to support the proposed precinct. Given this, to retain the structure of the PDP I recommended that a new precinct be added to the PDP.

### Conclusions and Recommendations

13.1.29 I recommend that a new “Waihi School Precinct” be included within the PDP. This includes:

- A new policy PREC8-P1
- Add additional rule within GRUZ-R7
- Amend the Planning maps to include the Waihi School Precinct over:
  - 611 Temuka Orari Highway, Temuka, ID: 13056 (Lot 1 DP 46763, CB26B/127)
  - 637 Temuka Orari Highway, Temuka, ID: 13051 (Sec 42 RES 389, CB20A/986)
- Add an additional reference to the “PREC8 – Waihi School Precinct” within SCHED16 of the PDP.

13.1.30 These changes are as follows:

#### **PREC8-P1      Waihi School Precinct**

Recognise and provide for education facilities in the Waihi School Precinct.

GRUZ-R7:

<b><u>PREC8 - Waihi School Precinct</u></b>	<b><u>Activity status: Permitted</u></b>  <b><u>Where</u></b>  <b><u>PER-1</u></b> <u>The education facility complies with GRUZ-S1 to GRUZ-S3; and</u>  <b><u>PER-2</u></b> <u>The education facility complies with GRUZ-S4.</u>	<b><u>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1: Restricted discretionary</u></b>  <b><u>Matters of discretion are restricted to: - the matters of discretion of any infringed standard(s).</u></b>  <b><u>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-2: Discretionary</u></b>
---	--	---

#### **SCHED16A - Schedule of Precincts Layer**

Unique Identifier	Name	Zone located
-------------------	------	--------------

<u>PREC8</u>	<u>PREC8 - Waihi School Precinct</u>	<u>General Rural Zone</u>
--------------	--------------------------------------	---------------------------

**Section 32AA**

- 13.1.31 I consider the additional Waihi School Precinct is an efficient and effective method of achieving GRUZ-O1 which provides for a limited range of activities that require a rural location. Given the education facility is existing on the site, I consider it is inefficient to require a resource consent for every new expansion of the education facility. I consider the additional site specific policy and rule will provide for education facilities in the Waihi School Precinct while also ensure that the relevant character and qualities of the GRUZ required by GRUZ-O2 are retained.

**13.2 Fonterra Submission - Clandeboye site**

- 13.2.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
Fonterra	165.1, 165.2, 165.22, 165.127 and 165.129

**Submissions**

- 13.2.2 Fonterra's submission highlights that they own and operate the Clandeboye manufacturing site (Clandeboye site) located near Temuka in the Timaru District. The submission states that the Clandeboye site is Fonterra's key asset within the Timaru District. The site processes up to 13 million litres of milk per day and is one of Fonterra's largest manufacturing sites, employing over 1000 staff.
- 13.2.3 The submission raises concern that the proposed General Industrial Zone fails to consider the unique characteristics of the Clandeboye site and highlight the provisions are unsuitable for the site and community needs. They seek amendments to introduce a new chapter for a "Special Purpose Zone - Strategic Rural Industry" (SPZ-SRI) tailored to the Clandeboye site which would have wider application but emphasise the responsibility of individual sites to demonstrate the need or benefit of the proposed zone.
- 13.2.4 The submission states that provisions of the SPZ-SRI would reduce reliance on resource consent processes, particularly for minor developments, by recognising that the effects of these activities, while needing to be managed, are anticipated in these specific locations. The SPZ-SRI will provide strategic rural industrial activities with both the flexibility to operate and the ability to expand existing activities, while also providing both Council and the surrounding community realistic expectations for the site in the long term.
- 13.2.5 The submission includes proposed drafting for the SPZ-SRI which includes separate objectives, policies, rules and standards for the zone. The proposed provisions enable the continued operation and development of strategic rural industry activities and ancillary

activities while also ensuring that strategic rural industrial activities to operate without being compromised by reverse sensitivity.<sup>270</sup>

- 13.2.6 The submitter also seeks the introduction of a new definition of “Strategic rural industry activities” as follows:

**Strategic rural industry activities means: any activity that is associated with the processing, testing, storage, handling, packaging or distribution of products manufactured at sites in the Special Purpose Zone - Strategic Rural Industry.**

- 13.2.7 In the context of the GRUZ, Fonterra [165.127] states that the Clandeboye site is surrounded by rural land, and they consider it is important that subdivision, use and development does not constrain Clandeboye’s operations through reverse sensitivity effects. They seek a new policy related to managing reverse sensitivity effects as follows:

**Subdivision, use and development in rural areas must avoid adverse reverse sensitivity effects on strategic rural industrial activities.**

- 13.2.8 In addition to the proposed policy Fonterra Limited [165.129] also consider it is appropriate that sensitive activities are setback 500m from irrigation farms noting there is potential for irrigation activity to give rise to perceived amenity effects and an increased building setback from boundaries will ensure effects on neighbouring properties are acceptable. They also seek the following additional subclause:

1. *No new sensitive activity may be established within 500m from:*

a. [...]

d. The boundary of any area used for the discharge of wastewater irrigation.”

### **Analysis**

- 13.2.9 When considered the merits of the “Special Purpose Zone – Strategic Rural Industry”, I disagree that the proposed GIZ is a poor fit for the Clandeboye site. I note that the activities on the Clandeboye site are captured within the “industrial activities” definition.<sup>271</sup>, and the provisions of the GIZ provide for a range of industrial activities. In addition, the character and qualities of the GIZ largely capture the character and qualities of the Clandeboye site. This supported by the submission from Fonterra Limited which supports the majority of the objectives and policies of the GIZ (GIZ-O1, GIZ-O2, GIZ-O3, GIZ-P1, GIZ-P6). In addition, no

---

<sup>270</sup> Fonterra [165.1 and 165.2]

<sup>271</sup> means an activity that manufactures, fabricates, processes, packages, distributes, repairs, stores, or disposes of materials (including raw, processed, or partly processed materials) or goods. It includes any ancillary activity to the industrial activity.

other parties have submitted on the PDP suggesting that the GIZ provisions are a poor fit for large scale industrial activities. Finally, I note that the NPS.<sup>272</sup> state that:

*“3. An additional special purpose zone must only be created when the proposed land use activities or anticipated outcomes of the additional zone meet all of the following criteria:*

- a) are significant to the district, region or country*
- b) are impractical to be managed through another zone*
- c) are impractical to be managed through a combination of spatial layers”*

- 13.2.10 In my view the submitter has not demonstrated that it is impractical to manage the Clandeboye site through the GIZ provisions. Given this, I consider the introduction of a special purpose zone for strategic rural industries will not achieve the requirements of the NPS. Additionally, I do not agree that a special purpose zone for strategic rural industries is required within the PDP.
- 13.2.11 Conceptually, I agree with the submitter that scale of the activities on the Clandeboye site, particularly the height of the 55 metre towers associated with the site, are larger than that generally found within a GIZ. However, from a plan architecture perspective I note that this can be accommodated within the structure of the existing GIZ framework by introducing a site-specific precinct within the GIZ chapter. This has been used within the notified PDP to accommodate the activities within the ‘Washdyke industrial expansion precinct’ (WIEP). The provisions of the GIZ acknowledge the distinctive character of the WIEP and a specific objective, policy, and rule framework is included within the GIZ which relate to maintaining the amenity values of adjoining Residential Zones in the WIEP precinct.
- 13.2.12 Ms Hollier (s42a officer for the GIZ chapter) have been in contact with the submitter to better understand the issues raised in submissions. As a result of these discussions, the submitter has provided two additional drafting options. One option proposes a “Proposed Special Purpose Zone –Clandeboye Dairy Manufacturing” and the other option proposes a “Clandeboye Precinct” as part of the GIZ chapter. I have reviewed the additional drafting proposed by the submitter related to the proposed special purpose zone and I retain the view that a special purpose zone is not required. My view is that a site-specific precinct within the GIZ chapter as a more efficient planning response. The merits of this option will be considered within Ms Hollier s42a report for the GIZ chapter.
- 13.2.13 Turning to the submitters suggested amendments to the GRUZ, I agree in part with the submitter that the PDP should include provisions that ensure subdivision, use and development does not constrain Clandeboye’s operations through reverse sensitivity

---

<sup>272</sup> Section 8(3)(a)

effects. However, I disagree that a new policy is required to protect “strategic rural industrial activities” from reverse sensitivity effects.

13.2.14 I note that both GRUZ-O3 and GRUZ-P5 manage sensitive activities in the GRUZ to ensure they avoid or mitigate adverse effects on primary production. In my assessment of GRUZ-P5 I have recommended amendments to the objective and policy to incorporate protection of “rural industry” more broadly within these provisions to ensure that sensitive activities are not established in locations that may create reverse sensitivity effects on rural industries. Given the recommend amendments to GRUZ-P5, I consider the additional policy sought by the submitter is not required. I also recommend a consequential amendment to the title of the GRUZ-P5 replacing “Protecting primary production” with “Reverse sensitivity” to better reflect the recommended change to the policy. I also note that GRUZ-P2(3) ensures that activities that can generate significant adverse effects and sensitive activities are well separated from each other.

13.2.15 When considering the activities at the Clandeboye site, I understand that the key effect that may result in reverse sensitive effects (excluding noise effects managed by the NOISE chapter) is the odour and associated amenity effects generated by the wastewater discharge. As such, I agree conceptually with the additional of a new standard within GRUZ-S4. I agree that locating sensitive activity in close proximity to areas used for the discharge of industrial waste will not achieve GRUZ-O2(3), GRUZ-P5, GRUZ-P2(3) which seeks to manage the location of sensitive activities to ensure they avoid adverse effects on primary production.

13.2.16 The submitter has sought that the sensitive activities setback be from “boundary of any area used for the discharge of wastewater irrigation”. “Wastewater” is defined in the PDP as:

*means any combination of two or more the following wastes: sewage, greywater or industrial and trade waste.*

13.2.17 I consider this drafting would apply to a broad range of “wastewater” irrigation including domestic wastewater irrigation, which are unlikely to have the same odour and associated amenity effects as an industrial and trade waste discharge. Instead, I consider it more appropriate that the setback be limited to “industrial and trade waste” (at Fonterra Clandeboye site) which is defined as in the PDP as:

*means liquid waste, with or without matter in suspension, from the receipt, manufacture or processing of materials as part of a commercial, industrial or trade process, but excludes sewage and greywater.*

13.2.18 I consider this drafting would refine the scope of the amendment so that it does not unnecessarily restrict the establishment of sensitive activities.

13.2.19 While I acknowledge that the management of odour is predominantly a regional council function managed through the Canterbury Regional Air Plan, I note that Section 31(1)(a) of

the RMA assigns territorial authorities with responsibilities to control land use, and to achieve integrated management. This includes managing effects of land use on air quality and on amenity values. Given this, I consider the suggested amendment (and other odour-based setbacks within the PDP) help to integrate the provisions of the PDP with other regional planning documents by ensuring that incompatible land uses are setback from each other.

- 13.2.20 I have been in contact with the submitter discussing the existing consents held by Fonterra to better understand the nature of the discharge and the potential effects. They have provided email correspondence setting out the consents held by Fonterra for the Clandeboye site and the setback limits between the consented discharge area and neighbouring dwellings. I consider it would be helpful if this information was included within evidence to the Hearing Panel as it will help to justify the need for a setback. At this stage, I have provisionally recommended that a new setback standard be included within GRUZ-S4 requiring a setback from the boundary of any area used for the discharge of industrial trade waste at Fonterra Clandeboye site. However, I have not recommended a distance for that setback. I welcome evidence from the submitter setting out the potential effects associated with the discharge, justification for the 500-metre setback distance, and further details of the geographic area that will be impacted by the proposed setback. I consider this further information will assist in developing an appropriate setback distance.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

- 13.2.21 I do not recommend the introduction of a new bespoke policy for “strategic rural industrial activities”.

- 13.2.22 I recommend that GRUZ-S4 is amended as follows:

GRUZ-S4	Setbacks for sensitive activities	
<b>General Rural Zone</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No new sensitive activity may be established within 500m from:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. the closest outer edge of any paddocks, hard-stand areas, structures or buildings used to house stock, or treatment systems, used for an intensive primary production activity; and</li> <li>b. an existing farm effluent disposal area; and</li> <li>c. a lawfully established quarry or mine.</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. No new building for a sensitive activity may be erected within 20m from any other site boundary in a different ownership where a primary production activity is being conducted, unless the site existed prior to 22 September 2022, in which case a 10m setback applies;</li> </ol>	<b>Not applicable</b>

	<p>3. No new building for a sensitive activity may be erected within 20m of an existing shelter belt.</p> <p>4. <u>No new sensitive activity may be established within xxm from the boundary of any area used for the discharge of industrial trade waste at Fonterra Clandeboye site.</u> <sup>273</sup></p> <p>Except that these setbacks do not apply to a new sensitive activity being established within the same site on which a lawfully established: intensive primary production activity; effluent disposal; quarry or mine; is located.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> <i>The Canterbury Regional Council regulates the discharge of contaminants into air from animal effluent in the Canterbury Air Regional Plan.</i></p>	
--	--	--

### Section 32AA

13.2.23 I consider the recommended amendments provide greater protection of the Clandeboye site, and other generators of industrial trade waste, while also ensuring that appropriate levels of amenity are provided around new sensitive activities. I consider the PDP will be more effective than the notified provisions in achieving GRUZ-O2(2).

13.2.24 The recommended amendments will not have any greater environmental or cultural effects than the notified provisions. The economic cost of the proposed setback rule above may include the reduced development potential of land within the GRUZ zone, and the increased resource consent costs for landowners seeking to establish sensitive activities. However, these costs may be offset by the social benefits of the proposed setback, such as ensuring an appropriate level of amenity for new sensitive activities and reduced conflicts between incompatible land uses. On balance, I consider the social benefits outweigh the potential economic costs.

### 13.3 Blandswood rezoning request

13.3.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
Carson, J	8.1
Smith, R	9.1

<sup>273</sup> Fonterra [165.129]

Lamb, M	24.1
Jesen, S	67.1
Melrose, R	69.1
Collins, G J and K V	71.1
Jowett, M	75.1
Challies and Ireland	77.1
Treeby, C	93.1
Bras, A	96.1
Woods, D	102.1
Ireland, G and J	110.1
Laird, H	111.1
Whitham, R	121.2
Buchanan and Small	123.1
Alison, A	126.2
Twaddle, N. J	127.2
Collins, D W and S M	141.1
Wilkinson, G A and V L	144.1
Bras, C	154.1
Melrose, G and S	195.1
Bras, P	232.1

### Submissions

13.3.2 22 submissions<sup>274</sup> were received opposing the inclusion of Blandswood, a long-established settlement with permanent houses and holiday homes, in the Open Space Zone and seeks rezoning from Open Space Zone – Holiday Hut Precinct to Settlement Zone. The following reasons were provided as to why the Settlement Zone was sought:

- The OPZ is not appropriate for private land with existing dwellings.
- The OSZ will mean resource consent is required to do anything on the submitter's property.
- The OSZ will result in a vacant section not being able to be built on despite its suitability for residential development.

---

<sup>274</sup> As listed in the table with paragraph 13.3.1.

- The OSZ will mean maintenance and development/improvement of properties will be restricted.
- The OSZ will unduly restricts property owners to develop and improve their homes or holiday homes.
- The Blandswood area is different from other areas where the OSZ is proposed.

13.3.3 Several submitters suggested that reasonable controls could be imposed to restrict the appearance of additional residential dwellings.

#### **Analysis**

13.3.4 When considering the submissions seeking that the Blandswood area be re-zoned from PREC4 - Holiday Hut Precinct within the Open Space Zone (OSZ) to a Settlement Zone (SETZ), I consider it is helpful to first set out what the two zones provide for, as notified. Starting with the SETZ, the introduction to the SETZ states:

*The District contains a number of small settlements dispersed throughout the rural area. These settlements (Acacia Drive, Cave, Ōrāri, Pareora, Winchester, Peel Forest, Blandswood and Woodbury) have a different character from the larger, more urban, centres. In general, they have larger allotment sizes and some contain a mixture of residential and non-residential activities. Most of these settlements have reticulated water supply but no reticulated sewerage.*

*The Settlement Zone seeks to enable residential and complementary non-residential activities and preserve the low density and pleasant character of these settlements. It also seeks to ensure that new development does not put pressure on existing infrastructure, create demands for infrastructure upgrades, or affect water supply bores.*

13.3.5 Objective SETZ-O2 describes the characters and qualities of the SETZ as:

- “1. small, low density rural settlements that have a mixture of activities including residential, commercial, community, light industrial and home business; and*
- 2. a range of amenity levels in different settlements; and*
- 3. openness, trees, landscaping, access to sun light; and*
- 4. small number of grazing animals.”*

13.3.6 This is supported by policies and a rule that enable a broad range of activities.

13.3.7 In contrast, the introduction to the PREC4 - Holiday Hut Precinct within the Open Space Zone (OSZ) states:

*PREC4 - Holiday Hut Precinct provides for the on-going use and maintenance of established holiday huts at Butlers, Milford, Waipopo, Rangitata, Stratheona and Blandswood that were originally established to provide short term residential accommodation for anglers during the fishing season, as well as being places traditionally used by mana whenua for mahika kai and other cultural practices.*

13.3.8 Objective PREC4-O1 lists the characteristics of the Holiday Hut Precinct as:

- “1. their river and coastal locations, and in the case of the Blandswood Huts, the forested backdrop; and*
- 2. being exposed to natural hazards; and*
- 3. an informal and ad hoc layout, with buildings in some cases being located closer than within a residential area; and*
- 4. generally small-scale development that is diverse in character, and uses a range of construction materials; and*
- 5. land used for informal recreational activities; and*
- 6. a lack of infrastructure, including formed roads, reticulated water supply, reticulated wastewater and stormwater systems; and*
- 7. activities that generally generate low levels of noise, except for occasional increases in noise levels arising from recreational activities including the use of watercraft and primary production in the adjoining Rural Zones; and*
- 8. activities that generally generate low levels of vehicle movements.”*

13.3.9 The policies and rules associated within the PREC4 - Holiday Hut Precinct, provide for a very limited range of activities.

13.3.10 I also note the PREC4 - Holiday Hut Precinct area also includes a number of overlays:

- a ‘High Hazard Overlay’ in the southwestern corner of the zone, and in this area the construction of a new residential dwelling is a non-complying activity if the dwelling has a ground floor area of 30m<sup>2</sup> or more (NH-R4):
- the majority of the zone is identified as a Visual Amenity Landscape (VAL2 - Peel Forest and Four Peaks Range), and in this overlay the construction of a new dwelling is a discretionary activity (NFL-R1(1) – RDIS-1).
- the northern section of the zone is identified as an outstanding natural landscape (ONL – 2 Peel Forest and Four Peaks Range), and in this overlay the construction of a new dwelling is a restricted discretionary activity (NFL-R1(1) – RDIS-1).

13.3.11 Regardless of the underlying zoning, the overlays listed above will also apply to the Blandswood area and will restrict the construction of new residential dwellings within the Precinct.

13.3.12 I have also discussed the proposed rezoning request with Kevin Kemp, Stormwater Team Leader at TDC, and he has advised that:

*“The Blandswood area of Peel Forest is not serviced by Council Three Water infrastructure (water, sewer, stormwater). The Drainage and Water unit have no planned extension of services or commissioning of new facilities to service this area. The TDC LTP has no long term indication of servicing for this area.*

*Lookout Road extends through the huts area but the seal terminates at the trailhead parking area to the Peel Forest DOC walk. The Land Transport Unit have no planned seal extension up Lookout Road toward the end of maintained carriageway. This road is to remain a rural, low-volume shingle carriageway.*

*Acacia Drive, Cave, Ōrāri, Pareora, Winchester, Peel Forest, and Woodbury are all serviced by rural water supplies. There are long term plans/projects looking at improving supplies to some of these areas, mainly with a focus on more resilience around quality. No clear direction on plans to support possible growth*

*The infrastructure group would not support changing the zoning of Blandswood to Settlement. There is no planned extension of services.”*

13.3.13 In my view, the character and infrastructure associated with the PREC4 - Holiday Hut Precinct is not consistent with the level of development that is enabled within the SETZ. Given the unique character of the PREC4 - Holiday Hut Precinct I consider it is appropriate that bespoke provisions are included within the PDP which recognise the distinctive characteristics of the precinct. I consider the broad nature of the SETZ provisions are not well suited to the Blandswood area.

13.3.14 In relation to the specific concerns raised by submitters that consider the Blandswood area is different from the other areas where the OSZ is proposed, I consider that that bespoke PREC4 - Holiday Hut Precinct zoning is appropriate for private land with existing dwellings. I consider the provisions seek to ensure the character of the area is maintained and the resource consent process is an appropriate means of achieving this.

13.3.15 In response to the submitters that consider the proposed PREC4 - Holiday Hut Precinct zoning will restrict property owners to maintain, develop and improve their homes or holiday homes, I note that section 10(1) of the RMA provides property owners with existing use rights which means that they are able to maintain and improve their existing residential dwellings provided the effects of any maintenance or improvements are the same or similar in character, intensity, and scale to that of the existing dwelling, provided the dwellings were lawfully established. Development and improvements that are of a greater character,

intensity, and scale to that of the existing dwelling are managed through the proposed PREC4 - Holiday Hut Precinct zone framework.

- 13.3.16 Given the assessment above, I disagree with submitters that the Blandswood area should be re-zoned SETZ. However, I note that the relief sought within the submissions is not limited to just seeking a rezoning of the Blandswood area. The submissions also sought consequential amendment for the PDP that achieve a similar outcome. Given this, I consider there is scope within the submissions to make amendments to the OSZ to provide a greater ability to develop properties in the Blandswood area. However, I consider that the merits of amending the Open Space Zone rules are best considered in the Open Space Zone hearing.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

- 13.3.17 No further amendments to the GURZ chapter are recommend. I recommend that the submissions listed in 8.9.1 above be transferred to the OSZ topic hearing for further consideration.

### **13.4 Other re-zoning requests**

- 13.4.1 The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in Appendix 2:

SUBMITTER NAME	SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER(S)
Scott, W and E	128.1
Earl and Lucia	13.1

- 13.4.2 Scott, W and E [128.1] supports the PDP and seeks it is retained as notified in relation to the zoning of the site at 22 Templer Street.
- 13.4.3 Earl and Lucia [13.1] consider the Rural Lifestyle Zone at Woodbury should be extended to include 42 Burdon Road, Woodbury given it is small in size (3.5ha) and adjoins the Rural Lifestyle Zone. They also note that it is outside the water protection area.



### Analysis

- 13.4.4 I agree with the suggested re-zoning. I note that RLZ-O1 sets out the purpose of the RLZ and states:

*The Rural Lifestyle Zone provides for areas adjoining Timaru, Temuka, Geraldine and Pleasant Point used predominantly for a residential lifestyle within a rural environment on lots smaller than those of the General rural zone, while enabling compatible primary production to occur.*

- 13.4.5 In contrast the purpose of the GRUZ as describe by GRUZ-O1 is:

*The General Rural Zone predominantly provides for primary production, including intensive primary production, as well as a limited range of activities that support primary production, including associated rural industry, and other activities that require a rural location.*

- 13.4.6 When considering the above descriptions, I agree with the submitter that the 3.5 ha site adjoining the existing RLZ, better fits with the character of the RLZ.

- 13.4.7 RLZ-O2 requires that:

*The character and qualities of the Rural Lifestyle Zone comprise:*

1. *natural character and openness; and*
2. *residential buildings, trees and landscaping that integrate with the natural and rural character of the area; and*
3. *a high level of amenity, outlook, access to sunlight and environmental quality; and*
4. *a pastoral landscape and the presence of compatible primary production.*

13.4.8 I consider the existing rural residential nature of the proposed site with a detached dwelling extensive planning, and paddocks, displays the character and qualities described within RLZ-O2.

13.4.9 RLZ-O5 requires that:

*Rural lifestyle development is integrated with the environment and appropriate infrastructure.*

13.4.10 When considering the future residential development potential of the site, I note that SUB-S1(4) of the PDP set a minimum site area for the RLZ of 5000m<sup>2</sup> if there is a sewer connection to each residential lot, otherwise a 2ha minimum area is required. I have been in contact with the TDC infrastructure planner who has advised that TDC doesn't have a sewer in this area and has no intention of extending sewer services. As such, a subdivision of this site will not be able to meet the minimum area requirements. In addition, RLZ-R2 provides for a maximum of one residential unit per site and one minor residential unit per site. As the site already contains an existing dwelling, the establishment of an additional dwelling would require resource consent as a non-complying activity. Given this I consider the future residential development potential of the site is very limited and the re-zoning of this site RLZ will not place any additional pressure on the existing infrastructure of the area.

13.4.11 In the absence of further explanation, I disagree an amendment to RLZ-R8 is required.

#### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

13.4.12 I recommend that: 42 Burdon Road, RD 21, Geraldine (LOT 3 DP 415886) from GRUZ to RLZ.

#### **Section 32AA**

13.4.13 I consider the existing rural residential nature of the proposed site with a detached dwelling extensive planning, and paddocks, displays the character and qualities described within RLZ-O2, and therefore the re-zoning the site RLZ is a more efficient and effective method of achieving RLZ-O2.

## 14. Appendix 1 – Changes Recommended to Provisions

### General Rural Zone

#### Introduction

The General Rural Zone is the largest zone in the District. The General Rural Zone is a dynamic environment, influenced by changing land use practice and by a wide range of primary production activities. As the land resource in this zone is a major contributor to the economic, social and cultural wellbeing of the District, and provides for the essential health needs of people and communities through food production, this chapter seeks to enable primary production (including intensive primary production) and a range of ancillary and associated activities that support primary production. Primary production activities are generally required to comply with standards to minimise adverse effects on sensitive activities and the environment.

The General Rural Zone includes a range of environments including hill and high country, downlands, plains and coastal areas, each with their own associated landscapes, vegetation and ecosystems. It also includes sensitive environments such as Outstanding Natural Landscapes, Outstanding Natural Features, Significant Natural Areas and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori. The potential impact of activities on sensitive environments in the General Rural Zone is managed through the district wide chapters.

The General Rural Zone also contains aggregate and mineral resources that are of considerable social and economic importance to the District and the wider region. These resources are only available where they occur and their extraction can be constrained by conflicting land uses. Extraction of these resources can potentially have significant impacts on the environment if not managed appropriately. Accordingly, this chapter seeks to manage extractive activities by way of consent.

#### Objectives

##### GRUZ-01 Purpose of the General Rural Zone

The General Rural Zone predominantly provides for primary production, including intensive primary production, as well as a limited range of activities that support primary production, including associated rural industry, and other activities that require a rural location.

##### GRUZ-02 Character and qualities of the General Rural Zone

The character and qualities of the General Rural Zone comprise:

1. large allotments with large areas of open space; and
2. a working environment of mostly utilitarian buildings and structures and machinery<sup>275</sup> where primary production generates noise, odour, light overspill and traffic, often on a cyclic and seasonable basis; and
3. higher levels of amenity immediately around sensitive activities and zone boundaries; and
4. vegetation, pasture, crops and forestry and livestock across a range of landscapes.

##### GRUZ-03 Protecting primary production

The land resource of the General Rural Zone is not diminished by activities with no functional or operational need to locate in the General rural zone, and primary production is protected from reverse sensitivity effects sensitive activities<sup>276</sup>.

<sup>275</sup> NZ Frost Fans [255.19]

<sup>276</sup> Helicopters Sth Cant. [53.20], Ballance [86.11], NZAAA [132.24]

**GRUZ-O4 Protecting sensitive activities and sensitive zones**

Intensive primary production, mining, quarrying and other intensive activities avoid or minimise ~~generates no or minimal~~<sup>277</sup> adverse effects on:

1. existing<sup>278</sup> sensitive activities; and
2. land ~~close to~~ Residential, Rural Lifestyle, Settlement, Māori Purpose and Open space zones.<sup>279</sup>

**GRUZ-O5 Mining and quarrying**

Mining and quarrying occurs in the General Rural Zone where the resource exists and where it will avoid or minimise ~~generates no or minimal~~ adverse effects on the sensitive environments, and sensitive activities and the transport network.<sup>280</sup>

**GRUZ-O6 Conservation activities**

A range of conservation activities occur in the General Rural Zone.

**Policies****GRUZ-P1 Primary production activities**

Enable a range of primary production activities, where they:

1. allow for the ongoing productive use of land for present and future generations; or
2. maintain the character and qualities of the General Rural Zone; and
3. meet the standards and requirements to minimise adverse effects on existing<sup>281</sup> sensitive activities and the environment.

**GRUZ-P2 Character and qualities of the General Rural Zone**

The character and qualities of the zone are maintained by:

1. requiring a large minimum allotment size that ensures ample open space around buildings; and
2. controlling the height and setbacks of buildings and structures; and
3. ensuring activities that can generate significant adverse effects and sensitive activities are well separated from each other.

**GRUZ-P3 Small scale commercial activities**

Provide for small-scale commercial activities, where they:

1. support, or are ancillary to primary productive activities; or
2. are ancillary and subordinate to the site's principal residential unit; and
3. are compatible or complimentary with the character and qualities of the Zone; and
4. are of size, scale and nature that will not compromise primary production.

**GRUZ-P4 Emergency services facilities**

Allow for emergency service facilities but require that they are designed and located to minimise adverse effects on existing activities and the character and qualities of the Zone.

**GRUZ-P5 ~~Protecting primary production~~ Reverse sensitivity**<sup>282</sup>

<sup>277</sup> Silver Fern Farms [172.113], Alliance Group [173.115]

<sup>278</sup> Silver Fern Farms [172.113], Alliance Group [173.115]

<sup>279</sup> Silver Fern Farms [172.113], Alliance Group [173.115]

<sup>280</sup> Waka Kotahi [143.146]

<sup>281</sup> Silver Fern Farms [172.114]

<sup>282</sup> Consequential amendment to Silver Fern Farms [172.116], Rural Contractors [178.7]

Manage sensitive activities in the zone to ensure:

1. they are located to avoid adverse effects on primary production and rural industry activities<sup>283</sup>; or
2. if avoidance is not possible, the sensitive activity includes mitigation measures so that there is minimal potential for adverse effects on the sensitive activity from primary production or rural industry activities..<sup>284</sup>

#### **GRUZ-P6 Mining and quarrying activities**

1. Enable small scale quarry activities (up to 2,000m<sup>2</sup>), subject to requirements to protect the environment and sensitive activities;
2. Only allow mining and other quarry activities in the General rural zone where:
  - a. adverse effects on sensitive environments<sup>285</sup> and sensitive activities are avoided, or if avoidance is not possible minimised; and
  - b. adverse effects on primary production and other activities are managed in accordance with appropriate management plans; and
  - c. vehicle access is suitable and safe, and traffic generation can be safely and efficiently accommodated by the surrounding road network; and
  - d. adverse effects on protected rock art and archaeological sites are avoided; and
  - e. adverse effects on local character and qualities are minimised; and
  - f. sites are progressively rehabilitated to enable the establishment of a land use consistent with the surrounding area.

#### **GRUZ-P7 Industrial activities, rural industries and other activities**

1. Only allow rural industries and other activities (not listed in the rules) in the General Rural Zone where:
  - a. the activity
    - i. was legally established use not permitted in the zone; or
    - ii. supports primary production; or
    - iii. has a functional or operational need for the activity to locate within the Zone; and
  - b. the activity is compatible or complimentary with the character and qualities of the Zone; and
  - c. there is adequate infrastructure available to service the activity, including on-site servicing where reticulated services are not available; and
  - d. there is adequate water supply provided for firefighting purposes; and
  - e. the scale, location and intensity of the activity will not compromise the efficiency and safety of the roading network; and
  - f. the activity does not constrain existing primary production or the establishment of activities otherwise permitted within the General rural zone; and
  - g. any adverse effects on primary production, sensitive activities, zone boundaries or sensitive environments are avoided, and if avoidance is not possible, adverse effects are minimised.
2. Avoid other industrial activities unless:
  - a. the matters under GRUZ-P7.1 above are complied with; and
  - b. the activity:
    - i. can demonstrate that it cannot be provided for in the General Industrial Zone, or an extension of the General Industrial Zone; or
    - ii. is of such a small scale or nature that all adverse effects on primary production, sensitive environment or sensitive activities will be avoided.

#### **GRUZ-P8 Residential activities (not including workers accommodation listed in GRUZ-P9)**

<sup>283</sup> Silver Fern Farms [172.116], Rural Contractors [178.7]

<sup>284</sup> Consequential amendment to Silver Fern Farms [172.116], Rural Contractors [178.7]

<sup>285</sup> Clause 16(2) of the RMA

Provide for residential activities in the General rural zone where:

1. fragmentation of rural land for non-primary production activities is avoided; and
2. the character and qualities of the General rural zone are maintained; and
3. the requirements of GRUZ-P5 are met; and
4. any minor residential unit is ancillary and subordinate to the site's principal residential unit.

#### **GRUZ-P9 Workers accommodation**

Provide for permanent workers accommodation and seasonal workers accommodation to support primary production where:

1. the site has an area of at<sup>286</sup> least 40 hectares for permanent workers accommodation, or 20ha for seasonal workers accommodation; or
2. on smaller sites where it can be demonstrated that it is required to meet the needs of the site's primary production activity; and
3. measures are put in place to ensure the workers accommodation cannot be subdivided off or sold separately to the site; and
4. the necessary infrastructure is provided and adverse effects on adjoining sites are minimised; and
5. the requirements of GRUZ-P5 are met, except for seasonal workers accommodation.

#### **GRUZ-P10 Conservation activities**

Enable a range of conservation activities where the character and qualities of the General Rural Zone are maintained.

#### **GRUZ-P11 Wildfire risk**

Control the location of woodlots and shelterbelts to reduce the wildfire risk to neighbouring residential properties<sup>287</sup>

#### **PREC8-P1 Waihi School Precinct**

Recognise and provide for education facilities in the Waihi School Precinct.<sup>288</sup>

## **Rules**

**Note:** For certain activities, consent may be required by rules in more than one chapter in the Plan. Unless expressly stated otherwise by a rule, consent is required under each of those rules. The steps plan users should take to determine what rules apply to any activity, and the status of that activity, are provided in Part 1, HPW — How the Plan Works - General Approach.

<b>GRUZ-R1</b>	<b>Primary production and intensive primary production, not otherwise listed in this chapter</b>	
<b>General Rural Zone</b>	<b>Activity status: Permitted</b>	<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-3: Restricted Discretionary</b>
	<b>Where:</b>  <b>PER-1</b>	<b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b>

<sup>286</sup> Clause 16(2) RMA

<sup>287</sup> TDC [42.46]

<sup>288</sup> Waihi School [236.1, 236.2]

	<p>The activity does not include any offensive trade; and</p> <p><b>PER-2</b> GRUZ-S5 is complied with; and</p> <p><b>PER-3</b> For grazing of stock within 50m of a residential unit under different ownership located in the Māori Purpose Zone, permanent ground cover of no less than 90% must be maintained, except during crop renewal or resowing.</p> <p><b>PER-4</b> For milking sheds and buildings used to house or feed stock are located at least:  <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 200m from any land in the Māori Purpose Zone, Settlement Zone and Residential Zones; and</li> <li>2. 100m from the notional boundary of an existing sensitive activity on a separate site under different ownership.<sup>289</sup></li> </ol> </p> <p><b>Note:</b> any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with GRUZ-R13.</p>	<p>1. the ability to manage grazing practices to ensure amenity effects on adjoining neighbours are minimised.</p> <p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-4: Restricted Discretionary</b></p> <p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. any adverse effect on adjoining properties; and</li> <li>2. mitigation measures.</li> </ol> <p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1 or PER-2: Discretionary</b></p>
<b>GRUZ-R2</b>	<b>Pig production for domestic self-subsistence home use</b>	
<b>General Rural Zone</b>	<p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b> The pigs are for the subsistence of the people residing on the site and are not sold to anyone not residing on the site; and</p> <p><b>PER-2</b> There <del>is</del> <u>are</u><sup>290</sup> no more than six pigs located on the site and the pigs are setback a minimum distance of 25m from a building containing an existing sensitive activity on a separate site under different ownership; or</p> <p><b>PER-3</b> There <del>is</del> <u>are</u><sup>291</sup> between 7 and 25 pigs on the site and the pigs are setback a minimum distance of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 50m of a building containing an existing sensitive activity on a</li> </ol>	<p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved: Discretionary</b></p>

<sup>289</sup> Keen et al [46.3]<sup>290</sup> Clause 16(2) RMA<sup>291</sup> Clause 16(2) RMA

	<p>separate site under different ownership; and</p> <p>2. 100m of the boundary with a Residential, Rural Lifestyle, Rural Settlement, Māori Purpose or Open Space zone.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with GRUZ-R13.</p>	
<b>GRUZ-R3</b>	<b>Keeping of poultry for domestic self-subsistence home use</b>	
<b>General Rural Zone</b>	<p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b> The poultry are for the subsistence of the people residing on the site and the poultry and their eggs<sup>292</sup> are not sold to anyone not residing on the site; and</p> <p><b>PER-2</b> There is no more than 30 birds located on the site; and</p> <p><b>PER-3</b> Any building or structure with an area of less than 50m<sup>2</sup> used to confine chickens is setback a minimum distance of 25m from a building containing an existing sensitive activity on a separate site under different ownership; and</p> <p><b>PER-4</b> No roosters are kept within 100m from the notional boundary of an existing sensitive activity on a separate site under different ownership; and</p> <p><b>Note:</b> any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with GRUZ-R13.</p>	<p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved: Discretionary</b></p>
<b>GRUZ-R4</b>	<b>Residential units, excluding seasonal workers accommodation and permanent workers accommodation</b>	
<b>General Rural Zone</b>	<p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b> There is a minimum site area of 40 hectares per principle<sup>293</sup> residential unit unless the site was created before [the</p>	<p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-5: Restricted Discretionary</b></p> <p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <p>2. the matters of discretion of any infringed standard.</p>

<sup>292</sup> Spiers, B [66.39]

<sup>293</sup> Clause 16(2) RMA

	<p>date this rule was made Operative] the 22 September 2022<sup>294</sup> and does not contain an existing principle<sup>295</sup> residential unit; and</p> <p><b>PER-2</b> There is a maximum of one minor residential unit per principal residential unit provided under <b>PER-1</b>; and</p> <p><b>PER-3</b> The minor unit has a maximum gross floor area of 80m<sup>2</sup>; and</p> <p><b>PER-4</b> Access to the minor residential unit, including any car parking area provided for the minor residential unit is accessed from the same access as the principal residential unit; and</p> <p><b>PER-5</b> GRUZ-S1, GRUZ-S2, GRUZ-S3 and GRUZ-S6 are complied with; and</p> <p><b>PER-6</b> GRUZ-S4 is complied with.</p> <p><i><b>Note:</b> any accessory building to the residential unit must be constructed in accordance with GRUZ-R13.</i></p>	<p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-6: Discretionary</b></p> <p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1 to PER-4: Non-complying</b></p>
<b>GRUZ-R5</b>	<b>Residential activities not otherwise listed in this chapter</b>	
<b>General Rural Zone</b>	<p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b> GRUZ-S4 is complied with.</p> <p><i><b>Note:</b> any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with GRUZ-R13.</i></p>	<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved: Discretionary</b>
<b>GRUZ-R6</b>	<b>Home business, excluding other permitted activities in this chapter</b>	
<b>General Rural Zone</b>	<p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b> The activity is undertaken entirely within, and ancillary to the use of, an existing residential unit; and</p> <p><b>PER-2</b></p>	<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved: Discretionary</b>

<sup>294</sup> Maze Pastures [41.5], MFL [60.42]

<sup>295</sup> Clause 16(2) RMA

	<p>The activity does not occupy a total area greater than 100m<sup>2</sup>; and</p> <p><b>PER-3</b> The resident(s) and a maximum of three other people not resident on the site are employed; and</p> <p><b>PER-4</b> No articles produced by the business are sold or displayed for sale on the premises; and</p> <p><b>PER-5</b> The home business does not involve an offensive trade or a licenced premise.</p> <p><i><b>Note:</b> any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with GRUZ-R13.</i></p>	
<b>GRUZ-R7</b>	<b>Educational facilities</b>	
<b>General Rural Zone</b>	<p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b> The activity is undertaken within, and ancillary to the use of, an existing principal residential unit; and</p> <p><b>PER-2</b> The education facility is for a childcare service, or home schooling; and</p> <p><b>PER-3</b> The maximum number of children attending at any one time is six, excluding any children who live there; and</p> <p><b>PER-4</b> <u>All the Standards of this chapter are complied with.</u><sup>296</sup></p>	<p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with: <u>Restricted</u> Discretionary</b></p> <p><b><u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>the matters of discretion of any infringed standard; and</u></li> <li>2. <u>the location and design of buildings and any proposed car parking and loading areas and access; and</u></li> <li>3. <u>hours of operation; and</u></li> <li>4. <u>noise, disturbance and loss of privacy of neighbours;</u></li> <li>5. <u>screening and landscaping;</u></li> <li>6. <u>waste treatment and disposal; and</u></li> <li>7. <u>whether the activity has a operational or functional need to locate in the General Rural Zone.</u><sup>297</sup></li> </ol>
<b>PREC8 - Waihi School Precinct</b>	<p><b><u>Activity status: Permitted</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Where</u></b></p> <p><b><u>PER-1</u></b> <u>The education facility complies with GRUZ-S1 to GRUZ-S3; and</u></p> <p><b><u>PER-2</u></b></p>	<p><b><u>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1: Restricted discretionary</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Matters of discretion are restricted to: - the matters of discretion of any infringed standard(s).</u></b></p>

<sup>296</sup> MoE [106.23]<sup>297</sup> MoE [106.23]

	The education facility complies with GRUZ-S4. <sup>298</sup>	<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-2: Discretionary</b> <sup>299</sup>
<b>GRUZ-R8</b>	<b>Supported residential care activity</b>	
<b>General Rural Zone</b>	<b>Activity status: Permitted</b>  <b>Where</b>  <b>PER-1</b> The supported residential care activity is within, and ancillary to the use of, an existing principal residential unit; and  <b>PER-2</b> The maximum occupancy does not exceed six residents, not including any staff.	<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved: Discretionary</b>
<b>GRUZ-R9</b>	<b>Residential visitor accommodation</b>	
<b>General Rural Zone</b>	<b>Activity status: Permitted</b>  <b>Where:</b>  <b>PER-1</b> The visitor accommodation is contained within, and ancillary to the use of, an existing principal residential unit; and  <b>PER-2</b> The maximum occupancy is six guests per night.	<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with: Discretionary</b>
<b>GRUZ-R10</b>	<b>Conservation activities</b>	
<b>General Rural Zone</b>	<b>Activity status: Permitted</b>  <b>Where:</b>  <b>PER-1</b> Land, buildings, and structures, equipment, machinery, vehicles and aircraft <sup>300</sup> are used for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1. preservation, protection, restoration, promulgation or enhancement of indigenous species or habitats of indigenous fauna; or</li> <li>• 2. weed or <sup>301</sup> pest control; or</li> <li>• 3. conservation education; or</li> <li>• 4. observation or surveying; or</li> </ul>	<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1: Discretionary</b>

<sup>298</sup> Waihi School [236.1, 236.2]

<sup>299</sup> Waihi School [236.1, 236.2]

<sup>300</sup> Helicopters Sth Cant. [53.24], NZAAA [132.30]

<sup>301</sup> Helicopters Sth Cant. [53.24], NZAAA [132.30]

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>5.</u><sup>302</sup> walking tracks, board walks, pedestrian bridge.</li> </ul> <p><b>Note:</b> any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with GRUZ-R13.</p>	
<b>GRUZ-R11</b>	<b>Recreation activities</b>	
<b>General Rural Zone</b>	<p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b> The activity is not operated as a commercial activity: and</p> <p><b>PER-1A</b> <u>Notwithstanding PER-1 above, any commercial recreation activity that is undertaken outdoors and involves less than 15 people.</u><sup>303</sup></p> <p><b>PER-2</b> Any organised sports comply with GRUZ-S4, 'sensitive activity' in this standard should be read as 'organised sports'; and<sup>304</sup></p> <p><b>Note:</b> any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with GRUZ-R13.</p>	<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with: Discretionary</b>
<b>GRUZ-R12</b>	<b>Rural produce retail</b>	
<b>General Rural Zone</b>	<p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b> The retail area has a maximum gross floor area of 100m<sup>2</sup> and is set back a minimum of 10m from a road boundary; and</p> <p><b>PER-2</b> There is no more than one rural produce retail operation per site; and</p> <p><b>PER-3</b> The access to the retail area is from a road, except where the road is a state</p>	<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved: Discretionary</b>

<sup>302</sup> Clause 16 RMA

<sup>303</sup> Rooney Holdings [174.84], Rooney, G.J.H. [191.84], Rooney Group [249.84], Rooney Farms [250.84], Rooney Earthmoving [251.84], TDL [252.84]

<sup>304</sup> RMA Clause 16

	highway with a speed limit greater than 80km/h; and  <b>Note:</b> any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with GRUZ-R13.	
<b>GRUZ-R13</b>	<b>Buildings and structures not listed in GRUZ-R17 or GRUZ-R18</b>	
<b>General Rural Zone</b>	<b>Activity status: Permitted</b>	<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1:</b> The same status as the activity the building or structure is associated with or ancillary to.
	<b>Where:</b>  <b>PER-1</b> The building or structure is associated with or ancillary to a permitted activity; and  <b>PER-2</b> GRUZ-S1, GRUZ-S2, GRUZ-S3 and GRUZ-6 are complied with.  <b>PER-3</b> GRUZ-S4 and GRUZ-S5 are complied with if relevant.	<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-2: Restricted Discretionary</b>  <b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b> 1. the relevant matters of discretion of any infringed standard.
		<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-3: Discretionary</b>
<b>GRUZ-R14</b>	<b>Use of <u>permanent</u> airstrips and helicopter landing sites</b>	
<b>General Rural Zone</b>	<b>Activity status: Permitted</b>	<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved: <u>Restricted</u> Discretionary.</b> <sup>308</sup>
	<b>Where:</b>  <b>PER-1</b> <del>The flights are for emergency purposes such as medical evacuations, search and rescue, firefighting or civil defence; or</del>  <b>PER-2</b> <del>The permeant airstrip or helicopter landing site is use is for primary production including spraying, stock management, fertiliser application or frost protection for:</del> 1. <u>used for a maximum of 30 seven</u> days within any 12 <u>three</u> month period where the airstrip or helicopter landing site is setback between 500m-1,000m from: a. any Residential zone; and b. the notional boundary of a building containing an <u>existing</u> noise sensitive activity, on a <u>separate site under different ownership not located on the</u>	<b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b>  1. <u>the extent of non-compliance with PER-2 and PER-3; and</u> 2. <u>the extent to which helicopter noise limits specified within Table 1 of NZS6807:1994 are complied with; and</u> 3. <u>the level, duration and character of the noise; and</u> 4. <u>proximity and nature of nearby activities and the adverse effects they may experience from the noise; and</u> 5. <u>the existing noise environment; and</u> 6. <u>effects on amenity values and anticipated character of the receiving environment; and</u> 7. <u>effects on health and well-being of people; and</u> 8. <u>noise mitigation measures; and</u> 9. <u>the practicality of utilising alternative sites.</u>

<sup>308</sup> Helicopters Sth Cant. [53.25], NZAAA [132.31]

	<p><del>site of the airstrip or helicopter land site;</del><sup>305</sup> or</p> <p>2. <del>the airstrip or helicopter landing site</del> is setback greater than 1,000m from:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>any Residential zone; and</del></li> <li><del>the notional boundary of a building containing an existing noise sensitive activity, on a separate site under different ownership not located on the site of the airstrip or helicopter land site;</del><sup>306</sup> or</li> </ol> <p><b>PER-3</b> Take offs or landings must not exceed 10 per month; and the airstrip or landing site is setback a minimum of 500m from:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>any Residential zone; and</del></li> <li><del>the notional boundary of a building containing a noise sensitive activity, not located on the site of the airstrip or helicopter land site.</del><sup>307</sup></li> </ol>	
<b>GRUZ-R14A</b>	<b>Aircraft and Helicopter Movements</b>	
<b>General Rural Zone</b>	<p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b> <u>Aircraft and Helicopter Movements are used for emergency purposes only such as medical emergencies, search and rescue or firefighting; or</u></p> <p><b>PER-2</b> <u>Aircraft and Helicopter Movements are associated with purposes ancillary to rural production including topdressing, spraying, stock management, fertiliser application, and frost mitigation, including the incidental landing and take-off of helicopters during their normal course of operation, or</u></p> <p><b>PER-3</b> <u>All other aircraft and helicopter movements must be setback greater than 100m from:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>any Residential zone; and</u></li> <li><u>the notional boundary of a building containing an existing noise sensitive</u></li> </ol>	<p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved: Restricted Discretionary</b></p> <p>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>the extent to which helicopter noise limits specified within Table 1 of NZS6807:1994 are complied with; and</u></li> <li><u>the level, duration and character of the noise; and</u></li> <li><u>proximity and nature of nearby activities and the adverse effects they may experience from the noise; and</u></li> <li><u>the existing noise environment; and</u></li> <li><u>effects on amenity values and anticipated character of the receiving environment; and</u></li> <li><u>effects on health and well-being of people; and</u></li> <li><u>noise mitigation measures; and</u></li> <li><u>the practicality of utilising alternative sites.</u><sup>310</sup></li> </ol>

<sup>305</sup> Evans, J [45.1], McAuley, S [57.1], Aubrey, L [59.1], Station Air [61.1], Pemberton, S [64.1], Cessna 180/185 Group et al [201.1], Coldicott, J. M. [118.1], Coldicott, G [254.1]

<sup>306</sup> Evans, J [45.1], McAuley, S [57.1], Aubrey, L [59.1], Station Air [61.1], Pemberton, S [64.1], Cessna 180/185 Group et al [201.1], Coldicott, J. M. [118.1], Coldicott, G [254.1]

<sup>307</sup> Helicopters Sth Cant. [53.25], NZAAA [132.31], Federated Farmers [182.201], Talbot, J [79.1]

<sup>310</sup> Helicopters Sth Cant. [53.25], NZAAA [132.31], Federated Farmers [182.201], Talbot, J [79.1]

	<u>activity, on a separate site under different ownership.</u> <sup>309</sup>	
<b>GRUZ-R15</b>	<b>Shelterbelts and woodlots</b> <sup>311</sup>	
<b>General rural zone</b>	<p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b> The height of any <u>shelterbelt trees</u> <sup>312</sup> located within 100m of a residential unit on an adjoining site are contained within an envelope defined by a recession plane of 1m vertical for every 3.5m horizontal that originates from the closest point of the residential unit; and</p> <p><b>PER-2</b> <u>Shelterbelt Trees</u> <sup>313</sup> are not in such a position that they cause icing of a road as a result of shading the road between 10 am and 2 pm on the shortest day.</p> <p><b>PER-3</b> <u>Any shelterbelt or woodlot shall be setback 30m from any residential unit or other principal building on an adjoining property.</u> <sup>314</sup></p>	<p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved: Restricted Discretionary</b></p> <p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. height and setback of trees from property boundaries and roads; and</li> <li>2. shading of houses; and</li> <li>3. shading of roads; and</li> <li>4. traffic safety; and</li> <li>7. tree species; and</li> <li>8. <u>wildfire risk on buildings.</u> <sup>315</sup></li> </ol>
<b>GRUZ-R16</b>	<p><b>Quarries and quarrying activities up to 2,000m<sup>2</sup>:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <del>up to 2,000m<sup>2</sup> (not in the bed of a river); and</del></li> <li>2. <del>in the bed of a river, which is authorised under the Regional Plan either as a permitted activity, or through a resource consent having been obtained from the Canterbury Regional Council.</del> <sup>316</sup></li> </ol>	
<b>General Rural Zone</b>	<p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b> The quarry is not within 10m of a site boundary; and</p> <p><b>PER-2</b> The quarry is not within 50m of a rock art site; and</p> <p><b>PER-3</b></p>	<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved: Discretionary</b>

<sup>309</sup> Helicopters Sth Cant. [53.25], NZAAA [132.31], Federated Farmers [182.201], Talbot, J [79.1]

<sup>311</sup> TDC [42.46]

<sup>312</sup> Clause 16(2) of the RMA

<sup>313</sup> Clause 16(2) of the RMA

<sup>314</sup> TDC [42.46]

<sup>315</sup> TDC [42.46]

<sup>316</sup> ECan [183.147], Road Metals [169.44], Fulton Hogan [170.46]

	<p>The quarry is not located within 500m of an existing sensitive activity located on another site or the boundary of any of the Residential zones, Rural lifestyle zone, Rural settlement zone, Māori Purpose zone or Open Space and recreation zones; and</p> <p><b>PER-4</b> The Accidental Discovery Protocol commitment form, contained within APP4 - Form confirming a commitment to adhering to an Accidental Discovery Protocol, has been completed and submitted to Council, at least 2 weeks prior to the commencement of any earthworks.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with GRUZ-R13.</p>	
<b>GRUZ-R17</b>	<b>Crop support structures</b>	
<b>General Rural Zone</b>	<p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b> GRUZ-S1, GRUZ-S2 and GRUZ-S6 are complied with.</p>	<p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved: Restricted Discretionary</b></p> <p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the relevant matters of discretion of any infringed standard.</li> </ol>
<b>GRUZ-R18</b>	<b>Artificial crop protection structures</b>	
<b>General Rural Zone</b>	<p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b> The structure(s) are open at the side; or</p> <p><b>PER-2</b> Dark green or black cloth is used for all vertical faces located within 20m of the boundary of the site;<sup>317</sup> and</p> <p><b>PER-3</b> The structure meets the following setback:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. For structure(s) less than 4m high, the structure(s) are setback a distance of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. 10m from road boundaries;</li> <li>b. 20m from road boundaries that are a national, regional or district arterial road;</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved: Restricted discretionary</b></p> <p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The extent of visual impacts including: limiting view shafts and panoramas from properties and public areas; changing the character of a location; changing the naturalness of the landscape; and creating an incongruous colour variation; and</li> <li>2. the extent of shading adverse effects on adjoining sites, activities and roads; and</li> <li>3. mitigation measures.</li> </ol>

<sup>317</sup> Hort NZ [245.120]

	<p>c. 15m from a non-road boundary of a site in different ownership; and</p> <p>2. For structure(s) greater than 4m in height, then the horizontal setback distance between the boundary and the structure should increase a further 5m than that stated above for every 2m increase in height; and</p> <p><b>PER-4</b>  <del>The structure(s) are collectively no longer than 100m (measured parallel to any common boundary with a site in different ownership).</del><sup>318</sup></p>	
<b>GRUZ-R19</b>	<b>Seasonal workers accommodation</b>	
<b>General Rural Zone</b>	<p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b>  It is located on a site larger than 40 hectares unless the site:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. was created before the 22 September 2022; and</li> <li>2. does not contain an existing household unit; and</li> <li>3. is located on a site larger than 20ha; and</li> </ol> <p><b>PER-2</b>  The site or buildings are occupied for a period not exceeding 180 days per year (occupancy records must be kept by the owner and made available to Timaru District Council upon request); and</p> <p><b>PER-3</b>  The site/buildings are not used for visitors accommodation; and</p> <p><b>PER-4</b>  All employees residing in the seasonal worker accommodation are employed in a primary production, rural industry or post-harvest facility located on, or off the site; and</p> <p><b>PER-5</b>  No more than 20 people live in the seasonal worker accommodation; and</p> <p><b>PER-6</b></p>	<p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1 to PER-7, and PER-9 <sup>320</sup>: Restricted Discretionary</b></p> <p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. adequacy of drinking water supply; and</li> <li>2. adequacy of water supply for firefighting purposes; and</li> <li>3. the size of the site to accommodate a discharge to ground; and</li> <li>4. methods to manage effects on existing activities, including the provision of screening, landscaping, and methods for noise management; and</li> <li>5. extent to which the design and management of facility complies with the Code of Practice for Able Bodied Seasonal Workers; and</li> <li>6. extent to which future subdivision around the seasonal worker accommodation is restricted; and</li> <li>7. the matters of discretion listed in GRUZ-S1, GRUZ-S2, GRUZ-S3 and GRUZ-6 if any of those standards are infringed.</li> </ol> <p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-8: Discretionary</b></p>

<sup>318</sup> Hort NZ [245.120]<sup>320</sup> Clause 16(2) RMA

	<p>The total gross floor area of all buildings used for seasonal worker accommodation is less than 500m<sup>2</sup>; and</p> <p><b>PER-7</b> Any camping area has a maximum area of 1,000m<sup>2</sup> and is setback a minimum distance of 100m from the nearest residential unit located on another site; and</p> <p><b>PER-8</b> GRUZ-S4 is complied with.</p> <p><b>PER-9</b> <u>GRUZ-S1, GRUZ-S2, GRUZ-S3, and GRUZ-S6 is complied with.</u><sup>319</sup></p> <p><i><b>Note:</b> any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with GRUZ-R13.</i></p>	
<b>GRUZ-R20</b>	<b>Permanent workers accommodation</b>	
<b>General Rural Zone</b>	<p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b> It is located on a site larger than <del>80</del> <u>40</u> hectares; and</p> <p><b>PER-2</b> An employment contract for the permanent full time worker(s) who will reside in the worker's accommodation is provided to Timaru District Council at the time of a building consent application and is available upon request; and</p> <p><b>PER-3</b> It is located on the same site where the permanent full worker is employed.</p> <p><b>PER-4</b> <u>GRUZ-S1, GRUZ-S2, GRUZ-S3, and GRUZ-6 is complied with.</u><sup>321</sup></p> <p><b>PER-5</b> <u>GRUZ-S4 is complied with.</u><sup>322</sup></p>	<p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1, <del>or</del> PER-2, or PER-4 : Restricted Discretionary</b></p> <p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the suitability of any documentary evidence that confirms the accommodation is provided for people that are employed on the site; and</li> <li>2. the extent to which the permanent workers accommodation is required to be provided on site to meet the needs of the site's primary production activity; and</li> <li>3. the extent of subject workers accommodation provided on the site;</li> <li>4. the location of workers accommodation;</li> <li>5. adequacy of drinking water supply; and</li> <li>6. adequacy of water supply for firefighting purposes; and</li> <li>7. the size of the site to accommodate a discharge to ground; and</li> <li>8. methods to manage effects on existing activities, including the provision of screening, setbacks,</li> </ol>

<sup>319</sup> Clause 16(2) RMA<sup>321</sup> Clause 16(2) RMA<sup>322</sup> Clause 16(2) RMA

	<p><b>Note:</b> any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with GRUZ-R13.</p>	<p>landscaping, and methods for noise management; and</p> <p>9. extent to which future subdivision around the workers accommodation is restricted; and</p> <p>10. the matters of discretion listed in GRUZ-S1, GRUZ-S2, GRUZ-S3 and GRUZ-S4<sup>6</sup> if any of those standards are infringed.</p> <p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-3: Non-Complying</b></p> <p><b><u>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-4: Discretionary</u></b><sup>323</sup></p>
--	--	---

<b>GRUZ-R21</b>	<b>Rural industry</b>	
<b>General Rural Zone</b>	<p><b>Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>RDIS-1</b> The activity is not an offensive trade.</p> <p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the suitability of the location, site design and layout; and</li> <li>2. the intensity and scale of the activity; and</li> <li>3. the extent of adverse effects on existing or permitted activities; and</li> <li>4. the extent of adverse effects on the safe and efficient operation of the road network, and suitability of onsite loading, manoeuvring and access; and</li> <li>5. the provision of infrastructure to service the activity; and</li> <li>6. measures to avoid, mitigate or remedy adverse effects.</li> </ol> <p><b>Note:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with GRUZ-R13.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved: <del>Non-complying</del> Discretionary</b><sup>324</sup></p>
<b>GRUZ-R22</b>	<b>Emergency services facilities</b>	

<sup>323</sup> Clause 16(2) RMA<sup>324</sup> Silver Fern Farms [60.44]

General Rural Zone	<p><b>Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</b></p> <p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. suitability of the location, site design and layout; and</li> <li>2. the intensity and scale of the activity; and</li> <li>3. extent of adverse effects on existing activities or permitted activities; and</li> <li>4. extent of adverse effects on the safe and efficient operation of the road network, and suitability of onsite loading, manoeuvring and access; and</li> <li>5. provision of infrastructure to service the activity; and</li> <li>6. measures to avoid, mitigate or remedy adverse effects.</li> </ol> <p><i>Note:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with GRUZ-R13.</li> </ol>	Activity status where compliance not achieved: Not applicable
GRUZ-R23	Expansion of existing consented quarries	
General Rural Zone	<p><b>Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</b></p> <p><b>RDIS-1</b> The entirety of the existing quarry operation<sup>325</sup> has an existing land use consent from Timaru District Council; and</p> <p><b>RDIS-2</b> The expansion of the existing quarry does not increase:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the rate of production beyond existing consented levels, and</li> <li>2. the hours of operation; and</li> </ol> <p><b>RDIS-3</b> The expansion does not occur within:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 500m of an existing sensitive activity located on another site, or the boundary of a Residential, Rural Lifestyle, Rural Settlement, Māori Purpose or Open Space zone; or</li> <li>2. 20m of a site boundary; or</li> <li>3. 100m of a riparian margin; or</li> <li>4. the mapped drinking water protection overlay; or</li> <li>5. an outstanding natural landscape or feature, significant natural area, high naturalness water body, visual</li> </ol>	Activity status where compliance not achieved: Discretionary

<sup>325</sup> Fulton Hogan [170.47], Road Metals [169.45]

	<p>amenity landscape, the coastal environment, a site or area of significance to Māori and a heritage item or setting.</p> <p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. adverse effects on the visual amenity and landscape character and the location and scale of any buildings; and</li> <li>2. the extent of dust nuisance, land instability, and contamination; and</li> <li>3. adverse effects on the margins of water bodies; and</li> <li>4. rehabilitation of the site; and</li> <li>5. the commitment to implement appropriate accidental discovery protocol, in accordance with the commitment form contained within APP4 - Form confirming a commitment to adhering to an Accidental Discovery Protocol.</li> <li>6. <u>the extent of adverse effects on the safe and efficient operation of the road network.</u><sup>326</sup></li> </ol> <p><b>Note:</b> any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with GRUZ-R13.</p>	
--	--	--

<b>GRUZ-R24</b>	<b>Mining and quarrying not listed in GRUZ-R16 or GRUZ-R23</b>	
<b>General Rural Zone</b>	<p><b>Activity status: Discretionary</b></p> <p><b>Note:</b> Pursuant to section 88 of the RMA, any application made under this provision must contain a rehabilitation plan and an accidental discovery protocol.</p>	<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved: Not applicable</b>
<b>GRUZ-R25</b>	<b>Rural tourism activity</b>	
<b>General Rural Zone</b>	<b>Activity status: Discretionary</b>	<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved: Not applicable</b>
<b>GRUZ-R26</b>	<b>Health care and community facilities</b>	
<b>General Rural Zone</b>	<b>Activity status: Discretionary</b>	<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved: Not applicable</b>
<b>GRUZ-R27</b>	<b>Expansion of existing legally established industrial activities, excluding mines and quarries</b>	

<sup>326</sup> Waka Kotahi [143.151]

General Rural Zone	Activity status: Discretionary	Activity status where compliance not achieved: Not applicable
GRUZ-R28	Activities not listed in the Rules section of this chapter	
General Rural Zone	Activity status: Discretionary	Activity status where compliance not achieved: Not applicable
GRUZ-R29	New Industrial activities not listed in GRUZ-21	
General Rural Zone	Activity status: Non-complying	Activity status where compliance not achieved: Not applicable

## Standards

GRUZ-S1	Height of buildings and structures	
General Rural Zone	<p>The height of buildings and structures must not exceed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 9m for residential units.</li> <li>2. 15m for other buildings and structures, except silos.</li> <li>3. 25m for silos.</li> </ol> <p>Height shall be measured from the ground level prior to any works commencing.</p>	<p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. dominance in the landscape; and</li> <li>2. overlooking and loss of privacy of adjacent residential units; and</li> <li>3. shading of adjacent residential units; and</li> <li>4. landscaping; and</li> <li>5. adverse effects on existing primary production facilities; and</li> <li>6. measures to avoid or mitigate adverse effects.</li> <li>7. <u>effects on radiocommunication activities conducted at the radiocommunication facilities at Fairview.</u><sup>327</sup></li> </ol>
GRUZ-S2	Height in relation to boundary	
General Rural Zone	<p>Buildings and structures (except irrigator, crop support structures and artificial crop protection structures) must be contained within a building envelope defined by recession planes from points 2.5m above ground level at the boundaries of the site. The method for determining recession planes and any permitted projection is described in APP8 - Recession Planes.</p>	<p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. any adverse effects on solar access to habitable rooms and outdoor living areas; and</li> <li>2. any adverse effects resulting from the bulk and dominance of buildings and structures on existing activities; and</li> <li>3. measures to avoid or mitigate adverse effects.</li> </ol>
GRUZ-S3	Boundary setbacks for buildings and structures	

<sup>327</sup> Radio NZ [152.57]

<b>General Rural Zone</b>	<p>New building and structures (excluding fences, irrigators, water troughs, <u>water tanks</u>,<sup>328</sup> crop support structures and artificial crop protection structures) shall be setback the following minimum distances:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 20m from all national, regional or district arterial road boundaries; and</li> <li>2. 10m from all other road boundaries; and</li> <li>3. 10m from any other site boundary in a different ownership.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. location of buildings and structures; and</li> <li>2. the extent of adverse effects including noise, smell, visual, character, privacy, shading and dominance; and</li> <li>3. measures to avoid and mitigation adverse effects.</li> </ol>
<b>GRUZ-S4</b>	<b>Setbacks for sensitive activities</b>	
<b>General Rural Zone</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No new sensitive activity may be established within 500m from: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. the closest outer edge of any paddocks, hard-stand areas, structures or buildings used to house stock, or treatment systems, used for an intensive primary production activity; and</li> <li>b. an existing farm effluent disposal area; and</li> <li>c. a lawfully established quarry or mine.</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. No new building for a sensitive activity may be erected within 20m from any other site boundary in a different ownership where a primary production activity is being conducted, unless the site existed prior to 22 September 2022, in which case a 10m setback applies;</li> <li>3. No new building for a sensitive activity may be erected within 20m of an existing shelter belt.</li> <li>4. <u>No new sensitive activity may be established within xxm from the boundary of any area used for the discharge of industrial trade waste at Fonterra Clandeboye site.</u><sup>329</sup></li> </ol> <p>Except that these setbacks do not apply to a new sensitive activity being established within the same site on which a lawfully established: intensive primary production activity; effluent disposal; quarry or mine; is located.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> <i>The Canterbury Regional Council regulates the discharge of contaminants into air from animal effluent in the Canterbury Air Regional Plan.</i></p>	<b>Not applicable</b>

<sup>328</sup> Maze Pastures [41.6], MFL [60.45]

<sup>329</sup> Fonterra [165.129]

GRUZ-S5	Intensive primary production activities and new farm effluent disposal areas	
<b>General Rural Zone</b>	<p>1. Prior to the establishment of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a new intensive primary production activity; or</li> <li>the expansion of an existing intensive primary production activity; or</li> <li>a new farm effluent disposal area;</li> </ol> <p>a plan showing the location of all paddocks, hard-stand areas, structures, buildings used to house stock, and treatment systems associated with the intensive primary production activity shall be provided to Council's District Planning Unit; and</p> <p>2. No new:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>intensive primary production (including expansion of an existing intensive primary production), except calf rearing for less than three months in any calendar year; or</li> <li>farm effluent disposal area (including expansion of an existing farm effluent area),</li> </ol> <p>may be established within:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>500m of the notional boundary of an existing sensitive activity on a separate site under different ownership; or</li> <li>100m of the boundary with a separate lot under different ownership; or</li> <li>1000m of the boundary with any of the Residential zones, Rural Lifestyle zone, Rural Settlement zone, Māori Purpose zone or Open Space and recreation zones.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b>  <b>Not applicable</b></p>
GRUZ-S6	Geraldine Downs Walking and Cycling Track	
<b>Geraldine Downs walking and cycling tracks specific control area</b>	<p>Buildings, structures, quarries or mines must not be located in the Geraldine Downs walking and cycling tracks specific control area identified on the planning map.</p>	<p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>safety of users of network; and</li> <li>impact on alignment and to connections to and within the network.</li> </ol>

## Rural Lifestyle Zone

### Introduction

The Rural Lifestyle Zone provides for areas used predominantly for a residential lifestyle within a rural environment on lots smaller than those of the General Rural Zone.

The Rural Lifestyle Zone provides a lifestyle choice and meets the demand for rural living. It is provided in areas adjoining Timaru, Temuka, Geraldine and Pleasant Point at locations that are capable of integrating with infrastructure. It has been focused on these locations in order to limit fragmentation of rural land; reduce impacts on high quality soils; and help avoid reverse sensitivity effects associated with housing in proximity to more intensive forms of primary production.

Both residential and rural activities are anticipated to occur in this zone. A high level of amenity and environmental quality is expected that is consistent with rural lifestyle living. The zone enables primary production to occur, but only to the extent that it does not significantly detract from character and qualities of the zone. It does not provide for intensive primary production and other activities with significant potential adverse effects on the environment in this zone.

New development is expected to integrate with the natural environment and infrastructure. This will primarily occur through the Development Area Plan process and development standards.

### Objectives

#### RLZ-O1 Purpose of the Rural Lifestyle Zone

The Rural Lifestyle Zone provides for areas adjoining Timaru, Temuka, Geraldine and Pleasant Point used predominantly for a residential lifestyle within a rural environment on lots smaller than those of the General rural zone, while enabling compatible primary production to occur.

#### RLZ-O2 Character and qualities of the Rural Lifestyle Zone

The character and qualities of the Rural Lifestyle Zone comprise:

1. natural character and openness; and
2. residential buildings, trees and landscaping that integrate with the natural and rural character of the area; and
3. a high level of amenity, outlook, access to sunlight and environmental quality; ~~and~~
4. a pastoral landscape and the presence of compatible primary production; and
5. a coordinated pattern of development at a density that is capable of efficiently connecting to sewer and water infrastructure.<sup>330</sup>

#### RLZ-O3 Protection from inappropriate activities

Activities that have significant potential adverse effects on the environment do not occur in the Rural Lifestyle Zone.

#### RLZ-O4 Compatible and complimentary activities

A range of compatible and complimentary commercial, community, health and emergency activities occur in the Rural Lifestyle Zone.

#### RLZ-O5 Integrated Development

<sup>330</sup> ECan [183.149]

Rural lifestyle development is integrated with the environment and appropriate infrastructure.

## Policies

### RLZ-P1 Residential activities

Enable residential activities, including minor residential units and supported residential care, where:

1. they maintain the character and qualities of the zone; and
2. are connected to a reticulated drinking water supply; and
3. any minor residential unit is subordinate to the principal residential unit; and
4. any supported residential care is ancillary to the use of the residential unit; and
5. they can comply with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice.

### RLZ-P2 Primary production (excluding intensive primary production)

1. Provide for primary production (excluding intensive primary production) where it:
  - a. allows for the ongoing productive use of land for present and future generations; and
  - b. maintains the character and qualities of the Rural Lifestyle Zone.

### RLZ-P3 Character and qualities

The character and qualities of the zone are maintained by:

1. ensuring the scale and setback of buildings and structures provides for an open character and access to sunlight; and
2. ensuring trees do not cause overshadowing; and
3. requiring trees that will contribute to rural and natural character; and
4. ensuring road boundary treatments and allotment sizes maintain an open character; and
5. ensuring activities are compatible with residential amenity and do not adversely affect the character and qualities of the zone.

### RLZ-P4 Commercial activities

Provide for small scale commercial activities where they:

1. are of a scale and nature that maintain the character and qualities of the Rural Lifestyle Zone; and
2. do not compromise residential amenity.

### RLZ-P5 Emergency services, health care and community facilities

Only allow emergency services, health care and community facilities where:

1. they serve the local rural community;
2. they have a functional or operational need to locate in the Rural Lifestyle Zone;
3. they are designed and located to minimise adverse effects on existing activities and the character and qualities of the zone.

### RLZ-P6 Conservation activities

Enable a range of conservation activities where they maintain the character and qualities of the zone.

### RLZ-P7 Recreation activities

Enable non-commercial recreation activities and small scale commercial recreation activities that maintain the character and qualities of the zone.

### RLZ-P8 Intensive primary production, mining, quarrying and industrial activities

Avoid intensive primary production, mining, quarrying and industrial activities in the zone, unless:

1. it is demonstrated that the activity cannot be conducted in the General Rural Zone, General Industrial Zone or the Port Zone; and
2. the activity is of such a small scale or nature that all adverse effects on sensitive activities will be avoided; and
3. there is adequate infrastructure available to service the activity, including on-site servicing where reticulated services are not available; and
4. there is adequate water supply provided for firefighting purposes; and
5. the character and qualities of the zone will be maintained or improved; and
6. the activity will not compromise the efficiency and safety of the roading network.

#### RLZ-P9 Other activities

Only allow other activities where:

1. there is a functional or operational need for the activity to locate within the Zone; and
2. the scale, intensity and nature of the activity is compatible with the character and qualities of the zone and all adverse effects are minimised; and
3. there is adequate infrastructure available to service the activity, including on-site servicing where reticulated services are not available; and
4. there is adequate water supply provided for firefighting purposes; and
5. the activity will not compromise the efficiency and safety of the roading network.

### Rules

**Note:** For certain activities, consent may be required by rules in more than one chapter in the Plan. Unless expressly stated otherwise by a rule, consent is required under each of those rules. The steps plan users should take to determine what rules apply to any activity, and the status of that activity, are provided in Part 1, HPW — How the Plan Works - General Approach.

RLZ-R1	Residential activities (not listed in this chapter)	
<b>Rural Lifestyle Zone</b>	<b>Activity status: Permitted</b>  <b>Where</b>  <b>PER-1</b> It does not include seasonal workers accommodation, or visitors accommodation except as provided for under rule RLZ-R9.  <b>PER-2</b> RLZ-S8 is complied with.  <i><b>Note:</b> Any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with RLZ-R14.</i>	<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-2: Restricted Discretionary</b>  <b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the matters of discretion of any infringed standard.</li> </ol> <b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1: Discretionary</b>
RLZ-R2	Residential units and minor residential units	
<b>Rural Lifestyle Zone</b>	<b>Activity status: Permitted</b>  <b>Where:</b>  <b>PER-1</b>	<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-5: Restricted Discretionary</b>  <b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the matters of discretion of any infringed standard.</li> </ol>

	<p>There is a maximum of one residential unit per site and one minor residential unit per site; and</p> <p><b>PER-2</b> There is a minimum site area of 5,000m<sup>2</sup>, unless the site existed before <del>22 September 2022</del> <u>[the date this rule was made Operative]</u><sup>331</sup>; and</p> <p><b>PER-3</b> The minor unit has a maximum gross floor area of 80m<sup>2</sup>; and</p> <p><b>PER-4</b> Access to the minor residential unit, including any car parking area provided for the minor residential unit, is from the same access as the principal residential unit; and</p> <p><b>PER-5</b> All the Standards of this chapter are complied with.</p> <p><i><b>Note:</b> Any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with RLZ-R14.</i></p>	<p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1, PER-2, PER-3, or PER-4: Non-complying</b></p>
<b>RLZ-R3</b>	<b>Primary production (not otherwise listed in this chapter)</b>	
<b>Rural Lifestyle Zone</b>	<p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b> The activity does not include any of the following activities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. an offensive trade;</li> <li>2. mining or quarrying;</li> <li>3. intensive primary production;</li> <li>4. extensive pig farming not provided in RLZ-R4;</li> <li>5. free range poultry farming not provided in RLZ-R5,</li> <li>6. milking sheds,</li> <li>7. buildings used to house or feed milking stock,</li> <li>8. stock effluent holding tanks,</li> <li>9. stock effluent treatment and storage ponds or a caress disposal area; and</li> </ol> <p><b>PER-2</b> All the Standards of this chapter are complied with.</p>	<p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-2: Restricted Discretionary</b></p> <p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the matters of discretion of any infringed standard.</li> </ol> <p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1: Non-complying</b></p>
<b>RLZ-R4</b>	<b>Pig production for domestic self-subsistence home use</b>	

<sup>331</sup> MFL [60.46]

Rural Lifestyle Zone	<p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b> The pigs are only for the subsistence of the people residing on the site and are not sold to anyone not residing on the site; and</p> <p><b>PER-2</b> There is no more than six pigs located on the site and the pigs are setback a minimum distance of 25m from a building containing an existing sensitive activity on a separate site under different ownership; and</p> <p><b>PER-3</b> All the Standards of this chapter are complied with.</p> <p><i>Note: Any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with RLZ-R14.</i></p>	<p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-3: Restricted Discretionary</b></p> <p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the matters of discretion of any infringed standard.</li> </ol> <p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1 or PER-2: Discretionary</b></p>
<b>RLZ-R5</b>	<b>Keeping of poultry for domestic self-subsistence home use</b>	
Rural Lifestyle Zone	<p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b> The poultry are for the subsistence of the people residing on the site and <u>the poultry and their eggs</u><sup>332</sup> are not sold to anyone not residing on the site; and</p> <p><b>PER-2</b> There is no more than 30 birds located on the site; and</p> <p><b>PER-2</b> Any building or structure with an area of less than 50m<sup>2</sup> used to confine chickens is setback a minimum distance of 25m from a building containing an existing sensitive activity on a separate site under different ownership; and</p> <p><b>PER-3</b> No roosters are kept within 100m from the notional boundary of an existing sensitive activity on a separate site under different ownership; and</p> <p><b>PER-4</b> All the Standards of this chapter are complied with.</p>	<p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-4: Restricted Discretionary</b></p> <p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the matters of discretion of any infringed standard.</li> </ol> <p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1, PER-2 or PER-3: Discretionary</b></p>

<sup>332</sup> Spiers, B [66.43]

	<b>Note:</b> Any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with RLZ-R14.	
<b>RLZ-R6</b>	<b>Home business (excluding other permitted activities in this chapter)</b>	
<b>Rural Lifestyle Zone</b>	<b>Activity status: Permitted</b>	<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1, PER-2, PER-3 or PER-4: Discretionary</b>
	<b>Where</b>  <b>PER-1</b> The home business is carried out entirely within an existing residential unit, or a building accessory to the residential unit, and is ancillary to the use of the residential unit; and  <b>PER-2</b> The activity does not occupy a total area greater than 100m <sup>2</sup> ; and  <b>PER-3</b> The resident(s) and no more than three other people not resident on the site are employed; and  <b>PER-4</b> No articles are sold or displayed for sale on the premises; and  <b>PER-5</b> The home business does not involve an offensive trade or a licenced premise.	<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-5: Non-complying</b>
<b>RLZ-R7</b>	<b>Educational facilities</b>	
<b>Rural Lifestyle Zone</b>	<b>Activity status: Permitted</b>	<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with: <u>Restricted</u> Discretionary</b>
	<b>Where</b>  <b>PER-1</b> The activity is undertaken within an existing residential unit and is ancillary to the use of that residential unit; and  <b>PER-2</b> The education facility is for a childcare service or home school; and  <b>PER-3</b> The maximum number of children attending at any one time is six, excluding any children who live in the residential unit.	<b><u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u></b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>the matters of discretion of any infringed standard; and</u></li> <li>2. <u>the location and design of buildings and any proposed car parking and loading areas and access; and</u></li> <li>3. <u>hours of operation; and</u></li> <li>4. <u>noise, disturbance and loss of privacy of neighbours;</u></li> <li>5. <u>screening and landscaping;</u></li> <li>6. <u>waste treatment and disposal; and</u></li> </ol>

		7. <u>whether the activity has a operational or functional need to locate in the RLZ.</u> <sup>333</sup>
<b>RLZ-R8</b>	<b>Supported residential care activity</b>	
<b>Rural Lifestyle Zone</b>	<b>Activity status: Permitted</b>  <b>Where</b>  <b>PER-1</b> The supported residential care activity is within an existing residential unit and is ancillary to the use of that residential unit; and  <b>PER-2</b> The maximum occupancy does not exceed six residents, excluding any staff.	<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved: Discretionary</b>
<b>RLZ-R9</b>	<b>Visitor accommodation and residential visitor accommodation</b>	
<b>Rural Lifestyle Zone</b>	<b>Activity status: Permitted</b>  <b>Where:</b>  <b>PER-1</b> For visitor accommodation, it is contained within an existing minor residential unit; and  <b>PER-2</b> For residential visitor accommodation, it is contained within an existing residential unit;  <b>PER-3</b> The maximum combined occupancy is six guests per night.	<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved: Discretionary</b>
<b>RLZ-R10</b>	<b>Conservation activities</b>	
<b>Rural Lifestyle Zone</b>	<b>Activity status: Permitted</b>  <b>Where:</b>  <b>PER-1</b> Land, buildings or structures are used for : <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. preservation, protection, restoration, promulgation, or enhancement or planting of indigenous species, or habitats of indigenous fauna; or</li> <li>2. pest control and weed control; or</li> <li>3. conservation education; or</li> <li>4. observation or surveying; or</li> <li>5. walking tracks, board walks, pedestrian bridges; and</li> </ol>	<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-2: Restricted Discretionary</b>  <b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the matters of discretion of any infringed standard.</li> </ol> <b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1: Discretionary</b>

---

<sup>333</sup> MoE [106.26]

	<p><b>PER-2</b> All the Standards of this chapter (except RLZ-S8), are complied with.</p> <p><i><b>Note:</b> Any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with RLZ-R14.</i></p>	
<b>RLZ-R11</b>	<b>Recreation activities</b>	
<b>Rural Lifestyle Zone</b>	<p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b> The activity is not a commercial activity, or an organised sporting events; and</p> <p><b>PER-2</b> All the Standards of this chapter (except RLZ-S9) are complied with.</p> <p><i><b>Note:</b> Any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with RLZ-R14.</i></p>	<p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-2: Restricted Discretionary</b></p> <p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the matters of discretion of any infringed standard.</li> </ol>
		<p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1: Discretionary</b></p>
<b>RLZ-R12</b>	<b>Rural produce retail</b>	
<b>Rural Lifestyle Zone</b>	<p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b> Retail sales must be limited to the sale of produce grown on the site; and</p> <p><b>PER-2</b> The retail area has a maximum gross floor area of 75m<sup>2</sup>; and</p> <p><b>PER-3</b> There is no more than one rural produce retail operation per site; and</p> <p><b>PER-4</b> Access to the retail area is not from a state highway with a speed limit greater than 80km/h; and</p> <p><b>PER-5</b> All the Standards of the zone are complied with.</p> <p><i><b>Note:</b> Any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with RLZ-R14.</i></p>	<p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-5: Restricted Discretionary</b></p> <p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the matters of discretion of any infringed standard.</li> </ol>
		<p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1, PER-2, PER-3, or PER-4: Discretionary</b></p>
<b>RLZ-R13</b>	<b>Rural produce manufacturing</b>	

<b>Rural Lifestyle Zone</b>	<p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b> The rural produce manufacturing area has a maximum gross floor area of 75m<sup>2</sup>; and</p> <p><b>PER-2</b> All manufacturing, altering, repairing, dismantling or processing of any materials or articles must be undertaken within a building; and</p> <p><b>PER-3</b> There must be no more than three full-time equivalent persons who reside elsewhere than on the site employed in rural produce and manufacturing activities on the site; and</p> <p><b>PER-4</b> Any associated retail sales must be limited to the sale of produce manufactured on the site; and</p> <p><b>PER-5</b> All the Standards of this chapter are complied with.</p> <p><i><b>Note:</b> Any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with RLZ-R14.</i></p>	<p><b>Activity status when compliance not achieved with PER-5: Restricted Discretionary</b></p> <p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the matters of discretion of any infringed standard.</li> </ol> <p><b>Activity status when compliance not achieved with PER-1, PER-2, PER-3 or PER-4: Discretionary</b></p>
<b>RLZ-R14</b>	<b>Buildings and structures (not provided in RLZ-R15 or RLZ-R16)</b>	
<b>Rural Lifestyle Zone</b>	<p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b> The building or structure is associated with or ancillary to a permitted activity; and</p> <p><b>PER-2</b> All the Standards of this chapter are complied with.</p>	<p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1: The same status as the activity the building or structure is associated with or ancillary to.</b></p> <p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-2: Restricted Discretionary</b></p> <p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the relevant matters of discretion of any infringed standard.</li> </ol>
<b>RLZ-R15</b>	<b>Crop support structures</b>	
<b>Rural Lifestyle Zone</b>	<p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b> RLZ-S1 and RLZ-S2 are complied with.</p>	<p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved: Restricted Discretionary</b></p> <p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the relevant matters of discretion of any infringed standard.</li> </ol>
<b>RLZ-R16</b>	<b>Artificial crop protection structures</b>	

<b>Rural Lifestyle Zone</b>	<p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b> The structure(s) are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>open at the side; or</li> <li>dark green or black cloth is used for all vertical faces; and</li> </ol> <p><b>PER-2</b> The structure meets the following setbacks:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For structure(s) less than 4m high, the structure(s) are setback a distance of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10m from road boundaries; and</li> <li>20m from road boundaries that are a national, regional or district arterial road; and</li> <li>15m from a non-road boundary of a site in different ownership; and</li> </ol> </li> <li>For structure(s) greater than 4m in height, then the horizontal setback distance between the boundary and the structure should increase a further 5m than that stated above for every 2m increase in height; and</li> </ol> <p><b>PER-4</b> The structure(s) are collectively no longer than 100m (measured parallel to any common boundary with a site in different ownership); and</p> <p><b>PER-5</b> RLZ-S1 and RLZ-S2 are complied with.</p>	<p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved: Restricted discretionary</b></p> <p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The extent of visual impacts including: limiting view shafts and panoramas from properties and public areas; changing the character of a location; changing the naturalness of the landscape; and creating an incongruous colour variation; and</li> <li>the extent of shading adverse effects on adjoining sites, activities and roads; and</li> <li>mitigation measures.</li> </ol>
<b>RLZ-R17</b>	<p><b>Emergency services, health care and community facilities</b> <b>Note: This includes health facilities not provided under RLZ-R8</b></p>	
<b>Rural Lifestyle Zone</b>	<p><b>Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</b></p> <p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>whether the activity serves the community in the vicinity of the site; and</li> <li>whether it has a functional or operational need to locate in the zone; and</li> <li>suitability of the location, site design and layout and design of buildings; and</li> <li>the intensity and scale of the activity; and</li> <li>the extent of adverse effects on the character and qualities of the zone; and</li> </ol>	<p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved: Not applicable</b></p>

	6. the extent of adverse effects on the safe and efficient operation of the road network, and suitability of onsite loading, manoeuvring and access; and 7. provision of infrastructure to service the activity; and 8. measures to avoid, mitigate or remedy adverse effects; and 9. the matters of discretion of any standard RLZ-S1 to RLZ-S11 not complied with.	
<b>RLZ-R18</b>	<b>Activities not otherwise listed in this chapter</b>	
<b>Rural Lifestyle Zone</b>	<b>Activity status: Discretionary</b>	<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved: Not applicable</b>
<b>RLZ-R19</b>	<b>Industrial activities</b>	
<b>Rural Lifestyle Zone</b>	<b>Activity status: Non-complying</b>	<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved: Not applicable</b>

## Standards

<b>RLZ-S1</b>	<b>Height of buildings and structures</b>	
<b>1. Rural Lifestyle Zone</b>	<p>The height of buildings and structures must not exceed 8m, except for buildings and structures located within 50m of a General Residential Zone, which must not exceed 4.5m in height.</p> <p><u>Towers and poles associated with emergency service facilities must not exceed 15m.</u><sup>334</sup></p> <p><b>Note:</b><sup>335</sup> Height shall be measured<sup>336</sup> from the existing ground level prior to any works commencing.</p>	<p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. dominance in the landscape; and</li> <li>2. overlooking and loss of privacy of adjacent residential units; and</li> <li>3. shading of adjacent residential units; and</li> <li>4. landscaping.</li> </ol>
<b>2. Brookfield Road specific control area</b>	<p>Buildings and structures must not exceed a maximum height of 4.5m in the Brookfield Road Specific Control Area.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> Height shall be measure from the existing ground level prior to any works commencing.</p>	<p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. dominance in the landscape; and</li> <li>2. overlooking and loss of privacy of adjacent residential units; and</li> <li>3. shading of adjacent residential units; and</li> <li>4. landscaping.</li> </ol>
<b>RLZ-S2</b>	<b>Height in relation to boundary</b>	

<sup>334</sup> FENZ [131.40]

<sup>335</sup> ECan [183.4]

<sup>336</sup> Clause 16(2) RMA

<b>Rural Lifestyle Zone</b>	Buildings and structures must be contained within a building envelope defined by recession planes from points 2.5m above ground level at the boundaries of the site. The method for determining recession planes and any permitted projection is described in APP8 - Recession Planes.	<b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. any impact on solar access to habitable rooms and outdoor living areas; and</li> <li>2. any adverse effects resulting from the bulk and dominance of buildings and structures on existing activities; and</li> <li>3. measures to avoid or mitigate adverse effects.</li> </ol>
<b>RLZ-S3</b>	<b>Building coverage</b>	
<b>Rural Lifestyle Zone</b>	<del>The footprint of all buildings on the site shall not exceed 10% site coverage.</del> The building coverage of any site must not exceed 10%. <sup>337</sup>	<b>Matters of discretion restricted to:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. adverse effects on the character and qualities of the zone; and</li> <li>2. landscaping and screening.</li> </ol>
<b>RLZ-S4</b>	<b>Boundary setbacks for buildings and structures</b>	
<b>Rural Lifestyle Zone</b>	All new buildings and structures (excluding fences, irrigators, water troughs, crop support structures and artificial crop protection structures) shall be setback 8m from all site boundaries.	<b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. location of buildings and structures; and</li> <li>2. the extent of adverse effects including noise, smell, visual, character, privacy, shading, dominance and reverse sensitivity; and</li> <li>3. measures to avoid and mitigation adverse effects.</li> </ol>
<b>RLZ-S5</b>	<b>Boundary treatment styles</b>	
<b>Rural Lifestyle Zone</b>	Boundary treatments must be limited to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. post and rail fences; or</li> <li>2. post and wire fences (including netting)<sup>338</sup>; or</li> <li>3. hedges; and</li> </ol> <p>The height of hedges must not exceed 1.2m.</p>	<b>Matters of discretion are limited to:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. adverse effects on the character and qualities of the zone; and</li> <li>2. security of livestock; and</li> <li>3. the location, height and design of fences or hedges</li> </ol>
<b>RLZ-S6</b>	<b>Colour reflectance</b>	
<b>Rural Lifestyle Zone</b>	The colour reflectance of materials must be no greater than: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 10% for roofs; and</li> <li>2. 30% for the exterior of building walls.</li> </ol>	<b>Matters of discretion restricted to:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. adverse effects on the character and qualities of the zone; and</li> <li>2. effect on amenity values.</li> </ol>
<b>RLZ-S7</b>	<b>Exterior building materials - Brookfield Road</b>	
<b>Brookfield Road Specific Control Area</b>	All materials used for buildings or fencing must be either: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. painted and/or stained in natural hues of grey, green and/or brown; or</li> <li>2. unpainted timber; or</li> <li>3. local bluestone; or</li> </ol>	<b>Matters of discretion restricted to:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. adverse effects on the character and qualities of the zone; and</li> <li>2. any adverse effects on amenity values; and</li> <li>3. alternative exterior materials.</li> </ol>

<sup>337</sup> ECan [183.1]<sup>338</sup> Spiers, B [66.44]

	4. bricks or concrete block that have muted and recessive colour tones.	
<b>RLZ-S8</b>	<b>Trees</b>	
<b>Rural Lifestyle Zone</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Within each site there must be a minimum of 4 trees (for sites under 5,000m<sup>2</sup>), or 8 trees (for sites over 5,000m<sup>2</sup>) capable of attaining a minimum height of 8 metres at maturity and those trees must: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. be 2.5m high at planting with a trunk diameter of 50mm; and</li> <li>b. be planted no closer than 20 metres apart; and</li> <li>c. include at least two trees planted in the road boundary setback, except for rear allotments; and</li> <li>d. be established prior to the issue of building consent for a building; and</li> <li>e. be maintained and any dead or diseased trees replaced; and</li> <li>f. not consist of pines, firs or eucalypts; and</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. the height of any trees located within 100m of a residential unit on an adjoining site are contained within an envelope defined by a recession plane of 1m vertical for every 3.5m horizontal that originates from the closest point of the residential unit.</li> </ol>	<b>Matters of discretion restricted to:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. adverse effects on the character and qualities of the zone; and</li> <li>2. effect on amenity values;</li> <li>3. height and setback of trees from property boundaries and roads; and</li> <li>4. shading of houses; and</li> <li>5. effects on the character of the area and amenity values; and</li> <li>6. tree species.</li> </ol>
<b>RLZ-S9</b>	<b>Water supply</b>	
<b>Rural Lifestyle Zone</b>	All residential and visitor accommodation activities on a site must be connected to a reticulated drinking water supply and comply with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice.	<b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. security of domestic water supply from contamination; and</li> <li>2. adequacy of storage volume of water for domestic and fire-fighting purposes.</li> <li>3. compliance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice.</li> </ol>
<b>RLZ-S10</b>	<b>Geraldine Downs Walking and Cycling Track</b>	
<b>Geraldine Downs walking and cycling tracks specific control area</b>	Buildings must not be located in the Geraldine Downs walking and cycling tracks specific control area identified on the planning map.	<b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. safety of users of network; and</li> <li>2. impact on alignment and to connections to and within the network.</li> </ol>

## Settlement Zone

### Introduction

The District contains a number of small settlements dispersed throughout the rural area. These settlements (Acacia Drive, Cave, Ōrāri, Pareora, Winchester, Peel Forest, Blandwood and Woodbury) have a different character from the larger, more urban, centres. In general, they have larger allotment sizes and some contain a mixture of residential and non-residential activities. Most of these settlements have reticulated water supply but no reticulated sewerage.

The Settlement Zone seeks to enable residential and complementary non-residential activities and preserve the low density and pleasant character of these settlements. It also seeks to ensure that new development does not put pressure on existing infrastructure, create demands for infrastructure upgrades, or affect water supply bores.

### Objectives

#### SETZ-O1 Purpose of the Settlement Zone

Small settlements are used predominantly for a cluster of residential, commercial, light industrial and/or community activities that are located in rural areas.

#### SETZ-O2 Character and qualities of the Settlement Zone

The character and qualities of the Settlement Zone comprise:

1. small, low density rural settlements that have a mixture of activities including residential, commercial, community, light industrial and home business; and
2. a range of amenity levels in different settlements; and
3. openness, trees, landscaping, access to sun light; and
4. small number of grazing animals.

#### SETZ-O3 Servicing in the Settlement Zone

On-site treatment and disposal of wastewater and stormwater does not:

1. compromise water supplies or the character and qualities of the zone; or
2. place pressure on existing network infrastructure, or create demand for new or upgraded network infrastructure.

### Policies

#### SETZ-P1 Range of activities

Enable residential activities and non-residential activities that:

1. can be adequately and safely serviced by reticulated water supply and by on-site wastewater and stormwater treatment and disposal; and
2. maintains the amenity and character of the settlement the activity is located; and
3. are compatible with the purpose, character and qualities of the Settlement zone.

#### SETZ-P2 Character and qualities of the settlement zone

The character and qualities of the Settlement Zone will be maintained by requiring:

1. larger permeable outdoor areas that provide opportunities for outdoor living, tree and garden planting and on-site wastewater and stormwater treatment and disposal; and
2. buildings and structures to be of a height and setback a distance from boundaries that allows surrounding sites to have a reasonable standard of sunlight access and privacy; and
3. buildings intended to be used for non-residential purposes to be of an appearance and scale which is compatible with residential buildings in the locality.

**SETZ-P3 Compatible<sup>339</sup> non-residential activities**

Provided for:

1. industrial activities within existing buildings; and
2. cafes, community facilities, educational facilities,<sup>340</sup> and emergency service facilities<sup>341</sup>; and
3. ensure they are designed and located to minimise adverse effects on existing activities and the character and qualities of the settlement.

**SETZ-P4 Other activities**

Only allow other activities where:

1. the nature, scale and intensity of the activity is compatible with the character and qualities of the zone and all adverse effects are minimised; and
2. there is adequate infrastructure available to service the activity, including on-site servicing where reticulated services are not available; and
3. there is adequate water supply provided for firefighting purposes; and
4. the activity will not compromise the efficiency and safety of the roading network.

**Rules**

**Note:** For certain activities, consent may be required by rules in more than one chapter in the Plan. Unless expressly stated otherwise by a rule, consent is required under each of those rules. The steps plan users should take to determine what rules apply to any activity, and the status of that activity, are provided in Part 1, HPW — How the Plan Works - General Approach.

SETZ-R1	Residential activity and Residential Unit	
Settlement Zone	<b>Activity status: Permitted</b>  <b>Where:</b>  <b>PER-1</b> There is no more than one residential unit per site; and  <b>PER-2</b> if residential visitor accommodation is provided within the residential unit, the maximum occupancy is six guests per night; and  <b>PER-3</b> SETZ-S1, SETZ-S2, SETZ-S3, SETZ-S4, SETZ-S5, and SETZ-S6 are complied with.  <i><b>Note:</b> Any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with SET-R8.</i>	<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-2: Restricted Discretionary</b>  <b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the number of visitors accommodated; and</li> <li>2. the location and design of buildings and any proposed parking and loading areas and access; and</li> <li>3. hours of operation; and</li> <li>4. noise, disturbance and loss of privacy of neighbours; and</li> <li>5. screening and landscaping; and</li> <li>6. waste treatment and disposal.</li> </ol>
		<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-3: Restricted Discretionary</b>  <b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the matters of discretion of any infringed standard.</li> </ol>
		<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1: Discretionary</b>

<sup>339</sup> MoE [106.29]

<sup>340</sup> MoE [106.29]

<sup>341</sup> Clause 16(2)

<b>SETZ-R2</b>	<b>Home business</b>	
<b>Settlement Zone</b>	<b>Activity status: Permitted</b>	<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-2: Restricted Discretionary</b>
	<b>Where:</b>	<b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b>
	<p><b>PER-1</b> The activity does not include an offensive trade; and</p> <p><b>PER-2</b> All the Standards of this chapter are complied with.</p> <p><i><b>Note:</b> Any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with SET-R8.</i></p>	<p>1. the matters of discretion of any infringed standard.</p> <p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1: Non-complying</b></p>
<b>SETZ-R3</b>	<b>Education facility</b>	
<b>Settlement Zone</b>	<b>Activity status: Permitted</b>	<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1, PER-2 or PER-3: Controlled</b>
	<b>Where:</b>	<b>Where:</b>
	<b>PER-1</b> The activity is undertaken within and is ancillary to a residential unit; and	<b>CON-1</b> the activity complies with <b>PER-4</b> .
	<b>PER-2</b> The educational facility is for a childcare service or home schooling; and	<b>Matters of control are restricted to:</b>
	<b>PER-3</b> The maximum number of children attending at any one time is six, excluding any children who live there; and	<p>1. the location and design of buildings and any proposed car parking and loading areas and access; and</p> <p>2. hours of operation; and</p> <p>3. noise, disturbance and loss of privacy of neighbours; and</p> <p>4. screening and landscaping; and</p> <p>5. waste treatment and disposal.</p>
	<b>PER-4</b> All the Standards of this chapter are complied with.	<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-4: Restricted Discretionary</b>
		<b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b>
		<p>1. the matters of discretion of any infringed standard.</p> <p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with CON-1: Restricted Discretionary</b></p> <p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <p>1. the matters of discretion of any infringed standard; and</p> <p>2. the location and design of buildings and any proposed car parking and loading areas and access; and</p> <p>3. hours of operation; and</p> <p>4. noise, disturbance and loss of privacy of neighbours; and</p>

		5. screening and landscaping; and 6. waste treatment and disposal.
<b>SETZ-R4</b>	<b>Market gardening and community gardens</b>	
<b>Settlement Zone</b>	<b>Activity status: Permitted</b>  <b>Where:</b>  <b>PER-1</b> The maximum area for sale of produce is 75m <sup>2</sup> ; and  <b>PER-2</b> All the Standards of this chapter are complied with.  <i><b>Note:</b> Any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with SET-R8.</i>	<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-2: Restricted Discretionary</b>  <b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b> 1. the matters of discretion of any infringed standard.  <b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1: Discretionary</b>
<b>SETZ-R5</b>	<b>Recreation activities</b>	
<b>Settlement Zone</b>	<b>Activity status: Permitted</b>  <b>Where</b>  <b>PER-1</b> There is no motorsport activity; and  <b>PER-2</b> All the Standards of this chapter are complied with.  <i><b>Note:</b> Any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with SET-R8.</i>	<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-2: Restricted Discretionary</b>  <b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b> 1. the relevant matters of discretion of any infringed standard.  <b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1: Discretionary</b>
<b>SETZ-R6</b>	<b>Grazing of animals</b>	
<b>Settlement Zone</b>	<b>Activity status: Permitted</b>  <b>Where:</b>  <b>PER-1</b> The maximum number of poultry is 12 and there must be no roosters; and  <b>PER-2</b> No grazing of animals occurs within 2m of a well head; and  <b>PER-3</b> There is no more than one pig kept on the site.	<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved: Discretionary</b>
<b>SETZ-R7</b>	<b>Offices</b>	
<b>Settlement Zone</b>	<b>Activity status: Permitted</b>  <b>Where:</b>	<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1: Restricted Discretionary</b>

	<p><b>PER-1</b> Any office shall have no more than six full time equivalent staff; and</p> <p><b>PER-2</b> All the Standards of this chapter are complied with.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> Any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with SET-R8.</p>	<p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. scale, intensity and character of business; <u>and</u> <sup>342</sup></li> <li>2. the matters of discretion of any infringed standard; and</li> <li>3. the location and design of buildings and any proposed parking and loading areas and access; <u>and</u> <sup>343</sup></li> <li>4. hours of operation; and</li> <li>5. noise, disturbance and loss of privacy of neighbours; and</li> <li>6. screening and landscaping; and</li> <li>7. waste treatment and disposal.</li> </ol> <p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-2: Restricted Discretionary</b></p> <p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the relevant matters of discretion of any infringed standard.</li> </ol>
<b>SETZ-R8</b>	<b>Buildings and structures</b>	
<b>Settlement Zone</b>	<p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b> The building or structure is associated with or ancillary to a permitted activity; and</p> <p><b>PER-2</b> All the Standards of this chapter are complied with.</p>	<p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1:</b> The same status as the activity the building or structure is associated with or ancillary to.</p> <p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-2: Restricted Discretionary</b></p> <p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the matters of discretion of any infringed standard.</li> </ol>
<b>SETZ-R9</b>	<b>Community facilities</b>	
<b>Settlement Zone</b>	<p><b>Activity status: Controlled</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>CON-1</b> All the Standards of this chapter are complied with.</p> <p><b>Matters of control are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the location and design of buildings, parking and loading areas and access; and</li> <li>2. hours of operation; and</li> <li>3. noise, disturbance and loss of privacy of neighbours; and</li> <li>4. screening and landscaping; and</li> <li>5. waste treatment and disposal.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with CON-1: Restricted Discretionary</b></p> <p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the matters of discretion of any infringed standard; and</li> <li>2. the location and design of buildings and any proposed parking and loading areas and access; and</li> <li>3. hours of operation; and</li> <li>4. noise, disturbance and loss of privacy of neighbours; and</li> <li>5. screening and landscaping; and</li> <li>6. waste treatment and disposal.</li> </ol>

<sup>342</sup> Clause 16 RMA<sup>343</sup> Clause 16 RMA

	<p><i>Note:</i></p> <p>2. Any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with SET-R8.</p>	
<b>SETZ-R10</b>	<b>Cafes</b>	
<b>Settlement Zone</b>	<p><b>Activity status: Controlled</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>CON-1</b> All the Standards of this chapter are complied with.</p> <p><b>Matters of control are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the location and design of buildings, parking and loading areas and access; and</li> <li>2. hours of operation; and</li> <li>3. noise, disturbance and loss of privacy of neighbours; and</li> <li>4. screening and landscaping; and</li> <li>5. waste treatment and disposal.</li> </ol> <p><i>Note: Any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with SET-R8.</i></p>	<p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved: Discretionary</b></p> <p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the matters of discretion of any infringed standard; and</li> <li>2. the location and design of buildings and any proposed parking and loading areas and access; and</li> <li>3. hours of operation; and</li> <li>4. noise, disturbance and loss of privacy of neighbours; and</li> <li>5. screening and landscaping; and</li> <li>6. waste treatment and disposal.</li> </ol>
<b>SETZ-R11</b>	<b>Industrial activities within existing industrial buildings</b>	
<b>Settlement Zone</b>	<p><b>Activity status: Controlled</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>CON-1</b> All the Standards of this chapter are complied with; and</p> <p><b>CON-2</b> The activity does not include an offensive trade; and</p> <p><b>Matters of control are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the location and design of parking and loading areas and access; and</li> <li>2. hours of operation; and</li> <li>3. noise, disturbance and loss of privacy of neighbours; and</li> <li>4. screening and landscaping; and</li> <li>5. waste treatment and disposal.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with CON-1: Restricted Discretionary</b></p> <p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the matters of discretion of any infringed standard; and</li> <li>2. the location and design of buildings and any proposed parking and loading areas and access</li> <li>3. hours of operation; and</li> <li>4. noise, disturbance and loss of privacy of neighbours; and</li> <li>5. screening and landscaping; and</li> <li>6. waste treatment and disposal.</li> </ol> <p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with CON-2: Non-Complying</b></p>
<b>SETZ-R12</b>	<b>Emergency Services Facilities</b>	
<b>Settlement Zone</b>	<p><b>Activity status: Controlled</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>CON-1</b> All the Standards of this chapter are complied with.</p>	<p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with CON-1: Restricted Discretionary</b></p> <p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the matters of discretion of any infringed standard; and</li> </ol>

	<p><b>Matters of control are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the location and design of buildings, parking and loading areas and access; and</li> <li>2. hours of operation; and</li> <li>3. noise, disturbance and loss of privacy of neighbours; and</li> <li>4. screening and landscaping; and</li> <li>5. waste treatment and disposal.</li> </ol> <p><i>Note: Any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with SET-R8.</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. the location and design of buildings and any proposed parking and loading areas and access</li> <li>3. hours of operation; and</li> <li>4. noise, disturbance and loss of privacy of neighbours; and</li> <li>5. screening and landscaping; and</li> <li>6. waste treatment and disposal.</li> </ol>
<b>SETZ-R13</b>	<b>Industrial activities not listed in SETZ-R12</b>	
<b>Settlement Zone</b>	<p><b>Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>RDIS-1</b> The activity is an extension to an existing industrial building or activity; and</p> <p><b>RDIS-2</b> The activity does not include an offensive trade; and</p> <p><b>RDIS-3</b> All the Standards of this chapter are complied with.</p> <p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the location and design of buildings, parking and loading areas and access; and</li> <li>2. hours of operation; and</li> <li>3. noise, disturbance and loss of privacy of neighbours; and</li> <li>4. screening and landscaping; and</li> <li>5. the treatment and disposal of stormwater, wastewater and any industrial or trade waste;</li> <li>6. Measures to avoid or mitigate adverse effects.</li> </ol>	<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with RDIS-1 or RDS-3: Discretionary</b>
		<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with RDIS-2: Non-complying</b>
<b>SETZ-R14</b>	<b>Any activities not otherwise listed</b>	
<b>Settlement Zone</b>	<b>Activity status: Discretionary</b>	<b>Activity status where compliance not achieved: Not applicable</b>

## Standards

<b>SETZ-S1</b>	<b>Height of buildings and structures</b>	
<b>Settlement Zone</b>	Buildings and structures, including additions and alterations to buildings and structures, must not exceed a maximum height of 10m.	<p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. dominance of the surrounding area; and</li> </ol>

	<p><u>Towers and poles associated with emergency service facilities must not exceed 15m.</u><sup>344</sup></p> <p><b>Note:</b><sup>345</sup> Height shall be measured<sup>346</sup> from the existing ground level prior to any works commencing.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. overlooking and loss of privacy to adjoining sites; and</li> <li>3. solar access to adjoining sites; and</li> <li>4. landscaping; and</li> <li>5. mitigation measures.</li> </ol>
<b>SETZ-S2</b>	<b>Height in relation to boundary</b>	
<b>Settlement Zone</b>	Buildings and structures must be contained within a building envelope defined by recession planes from points 2.5m above ground level at the boundaries of the site. The method for determining recession planes and any permitted projection is described in APP8 - Recession Planes.	<p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. any impact on privacy and the ability to use outdoor living space; and</li> <li>2. any impact on solar access to living rooms; and</li> <li>3. any adverse effects resulting from the bulk and dominance of built form; and</li> <li>4. any benefits, such as the use of architectural features or steps in the building facade;</li> <li>5. mitigation measures.</li> </ol>
<b>SETZ-S3</b>	<b>Building setbacks</b>	
<b>Settlement Zone</b>	Buildings must be set back a minimum of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 4.5m from any road boundary; and</li> <li>2. 3m from any internal boundary.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. overshadowing of adjacent sites; and</li> <li>2. sunlight and daylight access to internal and external living spaces of adjacent residential sites; and</li> <li>3. loss of privacy to adjacent residential sites; and</li> <li>4. mitigation measures.</li> </ol>
<b>SETZ-S4</b>	<b>Coverage</b>	
<b>Settlement zone</b>	<p><del>The maximum combined building and impervious surface coverage of the site must be 35%.</del></p> <p><u>The combined building coverage and impervious surface coverage of any site must not exceed 35%.</u><sup>347</sup></p>	<p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. availability of land for the purpose of treatment and/or disposal of sewage, stormwater, greywater or trade waste; and</li> <li>2. compatibility with the character and qualities of the zone; and</li> <li>3. visual dominance of buildings; and</li> <li>4. mitigation measures.</li> </ol>
<b>SETZ-S5</b>	<b>Water supply</b>	
<b>Settlement Zone</b>	All activities must: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. be connected to a community drinking water supply; or</li> </ol>	<p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. security of domestic water supply from contamination; and</li> </ol>

<sup>344</sup> FENZ [131.55]<sup>345</sup> ECan [183.4]<sup>346</sup> Clause 16(2) RMA<sup>347</sup> ECan [183.1]

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. be connected to a private drinking water supply; or</li> <li>3. store 45,000 litres of potable water on-site from another source.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. adequacy of storage volume of water for domestic and fire-fighting purposes.</li> </ol>
<b>SETZ-S6</b>	<b>Sewage treatment and disposal</b>	
<b>Settlement Zone</b>	<p>Any activity must:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. be connected to an available sewerage network where one exists; or</li> <li>2. be served by an on-site treatment and sewage disposal system that <u>is permitted or has been consented or approved</u><sup>348</sup> has been consented or approved by the Canterbury Regional Council.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. adverse effects on domestic water supplies; and</li> <li>2. contamination of soil and water.</li> </ol>
<b>SETZ-S7</b>	<b>Manufacturing, altering, repairing, dismantling or processing of materials</b>	
<b>Settlement Zone</b>	<p>All manufacturing, altering, repairing, dismantling or processing of any materials or articles associated with an activity must be carried out within a building.</p>	<p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. nature, scale and intensity of the activity; and</li> <li>2. noise, odour and dust effects on the surrounding area.</li> </ol>
<b>SETZ-S8</b>	<b>Outdoor storage, display and parking areas</b>	
<b>Settlement Zone</b>	<p>Any outdoor storage, display and parking areas located within any road or internal boundary setback under SETZ-S3 must be permanently screened by landscape planting of a minimum width of 2m and minimum height of 2m.</p>	<p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. visual impacts on neighbouring properties and the surrounding area; and</li> <li>2. type and maintenance of landscaping.</li> </ol>
<b>SETZ-S9</b>	<b>Home business</b>	
<b>Settlement Zone</b>	<p>The activity shall ensure that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. there must be no more than two full-time equivalent people engaged in the home business who resides off-site; and</li> <li>2. any retail sales, other than internet-based sales where no customer visits occur, must be limited to the sale of produce grown on the site and handcrafts manufactured on the site.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. scale, intensity and character of business; and</li> <li>2. hours of operation; and</li> <li>3. traffic generation; and</li> <li>4. provision of parking; and</li> <li>5. noise, odour, dust, disturbance and loss of privacy for neighbours; and</li> <li>6. mitigation measures.</li> </ol>

<sup>348</sup> ECan [183.155]

## Definitions

<u>Aircraft and helicopter movement</u>	<u>Means a single aircraft flight operation (landing or departure). Maintenance procedures are excluded.</u> <sup>349</sup>
<u>Commercial Recreational Activities</u>	<u>Means the commercial guiding, training, instructing, transportation or provision of recreation facilities to clients for recreational purposes.</u> <sup>350</sup>
<del>Intensive outdoor primary production</del>	<del>means primary production activities that principally occur within buildings and involve growing fungi, or keeping or rearing livestock (excluding calf rearing for a specified time period) or poultry.</del>
Intensive primary production	<p><u>means primary production activities that:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>involve the keeping or rearing of livestock that principally occurs outdoors, where the regular feed source for the livestock is substantially provided from off-site sources, but excludes:</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>calf-rearing for three months in any calendar year;</u></li> <li><u>pig production for domestic self-subsistence home use;</u></li> <li><u>extensive pig farming;</u></li> <li><u>free range poultry farming; and</u></li> <li><u>the feeding of supplementary feed during adverse weather events such as drought or snow or while stock are temporarily held prior to processing</u></li> </ol> </li> <li><u>are defined as intensive indoor primary production.</u></li> </ol> <p><del>means any activity defined as intensive indoor primary production or intensive outdoor primary production.</del> <sup>351</sup></p>
<u>Permanent airstrip or helicopter landing site</u>	<u>Means any defined area of land intended or designed to be used, whether wholly or partly, used for the landing or departure of aircraft.</u> <sup>352</sup>
<u>Post-harvest facility</u>	<u>Building operated by any number of growers and used for the storage, packing, washing, inspecting and grading of eggs, fruit,</u>

<sup>349</sup> Evans, J [45.1], McAuley, S [57.1], Aubrey, L [59.1], Station Air [61.1], Pemberton, S [64.1], Cessna 180/185 Group et al [201.1], Coldicott, J. M. [118.1], Coldicott, G [254.1]

<sup>350</sup> Rooney Holdings [174.84], Rooney, G.J.H. [191.84], Rooney Group [249.84], Rooney Farms [250.84], Rooney Earthmoving [251.84], TDL [252.84]

<sup>351</sup> Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu [185.11], Federated Farmers [182.15]

<sup>352</sup> Evans, J [45.1], McAuley, S [57.1], Aubrey, L [59.1], Station Air [61.1], Pemberton, S [64.1], Cessna 180/185 Group et al [201.1], Coldicott, J. M. [118.1], Coldicott, G [254.1]

	<p><u>vegetables, or other (natural and unprocessed) primary produce brought to the post-harvest facility from a range of locations, and includes all activities that are an integral aspect of post-harvest operations.</u></p> <p><u>Includes:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>use of the site for the collection and distribution of horticultural products;</u></li> <li>• <u>slicing and dicing agricultural products in preparation for distribution to retail outlets, including the disposal of associated waste material from these activities;</u></li> <li>• <u>preparation and shrink-wrapping horticultural products in preparation for distribution to retail outlets;</u></li> <li>• <u>collection and distribution of agricultural products including the cross loading of trucks used in the collection and delivery of horticultural products; and</u></li> <li>• <u>the on-site servicing and maintenance of vehicles and equipment associated with the activities.</u> <sup>353</sup></li> </ul>
Rural Residential Development — (RPS definition)	<p><del>means zoned residential development outside or on the fringes of urban areas which for primarily low density residential activities, ancillary activities and associated infrastructure.</del> <sup>354</sup></p>

## APP8 – Recession Planes

### Permitted projections above recession planes:

...

- e. Towers and poles associated with an emergency services facility provided that they are no more than 15m in height. <sup>355</sup>

## SCHED16A- Schedule of Precincts Layer

### SCHED16A - Schedule of Precincts Layer

<sup>353</sup> Hort NZ [245.24]

<sup>354</sup> ECan [183.11]

<sup>355</sup> FENZ [131.41], [131.65], [131.66]

Unique Identifier	Name	Zone located
<u>PREC8</u>	<u>PREC8 - Waihi School Precinct</u>	<u>General Rural Zone</u>

## Planning Maps

Amend the Planning maps to include the Waihi School Precinct over:

- 611 Temuka Orari Highway, Temuka, ID: 13056 (Lot 1 DP 46763, CB26B/127)
- 637 Temuka Orari Highway, Temuka, ID: 13051 (Sec 42 RES 389, CB20A/986)

Amend the Planning maps to rezone:

- 42 Burdon Road, RD 21, Geraldine (LOT 3 DP 415886) from GRUZ to RLZ

## 15. Appendix 2 - Recommended Responses to Submissions

### 15.1 Table B1- Rural Definitions

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept / Reject
Keen, Oliver, Forbes <i>et al</i>	46.1	Definitions	Definitions	Intensive Outdoor Primary Production	Opposes the approach to exclude free range poultry farming from the definition of Intensive Outdoor Primary Production and notes inconsistency between how free range poultry farming is considered between the GRUZ, the RLZ and the Māori Purpose Zones.  The approach of other districts within NZ and the Canterbury Air Regional Plan is outlined.  [Refer original submission for full reason].	Amend the definition of <b>Intensive Outdoor Primary Production</b> to include free range poultry farming.  OR  if this preferred relief is not accepted, then: Amend <b>GRUZ R1.PER-4</b> to include a minimum setback for buildings used house stock, to be 100m from the notional boundary of a sensitive activity on a neighbouring site under different ownership in the General Rural Zone (see related submission point).	Reject
Helicopters South Canterbury 2015 Ltd	53.2	Definitions	Definitions	New	Seeks the addition of a definition of agricultural aviation to include primary production, biosecurity, and conservation activities undertaken by agricultural aviation.	Add a definition of <b>Agricultural Aviation Activities</b> to the PDP, as follows:  <i>means the intermittent operation of an aircraft from a rural airstrip or helicopter landing area for primary production activities, and; conservation activities for biosecurity, or biodiversity purposes; including stock management, and the application of fertiliser, agrichemicals, or vertebrate toxic agents (VTA's). For clarity, aircraft includes fixed-wing aeroplanes, helicopters, and unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV's).</i>	Reject
Helicopters South Canterbury 2015 Ltd	53.5	Definitions	Definitions	New	Seeks to have the definition of a DAY as it relates to agricultural aviation activities added to the definitions to support the proposed alternative wording in GRUZ-R14 and NZAAA's proposed rule for NOSZ.	Add a definition of <b>Day</b> , as follows:  <i>A "Day" as it relates to agricultural aircraft activities;</i>  <i>means 10.5 hours aircraft hours conducted between the beginning of civil morning twilight (MCT) and the end of civil evening twilight (ECT).</i>  <i>NOTE. A day is defined in the Civil Aviation rules as: the hours between—</i>  <i>(1) the beginning of morning civil twilight, which is when the centre of the rising sun's disc is 6 degrees below the horizon; and</i>  <i>(2) the end of evening civil twilight, which is when the centre of the setting sun's disc is 6 degrees below the horizon.</i>	Reject
Helicopters South Canterbury 2015 Ltd	53.7	Definitions	Definitions	New	Seeks to have a definition of a Rural Airstrip included in the plan.	Add a definition of <b>Rural airstrip</b> to the PDP, as follows:  <i>means any defined area of land intended or designed to be used, whether wholly or partly, for the landing, departure, movement, or servicing of aircraft in the rural area.</i>	Accept in part
Helicopters South Canterbury 2015 Ltd	53.8	Definitions	Definitions	Primary production	Supports the definition that is consistent with the NPS definition.	Retain the definition as notified.	Accept

Milward Finlay Lobb	60.5	Definitions	Definitions	Residential Visitor Accommodation	Concerned that no maximum length of stay has been provided, therefore what is the difference between long term rental and short term visitor accommodation? Each activity has different adverse effects.	Amend definition of <b>Residential Visitor Accommodation</b> as follows:  <i>means the use of a residential unit for temporary accommodation advertised for a tariff to paying guests that is secondary and incidental to the use of the residential unit as a permanent residence. <u>The length of stay shall not exceed 3 months consecutively.</u></i>	Reject
Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited	86.1	Definitions	Definitions	New	Add a definition of 'agricultural aviation activities' to the plan as these activities are vital for supporting primary production.	Add a new definition:  <b><u>Agricultural aviation activities:</u></b>  <i>means the intermittent operation of an aircraft from a rural airstrip or helicopter landing area for primary production activities, and; conservation activities for biosecurity, or biodiversity purposes; including stock management, and the application of fertiliser, agrichemicals, or vertebrate toxic agents (VTA's). For clarity, aircraft includes fixed-wing aeroplanes, helicopters, and unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV's).</i>	Reject
Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited	86.2	Definitions	Definitions	New	Seek a definition of "day in relation to agricultural aviation" to be added to the PDP. Weather conditions affect the operation of agricultural aircraft often. In a single day, weather can restrict an aircraft's operation to a few hours - typically this can be at the beginning or end of the day as this is when the weather is normally the most calm. Therefore, it is important to recognise the definition of day as defined by civil aviation rules.	Add a new definition:  <b><u>Day [in relation to agricultural aviation]:</u></b>  <i>A "Day" as it relates to agricultural aircraft activities; means 10.5 hours aircraft hours conducted between the beginning of morning civil twilight (MCT) and the end of evening civil twilight (ECT). NOTE. A day is defined in the Civil Aviation rules as: the hours between— (1) the beginning of morning civil twilight, which is when the centre of the rising sun's disc is 6 degrees below the horizon; and (2) the end of evening civil twilight, which is when the centre of the setting sun's disc is 6 degrees below the horizon.</i>	Reject
Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited	86.3	Definitions	Definitions	New	Seeks to have a definition of rural airstrip included in the plan.	Add a new definition:  <b><u>Rural airstrip:</u></b> <i>Rural airstrip; means any defined area of land intended or designed to be used, whether wholly or partly, for the landing, departure, movement, or servicing of aircraft in the rural area.</i>	Accept in part
Dairy Holdings Limited	89.1	Definitions	Definitions	Ancillary rural earthworks	Supports definition of Ancillary rural earthworks.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Dairy Holdings Limited	89.2	Definitions	Definitions	Intensive outdoor primary production	Considers it is not clear as to what is included in the definition. Clarity is requested as to what amounts to 'substantial' in terms of externally sourced food source. Considers that dairy cattle should be excluded from this definition.	Amend the definition of <b>intensive outdoor primary production</b> as follows:  <i>means primary production activities involving the keeping or rearing of livestock that principally occurs outdoors, where the regular feed source for the livestock is substantially provided from off- site sources, <u>and includes [...]</u> but excludes:</i>  <i>a. calf-rearing for three months in any calendar year;</i>  <i>b. pig production for domestic self-subsistence home use;</i>  <i>c. extensive pig farming;</i>	Reject

						<p>d. <u>free range poultry farming</u>;</p> <p>e. <u>farming of dairy cattle</u>; and</p> <p>f. <u>the feeding of supplementary feed during adverse weather events such as drought or snow.</u></p>	
New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association	132.1	Definitions	Definitions	New	Requests a new definition for ‘Agricultural aviation activities’ to include primary production, biosecurity, and conservation activities undertaken by agricultural aviation.	<p>Add a new definition as follows:</p> <p><b><u>Agricultural aviation activities</u></b> means the intermittent operation of an aircraft from a rural airstrip or helicopter landing area for primary production activities, and; conservation activities for biosecurity, or biodiversity purposes; including stock management, and the application of fertiliser, agrichemicals, or vertebrate toxic agents (VTA’s). For clarity, aircraft includes fixed-wing aeroplanes, helicopters, and unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV’s).</p>	Reject
New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association	132.4	Definitions	Definitions	New	The definition of a ‘day’ as it relates to agricultural aviation activities should be added to the definitions to support the proposed alternative wording in GRUZ-R14 and NZAAA’s proposed rule for NOSZ.	<p>Add a new definition as follows:</p> <p><b><u>Day</u></b>  A "Day" as it relates to agricultural aircraft activities <del>means as it relates to agricultural aircraft activities</del>; means 10.5 hours aircraft hours conducted between the beginning of civil morning twilight (MCT) and the end of civil evening twilight (ECT). NOTE. A day is defined in the Civil Aviation rules as: the hours between—</p> <p><u>(1) the beginning of morning civil twilight, which is when the centre of the rising sun’s disc is 6 degrees below the horizon; and</u></p> <p><u>(2) the end of evening civil twilight, which is when the centre of the setting sun’s disc is 6 degrees below the horizon.</u></p>	Reject
New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association	132.8	Definitions	Definitions	Primary Production	Supports the definition of Primary Production that is consistent with the NPS definition.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association	132.9	Definitions	Definitions	New	Seeks to have a definition of a ‘Rural Airstrip’ included in the plan.	<p>Add a new definition as follows:</p> <p><b><u>Rural airstrip</u></b>  means any defined area of land intended or designed to be used, whether wholly or partly, for the landing, departure, movement, or servicing of aircraft in the rural area.</p>	Accept in part
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	156.12	Definitions	Definitions	Cultivation	Not specified.	Retain as notified.	Reject
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	156.16	Definitions	Definitions	Farm quarry	Not specified.	Retain as notified.	Accept

Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	156.17	Definitions	Definitions	Fertiliser	Not specified.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Transpower New Zealand Limited	159.4	Definitions	Definitions	Ancillary Rural Earthworks	The submitter is neutral in respect of the definition of ‘ancillary rural earthworks’, subject to the earthworks that fall under this definition being subject to the rules that provide for earthworks in the National Grid Yard.	1. Retain the definition of ‘ <b>ancillary rural earthworks</b> ’ AND 2. confirm that the activity is subject to the rules that relate to earthworks in the National Grid Yard.	Accept
Fonterra Limited	165.19	Definitions	Definitions	Rural industry	Rural industry: Fonterra supports the definition of rural industry proposed.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Fonterra Limited	165.20	Definitions	Definitions	Rural residential development	Opposes the definition of rural residential development. The National Planning Standards provide for a Rural Lifestyle Zone (as does the PDP) and considers that the District Plan wording regarding this category of development should be consistent. As such, all references to rural residential should be amended to rural lifestyle.	Amend the definition of <b>Rural Residential Development</b> as follows:  <del><b>Rural residential</b></del> <b><u>lifestyle development</u></b> : [...]	Accept
Fonterra Limited	165.22	Definitions	Definitions	New	Considers the PDP should include a definition of strategic rural industry activities.	Add a <b>new definition</b> to the PDP as follows:  <b><u>Strategic rural industry activities means: any activity that is associated with the processing, testing, storage, handling, packaging or distribution of products manufactured at sites in the Special Purpose Zone - Strategic Rural Industry.</u></b>	Reject
Road Metals Company Limited	169.3	Definitions	Definitions	Quarry	Supports the definition of ‘quarry’ as it is consistent with National Planning Standards.	Retain the definition of <b>Quarry</b> as notified.	Accept
Road Metals Company Limited	169.4	Definitions	Definitions	Quarrying Activities	Supports the definition of ‘quarrying activities’ in so far as it encompasses the range of activities associated with quarrying, however, as per submission point 169.2, the definition of cleanfill does limit the ability of quarry operators to rehabilitate quarries and will not aid in waste minimisation.	1. Retain the definition of <b>Quarrying Activities</b> as notified; AND  2. amend <b>Rules</b> surrounding quarrying to create a more integrated and efficient rule framework. Refer to the submitter’s comments on GRUZ-R16.	Accept in part
Road Metals Company Limited	169.6	Definitions	Definitions	Rural Industry	Conditionally supports the definition of ‘rural industry’ as taken from the NPS. However, it is assumed that the storage of vehicles and machinery associated with quarrying activities are included within the definition.	1. Retain definition of <b>Rural Industry</b> , on the basis that the definition encompasses the storage of vehicles and machinery associated with quarrying.  OR  2. If the storage of vehicles and machinery is not included as above, the PDP should be amended to recognise these activities, which support and service primary production activities, are appropriate in the GRUZ.	Accept

Fulton Limited	Hogan	170.3	Definitions	Definitions	Quarry	Supports the definition of quarry as it is consistent with National Planning Standards.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Fulton Limited	Hogan	170.4	Definitions	Definitions	Quarrying activities	Supports the definition of quarrying activities in so far as it encompasses the range of activities associated with quarrying, however, as per other submission point 170.2, the definition of cleanfill does limit the ability of quarry operators to rehabilitate quarries and will not aid in waste minimisation.	1. Retain the definition of <b>Quarrying Activities</b> as notified; AND  2. amend <b>Rules</b> surrounding quarrying to create a more integrated and efficient rule framework. Refer to the submitter's comments on GRUZ-R16.	Accept in part
Fulton Limited	Hogan	170.6	Definitions	Definitions	Rural Industry	Conditionally supports the definition of rural industry as taken from the NPS. However, it is assumed that the storage of vehicles and machinery associated with quarrying activities are included within the definition.	1. Retain definition of <b>Rural Industry</b> , on the basis that the definition encompasses the storage of vehicles and machinery associated with quarrying.  OR  2. If the storage of vehicles and machinery is not included as above, the PDP should be amended to recognise these activities, which support and service primary production activities, are appropriate in the GRUZ.	Accept
Silver Fern Farms		172.5	Definitions	Definitions	Intensive Outdoor Primary Production	The submitter seeks to ensure that the supplementary feeding of stock being temporarily held at a meat processing plant is not inadvertently defined as 'Intensive Outdoor Primary Production'. Otherwise, a non-complying activity status under Rule GIZ-R5 would inappropriately apply.	Amend the definition of <b>Intensive Primary Production</b> as follows:  <i>INTENSIVE OUTDOOR PRIMARY PRODUCTION</i>  [...]  <i>e. the feeding of supplementary feed during adverse weather events such as drought or snow or while stock are temporarily held prior to processing.</i>	Accept
Alliance Group Limited		173.5	Definitions	Definitions	Intensive Outdoor Primary Production	The submitter seeks to ensure that the supplementary feeding of stock being temporarily held at a meat processing plant is not inadvertently defined as 'Intensive Outdoor Primary Production'. Otherwise, a non-complying activity status under Rule GIZ-R5 would inappropriately apply.	Amend the definition of <b>Intensive Outdoor Primary Production</b> as follows:  [...]  <i>e. the feeding of supplementary feed during adverse weather events such as drought or snow or while stock are temporarily held prior to processing.</i>	Accept
Rooney Holdings Limited		174.10	Definitions	Definitions	Permanent workers accommodation	Oppose the definition as it only provides for full-time workers accommodation.	Amend definition of Permanent Workers Accommodation to provide for the accommodation of part-time workers of a primary production activity, or a rural industrial activity.	Accept in part
Rooney Holdings Limited		174.11	Definitions	Definitions	Quarrying activities	Support in part.	Amend definition of <b>Quarrying Activities</b> as follows:  <i>Means the extraction, processing (including crushing, screening, washing, and blending), transport, storage, sale and recycling of aggregates (clay, silt, rock, sand), deposition and removal of overburden material, rehabilitation, landscaping and clean filling of the quarry, and the use of land and accessory buildings for offices, workshops and car parking areas associated with the operation of the quarry.</i>	Reject

Rural Contractors New Zealand	178.1	Definitions	Definitions	New	Considers that a rural contractor depot would currently be captured under the definition of 'rural industry', resulting in a restricted discretionary activity resource consent. A permitted activity is considered more appropriate for small-scale rural contractor depots. The definition is proposed to support the associated GRUZ rules.	Add a new definition for <b>Rural contractor depot</b> as follows:  <b><u>Rural contractor depot</u></b>  <i><u>means the land and buildings used for the purposes of storing or maintaining machinery, equipment and associated goods and supplies associated with a rural contracting business that directly supports, services or is dependent on primary production.</u></i>  [See submission on GRUZ for relief sought on associated rules]	Reject
Rural Contractors New Zealand	178.2	Definitions	Definitions	Rural Industry	Supports the definition as appropriate to align with the National Planning Standards 2019.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Federated Farmers	182.11	Definitions	Definitions	Farm Quarry	Supports this definition.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Federated Farmers	182.12	Definitions	Definitions	Fertiliser	Supports this definition.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Federated Farmers	182.13	Definitions	Definitions	Intensive Indoor Primary Production	Seeks deletion of definition of 'Intensive Primary Production', as this can be defined within the definition of 'Intensive Primary Production'.	Delete the definition for <b>Intensive Indoor Primary Production</b> ; AND Instead include within the definition of 'Intensive Primary Production'.	Accept
Federated Farmers	182.14	Definitions	Definitions	Intensive Outdoor Primary Production	Seeks to deletion definition of 'Intensive Outdoor Primary Production' as it can be defined within the definition of 'Intensive Primary Production'	Delete definition for <b>Intensive Outdoor Primary Production</b> ; AND Instead include within the definition of 'Intensive Primary Production'.	Accept
Federated Farmers	182.15	Definitions	Definitions	Intensive Primary Production	Seeks a broader definition of 'Intensive Primary Production', encompassing Intensive Indoor Primary Production; Intensive Outdoor Primary Production; and Intensively Farmed Stock.  Opposes the inclusion of feeding 'supplementary feed during adverse weather events such as drought or snow'. Supplementary feed in an adverse weather event is critical for stock welfare.  The summary of .2 misses key points, the proposed definitions could have unintended consequences such as capturing dairy grazing bulls which are not seen as intensively farmed animals, or dry cattle stock on nonirrigated land.  [Refer to original submission for full details].	1. Delete the notified definition of <b>Intensive Primary Production</b> and replace with a new definition as follows:  <b><u>Intensive Primary Production</u></b>  <i><u>Refers to any of the following:</u></i>  <i><u>(a) commercial livestock kept and fed permanently in buildings or indoor enclosures on a particular site, where the stocking density precludes the maintenance of pasture or ground cover (e.g., pig farming);</u></i>  <i><u>(b) Land and buildings used for the commercial boarding and/or breeding of cats, dogs and other domestic cove€(c) farming of mushrooms or other fungi;</u></i>  <i><u>(d) dairy cattle, including cows, that are being milked on irrigated €d;</u></i>  <i><u>(e) Intensive winter grazing, that does not follow council rules.</u></i>  AND  2. Any consequential amendments required as a result of the relief sought.	Accept in part
Federated Farmers	182.19	Definitions	Definitions	Non-Intensive Primary Production	Supports this definition.	Retain as notified.	

Federated Farmers	182.21	Definitions	Definitions	New	Notes that the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land came into force on 12 October 2022 and contains an appropriate definition for land-based primary production.	1. Add a definition for <b>Land-based Primary Production</b> as defined in the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land 2022 into the District Plan.  AND 2. Any consequential amendments required as a result of the relief sought.	Reject
Federated Farmers	182.22	Definitions	Definitions	Quarry	Considers it is appropriate that 'Farm Quarries' are excluded and there is cross reference between the definitions.	1. Amend the definition of <b>Quarry</b> to specifically exclude farm quarries and their activities. AND 2. Any consequential amendments required as a result of the relief sought.	Reject
Federated Farmers	182.23	Definitions	Definitions	Quarrying Activities	Considers it is appropriate that 'Farm Quarries' are excluded and there is cross reference between the definitions.	1. Amend the definition of <b>Quarrying Activities</b> to specifically exclude farm quarries and their activities.  AND 2. Any consequential amendments required as a result of the relief sought.	Reject
Federated Farmers	182.7	Definitions	Definitions	Ancillary Rural Earthworks	Seeks the inclusion of new definition for 'Ancillary Rural Earthworks' into the district plan to encompass commonplace activities that should not have to apply for resource consent.  [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Delete the notified definition of <b>Ancillary Rural Earthworks</b> and replace with a new definition as follows:  <i>Ancillary Rural Earthworks</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>any earthworks or disturbance of soil associated with cultivation, land preparation (including the establishment of sediment and erosion control measures), for planting and growing operations of crops and pasture;</i></li> <li><i>the harvesting of agricultural and horticultural crops (farming) and forests (forestry); and planting trees, removing trees and horticultural root ripping;</i></li> <li><i>the maintenance and construction of facilities typically associated with farming and forestry activities. This includes (but is not limited to): farm/forestry tracks, roads, vehicle manoeuvring areas and landings, stock marshalling yards, stock races, silage pits, offal pits, farm effluent ponds, feeding pads, digging post holes, fencing and sediment control measures, drilling bores, the installation and maintenance of services such as water pipes and troughs, off-stream farm water storage dams, hard stand areas for stock, fertiliser storage pads, airstrips and helipads; and</i></li> <li><i>farm quarries where quarry winnings are only used within the farm quarry.</i></li> </ul> AND Any consequential amendments required as a result of the relief sought.	Reject

Federated Farmers	182.9	Definitions	Definitions	Cultivation	Seeks to 1. Amend the definition of ‘Cultivation’ to better fit the process of cultivation, that better represents the process occurring in the district.	1. Delete the notified definition of <b>Cultivation</b> and replace with a new definition as follows: <i>Cultivation:</i> <u>means any process that involves the turning or tilling the land. It can include:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Pasture renewal</u></li> <li><u>Cropping (such as maize)</u></li> <li><u>Intensive farming (such as commercial vegetable growing)</u></li> </ul> OR 2. Words to similar effect; AND 3. Any consequential amendments required as a result of the relief sought.	Reject
Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury)	183.11	Definitions	Definitions	Rural Residential Development	Opposes the use of Rural residential development as this term is not used in the plan and has been superseded by the National Planning Standard provisions for the Rural Lifestyle Zone.	Delete the definition of <b>Rural Residential Development</b> .	Accept
Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu	185.11	Definitions	Definitions	General	Considers the definitions for farming reduce the clarity and make understanding the potential effect of rules unclear. There are two definitions from the NPS and 6 new ones developed for this plan. These need to be simplified.	Amend the PDP to clarify and simplify the ‘farming’ based definitions, being: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Non-Intensive Primary Production;</li> <li>Intensive Primary Production;</li> <li>Intensive Outdoor Primary Production;</li> <li>Intensively Farmed Stock.</li> </ul>	Accept in part
GJH Rooney	191.10	Definitions	Definitions	Permanent workers accommodation	Oppose the definition as it only provides for full-time workers accommodation.	Amend definition of Permanent Workers Accommodation to provide for the accommodation of part-time workers of a primary production activity, or a rural industrial activity.	Accept in part
GJH Rooney	191.11	Definitions	Definitions	Quarrying activities	Support in part.	Amend definition of <b>Quarrying Activities</b> as follows: <i>Means the extraction, processing (including crushing, screening, washing, and blending), transport, storage, sale and recycling of aggregates (clay, silt, rock, sand), deposition <u>and removal</u> of overburden material, rehabilitation, landscaping and clean filling of the quarry, and the use of land and accessory buildings for offices, workshops and car parking areas associated with the operation of the quarry.</i>	Reject
Aggregate and Quarry Association	224.3	Definitions	Definitions	Primary Production	Supports the definition taken from the National Planning Standards.	None specified.	Accept
Aggregate and Quarry Association	224.4	Definitions	Definitions	Quarry	Supports the definition taken from the National Planning Standards.	None specified.	Accept
Aggregate and Quarry Association	224.5	Definitions	Definitions	Quarrying activities	Supports the definition taken from the National Planning Standards.	None specified.	Accept
Horticulture New Zealand	245.11	Definitions	Definitions	Intensive Primary Production	Requests that to assist interpretation and administration of the plan, a specific exclusion for greenhouses should be provided.	Amend the definition of <b>Intensive primary production</b> as follows: <i>means any activity defined as intensive indoor primary production or intensive outdoor primary production <u>and excludes greenhouses.</u></i>	Reject

Horticulture New Zealand	245.17	Definitions	Definitions	Permanent workers accommodation	Considers worker accommodation is necessary to enable horticultural activity.	Retain as notified.	Reject
Horticulture New Zealand	245.19	Definitions	Definitions	Primary production	Supports the use of this term.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Horticulture New Zealand	245.22	Definitions	Definitions	Rural industry	Notes the National Planning Standard includes a definition for rural industry which is useful to differentiate between industrial activities and those which are aligned with primary production.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Horticulture New Zealand	245.23	Definitions	Definitions	Rural produce manufacturing	Supports a definition for Rural Produce Manufacturing.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Horticulture New Zealand	245.24	Definitions	Definitions	Seasonal workers accommodation	Supports the definition and note that it refers to 'post-harvest facility' which should be defined.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Horticulture New Zealand	245.31	Definitions	Definitions	New	Considers the PDP should include a definition of post-harvest facility.	<p>Add new definition to the PDP as follows:</p> <p><b><u>Post-harvest facility.</u></b></p> <p><u>Building operated by any number of growers and used for the storage, packing, washing, inspecting and grading of eggs, fruit, vegetables, or other (natural and unprocessed) primary produce brought to the post-harvest facility from a range of locations, and includes all activities that are an integral aspect of post-harvest operations.</u></p> <p><u>Includes:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>use of the site for the collection and distribution of horticultural products;</u></li> <li><u>slicing and dicing agricultural products in preparation for distribution to retail outlets, including the disposal of associated waste material from these activities;</u></li> <li><u>preparation and shrink-wrapping horticultural products in preparation for distribution to retail outlets;</u></li> <li><u>collection and distribution of agricultural products including the cross loading of trucks used in the collection and delivery of horticultural products; and</u></li> <li><u>the on-site servicing and maintenance of vehicles and equipment associated with the activities.</u></li> </ul>	Accept
Horticulture New Zealand	245.32	Definitions	Definitions	New	Considers the plan should include provisions for frost fans, including a definition.	<p>Add a new definition of <b>Frost fan</b> as follows:</p> <p><b><u>Frost Fan</u></b></p> <p><u>Frost fans means a land-based device designed or adapted to mitigate frost damage by fanning warmer air over potentially frost-affected surfaces, and includes any motive source, the support structure and power source.</u></p>	Accept (interim)
Horticulture New Zealand	245.34	Definitions	Definitions	New	Notes the term rural airstrip is used in the rules but not defined.	<p>Add a new definition to the PDP as follows:</p> <p><b><u>Rural airstrip:</u></b></p>	Reject

						<u>means any defined area of land intended or designed to be used, whether wholly or partly, for the landing, departure, movement, or servicing of aircraft in the rural area.</u>										
Horticulture New Zealand	245.5	Definitions	Definitions	Ancillary Rural Earthworks	Supports the plans approach to ancillary rural earthworks and the specific provision for earthworks that might be associated with a biosecurity response for unwanted organisms. The definition refers to farming activities which are not defined.	Amend the definition of <b>Ancillary rural earthworks</b> as follows:  <i>means any earthworks associated with the maintenance and construction of facilities typically associated with <del>farming</del> <u>primary production</u> activities, including, but not limited to, farm tracks/roads (up to 6m wide), landings, stock races, silage pits, farm drains, farm effluent ponds, feeding pads, fencing and erosion and sediment control measures, and burying of material infected by unwanted organisms (as declared by Ministry for Primary Industries Chief Technical Officer or an emergency declared by the Minister under the Biosecurity Act 1993).</i>	Accept									
Horticulture New Zealand	245.6	Definitions	Definitions	Artificial crop protection structure	These are distinct structures which can require a different management approach.	Retain as notified.	Accept									
Horticulture New Zealand	245.8	Definitions	Definitions	Crop support structure	Supports the proposed definition.	Retain as notified.	Accept									
New Zealand Pork Industry Board	247.2	Definitions	Definitions	Primary Production	Considers that the plan interpretation and administration would be improved through the addition of a nesting table in the definition.	Amend the definition of <b>Primary production</b> to include the following ‘nesting’ table: <table><tr><td><u>Primary Production</u></td><td><u>Intensive Primary Production</u></td><td><u>Intensive Indoor Primary Production</u></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td><u>Intensive Outdoor Primary Production (Pig Farming)</u></td></tr><tr><td></td><td><u>Extensive Pig Farming</u></td><td></td></tr></table>	<u>Primary Production</u>	<u>Intensive Primary Production</u>	<u>Intensive Indoor Primary Production</u>			<u>Intensive Outdoor Primary Production (Pig Farming)</u>		<u>Extensive Pig Farming</u>		Accept in part
<u>Primary Production</u>	<u>Intensive Primary Production</u>	<u>Intensive Indoor Primary Production</u>														
		<u>Intensive Outdoor Primary Production (Pig Farming)</u>														
	<u>Extensive Pig Farming</u>															
New Zealand Pork Industry Board	247.3	Definitions	Definitions	New	Considers that Mobile Pig Shelters (being partially or fully roofed) would fall within the NPS definition of building and structure. The plan should provide relief from the rules for buildings and structures as they might apply to mobile pig shelters.	Add a new definition of <b>Ancillary buildings and structures (Primary Production)</b> for ancillary buildings and structures that support and are subsidiary to a primary production use. Mobile pig shelters to be included in this definition.	Reject									
New Zealand Pork Industry Board	247.4	Definitions	Definitions	Ancillary Rural Earthworks	The submitter supports the wording of this definition that includes the provision for the burying of infected material for biosecurity reasons.	Retain as notified.	Accept									
New Zealand Pork Industry Board	247.5	Definitions	Definitions	Intensive indoor primary production	The submitter supports the clarity the inclusion of the national planning standard definition brings.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part									
New Zealand Pork Industry Board	247.6	Definitions	Definitions	Intensive outdoor primary production	The submitter supports the clarity the inclusion of this definition brings.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part									
New Zealand Pork Industry Board	247.7	Definitions	Definitions	Extensive pig farming	The submitter the supports clarity the inclusion of this definition brings.	Retain as notified.	Accept									
Rooney Group Limited	249.10	Definitions	Definitions	Permanent workers accommodation	Oppose the definition as it only provides for full-time workers accommodation.	Amend definition of Permanent Workers Accommodation to provide for the accommodation of part-time workers of a primary production activity, or a rural industrial activity.	Accept in part									
Rooney Group Limited	249.11	Definitions	Definitions	Quarrying activities	Support in part.	Amend definition of <b>Quarrying Activities</b> as follows:	Reject									

						<i>Means the extraction, processing (including crushing, screening, washing, and blending), transport, storage, sale and recycling of aggregates (clay, silt, rock, sand), deposition <u>and removal</u> of overburden material, rehabilitation, landscaping and clean filling of the quarry, and the use of land and accessory buildings for offices, workshops and car parking areas associated with the operation of the quarry.</i>	
Rooney Farms Limited	250.10	Definitions	Definitions	Permanent workers accommodation	Oppose the definition as it only provides for full-time workers accommodation.	Amend definition of Permanent Workers Accommodation to provide for the accommodation of part-time workers of a primary production activity, or a rural industrial activity.	Accept in part
Rooney Farms Limited	250.11	Definitions	Definitions	Quarrying activities	Support in part.	Amend definition of <b>Quarrying Activities</b> as follows:  <i>Means the extraction, processing (including crushing, screening, washing, and blending), transport, storage, sale and recycling of aggregates (clay, silt, rock, sand), deposition <u>and removal</u> of overburden material, rehabilitation, landscaping and clean filling of the quarry, and the use of land and accessory buildings for offices, workshops and car parking areas associated with the operation of the quarry.</i>	Reject
Rooney Earthmoving Limited	251.10	Definitions	Definitions	Permanent workers accommodation	Oppose the definition as it only provides for full-time workers accommodation.	Amend definition of Permanent Workers Accommodation to provide for the accommodation of part-time workers of a primary production activity, or a rural industrial activity.	Accept in part
Rooney Earthmoving Limited	251.11	Definitions	Definitions	Quarrying activities	Support in part.	Amend definition of <b>Quarrying Activities</b> as follows:  <i>Means the extraction, processing (including crushing, screening, washing, and blending), transport, storage, sale and recycling of aggregates (clay, silt, rock, sand), deposition <u>and removal</u> of overburden material, rehabilitation, landscaping and clean filling of the quarry, and the use of land and accessory buildings for offices, workshops and car parking areas associated with the operation of the quarry.</i>	Reject
Timaru Developments Limited	252.10	Definitions	Definitions	Permanent workers accommodation	Oppose the definition as it only provides for full-time workers accommodation.	Amend definition of Permanent Workers Accommodation to provide for the accommodation of part-time workers of a primary production activity, or a rural industrial activity.	Accept in part
Timaru Developments Limited	252.11	Definitions	Definitions	Quarrying activities	Support in part.	Amend definition of <b>Quarrying Activities</b> as follows:  <i>Means the extraction, processing (including crushing, screening, washing, and blending), transport, storage, sale and recycling of aggregates (clay, silt, rock, sand), deposition <u>and removal</u> of overburden material, rehabilitation, landscaping and clean filling of the quarry, and the use of land and accessory buildings for offices, workshops and car parking areas associated with the operation of the quarry.</i>	Reject

## 15.2 General Rural Zone

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
Rooney Holdings Limited	174.5	General	General	General	Considers land-based gravel extraction is important to continuity of supply and consistency of gravel quality. Request the proposed plan to introduce a gravel extraction overlay across land where existing land-based gravel extraction and clean fill deposition occurs. Such a layer should recognise and provide for this activity as well as protecting the sites from encroachment of sensitive activities in a way that the proposed plan has recognised and protected primary production.	Add a new <b>Gravel Extraction Overlay</b> with relevant provisions, which: 1. includes land where existing land-based gravel extraction and clean fill deposition occurs; and 2. recognise and provide for gravel extraction activity as well as protecting the sites from encroachment of sensitive activities in a way that the proposed plan has recognised and protected primary production.	Reject
GJH Rooney	191.5	General	General	General	As above.	As above.	Reject
Rooney Group Limited	249.5	General	General	General	As above.	As above.	Reject
Rooney Farms Limited	250.5	General	General	General	As above.	As above.	Reject
Rooney Earthmoving Limited	251.5	General	General	General	As above.	As above.	Reject
Timaru Developments Limited	252.5	General	General	General	As above.	As above.	Reject
NZ Frost Fans Limited	255.28	Planning Maps	Non statutory layer		To support appropriate noise and reverse sensitivity provisions relating to frost fans, the submitter requests that the location of frost fans should be collected and included in a non- statutory layer in order to implement the NPS-HPL.	Amend the Planning Maps to include the location of frost fans as a non-statutory layer.	Accept (interim)
Bruce Eggleton	37.2	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	General	General	Opposes that farming now requires another form of consent when there are already requirements for consents from ECan.  The submitter questions the cost to administrate this.  [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	None specified.	Reject
Timaru District Council	42.46	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	General	General	Due to climate change, the risk associated with wildfires is expected to increase across many parts of the District. Additionally, such risks further increase when vegetation planting occurs in close proximity to	Amend the Introduction to the <b>GRUZ- General Rural Zone</b> as follows:  [...]  <u>Many people also live in the General Rural Zone and are accustomed to a level of amenity and the character of the zone. These people also</u>	Accept in part

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
					<p>where people live and work. This matter is not sufficiently addressed in the PDP.</p> <p>A new policy and rule and changes to the introduction of this chapter are suggested to capture this.</p>	<p><u><i>need to be protected from amenity and fire risk effects associated with rural land uses such as woodlots and shelterbelts.</i></u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add a new policy to the <b>General Rural Zone</b> Chapter:</p> <p><b><u>GRUZ-PXX</u></b></p> <p><u><i>Manage the planting of any woodlot or shelterbelt if it is located in a position that it increase the wildfire risk on any neighbouring residential property.</i></u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend <b>GRUZ-R15 Shelterbelts and woodlots</b>, as follows:</p> <p><b><u>PER-3</u></b></p> <p><u><i>Any shelterbelt or woodlot shall comply with the following separation distances, measured from the outside extent of the canopy:</i></u></p> <p><u><i>a) 30m from any residential unit or other principal building on an adjoining property; and</i></u></p> <p><u><i>b) 30m from any zone that is not a rural zone; and</i></u></p> <p><u><i>c) 5m from any adjoining legally established accessway to a residential unit or other principal building.</i></u></p> <p>Add a new <b>Matters of discretion</b>, as follows:</p> <p><u><i>[...]</i></u></p> <p><u><i>5. tree species, and</i></u></p> <p><u><i>6. wildfire risk on buildings.</i></u></p>	
Fenlea Farms Limited	171.1	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	General	General	<p>Oppose to any objectives, policies, rules and standards of the GRUZ in relation to the submitter's property at 158 Prattley Road, Timaru and 94 Milford-Clandeboyne Road, Timaru because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Intensively farmed stock is not expressly authorised within any zone and should be provided for in this zone;</li> </ul>	<p>1. Amend <b>GRUZ-R1</b> to permit primary production, intensive primary production and intensively farmed stock</p> <p>2. Amend <b>GRUZ-O1</b> to provide for primary production, intensive primary production and intensively farmed stock</p> <p>3. Any alternative relief that would address submitters concerns.</p>	Reject

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Intensively farmed stock should be protected under GRUZ-O3;</li> <li>Intensively farmed stock should be provided as a permitted activity under GRUZ-R1.</li> </ul>		
Alastair Joseph Rooney	177.3	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	General	General	<p>Opposes any objectives, policies, rules, standards and schedules of the GRUZ in relation to the overlay relating to the Properties because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Intensively farmed stock is not expressly authorised within any zone and should be provided for in this zone;</li> <li>Intensively farmed stock should be protected under GRUZ-O3;</li> <li>Intensively farmed stock should be provided as a permitted activity under GRUZ-R1.</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend <b>GRUZ-R1</b> to permit primary production, intensive primary production and intensively farmed stock</li> <li>Amend <b>GRUZ-O1</b> to provide for primary production, intensive primary production and intensively farmed stock</li> <li>Any alternative relief that would address submitters concerns.</li> </ol>	Reject
Federated Farmers	182.180	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	General	General	<p>Considers the PDP plan has strayed into private property rights through dictating what can and cannot be done on rural production land. Farmers undertake low impact subdivision for a variety of reasons. The proposed chapter has taken away any flexibility for farmers to subdivide their land for specific purposes without undermining the primary production or life-style value of the remaining land.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend (or create a new) overview, objectives, policies, rules, and standards in the <b>GRUZ - General Rural Zone</b> chapter to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>recognise and provide for private property rights;</li> <li>allow landowners to subdivide land for specific purposes such as creating lifestyle lots and lots for family members (amongst other matters)</li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p>AND</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any consequential amendments required as a result of the relief sought.</li> </ol>	Reject
K J Rooney Limited	197.1	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	General	General	<p>Opposed to any objectives, policies, rules, standards and schedules of the GRUZ in relation to the overlay relating to the Properties because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Intensively farmed stock is not expressly authorised within any zone and should be provided for in this zone;</li> <li>Intensively farmed stock should be protected under GRUZ-O3;</li> <li>Intensively farmed stock should be provided as a permitted activity under GRUZ-R1.</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend <b>GRUZ-R1</b> to permit primary production, intensive primary production and intensively farmed stock</li> <li>Amend <b>GRUZ-O1</b> to provide for primary production, intensive primary production and intensively farmed stock</li> <li>Any alternative relief that would address submitters concerns.</li> </ol>	Reject
Horticulture New Zealand	245.103	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	General	General	<p>The submitter outlines the difference between seasonal worker accommodation which is temporary and often communal living arrangements, being quite distinct from permanent worker accommodation which might support a full time employee and their family. Considers that the district plan will provide a planning framework for the</p>	<p>Supports addition of <b>GRUZ-19</b>.</p>	Accept

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
					community for at least the next decade and the submitter is supportive of the inclusion of a definition for seasonal workers accommodation. It is noted that several district plans have taken the approach of providing for such facilities based on a concept of shared kitchen and ablution facilities and separate sleeping quarters. This type of facility is cost efficient and adequately provides for seasonal accommodation.		
NZ Pork	247.18	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	General	General	The submitter generally supports the provisions for intensive primary production; the permitted activity status and associate standards for intensive primary production and the approach to rely on regional plans to address odour and dust from intensive farming activity.	None specified.  [note more detailed submission points on individual provisions].	Accept
NZ Frost Fans Limited	255.17	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	General	General	The provisions of the General Rural Chapter need to be strengthened and/or provisions added to adequately give effect to the NPS - HPL, as the PDP is:  1. Not ensuring the protection of highly productive land as defined in the NPS - HPL;  2. Not prioritising the use of highly productive land for land based production activities;  3. Not adequately protecting highly productive land from inappropriate (non-production) use and development,  4. Not managing reverse sensitivity effects in a manner that may constrain land based primary production activities on highly productive land.  Provisions separating non-productive uses from the effects of productive uses will be necessary. This would include avoiding the establishment of non-production uses, separation and noise insulation requirements for sensitive and non-productive uses. This includes GRUZ-O1, GRUZ-O2, GRUZ-O4, GRUZ-P1, GRUZ-P3, GRUZ-P5, GRUZ-P8, GRUZ-P9, 7 GRUZ-R4, GRUZ-R7, GRUZ-R8, GRUZ-R10, GRUZ-S1, and GRUZ-S4.	Amend the objectives, policies and methods and / or included to give effect to the NPS-HPL.	Reject
Horticulture New Zealand	245.102	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Introduction	General	Supports the introduction and references to the GRUZ is characterised by a wide range of primary production activities and specific recognition of the importance of the land resource in providing for the essential health needs of people and communities	Retain <b>Introduction</b> as notified.	Accept

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
					through food production. This aligns with s5(2) of the RMA and gives effects to the NPS-HPL 2022.		
	1.2	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O1 Purpose of the General Rural Zone	<p>Considers rather than focus solely on primary production, the objective should focus on supporting rural communities to generate income by altering/diversifying income streams, primary production should not be the sole focus.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-O1 Purpose of the General Rural Zone</b> as follows:</p> <p><i>The General Rural Zone predominantly provides for primary production, including intensive primary production, as well as a <del>limited range of activities that support primary production</del>, range of activities that support rural communities, including associated rural industry, and other activities that suit a rural location.</i></p>	Reject
Bruce Speirs	66.36	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O1 Purpose of the General Rural Zone	<p>Considers that since allotments in this zone vary in size, it would be inappropriate to apply the term large to many of these.</p>	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-O2 Purpose of the General Rural Zone</b> as follows:</p> <p><i>The character and qualities of the General Rural Zone comprise:</i></p> <p><del>1. large allotments with large areas of open space; and</del></p> <p>2. <i>a working environment of mostly utilitarian buildings and structures where primary production generates noise, odour, light overspill and traffic, often on a cyclic and seasonable basis; and</i></p> <p><i>[...]</i></p>	Reject
Dairy Holdings Limited	89.15	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O1 Purpose of the General Rural Zone	Supports this objective.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Ministry of Education	106.21	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O1 Purpose of the General Rural Zone	Support GRUZ-O1 as it provides for a range of activities, such as educational facilities, to meet the needs of local communities and in turn support a productive work environment.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	131.34	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O1 Purpose of the General Rural Zone	Supports GRUZ-O1 to the extent that the policy allows for activities of a limited scale which support other activities that require a rural location.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Radio New Zealand Limited	152.52	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O1 Purpose of the General Rural Zone	Supports GRUZ-O1, particularly the direction that the zone predominantly provides for activities that require a rural location.	Retain as notified	Accept
Fonterra Limited	165.124	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O1 Purpose of the General Rural Zone	It is appropriate that the General Rural Zone provides for primary production and activities that support primary production, such as rural industry.	Retain as notified.	Accept

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
Road Metals Company Limited	169.38	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O1 Purpose of the General Rural Zone	Supports GRUZ-O1 as it recognises the role of primary production in the rural landscape.	Not specified.	Accept
Fulton Hogan Limited	170.40	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O1 Purpose of the General Rural Zone	Supports GRUZ-O1 as it recognises the role of primary production in the rural landscape.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Silver Fern Farms	172.110	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O1 Purpose of the General Rural Zone	Considers it is appropriate to recognise that primary production is supported by other activities (like rural industry) that rely on locating in the rural environment.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Alliance Group Limited	173.112	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O1 Purpose of the General Rural Zone	Supports recognising that the General Rural Zone predominantly provides for primary production and a limited range of activities that support primary production.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Rural Contractors New Zealand	178.4	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O1 Purpose of the General Rural Zone	Supports the objective as it recognises the importance of providing for activities (such as rural industry) that support primary production and require a rural location.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Federated Farmers	182.181	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O1 Purpose of the General Rural Zone	Supports the objective.	1. Retain as notified; OR 2. Wording with similar effect.	Accept
Horticulture New Zealand	245.104	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O1 Purpose of the General Rural Zone	Supports this key objective and the outcomes sought for the GRUZ. Support the objective package that provides linkages to the strategic directions.	Retain as notified.	Accept
NZ Frost Fans Limited	255.18	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O1 Purpose of the General Rural Zone	Support this objective as it generally gives effect to NPS-HPL.	1. Amend the objectives, policies and methods of the PDP and / or included to give effect to the NPS-HPL.  AND/OR 2. Retain as notified.	Reject
Helicopters South Canterbury 2015 Ltd	53.19	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O2 Character and qualities of the General Rural Zone	The description of the rural zone is important to ensure that it adequately captures it can be noisy from primary production and associated activities. Sensitive activities locating in a rural zone should not be anticipating a higher level of amenity in a working rural production environment. This is inconsistent with GRUZ-O3 which seeks to protect primary production from sensitive activities	<i>Amend GRU-O2 Character and qualities of the General Rural Zone</i> as follows:  [...]  <i>1. a working environment of mostly utilitarian buildings and structures where primary production <u>and associated activities</u> generates noise, odour, light overspill and traffic, often on a cyclic and seasonable basis;</i>	Reject

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
						<p><del>2. higher levels of amenity immediately around sensitive activities and zone boundaries; and</del></p> <p>[...]</p>	
Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited	86.10	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O2 Character and qualities of the General Rural Zone	Supports the plan recognising the character and qualities of the General Rural Zone, however, seeks the amendments of clause 2 to refer directly to activities in support of primary production.	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-O2 Character and qualities of the General Rural Zone</b> as follows:</p> <p>[...]</p> <p>2. a working environment of mostly utilitarian buildings and structures where primary production, <u>and associated activities generates noise, odour, light overspill and traffic, often on a cyclic and seasonable basis;</u> and</p> <p>[...]</p>	Reject
Dairy Holdings Limited	89.16	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O2 Character and qualities of the General Rural Zone	Supports this objective.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association	132.23	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O2 Character and qualities of the General Rural Zone	Considers the description of the rural zone is important to ensure that it adequately describes that it can be a noisy environment. Noise in the rural zone is from primary production and associated activities. Sensitive activities locating in a rural zone should not be anticipating a higher level of amenity in a working rural production environment. This is inconsistent with GRUZ-O3 which seeks to protect primary production from sensitive activities.	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-O2</b> as follows:</p> <p><b>GRUZ-O2 Character and qualities of the General Rural Zone</b></p> <p><i>The character and qualities of the General Rural Zone comprise:</i></p> <p>1. large allotments with large areas of open space; and</p> <p>2. a working environment of mostly utilitarian buildings and structures where primary production <u>and associated activities</u> generates noise, odour, light overspill and traffic, often on a cyclic and seasonable basis; and</p> <p><del>3. higher levels of amenity immediately around sensitive activities and zone boundaries; and</del> vegetation, pasture, crops and forestry and livestock across a range of landscapes.</p>	Reject
Radio New Zealand Limited	152.53	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O2 Character and qualities of the General Rural Zone	Support GRUZ-O2, particularly the direction to maintain large allotments and large areas of open face.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
Road Metals Company Limited	169.39	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O2 Character and qualities of the	Supports GRUZ-O2 as it recognises that primary production activities, which are appropriate in the rural environment, may generate noise, odour, light and traffic	Not specified.	Accept in part

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
				General Rural Zone			
Fulton Hogan Limited	170.41	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O2 Character and qualities of the General Rural Zone	Supports GRUZ-O2 as it recognises that primary production activities, which are appropriate in the rural environment, may generate noise, odour, light and traffic	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
Silver Fern Farms	172.111	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O2 Character and qualities of the General Rural Zone	Considers it is appropriate to recognise the working environment characteristic of land in the GRUZ.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
Alliance Group Limited	173.113	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O2 Character and qualities of the General Rural Zone	The submitter agrees with the clear recognition of the working environment characteristic of land in the GRUZ.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
Rural Contractors New Zealand	178.5	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O2 Character and qualities of the General Rural Zone	Supports the objective as it recognises the characteristics and variable nature of the General Rural Zone working environment.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
Federated Farmers	182.182	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O2 Character and qualities of the General Rural Zone	Supports the objective.	1. Retain as notified; OR 2. Wording with similar effect.	Accept in part
Horticulture New Zealand	245.105	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O2 Character and qualities of the General Rural Zone	Considers the objective would be improved by identifying that the character and amenity of the GRUZ also reflects the primary production nature of the environment.  [refer to original submission for full reasons]	Amend <b>GRUZ-O2 Character and qualities of the General Rural Zone</b> as follows:  <i>The character and qualities of the General Rural Zone comprise:</i>  <i>1. <u>Rural character and amenity consistent with primary production.</u></i>  <i><del>2.</del> <u>large allotments with large areas of open space; and</u></i>  <i><del>2.</del> <u>3. a working environment of mostly utilitarian buildings and structures where primary production generates noise, odour, light overspill and traffic, often on a cyclic and seasonable basis; and</u></i>  <i><del>3.</del> <u>4. higher levels of Diverse amenity values immediately around sensitive activities and zone boundaries; and</u></i>	Reject

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
						<del>4. 5. vegetation, pasture, crops and forestry and livestock across a range of landscapes.</del>	
NZ Pork	247.19	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O2 Character and qualities of the General Rural Zone	Considers the objective seeks to achieve a higher level of amenity immediately around sensitive activities and zone boundaries without qualifying what that level of amenity is and this sits uncomfortably in an objective. Amenity values are a subjective element and will reflect a range of characteristics.	Amend <b>GRUZ-O2</b> as follows:  <b><i>GRUZ-O2 Character and qualities of the General Rural Zone</i></b>  <i>The character and qualities of the General Rural Zone comprise:</i>  <i>1. large allotments with large areas of open space; and</i>  <i>2. a working environment of mostly utilitarian buildings and structures where primary production generates noise, odour, light overspill and traffic, often on a cyclic and seasonable basis; and</i>  <del><i>3. higher levels of amenity immediately around sensitive activities and zone boundaries; and</i></del>  <del>4. 3. vegetation, pasture, crops and forestry and livestock across a range of landscapes.</del>	Reject
NZ Frost Fans Limited	255.19	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O2 Character and qualities of the General Rural Zone	The objective is generally supported as appropriate. However, the objective does not give effect to the NPS-HPL insofar as priority is not given to land based primary production land uses on highly productive land by not appropriately managing reverse sensitivity effects on land based primary production activities on highly productive land.	1. Amend the objectives, policies and methods of the PDP and / or included to give effect to the NPS-HPL.  AND 2. Amend <b>GRUZ-O2 Character and qualities of the General Rural Zone</b> as follows:  <i>The character and qualities of the General Rural Zone comprise:</i>  <i>1. large allotments with large areas of open space; and</i>  <i>2. a working environment of mostly utilitarian buildings, machinery and structures where primary production generates noise, odour, light overspill and traffic, often on a cyclic and seasonable basis; and</i>  <i>3. higher levels of amenity immediately around sensitive activities and zone boundaries; and</i>  <i>4. vegetation, pasture, crops and forestry and livestock across a range of landscapes.</i>	Reject
Helicopters South Canterbury 2015 Ltd	53.20	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O3 Protecting primary production	Supports the recognition of the importance of primary production and its long-term protection, but the objective should be clear that it is reverse sensitivity effects from sensitive activities that it is protected from.	Amend <b>GRUZ-O3 Protecting primary production</b> as follows:  <i>The land resource of the General Rural Zone is not diminished by activities with no functional or operational need to locate in the General rural zone, and primary production is protected from <u>reverse sensitivity effects</u> and sensitive activities.</i>	Reject

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited	86.11	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O3 Protecting primary production	Support the protection of primary production in rural zones, however, considers protection against reverse sensitivity effects should be specified.	Amend <b>GRUZ-O3 Protecting primary production</b> as follows:  <i>The land resource of the General Rural Zone is not diminished by activities with no functional or operational need to locate in the General rural zone, and primary production is protected from <u>reverse sensitivity effects</u> and sensitive activities.</i>	Reject
New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association	132.24	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O3 Protecting primary production	Supports recognising the importance of primary production and its long-term protection but should be clear that it is reverse sensitivity effects from sensitive activities that it is protected from.	Amend <b>GRUZ-O3</b> as follows:  <b>GRUZ-O3 Protecting primary production</b>  <i>The land resource of the General Rural Zone is not diminished by activities with no functional or operational need to locate in the General rural zone, and primary production is protected from <u>reverse sensitivity effects</u> and sensitive activities.</i>	Reject
Fonterra Limited	165.125	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O3 Protecting primary production	It is appropriate to protect primary production from sensitive activities. This protection should also be afforded to rural industry that is located in the general rural zone.	Amend <b>GRUZ-O3 Protecting primary production</b> as follows:  <i>The land resource of the General Rural Zone is not diminished by activities with no functional or operational need to locate in the General Rural Zone, and primary production is <u>and rural industry are</u> protected from sensitive activities.</i>	Reject
Road Metals Company Limited	169.40	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O3 Protecting primary production	Supports GRUZ-O3 as it recognises that sensitive activities can affect the effectiveness of primary productive activities in the rural zone.	Not specified.	Accept
Fulton Hogan Limited	170.42	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O3 Protecting primary production	Supports GRUZ-O3 as it recognises that sensitive activities can affect the effectiveness of primary productive activities in the rural zone.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Silver Fern Farms	172.112	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O3 Protecting primary production	Considers it appropriate to provide strong directions about the types of activities should be excluded from the GRUZ. Clarification required.	Amend <b>GRUZ-O3</b> as follows:  <b>GRUZ-O3 Protecting primary production</b>  <i>The land resource of the General Rural Zone is not diminished by activities with no functional or operational need to locate in the General rural zone, and primary production is protected from <u>encroachment by</u> sensitive activities.</i>	Reject
Alliance Group Limited	173.114	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O3 Protecting primary production	Considers it is appropriate to provide strong directions about the types of activities that should be excluded from the GRUZ. Therefore, seeks a minor amendment would clarify this.	Amend <b>GRUZ-O3</b> as follows:  <b>GRUZ-O3 Protecting primary production</b>  <i>The land resource of the General Rural Zone is not diminished by activities with no functional or operational need to locate in the General rural zone, and primary production is protected from <u>encroachment by</u> sensitive activities.</i>	Reject

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
Rural Contractors New Zealand	178.6	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O3 Protecting primary production	Supports the policy direction to protect the land resource from activities that have no functional or operational need to locate in the General Rural Zone.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Federated Farmers	182.183	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O3 Protecting primary production	Supports the objective.	1. Retain as notified; OR 2. Wording with similar effect.	Accept
Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury)	183.145	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O3 Protecting primary production	Supports, it is consistent with protecting the productive capacity of rural land, including highly productive land.	Retain <b>GRUZ-O3</b> as notified or preserve original intent.	Accept
Horticulture New Zealand	245.106	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O3 Protecting primary production	Supports a clear objective seeking to ensure that the land resource of the General Rural Zone is not diminished by activities with no functional or operational need to locate in the General rural zone, and primary production is protected from sensitive activities. Primary production activities rely on a range of rural resources for producing food. The land resource itself is important not just where in-situ soil is utilised but also in the context of providing for greenhouse activity and ancillary activities (e.g. post-harvest facilities).	Retain as notified.	Accept
NZ Pork	247.20	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O3 Protecting primary production	Supports the directive objective and clear outcome sought. Supports the recognition through the plan that a range of primary production activities have a functional and locational need to locate in the general rural zone including intensive primary production.	Retain as notified.	Accept
NZ Frost Fans Limited	255.20	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O3 Protecting primary production	The objective partially gives effect to the NPS-HPL insofar as priority is given to land based primary production land uses on highly productive land and by managing reverse sensitivity effects on land based primary production activities on highly productive land.	1. Amend the objectives, policies and methods of the PDP and / or included to give effect to the NPS-HPL. AND 2. Amend <b>GRUZ-O3 Protecting primary production</b> as follows: <i>The land resource of the General Rural Zone, and the ability to undertake land based primary production, is not diminished by activities with no functional or operational need to locate in the General rural zone, and primary production is protected from sensitive activities.</i>	Reject
Helicopters South Canterbury 2015 Ltd	53.21	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O4 Protecting sensitive activities	GRUZ-O4 refers to ‘intensive activities’ which isn’t defined so it is unclear what it refers to. Similarly, it is unclear land close to’ residential, rural settlement,	1. Delete <b>GRUZ-O4 Protecting sensitive activities</b> ;	Reject

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
				and sensitive zones	Māori purpose and Open space zones would be'. The focus should be on ensuring that sensitive activities don't affect primary production.  [Refer original submission for full reason].	OR  2. Delete and replace with a new <b>GRUZ-O4:</b>  <u><i>Sensitive activities locating in the General Rural Zone anticipate effects that are generated by primary production activities and the boundary of the rural zones are managed through setbacks.</i></u>	
Ministry of Education	106.22	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O4 Protecting sensitive activities and sensitive zones	Supports GRUZ-O4 as it seeks to protect sensitive activities, which includes educational facilities, from adverse effects from intensive rural activities.	Retain as notified.	Accept
New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association	132.25	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O4 Protecting sensitive activities and sensitive zones	GRUZ-O4 refers to 'intensive activities' which isn't defined so it is unclear what it refers to. The focus should be on ensuring that sensitive activities don't affect primary production.  Sensitive activities locating in rural zones should recognise that they are locating in a working rural production environment so 'protecting' their amenity is inappropriate.  It is unclear what 'land close to' residential, rural settlement, Māori purpose and Open space zones would be. Management of the boundary interface should be through the use of setbacks.	1. Delete <b>GRUZ-O4</b>  OR 2. Amend <b>GRUZ-O4</b> as follows:  <b><i>GRUZ-O4 Protecting sensitive activities and sensitive zones</i></b> <del><i>Intensive primary production, mining, quarrying and other intensive activities generates no or minimal adverse effects on:</i></del> <del><i>1. sensitive activities; and</i></del> <del><i>2. land close to Residential, Rural settlement, Māori Purpose and Open space zones.</i></del>  <u><i>Sensitive activities locating in the General Rural Zone anticipate effects that are generated by primary production activities and the boundary of the rural zones are managed through setbacks.</i></u>	Reject
Road Metals Company Limited	169.41	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O4 Protecting sensitive activities and sensitive zones	Considers that GRUZ-O4 should acknowledge that quarrying activities, which are anticipated in the rural zones, should not be held to a higher standard than other activities in the zone.  Given that quarrying activities are a primary production activity that is anticipated in the rural zone.	Amend <b>GRUZ -O4 Protecting sensitive activities and sensitive zones</b> as follows:  <del><i>Effects from Intensive primary production, mining, quarrying and other intensive activities generates no or minimal adverse effects on:</i></del> <del><i>1. sensitive activities; and</i></del> <del><i>2. land close to Residential, Rural settlement, Māori Purpose and Open space zones</i></del> <u><i>avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects.</i></u>	Reject
Fulton Hogan Limited	170.43	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O4 Protecting sensitive activities and sensitive zones	Considers that GRUZ-O4 should acknowledge that quarrying activities, which are anticipated in the rural zones, should not be held to a higher standard than other activities in the zone.	Amend <b>GRUZ -O4 Protecting sensitive activities and sensitive zones</b> as follows:  <del><i>Effects from Intensive primary production, mining, quarrying and other intensive activities generates no or minimal adverse effects on:</i></del> <del><i>1. sensitive activities; and</i></del>	Reject

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
						2. <i>land close to Residential, Rural settlement, Māori Purpose and Open space zones</i> <u>avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects.</u>	
Silver Fern Farms	172.113	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O4 Protecting sensitive activities and sensitive zones	Considers that clause (1) appears to be requiring that rural activities respond to encroachment by incompatible sensitive activities, which is inconsistent with the direction of GRUZ-O3.  Considers it would not be appropriate for policy to constrain primary production, mining, quarrying etc if a new sensitive activity establishes in the area. Considers clause (2) is ambiguous.	Amend <b>GRUZ-O4</b> as follows:  <b><del>GRUZ-O4 Protecting</del> Managing sensitive activities and sensitive zones</b>  <i>Intensive primary production, mining, quarrying, rural industry and other intensive activities</i> <u>avoid or minimise</u> <del>generates no or minimal adverse effects on:</del>  1. <u>existing</u> sensitive activities; and  2. <del>land close to</del> <u>in Residential, Rural Settlement, Māori Purpose and Open space zones.</u>	Accept
Alliance Group Limited	173.115	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O4 Protecting sensitive activities and sensitive zones	Notes sub-clause (1) appears to require rural activities to respond to encroachment by incompatible sensitive activities, otherwise will be inconsistent with the direction of GRUZ-O3.  While it may be feasible to manage effects on <b>existing</b> sensitive activities in rural areas, it would not be appropriate for policy to constrain primary production, mining, quarrying etc. if a <b>new</b> sensitive activity establishes in the area. Considers sub-clause 2 as ambiguous.	Amend <b>GRUZ-O4</b> as follows:  <b>GRUZ-O4 Protecting sensitive activities and sensitive zones</b>  <i>Intensive primary production, mining, quarrying, rural industry and other intensive activities</i> <u>avoid or minimise</u> <del>generates no or minimal adverse effects on:</del>  1. <u>existing</u> sensitive activities; and  2. <del>land close to</del> <u>in Residential, Rural Settlement, Māori Purpose and Open space zones.</u>	Accept in part
Federated Farmers	182.184	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O4 Protecting sensitive activities and sensitive zones	Supports in part GRUZ-O4, but bureaucracy cannot be placed on private landowners without proper remuneration for the land being retired or lost as a result from existing primary production use. Also seek to make minor amendments to this objective to better represent the rural zone.	1. Amend <b>GRUZ-O4 Protecting sensitive activities and sensitive zones</b> as follows:  <i>Intensive primary production, mining, quarrying and other intensive activities</i> <u>generates no or minimal adverse effects on:</u>  1. <i>sensitive activities; and</i>  2. <i>land close to Residential, Rural settlement, Māori Purpose and Open space zones, unless the existing activities still occur.</i>  AND  2. Any consequential amendments required as a result of the relief sought.	Accept
Horticulture New Zealand	245.107	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O4 Protecting sensitive activities and sensitive zones	Notes that the reference to ‘intensive activities’ is not defined.  Sensitive activities locating in rural zones should recognise that they are locating in a working rural production environment so ‘protecting’ their amenity is inappropriate. It is unclear what ‘land close to’ Residential, Rural settlement, Māori Purpose and Open space zones would be.	1. Delete <b>GRUZ-O4</b> ;  OR  2. Adverse effects of intensive primary production, mining and quarrying on sensitive activities are management through setbacks	Reject

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
					Management of the boundary interface should be through the use of setbacks.	<p>OR</p> <p>3. Amend <b>GRUZ-O4</b> as follows:</p> <p><b><i>GRUZ-O4 Protecting sensitive activities and sensitive zones</i></b></p> <p><del><i>Intensive primary production, mining, quarrying and other intensive activities generates no or minimal adverse effects on:</i></del></p> <p><del><i>1. sensitive activities; and</i></del></p> <p><del><i>2. land close to Residential, Rural settlement, Māori Purpose and Open space zones.</i></del></p> <p><u><i>Sensitive activities locating in the General Rural Zone anticipate effects that are generated by primary production activities and the boundary of the rural zones are managed through setbacks.</i></u></p>	
NZ Frost Fans Limited	255.21	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O4 Protecting sensitive activities and sensitive zones	The objective does not give effect to the NPS-HPL insofar as priority is not given to land based primary production land uses on highly productive land by not appropriately managing reverse sensitivity effects on land based primary production activities on highly productive land. In many instances there are no alternative locations for these uses, whereas sensitive uses may have alternative locations available or that are more appropriate.	<p>1. Amend the objectives, policies and methods of the PDP and / or included to give effect to the NPS-HPL.</p> <p>AND either:</p> <p>2. Delete <b>GRUZ-O4 Protecting sensitive activities and sensitive zones</b></p> <p>OR</p> <p>3. Amend <b>GRUZ-O4</b> as follows:</p> <p><del><i>Intensive primary production, mining, quarrying and other intensive activities generates no or minimal adverse effects on:</i></del></p> <p><del><i>1. sensitive activities; and</i></del></p> <p><del><i>2. land close to located in Residential, Rural settlement, Māori Purpose and Open space zones.</i></del></p>	Reject
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	143.146	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O5 Mining and quarrying	Supports allowing mining and quarrying where it can be demonstrated that this will not impact on the safe and efficient function of the state highway networks. It is considered that the objective requires amending to align with GRUZ-P6.	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-O5</b> as follows:</p> <p><b><i>GRUZ-O5 Mining and quarrying</i></b></p> <p><i>Mining and quarrying occurs in the General Rural Zone where the resource exists and where it will have no or minimal adverse effects on the <u>transport network</u>, sensitive environments and sensitive activities.</i></p>	Accept
Road Metals Company Limited	169.42	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O5 Mining and quarrying	This objective holds quarrying to a higher standard than other activities that are appropriate for the zone.	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-O5 Mining and quarrying</b> as follows:</p> <p><i>Mining and quarrying occurs in the General Rural Zone where the resource exists and where it will have no or minimal adverse effects on</i></p>	Reject

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
					Quarrying is an appropriate and anticipated activity within the rural zone, and these activities must be located where the resource exists.	<del>the sensitive environments and sensitive activities</del> <u>are avoided, remedied or mitigated.</u>	
Fulton Hogan Limited	170.44	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O5 Mining and quarrying	This objective holds quarrying to a higher standard than other activities that are appropriate for the zone.	Amend <b>GRUZ-O5 Mining and quarrying</b> as follows:  <i>Mining and quarrying occurs in the General Rural Zone where the resource exists and where <del>it will have no or minimal</del> adverse effects on <del>the sensitive environments and sensitive activities</del> <u>are avoided, remedied or mitigated.</u></i>	Reject
Federated Farmers	182.185	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O5 Mining and quarrying	Supports the objective.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
Aggregate and Quarry Association	224.6	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O5 Mining and quarrying	Considers GRUZ-O5 should more clearly enable quarrying where any adverse effects can be mitigated under the effects management hierarchy.  Acknowledges the reference to ‘where the resource exists’ implicitly acknowledges that quarrying resources are locationally constrained.	Amend <b>GRUZ-O5</b> as follows:  <b><i>GRUZ-O5 Mining and quarrying</i></b>  <i>Mining and quarrying occurs in the General Rural Zone where the resource exists and where it will have no or minimal adverse effects <u>unless those effects can be mitigated as set out in GRUZ-P6 on the sensitive environments and sensitive activities.</u></i>	Reject
Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation Tumuaki Ahurei	166.126	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O6 Conservation activities	The submitter supports the inclusion of this objective as it provides a permitted activity for conservation activities in the general rural zone. As submitted in submission points above, it is considered necessary to include a definition of ‘conservation activity’.	Retain <b>GRUZ-O6 Conservation activities</b> as notified;	Accept
Federated Farmers	182.186	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Objectives	GRUZ-O6 Conservation activities	Supports the objective.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Helicopters South Canterbury 2015 Ltd	53.22	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P1 Primary production activities	Supports the enabling of primary production activities but seeks to have agricultural aviation acknowledged as part of rural character.	Amend <b>GRUZ-P1</b> as follows:  <i>Enable a range of primary production and associated activities where they:</i>  <i>1. [...]</i>  <i>3. meet the standards and requirements to <del>minimise</del> <u>avoid, remedy or mitigate</u> adverse effects on <del>sensitive activities and the environment;</del> <u>and</u></i>  <i><u>enabling a range of compatible activities that support primary production activities, including ancillary activities, and agricultural aviation.</u></i>	Reject

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
Dairy Holdings Limited	89.17	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P1 Primary production activities	Supports this policy.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association	132.26	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P1 Primary production activities	Supports the enabling of primary production activities but seeks to have agricultural aviation acknowledged as part of the rural character.	Amend <b>GRUZ-P1</b> as follows: <b><i>GRUZ-P1 Primary production activities</i></b> <i>Enable a range of primary production <u>and associated</u> activities, where they:</i> <i>1. allow for the ongoing productive use of land for present and future generations; or</i> <i>2. maintain the character and qualities of the General Rural Zone; and</i> <i>3. meet the standards and requirements to <u>minimise avoid, remedy or mitigate</u> adverse effects on sensitive activities and the environment.</i> <i>4. enabling a range of compatible activities that support primary production activities, including ancillary activities, and agricultural aviation.</i>	Reject
Silver Fern Farms	172.114	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P1 Primary production activities	The submitter wants to ensure that the establishment of new incompatible activities in the GRUZ do not inadvertently receive policy support.	Amend <b>GRUZ-P1</b> as follows: <b><i>GRUZ-P1 Primary production activities</i></b> <i>Enable a range of primary production activities, where they:</i> <i>[...]</i> <i>3. meet the standards and requirements to minimise adverse effects on <u>existing</u> sensitive activities and the environment.</i>	Accept
Alliance Group Limited	173.116	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P1 Primary production activities	The submitter recommends an amendment to ensure that the establishment of new incompatible activities in the GRUZ do not inadvertently receive policy support.	Amend <b>GRUZ-P1</b> as follows: <b><i>GRUZ-P1 Primary production activities</i></b> <i>Enable a range of primary production activities, where they:</i> <i>[...]</i> <i>3. meet the standards and requirements to minimise adverse effects on <u>existing</u> sensitive activities and the environment.</i>	Accept
Federated Farmers	182.187	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P1 Primary production activities	Supports GRUZ-P1 but it should go further than simply allowing primary production and should enable it instead, as per the enabling intent of Section 5 of the RMA.	1. Amend <b>GRUZ-P1 Primary production activities</b> as follows: <i>Enable a range of primary production activities, where they:</i> <i>1. <del>allow</del> <u>enable</u> for the ongoing productive use of land for present and future generations; or</i> <i>[...]</i> AND 2. Any consequential amendments required as a result of the relief sought.	Reject

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury)	183.146	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P1 Primary production activities	Supports as it contributes to fulfilling Policy 5.3.12 CRPS.	Retain <b>GRUZ-P1</b> as notified or preserve original intent.	Accept in part
Horticulture New Zealand	245.108	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P1 Primary production activities	Supports the direction of the policy and the 'enable' focus for primary production activities.	Amend <b>GRUZ-P1 Primary production activities</b> as follows:  <i>Enable a range of primary production activities, where they:</i>  <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>allow for the ongoing productive use of land for present and future generations; or</li> <li>maintain the character and qualities of the General Rural Zone; and</li> <li>meet the standards and requirements to <del>minimise avoid, remedy or mitigate</del> adverse effects on <del>sensitive activities and</del> the environment,</li> <li><u>enabling a range of compatible activities that support primary production activities, including ancillary activities, and agricultural aviation.</u></li> </ol>	Reject
NZ Pork	247.21	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P1 Primary production activities	Supports a clear description of the character of the General Rural Zone where primary production is the predominant land use noting that primary production includes intensive primary production.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
NZ Frost Fans Limited	255.22	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P1 Primary production activities	The policy is generally supported as appropriate. However, the policy does not give effect to the NPS-HPL insofar as priority is not given to land based primary production land uses on highly productive land by not appropriately managing reverse sensitivity effects on land based primary production activities on highly productive land.	1. Amend the objectives, policies and methods of the PDP and / or included to give effect to the NPS-HPL.  AND 2. Amend <b>GRUZ-P1 Primary production activities</b> as follows:  <i>Enable a range of primary production activities, where they:</i>  <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>allow for the ongoing productive use of land for present and future generations; or</li> <li>maintain the character and qualities of the General Rural Zone; and</li> <li><del>meet the standards and requirements to minimise adverse effects on sensitive activities and the environment and</del> <u>prioritise them over activities that do not have a functional or operational need to locate in the General Rural Zone.</u></li> </ol>	Reject
Bruce Speirs	66.37	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P2 Character and qualities of the	Considers that many of the smaller allotments in this zone have ample open space around buildings, and it	Amend <b>GRUZ-P2 Character and qualities of the General Rural Zone</b> as follows:	Reject

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
				General Rural Zone	is therefore both inaccurate and redundant to include 'large minimum'.	<p><i>The character and qualities of the zone are maintained by:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. requiring a <del>large minimum</del> allotment size that ensures ample open space around buildings; and</i></li> <li><i>2. controlling the height and setbacks of buildings and structures; and</i></li> <li><i>3. [...]</i></li> </ol>	
Dairy Holdings Limited	89.18	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P2 Character and qualities of the General Rural Zone	Supports this policy.	Retain as notified.	Accept
New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association	132.27	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P2 Character and qualities of the General Rural Zone	Supports the separation distances in GRUZ-P2.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Radio New Zealand Limited	152.54	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P2 Character and qualities of the General Rural Zone	Supports GRUZ-P2 as it maintains the character and qualities of the General Rural Zone.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Silver Fern Farms	172.115	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P2 Character and qualities of the General Rural Zone	Considers it appropriate for the policy to reiterate the principle of land use separation, in order to discourage sensitive activities from constraining rural activities.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Alliance Group Limited	173.117	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P2 Character and qualities of the General Rural Zone	It is appropriate to reiterate the principle of land use separation, in order to discourage sensitive activities from constraining rural activities.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Federated Farmers	182.188	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P2 Character and qualities of the General Rural Zone	Supports GRUZ-P2 it ensures the character and qualities of the general rural zone are protected from urban creep and development which could occur within the urban zone.	1. Retain as notified; OR 2. Wording with similar effect.	Accept

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
Horticulture New Zealand	245.109	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P2 Character and qualities of the General Rural Zone	Supports a clear policy setting out how the character and qualities of the GRUZ are to be maintained. Setbacks are an important tool to managing reverse sensitivity and avoiding conflict.	Retain as notified.	Accept
NZ Pork	247.22	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P2 Character and qualities of the General Rural Zone	Supports the clear policy on limiting land fragmentation to particular circumstances where adverse effects on primary production are avoided. Supports the recognition of the need to separate sensitive activities from primary production where conflicts may arise.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Federated Farmers	182.189	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P3 Small scale commercial activities	Considers this policy is important in making sure that development is in line with what occurs within the zone and will not affect the primary operations within the zone.	1. Retain as notified; OR 2. Wording with similar effect.	Accept
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	131.35	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P4 Emergency services facilities	Support that GRUZ-P4 allows for emergency service facilities in the rural zone.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Federated Farmers	182.190	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P4 Emergency services facilities	Support. It is important for any sector of New Zealand to have proper access to emergency facilities. Many of these are supported by farmer volunteers.	1. Retain as notified; OR 2. Wording with similar effect.	Accept
Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited	86.12	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P5 Protecting primary production	Supports the protection of primary production from reverse sensitivity effects.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
Dairy Holdings Limited	89.19	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P5 Protecting primary production	Supports this policy.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association	132.28	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P5 Protecting primary production	Supports the protection for primary production activities from reverse sensitivity effects in GRUZ-P5.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
Silver Fern Farms	172.116	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P5 Protecting	Supports recognition of rural industry in this policy, given the activity is similarly vulnerable to reverse sensitivity effects and is dependent on a rural	Amend <b>GRUZ-P5</b> as follows: <b><i>GRUZ-P5 Protecting primary production and supporting activities</i></b>	Accept in part

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
				primary production	location with ample separation from sensitive activities.	<p><i>Manage sensitive activities in the zone to ensure:</i></p> <p><i>1. they are located to avoid adverse effects on primary production <u>and supporting rural activities</u>; or</i></p> <p><i>2. if avoidance is not possible, the sensitive activity includes mitigation measures so that there is minimal potential for adverse effects on the sensitive activity from primary production <u>and supporting rural activities</u>.</i></p>	
Rural Contractors New Zealand	178.7	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P5 Protecting primary production	Considers GRUZ-P5 needs to be broadened to ensure that rural and industry and other activities that support primary production are also protected from potential reverse sensitivity effects arising from the establishment of nearby sensitive activities.	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-P5</b> as follows:</p> <p><b><u>GRUZ-P5 Protecting primary production, rural industry and other supporting activities</u></b></p> <p><i>Manage sensitive activities in the zone to ensure:</i></p> <p><i>1. they are located to avoid adverse effects on primary production, rural industry and other supporting activities; or</i></p> <p><i>2. if avoidance is not possible, the sensitive activity includes mitigation measures so that there is minimal potential for adverse effects on the sensitive activity from primary production, <u>rural industry and other supporting activities</u>.</i></p>	Accept in part
Federated Farmers	182.191	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P5 Protecting primary production	Supports GRUZ-P5 but amend to go further than simply <i>avoiding</i> primary production and should <i>enable</i> it instead, as per the enabling intent of Section 5 of the RMA.	<p>1. Amend <b>GRUZ-P5 Protecting primary production</b> as follows:</p> <p><i>Manage sensitive activities in the zone to ensure:</i></p> <p><i>1. they are located to <del>avoid</del> <u>enable management of</u> adverse effects on primary production.</i></p> <p><i>[...]</i></p> <p>AND</p> <p>2. Any consequential amendments required as a result of the relief sought.</p>	Reject
Horticulture New Zealand	245.110	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P5 Protecting primary production	Supports a clear policy seeking to ensure that primary production is protected from sensitive activities. Particularly support the ‘avoidance’ directive.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
NZ Pork	247.23	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P5 Protecting primary production	Supports the clear policy that seeks firstly to manage sensitive activities in the zone to avoid adverse effects on primary production.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
NZ Frost Fans Limited	255.23	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P5 Protecting primary production	The policy is generally supported as appropriate. However, the policy does not give effect to the NPS-HPL insofar as priority is not given to land based primary production land uses on highly productive land by not appropriately managing reverse	<p>1. Amend the objectives, policies and methods of the PDP and / or included to give effect to the NPS-HPL.</p> <p>AND</p>	Reject

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
					sensitivity effects on land based primary production activities on highly productive land.	<p>2. Amend <b>GRUZ-P5 Protecting primary production</b> as follows:</p> <p><i>Manage sensitive activities in the zone to ensure:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. they are located to avoid adverse effects on primary production; or</i></li> <li><i>2. if avoidance is not possible, the sensitive activity includes mitigation measures so that there is minimal potential for adverse effects on the sensitive activity from primary production activities.</i></li> <li><i>3. that they do not locate in the General Rural Zone unless they have a functional or operational need to.</i></li> </ol>	
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	143.147	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P6 Mining and quarrying activities	Supports allowing mining and quarrying activities where there is suitable and safe vehicle access, and the road network can accommodate the activity safely and efficiently.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation Tumuaki Ahurei	166.129	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P6 Mining and quarrying activities	The submitter supports the management of mining and quarrying activities and rural industries to ensure that adverse effects on sensitive environments are avoided or considered under the effects management hierarchy.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Road Metals Company Limited	169.43	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P6 Mining and quarrying activities	The wording of this policy could be better structured to give effect to recognise mining and quarrying are appropriate in the rural zone.	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-P6 Mining and quarrying activities</b> as follows:</p> <p><i>1. Enable small scale quarry activities (up to 2,000m<sup>2</sup>), subject to requirements to protect the environment and sensitive activities;</i></p> <p><i>2. <del>Only allow</del> Provide for mining and other quarry activities in the General rural zone where:</i></p> <p><i>a. [...]</i></p>	Reject
Fulton Hogan Limited	170.45	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P6 Mining and quarrying activities	The wording of this policy could be better structured to give effect to recognise mining and quarrying are appropriate in the rural zone.	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-P6 Mining and quarrying activities</b> as follows:</p> <p><i>1. Enable small scale quarry activities (up to 2,000m<sup>2</sup>), subject to requirements to protect the environment and sensitive activities;</i></p> <p><i>2. <del>Only allow</del> Provide for mining and other quarry activities in the General rural zone where:</i></p> <p><i>a. [...]</i></p>	Reject
Federated Farmers	182.192	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P6 Mining and quarrying activities	Supports GRUZ-6 but it should go further, rather than putting landowners off using their land as a diversification of income for the district, we should enable such production, as per enabling intent of Section 5 of the RMA.	<p>1. Amend <b>GRUZ-P6 Mining and quarrying activities</b> as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. Enable small scale quarry activities (up to 2,000m<sup>2</sup>), subject to requirements to protect the environment and sensitive activities;</i></li> <li><i>2. Only allow mining and other quarry activities in the General rural zone where:</i></li> </ol>	Reject

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
						<p>a. adverse effects on sensitive environment and sensitive activities are <del>avoided managed</del>, or if <del>avoidance management</del> is not possible minimised; and</p> <p>b. adverse effects on primary production and other activities are managed in accordance with appropriate management plans; and</p> <p>c. vehicle access is suitable and safe, and traffic generation can be safely and efficiently accommodated by the surrounding road network; and</p> <p>d. adverse effects on protected rock art and archaeological sites are <del>avoided minimised</del>; and</p> <p>e. <del>adverse effects on local character and qualities are minimised; and</del></p> <p>f. sites are progressively rehabilitated to enable the establishment of a land use consistent with the surrounding area.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>2. Any consequential amendments required as a result of the relief sought.</p>	
Aggregate and Quarry Association	224.7	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P6 Mining and quarrying activities	Considers the policy provides a consenting pathway for medium and large-scale quarry activities using the effects hierarchy. The submitter considers the conditions listed are reasonable and most quarrying activities in rural areas would meet them. However, considers the intent of GRUZ should be to allow quarrying in rural areas unless the adverse effects cannot be managed.	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-P6</b> and associated rules to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Allow for quarrying in rural areas unless the adverse effects cannot be managed;</li> <li>- Provide for case-by-case assessment to be done of each quarrying proposal that is made and the opportunity for any adverse effects to be mitigated.</li> </ul>	Reject
Port Blakely Limited	94.12	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P7 Industrial activities, rural industries and other activities	Considers the policy GRUZ-P7.1 should have some flexibility to acknowledge that many rural industries use heavy vehicles throughout their daily operations. Without this access to rural roads, many rural industries would cease to operate.	Amend <b>GRUZ-P7.1</b> to acknowledge the legitimate need of rural industries to use the roading network through the Timaru District, with their heavy vehicles.	Reject
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	143.148	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P7 Industrial activities, rural industries and other activities	Supports allowing rural industries and other activities where there is adequate infrastructure and where the scale, location and intensity will not compromise the safety and efficiency of the roading network.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Radio New Zealand Limited	152.55	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P7 Industrial	Support GRUZ-P7, particularly the provision for activities that are legally established and have a	Retain as notified.	Accept

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
				activities, rural industries and other activities	functional or operational need to locate in the General Rural Zone.		
Transpower New Zealand Limited	159.96	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P7 Industrial activities, rural industries and other activities	<p>The submitter outlines the technical needs of the National Grid and that the adverse effects of the National Grid cannot always be minimised. Considers that given the national significance of the National Grid, and order to give effect to the NPSET, the PDP should acknowledge these characteristics of the National Grid by ensuring that there is a policy 'pathway' (as opposed to a policy that may have the effect of preventing the National Grid) for the operation, maintenance, upgrade and development of the National Grid in all zones.</p> <p>In the case of the Rural Zones, it is these zones that are most likely, and most appropriate to accommodate the National Grid. As such, it is important that the Rural Zone provisions do not dissuade the location of the National Grid in the Rural Zones.</p>	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-P7 Industrial activities, rural industries and other activities</b> as follows:</p> <p><i>1. Only allow rural industries and other activities (not listed in the rules) in the General Rural Zone where:</i></p> <p><i>[...]</i></p> <p><i>x. the activity is regionally significant infrastructure;</i></p> <p><i>[...]</i></p>	Accept in part
Fonterra Limited	165.126	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P7 Industrial activities, rural industries and other activities	Generally supports the proposed wording of this policy but considers that the word 'only' should be deleted.	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-P7 Industrial activities</b> as follows:</p> <p><del>Only</del> <i>Allow rural industries and other activities (not listed in the rules) in the General Rural Zone where:</i></p> <p><i>[...]</i></p>	Reject
Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation Tumuaki Ahurei	166.130	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P7 Industrial activities, rural industries and other activities	The submitter supports the management of mining and quarrying activities and rural industries to ensure that adverse effects on sensitive environments are avoided or considered under the effects management hierarchy.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Silver Fern Farms	172.117	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P7 Industrial activities, rural industries and other activities	Considers it appropriate that the policy allows for established industrial activities in the GRUZ, which recognises the significant investment in such activities that cannot be easily relocated.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Rural Contractors New Zealand	178.8	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P7 Industrial activities, rural industries and other activities	Supports that Policy GRUZ-P7 clearly provides for activities (such as rural industry) that support primary production and require a rural location.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Federated Farmers	182.193	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P7 Industrial activities, rural	Supports with amendments to 'enable' primary production.	1. Amend <b>GRUZ-P7 Industrial activities, rural industries and other activities</b> as follows:	Reject

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
				industries and other activities		<p><i>Only allow rural industries and other activities (not listed in the rules) in the General Rural Zone where:</i></p> <p><i>a. the activity</i></p> <p><i>i. was legally established use not permitted in the zone; or</i></p> <p><i>ii. supports <u>and enables</u> primary production <u>functions</u>; or</i></p> <p><i>iii. has a functional or operational need for the activity to locate within the Zone; and</i></p> <p><i>[...]</i></p> <p>AND</p> <p>2. Any consequential amendments required as a result of the relief sought.</p>	
Horticulture New Zealand	245.111	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P7 Industrial activities, rural industries and other activities	<p>Supports specific provision for post-harvest facilities and rural industry as this is consistent with the intent of the National Planning Standards Zone Framework for the rural production zone.</p> <p>[refer to original submission for full reasons]</p>	Retain as notified.	Accept
Federated Farmers	182.194	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P8 Residential activities (not including workers accommodation listed in GRUZ-P9)	<p>Supports GRUZ-P8 with amendments to encourage farmers to diversify the income streams from their land, in order to better accommodate the changed environment they work in. Farmers need to be able to subdivide land to create revenue streams and also for generational use on the land.</p>	<p>1. Amend <b>GRUZ-P8 Residential activities (not including workers accommodation listed in GRUZ-P9)</b> as follows:</p> <p><i>Provide for residential activities in the General rural zone where:</i></p> <p><i>1. fragmentation of rural land for non-primary production activities is <del>avoided</del> managed; and</i></p> <p><i>2. the character and qualities of the General rural zone are maintained; and</i></p> <p><i>3. the requirements of GRUZ-P5 are met; and</i></p> <p><i>4. any minor residential unit is ancillary and subordinate to the site's principal residential unit.</i></p> <p>AND</p> <p>2. Any consequential amendments required as a result of the relief sought.</p>	Reject
NZ Frost Fans Limited	255.24	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P8 Residential activities (not including workers accommodation listed in GRUZ-P9)	<p>The policy does not give effect to the NPS-HPL insofar as priority is not given to land based primary production land uses on highly productive land by not appropriately managing reverse sensitivity effects on land based primary production activities on highly productive land.</p>	<p>1. Amend the objectives, policies and methods of the PDP and / or included to give effect to the NPS-HPL.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>2. Amend <b>GRUZ-P8 Residential activities (not including workers accommodation listed in GRUZ-P9)</b> as follows:</p>	Reject

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
						<p><i>Provide for residential activities in the General rural zone where:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. fragmentation of rural land for non-primary production activities is avoided; and</i></li> <li><i>2. the character and qualities of the General rural zone are maintained; and</i></li> <li><i>3. the requirements of GRUZ-P5 are met; and</i></li> <li><i>4. any minor residential unit is ancillary and subordinate to the site's principal residential unit.</i></li> <li><i><u>5. the undertaking of land-based primary production is prioritised.</u></i></li> </ol>	
Silver Fern Farms	172.118	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P9 Workers accommodation	Supports the provision for workers accommodation in the GRUZ.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Alliance Group Limited	173.118	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P9 Workers accommodation	Considers it is appropriate for workers accommodation in the GRUZ.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Federated Farmers	182.195	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P9 Workers accommodation	Supports this policy. Considers It is important for landowners who require staffing for their land to have the ability to properly care for and enable people to move to prospective employment where housing may be an issue.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Retain as notified;</li> </ol> <p>OR</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Wording with similar effect.</li> </ol>	Accept
Horticulture New Zealand	245.112	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P9 Workers accommodation	Supports a policy and rule framework for workers and seasonal workers accommodation, both of which provide for activities essential to primary production. Where the minimum parent lot area requirements are not met it is appropriate to provide a consenting pathway to consider individual cases.	Retain as notified.	Accept
NZ Pork	247.24	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P9 Workers accommodation	Supports the specific provision for workers accommodation. Note that the 40ha qualifier is unworkable for pig farming activity that tends to operate on small farming units.	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-P9</b> as follows:</p> <p><b><i>GRUZ-P9 Workers accommodation</i></b></p> <p><i>Provide for permanent workers accommodation and seasonal workers accommodation to support primary production where:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. the site has an area of least <del>40</del> 20 hectares for permanent workers accommodation, or 20ha for seasonal workers accommodation; or</i></li> <li><i>2. on smaller sites where it can be demonstrated that it is required to meet the needs of the site's primary production activity; and</i></li> <li><i>3. measures are put in place to ensure the workers accommodation cannot be subdivided off or sold separately to the site; and</i></li> </ol>	Reject

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
						<p>4. the necessary infrastructure is provided and adverse effects on adjoining sites are minimised; and</p> <p>5. the requirements of GRUZ-P5 are met, except for seasonal workers accommodation.</p>	
Helicopters South Canterbury 2015 Ltd	53.23	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P10 Conservation activities	The rule providing for conservation activities in the General Rural Zone is supported but considers the definition of conservation activities should be amended as sought in previous submission point.	Retain <b>GRUZ-P10</b> subject to amending the <b>definition</b> of Department of Conservation Activity (as per previous submission point).	Accept
New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association	132.29	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P10 Conservation activities	Supports GRUZ-P10 insofar as it provides for conservation activities in the General Rural Zone but seeks to ensure that the definition of conservation activities is amended as outlined in earlier submission point.	Retain as notified AND Amend the definition of ‘department of conservation activity’ as sought above.	Accept
Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation Tumuaki Ahurei	166.127	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	GRUZ-P10 Conservation activities	The Submitter supports the inclusion of this policy as it provides a permitted activity for conservation activities in the general rural zone. As submitted above, it is considered necessary to include a definition of ‘conservation activity’.	Retain <b>GRUZ-P10 Conservation activities</b> as notified; AND Include a new definition for ‘conservation activity’ (see submission point on Definitions).	Accept
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	131.36	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	New	Seeks a new policy that ensures all land use activities in the General Rural Zone are adequately serviced, particularly in relation to firefighting water supply. This policy will support the new standard sought in this zone relating to the requirement to provide water supply.	Add a new policy in the <b>GRUZ -General Rural Zone</b> chapter as follows: <b><u>GRUZ-P11</u></b> <i><u>Ensure all development and subdivision provide a suitable on-site wastewater treatment and disposal system, stormwater systems, and water supply unless an approved alternative system is available.</u></i>	Reject
Fonterra Limited	165.127	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Policies	New	The Clandeboye site is surrounded by rural land. It is important that subdivision, use and development does not constrain Clandeboye’s operations through reverse sensitivity effects.	Add new policy to the <b>GRUZ - General Rural Zone Chapter</b> as follows: <b><u>GRUZ-PX Reverse sensitivity</u></b> <i><u>Subdivision, use and development in rural areas must avoid adverse reverse sensitivity effects on strategic rural industrial activities.</u></i>	Reject
Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury)	183.144	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	General	Within the GRUZ chapter, for many activities built form standards are only referenced in some rules. It is important to ensure that the standards apply to all activities regardless of consent status, as these form an important part of rural character and the permitted baseline.	Amend the activity rules of <b>GRUZ</b> to ensure that the built form standards apply to all activities, regardless of activity status.	Reject
Keen, Oliver, Forbes <i>et al</i>	46.3	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R1 Primary production and intensive primary production, not	Opposes GRUZ-R1.PER-4, as there is an inconsistency which requires a GRUZ property that neighbours a Residential Zone on one side has to have a building that houses animals 200m away from that boundary,	Amend <b>GRUZ-R1 Primary production and intensive primary production</b> , as follows:	Accept

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
				otherwise listed in this chapter	<p>but the neighbouring GRUZ property boundary on the other side within the GRUZ, is only a 10m setback for the building that house animals.</p> <p>Considers buildings used to house or feed stock should be located at least 100m from the notional boundary of an existing sensitive activity on a property under different ownership.</p> <p>Examples of other districts and anomalies in the Timaru PDP are provided.</p> <p>[Refer original submission for full reason].</p>	<p>[...]</p> <p><b>PER-4</b></p> <p><i>For milking sheds and buildings used to house or feed stock are located at least 200m from any land in the Māori Purpose Zone, Settlement Zone and Residential Zones, or <u>at least 100m from the notional boundary of an existing sensitive activity on a property under different ownership in the General Rural Zone.</u></i></p>	
Bruce Speirs	66.38	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R1 Primary production and intensive primary production, not otherwise listed in this chapter	<p>Considers there is no valid reason to restrict the application of this rule to land adjoining the Māori Purpose Zone.</p>	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-R1 Primary production and intensive primary production, not otherwise listed in this chapter</b> as follows:</p> <p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p>[...]</p> <p><b>PER-3</b></p> <p><i>For grazing of stock within 50m of a residential unit under different ownership <del>located in the Māori Purpose Zone</del>, permanent ground cover of no less than 90% must be maintained, except during crop renewal or resowing.</i></p> <p><b>PER-4</b></p> <p>[...]</p>	Reject
Dairy Holdings Limited	89.20	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R1 Primary production and intensive primary production, not otherwise listed in this chapter	Supports this rule.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
Silver Fern Farms	172.119	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R1 Primary production and intensive primary production, not otherwise listed in this chapter	Considers the discretionary consenting pathway for activities which breach rule GRUZ-R1 PER-2, is appropriate.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
Federated Farmers	182.196	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R1 Primary production and intensive primary production, not otherwise listed in this chapter	Considers the permitted activity classification for rural produce retail appropriate but questions the 30m setback from internal boundaries in GRUZ-R1 PER-1. d PER-1 for this to be set back a minimum of 30m from any internal boundaries. Stands and stalls for farm produce need to be located where they are visible from the road. A 30m setback is onerous and unrealistic.	<p>1. Amend <b>GRUZ-R1 Primary production and intensive primary production, not otherwise listed in this chapter</b> by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Deleting the 50m and 200m setback requirement from PER-3 and PER-4 of rule GRUZ-R1;</li> <li>If the Council is not inclined to accept the relief outlined in above, reduce the setback from 30m to 5m.</li> </ol> <p>AND</p> <p>2. Any consequential amendments required as a result of the relief sought.</p>	Reject
Horticulture New Zealand	245.113	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R1 Primary production and intensive primary production, not otherwise listed in this chapter	Support a permitted activity status for primary production and intensive primary production as an appropriate resource management response for the GRUZ and the objective and policy framework that supports this method.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
NZ Pork	247.25	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R1 Primary production and intensive primary production, not otherwise listed in this chapter	Supports a permitted activity status for primary production and intensive primary production activities.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
Federated Farmers	182.197	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R2 Pig production for domestic self-subsistence home use	<p>Opposes GRUZ-R2 which put landowners off the diversification of their income streams. A 100m boundary is not proposed under many district plans, which have a 50m boundary. Considers the council should be in line with what is already occurring in industry.</p> <p>[refer to original submission for full details].</p>	<p>1. Amend <b>GRUZ-R2 Pig production for domestic self-subsistence home use</b> as follows:</p> <p>[...]</p> <p><del><b>PER-1</b></del> <del>The pigs are for the subsistence of the people residing on the site; and are not sold to anyone not residing on the site; and</del></p> <p><b>PER-2</b> There are no more than <del>six</del> <u>twenty five</u> pigs located on the site and the pigs are setback a minimum distance of 25m from a building containing an existing sensitive activity on a separate site under different ownership; or</p>	Reject

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
						<p><b>PER-3</b>  There is <del>between 7 and</del> 25 pigs on the site and the pigs are setback a minimum distance of:  (a) 50m of a building containing an existing sensitive activity on a separate site under different ownership; and  (b) <del>100m</del> 50m of the boundary with a Residential, Rural Lifestyle, Rural Settlement, Māori Purpose or Open Space Zone.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>2. Any consequential amendments required as a result of the relief sought.</p>	
Keen, Oliver, Forbes <i>et al</i>	46.2	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R3 Keeping of poultry for domestic self-subsistence home use	<p>Support GRUZ-R3, but highlights that there are more rules in the PDP for an owner of less than 30 poultry, than there is for a commercial free range poultry farm.</p> <p>Examples, of how the PDP would work in effect and how industry guidelines work are provided.</p> <p>[Refer original submission for full reason].</p>	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
Bruce Speirs	66.39	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R3 Keeping of poultry for domestic self-subsistence home use	<p>Assumes the intent that eggs are also for self-subsistence purposes so has suggested wording to reflect this. Also, there is a redundant 'and'.</p>	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-R3 Keeping of poultry for domestic self-subsistence home use</b> as follows:</p> <p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b></p> <p>The poultry are for the subsistence of the people residing on the site and <u>they or their eggs</u> are not sold to anyone not residing on the site; and</p> <p>[...]</p> <p><b>PER-4</b></p> <p>No roosters are kept within 100m from the boundary of an existing sensitive activity on a separate site under different ownership; <del>and</del></p>	Accept

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
Federated Farmers	182.198	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R3 Keeping of poultry for domestic self-subsistence home use	Supports GRUZ-R3 but considers PER-4 is over prescriptive and creates regulation that is not in line with is being proposed with other district councils in their plans. 100m is over prescriptive, where most councils ask for 25-50m from boundary fences. This rule would severely restrict small farmland blocks.	<p>1. Amend <b>GRUZ-3 Keeping of poultry for domestic self-subsistence home use</b> as follows:</p> <p>[...]</p> <p><b>PER-4</b></p> <p><i>No roosters are kept within <del>100m</del> 25-50m from the notional boundary of an existing sensitive activity on a separate site under different ownership.</i></p> <p>AND</p> <p>2. Any consequential amendments required as a result of the relief sought.</p>	Reject
Lifestyle Builds Ltd	7.1	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R4 Residential units, excluding seasonal workers accommodation and permanent workers accommodation	<p>Considers the 80m<sup>2</sup> limitation for Minor Residential Unit should exclude garages and veranda's so that the habitable part of the building is only measured. In rural areas in particular people often need a large storage shed as well as minor dwellings. Waimakariri DC have a good approach.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-R4.PER-3</b> for minor residential building along the following lines (similar to Waimakariri DC):</p> <p><i>Gross habitable floor area (measure outside of cladding) 80m<sup>2</sup>, <u>excludes terrace, sundecks, garages, verandahs.</u></i></p>	Reject
Pye Group Ltd, Dialan Dairy Ltd, Grantlea Dairy Ltd, South Park Farm Ltd, South Stream Dairy Ltd	35.6	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R4 Residential units, excluding seasonal workers accommodation and permanent workers accommodation	Questions the differentiation between residential units (GRUZ-R4) and the workers accommodation (GRUZ-R20), both provide for a house for someone to live in, yet the rules are different. Additionally, the need for an employment contract with the building consent application is questioned as an employee could resign at any time.	Seeks explanation as to why there is a differentiation between Residential Units and Permanent Workers Accommodation, and if there is no clear reason, delete GRUZ-R20 and amend GRUZ-R4 to remove the reference to Permanent Workers Accommodation.	Reject
Maze Pastures Limited	41.5	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R4 Residential units, excluding seasonal workers accommodation and permanent workers accommodation	<p>Concerns that GRUZ-R4 does not sufficiently consider subdivision consent (101.2021.131) issued for the submitter's property in 2021. The rule allows residential unit on sites less than 40ha only if the site was created prior to 22 September 2022. The submitter's subdivision didn't obtain certificate of title before that date.</p> <p>[Refer original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-R4 Residential Units [...]</b> as follows:</p> <p><b>Activity Status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b></p> <p><i>There is a minimum site area of 40 hectares per residential unit unless the site <del>was created before 22 September 2022</del> is subject to a <u>subdivision consent approved by Council before the date that the Timaru District Plan becomes fully operative; and</u></i></p>	Accept in part

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
						[...]	
Milward Finlay Lobb	60.42	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R4 Residential units, excluding seasonal workers accommodation and permanent workers accommodation	Allowance needs to be made for approved subdivision consents issued by the Timaru District Council before the District Plan is fully operative.	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-R4 Residential Units...</b> as follows:</p> <p><b>Activity Status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b></p> <p><i>There is a minimum site area of 40 hectares per residential unit unless the site <del>was created before 22 September 2022</del> is subject to a subdivision consent approved by Council before the date that the Timaru District Plan becomes fully operative; and</i></p> <p>[...]</p>	Accept in part
Bruce Speirs	66.40	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R4 Residential units, excluding seasonal workers accommodation and permanent workers accommodation	Suggests alternative wording to better reflect the intent of the rule.	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-R4 Residential units, excluding seasonal workers accommodation and permanent workers accommodation</b> as follows:</p> <p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b></p> <p><i>There is a minimum site area of 40 hectares per residential unit unless the site <del>was created before the 22 September 2022 and does not contain an existing residential unit</del>; This is for the construction of the sole residential unit on a site; and</i></p> <p><b>PER-2</b></p> <p><i>There is a maximum of one minor residential unit per principal residential unit provided under <b>PER-1</b>; and</i></p> <p>[...]</p>	Reject
Leslie Raymond Rawlings	120.1	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R4 Residential units, excluding seasonal workers accommodation and permanent workers accommodation	<p>Opposes GRUZ-R4 which allows for an 80 square metre house for a dependant relative on an existing 4 Ha/Lifestyle block.</p> <p>Considers there is a lack of transparency in the criteria for such a house, and existing small blocks are cluttered with sheds and houses, ruining the existing environment and creating problems in</p>	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-R4</b> in relation to house for a dependent relative to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-be limited to relocatable construction; and</li> <li>-be limited to sites that are no less than 20ha in area; and</li> <li>-provide additional transparency in criteria.</li> </ul>	Reject

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
					Hadlow/ Gleniti area. Restrictions should be put in place to limit impacts on neighbouring houses. [Refer original submission for full reason]		
Silver Fern Farms	172.120	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R4 Residential units, excluding seasonal workers accommodation and permanent workers accommodation	Considers a very low density of residential development is appropriate in the GRUZ and the UFD objectives, including the separation of incompatible activities.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
Alliance Group Limited	173.119	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R4 Residential units, excluding seasonal workers accommodation and permanent workers accommodation	Considers it is appropriate to only provide for a low density of residential development in the GRUZ, to support the UFD objectives, including the separation of incompatible activities.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
Rooney Holdings Limited	174.83	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R4 Residential units, excluding seasonal workers accommodation and permanent workers accommodation	Oppose GRUZ-R4 PER-1. Considers that a minimum site area of 40ha is unnecessary and overly restrictive. The minimum site area should be 10ha and should also provide for clustering of residential units on a site comparable to the overall property size where a farm comprises multiple records of title . Changes to PER-1 to reflect this would provide more flexibility to farm owners and avoid unnecessary and costly resource consents.	Amend <b>GRUZ-R4 Residential units, ...</b> to provide for the following: -a reduced minimum site area of 10ha; -the clustering of residential units on a site regardless of the site size up to a 1 residential unit per 10ha of overall property (combined sites) area.	Reject
GJH Rooney	191.83	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R4 Residential units, excluding seasonal workers accommodation and permanent workers accommodation	Oppose GRUZ-R4 PER-1. Considers that a minimum site area of 40ha is unnecessary and overly restrictive. The minimum site area should be 10ha and should also provide for clustering of residential units on a site comparable to the overall property size where a farm comprises multiple records of title. Changes to PER-1 to reflect this would provide more flexibility to farm owners and avoid unnecessary and costly resource consents.	Amend <b>GRUZ-R4 Residential units, ...</b> to provide for the following: -a reduced minimum site area of 10ha; -the clustering of residential units on a site regardless of the site size up to a 1 residential unit per 10ha of overall property (combined sites) area.	Reject
Horticulture New Zealand	245.124	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R4 Residential units, excluding seasonal workers accommodation and permanent	Support the rule framework for residential units including the minimum site size of 40ha and minor dwelling control.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
				workers accommodation			
Rooney Group Limited	249.83	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R4 Residential units, excluding seasonal workers accommodation and permanent workers accommodation	Oppose GRUZ-R4 PER-1. Considers that a minimum site area of 40ha is unnecessary and overly restrictive. The minimum site area should be 10ha and should also provide for clustering of residential units on a site comparable to the overall property size where a farm comprises multiple records of title . Changes to PER-1 to reflect this would provide more flexibility to farm owners and avoid unnecessary and costly resource consents.	Amend <b>GRUZ-R4 Residential units, ...</b> to provide for the following:  -a reduced minimum site area of 10ha;  -the clustering of residential units on a site regardless of the site size up to a 1 residential unit per 10ha of overall property (combined sites) area.	Reject
Rooney Farms Limited	250.83	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R4 Residential units, excluding seasonal workers accommodation and permanent workers accommodation	Oppose GRUZ-R4 PER-1. Considers that a minimum site area of 40ha is unnecessary and overly restrictive. The minimum site area should be 10ha and should also provide for clustering of residential units on a site comparable to the overall property size where a farm comprises multiple records of title . Changes to PER-1 to reflect this would provide more flexibility to farm owners and avoid unnecessary and costly resource consents.	Amend <b>GRUZ-R4 Residential units, ...</b> to provide for the following:  -a reduced minimum site area of 10ha;  -the clustering of residential units on a site regardless of the site size up to a 1 residential unit per 10ha of overall property (combined sites) area.	Reject
Rooney Earthmoving Limited	251.83	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R4 Residential units, excluding seasonal workers accommodation and permanent workers accommodation	Oppose GRUZ-R4 PER-1. Considers that a minimum site area of 40ha is unnecessary and overly restrictive. The minimum site area should be 10ha and should also provide for clustering of residential units on a site comparable to the overall property size where a farm comprises multiple records of title . Changes to PER-1 to reflect this would provide more flexibility to farm owners and avoid unnecessary and costly resource consents.	Amend <b>GRUZ-R4 Residential units, ...</b> to provide for the following:  -a reduced minimum site area of 10ha;  -the clustering of residential units on a site regardless of the site size up to a 1 residential unit per 10ha of overall property (combined sites) area.	Reject
Timaru Developments Limited	252.83	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R4 Residential units, excluding seasonal workers accommodation and permanent workers accommodation	Oppose GRUZ-R4 PER-1. Considers that a minimum site area of 40ha is unnecessary and overly restrictive. The minimum site area should be 10ha and should also provide for clustering of residential units on a site comparable to the overall property size where a farm comprises multiple records of title . Changes to PER-1 to reflect this would provide more flexibility to farm owners and avoid unnecessary and costly resource consents.	Amend <b>GRUZ-R4 Residential units, ...</b> to provide for the following:  -a reduced minimum site area of 10ha;  -the clustering of residential units on a site regardless of the site size up to a 1 residential unit per 10ha of overall property (combined sites) area.	Reject
NZ Frost Fans Limited	255.25	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R4 Residential units, excluding seasonal workers accommodation	The rule does not give effect to the NPS-HPL insofar as priority is not given to land based primary production land uses on highly productive land by not appropriately managing reverse sensitivity effects on land based primary production activities	1. Amend the objectives, policies and methods of the PDP and / or included to give effect to the NPS-HPL.  AND	Reject

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
				and permanent workers accommodation	on highly productive land. In particular, non-compliance with PER-3 should be a non-complying activity.	2. Amend <b>GRUZ-R4 Residential units, excluding seasonal workers accommodation and permanent workers accommodation</b> so that non-compliance with PER-3 results in a non-complying activity.	
Ministry of Education	106.23	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R7 Educational facilities	<p>Considers that educational facilities should be provided in this zone as they are considered essential social infrastructure. As such the submitter considers the rule is too restrictive in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>operation hours;</li> <li>limitation to existing residential units</li> <li>limiting maximum number of children</li> <li>Discretionary status where compliance is not achieved.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer original submission or full reason]</p>	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-R7 Educational facilities</b> as follows:</p> <p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b></p> <p><del>The activity is undertaken within, and ancillary to the use of, an existing principal residential unit; and</del> <u>The activity complies with GRUZ-S1 - GRUZ-S4</u></p> <p><b>PER-2</b></p> <p><del>The education facility is for a childcare service, or home schooling; and</del></p> <p><b>PER-3</b></p> <p><del>The maximum number of children attending at any one time is six, excluding any children who live there.</del></p> <p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with: Discretionary Restricted discretionary</b></p> <p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <p><u>1. Adverse effects on the rural amenity values of adjoining rural properties and the surrounding area are avoided or mitigated; and</u></p> <p><u>2. The character and quality of the surrounding area is not compromised; and</u></p> <p><u>3. They contribute to the health and wellbeing of people in the surrounding area; and</u></p> <p><u>4. The scale, form and design of any building means the amenity values of the surrounding area are maintained; and</u></p> <p><u>5. Road safety and efficiency is maintained; and</u></p> <p><u>6. The activity has an operational or functional need to locate in the General Rural Zone.</u></p>	Reject
Horticulture New Zealand	245.125	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R7 Educational facilities	The submitter considers that Educational Facilities are sensitive to the effects of primary production and necessitate controls to avoid compromising food production activity.	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-R7 Educational facilities</b> as follows:</p> <p><b>Activity status: <del>Permitted</del> Restricted Discretionary</b></p> <p><b>Where</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b></p> <p><del>The activity is undertaken within, and ancillary to the use of, an existing principal residential unit; and</del></p>	Reject

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
						<p><b>PER-2</b></p> <p><i>The education facility is for a childcare service, or home schooling; and</i></p> <p><b>PER-3</b></p> <p><i>The maximum number of children attending at any one time is six, excluding any children who live there.</i></p> <p><b><u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u></b></p> <p><u>1. XXXXXX [insert matters of description]</u></p> <p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with: Discretionary</b></p>	
NZ Pork	247.26	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R7 Educational facilities	Considers that these activities are likely to be sensitive to the effects of primary production and are more appropriately managed in the General Rural Zone through a consent process.	Amend activity status within <b>GRUZ-R7</b> from a Permitted Activity to a Restricted Discretionary Activity.	Reject
Horticulture New Zealand	245.126	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R8 Supported residential care activity	The submitter considers that Supported residential care activity is sensitive to the effects of primary production and necessitate controls to avoid compromising food production activity.	<p>Amend activity status of <b>GRUZ-R8</b> from Permitted to Restricted Discretionary. as follows:</p> <p><b><i>GRUZ-R8 Supported residential care activity</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Activity status: <del>Permitted</del> Restricted Discretionary</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Where</i></b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b></p> <p><i>The supported residential care activity is within, and ancillary to the use of, an existing principal residential unit; and</i></p> <p><b>PER-2</b></p> <p><i>The maximum occupancy does not exceed six residents, not including any staff.</i></p> <p><b><u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u></b></p> <p><u>1. XXXXXX [insert matters of description]</u></p> <p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with: Discretionary</b></p>	Reject

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
NZ Pork	247.27	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R8 Supported residential care activity	Considers that these activities are likely to be sensitive to the effects of primary production and are more appropriately managed in the General Rural Zone through a consent process.	Amend activity status within <b>GRUZ-R8</b> from a Permitted Activity to a Restricted Discretionary Activity.	Reject
Silver Fern Farms	172.121	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R9 Residential Visitor Accommodation	Considers it is appropriate to heavily restrict this activity, given the potential for reverse sensitivity effects that constrain legitimate primary production and supporting activities.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Alliance Group Limited	173.120	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R9 Residential visitor accommodation	Considers it is appropriate to heavily restrict this activity in the GRUZ, given the potential for it to generate reverse sensitivity effects that constrain legitimate primary production and supporting activities.	Retain as notified.	Accept
NZ Pork	247.28	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R9 Residential visitor accommodation	Considers that these activities are likely to be sensitive to the effects of primary production and are more appropriately managed in the General Rural Zone through a consent process.	Amend activity within <b>GRUZ-9</b> from a Permitted Activity status to a Restricted Discretionary Activity.	Reject
Horticulture New Zealand	245.127	GRUZ General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R9 Residential visitor accommodation	Residential visitor accommodation is sensitive to the effects of primary production and necessitate controls to avoid compromising food production activity.	Amend GRUZ-R9 Residential visitor accommodation as follows:  <i>Activity status: <del>Permitted</del> <u>Restricted Discretionary</u></i>  <b><u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u></b>  <i><u>1. XXXXXX [insert matters of description]</u></i>	Reject
Helicopters South Canterbury 2015 Ltd	53.24	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R10 Conservation activities	Considers provide for equipment used for weed and pest control should be made.	Amend <b>GRUZ-R10</b> as follows:  <b><i>Conservation activities</i></b>  <b><i>Activity status: Permitted</i></b>  <b><i>Where</i></b>  <b><i>PER-1</i></b>  <i>Land, buildings and structures <u>and equipment, machinery, vehicles and aircraft</u> are used for:</i>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>preservation, protection, restoration, promulgation or enhancement of indigenous species or habitats of indigenous fauna; or</i></li> <li><i><u>Weed and pest control</u>; or</i></li> </ul>	Accept

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
						[...]	
New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association	132.30	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R10 Conservation activities	GRUZ-R10 should make provision for equipment used for weed and pest control.	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-R10</b> as follows:</p> <p><b>GRUZ-R10 Conservation activities</b></p> <p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b></p> <p><u>Land, buildings and structures and equipment, machinery, vehicles and aircraft are used for:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>preservation, protection, restoration, promulgation or enhancement of indigenous species or habitats of indigenous fauna; or</u></li> <li>2. <u>Weed and pest control; or</u></li> <li>3. <u>conservation education; or</u></li> <li>4. <u>observation or surveying; or</u></li> <li>5. <u>walking tracks, board walks, pedestrian bridge.</u></li> </ol> <p><i>Note: any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with GRUZ-R13.</i></p>	Accept
Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation Tumuaki Ahurei	166.128	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R10 Conservation activities	The submitter supports the inclusion of this rule as it provides a permitted activity for conservation activities in the general rural zone. As submitted above, it is considered necessary to include a definition of ‘conservation activity’.	<p>Retain <b>GRUZ-R10 Conservation activities</b> as notified;</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Include a new definition for ‘conservation activity’ (see submission point on Definitions).</p>	Accept in part
Federated Farmers	182.199	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R10 Conservation activities	Requests the inclusion of recognition of agricultural conservation activities through the use of aviation. Farmers hold intergenerational views and conservation is a way to ensure their land is protected, left in a better state for future generations to enjoy.	<p>1. Amend <b>GRUZ-R10 Conservation activities</b> follows:</p> <p><b>GRUZ-R10</b></p> <p>[...]</p> <p><b>PER-1</b></p> <p><i>Land, buildings and structures are used for:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Preservation, protection, restoration, promulgation or enhancement of indigenous species or habitats of indigenous fauna; or</i></li> <li>• <i>pest control; or</i></li> <li>• <i>conservation education; or</i></li> <li>• <i>observation or surveying; or</i></li> <li>• <u>agricultural aviation conservation</u></li> <li>• <i>walking tracks, board walks, pedestrian bridge.</i></li> </ul> <p>AND</p>	Accept in part

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
						2. Any consequential amendments required as a result of the relief sought	
Rooney Holdings Limited	174.84	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R11 Recreation activities	Oppose GRUZ-R11 PER-1. It is considered that the rule should provide for commercial activities that are non-motorised, or predominately non- motorised as a permitted activity.	Amend <b>GRUZ-R11 Recreation activities</b> to provide or commercial activities that are predominantly non-motorised.	Accept
GJH Rooney	191.84	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R11 Recreation activities	Oppose GRUZ-R11 PER-1. It is considered that the rule should provide for commercial activities that are non-motorised, or predominately non-motorised as a permitted activity.	Amend <b>GRUZ-R11 Recreation activities</b> to provide or commercial activities that are predominantly non-motorised.	Accept
Horticulture New Zealand	245.114	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R11 Recreation activities	The submitter considers that Recreation activities are sensitive to the effects of primary production and necessitate controls to avoid compromising food production activity.	Amend <b>GRUZ-R11</b> as follows:  <b><i>GRUZ-R11 Recreation activities</i></b>  <b><i>Activity status: <del>Permitted</del> Restricted Discretionary</i></b>   <b><i>Where</i></b>  <b><i>PER-1</i></b>  <i>The activity is not operated as a commercial activity; and</i>  <b><i>PER-2</i></b>  <i>Any organised sports comply with GRUZ-S4, 'sensitive activity' in this standard should be read as 'organised sports'; and</i>  <b><i>Note: any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with GRUZ-R13.</i></b>  <b><i>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</i></b>  <u><i>1. XXXXXX [insert matters of description]</i></u>  <b><i>Activity status where compliance not achieved with: Discretionary</i></b>	Reject
NZ Pork	247.29	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R11 Recreation activities	Considers that these activities are likely to be sensitive to the effects of primary production and are more appropriately managed in the General Rural Zone through a consent process.	Amend activity status within <b>GRUZ-R11</b> from a Permitted Activity to a Restricted Discretionary Activity.	Reject

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
Rooney Group Limited	249.84	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R11 Recreation activities	Oppose GRUZ-R11 PER-1. It is considered that the rule should provide for commercial activities that are non-motorised, or predominately non- motorised as a permitted activity.	Amend <b>GRUZ-R11 Recreation activities</b> to provide or commercial activities that are predominantly non-motorised.	Accept
Rooney Farms Limited	250.84	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R11 Recreation activities	Oppose GRUZ-R11 PER-1. It is considered that the rule should provide for commercial activities that are non-motorised, or predominately non- motorised as a permitted activity.	Amend <b>GRUZ-R11 Recreation activities</b> to provide or commercial activities that are predominantly non-motorised.	Accept
Rooney Earthmoving Limited	251.84	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R11 Recreation activities	Oppose GRUZ-R11 PER-1. It is considered that the rule should provide for commercial activities that are non-motorised, or predominately non- motorised as a permitted activity.	Amend <b>GRUZ-R11 Recreation activities</b> to provide or commercial activities that are predominantly non-motorised.	Accept
Timaru Developments Limited	252.84	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R11 Recreation activities	Oppose GRUZ-R11 PER-1. It is considered that the rule should provide for commercial activities that are non-motorised, or predominately non- motorised as a permitted activity.	Amend <b>GRUZ-R11 Recreation activities</b> to provide or commercial activities that are predominantly non-motorised.	Accept
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	143.149	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R12 Rural produce retail	The rule is generally supported; however, the submitter seeks to control rural produce retail on the state highway in speed environments with a speed limit greater than 50km/h. Rural retail activities can result in additional vehicle movements and vehicle manoeuvring in locations that may not be suitable for these to occur. It is considered that the speed limit for permitted rural retail activities be amended from 80km/h to 50km/h to ensure that the safe and efficient function of the state highway is maintained.	Amend <b>GRUZ-R12</b> as follows:  <b><i>GRUZ-R12 Rural produce retail</i></b>  <b><i>Activity status: Permitted</i></b>  [...]  <b><i>PER-3</i></b>  <i>The access to the retail area is from a road, except where the road is a state highway with a speed limit greater than <del>80km/h</del>; <u>50km/h</u> and</i>  [...]	Reject
Federated Farmers	182.200	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R12 Rural produce retail	Supports the policy with amendments. A setback of 10m as too prescriptive is not obtainable on all highways and byways of the district. It is important that council enables the conditions of growth for these stalls and not stifle.	1. Amend <b>GRUZ-R12 Rural produce retail</b> as follows: [...] <b><i>PER-1:</i></b> <i>The retail area has a maximum gross floor area of 100m<sup>2</sup> and is set back a minimum of <del>10m</del> <u>8m</u> from a road boundary, <u>where deemed safe</u>; and</i>	Reject

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
						<p>[...]</p> <p>AND</p> <p>2. Any consequential amendments required as a result of the relief sought.</p>	
Horticulture New Zealand	245.115	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R12 Rural produce retail	Supports that rural produce stalls are an anticipated activity in the rural environment, these support a number of well beings and can be managed to avoid or mitigate adverse effects.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Radio New Zealand Limited	152.56	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R13 Buildings and structures not listed in GRUZ-R17 or GRUZ-R18	Support GRUZ-R13 and in particular the permitted activity status for buildings and structures in the General Rural Zone.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Horticulture New Zealand	245.116	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R13 Buildings and structures not listed in GRUZ-R17 or GRUZ-R18	Support a permitted activity status of buildings and structures associated with or ancillary to primary production.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Ian Sinclair	39.1	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R14 Use of airstrips and helicopter landing sites	<p>Considers an additional class of operations on private airstrips in the GRUZ should be permitted to allow for recreation, gatherings of pilots and aircraft. This would preserve the existing use of aircraft owners currently enjoy. There is no adverse effects compared to normal farming activities and there is no existing issue with such activities.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-14 PER-3</b> to allow unlimited movements;</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Add PER-4 to allow unlimited movements for recreation and private use.</p>	Accept in part
John Evans	45.1	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R14 Use of airstrips and helicopter landing sites	<p>Oppose GRUZ-R14 PER-3 which imposes a limit of 10 take-offs and landings per month. This is overly restrictive and limits existing use rights. Aviation and private airstrips have been operating for 75 years and have not created an issue, and the noise duration is such that impacts are low compared to other permitted uses.</p> <p>[Refer original submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-14 PER-3</b> to preserve the existing rights by removing take-off and landing) frequency limitations.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Allow for existing rights to host a fly-in, as organised by organisations such as the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association.</p>	Accept in part

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
Helicopters South Canterbury 2015 Ltd	53.25	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R14 Use of airstrips and helicopter landing sites	Support the enabling nature of the rule, however, it is overly complex and the proposed setbacks will be unduly restrictive which are not supported or justified by the s32 Report.	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-R14</b> as follows:</p> <p><b><i>GRUZ-R14 Use of <u>Rural</u> airstrips and helicopter <u>landing sites</u> areas</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Activity status: Permitted</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Where:</i></b></p> <p><b><i>PER-1</i></b></p> <p><i>The flights are for emergency purposes such as medical evacuations, search and rescue, firefighting or civil defence; or</i></p> <p><b><i>PER-2</i></b></p> <p><i>The use is for primary production including spraying, stock management, fertiliser application or frost protection for:</i></p> <p><i>1. a maximum of seven days within any three month period where the airstrip or helicopter landing site is setback between 500m 1,000m from:</i></p> <p><i>a. any Residential zone; and</i></p> <p><i>b. the notional boundary of a building containing a noise sensitive activity, not located on the site of the airstrip or helicopter land site; or</i></p> <p><i>2. the airstrip or helicopter landing site is setback greater than 1,000m from:</i></p> <p><i>a. any Residential zone; and</i></p> <p><i>b. the notional boundary of a building containing a noise sensitive activity, not located on the site of the airstrip or helicopter land site; or</i></p> <p><b><i>PER-3</i></b></p> <p><i>Take offs or landings must not exceed 10 per month; and the airstrip or landing site is setback a minimum of 500m from:</i></p> <p><i>1. any Residential zone; and</i></p>	Accept in part

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
						<p><del>2. the notional boundary of a building containing a noise sensitive activity not located on the site of the airstrip or helicopter land site.</del></p> <p><b><u>PER-1</u></b></p> <p><u>Agricultural aviation activities for the purpose primary production or conservation on a seasonal, temporary or intermittent basis for a period up to 30 days in any 12 month period or 315 aircraft hours (whichever is the greater).</u></p> <p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved:</b> <u>Restricted Discretionary</u></p>	
Sid McAuley	57.1	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R14 Use of airstrips and helicopter landing sites	<p>Objects to any restrictions of light aircraft in the Timaru District. Aviators wish to be able to land on fellow aviators properties, which has never caused complaints in the past.</p> <p>[Refer original submission for full reason].</p>	Amend <b>GRUZ-R14 Use of airstrips and helicopter landing sites</b> to remove restrictions, particularly the limitations on the number of take offs and landings per month.	Accept in part
Louise Aubrey	59.1	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R14 Use of airstrips and helicopter landing sites	<p>Considers the limit of 10 take-offs and landings per month is overly restrictive and excessively limits the existing use and rights of aviators operating aircraft on private airstrips. This will make recreation, business, training and social gatherings such as fly-ins virtually unachievable which will have a detrimental impact on businesses, recreation opportunities and mental health of residents.</p> <p>[Refer original submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-R14 Use of airstrips and helicopter landing sites</b> with the following changes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>remove movement restrictions in PER-3;</li> <li>amend to preserve the existing right to host a fly-in, as organised by organisations such as the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association (AOPA) and aero clubs.</li> </ol>	Accept in part
Station Air Ltd	61.1	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R14 Use of airstrips and helicopter landing sites	<p>Considers the limit of only 10 take-offs per month is overly restrictive and heavily hinders the abilities of aviators, aviation clubs and business owners to continue their activities.</p>	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-R14 Use of airstrips and helicopter landing sites</b> to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>delete the limitations of take-offs under PER3;</li> <li>allow landowners to retain their existing rights to use their airstrips without a frequency limit.</li> </ol>	Accept in part

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
					[Refer original submission for full reason].		
Simon Pemberton	64.1	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R14 Use of airstrips and helicopter landing sites	<p>Considers that the proposal to limit takeoffs and landings to ten per month would be restrictive and would excessively limit the use, and the right to use private airstrips for recreation, business, primary production requirements and emergency purposes.</p> <p>[refer to original submission for full reasons]</p>	Amend <b>GRUZ-R14.PER-3</b> to preserve the existing use rights of private landowners and the aviation community by removing the proposed limitations in PER-3.	Accept in part
Jeremy Talbot	79.1	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R14 Use of airstrips and helicopter landing sites	<p>Oppose GRUZ-R14 as it is too restrictive on owners of small light aircraft on a small property which are used for a range of activities including flight training, farming, transportation and social events.</p> <p>As the operation of small flights is largely weather dependent, owners tend to make the most of them on a fly day (e.g., 26 were seen on a small airstrip on a fly day).</p> <p>Considers the 500m from any boundary is unworkable either due to constraints on space, or practically with the strip needing to be placed in to the prevailing wind.</p> <p>[Refer original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-R14 Use of airstrips and helicopter landing sites</b> with the following changes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. remove restrictions on number of landings; and</li> <li>2. Remove the 500m from boundary for landing strip.</li> </ol>	Accept in part
Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited	86.13	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R14 Use of airstrips and helicopter landing sites	<p>Opposes this overly restrictive rule as it conflicts with GRUZ-O3 - Protecting Primary Production, and to prevent significant unintended negative impacts on agricultural production in the Timaru District and the subsequent economic and social aspirations of the district and region. Considers restrictions on the number of days a rural airstrip can be used over a certain period does not take into account delays associated with inclement weather, the use of one airstrip for more than one farm, the number of take offs and landings typically required in one hour of operation, or one day. The rule does not consider the use of airstrips for a range of different activities, which need to take place at different times of the year.</p>	<p>Delete current <b>GRUZ-R14 Use of airstrips and helicopter landing sites</b> and replace with the following:</p> <p><b><i>GRUZ-R14 Use of airstrips and helicopter landing sites</i></b></p> <p><u><i>Aircraft and helicopter movements are limited to</i></u></p> <p><u><i>between the hours of Morning Civil Twilight and Evening Civil Twilight as defined in the Civil Aviation rules</i></u></p> <p><u><i>A log detailing the time and date of all aircraft movements and helicopter movements shall be maintained and made available to the Council at its request.</i></u></p>	Accept in part

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
Judith Margaret Coldicott	118.1	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R14 Use of airstrips and helicopter landing sites	Oppose the restriction in GRU-R14.PER-3 which limits the number of aircraft movements on private land. Considers private flying, flight training, and associated aviation on private land have been part of Timaru's history and helped to build the country. Considers the rule is an attempt to resolve a perceived problem, where one does not exist.	Amend <b>GRU-R14.PER-3</b> so it: 1. does not restrict the lawful rights of property owners to carry out aviation activities on private land; 2. does not impose movement restrictions on landing sites, within the district, where private landowners consent to the operation; 3. upholds the right to use private land for unrestricted aviation activities; and 4. encourages and strengthens the pursuit of aviation in the rural rules.	Accept in part
Russell Kenneth Brodie	125.1	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R14 Use of airstrips and helicopter landing sites	Oppose GRUZ-R14.P3 that limits aircraft or helicopter movements on private land within the district.	Amend <b>GRUZ-R14.PER-3</b> to retain the current status quo and not limit the number of aircraft or helicopter take off or landings.	Accept in part
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	131.38	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R14 Use of airstrips and helicopter landing sites	Support GRUZ-R14 as it allows for flights for emergency purposes as a permitted activity.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association	132.31	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R14 Use of airstrips and helicopter landing sites	Opposes the overly complex rule GRUZ-R14 which includes unduly restrictive setbacks which are not supported or justified by the s32 Report. Rule should be more enabling.	Amend <b>GRUZ-R14</b> as follows: <b><i>GRUZ-R14 Use of <u>Rural</u> airstrips and helicopter landing sites Areas</i></b> <b><i>Activity status: Permitted</i></b> <b><i>Where:</i></b> <b><i>PER-1</i></b> <b><i><del>The flights are for emergency purposes such as medical evacuations, search and rescue, firefighting or civil defence; or</del></i></b> <b><i>PER-2</i></b> <b><i><del>The use is for primary production including spraying, stock management, fertiliser application or frost protection for:</del></i></b> <b><i><del>1. a maximum of seven days within any three month period where the airstrip or helicopter landing site is setback between 500m-1,000m from:</del></i></b> <b><i><del>a). any Residential zone; and</del></i></b> <b><i><del>b). the notional boundary of a building containing a noise sensitive activity, not located on the site of the airstrip or helicopter land site; or</del></i></b> <b><i><del>2. the airstrip or helicopter landing site is setback greater than 1,000m from:</del></i></b> <b><i><del>a). any Residential zone; and</del></i></b> <b><i><del>b). the notional boundary of a building containing a noise sensitive activity, not located on the site of the airstrip or helicopter land site; or</del></i></b> <b><i>PER-3</i></b>	Accept in part

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
						<p><del>Take offs or landings must not exceed 10 per month; and the airstrip or landing site is setback a minimum of 500m from:</del></p> <p><del>a). any Residential zone; and</del></p> <p><del>b.) the notional boundary of a building containing a noise sensitive activity not located on the site of the airstrip or helicopter land site.</del></p> <p><u>Agricultural aviation activities for the purpose primary production or conservation on a seasonal, temporary or intermittent basis for a period of up to 30 days in any 12 month period of 315 aircraft hours (whichever is the greater).</u></p> <p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved: <u>Restricted Discretionary</u></b></p>	
Rooney Holdings Limited	174.85	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R14 Use of airstrips and helicopter landing sites	Supports the provisions of the rule for primary production but considers that the rule should also provide for take- off and landings associated with recreational activities such as hunting and fishing whether commercial or non-commercial. Such activities are often associated with properties undertaking primary production and provide an integrated part of the income stream for that property.	Amend <b>GRUZ-R14 Use of airstrips and helicopter landing sites</b> to provide for take-off and landings associated with commercial and non-commercial recreational activities.	Accept in part
Federated Farmers	182.201	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R14 Use of airstrips and helicopter landing sites	Oppose GRUZ-R14. Supports the submission by the New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association to delete PER-1 and PER- 2 and replace with alternative wording. The definition needs to support the permitted activity defined in the rule. Support of PER-3.	<p>1. Amend <b>GRUZ-14 Use of airstrips and helicopter landing sites</b> as follows:</p> <p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b><del>PER-1</del></b></p> <p><del>The flights are for emergency purposes such as medical evacuations, search and rescue, firefighting or civil defence; or</del></p> <p><b><del>PER-2</del></b></p> <p><del>The use is for primary production including spraying, stock management, fertiliser application or frost protection for:</del></p> <p><del>1. a maximum of seven days within any three month period where the airstrip or helicopter landing site is setback between 500m 1,000m from:</del></p> <p><del>a. any Residential zone; and</del></p> <p><del>b. the notional boundary of a building containing a noise sensitivity activity, not located on the site of the airstrip or helicopter land site; or</del></p> <p><del>2. the airstrip or helicopter landing site is setback greater than 1,000m from:</del></p>	Accept in part

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
						<p><del>a. any Residential zone; and</del></p> <p><del>b. the notional boundary of a building containing a noise sensitive activity, not located on the site of the airstrip or helicopter land site; or</del></p> <p><b><u>PER-1</u></b></p> <p><u>Agricultural aviation activities of the purpose of primary production or conservation on a seasonal temporary or intermittent basis for a period up to 30 days in any 12 month period or 315 aircraft hours (whichever is greater).</u></p> <p><b><u>PER-3 2</u></b></p> <p>Take offs or landings must not exceed 10 per month; and the airstrip or landing site is setback a minimum of 500m from:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>any Residential zone; and</li> <li>the notional boundary of a building containing a noise sensitive activity not located on the site of the airstrip or helicopter land site.</li> </ol> <p><b><u>Aircraft</u></b> means, any machine that can derive support in the atmosphere from the reactions of the air otherwise than by the reactions of the air against the surface of the earth.</p> <p><b><u>Agricultural aviation activity</u></b> means the intermittent operation of an aircraft from a rural airstrip or helicopter landing area for primary production, biosecurity, or biodiversity purposes including stock management, and the application of fertiliser, agrichemicals, or vertebrate toxic agents (VTA's). For clarity, aircraft includes fixed-wing aeroplanes, helicopters, and unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV's)</p> <p><b><u>A "Day"</u></b> as it relates to agricultural aircraft activities means 10.5 hours aircraft hours conducted between the beginning of civil morning twilight (MCT) and the end of civil evening twilight (ECT).</p> <p><b><u>NOTE.</u></b> A day is defined in the Civil Aviation rules as: the hours between—</p> <p><u>(1) the beginning of morning civil twilight, which is when the centre of the rising sun's disc is 6 degrees below the horizon; and</u></p> <p><u>(2) the end of evening civil twilight, which is when the centre of the setting sun's disc is 6 degrees below the horizon.</u></p> <p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved: Discretionary</b></p> <p>AND</p> <p>2. Any consequential amendments required as a result of the relief sought.</p>	

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
GJH Rooney	191.85	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R14 Use of airstrips and helicopter landing sites	Supports the provisions of the rule for primary production but considers that the rule should also provide for take-Off and landings associated with recreational activities such as hunting and fishing whether commercial or non-commercial. Such activities are often associated with properties undertaking primary production and provide an integrated part of the income stream for that property.	Amend <b>GRUZ-R14 Use of airstrips and helicopter landing sites</b> to provide for take-off and landings associated with commercial and non-commercial recreational activities.	Accept in part
Cessna 180/185 Group, Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, Sports Aircraft Association, Recreational Backcountry Pilots Association	201.1	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R14 Use of airstrips and helicopter landing sites	<p>The submitter considers that aircraft landings in rural areas have minimal effect on conservation, landscape or wilderness values in those areas where fixed-winged aircraft can be landed. Noise effects are already adequately managed in the current District Plan, as mentioned by the Stage 2 Noise and Vibration report by Malcolm Hunt and Associates (Page 14), which states: Overall however, the existing district plans are considered a sufficient deterrent. [...] no significant changes to the overall approach to land use controls in aircraft noise-affected areas are considered necessary. Rule GRUZ-R14 is unnecessarily onerous and unduly penalises recreational aircraft owners. It provides arbitrary rules which are not correlated to noise effects. The necessity of this rule is questionable.</p> <p>Oppose to PER-2.2.b as it should allow private airstrip owners to use their airstrip at any time and under any circumstances if the airstrip is located nearby a noise sensitive activity owned/occupied by the airstrip or helicopter landing site operator.</p> <p>Oppose to PER-3, especially the 10 trip per month restriction which are not based on fact.</p> <p>[Refer original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-R14 Use of airstrips and helicopter landing sites</b> as follows:</p> <p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b></p> <p><i>The flights are for emergency purposes such as medical evacuations, search and rescue, firefighting or civil defence; or</i></p> <p><b>PER-2</b></p> <p><i>The use is for primary production including spraying, stock management, fertiliser application or frost protection for:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>a maximum of seven days within any three month period where the airstrip or helicopter landing site is setback between 500m-1,000m from:</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>any Residential zone; and</i></li> <li><i>the notional boundary of a building containing a noise sensitive activity, not located on the site of the airstrip or helicopter land site; or</i></li> </ol> </li> <li><i>the airstrip or helicopter landing site is setback greater than 1,000m from:</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>any Residential zone; and</i></li> <li><i>the notional boundary of a building containing a noise sensitive activity, not <del>located on the site of</del> owned or occupied by the airstrip or helicopter land site operator; or</i></li> </ol> </li> </ol>	Accept in part

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
						<p><b>PER-3</b></p> <p><del>Take-offs or landings must not exceed 10 per month; and the airstrip or landing site is setback a minimum of 500m from:</del></p> <p><del>1. any Residential zone; and</del></p> <p><del>2. the notional boundary of a building containing a noise sensitive activity not located on the site of the airstrip or helicopter land site.</del></p> <p><u>For activities not associated with Rule PER-2 above, the airstrip or landing site is setback a minimum of 500m from:</u></p> <p><u>1. any Residential zone; and</u></p> <p><u>2. the notional boundary of a building containing a noise sensitive activity not owned or occupied by the airstrip or helicopter landing site operator.</u></p>	
Horticulture New Zealand	245.117	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R14 Use of airstrips and helicopter landing sites	Considers the use of aircraft for primary production should be provided as a permitted activity. There is no justification in the s32 Report for the proposed setbacks and time limits and would sterilise use of rural production land.	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-R14</b> as follows:</p> <p><b><i>GRUZ-R14 Use of airstrips and helicopter landing sites</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Activity status: Permitted</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Where:</i></b></p> <p><b><i>PER-1</i></b></p> <p><i>The flights are for emergency purposes such as medical evacuations, search and rescue, firefighting or civil defence; or</i></p> <p><b><i>PER-2</i></b></p> <p><i>The use is for primary production including spraying, stock management, fertiliser application or frost protection for:</i></p> <p><del>1. a maximum of seven days within any three month period where the airstrip or helicopter landing site is setback between 500m 1,000m from:</del></p> <p><del>a. any Residential zone; and</del></p> <p><del>b. the notional boundary of a building containing a noise sensitive activity, not located on the site of the airstrip or helicopter land site; or</del></p>	Accept in part

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
						<p><del>2. the airstrip or helicopter landing site is setback greater than 1,000m from:</del></p> <p><del>a. any Residential zone; and</del></p> <p><del>b. the notional boundary of a building containing a noise sensitive activity, not located on the site of the airstrip or helicopter land site; or</del></p> <p>[...]</p>	
Rooney Group Limited	249.85	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R14 Use of airstrips and helicopter landing sites	Supports the provisions of the rule for primary production but considers that the rule should also provide for take- off and landings associated with recreational activities such as hunting and fishing whether commercial or non-commercial. Such activities are often associated with properties undertaking primary production and provide an integrated part of the income stream for that property.	Amend <b>GRUZ-R14 Use of airstrips and helicopter landing sites</b> to provide for take-off and landings associated with commercial and non-commercial recreational activities.	Accept in part
Rooney Farms Limited	250.85	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R14 Use of airstrips and helicopter landing sites	Supports the provisions of the rule for primary production but considers that the rule should also provide for take- off and landings associated with recreational activities such as hunting and fishing whether commercial or non-commercial. Such activities are often associated with properties undertaking primary production and provide an integrated part of the income stream for that property.	Amend <b>GRUZ-R14 Use of airstrips and helicopter landing sites</b> to provide for take-off and landings associated with commercial and non-commercial recreational activities.	Accept in part
Rooney Earthmoving Limited	251.85	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R14 Use of airstrips and helicopter landing sites	Supports the provisions of the rule for primary production but considers that the rule should also provide for take- off and landings associated with recreational activities such as hunting and fishing whether commercial or non-commercial. Such activities are often associated with properties undertaking primary production and provide an integrated part of the income stream for that property.	Amend <b>GRUZ-R14 Use of airstrips and helicopter landing sites</b> to provide for take-off and landings associated with commercial and non-commercial recreational activities.	Accept in part
Timaru Developments Limited	252.85	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R14 Use of airstrips and helicopter landing sites	Supports the provisions of the rule for primary production but considers that the rule should also provide for take- off and landings associated with recreational activities such as hunting and fishing whether commercial or non-commercial. Such activities are often associated with properties undertaking primary production and provide an	Amend <b>GRUZ-R14 Use of airstrips and helicopter landing sites</b> to provide for take-off and landings associated with commercial and non-commercial recreational activities.	Accept in part

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
					integrated part of the income stream for that property.		
Grant Coldicott	254.1	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R14 Use of airstrips and helicopter landing sites	Oppose the restriction in GRU-R14.PER-3 which limits the number of aircraft movements on private land. Considers private flying, flight training, and associated aviation on private land have been part of Timaru's history and the submitter's recreational aircraft operation generates insignificant effects and often not noticed by close neighbours. Considers the restriction are unnecessary with no public benefit.	Amend <b>GRU-R14.PER-3</b> to:  1. preserve existing rights to the quiet and peaceful enjoyment of one's property and allow land owners to use common sense in exercising unrestricted aircraft movement rights from their properties.  2. allow the maximum flexibility to ensure aviators have the rights to land and take off at suitable sites on private land with the consent of land owner.  3. not arbitrarily restrict the freedom of land owners to allow aircraft to take off and land on suitable sites and the pilots in command must not be restrained from carrying out a landing or take off at a site approved by the land owner.	Accept in part
Milward Finlay Lobb	60.43	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R15 Shelterbelts	Considers the rule as drafted is unclear on existing use rights.	Amend <b>GRUZ-R15 Shelterbelts</b> to include existing use rights prior to the District Plan being fully operative.	Reject
H B	74.3	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R15 Shelterbelts	The car driving experience along State Highway 1 from Christchurch to Timaru could be improved by a corridor of indigenous vegetation.  [Please see original submission for full details].	Add a new clause or amend <b>GRUZ-R15 Shelterbelts</b> to state that 'no trees or shelterbelts shall be planted within 15m of SH1 unless they are of an indigenous variety'.	Reject
Silver Fern Farms	172.122	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R15 Shelterbelts	Considers permitting the planting of shelterbelts with a fall back restricted discretionary consenting pathway is appropriate.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Federated Farmers	182.202	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R15 Shelterbelts	Considers GRUZ-R15 very specific and detailed, overly prescriptive for a minor effect and an activity that is already regulated under Property Law Act. The policy restricts that matter to shading of property and roads, so the rule must only be for this purpose. Farm shelterbelts will be restricted, meaning farmers will not be able to provide shade and shelter for livestock welfare.	1. Delete <b>GRUZ-R15 Shelterbelts</b> ;  AND 2. Any consequential amendments required as a result of the relief sought.	Reject
Horticulture New Zealand	245.118	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R15 Shelterbelts	Opposes the recession plane regulation when lots in the rural zone should be large enough (as supported by the subdivision regime) to provide sufficient setback such that daylight rules are not required. The regulation would affect existing established shelterbelts in place as part of primary production.	Amend <b>GRUZ-R15 Shelterbelts</b> as follows:  <b>Activity status: Permitted</b>  <b>Where:</b>  <b>PER-1</b>  <del>The height of any trees located within 100m of a residential unit on an adjoining site are contained within an envelope defined by a recession</del>	Reject

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
						<p><del>plane of 1m vertical for every 3.5m horizontal that originates from the closest point of the residential unit; and</del></p> <p><b>PER-2</b></p> <p>Trees are not in such a position that they cause icing of a road as a result of shading the road between 10 am and 2 pm on the shortest day.</p> <p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved:</b></p> <p><b>Restricted Discretionary</b></p> <p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. height and setback of trees from property boundaries and roads; and</li> <li><del>2. shading of houses; and</del></li> <li><del>3. 2. shading of roads; and</del></li> <li>4. <del>3. traffic safety; and</del></li> <li><del>5. 4. tree species.</del></li> </ol>	
Road Metals Company Limited	169.44	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R16 Quarries and quarrying activities [...]	Opposes GRUZ-R16 as it represents further duplication of rules. Inert fill that does not fall within the definition of cleanfill should also be allowed for to avoid unnecessarily limiting the rehabilitation of a quarry.	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ -R16</b> as follows:</p> <p><b><u>GRUZ-R16 Quarries and quarrying activities including backfilling with managed fill:</u></b></p> <p><b>[...]</b></p> <p><b>PER-2</b></p> <p>The quarry in not within 50m of a rock art site; and PER-3 The quarry is not located within <del>500</del> <u>250m</u> of an existing sensitive activity located on another site or the boundary of any of the Residential zones, Rural lifestyle zone, Rural settlement zone, Māori Purpose zone or Open Space and recreation zones; and</p> <p>[...]</p>	Reject

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
Fulton Hogan Limited	170.46	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R16 Quarries and quarrying activities [...]	Opposes GRUZ-R16 as it represents further duplication of rules. Inert fill that does not fall within the definition of cleanfill should also be allowed for to avoid unnecessarily limiting the rehabilitation of a quarry.	Amend <b>GRUZ -R16</b> as follows:  <b><i>GRUZ-R16 Quarries and quarrying activities <u>including backfilling with managed fill</u></i></b>  [...]	Reject
Rooney Holdings Limited	174.86	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R16 Quarries and quarrying activities [...]	Opposes GRUZ-16 PER-4 requiring Accidental Discovery Protocol. Considers the SASM areas in the proposed plan are extensive and the Accidental Discovery Protocol commitment should only be required in SASM areas. Council should be promoting the practice of accidental discovery rather than regulating for it through a rule.  [see original submission for full reason]	Amend <b>GRUZ-R16</b> as follows:  <b><i>GRUZ-R16 Quarries and quarrying activities: up to 2,000m<sup>2</sup> (not in the bed of a river); and in the bed of a river , which is authorised under the Regional Plan either as a permitted activity, or through a resource consent having been obtained from the Canterbury Regional Council</i></b>  <b><i>Activity status: Permitted</i></b>  [....]  <b><i>PER-4</i></b>  <b><i>Where located in a SASM's, the Accidental Discovery Protocol commitment form, contained within APP4 - Form confirming a commitment to adhering to an Accidental Discovery Protocol, has been completed and submitted to Council, at least 2 weeks prior to the commencement of any earthworks.</i></b>	Reject
Federated Farmers	182.203	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R16 Quarries and quarrying activities [...]	Supports this rule.	1. Retain as notified;  OR  2. Wording with similar effect.	Accept in part
Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury)	183.147	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R16 Quarries and quarrying activities [...]	Supports the intention of TDC to clarify that gravel extraction in the beds of lakes and rivers requires Regional Council resource consents. However, this may cause confusion because beds of lakes and rivers are not under District Council jurisdiction.	1. Amend the title of <b>GRUZ-R16</b> as follows:  <b><i>GRUZ-R16 Quarries and quarrying activities:</i></b>  <b><i>1. up to 2,000m<sup>2</sup> (not in the bed of a river); and</i></b> <b><i>2. <del>in the bed of a river, which is authorised under the Regional Plan either as a permitted activity, or through a resource consent having been obtained from the Canterbury Regional Council</del></i></b>  AND  2. add an advisory note to <b>GRUZ-R16</b> to the effect that works in the beds of lakes and rivers are within the jurisdiction of the Regional Council and will require resource consents unless a Regional Plan provides a permitted activity for them.	Accept
GJH Rooney	191.86	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R16 Quarries and	Opposes GRUZ-16 PER-4 requiring Accidental Discovery Protocol. Considers the SASM areas in the	Amend <b>GRUZ-R16</b> as follows:	Reject

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
				quarrying activities [...]	proposed plan are extensive and the Accidental Discovery Protocol commitment should only be required in SASM areas. Council should be promoting the practice of accidental discovery rather than regulating for it through a rule.  [see original submission for full reason]	<b><i>GRUZ-R16 Quarries and quarrying activities: up to 2,000m<sup>2</sup> (not in the bed of a river); and in the bed of a river , which is authorised under the Regional Plan either as a permitted activity, or through a resource consent having been obtained from the Canterbury Regional Council</i></b>  <b><i>Activity status: Permitted</i></b>  <b><i>[....]</i></b>  <b><i>PER-4</i></b>  <i>Where located in a SASM's, the Accidental Discovery Protocol commitment form, contained within APP4 - Form confirming a commitment to adhering to an Accidental Discovery Protocol, has been completed and submitted to Council, at least 2 weeks prior to the commencement of any earthworks.</i>	
Aggregate and Quarry Association	224.8	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R16 Quarries and quarrying activities [...]	Supports the permitted activity status of GRUZ-R16 relating to small quarrying in the bed of the river.  Although considers where compliance is not achieved the activity status should be changed from discretionary to restricted discretionary.	Amend <b>GRUZ-R16</b> as follows:  <b><i>GRUZ-R16 Quarries and quarrying activities</i></b>  <b><i>1. up to 2,000m<sup>2</sup> (not in the bed of a river); and</i></b>  <b><i>2. in the bed of a river, which is authorised under the Regional Plan either as a permitted activity, or through a resource consent having been obtained from the Canterbury Regional Council</i></b>  <b><i>Activity status: Permitted</i></b>   <b><i>Where:</i></b>  <b><i>PER-1</i></b>  <i>The quarry is not within 10m of a site boundary; and</i>  <b><i>PER-2</i></b>  <i>The quarry in not within 50m of a rock art site; and</i>  <b><i>PER-3</i></b>  <i>The quarry is not located within 500m of an existing sensitive activity located on another site or the boundary of any of the Residential zones, Rural lifestyle zone, Rural settlement zone, Māori Purpose zone or Open Space and recreation zones; and</i>	Reject

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
						<p><b>PER-4</b></p> <p><i>The Accidental Discovery Protocol commitment form, contained within APP4 - Form confirming a commitment to adhering to an Accidental Discovery Protocol, has been completed and submitted to Council, at least 2 weeks prior to the commencement of any earthworks.</i></p> <p><b>Note:</b> any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with GRUZ-R13.</p> <p>[...]</p> <p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved: <del>Discretionary</del> Restricted Discretionary.</b></p> <p>[No matters of discretion are specified in the submission]</p>	
Rooney Group Limited	249.86	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R16 Quarries and quarrying activities [...]	<p>Opposes GRUZ-16 PER-4 requiring Accidental Discovery Protocol. Considers the SASM areas in the proposed plan are extensive and the Accidental Discovery Protocol commitment should only be required in SASM areas. Council should be promoting the practice of accidental discovery rather than regulating for it through a rule.</p> <p>[see original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-R16</b> as follows:</p> <p><b><i>GRUZ-R16 Quarries and quarrying activities: up to 2,000m<sup>2</sup> (not in the bed of a river); and in the bed of a river , which is authorised under the Regional Plan either as a permitted activity, or through a resource consent having been obtained from the Canterbury Regional Council</i></b></p> <p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p>[...]</p> <p><b>PER-4</b></p> <p><i>Where located in a SASM's, the Accidental Discovery Protocol commitment form, contained within APP4 - Form confirming a commitment to adhering to an Accidental Discovery Protocol, has been completed and submitted to Council, at least 2 weeks prior to the commencement of any earthworks.</i></p>	Reject
Rooney Farms Limited	250.86	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R16 Quarries and quarrying activities [...]	<p>Opposes GRUZ-16 PER-4 requiring Accidental Discovery Protocol. Considers the SASM areas in the proposed plan are extensive and the Accidental Discovery Protocol commitment should only be required in SASM areas. Council should be promoting the practice of accidental discovery rather than regulating for it through a rule.</p> <p>[see original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-R16</b> as follows:</p> <p><b><i>GRUZ-R16 Quarries and quarrying activities: up to 2,000m<sup>2</sup> (not in the bed of a river); and in the bed of a river , which is authorised under the Regional Plan either as a permitted activity, or through a resource consent having been obtained from the Canterbury Regional Council</i></b></p> <p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p>	Reject

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
						<p>[...]</p> <p><b>PER-4</b></p> <p><i>Where located in a SASM's, the Accidental Discovery Protocol commitment form, contained within APP4 - Form confirming a commitment to adhering to an Accidental Discovery Protocol, has been completed and submitted to Council, at least 2 weeks prior to the commencement of any earthworks.</i></p>	
Rooney Earthmoving Limited	251.86	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R16 Quarries and quarrying activities [...]	<p>Opposes GRUZ-16 PER-4 requiring Accidental Discovery Protocol. Considers the SASM areas in the proposed plan are extensive and the Accidental Discovery Protocol commitment should only be required in SASM areas. Council should be promoting the practice of accidental discovery rather than regulating for it through a rule.</p> <p>[see original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-R16</b> as follows:</p> <p><b><i>GRUZ-R16 Quarries and quarrying activities: up to 2,000m<sup>2</sup> (not in the bed of a river); and in the bed of a river , which is authorised under the Regional Plan either as a permitted activity, or through a resource consent having been obtained from the Canterbury Regional Council</i></b></p> <p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p>[...]</p> <p><b>PER-4</b></p> <p><i>Where located in a SASM's, the Accidental Discovery Protocol commitment form, contained within APP4 - Form confirming a commitment to adhering to an Accidental Discovery Protocol, has been completed and submitted to Council, at least 2 weeks prior to the commencement of any earthworks.</i></p>	Reject
Timaru Developments Limited	252.86	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R16 Quarries and quarrying activities [...]	<p>Opposes GRUZ-16 PER-4 requiring Accidental Discovery Protocol. Considers the SASM areas in the proposed plan are extensive and the Accidental Discovery Protocol commitment should only be required in SASM areas. Council should be promoting the practice of accidental discovery rather than regulating for it through a rule.</p> <p>[see original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-R16</b> as follows:</p> <p><b><i>GRUZ-R16 Quarries and quarrying activities: up to 2,000m<sup>2</sup> (not in the bed of a river); and in the bed of a river , which is authorised under the Regional Plan either as a permitted activity, or through a resource consent having been obtained from the Canterbury Regional Council</i></b></p> <p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p>[...]</p> <p><b>PER-4</b></p> <p><i>Where located in a SASM's, the Accidental Discovery Protocol commitment form, contained within APP4 - Form confirming a commitment to adhering to an Accidental Discovery Protocol, has been completed and submitted to Council, at least 2 weeks prior to the commencement of any earthworks.</i></p>	Reject
Horticulture New Zealand	245.119	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R17 Crop support structures	Supports a permitted activity with appropriate standards for a necessary element of primary production.	Retain as notified.	Accept

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
Federated Farmers	182.204	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R18 Artificial crop protection structures	Supports GRUZ-R18 but urge council to be careful with permitting restricted discretionary activity such as shading on roads. This is covered in regulation already and does not need a double up.	1. Retain as notified; OR 2. Wording with similar effect.	Accept in part
Horticulture New Zealand	245.120	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R18 Artificial crop protection structures	Considers a permitted activity rule with appropriate standards for a necessary element of primary production is supported. But considers the proposed the rule is unworkable and unnecessarily restrictive.  [refer to original submission for full reasons]	Amend <b>GRUZ-R18</b> as follows:  <b><i>GRUZ-R18 Artificial crop protection structures</i></b>  <b><i>Activity status: Permitted</i></b>  <b><i>Where:</i></b>  <b><i>PER-1</i></b>  <i>The structure(s) are open at the side; or</i>  <b><i>PER-2</i></b>  <i>Dark green or black cloth is used for all vertical faces <u>when within 10m of a road or existing residential unit; and</u></i>  <b><i>PER-3</i></b>  <i>The structure meets the following setback:</i>  <i><del>1. For structure(s) less than 4m high, the structure(s) are setback a distance of:</del></i>  <i><del>a. 10m from road boundaries;</del></i>  <i><del>b. 20m from road boundaries that are a national, regional or district arterial road;</del></i>  <i><del>c. 15m from a non-road boundary of a site in different ownership; and</del></i>  <i><del>2. For structure(s) greater than 4m in height, then the horizontal setback distance between the boundary and the structure should increase a further 5m than that stated above for every 2m increase in height; and</del></i>  <i><u>For structure(s) less than 6m high, the structure(s) are setback a distance of: 3m from the boundary</u></i>  <b><i>PER-4</i></b>	Reject

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
						<p><i>The structure(s) are collectively no longer than 100m (measured parallel to any common boundary with a site in different ownership).</i></p> <p>[...]</p>	
Bruce Speirs	66.41	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R19 Seasonal workers accommodation	Suggests alternative wording to better reflect the intent of the rule.	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-19 Seasonal workers accommodation</b> as follows:</p> <p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b></p> <p><i><u>The accommodation is to be on a site of at least 20 ha area and no existing household unit is present. It is located on a site larger than 40 hectares unless the site:</u></i></p> <p><i><u>1. was created before the 22 September 2022; and</u></i></p> <p><i><u>2. does not contain an existing household unit; and</u></i></p> <p><i><u>3. is located on a site larger than 20ha; and</u></i></p> <p>[...]</p>	Reject
Silver Fern Farms	172.123	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R19 Seasonal workers accommodation	Considers the approach to seasonal worker accommodation in the GRUZ is appropriate.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Alliance Group Limited	173.121	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R19 Seasonal workers accommodation	Considers it is appropriate to provide for seasonal worker accommodation in the GRUZ as a permitted activity, or as a restricted discretionary activity where standards are not met.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Horticulture New Zealand	245.121	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R19 Seasonal workers accommodation	<p>Supports a policy and rule framework for permanent workers and seasonal workers accommodation. But considers where the minimum parent lot area requirements too large and when this is not met it is appropriate to provide a consenting pathway to consider individual cases.</p> <p>[refer to original submission for full reasons]</p>	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-R19 Seasonal workers accommodation</b> as follows:</p> <p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b></p> <p><i>It is located on a site larger than 40 <u>10</u> hectares unless the site:</i></p> <p><i><u>1. was created before the 22 September 2022; and</u></i></p> <p><i><u>2. does not contain an existing household unit; and</u></i></p>	Reject

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
						<p><del>3. is located on a site larger than 20ha; and</del></p> <p><b>PER-2</b></p> <p>The site or buildings are occupied for a period not exceeding 180 days per year (occupancy records must be kept by the owner and made available to Timaru District Council upon request); and</p> <p>[...]</p>	
Pye Group Ltd, Dialan Dairy Ltd, Grantlea Dairy Ltd, South Park Farm Ltd, South Stream Dairy Ltd	35.5	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R20 Permanent workers accommodation	Questions the differentiation between residential units (GRUZ-R4) and the workers accommodation (GRUZ-R20), both provide for a house for someone to live in, yet the rules are different. Additionally, the need for an employment contract with the building consent application is questioned as an employee could resign at any time.	Seeks explanation as to why there is a differentiation between Residential Units and Permanent Workers Accommodation, and if there is no clear reason, delete GRUZ-R20 and amend GRUZ-R4 to remove the reference to Permanent Workers Accommodation.	Reject
Dairy Holdings Limited	89.21	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R20 Permanent workers accommodation	Supports this rule.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
Silver Fern Farms	172.124	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R20 Permanent workers accommodation	Considers the approach appropriate.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
Alliance Group Limited	173.122	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R20 Permanent workers accommodation	Considers it is appropriate to provide for permanent worker accommodation in the GRUZ as a permitted activity, or as a restricted discretionary activity where standards are not met.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
Rooney Holdings Limited	174.87	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R20 Permanent workers accommodation	<p>Opposes GRUZ-20. It is considered the minimum requirement of 80 hectares is too large and not necessary . A restriction tied to an overall property size of 40 hectares would be more appropriate and should provide for clustering of residential units as appropriate to the size and scale of the property. Considers that as long as the minimum site/property threshold is met there should be no further restrictions . Limiting the scope of the use of those residential units is not a sustainable use of existing resources.</p> <p>[see original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-R20</b> as follows:</p> <p><b>GRUZ-R20 Permanent workers accommodation</b></p> <p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b></p> <p><u>It is located on a site larger than 40 <del>80</del> hectares ; or that where a property comprises more than one record of title, the sum of the titles is greater than 40 hectares. The overall density shall not be greater than 1 unit per 40 hectares that comprises the property .; and</u></p> <p><b>PER-2</b></p>	Accept in part

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
						<p><del>An employment contract for the permanent full time worker(s) who will reside in the worker's accommodation is provided to Timaru District Council at the time of a building consent application and is available upon request; and</del></p> <p><b><del>PER-3</del></b></p> <p><del>It is located on the same site where the permanent full worker is employed.</del></p> <p><del>Note : any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with GRUZ-R13.</del></p>	
GJH Rooney	191.87	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R20 Permanent workers accommodation	<p>Opposes GRUZ-20. It is considered the minimum requirement of 80 hectares is too large and not necessary. A restriction tied to an overall property size of 40 hectares would be more appropriate and should provide for clustering of residential units as appropriate to the size and scale of the property. Considers that as long as the minimum site/property threshold is met there should be no further restrictions. Limiting the scope of the use of those residential units is not a sustainable use of existing resources.</p> <p>[see original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-R20</b> as follows:</p> <p><b><i>GRUZ-R20 Permanent workers accommodation</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Activity status: Permitted</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Where:</i></b></p> <p><b><i>PER-1</i></b></p> <p><i>It is located on a site larger than 40 <del>80</del> hectares ; <u>or that where a property comprises more than one record of title, the sum of the titles is greater than 40 hectares. The overall density shall not be greater than 1 unit per 40 hectares that comprises the property ;</u> and</i></p> <p><b><i>PER-2</i></b></p> <p><del>An employment contract for the permanent full time worker(s) who will reside in the worker's accommodation is provided to Timaru District Council at the time of a building consent application and is available upon request; and</del></p> <p><b><i>PER-3</i></b></p> <p><del>It is located on the same site where the permanent full worker is employed.</del></p> <p><del>Note : any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with GRUZ-R13.</del></p>	Accept in part
Horticulture New Zealand	245.122	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R20 Permanent workers accommodation	<p>Supports a policy and rule framework for permanent workers and seasonal workers accommodation. But considers where the minimum parent lot area requirements too large and when this is not met it is appropriate to provide a consenting pathway to consider individual cases.</p> <p>[refer to original submission for full reasons]</p>	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-R20 Permanent workers accommodation</b> as follows:</p> <p><b><i>Activity status: Permitted</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Where:</i></b></p> <p><b><i>PER-1</i></b></p> <p><i>It is located on a site larger than <del>80</del> <u>10</u> hectares; and</i></p> <p><b><i>PER-2</i></b></p>	Accept in part

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
						<p><i>An employment contract for the permanent full time worker(s) who will reside in the worker's accommodation is provided to Timaru District Council at the time of a building consent application and is available upon request; and</i></p> <p><b>PER-3</b></p> <p><i>It is located on the same site where the permanent full worker is employed.</i></p> <p><b>Note:</b> any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with GRUZ-R13.</p> <p>[...]</p>	
NZ Pork	247.30	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R20 Permanent workers accommodation	Considers an alignment with policy for seasonal workers accommodation and 20ha qualifier.	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-R20</b> as follows:</p> <p><b>GRUZ-R20 Permanent workers accommodation</b></p> <p><b>General Rural Zone</b></p> <p><b>Activity Status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b></p> <p><i>It is located on a site larger than <del>80</del> 20 hectares; and</i></p> <p>[...]</p>	Accept in part
Rooney Group Limited	249.87	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R20 Permanent workers accommodation	<p>Opposes GRUZ-20. It is considered the minimum requirement of 80 hectares is too large and not necessary . A restriction tied to an overall property size of 40 hectares would be more appropriate and should provide for clustering of residential units as appropriate to the size and scale of the property. Considers that as long as the minimum site/property threshold is met there should be no further restrictions . Limiting the scope of the use of those residential units is not a sustainable use of existing resources.</p> <p>[see original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-R20</b> as follows:</p> <p><b>GRUZ-R20 Permanent workers accommodation</b></p> <p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b></p> <p><i>It is located on a site larger than 40 <del>80</del> hectares ; <u>or that where a property comprises more than one record of title, the sum of the titles</u></i></p>	Accept in part

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
						<p><u>is greater than 40 hectares. The overall density shall not be greater than 1 unit per 40 hectares that comprises the property ; and</u></p> <p><b><del>PER-2</del></b></p> <p><del>An employment contract for the permanent full time worker(s) who will reside in the worker's accommodation is provided to Timaru District Council at the time of a building consent application and is available upon request; and</del></p> <p><b><del>PER-3</del></b></p> <p><del>It is located on the same site where the permanent full worker is employed.</del></p> <p><i>Note : any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with GRUZ-R13.</i></p>	
Rooney Farms Limited	250.87	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R20 Permanent workers accommodation	<p>Opposes GRUZ-20. It is considered the minimum requirement of 80 hectares is too large and not necessary . A restriction tied to an overall property size of 40 hectares would be more appropriate and should provide for clustering of residential units as appropriate to the size and scale of the property. Considers that as long as the minimum site/property threshold is met there should be no further restrictions . Limiting the scope of the use of those residential units is not a sustainable use of existing resources.</p> <p>[see original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-R20</b> as follows:</p> <p><b><i>GRUZ-R20 Permanent workers accommodation</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Activity status: Permitted</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Where:</i></b></p> <p><b><i>PER-1</i></b></p> <p><u>It is located on a site larger than 40 <del>80</del> hectares ; or that where a property comprises more than one record of title, the sum of the titles is greater than 40 hectares. The overall density shall not be greater than 1 unit per 40 hectares that comprises the property ; and</u></p> <p><b><del>PER-2</del></b></p> <p><del>An employment contract for the permanent full time worker(s) who will reside in the worker's accommodation is provided to Timaru District Council at the time of a building consent application and is available upon request; and</del></p> <p><b><del>PER-3</del></b></p> <p><del>It is located on the same site where the permanent full worker is employed.</del></p> <p><i>Note : any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with GRUZ-R13.</i></p>	Accept in part

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
Rooney Earthmoving Limited	251.87	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R20 Permanent workers accommodation	<p>Opposes GRUZ-20. It is considered the minimum requirement of 80 hectares is too large and not necessary . A restriction tied to an overall property size of 40 hectares would be more appropriate and should provide for clustering of residential units as appropriate to the size and scale of the property. Considers that as long as the minimum site/property threshold is met there should be no further restrictions . Limiting the scope of the use of those residential units is not a sustainable use of existing resources.</p> <p>[see original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-R20</b> as follows:</p> <p><b>GRUZ-R20 Permanent workers accommodation</b></p> <p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b></p> <p><u>It is located on a site larger than 40 <del>80</del> hectares ; or that where a property comprises more than one record of title, the sum of the titles is greater than 40 hectares. The overall density shall not be greater than 1 unit per 40 hectares that comprises the property .; and</u></p> <p><b>PER-2</b></p> <p><del>An employment contract for the permanent full time worker(s) who will reside in the worker's accommodation is provided to Timaru District Council at the time of a building consent application and is available upon request; and</del></p> <p><b>PER-3</b></p> <p><del>It is located on the same site where the permanent full worker is employed.</del></p> <p><i>Note: any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with GRUZ-R13.</i></p>	Accept in part
Timaru Developments Limited	252.87	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R20 Permanent workers accommodation	<p>Opposes GRUZ-20. It is considered the minimum requirement of 80 hectares is too large and not necessary . A restriction tied to an overall property size of 40 hectares would be more appropriate and should provide for clustering of residential units as appropriate to the size and scale of the property. Considers that as long as the minimum site/property threshold is met there should be no further restrictions . Limiting the scope of the use of those residential units is not a sustainable use of existing resources.</p> <p>[see original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-R20</b> as follows:</p> <p><b>GRUZ-R20 Permanent workers accommodation</b></p> <p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b></p> <p><u>It is located on a site larger than 40 <del>80</del> hectares ; or that where a property comprises more than one record of title, the sum of the titles is greater than 40 hectares. The overall density shall not be greater than 1 unit per 40 hectares that comprises the property .; and</u></p> <p><b>PER-2</b></p> <p><del>An employment contract for the permanent full time worker(s) who will reside in the worker's accommodation is provided to Timaru District Council at the time of a building consent application and is available upon request; and</del></p> <p><b>PER-3</b></p> <p><del>It is located on the same site where the permanent full worker is employed.</del></p> <p><i>Note: any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with GRUZ-R13.</i></p>	Accept in part

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
Graeme Clarke	1.3	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R21 Rural industry	Amend GRUZ-R21 to better allow for diversified land use in this zone.	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-R21 Rural industry</b> as follows:</p> <p><b>Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>RDIS-1</b></p> <p><i>The activity is not an offensive trade.</i></p> <p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <p>1. the suitability of the <del>location</del> site design and layout; and</p> <p>2. the intensity and scale of the activity; and</p> <p>[...]</p>	Reject
Maze Pastures Limited	41.3	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R21 Rural industry	<p>Seeks further clarification as to how the Proposed District Plan would affect the submitter to continue to operate efficiently and economically for rural production purposes.</p> <p>[Refer original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-R21 Rural Industry</b> as follows:</p> <p><b>Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>RDIS-1</b></p> <p><i>The activity is not an offensive trade <u>and existing use rights apply for all Rural Industry established prior to the District Plan being fully operative.</u></i></p> <p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to: [...]</b></p>	Reject
Milward Finlay Lobb	60.44	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R21 Rural industry	Considers the rule as drafted is unclear on existing use rights.	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-R21 Rural Industry</b> as follows:</p> <p><b>Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>RDIS-1</b></p> <p><i>The activity is not an offensive trade <u>and existing use rights apply for all Rural Industry established prior to the District Plan being fully operative.</u></i></p> <p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p>	Reject

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
						[...]	
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	143.150	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R21 Rural industry	Supports only allowing rural industry activities where the activity does not adversely impact on the safe and efficient operation of the road network.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
Fonterra Limited	165.128	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R21 Rural industry	Consider it is appropriate to provide for rural industry activities as restricted discretionary activities.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
Silver Fern Farms	172.125	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R21 Rural industry	<p>Considers the non-complying activity status for offensive trades associated with rural industry is onerous. It is noted that Rule GRUZ-R1 PER-1, allows for offensive trades associated with primary production or intensive primary production as discretionary.</p> <p>Offensive trades associated with rural industry are likely to locate in rural areas preferentially, due to the ability to achieve suitable separation from incompatible activities and the functional need of rural industry for a rural location.</p> <p>[refer to original submission for full reasons]</p>	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-R21</b> as follows:</p> <p><b>GRUZ-R21 Rural industry</b></p> <p>[...]</p> <p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved: <u>Discretionary Non-complying</u></b></p>	Accept
Alliance Group Limited	173.123	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R21 Rural industry	Considers a Restricted Activity status for Rural industry in the General Rural Zone is appropriate.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
Rural Contractors New Zealand	178.10	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R21 Rural industry	As outlined in submission point 178.9, the submitter seeks a new permitted activity rule to enable rural contractor depots. Accordingly, a consequential amendment is required in relation to Rule GRUZ-R21	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-R21 Rural industry</b> as follows:</p> <p><b>GRUZ-R21 Rural industry (<u>excluding a rural contractor depot</u>)</b></p> <p>[...]</p> <p>[This is a consequential amendment to the relief sought in 178.9]</p>	Reject
Federated Farmers	182.205	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R21 Rural industry	Supports farming activity being classified as a permitted activity.	Retain permitted activity classification status in <b>GRUZ-R21 Rural industry</b> as notified.	Accept in part
Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu	185.106	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R21 Rural industry	Considers that within the Rural zones, the matters listed in the Restricted Discretionary Activities do not seem to have any ability to consider the values of these overlays, particularly SASM rules unless the activity also requires consent under the SASM rules. Considers cultural values needs to be a matter of discretion in these zones.	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-R21 Rural industry</b> by adding an additional matter of discretion as follows:</p> <p><b>Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</b></p> <p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <p>1. [...]</p> <p><u>7. the potential of any adverse effects on the spiritual and cultural values and beliefs of Kāti Huirapa, including measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects.</u></p>	Reject

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	131.39	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R22 Emergency services facilities	Submitter does not support emergency service facilities being a restricted discretionary activity in the General Rural Zone and requests permitted activity status.  New fire stations in the district may be necessary to continue to achieve emergency response times. It is noted that Fire and Emergency is not a requiring authority. A permitted activity rule is therefore the best way to facilitate new fire stations. GRUZ-P4 supports emergency service facilities.	Amend the activity status of <b>GRUZ-R22 Emergency services facilities</b> from Restricted Discretionary to a Permitted Activity.	Reject
Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu	185.107	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R22 Emergency services facilities	Considers that within the Rural zones, the matters listed in the Restricted Discretionary Activities do not seem to have any ability to consider the values of these overlays, particularly SASM rules unless the activity also requires consent under the SASM rules. Considers cultural values needs to be a matter of discretion in these zones.	Amend <b>GRUZ-R22 Emergency services facilities</b> as follows: <b>Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</b> <b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b> 1. [...].  <u>7. the potential of any adverse effects on the spiritual and cultural values and beliefs of Kāti Huirapa, including measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects.</u>	Reject
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	143.151	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R23 Expansion of existing consented quarries	Seeks that for any quarry expansion activity this must demonstrate that this will not impact on the safe and efficient function of the state highway networks. It is considered that the matters of discretion need to relate to the effects on the road network.	Amend <b>GRUZ-R23</b> as follows:  <b>GRUZ-R23 Expansion of existing consented quarries</b>  <b>Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</b>  [...]  <b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b> [...]  <u>6. the extent of adverse effects on the safe and efficient operation of the transport network.</u>	Accept
Road Metals Company Limited	169.45	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R23 Expansion of existing consented quarries	Opposes GRUZ-R23 as it does not provide for lawfully established, un-consented quarries. Considers the term “quarry operation” should be replaced with a defined term and that there is a difference in potential effects between extraction activities and processing, the rule should make this distinction.	Amend <b>GRUZ- R23</b> as follows:  <b>GRUZ-R23 Expansion of existing <u>lawfully established consented</u> quarries.</b>  <b>Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</b>  <b>RDIS-1</b>	Accept in part

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
						<p><i>The entirety of the existing quarrying activity <del>operation</del> has an existing land use consent from Timaru District Council <u>or is otherwise lawfully established</u>; and</i></p> <p><b>RDIS-2</b></p> <p><i>The expansion of the existing quarry does not increase:</i></p> <p><i>a) the rate of production beyond existing <u>lawfully established</u> <del>consented</del> levels, and</i></p> <p><i>b) the hours of operation; and</i></p> <p><b>RDIS-3</b></p> <p><i>The expansion does not occur within:</i></p> <p><i>a) <u>i. 500m for processing activities; and</u></i></p> <p><i><u>ii. 200m for any excavation activity;</u></i></p> <p><i>of an existing sensitive activity located on another site, or the boundary of a Residential, Rural Lifestyle, Rural Settlement, Māori Purpose or Open Space zone; or</i></p> <p><i>b) 20m of a site boundary</i></p> <p><i>[ ...]</i></p>	
Fulton Hogan Limited	170.47	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R23 Expansion of existing consented quarries	The policy does not provide for lawfully established un-consented quarries. Considers the term “quarry operation” should be replaced with a defined term and that there is a difference in potential effects between extraction activities and processing, the rule should make this distinction.	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ- R23</b> as follows:</p> <p><b><i>GRUZ-R23 Expansion of existing <u>lawfully established</u> <del>consented</del> quarries.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</i></b></p> <p><b>RDIS-1</b></p> <p><i>The entirety of the existing quarrying activity <del>operation</del> has an existing land use consent from Timaru District Council <u>or is otherwise lawfully established</u>; and</i></p> <p><b>RDIS-2</b></p> <p><i>The expansion of the existing quarry does not increase:</i></p> <p><i>a) the rate of production beyond existing <u>lawfully established</u> <del>consented</del> levels, and</i></p> <p><i>b) the hours of operation; and</i></p>	Accept in part

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
						<p><b>RDIS-3</b></p> <p><i>The expansion does not occur within:</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">b) <u>i. 500m for processing activities; and</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><u>ii. 200m for any excavation activity;</u></p> <p><i>of an existing sensitive activity located on another site, or the boundary of a Residential, Rural Lifestyle, Rural Settlement, Māori Purpose or Open Space zone; or</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">b) 20m of a site boundary</p> <p>[...]</p>	
Federated Farmers	182.206	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R23 Expansion of existing consented quarries	Considers that farm quarries need to be clearly differentiated from industrial extractive quarries.	<p>1. Amend <b>GRUZ-R23 Expansion of existing consented quarries</b> as follows:</p> <p>[...]</p> <p><b>RDIS-1</b></p> <p><i>The entirety of the existing quarry operation has an existing land use consent from Timaru District Council <u>on all land, excluding farm quarries</u> and</i></p> <p>[...]</p> <p>AND</p> <p>2. Any consequential amendments required as a result of the relief sought.</p>	Reject
Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu	185.108	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R23 Expansion of existing consented quarries	Considers that within the Rural zones, the matters listed in the Restricted Discretionary Activities do not seem to have any ability to consider the values of these overlays, particularly SASM rules unless the activity also requires consent under the SASM rules. Considers cultural values needs to be a matter of discretion in these zones.	<p>Amend <b>GRUZ-R23 Expansion of existing consented quarries</b> as follows:</p> <p><b>Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</b></p> <p>[...]</p> <p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <p>1. [...]</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><u>6. the potential of any adverse effects on the spiritual and cultural values and beliefs of Kāti Huirapa, including measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects.</u></p>	Reject
Aggregate and Quarry Association	224.9	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R23 Expansion of existing consented quarries	Supports the rule which provides a restricted discretionary activity status for expansion of existing consented quarries.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
Aggregate and Quarry Association	224.10	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R24 Mining and quarrying not listed in GRUZ-R16 or GRUZ-R23	Supports the rule which provides a restricted discretionary activity status.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Silver Fern Farms	172.126	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R27 Expansion of existing legally established industrial activities, excluding mines and quarries	Considers it appropriate the rule provides for the expansion of existing industry with a discretionary consenting pathway.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Alliance Group Limited	173.124	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R27 Expansion of existing legally established industrial activities, excluding mines and quarries	Considers it is appropriate to provide for the expansion of existing industry with a discretionary consenting pathway.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Graeme Clarke	1.4	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R29 New Industrial activities not listed in GRUZ-21	Opposes GRUZ-R29 as this rule is overly restrictive on allowing a shift to other potential income streams as is essential for rural areas.	Amend <b>GRUZ-R29 New Industrial activities</b> as follows:  <b><u>Activity status: <del>Non-Complying</del> Restricted Discretionary</u></b>  <b><u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u></b>  <b><u>[...]</u></b>  [no matters of discretion are specified in the submission.]	Reject
EnviroWaste Services Ltd	162.17	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R29 New Industrial activities not listed in GRUZ-21	The submitter is concerned that clean fills and landfills will be controlled under GRUZ-R29 as a Non-Complying activity, which do not have a consenting pathway in the GRUZ. The submitter considers that the GRUZ is the most likely zone to accommodate such activities, to allow for residential, commercial, industrial and rural growth, and should have an activity status of Discretionary Activity that must achieve GRUZ-P7.  [Refer to original submission for full reason]	None specified.	Reject
Horticulture New Zealand	245.123	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-R29 New Industrial	Considers a non-complying activity status for new industry is an appropriate resource management response for these out of zone activities.	Retain as notified.	Accept

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
				activities not listed in GRUZ-21			
Keen, Oliver, Forbes <i>et al</i>	46.4	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	New	<p>Considers that should the relief sought on the definition of Intensive Outdoor Primary Production not be granted, then there should be specific rules in the GRUZ regarding free range poultry farming to protect the interests of both the farmer of the free range poultry and the neighbouring properties.</p> <p>The rules should manage the noise associated with roosters; and permanent vegetation cover.</p> <p>[Refer original submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Should the relief sought regarding including Free Range Poultry Farming within the definition of Intensive Primary Production not be granted:</p> <p>Add a new rule within the GRUZ, as follows:</p> <p><b><u>GRUZ-RX Keeping of poultry for commercial free range poultry farming</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Activity status: Permitted</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Where:</u></b></p> <p><b><u>PER-1</u></b></p> <p><b><u>All of the poultry farmed have access to open air runs; and</u></b></p> <p><b><u>PER-2</u></b></p> <p><b><u>the stocking rate of the runs and weatherproof shelter to which the birds have access does not exceed the industry standard for the relevant bird type; and</u></b></p> <p><b><u>PER-3</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Any building or structure used to house poultry is setback a minimum distance of 100m from the notional boundary of a building containing an existing sensitive activity on a separate site under different ownership; and</u></b></p> <p><b><u>PER-4</u></b></p> <p><b><u>No roosters are kept within 100m from the notional boundary of an existing sensitive activity on a separate site under different ownership; and</u></b></p> <p><b><u>PER-5</u></b></p>	Accept in part

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
						<p><u>Option 1) Permanent vegetated ground cover no less than 90% must be maintained on the land where birds are permitted to range, except during renewal or resowing.</u></p> <p><u>Option 2) Permanent vegetated ground cover is maintained in good condition on the land where birds are permitted to range, except during renewal or resowing.</u></p> <p><b><u>Note: any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with GRUZ-R13.</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Activity status where compliance not achieved: Discretionary</u></b></p>	
Rural Contractors New Zealand	178.9	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	New	The definition of 'rural industry' would include a rural contractor depot because it is 'an industry or business undertaken in a rural environment that directly supports, services, or is dependent on primary production'. As a result, a restricted discretionary activity resource consent would be required. A new permitted activity rule is considered more appropriate for small-scale rural contractor depots. A consequential amendment is required to Rule GRUZ-R21 so that it does not apply to rural contractor depots, if this rule is accepted.	<p>Insert a new rule into the <b>GRUZ - General Rural Zone Chapter</b> as follows:</p> <p><b><u>GRUZ-RXX Rural Contractor Depot</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Activity Status Permitted</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Where:</u></b></p> <p><b><u>PER-1</u></b></p> <p><u>The maximum number of staff is 7 (other than persons living on the site).</u></p> <p><b><u>PER-2</u></b></p> <p><u>The rural contractor depot (including associated vehicle access, parking and manoeuvring areas) is set back at least 50m from any existing sensitive activity.</u></p> <p><u>Note: any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with GRUZ-R13.</u></p> <p><b><u>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1 to PER-2: Restricted Discretionary</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u></b></p> <p><u>1. the suitability of the location, site design and layout; and</u></p> <p><u>2. the intensity and scale of the activity; and</u></p> <p><u>3. the extent of adverse effects on existing or permitted activities; and</u></p> <p><u>4. the extent of adverse effects on the safe and efficient operation of the road network, and suitability of onsite loading, manoeuvring and access; and</u></p> <p><u>5. the provision of infrastructure to service the activity; and</u></p> <p><u>6. measures to avoid, mitigate or remedy adverse effects.</u></p> <p>[See submission 178.10 on GRUZ-R21 for consequential changes]</p>	Reject

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	131.37	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	Rules	Supports in part GRUZ-R1, R4, R5, R7, R8, R9, and R13, subject to the inclusion of a new standard GRUZ-S7 that requires these activities to provide a firefighting water supply.  [see submission on GRUZ standards for the wording of new standard]	Amend <b>GRUZ-R1, GRUZ-R4, GRUZ-R5, GRUZ-R7, GRUZ-R8, GRUZ-R9</b> and <b>GRUZ-R13</b> to require compliance with the new standard as follows:  Compliance with: <i>x. GRUZ-S7 Servicing</i> <i>[...]</i>	Reject
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	131.40	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Standards	GRUZ-S1 Height of buildings and structures	Support GRUZ-S1 as fire stations would be a building and structure under (2) therefore could be a maximum height of 15m.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
Radio New Zealand Limited	152.57	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Standards	GRUZ-S1 Height of buildings and structures	Support subject to amendments to address the electromagnetic radiation safety risks of tall structures within 1,000m of the submitter's facility at Fairview. An advice note is also requested that ensures submitter is notified or consulted about the construction of elevated structures near submitter's Facilities.	Amend <b>GRUZ-S1</b> as follows: <b><i>GRUZ-S1 Height of buildings and structures</i></b> <i>The height of buildings and structures must not exceed:</i> <i>1. 9m for residential units.</i> <i>2. 15m for other buildings and structures, except silos.</i> <i>3. 25m for silos.</i> <i>4. 49m within 1,000m of RNZ's Facilities at Fairview</i> <b><i>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</i></b> <i>[...]</i> <b><i>7. Risk of electromagnetic radiation effects from radiocommunication activities conducted at RNZ's Facilities at Fairview.</i></b>  AND  Add an advice note to <b>GRUZ-S1</b> that ensures the RNZ is notified or consulted about the construction of elevated structures near the RNZ's Facilities.	Reject
NZ Frost Fans Limited	255.26	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Standards	GRUZ-S1 Height of buildings and structures	Support GRUZ-S1.2 height of 15m for other buildings and structures height provision.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	131.41	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Standards	GRUZ-S2 Height in relation to boundary	Considers that an exemption is required for towers and poles to enable crucial operations including drying hoses, communication and training.	Amend <b>GRUZ-S2</b> as follows: <b><i>GRUZ-S2 Height in relation to boundary</i></b> <i>Buildings and structures (except irrigator, crop support structures and artificial crop protection structures) must be contained within a building envelope defined by recession planes from points 2.5m above ground level at the boundaries of the site. The method for determining recession planes and any permitted projection is described in APP8 - Recession Planes.</i>  <b><i>Note: Towers and poles associated with emergency service facilities up to 15m in height are exempt from this rule.</i></b>	Accept

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
Horticulture New Zealand	245.128	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-S2 Height in relation to boundary	While an activity and effects that can be managed through setbacks, the intended outcome is supported.	Retain as notified	Accept
Horticulture New Zealand	245.129	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Rules	GRUZ-S3 Boundary setbacks for buildings and structures	Boundary setbacks for buildings and structures are supported where residential units are recognised as sensitive activities and exclusions for necessary primary production structures provided.	Retain as notified	Accept
Graeme Clarke	1.1	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Standards	GRUZ-S3 Boundary setbacks for buildings and structures	Supports setback distances in GRUZ-S3 as it will help preserve amenity values of the zone.	Retain <b>GRUZ-S3</b> as notified.	Accept in part
Maze Pastures Limited	41.6	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Standards	GRUZ-S3 Boundary setbacks for buildings and structures	Not specified.	Amend <b>GRUZ-S3 Boundary setbacks for buildings and structures</b> as follows:  <i>New building and structures (excluding fences, irrigators, water troughs, <u>water tank/s</u>, crop support structures and artificial crop protection structures) shall be setback the following minimum distances:</i>  <i>1. 20m from all national, regional or district arterial road boundaries; and</i>  <i>2. 10m from all other road boundaries; and</i>  <i>10m from any other site boundary in a different ownership.</i>	Reject
Milward Finlay Lobb	60.45	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Standards	GRUZ-S3 Boundary setbacks for buildings and structures	Request to amend standard to exempt water tank/s from setback requirements (noting that GRUZ-S2 will require water tank/s to meet recession plane requirements).	Amend <b>GRUZ-S3 Boundary setbacks for buildings and structures</b> as follows:  <i>New building and structures (excluding fences, irrigators, water troughs, <u>water tank/s</u>, crop support structures and artificial crop protection structures) shall be setback the following minimum distances:</i>  <i>1. 20m from all national, regional or district arterial road boundaries; and</i>  <i>2. 10m from all other road boundaries; and</i>  <i>3. 10m from any other site boundary in a different ownership.</i>	Reject

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	131.42	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Standards	GRUZ-S3 Boundary setbacks for buildings and structures	Support the setbacks for buildings and structures however seek to have emergency service facilities excluded from this rule for logistical and operational requirements.	Amend <b>GRUZ-S3</b> as follows: <b><i>GRUZ-S3 Boundary setbacks for buildings and structures</i></b> <i>New building and structures (excluding fences, irrigators, water troughs, crop support structures and artificial crop protection structures) shall be setback the following minimum distances:</i> <i>1. 20m from all national, regional or district arterial road boundaries; and</i> <i>2. 10m from all other road boundaries; and</i> <i>3. 10m from any other site boundary in a different ownership.</i> <b><u>4. Emergency Service Facilities are exempt from the setbacks and may be located within the above setbacks from road boundaries.</u></b>	Accept in part
NZ Pork	247.31	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Standards	GRUZ-S3 Boundary setbacks for buildings and structures	The submitter seeks relief from the rules for buildings and structures as they might apply to mobile pig shelters.	Amend <b>GRUZ-S3</b> as follows: <b><i>GRUZ-S3 Boundary setbacks for buildings and structures</i></b>  <b><i>General Rural Zone</i></b>  <i>New building and structures (excluding fences, irrigators, water troughs, crop support structures and artificial crop protection structures) shall be setback the following minimum distances:</i>  <b><i>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</i></b>  <i>1. location of buildings and structures; and</i>  <i>2. the extent of adverse effects including noise, smell, visual, character, privacy, shading and dominance; and</i>  <i>3. measures to avoid and mitigation adverse effects.</i>  <b><u>(This standard does not apply to movable pig shelters including farrowing huts less than 30m<sup>2</sup> in area and 2m in height).</u></b>	Reject
Fonterra Limited	165.129	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Standards	GRUZ-S4 Setbacks for sensitive activities	Considers that it is appropriate that sensitive activities are setback 500m from its irrigation farms. Specifically, submitter holds regional resource consents to irrigate process wastewater to land on (Submitter owned) farms near the Clandebye manufacturing site. This irrigation activity has the potential to give rise to perceived amenity effects at times and an increased building setback from boundaries will ensure that effects on neighbouring properties are acceptable.	Amend <b>GRUZ-S4 Setbacks for sensitive activities</b> as follows: <i>1. No new sensitive activity may be established within 500m from:</i> <i>[...]</i> <b><u>d. The boundary of any area used for the discharge of wastewater irrigation.</u></b>	Accept in part

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
Road Metals Company Limited	169.46	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Standards	GRUZ-S4 Setbacks for sensitive activities	Supports GRUZ-S4 as this standard sets out requirements for where sensitive activities can establish to avoid reverse sensitivity effects.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Fulton Hogan Limited	170.48	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Standards	GRUZ-S4 Setbacks for sensitive activities	This standard sets out requirements for where sensitive activities can establish to avoid reverse sensitivity effects.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Silver Fern Farms	172.127	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Standards	GRUZ-S4 Setbacks for sensitive activities	Considers that restricting the siting of sensitive activities relative to primary production activities, is appropriate. The submitter seeks amendments to ensure the setbacks are also applied to supporting activities that are similarly vulnerable to reverse sensitivity effects.	Amend <b>GRUZ-S4</b> as follows: <b>GRUZ-S4 Setbacks for sensitive activities</b> 1. No new sensitive activity may be established within 500m from: a. the closest outer edge of any paddocks, hard-stand areas, structures or buildings used to house stock, or treatment systems, used for an intensive primary production activity <u>or rural industry</u> ; and b. an existing farm effluent disposal area; and c. a lawfully established quarry or mine. 2. No new building for a sensitive activity may be erected within 20 m from any other site boundary in a different ownership where a primary production <u>or rural industry</u> activity is being conducted, unless the site existed prior to 22 September 2022, in which case a 10m setback applies; 3. No new building for a sensitive activity may be erected within 20 m of an existing shelter belt.	Reject
Alliance Group Limited	173.125	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Standards	GRUZ-S4 Setbacks for sensitive activities	Considers it is appropriate to restrict the siting of sensitive activities. But considers the standard is also applied to supporting activities that are similarly vulnerable to reverse sensitivity effects.	Amend <b>GRUZ-S4</b> as follows: <b>GRUZ-S4 Setbacks for sensitive activities</b> 1. No new sensitive activity may be established within 500m from: a. the closest outer edge of any paddocks, hard-stand areas, structures or buildings used to house stock, or treatment systems, used for an intensive primary production activity <u>or rural industry</u> ; and b. an existing farm effluent disposal area; and c. a lawfully established quarry or mine. 2. No new building for a sensitive activity may be erected within 20m from any other site boundary in a different ownership where a primary production <u>or rural industry</u> activity is being conducted, unless the site existed prior to 22 September 2022, in which case a 10m setback applies; [...]	Reject

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
Rooney Holdings Limited	174.88	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Standards	GRUZ-S4 Setbacks for Sensitive Activities	The submitter believes the standard should exclude rural water tanks as these are a building by definition and are predominately located on boundaries adjoining fence lines.	Amend <b>GRUZ-S4</b> to exclude water tanks.	Reject
Rural Contractors New Zealand	178.11	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Standards	GRUZ-S4 Setbacks for sensitive activities	Considers that it is appropriate to restrict the siting of sensitive activities relative to primary production activities. However, a consequential amendment is required to account for the new rural contractor definition and rule.	Amend <b>GRUZ-S4 Setbacks for sensitive activities</b> as follows: <b><i>GRUZ-S4 Setbacks for sensitive activities</i></b> [...] <i>3. No new building for a sensitive activity may be erected within 20m of an existing shelter belt;</i> <i>4. No new building for a sensitive activity may be erected within 50m of a rural contractor depot (including associated vehicle access, parking and manoeuvring areas).</i>	Reject
Barkers Fruit Processors Limited	179.19	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Standards	GRUZ-S4 Setbacks for sensitive activities	Considers a setback for sensitive activities, or buildings for sensitive activities, is an appropriate tool to manage reverse sensitivity effects which may arise from the site.	Amend <b>GRUZ-S4 Setbacks for sensitive activities</b> as follows: [...] <i>4. No new sensitive activity shall be established, and no new building for a sensitive activity shall be erected within 100m from the boundary of the General Industrial Zone at 72 Shaw Road (Lot 3 DP58430).</i>	Reject
GJH Rooney	191.88	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Standards	GRUZ-S4 Setbacks for Sensitive Activities	The submitter believes the standard should exclude rural water tanks as these are a building by definition and are predominately located on boundaries adjoining fence lines.	Amend <b>GRUZ-S4</b> to exclude water tanks.	Reject
Aggregate and Quarry Association	224.11	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Standards	GRUZ-S4 Setbacks for sensitive activities	Supports the standard relating to setbacks. The nature of extractive industry operations including noise, vibration and dust, non-compatible land uses, such as residential areas must not be allowed to encroach upon these operations or their surrounding areas. This standard provides for benefit and comfort of residents as much as it is to prevent disruption to extractive operations. Support the 500m setback provided.	Retain as notified.	Accept
J R Livestock Limited	241.32	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Standards	GRUZ-S4 Setbacks for sensitive activities	As the submitter's site is surrounded by GRUZ, a setback for sensitive activities, or buildings for sensitive activities, is considered an appropriate tool to manage reverse sensitivity effects which may arise from the GIZ. It would be consistent with GRUZ-S4.	Amend <b>GRUZ-S4</b> as follows: <b><i>GRUZ-S4 Setbacks for sensitive activities</i></b> [...] <i>3. No new building for a sensitive activity may be erected within 20m of an existing shelter belt.</i>	Reject

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
						<p><u>4. No new sensitive activity shall be established, and no new building for a sensitive activity shall be erected within 100m from the boundary of the General Industrial Zone.</u></p> <p>[...]</p>	
NZ Pork	247.32	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Standards	GRUZ-S4 Setbacks for sensitive activities	Supports setbacks for sensitive activities as a method to separate these activities from primary production activities.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Hort NZ	245.130	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Standards	GRUZ-S4 Setbacks for sensitive activities		<p>Amend GRUZ-S4 Setbacks for sensitive activities as follows:</p> <p>[...]</p> <p>2. No new building for a sensitive activity may be erected within 20m from any other site boundary in a different ownership where a primary production activity is being conducted, <del>unless the site existed prior to 22 September 2022, in which case a 10m setback applies</del>; No new building for a sensitive activity may be erected within 20m of an existing shelter belt.</p> <p>[...]</p>	Reject
Rooney Group Limited	249.88	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Standards	GRUZ-S4 Setbacks for Sensitive Activities	The submitter believes the standard should exclude rural water tanks as these are a building by definition and are predominately located on boundaries adjoining fence lines.	Amend <b>GRUZ-S4</b> to exclude water tanks.	Reject
Rooney Farms Limited	250.88	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Standards	GRUZ-S4 Setbacks for Sensitive Activities	The submitter believes the standard should exclude rural water tanks as these are a building by definition and are predominately located on boundaries adjoining fence lines.	Amend <b>GRUZ-S4</b> to exclude water tanks.	Reject
Rooney Earthmoving Limited	251.88	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Standards	GRUZ-S4 Setbacks for Sensitive Activities	The submitter believes the standard should exclude rural water tanks as these are a building by definition and are predominately located on boundaries adjoining fence lines.	Amend <b>GRUZ-S4</b> to exclude water tanks.	Reject
Timaru Developments Limited	252.88	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Standards	GRUZ-S4 Setbacks for Sensitive Activities	The submitter believes the standard should exclude rural water tanks as these are a building by definition and are predominately located on boundaries adjoining fence lines.	Amend <b>GRUZ-S4</b> to exclude water tanks.	Reject
NZ Frost Fans Limited	255.27	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Standards	GRUZ-S4 Setbacks for sensitive activities	The standard is generally supported as appropriate. However, the standard does not give effect to the NPS-HPL insofar as priority is not given to land based primary production land uses on highly productive	<p>1. Amend the objectives, policies and methods of the PDP and / or included to give effect to the NPS-HPL.</p> <p>AND</p>	Reject

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
					land by not appropriately managing reverse sensitivity effects on land based primary production activities on highly productive land.	<p>2. Amend <b>GRUZ-S4 Setbacks for sensitive activities</b> as follows:</p> <p><b>General Rural Zone</b></p> <p><i>1. No new sensitive activity may be established within 500m from:</i></p> <p><i>[...]</i></p> <p><i>3. No new building for a sensitive activity may be erected within 20m of an existing shelter belt.</i></p> <p><u><i>4. No new building for a sensitive activity may be established within 300m of an existing or consented frost fan.</i></u></p>	
Pye Group Ltd, Dialan Dairy Ltd, Grantlea Dairy Ltd, South Park Farm Ltd, South Stream Dairy Ltd	35.7	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Standards	GRUZ-S5 Intensive primary production activities and new farm effluent disposal areas	Considers intensive primary production and effluent disposal areas already require land use consent from ECan. This includes the requirement to consult with iwi and ongoing monitoring from ECan.	Delete <b>GRUZ-S5</b> .	Reject
Dairy Holdings Limited	89.22	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Standards	GRUZ-S5 Intensive primary production activities and new farm effluent disposal areas	Considers the standard is inappropriate and the matters it seeks to control are more appropriately managed by the regional council.	Delete <b>GRUZ-S5 Intensive primary production activities and new farm effluent disposal areas</b> .	Reject
Silver Fern Farms	172.128	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Standards	GRUZ-S5 Intensive primary production activities and new farm effluent disposal areas	Considers this standard is appropriately targeted to address the potential effects of new farm effluent disposal areas.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Alliance Group Limited	173.126	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Standards	GRUZ-S5 Intensive primary production activities and new farm effluent disposal areas	Considers the standard is appropriately targeted to address the potential effects of new farm effluent disposal areas.	Retain as notified.	Accept
NZ Pork	247.33	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Standards	GRUZ-S5 Intensive primary production activities and new farm effluent disposal areas	Supports proposed standards for managing intensive primary production activities.	Retain as notified.	Accept

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	131.43	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Standards	New	<p>A new standard is requested in the GRUZ - General Residential Zone chapter requiring the provision of firefighting water supply for activities (such as the construction of a new residential dwelling) not subject to subdivision. This amendment will give effect to the new policy sought by Fire and Emergency (GRUZ-P10) and is consistent with the approach taken in SUB-S5.</p> <p>[see submission on GRUZ rules for applicable rules]</p>	<p>Add new standard <b>GRUZ-S7 Servicing</b> as follows:</p> <p><u>1. All new developments that will require a water supply must be connected to a public reticulated water supply, where one is available.</u></p> <p><u>2. Where the new development will not be connected to a public reticulated water supply, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory water supply can be provided to each lot.</u></p> <p><u>Note: Further advice and information about how an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply can be provided to a development can be obtained from Fire and Emergency New Zealand and the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u></p>	Reject
Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury)	183.148	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	Standards	New	<p>Considers a limit on building coverage in the General Rural Zone is appropriate, as it is an important component of rural character.</p>	<p>Add a new standard to the <b>GRUZ chapter</b>, for buildings in the General Rural zone limiting building coverage to 10% of the net site area, with appropriate restricted discretionary assessment matters as found in other zones.</p>	Reject

## 15.3 Rural Lifestyle Zone

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
Federated Farmers	182.207	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	General	General	Supports this Chapter.	1. Retain the <b>RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone</b> Chapter as notified; OR 2. Wording with similar effect; AND 3. Any consequential amendments.	Accept in part
Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury)	183.149	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Objectives	RLZ-O2 Character and qualities of the Rural Lifestyle Zone	Supports RLZ-O2 but concerned that clause (4) from the draft Plan Objective, which related to a coordinated pattern of development and an appropriate density level with reticulated network connections, has been removed.	Reconsider having a clause in <b>RLZ-O2</b> concerning reticulated network connections and a co-ordinated pattern of development and ensure the approach to Rural Lifestyle Zoning is consistent with the NPS-HPL.	Accept
Ministry of Education	106.24	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Objectives	RLZ-O4 Compatible and complimentary activities	Acknowledges that the primary purpose of the Rural Zone is to provide for primary production. However, Considers that educational facilities should be provided for where there is potential need within rural communities.	Amend <b>RLZ-O4 Compatible and complimentary activities</b> as follows:  <i>A range of compatible and complimentary commercial, <u>education</u>, community, health and emergency activities occur in the Rural Lifestyle Zone.</i>	Reject
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	131.44	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Objectives	RLZ-O4 Compatible and complimentary activities	Supports RLZ-O4 as it includes a range of activities including emergency activities.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	131.45	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Policies	RLZ-P1 Residential activities	Support RLZ-P1 as it requires residential activities where they can comply with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	131.46	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Policies	RLZ-P5 Emergency services, health care and community facilities	Support RLZ-P5 as it allows for emergency service facilities.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Ministry of Education	106.25	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Policies	RLZ-P9 Other activities	Supports this Policy RLZ-P9 as it allows for the educational facilities to support the needs of the local communities with a minor amendment to the wording of the policy to refer to 'enable'. This aligns with the language used in the strategic directions of Plan.	Amend <b>RLZ-P9 Other Activities</b> as follows: <del>Only allow</del> <u>Enable</u> other activities where:  1. <i>there is a functional or operational need for the activity to locate within the Zone; and</i>  2. <i>the scale, intensity and nature of the activity is compatible with the character and qualities of the zone and all adverse effects are minimised; and</i>  3. <i>there is adequate infrastructure available to service the activity, including on-site servicing where reticulated services are not available; and</i>  4. <i>there is adequate water supply provided for firefighting purposes; and</i>  5. <i>the activity will not compromise the efficiency and safety of the roading network.</i>	Reject

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
Transpower New Zealand Limited	159.97	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Policies	RLZ-P9 Other activities	The submitter outlines the technical needs of the National Grid and that the adverse effects of the National Grid cannot always be minimised. Considers that given the national significance of the National Grid, and in order to give effect to the NPSET, the PDP should acknowledge these characteristics of the National Grid by ensuring that there is a policy 'pathway' (as opposed to a policy that may have the effect of preventing the National Grid) for the operation, maintenance, upgrade and development of the National Grid in all zones.	Amend <b>RLZ-P9 Other activities</b> as follows: <i>Only allow rural industries and other activities (not listed in the rules) in the General Rural Zone where:</i> <i>1. there is a functional or operational need for the activity to locate within the Zone; <del>and-or</del>"</i> <i>2. the scale, intensity and nature of the activity is compatible with the character and qualities of the zone and all adverse effects are minimised; and</i> <i>3. there is adequate infrastructure available to service the activity, including on-site servicing where reticulated services are not available; and</i> <i>4. there is adequate water supply provided for firefighting purposes; and</i> <i>5. the activity will not compromise the efficiency and safety of the roading network</i>	Reject
Joanne Hanifin	3.3	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Rules	General	Considers that the change of zoning from Rural 2 to Rural Lifestyle Zone, the implications of which, have not been explained by Council.	Request a phone call from Council to explain the new <b>Rural Lifestyle Zone</b> .	Reject
Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury)	183.150	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Rules	General	Within the GRUZ Chapter, many activities built form standards are only referenced in some rules. It is important to ensure that the standards apply to all activities regardless of consent status, as these form an important part of rural character and the permitted baseline.	Amend the activity rules of <b>RLZ</b> to ensure that the built form standards apply to all activities, regardless of activity status.	Reject
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	131.47	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Rules	RLZ-R1 Residential activities (not listed in this chapter)	Supports in part RLZ-R1 as RLZ-S9 requires all residential and visitor accommodation to be provided with firefighting water supply.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Lifestyle Builds Ltd	7.2	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Rules	RLZ-R2 Residential units and minor residential units	Considers the 80m <sup>2</sup> limitation for Minor Residential Unit should exclude garages and verandahs so that the habitable part of the building is only measured. In rural areas in particular people often need a large storage shed as well as minor dwellings. Waimakariri DC have a good approach.  [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Amend <b>RLZ-R2.PER-3</b> for minor residential building along the following lines (similar to Waimakariri DC):  <i>Gross habitable floor area (measure outside of cladding) 80m<sup>2</sup>, <u>excludes terrace, sundecks, garages, verandahs.</u></i>	Reject
Milward Finlay Lobb	60.46	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Rules	RLZ-R2 Residential units and minor residential units	Considers RLZ-R2.PER-2 does not makes allowance for subdivision consents that were approved by Council prior to the proposed District Plan being notified.	Amend <b>RLZ-R2 Residential units and minor residential units</b> as follows:  <b>Activity status: Permitted</b>  <b>Where:</b>  <b>PER-1</b>	Accept in part

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
						<p><i>There is a maximum of one residential unit per site and one minor residential unit per site; and</i></p> <p><b>PER-2</b></p> <p><i>There is a minimum site area of 5,000m<sup>2</sup>, unless the site <del>existed before 22 September 2022</del> is subject a subdivision consent approved by Council before the date the Timaru District Plan becomes fully operative; and</i></p> <p><b>PER-3</b></p> <p><i>The minor unit has a maximum gross floor area of 80m<sup>2</sup>; and</i></p> <p>[...]</p>	
Bruce Speirs	66.42	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Rules	RLZ-R2 Residential units and minor residential units	Considers this rule redundant as it is within council's power to preclude allotments of less than 5,000 m <sup>2</sup> after the date specified. It also appears to be a factually incorrect statement of the intent of the rule.	<p>Amend <b>RLZ-R2 Residential units and minor residential units</b>, as follows:</p> <p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b></p> <p><i>There is a maximum of one residential unit per site and one minor residential unit per site; and</i></p> <p><b>PER-2</b></p> <p><del><i>There is a minimum site area of 5,000m<sup>2</sup>, unless the site existed before 22 September 2022; and</i></del></p> <p><b>PER-3</b></p> <p>[...]</p>	Reject
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	131.48	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Rules	RLZ-R2 Residential units and minor residential units	Supports in part RLZ-R2 as RLZ-S9 requires all residential and visitor accommodation to be provided with firefighting water supply.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	131.49	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Rules	RLZ-R3 Primary production (not otherwise listed in this chapter)	Supports in part RLZ-R3 as RLZ-S9 requires all residential and visitor accommodation to be provided with firefighting water supply.	Retain as notified.	Accept

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
Bruce Speirs	66.43	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Rules	RLZ-R5 Keeping of poultry for domestic self-subsistence home use	Assumes the intent that eggs are also for self-subsistence purposes so has suggested wording to reflect this.	<p>Amend <b>RLZ-R5 Keeping of poultry for domestic self-subsistence home use</b> as follows:</p> <p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b></p> <p><i>The poultry are for the subsistence of the people residing on the site and they or there eggs are not sold to anyone not residing on the site; and</i></p> <p><b>PER-2</b></p> <p>[...]</p>	Accept
Ministry of Education	106.26	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Rules	RLZ-R7 Educational facilities	<p>Considers that educational facilities should be provided in this zone as they are considered essential social infrastructure. As such the submitter considers the rule is too restrictive in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• building type;</li> <li>• type of education services;</li> <li>• limitation to existing residential units</li> <li>• limiting maximum number of children</li> <li>• Discretionary status where compliance is not achieved.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer original submission or full reason]</p>	<p>Amend <b>RLZ-R7 Rural Lifestyle Zone</b> as follows:</p> <p><b>Educational facilities</b></p> <p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where</b></p> <p><b>PER-1</b></p> <p><i>The activity is undertaken within an existing residential unit and is ancillary to the use of that residential unit; and The activity complies with RLZ-S1 - RLZ-S10</i></p> <p><b>PER-2</b></p> <p><i>The education facility is for a childcare service or home school; and</i></p> <p><b>PER-3</b></p> <p><i>The maximum number of children attending at any one time is six, excluding any children who live in the residential unit.</i></p> <p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved: <del>Discretionary</del></b></p> <p><b><u>Restricted discretionary</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. Adverse effects on the rural amenity values of adjoining rural properties and the surrounding area are avoided or mitigated; and</i></li> <li><i>2. The character and quality of the surrounding area is not compromised; and</i></li> <li><i>3. They contribute to the health and wellbeing of people in the surrounding area; and</i></li> <li><i>4. The scale, form and design of any building means the amenity values of the surrounding area are maintained; and</i></li> </ol>	Reject

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
						<p>5. <u>Road safety and efficiency is maintained; and</u></p> <p>6. <u>The activity has an operational or functional need to locate in the Rural Lifestyle Zone.</u></p>	
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	131.50	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Rules	RLZ-R7 Educational facilities	Supports in part RLZ-R7 as RLZ-S9 requires all residential and visitor accommodation to be provided with firefighting water supply.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	131.51	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Rules	RLZ-R8 Supported residential care activity	Supports in part RLZ-R8 as RLZ-S9 requires all residential and visitor accommodation to be provided with firefighting water supply.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	131.52	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Rules	RLZ-R9 Visitor accommodation and residential visitor accommodation	Supports in part RLZ-R9 as RLZ-S9 requires all residential and visitor accommodation to be provided with firefighting water supply.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	143.152	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Rules	RLZ-R12 Rural produce retail	Seeks to control rural produce retail on State Highway's in speed environments with a speed limit greater than 50km/h. Rural retail activities can result in additional vehicle movements and vehicle manoeuvring in locations that may not be suitable for these to occur. It is considered that the speed limit for permitted rural retail activities be amended from 80km/h to 50km/h to ensure that the safe and efficient function of the state highway is maintained	<p>Amend <b>RLZ-R12</b> as follows:</p> <p><b><i>RLZ-R12 Rural produce retail</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Activity status: Permitted</i></b></p> <p>[...]</p> <p><b><i>PER-4</i></b></p> <p><i>Access to the retail area is not from a state highway with a speed limit greater than <del>80km/h</del> 50km/h; and</i></p> <p><b><i>PER-5</i></b></p> <p><i>All the Standards of the zone are complied with.</i></p> <p><i>Note: Any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with RLZ-R14.</i></p>	Reject
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	131.53	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Rules	RLZ-R14 Buildings and structures (not provided in RLZ-R15 or RLZ-R16)	Supports in part RLZ-R14 as RLZ-S9 requires all residential and visitor accommodation to be provided with firefighting water supply.	Retain as notified.	Accept

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
Federated Farmers	182.208	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Rules	RLZ-R16 Artificial crop protection structures	Supports GRUZ-R16 but urge council to be careful with permitting restricted discretionary activity such as shading on roads. This is covered in regulation already and does not need a double up.	1. Retain as notified; OR 2. Wording with similar effect; AND 3. Any consequential amendments.	Accept
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	131.54	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Rules	RLZ-R17 Emergency services, health care and community facilities	The submitter considers that emergency service facilities should be a permitted activity subject to standards.  New fire stations in the district may be necessary to continue to achieve emergency response times. It is noted that Fire and Emergency is not a requiring authority. A permitted activity rule is therefore the best way to facilitate new fire stations.	Amend <b>RLZ-R17 Emergency services, health care [...]</b> by changing the activity status for emergency services facilities in from Restricted Discretionary to Permitted.	Reject
Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu	185.109	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Rules	RLZ-R17 Emergency services, health care and community facilities	Considers that within the Rural zones, the matters listed in the Restricted Discretionary Activities do not seem to have any ability to consider the values of these overlays, particularly SASM rules unless the activity also requires consent under the SASM rules. Considers cultural values needs to be a matter of discretion in these zones.	Amend <b>RLZ-R17 Emergency services, health care and community facilities</b> as follows:  <b>Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</b> <b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b>  1. [...]  <u>10. the potential of any adverse effects on the spiritual and cultural values and beliefs of Kāti Huirapa, including measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects.</u>	Reject
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	131.55	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Standards	RLZ-S1 Height of buildings and structures	Supports RLZ-S1 to the extent that it provides a maximum height of 8m for any building. However, fire stations are typically single storied buildings of approximately 8-9m in height and if located within 50m of a general residential area could restrict the location of future fire stations therefore emergency service facilities should be exempt from this rule.	Amend <b>RLZ-S1</b> as follows:  <b>RLZ-S1 Height of buildings and structures</b>  <b>1. Rural Lifestyle Zone</b> <i>The height of buildings and structures must not exceed 8m, except for buildings and structures located within 50m of a General Residential Zone, which must not exceed 4.5m in height.</i>  <b>Note:</b> Height shall be measure from the existing ground level prior to any works commencing. <b>Note:</b> <u>Emergency service facilities are exempt from this standard.</u>  [...]	Accept in part
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	131.56	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Standards	RLZ-S2 Height in relation to boundary	Considers that an exemption for towers and poles is required to enable crucial operations such as hose drying, communications and training.	Amend <b>RLZ-S2</b> as follows:  <b>RLZ-S2 Height in relation to boundary</b>  <i>Buildings and structures must be contained within a building envelope defined by recession planes from points 2.5m above ground level at the boundaries of the site. The method for determining recession planes and any permitted projection is described in APP8 - Recession Planes.</i>  <u>Note: Towers and poles associated with emergency service facilities up to 15m in height are exempt from this rule.</u>	Accept in part

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
Milward Finlay Lobb	60.47	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Standards	RLZ-S3 Building coverage	Considers the rule as notified conflicts with TDC land use consent 102.2021.54.1 for the Brookfield Road specific control area, with permitted building coverage being in excess of 10% of the site area.	<p>1. Amend the <b>RLZ-S3</b> so the 10% site coverage as notified doesn't apply to Brookfield road specific control area;</p> <p>AND</p> <p>2. Add a new subclause under <b>RLZ-S3 Building coverage</b> as follows:</p> <p><b><u>Brookfield Road specific control area</u></b></p> <p><b><u>The footprint of all buildings on the site shall not exceed 12.5% of the net site area.</u></b></p>	Reject
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	131.57	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Standards	RLZ-S4 Boundary setbacks for buildings and structures	Support the setback from all site boundaries in this zone.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Bruce Speirs	66.44	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Standards	RLZ-S5 Boundary treatment styles	Considers a post and netting fence will be more appropriate in many situations.	<p>Amend <b>RLZ-S5 Boundary treatment styles</b> as follows:</p> <p><i>Boundary treatments must be limited to:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>post and rail fences; or</i></li> <li><i>post and wire fences <u>and post and netting fences</u>; or</i></li> <li><i>hedges, and</i></li> </ol>	Accept
Milward Finlay Lobb	60.48	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Standards	RLZ-S8 Trees	Considers the rule conflicts with subdivision consent 101.2016.506 and the associated TDC Engineering approval. Seeks that the tree provisions for the Brookfield Road specific control area are retained from the current Rural Residential (Brookfield Road) zone, being Part D, General Rule 1.11.7.4.15.	<p>1. Amend <b>RLZ-S8 Trees</b> so the requirements as notified doesn't apply to Brookfield Road Specific Control Area;</p> <p>AND</p> <p>2. Add a new subclause under <b>RLZ-S8 Trees</b> as follows:</p> <p><b><u>Brookfield Road specific control area</u></b></p> <p><i>Within each site there shall be:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i><u>a minimum of 4 trees capable of attaining a minimum height of 8m at maturity; and</u></i></li> <li><i><u>these trees shall be planted no closer than 10 metres apart; and</u></i></li> <li><i><u>these trees shall be located within the permitted building areas; and</u></i></li> </ol>	Reject

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
						<i>d. <u>except for rear lots, at least 2 of the required 4 trees shall be planted in the road setback.</u></i>	
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	131.58	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Standards	RLZ-S9 Water supply	Support this standard however seek to amend the standard to include all activities that require water supply not just residential and visitor accommodation.	Amend <b>RLZ-S9</b> as follows:  <b><i>RLZ-S9 Water supply</i></b>  <i>All <del>residential and visitor accommodation</del> activities on a site <del>must be</del> that are connected to a reticulated drinking water supply and must comply with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice.</i>	Reject
Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury)	183.151	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Standards	RLZ-S9 Water supply	Supports the need for a safe water supply and sufficient water for firefighting.	Retain <b>RLZ-S9</b> as notified or preserve original intent.	Accept
John McKenzie	10.2	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Standards	General	RLZ-S1 (Height of buildings and structures) unfairly penalizes owners of sites that are effectively in the urban precinct of the Geraldine Community. RLZ-S3 (Building coverage) and RLZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks for buildings and structures) are unrealistic restrictions on small lots. RLZ-S5 (Boundary treatment styles), RLZ-S6 (Colour reflectance), and RLZ-S8 (Trees) impinge on property ownership rights within the urban precinct of the Geraldine Township and are an unnecessary restriction without benefit to the natural rural landscape.  [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	If the preferred relief of rezoning 2, 4, 6, 12 Shaw Street and 6 & 6A Hislop Street as General Residential Zone is not accepted, then these properties and those others under 2001 sqm. should be exempt from standards RLZ-S1 (Height of buildings and structures), RLZ-S3 (Building coverage), RLZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks for buildings and structures), RLZ-S5 (Boundary treatment styles), RLZ-S6 (Colour reflectance), and RLZ-S8 (Trees).	Reject
Agnes Baekelandt	87.2	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Standards	General	The small allotments in the RLZ on Shaw and Hislop Streets are small scale and unable to achieve yard setbacks set out in Schedule 16 and the RLZ of the PDP. They are below the minimum site area of 5000 sq metres for new Lots referred to in RLZ-R2. These lots have been granted subdivision consent by Council with the intent of them being developed as residential properties. No rural residential properties.  [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	If the preferred relief of rezoning 2, 4, 6, 12 Shaw Street and 6 & 6A Hislop Street as General Residential Zone is not accepted, then amend the standards of the RLZ to exclude Lots existing at the time of public notification of the Proposed District Plan which are less than 2001 square metres in area.	Reject
Joseph John McKenzie and Catherine Bo Choung	103.2	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Standards	RLZ-S1 Height of buildings and structures	Oppose RLZ-S1 as it relates to 2, 4, 6, 12 Shaw Street and 6 & 6A Hislop Street. The standard when applied to these small Lots are overly restrictive and un-necessary within the urban precinct of Geraldine.  [Refer original submission for full reason].	If the rezone request as it relates to 2, 4, 6, 12 Shaw Street and 6 & 6A Hislop Street isn't accepted, amend the standard to exclude Lots existing at the time of public notification of the Proposed District Plan which are less than 2001 square metres in area by providing an exemption for small lots from all of those RLZ standards which are impractical when applied to small lots.	Reject

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
Malpati Regenvanu	180.3	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Standards	RLZ-S1 Height of buildings and structures	Oppose RLZ-S1 as it relates to 2, 4, 6, 12 Shaw Street and 6 & 6A Hislop Street. The standard when applied to these small Lots are overly restrictive and un-necessary within the urban precinct of Geraldine.  [Refer original submission for full reason].	If the rezone request as it relates to 2, 4, 6, 12 Shaw Street and 6 & 6A Hislop Street isn't accepted, amend the standard to exclude Lots existing at the time of public notification of the Proposed District Plan which are less than 2001 square metres in area by providing an exemption for small lots from all of those RLZ standards which are impractical when applied to small lots.	Reject
David Walter & Charlotte Marie Hussey	218.3	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Standards	RLZ-S1 Height of buildings and structures	Oppose RLZ-S1 as it relates to 2, 4, 6, 12 Shaw Street and 6 & 6A Hislop Street. The standard when applied to these small Lots are overly restrictive and un-necessary within the urban precinct of Geraldine.  [Refer original submission for full reason].	If the rezone request as it relates to 2, 4, 6, 12 Shaw Street and 6 & 6A Hislop Street isn't accepted, amend the standard to exclude Lots existing at the time of public notification of the Proposed District Plan which are less than 2001 square metres in area by providing an exemption for small lots from all of those RLZ standards which are impractical when applied to small lots.	Reject
Joseph John McKenzie and Catherine Bo Choung	103.3	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Standards	RLZ-S3 Building coverage	Oppose RLZ-S3 as it relates to 2, 4, 6, 12 Shaw Street and 6 & 6A Hislop Street. The standard when applied to these small Lots are overly restrictive and un-necessary within the urban precinct of Geraldine.  [Refer original submission for full reason]	If the rezone request as it relates to 2, 4, 6, 12 Shaw Street and 6 & 6A Hislop Street isn't accepted, amend the standard to exclude Lots existing at the time of public notification of the Proposed District Plan which are less than 2001 square metres in area by providing an exemption for small lots from all of those RLZ standards which are impractical when applied to small lots.	Reject
Malpati Regenvanu	180.4	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Standards	RLZ-S3 Building coverage	Oppose RLZ-S3 as it relates to 2, 4, 6, 12 Shaw Street and 6 & 6A Hislop Street. The standard when applied to these small Lots are overly restrictive and un-necessary within the urban precinct of Geraldine.  [Refer original submission for full reason]	If the rezone request as it relates to 2, 4, 6, 12 Shaw Street and 6 & 6A Hislop Street isn't accepted, amend the standard to exclude Lots existing at the time of public notification of the Proposed District Plan which are less than 2001 square metres in area by providing an exemption for small lots from all of those RLZ standards which are impractical when applied to small lots.	Reject
David Walter & Charlotte Marie Hussey	218.4	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Standards	RLZ-S3 Building coverage	Oppose RLZ-S3 as it relates to 2, 4, 6, 12 Shaw Street and 6 & 6A Hislop Street. The standard when applied to these small Lots are overly restrictive and un-necessary within the urban precinct of Geraldine.  [Refer original submission for full reason]	If the rezone request as it relates to 2, 4, 6, 12 Shaw Street and 6 & 6A Hislop Street isn't accepted, amend the standard to exclude Lots existing at the time of public notification of the Proposed District Plan which are less than 2001 square metres in area by providing an exemption for small lots from all of those RLZ standards which are impractical when applied to small lots.	Reject
Joseph John McKenzie and Catherine Bo Choung	103.4	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Standards	RLZ-S4 Boundary setbacks for buildings and structures	Oppose RLZ-S4 as it relates to 2, 4, 6, 12 Shaw Street and 6 & 6A Hislop Street. The standard when applied to these small Lots are overly restrictive and un-necessary within the urban precinct of Geraldine. Building setbacks of 8 metres on these small Lots are unrealistic.  [Refer original submission for full reason]	If the rezone request as it relates to 2, 4, 6, 12 Shaw Street and 6 & 6A Hislop Street isn't accepted, amend the standard to exclude Lots existing at the time of public notification of the Proposed District Plan which are less than 2001 square metres in area by providing an exemption for small lots from all of those RLZ standards which are impractical when applied to small lots.	Reject
Malpati Regenvanu	180.5	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Standards	RLZ-S4 Boundary setbacks for buildings and structures	Oppose RLZ-S4 as it relates to 2, 4, 6, 12 Shaw Street and 6 & 6A Hislop Street. The standard when applied to these small Lots are overly restrictive and un-necessary within the urban precinct of Geraldine. Building setbacks of 8 metres on these small Lots are unrealistic.  [Refer original submission for full reason]	If the rezone request as it relates to 2, 4, 6, 12 Shaw Street and 6 & 6A Hislop Street isn't accepted, amend the standard to exclude Lots existing at the time of public notification of the Proposed District Plan which are less than 2001 square metres in area by providing an exemption for small lots from all of those RLZ standards which are impractical when applied to small lots.	Reject

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
David Walter & Charlotte Marie Hussey	218.5	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Standards	RLZ-S4 Boundary setbacks for buildings and structures	Oppose RLZ-S4 as it relates to 2, 4, 6, 12 Shaw Street and 6 & 6A Hislop Street. The standard when applied to these small Lots are overly restrictive and un-necessary within the urban precinct of Geraldine. Building setbacks of 8 metres on these small Lots are unrealistic.  [Refer original submission for full reason]	If the rezone request as it relates to 2, 4, 6, 12 Shaw Street and 6 & 6A Hislop Street isn't accepted, amend the standard to exclude Lots existing at the time of public notification of the Proposed District Plan which are less than 2001 square metres in area by providing an exemption for small lots from all of those RLZ standards which are impractical when applied to small lots.	Reject
Joseph John McKenzie and Catherine Bo Choung	103.5	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Standards	RLZ-S5 Boundary treatment styles	Oppose RLZ-S5 as it relates to 2, 4, 6, 12 Shaw Street and 6 & 6A Hislop Street as the standard impinge on property ownership rights with the urban precinct of the Geraldine Township. The properties are small in nature with subdivision consent granted by Council with the intent of them being developed as residential properties, not rural residential properties. The standard is therefore an un-necessarily restriction without providing a benefit to the natural rural landscape of the Geraldine Downs. Such controls are inconsistent with other properties in the Geraldine Township.  [Refer to original submission for full reason].	If the rezone request in relation to 2, 4, 6, 12 Shaw Street and 6 & 6A Hislop Street isn't accepted, amend the standard to exclude Lots existing at the time of public notification of the Proposed District Plan which are less than 2001 square metres in area by providing an exemption for small lots from all of those RLZ standards which are impractical when applied to small lots.	Reject
Malpati Regenvanu	180.6	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Standards	RLZ-S5 Boundary treatment styles	Oppose RLZ-S5 as it relates to 2, 4, 6, 12 Shaw Street and 6 & 6A Hislop Street as the standard impinge on property ownership rights with the urban precinct of the Geraldine Township. The properties are small in nature with subdivision consent granted by Council with the intent of them being developed as residential properties, not rural residential properties. The standard is therefore an un-necessarily restriction without providing a benefit to the natural rural landscape of the Geraldine Downs. Such controls are inconsistent with other properties in the Geraldine Township.  [Refer to original submission for full reason].	If the rezone request in relation to 2, 4, 6, 12 Shaw Street and 6 & 6A Hislop Street isn't accepted, amend the standard to exclude Lots existing at the time of public notification of the Proposed District Plan which are less than 2001 square metres in area by providing an exemption for small lots from all of those RLZ standards which are impractical when applied to small lots.	Reject
David Walter & Charlotte Marie Hussey	218.6	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Standards	RLZ-S5 Boundary treatment styles	Oppose RLZ-S5 as it relates to 2, 4, 6, 12 Shaw Street and 6 & 6A Hislop Street as the standard impinge on property ownership rights with the urban precinct of the Geraldine Township. The properties are small in nature with subdivision consent granted by Council with the intent of them being developed as residential properties, not rural residential properties. The standard is therefore an un-necessarily restriction without providing a benefit to the natural rural landscape of the Geraldine Downs. Such controls are inconsistent with other properties in the Geraldine Township.  [Refer to original submission for full reason].	If the rezone request in relation to 2, 4, 6, 12 Shaw Street and 6 & 6A Hislop Street isn't accepted, amend the standard to exclude Lots existing at the time of public notification of the Proposed District Plan which are less than 2001 square metres in area by providing an exemption for small lots from all of those RLZ standards which are impractical when applied to small lots.	Reject

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
Joseph John McKenzie and Catherine Bo Choung	103.6	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Standards	RLZ-S6 Colour reflectance	Oppose RLZ-S6 as it relates to 2, 4, 6, 12 Shaw Street and 6 & 6A Hislop Street as the standard impinge on property ownership rights with the urban precinct of the Geraldine Township. The properties are small in nature with subdivision consent granted by Council with the intent of them being developed as residential properties, not rural residential properties. The standard is therefore unnecessary restriction without providing a benefit to the natural rural landscape of the Geraldine Downs. Such controls are inconsistent with other properties in the Geraldine Township.  [Refer to original submission for full reason].	If the rezone request in relation to 2, 4, 6, 12 Shaw Street and 6 & 6A Hislop Street isn't accepted, amend the standard to exclude Lots existing at the time of public notification of the Proposed District Plan which are less than 2001 square metres in area by providing an exemption for small lots from all of those RLZ standards which are impractical when applied to small lots.	Reject
Malpati Regenvanu	180.7	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Standards	RLZ-S6 Colour reflectance	Oppose RLZ-S6 as it relates to 2, 4, 6, 12 Shaw Street and 6 & 6A Hislop Street as the standard impinge on property ownership rights with the urban precinct of the Geraldine Township. The properties are small in nature with subdivision consent granted by Council with the intent of them being developed as residential properties, not rural residential properties. The standard is therefore unnecessary restriction without providing a benefit to the natural rural landscape of the Geraldine Downs. Such controls are inconsistent with other properties in the Geraldine Township.  [Refer to original submission for full reason].	If the rezone request in relation to 2, 4, 6, 12 Shaw Street and 6 & 6A Hislop Street isn't accepted, amend the standard to exclude Lots existing at the time of public notification of the Proposed District Plan which are less than 2001 square metres in area by providing an exemption for small lots from all of those RLZ standards which are impractical when applied to small lots.	Reject
David Walter & Charlotte Marie Hussey	218.7	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Standards	RLZ-S6 Colour reflectance	Oppose RLZ-S6 as it relates to 2, 4, 6, 12 Shaw Street and 6 & 6A Hislop Street as the standard impinge on property ownership rights with the urban precinct of the Geraldine Township. The properties are small in nature with subdivision consent granted by Council with the intent of them being developed as residential properties, not rural residential properties. The standard is therefore unnecessary restriction without providing a benefit to the natural rural landscape of the Geraldine Downs. Such controls are inconsistent with other properties in the Geraldine Township.  [Refer to original submission for full reason].	If the rezone request in relation to 2, 4, 6, 12 Shaw Street and 6 & 6A Hislop Street isn't accepted, amend the standard to exclude Lots existing at the time of public notification of the Proposed District Plan which are less than 2001 square metres in area by providing an exemption for small lots from all of those RLZ standards which are impractical when applied to small lots.	Reject
Joseph John McKenzie and Catherine Bo Choung	103.7	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Standards	RLZ-S8 Trees Rural	Oppose RLZ-S8 as it relates to 2, 4, 6, 12 Shaw Street and 6 & 6A Hislop Street as the standard impinge on property ownership rights with the urban precinct of the Geraldine Township. The properties are small in nature with subdivision consent granted by Council with the intent of them being developed as residential properties, not rural residential properties. The standard is therefore unnecessary restriction without providing a benefit to the	If the rezone request in relation to 2, 4, 6, 12 Shaw Street and 6 & 6A Hislop Street isn't accepted, amend the standard to exclude Lots existing at the time of public notification of the Proposed District Plan which are less than 2001 square metres in area by providing an exemption for small lots from all of those RLZ standards which are impractical when applied to small lots.	Reject

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
					natural rural landscape of the Geraldine Downs. Such controls are inconsistent with other properties in the Geraldine Township.  [Refer to original submission for full reason].		
Malpati Regenvanu	180.8	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Standards	RLZ-S8 Trees Rural	Oppose RLZ-S8 as it relates to 2, 4, 6, 12 Shaw Street and 6 & 6A Hislop Street as the standard impinge on property ownership rights with the urban precinct of the Geraldine Township. The properties are small in nature with subdivision consent granted by Council with the intent of them being developed as residential properties, not rural residential properties. The standard is therefore unnecessary restriction without providing a benefit to the natural rural landscape of the Geraldine Downs. Such controls are inconsistent with other properties in the Geraldine Township.  [Refer to original submission for full reason].	If the rezone request in relation to 2, 4, 6, 12 Shaw Street and 6 & 6A Hislop Street isn't accepted, amend the standard to exclude Lots existing at the time of public notification of the Proposed District Plan which are less than 2001 square metres in area by providing an exemption for small lots from all of those RLZ standards which are impractical when applied to small lots.	Reject
David Walter & Charlotte Marie Hussey	218.8	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone	Standards	RLZ-S8 Trees Rural	Oppose RLZ-S8 as it relates to 2, 4, 6, 12 Shaw Street and 6 & 6A Hislop Street as the standard impinge on property ownership rights with the urban precinct of the Geraldine Township. The properties are small in nature with subdivision consent granted by Council with the intent of them being developed as residential properties, not rural residential properties. The standard is therefore unnecessary restriction without providing a benefit to the natural rural landscape of the Geraldine Downs. Such controls are inconsistent with other properties in the Geraldine Township.  [Refer to original submission for full reason].	If the rezone request in relation to 2, 4, 6, 12 Shaw Street and 6 & 6A Hislop Street isn't accepted, amend the standard to exclude Lots existing at the time of public notification of the Proposed District Plan which are less than 2001 square metres in area by providing an exemption for small lots from all of those RLZ standards which are impractical when applied to small lots.	Reject
Horticulture New Zealand	245.23	Definitions	Definitions	Rural produce manufacturing	Supports a definition for Rural Produce Manufacturing.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Bruce Speirs	66.2	Planning Maps	Rural Lifestyle Zone	General	The Rural Lifestyle Zone is inconsistent with Policy 6 of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Soils.	Delete the <b>Rural Lifestyle Zone</b> from areas where highly productive soils are present.	Reject
Bernard John O'Keefe, Joy Ellen Maud O'Keefe, Alan Leslie Stout & Brian Adrian Vogel	198.1	Planning Maps	Rural Lifestyle Zone	General	The Submitters support the rezoning of 16, 26, and 36 Burdon Road, Woodbury to Rural Lifestyle Zone from Rural One Zone.  [see original submission for full reason]	Retain the RLZ of 16, 26, and 36 Burdon Road, Woodbury as notified.	Accept

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
Kenneth James Weavers	153.1	Planning Maps	Rural Lifestyle Zone	General	With reference to 1 North Town Belt, Temuka, there has been no consultation on the changes with affected landowners. Oppose any changes that the council and local Māori want to make to my land. The Council's website does not explain the changes. Questions what changes are proposed at what cost to the land owner. Specifically regarding Rural Lifestyle Zoning not Rural.	Answers are sought about which changes are proposed and at which cost to the landowner with the land at 1 North Town Belt being changed from Rural Zone to Rural Lifestyle Zone.	Accept

#### 15.4 Settlement Zone

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
Federated Farmers	182.209	SETZ - Settlement Zone	General	General	Supports this Chapter.	1. Retain the <b>SETZ - Settlement Zone</b> Chapter as notified; OR 2. Wording with similar effect; AND 3. Any consequential amendments.	Accept in part
Robert Whitham	121.2	SETZ - Settlement Zone	General	General	Considers there is an absence of a specific analysis and subsequent reporting on development constraints on Peel Forest Settlement Zone.	Decline the plan change	Reject
Amy Alison	126.2	SETZ - Settlement Zone	General	General	Considers there is an absence of a specific analysis and subsequent reporting on development constraints on Peel Forest Settlement Zone.	Decline the plan change.	Reject
Nicolas John Twaddle	127.2	SETZ - Settlement Zone	General	General	Considers there is an absence of a specific analysis and subsequent reporting on development constraints on Peel Forest Settlement Zone.	Decline the plan change.	Reject
Ministry of Education	106.27	SETZ - Settlement Zone	Objectives	SETZ-O1 Purpose of the Settlement Zone	Acknowledges that the primary purpose of the Settlement Zone is to provide for low density residential use within rural areas, however, considers that educational facilities should be provided for where there is potential need within rural communities.	Amend <b>SETZ-O1 Purpose of the Settlement Zone</b> as follows: <i>Small settlements are used predominantly for a cluster of residential, <u>education</u>, commercial, light industrial and/or community activities that are located in rural areas.</i>	Reject
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	131.59	SETZ - Settlement Zone	Objectives	SETZ-O1 Purpose of the Settlement Zone	Supports SETZ-O1, to the extent that the objective provides for commercial, light industrial and/or community activities. Fire stations in rural zones are generally of limited scale and support the function and wellbeing of rural communities, providing for the health, safety and wellbeing of people.	Retain as notified.	Accept

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
Ministry of Education	106.28	SETZ - Settlement Zone	Objectives	SETZ-O2 Character and qualities of the Settlement Zone	Acknowledges that the primary purpose of the Settlement Zone is to provide for low density residential use within rural areas. However, Considers that educational facilities should be provided for where there is potential need within rural communities.	Amend <b>SETZ-O2 Character and qualities of the Settlement Zone</b> as follows:  <i>The character and qualities of the Settlement Zone comprise:</i>  <i>1. small, low density rural settlements that have a mixture of activities including residential, <u>education</u>, commercial, community, light industrial and home business; and</i>  <i>[...]</i>	Reject
Silver Fern Farms	172.129	SETZ - Settlement Zone	Objectives	SETZ-O2 Character and qualities of the Settlement Zone	Considers restricting development in the Settlement Zone to “low density rural settlements” is appropriate, given the interface of the zone with the working rural environment and at Pareora, meat processing facility, as well as servicing constraints and the strategic directions towards settlement patterns for the district set out in the UFD provisions.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury)	183.153	SETZ - Settlement Zone	Objectives	SETZ-O3 Servicing in the Settlement Zone	Support clause (1) which relates to the provision of servicing in such a way that access to safe drinking water supplies is maintained.	Retain <b>SETZ-O3</b> as notified or preserve original intent.	Accept
Silver Fern Farms	172.130	SETZ - Settlement Zone	Policies	SETZ-P1 Range of activities	Considers the policy direction to ensure that activities are compatible with the unique purpose, character and qualities of the Settlement Zone, is appropriate.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Ministry of Education	106.29	SETZ - Settlement Zone	Policies	SETZ-P3 Combatale non-residential activities	Acknowledges that the primary purpose of the Settlement Zone is to provide for low density residential use within rural areas and considers that educational facilities should be provided for where there is potential need within rural communities and seek explicitly inclusion of this within the policy. Drafting error to be corrected.	Amend <b>SETZ-P3</b> as follows:  <b><del>SETZ-P3 Combatale</del> <u>Compatible non-residential activities</u></b>  <i>Provides for:</i>  <i>1. industrial activities within existing buildings; and</i>  <i>2. cafes, community facilities, <u>educational facilities</u>, and emergency; and</i>  <i>3. ensure they are designed and located to minimise adverse effects on existing activities and the character and qualities of the settlement.</i>	Accept
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	131.60	SETZ - Settlement Zone	Policies	SETZ-P3 Combatale non-residential activities	Supports SETZ-P3, to the extent that it provides for non-residential activities and specifically emergency facilities. Fire stations in rural zones are generally of limited scale and support the function and wellbeing of rural communities, providing for the health, safety and wellbeing of people.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Transpower New Zealand Limited	159.98	SETZ - Settlement Zone	Policies	SETZ-P4 Other activities	The submitter outlines the technical needs of the National Grid and that the adverse effects of the National Grid cannot always be minimised. Considers that given the national significance of the National Grid, and order to give effect to the NPSET, PDP should acknowledge these characteristics of the National Grid by ensuring that there is a policy ‘pathway’ (as opposed to a policy that may have	Amend Policy <b>SETZ-P4 Other activities</b> as follows:  <i>Only allow other activities where:</i>  <i>[...]</i>  <i><u>x. there is a functional or operational need for the activity to locate within the Zone; or</u></i>	Reject

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
					the effect of preventing the National Grid) for the operation, maintenance, upgrade and development of the National Grid in all zones.	[...]	
Silver Fern Farms	172.131	SETZ - Settlement Zone	Policies	SETZ-P4 Other activities	Considers it is appropriate to restrict the further development and use of land in the SETZ to activities that are compatible with the zone and can manage adverse effects on the surroundings.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury)	183.152	SETZ - Settlement Zone	Rules	General	Within the SETZ Chapter, many activities built form standards are only referenced in some rules. It is important to ensure that the standards apply to all activities regardless of consent status, as these form an important part of character for the zones and the permitted baseline.	Amend the activity rules of <b>SETZ</b> to ensure that the built form standards apply to all activities, regardless of activity status.	Reject
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	131.61	SETZ - Settlement Zone	Rules	SETZ-R1 Residential activity and Residential Unit	Supports in part SETZ-R1 subject to the amendment of SETZ-S5 that requires these activities to provide firefighting water.	Amend <b>SETZ-R1</b> to include firefighting water subject to the amendment of SETZ-S5.	Accept
Silver Fern Farms	172.132	SETZ - Settlement Zone	Rules	SETZ-R1 Residential activity and Residential Unit	Considers it is appropriate to require a discretionary resource consent for multi-dwelling development in the SETZ.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Ministry of Education	106.30	SETZ - Settlement Zone	Rules	SETZ-R3 Education facility	<p>Considers that educational facilities should be provided in this zone as they are considered essential social infrastructure. As such the submitter considers the rule is too restrictive in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• building type;</li> <li>• type of education services;</li> <li>• operation hours</li> <li>• limitation to existing residential units</li> <li>• limiting maximum number of children</li> <li>• Discretionary status where compliance is not achieved.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer original submission or full reason]</p>	<p>Amend <b>SETZ-R3 Education facility</b> as follows:</p> <p><b>Activity status: Permitted</b></p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p><del><b>PER-1</b></del></p> <p><del>The activity is undertaken within and is ancillary to a residential unit; and</del></p> <p><del><b>PER-2</b></del></p> <p><del>The educational facility is for a childcare service or home schooling; and</del></p> <p><del><b>PER-3</b></del></p> <p><del>The maximum number of children attending at any one time is six, excluding any children who live there; and</del></p> <p><del><b>PER-4 PER-1</b></del></p> <p>All the Standards of this chapter are complied with.</p> <p><b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1, <del>PER-2</del> or <del>PER-3</del>: Controlled Restricted discretionary</b></p> <p><del><b>Where:</b></del></p> <p><del><b>CON-1</b></del></p> <p><del>the activity complies with <del>PER-4</del>.</del></p> <p><b>Matters of control are restricted to:</b></p>	Reject

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
						<del>1. the location and design of buildings and any proposed car parking and loading areas and access; and</del> <del>2. hours of operation; and</del> <del>3. noise, disturbance and loss of privacy of neighbours; and</del> <del>4. screening and landscaping; and</del> <del>5. waste treatment and disposal.</del> <b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER 4: Restricted Discretionary</b> <b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b> <del>1. the matters of discretion of any infringed standard.</del> <b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with CON 1: Restricted Discretionary</b> <b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b> 1. the matters of discretion of any infringed standard; and 2. the location and design of buildings and any proposed car parking and loading areas and access; and 3. hours of operation; and 4. noise, disturbance and loss of privacy of neighbours; and 5. screening and landscaping; and 6. waste treatment and disposal.	
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	131.62	SETZ - Settlement Zone	Rules	SETZ-R3 Education facility	Supports in part SETZ- R3 subject to the amendment of SETZ-S5 that requires these activities to provide firefighting water.	Amend <b>SETZ-R3</b> to include firefighting water subject to the amendment of SETZ-S5.	Reject
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	131.63	SETZ - Settlement Zone	Rules	SETZ-R8 Buildings and structures	Supports in part SETZ- R8, subject to the amendment of SETZ-S5 that requires these activities to provide firefighting water.	Amend <b>SETZ-R8</b> to include firefighting water subject to the amendment of SETZ-S5.	Reject
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	143.153	SETZ - Settlement Zone	Rules	SETZ-R9 Community facilities	Seeks that community facilities must demonstrate that this will not impact on the safe and efficient function of the state highway network. It is considered that the matters of control need to relate to the effects on the road network.	Amend <b>SETZ-R9</b> as follows:  <b>SETZ-R9 Community facilities Settlement Zone</b>  <b>Activity status: Controlled</b>  [...]  <b>Matters of control are restricted to:</b>	Reject

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
						<p>[...]</p> <p><u>6. the extent of adverse effects on the safe and efficient operation of the transport network.</u></p>	
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	143.154	SETZ - Settlement Zone	Rules	SETZ-R10 Cafes	Seeks that cafés must demonstrate that this will not impact on the safe and efficient function of the state highway networks. It is considered that the matters of control need to relate to the effects on the road network.	<p>Amend <b>SETZ-R10</b> as follows:</p> <p><b>SETZ-R10 Cafes Settlement Zone</b></p> <p>[...]</p> <p>Matters of control are restricted to:</p> <p>[...]</p> <p><u>6. the extent of adverse effects on the safe and efficient operation of the transport network.</u></p>	Reject
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	143.155	SETZ - Settlement Zone	Rules	SETZ-R11 Industrial activities within existing industrial buildings	Seeks those industrial activities within existing industrial buildings must demonstrate that this will not impact on the safe and efficient function of the state highway networks. It is considered that the matters of control need to relate to the effects on the road network	<p>Amend <b>SETZ-R11</b> as follows:</p> <p><b>SETZ-R11 Industrial activities within existing industrial buildings</b></p> <p>[...]</p> <p>Matters of control are restricted to:</p> <p>[...]</p> <p><u>6. the extent of adverse effects on the safe and efficient operation of the transport network.</u></p>	Reject
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	131.64	SETZ - Settlement Zone	Rules	SETZ-R12 Emergency Services Facilities	Considers that emergency service facilities should be provided for as a permitted activity. New fire stations in the district may be necessary to continue to achieve emergency response times. It is noted that Fire and Emergency is not a requiring authority. A permitted activity rule is therefore the best way to facilitate new fire stations.	Amend the activity status of <b>SETZ-R12 Emergency Services Facilities</b> from Controlled to a Permitted Activity.	Reject
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	143.156	SETZ - Settlement Zone	Rules	SETZ-R13 Industrial activities not listed in SETZ-R12	Seeks industrial activities must demonstrate that this will not impact on the safe and efficient function of the state highway networks. It is considered that the matters of discretion need to relate to the effects on the road network	<p>Amend <b>SETZ-R13</b> as follows:</p> <p><b>SETZ-R13 Industrial activities not listed in SETZ-R12</b></p> <p>[...]</p>	Reject


Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
						<p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <p>[...]</p> <p>7. the extent of adverse effects on the safe and efficient operation of the transport network</p>	
Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu	185.110	SETZ - Settlement Zone	Rules	SETZ-R13 Industrial activities not listed in SETZ-R12	Considers that within the Rural zones, the matters listed in the Restricted Discretionary Activities do not seem to have any ability to consider the values of these overlays, particularly SASM rules unless the activity also requires consent under the SASM rules. Considers cultural values needs to be a matter of discretion in these zones.	<p>Amend <b>SETZ-R13 Industrial activities not listed in SETZ-R12</b> as follows:</p> <p><b>Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</b></p> <p>[...]</p> <p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <p>1. [...]</p> <p>7. the potential of any adverse effects on the spiritual and cultural values and beliefs of Kāti Huirapa, including measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects.</p>	Reject
Silver Fern Farms	172.133	SETZ - Settlement Zone	Rules	SETZ-R14 Any activities not otherwise listed	Considers it is appropriate to require a discretionary resource consent for unanticipated activities in the SETZ.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	131.65	SETZ - Settlement Zone	Standards	SETZ-S1 Height of buildings and structures	Supports SETZ-S1 to the extent that it provides a maximum height of 10m for any building however they seek an exemption for towers and poles, for the reasons set out in submission point SETZ-S2 Height in relation to boundary below.	<p>Amend <b>SETZ-S1</b> as follows:</p> <p><b>SETZ-S1 Height of buildings and structures Buildings and structures</b></p> <p><i>Buildings and structures, including additions and alterations to buildings and structures, must not exceed a maximum height of 10m.</i></p> <p><i>Note: Height shall be measure from the existing ground level prior to any works commencing.</i></p> <p><u>Towers and poles associated with emergency service facilities up to 15m in height are exempt from this rule.</u></p>	Reject
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	131.66	SETZ - Settlement Zone	Standards	SETZ-S2 Height in relation to boundary	Considers that an exemption for towers poles is needed to enable crucial operations such as hose drying, communication and training.	<p>Amend <b>SETZ-S2</b> as follows:</p> <p><b>SETZ-S2 Height in relation to boundary</b></p> <p><i>Buildings and structures must be contained within a building envelope defined by recession planes from points 2.5m above ground level at the boundaries of the site. The method for determining recession planes and any permitted projection is described in APP8 - Recession Planes.</i></p> <p><u>Towers and poles associated with emergency service facilities up to 15m in height are exempt from this rule.</u></p>	Reject
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	131.67	SETZ - Settlement Zone	Standards	SETZ-S3 Building setbacks	Support SETZ-S3 as this will enable Fire and Emergency to still undertake operational requirements.	Retain as notified.	Accept


Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept/Reject
Milward Finlay Lobb	60.41	SETZ - Settlement Zone	Standards	SETZ-S4 Coverage	Considers a building coverage rule does not lend itself to innovative modern design, resulting in dwellings all looking very similar and typically built on the maximum site coverage limit possible.	Delete <b>SETZ-S4 Coverage</b> .	Reject
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	131.68	SETZ - Settlement Zone	Standards	SETZ-S5 Water supply	Support in part SETZ-S5 as it requires servicing in the settlement zone, but they seek an inclusion to S5 that advice and information about how an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply can be provided as per the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.	Amend <b>SETZ-S5</b> as follows: <b>SETZ-S5 Water supply</b> <i>All activities must:</i> 1. be connected to a community drinking water supply; or 2. be connected to a private drinking water supply; or 3. store 45,000 litres of potable water on-site from another source. 4. <u>If the future use of the allotment requires water supply for firefighting purposes, evidence of how onsite firefighting water supply storage will be achieved in accordance with New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u> <u>Further advice and information about how an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply can be provided to each lot can be obtained from Fire and Emergency New Zealand and the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008</u>	Reject
Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury)	183.154	SETZ - Settlement Zone	Standards	SETZ-S5 Water supply Settlement Zone	Supports SETZ-S5 as it is consistent with the CRPS in terms of maintaining safe reticulated water supplies.	Retain <b>SETZ-S5</b> as notified or preserve original intent.	Accept
Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury)	183.155	SETZ - Settlement Zone	Standards	SETZ-S6 Sewage treatment and disposal	Supports the requirement to connect to a reticulated sewerage system. Clause 1 ensures that connecting to a reticulated sewerage system is the preference, with onsite disposal occurring only where there is not an available reticulated network. However, the wording makes it unclear as to if a certificate of compliance is required if the activity is permitted under the Regional Plan.	Amend <b>SETZ-S6 Sewage treatment and disposal</b> as follows: <i>Any activity must:</i> 1. be connected to an available sewerage network where one exists; or 2. be served by an on-site treatment and sewage disposal system that has been consented or <del>approved</del> <u>permitted</u> by the Canterbury Regional Council.	Accept
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	131.69	SETZ - Settlement Zone	Standards	SETZ-S8 Outdoor storage, display and parking areas	Requests amendments so that the screening requirements of this standard will not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves or other emergency response facilities.	Amend <b>SETZ-S8</b> as follows: <b>SETZ-S8 Outdoor storage, display and parking areas</b> <i>Any outdoor storage, display and parking areas located within any road or internal boundary setback under SETZ-S3 must be permanently screened by landscape planting of a minimum width of 2m and minimum height of 2m.</i> <u>Screening shall not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves, or other emergency response facilities.</u>	Reject


## 15.5 Rezone & Mapping

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub- section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept / Reject
Aaron Carson	8.1	Planning Maps	Rezone	Planning Maps	Opposes the inclusion of Blandswood, a long established settlement, in the Open Space Zone.	1. Rezone Blandswood from Open Space Zone - Holiday Hut Precinct to Settlement Zone; and  2. Any consequential amendments to the Proposed Plan.	Reject
Rachel Smith	9.1	Planning Maps	Rezone	Planning Maps	Opposes the inclusion of Blandswood in the Natural Open Space Zone. The zoning is not appropriate for private land with existing dwellings.	1. Rezone Blandswood from Open Space Zone - Holiday Hut Precinct to Settlement Zone; and  2. Any consequential amendments to the Proposed Plan.	Reject
Mike Lamb	24.1	Planning Maps	Rezone	Planning Maps	Considers the proposed OSZ will mean resource consent is required to do anything on the submitter's section on Lookout Road at Blandswood. Considers the sloping ground makes a transportable building or caravan impossible. Considers the proposed zoning will mean the section is worthless.	1. Rezone Lookout Road (CB26A/1208, Lot 27 DP8214, VR 2464011211) at Blandswood from Open Space Zone - Holiday Hut Precinct to <b>Rural 4B</b> from the Operative District Plan.	Reject
Scott Jesen	67.1	Planning Maps	Rezone	Planning Maps	Opposes the zoning of 166 Blandswood Road as OSZ with a Hut Precinct Overlay.	1. Rezone Blandswood from Open Space Zone - Holiday Hut Precinct to <b>Settlement Zone</b> .	Reject
Ruth Melrose	69.1	Planning Maps	Rezone	Planning Maps	Opposes the zoning of Blandswood as OSZ, it would result in a vacant section not being able to be built on despite its suitability for residential development.  [See original submission for full reasons].	1. Rezone Blandswood from Open Space Zone - Holiday Hut Precinct to <b>Settlement Zone</b> ; and  2. Any consequential amendments to the Proposed Plan.	Reject
Graham John and Kathleen Veronica Collins	71.1	Planning Maps	Rezone	Planning Maps	Oppose having Blandswood in the Open Space Zone.	1. Rezone Blandswood from Open Space Zone - Holiday Hut Precinct to <b>Settlement Zone</b> ; and  2. Any consequential amendments to the Proposed Plan.	Reject
Miriam Jowett	75.1	Planning Maps	Rezone	Planning Maps	Opposes having Blandswood in the Open Space Zone.	1. Rezone Blandswood from Open Space Zone - Holiday Hut Precinct to <b>Settlement Zone</b> ; and  2. Any consequential amendments to the Proposed Plan.	Reject
Luke Challies and Elizabeth Ireland	77.1	Planning Maps	Rezone	Planning Maps	Oppose the zone change from Rural 4B to Open Space Zone - Hut Precinct within the Blandswood Area, due to detracting from the area as maintenance and development/improvement of properties will be restricted. The area is different to Rangitata or Opihi hut sites as for the most part the "huts" are within the one title, whereas blandswood properties are on single titles. Considers property owners should have greater freedom and rights to improve their properties.  [Refer original submission for full reason]	1. Rezone Blandswood from Open Space Zone - Holiday Hut Precinct to <b>Settlement Zone</b> ; and  2. Any consequential amendments to the Proposed Plan.	Reject
Catharina Treeby	93.1	Planning Maps	Rezone	Planning Maps	Oppose having Blandswood in the Open Space Zone.	1. Rezone Blandswood from Open Space Zone - Holiday Hut Precinct to <b>Settlement Zone</b> ; and	Reject

						2.Any consequential amendments to the Proposed Plan.	
Ali Bras	96.1	Planning Maps	Rezone	Planning Maps	Oppose having Blandswood included in the Open Space Zone.	1. Rezone Blandswood from Open Space Zone - Holiday Hut Precinct to <b>Settlement Zone</b> ; and  2.Any consequential amendments to the Proposed Plan.	Reject
David Stanley Woods	102.1	Planning Maps	Rezone	Planning Maps	Opposes having Blandswood included in the Open Space Zone.	1. Rezone Blandswood from Open Space Zone - Holiday Hut Precinct to <b>Settlement Zone</b> . 2.Make any consequential amendments in the Proposed District Plan.	Reject
Gordon & Jillian Ireland	110.1	Planning Maps	Rezone	Planning Maps	Oppose the inclusion of Blandswood in the Open Space Zone as considered the area is more appropriate for Settlement Zone. [Refer original submission for full reason]	1. Rezone Blandswood from Open Space Zone - Holiday Hut Precinct to <b>Settlement Zone</b> . 2.Make any consequential amendments in the Proposed District Plan.	Reject
Hamish Laird	111.1	Planning Maps	Rezone	Planning Maps	Opposes the inclusion of Blandswood in the Open Space Zone.	1. Rezone Blandswood from Open Space Zone - Holiday Hut Precinct to <b>Settlement Zone</b> . 2.Make any consequential amendments in the Proposed District Plan.	Reject
Elizabeth Jane Small and Roger Ellis Buchanan	123.1	Planning Maps	Rezone	Planning Maps	It is unreasonable to zone the Blandswood area OSZ. Subject to suitable controls it is suitable for residential development. The land was purchased on the basis that a house could be built. Rates have also been paid on that basis.	1.Rezone Blandswood from Open Space Zone - Holiday Hut Precinct to <b>Settlement Zone</b> .	Reject
David William & Siobhan Mary Collins	141.1	Planning Maps	Rezone	Planning Maps	Oppose the Open Space Zoning of Blandswood, it is different from the other areas where this zoning is proposed.	1. Rezone Blandswood from <b>OSZ</b> to <b>SETZ</b>  AND 2.Make any necessary consequential amendments.	Reject
Gregory Andrew and Vivienne Louise Wilkinson	144.1	Planning Maps	Rezone	Planning Maps	Opposes the Open Space Zone for Blandswood as this unduly restricts property owners to develop and improve their homes or holiday homes.	1.Rezone Blandswood from the Open Space Zone to the <b>Settlement Zone</b> .	Reject
David William & Siobhan Mary Collins	141.1	Planning Maps	Rezone	Planning Maps	Oppose the Open Space Zoning of Blandswood, it is different from the other areas where this zoning is proposed.	2. Rezone Blandswood from <b>OSZ</b> to <b>SETZ</b>  AND 3.Make any necessary consequential amendments.	Reject
Gregory Andrew and Vivienne Louise Wilkinson	144.1	Planning Maps	Rezone	Planning Maps	Opposes the Open Space Zone for Blandswood as this unduly restricts property owners to develop and improve their homes or holiday homes.	Rezone Blandswood from the Open Space Zone to the <b>Settlement Zone</b> .	Reject
Graham and Sharon Melrose	195.1	Planning Maps	Rezone	Planning Maps	The Submitter opposes the inclusion of Blandswood in the Open Space Zone. The reason is due to the area not being leasehold but in private ownership and is not in the same category as a cemetery or fishing hut. The submitter considers the OSZ will severely limit their options on their non-built land and request the area be zoned Settlement Zone.	<b>1.Rezone</b> Blandswood from Open Space Zone - Holiday Hut Precinct to Settlement Zone; and 2.Any consequential amendments to the Proposed Plan.	Reject
Christian Bras	154.1	Planning Maps	Rezone	Planning Maps	Oppose having Blandswood included in the Open Space Zone.	1. <b>Rezone</b> Blandswood from Open Space Zone - Holiday Hut Precinct to Settlement Zone; and	Reject

						2. Any consequential amendments.	
Peter Bras	232.1	Planning Maps	Rezone	Planning Maps	Oppose having Blandswood included in the Open Space Zone.	1. Rezone Blandswood from Open Space Zone - Holiday Hut Precinct to Settlement Zone: and Any consequential amendments in the Proposed District plan.	Reject
David George Earl and Maria Lucia Earl	13.1	Planning Maps	Rezone	Planning Maps	Consider the Rural Lifestyle Zone at Woodbury should be extended to include 42 Burdon Road, Woodbury given it is small in size (3.5ha), adjoins the Rural Lifestyle Zone and is outside of the water protection area.  [Refer original submission for full reason]	Rezone 42 Burdon Road, Woodbury, legally described as Lot 3 DP 415886 (3.5080 ha) from General Rural Zone to <b>Rural Lifestyle Zone</b> . Subject site is outlined below.  	Accept
Warren and Elizabeth Scott	128.1	General	General	General	Supports the PDP in relation to 22 Templer Street, Geraldine, Lot 1 - 6 DP 16535, Part Lot 22 DP 2717 and Part Lot 70 DP 3285, subject to the relief set out in later submission points. Consequential relief may be necessary.	Retain as notified in relation to 22 Templer Street, Geraldine, Lot 1 - 6 DP 16535, Part Lot 22 DP 2717 and Part Lot 70 DP 3285, subject to relief sought in the submission. Consequential relief may be necessary.	Accept
Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited	86.14	General	General	General	Supports the intent of the proposed District Plan which has an overall aim to manage natural and physical resources that are important in the district and to ensure that environmental qualities and values are safeguarded for future generations to enjoy. The submitter recognises that safeguarding the environment and ensuring our interactions will enable a resilient economy that can thrive. This is a priority for New Zealand, and we also recognize that farmers support this - with a large number of them, whom we are involved with, already implementing measures and planning further mitigations to reduce negative environmental impacts from their farms. The submitter's main points of concern are to ensure that the proposed District Plan does not lead to any unintended negative impacts on the area's environment, and	Support the proposed plan's recognition of the need to protect primary production and associated activities in rural zones. Primary production is central to the social, economic and cultural well-being of the Timaru District. Part B of this submission addresses the parts of the proposed District Plan that are relevant to the interests of the submitter.	Reject

					economic and social aspirations. Food production systems need to be optimised and supported by suitable regional and district policies to help establish a resilient primary sector which will form an integral part of the success of all regions in New Zealand.		
Dairy Holdings Limited	89.23	General	General	General	The submitter considers that the relief set out in this submission is the more appropriate way to achieve the purposes of the RMA. Overall, the submitter seeks that objectives, policies and rules continue to enable existing farming activities in the Timaru District; and activities associated with farming (including existing intensively farmed stock) be permitted.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That objectives, policies and rules continue to enable existing farming activities in the Timaru District; and</li> <li>2. Activities associated with farming (including existing intensively farmed stock) be permitted.</li> <li>3. That the relief as set out in Annexure B is granted.</li> </ol> <p>OR</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Alternatively, that the Panel grant any other similar relief that would deal with DHL's concerns set out in this submission.</li> </ol>	Reject
Fonterra Limited	165.1	General	Special Purpose Zone	New	<p>The submitter is concerned that the proposed General Industry Zone (GIZ) is a poor fit for their site, in particular the zone policy framework does not account for the special characteristics of the Clandeboye site. The submitter outlines the nature of their operation and how the PDP provisions are not suitable for the needs of the site or Council/Community.</p> <p>Considers that there is significant benefit to Council, the community and their operations, to provide for the Clandeboye site in a "specific" new zone, being the SPZ-SRI. It is anticipated that this new zone will have wider application than the Clandeboye site, although it is the responsibility of individual sites to pursue the zoning and demonstrate the need or benefit of the zone to their site and operations.</p> <p>[see original submission for full detail]</p>	<p>Amend the PDP to add a new <b>Strategic Rural Industry Zone</b>, including necessary changes to the Planning Maps and a new Chapter including a new Introduction, Objectives, Policies, rules and Standards as outlined in Attachment B of the original submission.</p> 	Accept in part

Fonterra Limited	165.2	Planning Maps	Rezone		<p>Submitter opposes the General Industry Zoning and General Rural Zoning on their Clandeboye site. The submitter is proposing a new Special Purpose Zone - Strategic Rural Industry Zone for Clandeboye site.</p> <p>[see original submission for full detail]</p>	<p>Amend the zoning of the land at Clandeboye on attached map, to a <b>Special Purpose Zone - Strategic Rural Industry Zone</b>;</p> <p>OR</p> <p>If the preferred relief is not accepted then:</p> <p>Extend the GIZ to include all of the land shown on attached map.</p> <p>Alternative relief may be considered by submitter through this process.</p>	Accept in part
							
Fonterra Limited	165.22	Definitions	Definitions	New	Considers the PDP should include a definition of strategic rural industry activities.	<p>Add a <b>new definition</b> to the PDP as follows:</p> <p><b><u>Strategic rural industry activities means: any activity that is associated with the processing, testing, storage, handling, packaging or distribution of products manufactured at sites in the Special Purpose Zone - Strategic Rural Industry.</u></b></p>	Reject
Federated Farmers	182.1	General	General	General	Seeks that the District Plan contains a resource management policy framework that enables primary production in rural areas to occur as existing uses where it is already established and with as few barriers where it is sought to establish new primary production activities.	<p>Amend the PDP to:</p> <p>(a) include a clear pathway for existing primary production activities to continue in the rural zones of the Timaru district; and</p> <p>(b) Any consequential amendments required as a result of the relief sought.</p>	Reject
Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury)	183.1	General	General	General	Notes that a large number of rules in the plan use variable terminology to define floor areas of buildings, often with the term undefined, so that it is not clear what is being measured. It is necessary to review all references to size of buildings and consider whether a clear definition is required linking development to either the "building footprint" or "gross floor area",	Review the entire plan so all references to the size of buildings, link to either building footprint or gross floor area which are defined terms in the National Planning Standards.	Accept

					which are defined National Planning Standard terms, and then create exclusions from those terms within the rules if necessary.		
Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury)	183.4	General	General	General	Note across the whole plan, that references to "height" of buildings or structures do not make reference to where height is measured from (for example Open Space Zones and Rural Lifestyle Zone). Ensure that height for buildings and structures is measured from "ground level", which is a national planning standard term, with consistent expression of height rules across the plan.	Review all references to the height of buildings across the plan to ensure that height is measured from ground level, with consistent expression of height rules.	Reject
Aggregate and Quarry Association	224.1	General	General	General	Considers the PDP is generally supportive of quarrying but considers this support could be clearer in places to remove any uncertainty. The submitter puts forward that aggregate is a locationally constrained resource and quarrying can only occur where suitable aggregate resource exists. It is important that the PDP does not shut off access to potential aggregate resources. The submitter states that Council planning must identify where the rock is located and protect those areas from other development and alternative land uses. Transporting aggregate is very expensive.	Requests that the areas of aggregate resources be identified by the Council, with the help of the submitter.	Reject
Waihi School Trust Board	236.1	Planning Maps	Rezone		<p>The Submitter opposes the General Rural Zoning of Waihi School and Rolleston Site (site used for recreational purposes by Waihi School) as the school will not naturally fit within the purposes of the GRUZ.</p> <p>The submitter considers the School qualifies for an additional Special Purpose Zone under the National Planning Standards given:</p> <p>the school is significant; it is impractical to manage the school in GRUZ; and spatial layers such as precinct or specific control areas are unable to provide a comprehensive management package as a zone could.</p> <p>Therefore, the submitter proposes that the sites are zoned as Special Purpose (School) Zone.</p> <p>Alternatively, if Council do not wish to create a new zone, the submitter would accept the school remain in GRUZ with specific school provisions by spatial layers such as precinct or specific control areas.</p> <p>[refer to original submission for full reasons]</p>	<p>1. Create an additional Special Purpose (School) zone and rezone 611 Temuka-Orari Highway (Waihi School) and the 'Rolleston Site' (Lot 42 Reserve 389 held in Record of Title CB20A/986) to Special Purpose (School) Zone.</p> <p>2. Alternatively, if Council do not wish to create a new Special Purpose Zone, the submitter request the school be provided for by way of precinct or specific control areas to the sites.</p>	Accept in part

Waihi School Trust Board	236.2	Special Purpose Zones	New		Submission point deleted due to duplication, refer to submission point 236.1.	Refer to submission point 136.1	Accept in part
Horticulture New Zealand	245.1	General	General	General	<p>The submitter seeks that the Council recognise the potential for reverse sensitivity effects and provide a robust framework to ensure that activities are appropriately located and reverse sensitivity is avoided.</p> <p>[refer to original submission for full reasons]</p>	Manage reverse sensitivity including through avoiding the creation of conflicts between land uses.	Reject
Horticulture New Zealand	245.2	General	General	General	<p>The submitter considers how food security and the values of highly productive land should be provided for. Land is a finite resource and urban and lifestyle development within horticultural areas results in increasing pressure on crop rotations, restricting orchard expansion, increasing land prices, and increasing social tension due to complaints from neighbours about horticultural activities. There is the potential horticultural expansion in the Timaru District including post-harvest facilities.</p> <p>[refer to original submission for full reasons]</p>	Ensure that urban development and productive land are considered together to provide a planned approach so new urban areas are designed to protect productive capacity. Especially reverse sensitivity pressures on growers.	Reject

## 16. Appendix 3 – Waihi School further information

## Comment on the application of the NPS-HPL to the Waihi School site.

### 1 Background

The Waihi School Trust Board has requested that The AgriBusiness Group (TAG) compile a report on the application of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL), on Waihi School, Lot 1 DP 46763 (the site).

The site is the subject of a submission (#236) on the Proposed Timaru District Plan (PTDP), to recognise and provide for education activities and education facilities at Waihi School. What is proposed is a spatial layer mechanism as a specific control area, and this is proposed as the 'Waihi School Specific Control Area'. It is intended that the Waihi School Specific Control Area has provisions which retain the GRUZ objectives as notified and include an additional GRUZ policy and rules which recognise and provide for education activities and education facilities in the Waihi School Specific Control Area.

This means that the submission should be assessed under Clause 3.11 of the NPS-HPL as it is an existing activity.

#### **3.11 Continuation of existing activities**

- (1) *Territorial authorities must include objectives, policies, and rules in their district plans to:*
  - (a) *enable the maintenance, operation, or upgrade of any existing activities on highly productive land; and*
  - (a) *ensure that any loss of highly productive land from those activities is minimised.*
- (2) *In this clause, **existing activity** means an activity that, at the commencement date:*
  - (a) *is a consented activity, designated activity, or an activity covered by a notice of requirement; or*
  - (a) *has an existing use of land or activity protected or allowed by section 10 or section 20A of the Act.*

Therefore, to satisfy this clause we are required to prove that the loss of highly productive land from those activities is minimised.

## 2 Description of the site.

The data which is available on Land Use Capability (LUC) classification in the New Zealand Land Resources Inventory Series (LRIS) Portal<sup>1</sup> is shown in Figure 1. We can see from Figure 1 that all of the land on the site is LUC 2.



**Figure 1: Land Use Capability (NZLRI OUREnvironment) Green is LUC 2.**

In the NPS-HPL all land designated as LUC1, 2, and 3, and zoned Rural, is automatically considered to be highly productive land.

The site which is shown in Figure 2 is approximately 8.85ha. What we can see from Figure 2 is that approximately 45% of the site is taken up with buildings, curtilage and hard covered sports facilities. The remaining approximately 55% of the site is used as grass covered sports and recreation grounds.

In reference to 3.11 (2) the school was first established on the site in 1907 through a historical mix of permitted activity (existing use rights) and more recently through resource consent.

None of the site has been used for primary industry production for over 100 years.

---

<sup>1</sup> [https://oureenvironment.scinfo.org.nz/maps-and-tools/app/Land%20Capability/Iri\\_luc\\_hpl](https://oureenvironment.scinfo.org.nz/maps-and-tools/app/Land%20Capability/Iri_luc_hpl)



Figure 2: Map of the Waihi School site (Google Maps)

### 3 Consideration of the NPS-HPL

Under Clause 3.11 of the NPS-HPL the acceptance of submission (#236) on the Proposed Timaru District Plan (PTDP), to recognise and provide for education activities and education facilities at Waihi School by adopting a spatial layer mechanism as a specific control area, the Timaru District Council can be satisfied that:

- the maintenance, operation, and upgrade of the existing Waihi School activities on the highly productive land will be provided for; and
- that any loss of highly productive land from those activities is minimised.

Therefore, the proposed submission meets the test of Clause 3.11 of the NPS-HPL.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Stuart John Ford'.

Stuart John Ford 14/06/2024

## **Productivity Assessment and comment on the impact of Clause 3.10 of the NPS-HPL on the land at 637 Temuka – Orari Highway, Winchester.**

### **1 Background**

The Waihi School Trust Board has commissioned The AgriBusiness Group (TAG) to compile a report on Agricultural Productivity and Commercial Viability, including supporting evidence related to the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL), on land located at 637 Temuka – Orari Highway, Winchester (the site).

The site is the subject of a submission (#236) on the Proposed Timaru District Plan (PTDP), to recognise and provide for education activities and education facilities at Waihi School. What is proposed is a spatial layer mechanism as a specific control area, and this is proposed as the 'Waihi School Specific Control Area'. It is intended that the Waihi School Specific Control Area has provisions which retain the GRUZ objectives as notified and include an additional GRUZ policy and rules which recognise and provide for education activities and education facilities in the Waihi School Specific Control Area.

The site, which is approximately 7.75 ha, is proposed to be held in a charitable trust and managed by Waihi School. Waihi School has plans for a multisport centre on the site and resource consent has been lodged with the Timaru District Council. The proposed setup for the multisport centre is shown in Appendix A.

### **2 Description of the site**

As can be seen from Figure 1 the site is immediately North of the Waihi School site and is to the West of State Highway 1 (SH 1), with the only access onto the site being from State Highway 1. The land uses immediately around the site are all lifestyle blocks. The land to the East and South, across SH1 are all relatively large scale arable and dairy operations. The land use to the North along Reilly Road are all medium sized lifestyle blocks while the land to the West is medium scale arable and dairy land uses. The site is effectively land locked from any reasonable scale productive rural land uses mainly because of its situation immediately adjacent to SH 1.



Figure 1: Map of Site showing neighbouring land uses

### 3 Productivity

The productivity of the site is determined by a number of factors including the nature of the soils, the climate and the scale of the operation.

The economic viability<sup>1</sup> of the site is determined by the ability of the site to return profits from the farming of the site to offer the owners a sufficient return.

#### 3.1 Soils

Figure 2 is a screenshot of the data held in the Manaaki Whenua Landcare Research's online portal of soils in New Zealand SMap<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> We use the definition for commercial viability that is used in the Cambridge dictionary which is "*the ability of a business, product, or service to compete effectively and to make a profit*".

<sup>2</sup><https://smap.landcareresearch.co.nz/maps-and-tools/app/>



**Figure 2: Soils on the site as mapped in SMap.**

Table 1 lists the soils on the site by sibling description, area and proportion.

**Table 1: Soils on the site by sibling description, area and proportion.**

Soil Sibling	Area (ha)	Proportion (%)
Eyre_3a.1	4.0	49
Eyre_1a.1	2.0	21
Templeton_1a.1	1	15
Waka_1a.1	1	15

Definitions of the key soil physical properties that are listed in the SMap<sup>3</sup> fact sheet for the soils that are present on the site are shown in Table 2.

<sup>3</sup> <https://smap.landcareresearch.co.nz/maps-and-tools/factsheets/>

**Table 2: Description of the Soils on Site**

Soil Name	Eyre	Eyre	Templeton	Wakanui
SMap Name	Eyre_3a.1	Eyre_1a.1	Templeton_ 1a.1	Waka_1a.1
Depth Class	Shallow (20-40 cm)	Shallow (20 - 45 cm)	Deep (> 1m)	Deep (> 1m)
Rooting Depth	70-100 (cm)	70 - 100 (cm)	Unlimited	Unlimited
Depth to Stony Layer	Shallow	Shallow	None	None
Texture Profile	Silt	Silt	Silt	Silt
Topsoil Stoniness	Moderately Stony	Stoneless	Stoneless	Stoneless
Draining Class	Well Drained	Well drained	Moderately well Drained	Imperfectly drained
Profile Available Water (0 to 100)	Moderate to low (88cm)	Moderate (118 mm)	Moderate to High (157 mm)	High (153 mm)

The two Eyre siblings make up 6 ha (70%) of the site. These soils are shallow loam soils which are slightly to moderately stony that are well drained and have a moderate or moderate to low Profile Available Water (PAW). The Templeton and Wakanui soils that make up 2 ha (30%) of the site are deep loams that are stoneless, moderately or imperfectly drained with a moderate to high PAW.

These Eyre soils are theoretically suitable for a limited range of pastoral land uses as dryland while the Templeton and Wakanui soils are theoretically suitable for horticulture, vegetable, arable and pastoral land uses.

### 3.2 Land Use Capability

The data which is available on Land Use Capability (LUC) in the New Zealand Land Resources Inventory Series (LRIS) Portal<sup>4</sup> is shown in Figure 3. We can see from Figure 3 that 7 ha (94%) of the land on the site is LUC 2 while the remaining 6% is unclassified land.

In the NPS-HPL all land designated as LUC1, 2, and 3, and zoned Rural, is automatically considered to be highly productive land.



**Figure 3: Land Use Capability (NZLRI OUREnvironment) Green is LUC 2.**

### 3.3 Land Use Constraints

The site has a number of significant land use constraints on the site.

#### 3.3.1 Scale

The scale of the site is a significant constraint because at only approximately 7.75 ha it lacks any of the scale which is necessary to achieve the economies of scale which are necessary to achieve commercial viability for any but the most intensive land uses.

#### 3.3.2 Exclusion of Horticulture

While the potential for intensive horticultural land use has been considered it has been rejected for the reason that the shallow soils that make up 70% of the site are not suitable for horticultural crops. The remaining 2 ha is too small to consider development of any of the intensive horticultural land uses that it is theoretically capable of.

#### 3.3.3 Irrigation is not viable

Although we are aware that the site does have a water right to extract irrigation water from Dobies Creek we have discounted the ability to irrigate the block because of the uncertainty of the reliability of this sort of surface water take which is restricted by the flows within the water source.

The site is too small to justify expenditure of at least \$25,000 to sink a well let alone the additional cost of setting up the infrastructure to apply the water. The scale and the soils on the site are very restrictive in their land use potential which would mean that sufficient advantage could not be gained from irrigating the site to run any of the arable or pastoral land uses available to pay for the additional cost of establishing the irrigation capability.

#### 3.3.4 Limitation of Arable Land Use

The light and stony soils are not suitable to grow arable crops in a dryland state. The site is not large enough to be able to farm it with a rotation of crops that is necessary so it would be necessary to farm it in conjunction with a larger arable farming operation. The large volume of traffic on SH 1 would mean that it would not be an attractive option for a farmer to bring large agricultural machinery to the site and therefore incorporate it into their own farming operation.

The site is both too small and in a location that means that it is not an attractive option to be integrated into a larger farming operation.

### 3.3.5 Pastoral Land Uses Are Restricted

It would be theoretically possible for the land to be used for pastoral grazing (sheep and beef) however there are a number of significant constraints on that land use being achieved. The constraints include:

- The costs associated with intensifying the productivity of the site e.g. providing for winter crops and providing additional supplementary feed from off site are all too expensive to be justified on a such a small scale.
- The fact it is not considered viable to establish irrigation on the site means that in most years it would lack sufficient moisture over the summer months to maintain the stocking rate and so the livestock would have to be diminished in numbers during that period.
- The scale of the site is too small to offer a prospective farmer any real advantage in farming the site.

The site is surrounded by other lifestyle blocks, and Waihi School, and because of its scale it is impractical to integrate it into a larger pastoral farming venture due to its specific location, being immediately adjacent to SH 1. It is my opinion that the site would not be an attractive option for a pastoral farmer to take up to add to other productive land because of its size and location.

The likelihood of encountering reverse sensitivity issues from neighboring properties is considerable, especially if more intensive land uses are introduced beyond the current pastoral practices typical of lifestyle blocks.

I believe that the optimal land use for this property would be lifestyle sheep and beef grazing. In my assessment, this land use is consistently about half as productive as a comparable large-scale farming operation.

## 4 Economic Viability

Considering the constraints limiting the site's potential for primary production, the highest and best land use is dryland sheep and beef grazing. In order to evaluate the site's commercial viability, I've assumed this land use across the entire 7.75 ha. In reality it would be a smaller area as there is an existing dwelling and garden area on the site.

I have used Beef and Lamb NZ's farm monitoring representative model for evaluating the financial performance of the block, specifically adopting the structure of the Class 6 Canterbury/Marlborough finishing and breeding model. This model reflects the performance of a dryland system situated in a region with 650 mm rainfall. Table 3 outlines the key financial metrics of this model. The Earnings Before Interest and Tax (EBIT) measure shows the surplus generated which is available to cover interest and taxation and provide a surplus for an owner.

**Table 3: Key Financial Metrics of Dryland Sheep and Beef Representative Model (\$/ha)**

Sheep and Beef	
Gross Farm Revenue	1,184
Farm Operating Expenses	716
Earnings Before Interest and Tax	467

If the whole 7.75 ha were available for production, the financial performance would be as shown in Table 4.

**Table 4: Financial performance of the site. (\$)**

Sheep and Beef	
Gross Farm Revenue	8,285
Farm Operating Expenses	5,014
Earnings Before Interest and Tax	3,271

Although calculating the amount that would be required to provide sufficient return is very subjective, if we were to provide a sense check by providing for a return for management of 1.5% of the Gross Revenue and Interest payments on 40 percent of the capital value of the property at 7%, the total required to cover those costs would be \$26,304 whereas the site can only return \$3,271. It's important to note that, under the given assumptions, there would be no tax obligation, as the net taxation position of the site would result in a \$18,451 loss.

It is my opinion that pastoral land use that could potentially establish on the 7.75 ha site is unable to provide sufficient income to provide for interest, taxation and a return for management as a stand-alone unit therefore it cannot be considered to be commercially viable.

Therefore, I conclude that the site is unable to be considered as commercially viable both now and in 30 years' time.

In coming to this conclusion, I have considered that the permanent or long-term constraints on economic viability cannot be addressed through any reasonably practicable options that would retain the productive capacity of the highly productive land, by evaluating options such as:

- (a) The alternate forms of land-based primary production are severely constrained by the scale of the site, the soils, location and access constraints which are on the site.
- (b) The economic viability test has been carried out by using the most advanced land-management strategy that is available on the site.
- (c) Alternative production strategies have been rejected because of the severe constraints on the site that limit the ability to adopt them.
- (d) Water efficiency or storage methods are not appropriate to this site because the very small scale would preclude the ability to return the costs of the investment in that technology.
- (e) Reallocation or transfer of water and nutrient allocations is not a viable factor on this Site.
- (f) Boundary adjustments, including amalgamations, are not possible because the Site is virtually land locked from other economically viable HPL land.

- (g) The scale of the site and the difficulty of access preclude the block being leased to another larger farming operation.

## 5 Consideration of the NPS-HPL

We were asked to comment on relevant matters in the NPS-HPL given the productivity and viability findings in this report.

Clause 3.10 in the NPS-HPL Exemption for highly productive land subject to permanent or long-term constraints states that:

- (1) Territorial authorities may only allow highly productive land to be subdivided, used, or developed for activities not otherwise enabled under clauses 3.7, 3.8, or 3.9 if satisfied that:
  - (a) there are permanent or long-term constraints on the land that mean the use of the highly productive land for land-based primary production is not able to be economically viable for at least 30 years; and
  - (b) the subdivision, use, or development:
    - (i) avoids any significant loss (either individually or cumulatively) of productive capacity of highly productive land in the district; and
    - (ii) avoids the fragmentation of large and geographically cohesive areas of highly productive land; and
    - (iii) avoids if possible, or otherwise mitigates, any potential reverse sensitivity effects on surrounding land-based primary production from the subdivision, use, or development; and
  - (c) the environmental, social, cultural and economic benefits of the subdivision, use, or development outweigh the long-term environmental, social, cultural and economic costs associated with the loss of highly productive land for land-based primary production, taking into account both tangible and intangible values.
- (2) In order to satisfy a territorial authority as required by subclause (1)(a), an applicant must demonstrate that the permanent or long-term constraints on economic viability cannot be addressed through any reasonably practicable options that would retain the productive capacity of the highly productive land, by evaluating options such as (without limitation):
  - (a) alternate forms of land-based primary production:
  - (b) improved land-management strategies:
  - (c) alternative production strategies:
  - (d) water efficiency or storage methods:
  - (e) reallocation or transfer of water and nutrient allocations:
  - (f) boundary adjustments (including amalgamations):
  - (g) lease arrangements.

In providing this report I have taken account of the Guide to Implementation dated March 2023 and I have adopted the three tests which the proposal must meet which are set out in the report for the evaluation of land which has permanent or long-term constraints for which exemptions apply and I have analysed each of the tests set out in Section 3.10 of the NPS-HPL.

For the first test which is that there are permanent or long-term constraints on the land that mean the use of the highly productive land for land-based primary production is not able to be economically viable for at least 30 years I have evaluated the two steps. The first step is that there is a permanent or long-term constraint on the land that will be present for at least 30 years. Having listed and analysed those factors I have then assessed the second step which is that the constraint means that land-based primary production cannot be economically viable for at least 30 years.

The second test is to assess whether the granting of this consent would compromise the ability of other HPL land in the district to be used for land based primary production.

The third test is whether the benefits of the proposed development outweigh the costs of the loss of highly productive land taking into account both tangible and intangible values.

I have relied on the information provided to me by Waihi School in the preparation of this report.

This report follows the format which has been accepted in other evaluations.

In my professional role I have undertaken work relating to the NPS-HPL and particularly the applicable criteria to exempt land from compliance with the NPS-HPL for both the applicants and as a professional peer reviewer for Councils.

Regarding 1(a), I conclude that utilizing the High-Productivity Land (HPL) for primary production on this site would not be economically viable for a minimum of 30 years. In reaching this conclusion, we have considered the following practical options:

- The model used to assess the commercial viability of the block is the highest and best possible land use option because of the constraints of the lack of size, dryland nature of the light shallow soils and the distance from compatible farm operations
- The model used reflects the average performance of the representative model.

Concerning (b) (i), we are of the opinion that the loss of 7.75 ha of HPL is not significant in the Canterbury region which contains 140,492 hectares of HPL land.

In relation to 1(b) (ii), I am of the opinion that the proposal avoids fragmenting large and geographically cohesive areas of HPL. The scale of the area to be lost, comprising 7.75 ha, is not significant in the context of the surrounding HPL land and will not contribute to additional fragmentation.

In relation to 1(b) (iii), we believe the proposal mitigates potential reverse sensitivity effects on surrounding land-based primary production. This is because much of the surrounding land comprises rural lifestyle blocks which are unlikely to be the source of concerns relating to reverse sensitivity effects.

In relation to 1(c) our assessment of the costs and benefits of the proposal are shown in Table 5.

**Table 5: Costs and Benefits Proposal**

Category	Costs of the loss of HPL	Benefits of the proposal
<b>Environmental</b>		
Carbon sequestration		Insignificant change
Support Habitat	Enhanced	
Water filtration		Insignificant change
Flood mitigation		Insignificant change
Nutrient		Insignificant change
Climate regulation		Insignificant change
Air and water quality	Insignificant change	
Biodiversity conservation	Enhanced	
<b>Social/ Cultural</b>		
Sense of belonging and place		Greatly enhanced
Social fabric		Insignificant change
Food security	Insignificant change	
Spiritual value	Insignificant change	
<b>Economic</b>		
Income		Considerably Higher
Employment		Enhanced
Flow on impacts to a wider community		Enhanced

The net environmental benefits of the proposed land use are positive due to the enhanced planting which will improve both the provision of habitat and biodiversity on the site.

Social impacts of the proposed land use will remain substantially unchanged from the current land use and are likely to be positive. The proposed land use is unlikely to impact food security due to the size and limited output that the site would be capable of producing.

The economic impact is positive because, as previously explained, the site's highest and best use for primary production is not commercially viable. Effectively transitioning to another land use will bring positive benefits. The land use will likely enhance employment in the area albeit on a relatively small scale. This will likely have some positive flow on socio-economic benefits to the wider community through additional money being spent in the community. There will also be recreational and educational benefits and enhanced health and wellbeing for the Waihi School community, and the wider community.

This leads to the conclusion that the proposed land use as a multisport venue would result in economic, social and environmental benefits that outweigh the costs associated with the loss of HPL land.

## 6 Conclusion

I conclude that the proposed use as a multisport venue meets all of the limbs in the clause 3.10 test and therefore Timaru District Council should be satisfied that this HPL can be used for activities not otherwise enabled under clauses 3.7, 3.8, or 3.9 of the NPS-HPL.



Stuart John Ford 14/06/2024

## Appendix A: Design of proposed multisport venue.



**baxter**  
design

0 5 10 20m

SCALE = 1:1000 AT A3

REFERENCE: 2495-SK11 - SCALE = 1:1000 AT A3 - 11 OCT 2021

CONCEPT - NOT A WORKING DRAWING - NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

**J & W ROLLESTON**  
SPORTS FACILITY CONCEPT MASTERPLAN